

**THE REFORMED THEOLOGY OF
BENJAMIN KEACH (1640-1704)**

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Faculty of Theology
University of Oxford

Jonathan W. Arnold
Michaelmas Term 2009

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A note of thanks seems too trite to express accurately my debt of gratitude to my supervisor, Prof. John Briggs, whose interest in me as a person and as a scholar was only matched by his keen insight, his profound understanding, and his constructive criticism. In addition, the staff of the Angus Library, Regent's Park College, also deserves far more than a mere thanks. From the beginning of my time at Oxford, Sue Mills, Andrew Hudson, Julian Lock, and Sheila Wood went out of their way to assist me in my research. But my deepest gratitude in this respect must be reserved for Emma Walsh, with whom it was my honor and privilege to explore the vast holdings of the Angus, to brainstorm and dream about the future of those holdings, and to see those dreams begin to be fulfilled. Under her leadership, the Angus has a bright future, and I look forward to working with her in the future. I also wish to thank the staffs of the Bodleian Library, Surrey History Centre, the London Metropolitan Archives, the Dr. Williams's Library, and the British Library. Larry Kreitzer, who accompanied me on numerous trips to archives and acquainted me with the various repositories, deserves my thanks as both a colleague and friend. Also, my mentor and friend, Bob Pyne, deserves thanks for encouraging me and challenging me.

The long days spent at my desk in the Angus would have been far less endurable without my fellow students who often gave me plenty of reason to procrastinate and to think outside of my box. Especially significant were the sometimes intense, always hilarious conversations with Matthew Tennant and Clark Elliston. I'm sure I wasted far too much of their time, but I would not have wanted to waste any less. Clint Bass's scholarly interest in the seventeenth-century Baptists made him a helpful colleague, but our common interests, shared perspectives (theological and otherwise), and similar experiences made him a close friend with whom I am excited to continue working.

My families made the entire experience in Oxford even better than it inherently was. The Thompson-Rash family encouraged me beyond my expectations and have always been enthusiastic supporters despite my studies taking their family an ocean away from them. The family at Headington Baptist Church took us in and included us as their own. They made Oxford the place that we will always consider 'home', and there is no greater compliment than that. Several Oxonians deserve special mention: Uncle Scott and Aunt Tina who we are honored to have as second parents to our children, the Edwards-Grundys, the Sparkes, the Johnsons, the Bands, not to mention the university students and numerous others who would take too long to name. My parents, Wes and Debbie Arnold, who have always been supportive, encouraging, and interested deserve far more than this note of thanks. The never-ending packages, skype calls, and visits made living across the Pond easier.

Finally, I thank my immediate family. My boys—the two youngest, Benjamin and Lukas, are Oxonians by birth and the eldest, Nathaniel, is an adoptive Oxonian—have 'shared' me with my studies for their entire lives. They have each 'read' more historical theology before they could speak than most people will read in their lives. I pray that they will be blessed by that heritage. But, even more fervently, I pray that I will always be a better father than I am a scholar. And, in the place of ultimate honor she deserves, I thank my wife, my love. It is my honor and joy to chase our dreams together. Thank you for your never-ending support, your patience with my neuroses (especially when I immediately see the worst possible scenarios), your respect and pride, and your companionship. I am blessed beyond belief by having you as my wife, and I hope that I am as wonderful a spouse to you as you are to me. I am glad you have given me the opportunity to try. In sum, I thank you for loving me and letting me love you!

THE REFORMED THEOLOGY OF BENJAMIN KEACH (1640-1704)

Abstract

Benjamin Keach, the most prolific Particular Baptist theologian of the seventeenth century, described himself as a defender of 'Reformed Orthodoxy'. Despite this self-identification, modern scholarship has largely relegated Keach to a self-educated dissenting pastor whose major achievement could be found in his controversial support of hymn singing. Two recent dissertations have attempted to revise this view of Keach, but no scholarly work has yet attempted to wrestle holistically with Keach's view of himself as a Reformed theologian. This work fills that void by reviewing Keach's own understanding of the term 'Reformed Orthodoxy', reconstructing Keach's connections both in the personal contacts available in dissenting London and Buckinghamshire and in the books at his disposal, examining the major aspects of his theology, and placing that theology within the spectrum of Reformed Orthodoxy.

From the time of his entry onto the public theological stage, Keach quickly became identified with those with whom he networked intellectually. From his branding as a Fifth Monarchist to his identification first as a General Baptist and later as the most prominent Particular Baptist, those connections proved to be the most idiosyncratic characteristic of Keach's theological pilgrimage. Those connections crossed the conventional lines of systematic theology and boundaries of religious sects, resulting in Keach's theology crossing those same lines yet remaining Reformed in its major assertions.

Following the organizational structure of Keach's catechisms and confessions, this work proceeds by expounding and interrogating Keach's major theological positions—his understanding of the Trinity including this doctrine's foundational role in ecclesiology, the significance of the covenants, justification, and eschatology. Throughout this exposition, Keach's theological lenses, shaped by his contacts and his independent, creative thought, become clear. Ultimately, Keach proves himself to be a capable Reformed theologian, able and willing to dialogue with the most influential theologians, yet consistently forging his own ground within Reformed Orthodoxy as a whole and more specifically Particular Baptist theology.

THE REFORMED THEOLOGY OF BENJAMIN KEACH (1640-1704)

Abstract

Benjamin Keach, the most prolific Particular Baptist theologian of the seventeenth century, described himself as a defender of 'Reformed Orthodoxy'. Despite this self-identification, modern scholarship has largely relegated Keach to the status of a self-educated dissenting pastor whose theology could be summarized simply as biblical and whose defining accomplishment lay in his controversial defense of hymn-singing. Two recent dissertations have attempted to correct this view of Keach by dealing with Keach as a constructive theologian; however, no scholarly work has yet attempted to wrestle holistically with Keach's view of himself as a Reformed theologian. This work seeks to fill that void. Since the description of a seventeenth-century theologian as 'biblical' does little to distinguish him from most of his contemporaries, this work moves beyond that superficial description to a more in-depth examination of Keach's thought, answering the question 'What did it mean for Keach to be biblical?' Additionally, the fact that Keach saw himself first and foremost as a Reformed theologian begs the question 'What did Keach understand as Reformed?' Neither of these questions have been adequately answered by modern scholarship. In order to answer these questions adequately, the spheres of influence which helped mold Keach's theology are here reconstructed, providing insight into Keach's biblical exegesis and Reformed speculative theology, thereby showing him to be *the* significant theological personality of the Particular Baptists in the late seventeenth century. As such, Keach's theological influence can be seen to be articulated in the official Particular Baptist theology which emerged in the *Second London Confession*. Several significant points of disparity (e.g., a move away from the common 'sufficient for all but efficient for some' explication of the atonement, a distinction between actual and virtual justification, and explicit millenarianism) also appear, demonstrating Keach's continuing independent thought, though his methodology remains consistent with that of the Puritan roots of British Reformed Orthodoxy, including ample biblical exegesis and almost incessant citations of 'authoritative sources'.

The introductory chapter provides a modern context for this study. Beginning with a broad overview of the current state of scholarship on Reformation and Post-Reformation theology, this chapter establishes both the foundations and the need for this particular study. Specifically, this chapter traces the recent developments in scholarship which have re-characterized Post-Reformation theology as the creative and speculative product resulting from the combination of multiple streams of thought rather than the previously-held view of Post-Reformation theology as mere attempts at rigid reproductions of the systems of major Reformation theologians. Using this foundation, this chapter demonstrates the now-antiquated nature of the few studies of Keach's theology and the need for a new study which places Keach in the now-prevalent multiple-streams understanding of Post-Reformation theology.

Focusing on Keach's theological development from his earliest days as a young General Baptist preacher in Buckinghamshire and his move to Southwark in 1668, the first chapter provides the biographical framework by which Keach's theological viewpoints are expounded. While not a formal biography, this section utilizes archival sources to identify the personal connections Keach developed throughout his ministerial career—connections which helped define Keach's particular theological stances. This chapter also reconstructs the theological library which Keach referenced throughout his voluminous publishing career. Thus, the identification of those 'authoritative sources' (e.g., Isaac Chauncy, Martin Luther via John Troughton, John Owen) is one of the major contributions of this chapter.

With Keach's personal connections serving as the foundation, the argument moves to an analysis of his theological work beginning, in chapter two, with his catechisms and confessions which effectively and succinctly summarize his views. This chapter places Keach in the context of seventeenth-century catechists—a rather unique position for a dissenting theologian—and demonstrates Keach's characteristic independence. From his first controversial publication, a children's catechism which was condemned as heretical by Judge Hyde and burned by the public executioner, Keach refused to simply follow other more-established theologians. Even after he had attached himself to the Reformed tradition (that is, by 1672), Keach never simply reflected the thought of others, continuing to publish his own catechisms and to compose his own confessional statement to be used both by his own congregation and

by others as far afield as the Philadelphia Association in the North American colonies. Keach's catechisms provide the organizing structure for the remainder of the analysis of Keach's theology, moving from Trinitarianism to covenant theology to justification and ending with eschatology.

The third chapter, on Keach's doctrine of the Godhead, examines Keach's understanding of the doctrine of the Trinity, a particularly important concept considering the on-going discussions surrounding this doctrine among the General Baptists of his day. Keach retained numerous connections with his General Baptist contemporaries but understood the dangers of any movement away from what he considered to be orthodox Trinitarianism. Keach carefully tied each of his theological discussions to all three Persons of the Trinity, consistently emphasizing the role of the Holy Spirit in situations where others only focused on the Father and/or the Son. Keach can, thus, be correctly labeled a Trinitarian theologian. In addition to the requisite discussions of the three Persons of the Trinity and Keach's understanding of the relationship between those Persons, this chapter also includes a discussion of Keach's ecclesiology and sacramental theology because he saw both as directly related to the Trinity and specifically to the role of the Holy Spirit. This discussion provides insight into Keach's understanding of the visible and the invisible church, including his willingness to expand the boundaries of the visible church beyond the limits of his own sect. Despite his generous view of members of the church—which Keach saw as including those who disagreed on the doctrines of sacramentalism, ecclesiology, eschatology, and even some aspects of justification—this work shows the recent categorizing of Keach as a catholic theologian as an overstatement.

The fourth chapter focuses on Keach's understanding of Federal Theology and his view of the covenants. Keach attributes his shift from the Arminian teaching of the General Baptists to the Reformed theology of the Particular Baptists to a new understanding of the covenants. Relying largely on the work of his Independent contemporary, Isaac Chauncy (who follows Herman Witsius), Keach delineates two over-arching covenants: the prelapsarian Covenant of Works and the Covenant of Grace. Each of these covenants involved the First Person of the Trinity and the representative of humanity as the primary agents. In the Covenant of Works, Adam served as the representative of all humanity, with his sin condemning all his progeny.

In the Covenant of Grace, significantly synonymous with the Covenant of Redemption in Keach's view, Christ served as the representative of elect humanity, with his active obedience fulfilling the requirements of the law for the elect and his passive obedience satisfying the wrath and justice of God against all the sins of the elect. This federal understanding of the covenants places Keach in a small segment of Reformed Theology, separating him even from his most frequent authority, John Owen, thanks to Owen seeing the Covenants of Grace and Redemption as two separate covenants. This over-arching aspect of Keach's theology provides the initial major point of contention between Keach and the influential Presbyterian leader, Richard Baxter. That contention extended across the majority of Keach's career, with Baxter's followers picking up his mantle after Baxter died in 1691. True to form, Keach also made it a point to highlight the roles of each of the three Persons of the Trinity in his covenant theology. This chapter gives due consideration to that aspect of Keach's federal exposition.

In the fifth chapter, the exposition of Keach's understanding of the doctrine of justification builds upon the federal system outlined in the previous chapter. Keach's understanding of justification arises from two separate controversies which Keach joined: the Quaker controversy largely debated between the Particular Baptist, Thomas Hicks, and the Quakers, George Whitehead, William Penn, and Isaac Penington; and the Antinomian/Neonomianism Controversy largely debated between Isaac Chauncy, on the one side, and Richard Baxter, Daniel Williams, and Samuel Clark, on the other. Keach did not start either of these controversies, and, from an external perspective, actually played a fairly minor role. However, these controversies provided the opportunity for Keach to establish himself as *the* spokesman for the Particular Baptists and a capable polemicist. These controversies also provided the opportunities for Keach to define his own view of justification which included the definition of justification as a declaration of righteousness based on an alien righteousness, the imputed active and passive obedience of Christ, the distinguishing between justification and sanctification, and the role of faith in justification. In this process, Keach displays his adherence to the justification theology of John Owen—both strongly anti-Quaker and anti-Baxterian—while he distances himself from the charges of antinomianism levied by his opponents. Keach's understanding of justification harmonizes with the major Reformed confessional statements—the

Westminster Standards, the *Savoy Declaration*, and the *Second London Confession*—but retains his own independence and uniquenesses in some significant aspects (e.g., his explication of the doctrine of limited atonement, more emphasis on the role of the Holy Spirit, and the development of the distinction between actual and virtual justification).

The sixth chapter explores Keach's eschatological views and places them in the historical context of the re-birth of millennialism in the seventeenth century. In his discussion of the end times, Keach demonstrates the results of his self-education by displaying an impressive ability to interact with all of the major eschatological writers, including Johan Alsted, Thomas Brightman, Joseph Mede, Pierre Jurieu, and Thomas Goodwin, as well as several less well-known writers such as the Particular Baptist, Hanserd Knollys, and an anonymous French minister. In this exposition, Keach significantly refuses to rely on any other theologian's calculation of biblical dates, choosing instead to re-work the prophetic eschatological timeline completely independently. The resulting eschatology aligns closely—though not exactly—with that espoused by Thomas Goodwin. Specifically, Keach holds to a future thousand-year millennium with a personal reign of Christ, sees England as having a pivotal role in the end-times events, and believes these events to be imminent with the millennium beginning by AD 1730.

The concluding chapter views the theology of Keach as a whole and locates the entirety of his thought within the spectrum of Reformed Orthodoxy in general and more specifically Particular Baptist theology. In the end, Keach's theology falls largely within the bounds of Reformed Orthodoxy but includes several points of distinction from the major Reformed theologians. This concluding chapter also highlights Keach's role as a theologian in his own right—though specifically not a systematic theologian—and argues that his constant willingness to remain paradoxically independent from *and* reliant upon those he saw as theological authorities proved to be the basis for his highly influential theological expositions. Ultimately, the Reformed theology espoused by Keach and examined in this work became the lasting theological formulation of Particular Baptist theology for generations to come both in the British Isles and in the North American colonies, making his theology 'mainstream' in some sense. However, within his own time,

Keach's theology pushed the boundaries of radicalism on numerous fronts, making his independent thought *the* defining aspect of his theology.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xi
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. KEACH'S SOCIAL NETWORKS, AUTHORITIES, AND INFLUENCES	12
Early Social Networks	
London Networks	
Close Personal Contacts	
Publishing Networks	
Book Access	
Literary Connections	
Conclusion	
III. CATECHISMS AND CONFESSIONS	48
History of Catechetical Literature	
Continental Catechisms	
England	
Benjamin Keach's Catechisms	
Keach's Works	
Keach's Purposes	
Keach's Uniquenesses	
Confessions	
Benjamin Keach's Confessional Works	
The Content of Keach's Confessions	
The Usage of Keach's Confessions	
Keach's Influence and Legacy	
IV. THE GODHEAD	84
The Doctrine of the Godhead	
The Rise of Trinitarian Concerns in England	
The Establishment and the Trinity	
From Mainstream to Baptists	
Benjamin Keach's Doctrine of the Godhead	
Trinitarian Theology	
Benjamin Keach's Trinitarian Theology Proper	
The Order and Oeconomy of the Blessed Trinity	
Conclusion	
V. FEDERAL THEOLOGY	128
Introduction to Covenant Theology	
Defining the Terms	
Theological Development: From the Continent to England	
Benjamin Keach's Covenant Theology	
Identifying the Covenants	
Development of the Covenants	
Comparison of the Two Covenants	
Implications	

VI. JUSTIFICATION	171
Significance of the Doctrine	
The Context	
Keach's Evangelical and Theological Conversions	
The Impetus for Keach's Exposition	
The Content of Keach's Doctrine of Justification	
Definition of Justification	
Model of the Atonement	
Ordo Salutis	
Role of Faith	
Antinomian?	
VII. MILLENARIAN ESCHATOLOGY	215
Eschatology in the Late Sixteenth and Early Seventeenth Centuries	
Chiliasm	
Literal Hermeneutic	
Common Eschatological Themes	
Radicalism	
Benjamin Keach's Eschatology	
Chiliasm	
Prophetic Themes	
Chronology	
Eschatological Hope	
Radicalism?	
Conclusion	
VIII. KEACH AND REFORMED ORTHODOXY	261
BIBLIOGRAPHY	268

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

- 1644 London Confession *The confession of faith, of those churches which are commonly (though falsly) called Anabaptists. London: s.n., 1644.*
- 1646 London Confession *A confession of faith of seven congregations or churches of Christ in London, which are commonly (but uniustly) called Anabaptists. London: printed by Math. Simmons, and are to be sold by John Hancock in Popes-head Alley, 1646.*
- Articles of Henry VIII *Articles devised by the kynges highnes maiestie, to stablyshe Christen quietnes and vnitie amonge us, and to auoyde contentious opinio[n]s, which articles be also approued by the consent and determination of the hole clergie of this realme. London, 1536.*
- Augsburg Confession *Melanchthon, Philipp. The confessyon of the fayth of the Germaynes exhibited to the moste victorious Emperour Charles the. V. In the councill or assemple holden at Augusta the yere of our lorde. 1530. To which is added the apologie of Melanchthon who defendeth with reasons inuincible the aforesayde confesyon translated by Rycharde Tauerner at the commaundeme[n]t of his master Thomas Cromwel chefe secretarie to the kynges grace. [London]: in fletestrete, by me Robert Redman, dwellynge at the sygne of the George nexte to saynt Dunstones Church, 1536.*
- Baptist Catechism *The baptist catechism: Or, a brief instruction in the principles of Christian religion. Sixteenth, Corrected edn. London: printed for, and sold by Joseph Marshall, at the Bible in Newgate-Street, 1764?*
- BDBR *Greaves, Richard L., and Robert Zaller, eds. Biographical Dictionary of British Radicals in the Seventeenth Century. 3 vols. Brighton, Sussex: Harvester Press, 1982.*
- CSPD *Various editors, Calendar of State Papers Domestic Series. Reigns of Charles II, James II, and Interregnum.*

Geneva Bible	<i>The bible and holy scriptures, tr. According to the ebrue and greke by w. Whittingham and others.</i> Geneua: R. Hall, 1560.
Heidelberg Catechism	Olevian, Caspar, and Zacharias Ursinus. <i>A catechisme or briefe instruction in the principles and grounds of the true Christian religion with a short treatise premised concerning the profity and necessitie of catechizing.</i> London: printed by Edvvard Griffin for Henry Fetherstone, 1617.
Horsleydown Register	<i>A perfect and compleat regester of marriages, natiuities, and burials belonging to the congregation that meeteth at Horsly:Downe; over whom Benjamin Keach is overseer.</i> National Archives, Kew. PRO RG4/4188.
Narrative of the proceedings [1689-92]	<i>A narrative of the proceedings of the general assembly of diuers pastors, messengers and ministering brethren of the baptized churches, met together in London..., from diuers parts of England and Wales: Owning the doctrine of personal election, and final perseverance.</i> London: s.n., 1689-92.
ODNB	<i>Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.</i> Online edn. Oxford University Press, 2004.
OED	<i>Oxford English Dictionary.</i> Online edn. Oxford University Press, 2009 [http://www.oed.com].
Orthodox Creed	<i>An orthodox creed, or, a protestant confession of faith being an essay to unite and confirm all true protestants in the fundamental articles of the Christian religion, against the errors and heresies of the church of Rome.</i> London: s.n., 1679.
Racovian Catechism	<i>Catechesis ecclesiarum: Quae in regno poloniae, et magno ducatu lithuaniae, et aliis ad istud regnum pertinentibus provinciis, affirmant, neminem alium praeter patrem domini nostri iesu christi, esse illum unum deum israelis: Hominem autem illum iesum nazarenum, qui ex virgine natus est, nec alium, praeter aut ante ipsum, dei filium unigenitum et agnoscunt et confitentur.</i> Racoviae: [s.n.], 1609.

- Savoy Declaration *A declaration of the faith and order owned and practised in the congregational churches in England agreed upon and consented unto by their elders and messengers in their meeting at the Savoy, October 12, 1658. London: printed by J.P., 1659.*
- Second Helvetic Confession *Beza, Theodore, and Heinrich Bullinger. A confession of fayth made by common consent of diuers reformed churches beyonde the seas: With an exhortation to the reformation of the churche. Perused and allowed accordinge to the queenes maiesties iniunctions. London: by Henry Wykes for Lucas Harrison, 1568.*
- Second London Confession *A confession of faith put forth by the elders and brethren of many congregations of Christians (baptized upon profession of their faith) in London and the country. London: printed for Benjamin Harris and are to be sold at his shop, 1677.*
- Standard Confession *A brief confession or declaration of faith set forth by many of us, who are (falsely) called Anabaptists, to inform all men (in these dayes of scandal and reproach) of our innocent belief and practise. London: printed by G.D. for F. Smith, at the Elephant and Castle, near Temple-Barr, 1660.*
- Thirty Nine Articles [1562] *Articles agreed upon by the arch-bishops and bishops of both provinces, and the whole clergie in the convocation holden at London, in the yeer 1562. For the avoiding of diversities of opinions, and for the stablishing of consent touching true religion. Re-printed by his majesties commandment: With his royall declaration prefixed thereunto. London: Robert Barker, printer to the Kings most excellent Majestie: and by the assignes of John Bill, 1638.*
- Thurloe Papers *A collection of the state papers of john thurloe, esq secretary, first, to the council of state, and afterwards to the two protectors, oliver and richard cromwell. 7 vols. London: printed for the executor of the late Mr. Fletcher Gyles; Thomas Woodward; and Charles Davis, 1742.*

Westminster Confession and
Catechisms

The confession of faith, and the larger and shorter catechisme, first agreed upon by the assembly of divines at Westminster. And now appointed by the generall assembly of the Kirk of Scotland, to be a part of uniformity in religion between the Kirks of Christ in the three kingdomes. Edinburgh: printed by Gedeon Lithgovv, printer to the Universitie of Edinburgh, 1649.

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

If Carl Trueman is correct in his recent observation that ‘the name of John Owen (1616-1683) is little known today even in theological circles outside of very conservative evangelical churches and the narrow and highly specialized field of early modern intellectual history’,¹ the possibility that one of Owen’s less prominent contemporaries would be known even in those small circles seems a long-shot, at best. Thus, the almost total neglect of the work of Benjamin Keach (1640-1704), one of the leading Particular Baptist theologians of his day, comes as little or no surprise. That previous neglect, however, should not be taken as an accurate indication of Keach’s importance as a dissenting theologian. In fact, among his contemporaries, Keach’s place as an influential theologian was rarely questioned. Thomas Crosby, the Baptist historian of the early eighteenth century and one of Keach’s sons-in-law, described Keach as a ‘truly famous servant of Christ’² in his rather lengthy, forty-page biographical entry. John Dunton, the prolific publisher of dissenters in the seventeenth century, described Keach as a ‘*War-like Author* [who was] much admir’d amongst the *Anabaptists* ... a popular Preacher ... [whose] *War with the Devil* and *Travels of True Godliness* (of which I printed Ten Thousand) will sell to the end of Time’.³ Dunton’s prognostication only slightly exaggerated Keach’s prowess as an author as several of his works have been in nearly-continuous publication since they were originally published.

Indeed, as the most prolific theologian among his group of dissenters—responsible for more than fifty mostly book-length publications—Keach often served as a spokesperson for those who shared his viewpoint in the major controversies of his day. As such, the theology of Benjamin Keach proves to be a worthwhile study, providing useful and unique insight into the theological foundations of the early English

¹ Carl Trueman, *John Owen: Reformed Catholic, Renaissance Man* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007), 1.

² Thomas Crosby, *The history of the English Baptists from the Reformation to the beginning of the reign of George I* (London: for the author, 1738), IV:290.

³ John Dunton, *The life and errors of John Dunton late citizen of London* (London: for S. Malthus, 1705), 732 (sic). The numbers are inverted and should be ‘237’ (sig. R2r).

Baptists—especially the Particular Baptists, the group with whom Keach most closely associated. The historical interest in Keach’s thought extends beyond that rather limited application, however, as any reading of Keach quickly reveals an independent theologian who was willing to cross both formal and de facto lines of association in defending what he believed to be orthodoxy and attacking what he considered heresy. As such, the study of Keach provides insight into dissenting theology as a whole and, as shall be seen, the role of the intricate connections forged within that dissenting community. Thus, the study of Keach must be placed in a larger context of Post-Reformation studies which encompasses Baptist historiography and English dissent as a whole.

Literary Review

Post-Reformation Studies

The past several decades have witnessed an upsurge in interest in Reformation history and, specifically, the English Reformation. During that time, a large number of studies have been published and/or republished, keeping the era at the fore of ongoing academic research. In that time, the questions asked of and about the theologians and theology of the era have changed with the greatest shift in Reformation studies being the de-emphasis of individual-theologian-based systems and a greater emphasis on the continuity between theologians, theological systems, and even theological eras. Heiko Oberman’s *Harvest of Medieval Theology* remains one of the classic works in this area. That work, originally published in 1963, was republished in the 1980s at the beginning of the large-scale re-examination of Reformation studies. The interim years between these two publications of Oberman’s work (it has since been republished in paperback, 2001) saw the development of the ‘Calvin versus the Calvinists’ debate which all but monopolized scholarship of Reformed theology for the better part of the twentieth century and involved such notable scholars as Basil Hall and Paul Helm with R.T. Kendall’s controversial monograph, *Calvin and English Calvinism to 1649*, also fueling that debate. The overarching thesis of this debate focused on the relationship—even the adherence—of a given theological system to that of one ‘great theologian’ or another—more often than not, John Calvin.

Building on the work of Oberman, which demonstrated the continuity between the medieval church and the Reformation, Richard A. Muller, in his recent four-

volume magnum opus, *Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics*, argued convincingly that the development and establishment of post-Reformation theology did not stem from (or adhere to) a single source, nor did its adherents ever intend for that to be the case. Rather, the Reformation and post-Reformation eras were characterized by ‘intra-confessional diversity’ which did not create ‘a monolithic theology [to be] duplicated and reduplicated among a host of thinkers’.⁴ Muller’s work did not completely silence the Calvin versus the Calvinists debate—or the more general arguments which attached specific traditions to single ‘great’ theologians⁵—but the tide clearly turned, as exemplified by general studies such as Philip Benedict’s *Christ’s Churches Purely Reformed* and Diarmaid MacCulloch’s *The Reformation* and by studies focusing on the development of specific doctrines such as G. Michael Thomas’ *The Extent of the Atonement* and even Alister McGrath’s oft-republished *Iustitia Dei*.⁶ Throughout these studies, the emphasis placed on the continuity of theological development across traditions and eras supports the Muller-led analysis of historical theology and opposes the once-prominent ‘great individual theologian’ reading of history.

*English Reformation and Post-Reformation*⁷

Although arguably more immune to the single great theologian hypotheses of history, the study of the English Reformation and post-Reformation has experienced a similar shift in focus. That shift has been expressed by an upsurge in interest of previously-unexplored individual theologians (rather than the ‘great theologians’ which had previously been studied) and theological developments across eras and traditions.

⁴ Richard A. Muller, *Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics: the Rise and Development of Reformed Orthodoxy, ca. 1520 to ca. 1725* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Academic, 2003), I:41.

⁵ Muller’s four-volume work was originally published in 1993. Works (both original and re-publications) which continued the ‘Calvin vs. the Calvinists’ debate (in one form or another) after Muller’s ground-breaking publication included: Paul Helm, *Calvin and the Calvinists* (Edinburgh: Banner of Truth Trust, 1998); R. T. Kendall, *Calvin and English Calvinism to 1649* (Carlisle: Paternoster, 1997); Stephen Thorson, ‘Tensions in Calvin’s View of Faith: Unexamined Assumptions in R T Kendall’s Calvin and English Calvinism to 1649’, *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 37 (1994), 413-26. Numerous other journal articles could also be added to this list.

⁶ The best example of this shift can be found in the papers presented at the 2009 conference in Geneva celebrating the 500th anniversary of Calvin’s birth. Despite celebrating John Calvin as a person and theologian, nearly every paper at the conference highlighted the fact that Calvin was not solely (or, sometimes even primarily) responsible for the system of thought which came to be known as Calvinism.

⁷ This general synopsis is concerned mainly with literature published in the recent decade and focusing on the seventeenth century.

Carl Trueman has led the way with his studies of John Owen, culminating in his recent publication entitled *John Owen: Reformed Catholic, Renaissance Man*. Joining Trueman with recent Owen studies are Alan Spence, Robert W. Oliver, Sebastian Rehnman, among others.⁸ Led by the recent publication of two dissertations,⁹ studies of Richard Baxter have also garnered increasing interest.¹⁰ Likewise studies of John Milton and John Bunyan have been published with increasing regularity.¹¹ Even less renowned theologians (at least in terms of legacy) such as Samuel Rutherford,¹² John

⁸ In the last decade alone, the following studies specifically on Owen have been published: Steve Griffiths, *Redeem the Time: the Problem of Sin in the Writings of John Owen* (Fearn: Mentor, 2001); Lee Gatiss, *From Life's First Cry: John Owen on Infant Baptism and Infant Salvation* (London: Latimer Trust, 2008); Sebastian Rehnman, *Divine Discourse: the Theological Methodology of John Owen* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2002); Alan Spence, *Incarnation and Inspiration: John Owen and the Coherence of Christology* (London: T & T Clark, 2007); Robert W. Oliver, ed. *John Owen: the Man and His Theology* (Darlington: Evangelical Press, 2002); Jon D. Payne, *John Owen on the Lord's Supper* (Edinburgh: Banner of Truth Trust, 2004); Kopic, *Communion with God: the Divine and the Human in the Theology of John Owen* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Academic, 2007). Note that Trueman took these studies into consideration when he noted the relative ambiguity of Owen.

⁹ J.I. Packer's DPhil dissertation was originally submitted in 1954 and entitled 'The Redemption and Restoration of Man in the Thought of Richard Baxter'. Hans Boersma's 'A Hot Pepper Corn: Richard Baxter's Doctrine of Justification in its Seventeenth-Century Context of Controversy' was first submitted in 1993. Both were re-published as monographs in this decade. Boersma provided an excellent overview of Baxterian studies in the opening chapter of his work. J. I. Packer, *The Redemption & Restoration of Man in the Thought of Richard Baxter: a Study in Puritan Theology* (Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 2003); Hans Boersma, *A Hot Pepper Corn: Richard Baxter's Doctrine of Justification in its Seventeenth-Century Context of Controversy* (Vancouver: Regent College Publishing, 2004).

¹⁰ Other significant studies of Baxter include: Paul Lim, *In Pursuit of Purity, Unity, and Liberty: Richard Baxter's Puritan Ecclesiology in its Seventeenth-Century Context* (Boston: Brill, 2004); J. William Black, *Reformation Pastors: Richard Baxter and the Ideal of the Reformed Pastor* (Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 2004); Tim Cooper, *Fear and Polemic in Seventeenth-Century England: Richard Baxter and Antinomianism* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2001).

¹¹ Separating theology-focused studies from the literature-focused studies can be difficult given the obvious overlap in the genres and the thought of these authors/theologians. However, both Milton's and Bunyan's theological thought has been increasingly appreciated. On Milton, see for example: Walter S. H. Lim, *John Milton, Radical Politics, and Biblical Republicanism* (Newark, Del.: University of Delaware Press, 2006); Gordon Campbell and Thomas N. Corns, *John Milton: Life, Work, and Thought* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008). On Bunyan, see Anne Dunan-Page, *Grace Overwhelming: John Bunyan, the Pilgrim's Progress and the Extremes of the Baptist Mind* (New York: Peter Lang, 2006); Beth Lynch, *John Bunyan and the Language of Conviction* (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2004); Galen K. Johnson, *Prisoner of Conscience: John Bunyan on Self, Community, and Christian Faith* (Carlisle: Paternoster, 2003); N. H. Keeble, *John Bunyan: Reading, Dissenting, Writing* (Oxford: P. Lang, 2002); Richard L. Greaves, *Glimpses of Glory: John Bunyan and English Dissent* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 2002).

¹² Kingsley G. Rendell, *Samuel Rutherford: a New Biography of the Man and His Ministry* (Fearn, Ross-shire, Scotland: Christian Focus, 2003); John Coffey, *Politics, Religion and the British Revolutions: the Mind of Samuel Rutherford* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997).

Donne,¹³ John Goodwin,¹⁴ Hanserd Knollys,¹⁵ and Thomas Grantham¹⁶ have all been the subjects of recent studies which explore the inter-connectivity of traditions in the English theological landscape and, collectively, chip away at the idea that post-Reformation theologians saw themselves as rigidly tied to the work of a single preceding theologian.

This ‘multiple streams’ view of theological development can be seen in general studies of seventeenth-century English theology as well. Nicholas Tyacke and, more recently, Stephen Hampton have highlighted the diversity within the establishment which had previously been seen as largely monolithic.¹⁷ The study of English dissent has more consistently acknowledged a variety of influences within its theological development, if only because of the diversity of beliefs espoused by those categorized as dissenters. B.S. Capp, for example, highlighted the surprisingly varied sources for English millenarianism in his monumental study entitled *The Fifth Monarchy Men*. Despite those varied sources, the picture of this single aspect of English dissent painted by Capp suffered from a somewhat artificial unanimity. In another demonstration of the now-prevalent reading of post-Reformation theology, that issue has recently been addressed by both David Como and Crawford Gribben.¹⁸ As evidenced by these few examples, research on English dissent has focused largely,

¹³ Jeanne Shami, *John Donne and Conformity in Crisis in the Late Jacobean Pulpit* (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2003).

¹⁴ John Coffey, *John Goodwin and the Puritan Revolution: Religion and Intellectual Change in Seventeenth-Century England* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2006).

¹⁵ Dennis C. Bustin, *Paradox and Perseverance: Hanserd Knollys, Particular Baptist Pioneer in Seventeenth-Century England* (Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2006); Barry H. Howson, *Erroneous and Schismatical Opinions: the Questions of Orthodoxy Regarding the Theology of Hanserd Knollys (c. 1599-1691)* (Leiden: Brill, 2001).

¹⁶ Clint Bass, ‘Thomas Grantham and General Baptist Theology’, DPhil Thesis, University of Oxford, 2008.

¹⁷ Tyacke convincingly argued that the rise of Laudianism contributed to the outbreak of the English Civil Wars as the anti-Laudians strengthened their opposition against the establishment. Nicholas Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists: the Rise of English Arminianism c.1590-1640* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987). For his part, Hampton traced the anti-Laudians (and their successors) within the Church of England and demonstrated a continuing presence of conforming Reformed theologians. Stephen William Peter Hampton, *Anti-Arminians: the Anglican Reformed Tradition from Charles II to George I* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008).

¹⁸ David R. Como, *Blown by the Spirit: Puritanism and the Emergence of an Antinomian Underground in Pre-Civil-War England* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2004); Crawford Gribben, *The Puritan Millennium: Literature and Theology, 1550-1682* (Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2008).

though not exclusively, on its role in the events surrounding the English Civil Wars.¹⁹ That being said, several more recent works have highlighted the role of dissent during the Restoration and the move toward official toleration.²⁰ Collectively, these studies have buttressed the multiple-streams reading by focusing on lesser-known theologians and highlighting the variety of dissenting thought and source material.

Baptist Studies

The discussion about Baptist origins has also shifted in the recent past. Fueled by a printed debate between W.S. Hudson, arguing that Baptist theology developed without Anabaptist influence, and E.A. Payne, highlighting the interactions between Baptists and Anabaptists, most Baptist historiography of the early twentieth century attempted to identify the main source (or even *only* source) of English Baptist theology.²¹ Even the monumental work of B.R. White, exemplified by his *The English Separatist Tradition*, can largely be included in this overarching debate, with White ar-

¹⁹ The work of Como, Capp, and even Tyacke obviously fit into this category. Other works that largely focused on this era include: Mark R. Bell, *Apocalypse How?: Baptist Movements During the English Revolution* (Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 2000); John Gurney, *Brave Community: the Digger Movement in the English Revolution* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007); James R. Ottesen, *The Levellers: Overton, Walwyn and Lilburne* (Bristol: Thoemmes, 2003); Christopher Durston and Judith D. Maltby, eds, *Religion in Revolutionary England* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2006); Geoffrey Robertson and Philip Baker, *The Putney Debates: the Levellers* (London: Verso, 2007); Toon, *Puritans, the Millennium and the Future of Israel: Puritan Eschatology, 1600 to 1660* (Cambridge: James Clarke, 2002). This focus is certainly understandable, given the proliferation of dissenting theologies through the New Model Army. See Christopher Hill, *The Century of Revolution, 1603-1714* (Wokingham: Van Nostrand Reinhold (UK), 1980), 139-60; Michael R. Watts, *The Dissenters* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985), 105-11.

²⁰ See Ole Peter Grell, Jonathan I. Israel and Nicholas Tyacke, eds, *From Persecution to Toleration: the Glorious Revolution and Religion in England* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991); John Coffey, *Persecution and Toleration in Protestant England, 1558-1689* (Harlow: Longman, 2000); Andrew R. Murphy, *Conscience and Community: Revisiting Toleration and Religious Dissent in Early Modern England and America* (University Park, Pa.: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2001); Martin P. Sutherland, *Peace, Toleration and Decay: the Ecclesiology of Later Stuart Dissent* (Carlisle: Paternoster, 2003).

²¹ W. S. Hudson, 'Baptists were not Anabaptists', *The Chronicle* 16 (1953), 71-9; W. S. Hudson, 'Who were the Baptists', *Baptist Quarterly* 16 (1956), 303-12; W. S. Hudson, 'Who were the Baptists', *Baptist Quarterly* 17 (1957), 53-5; Earnest A. Payne, 'Who Were the Baptists?', *The Baptist Quarterly* 16 (1956), 339-42; Earnest A. Payne, 'Contacts Between the Baptists and Anabaptists', *Foundations* IV (1961), 39-55. This generally accepted either-or mentality laid the foundation for such influential studies as Lonnie D. Kliever, 'General Baptist Origins: The Question of Anabaptist Influence', *The Mennonite Quarterly Review* XXXVI (1962), 290-321; Glen Harold Stassen, 'Anabaptist Influence in the Origin of the Particular Baptists', *Mennonite Quarterly Review* 36 (1962), 322-48.

guing that the Baptists arose from the indigenous English Separatist movement that had been driven underground during the Marian regime.²²

With Stephen Wright's recent work, *The Early English Baptists, 1603-1649*, that discussion has moved away from the single-source focused studies to a more-nuanced view of multiple-source development. Relying on his own research into previously un-/under-studied primary sources, Wright called into question the accepted view of separate beginnings for the different streams of Baptists. This new view of blurred boundaries between the different groups of Baptists allowed Wright to highlight the variety of sources and influences upon the early development of English Baptists. This shift in Baptist historiography is not dissimilar from the concurrent one in Reformation scholarship.²³

One additional development in Baptist historiography deserves mention. In 1962, Glen H. Stassen cited the general histories authored by A.C. Underwood, Henry C. Vedder, W.T. Whitley, and R.G. Torbet as proof that 'Baptist historiography has concentrated on the [General Baptists]' at the expense of the Particular Baptists.²⁴ That may have been the case in 1962, but in the intervening decades, the pendulum has swung almost to the opposite extreme. Whether this change was more influenced by the upsurge in interest in the Reformed theology with which the Particular Baptists were seen to agree or by the assertion of Charles R. Andrews that the General Baptists actually either died out in the seventeenth century or became Unitarians remains open

²² Other works encompassed, to one extent or another, by this debate include: Murray Tolmie, *The Triumph of the Saints: the Separate Churches of London, 1616-1649* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977); Stephen Brachlow, *The Communion of Saints: Radical Puritan and Separatist Ecclesiology, 1570-1625* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988); James Robert Coggins, *John Smyth's Congregation: English Separatism, Mennonite Influence, and the Elect Nation* (Waterloo, Ont: Herald Press, 1991); Jason K. Lee, *The Theology of John Smyth: Puritan, Separatist, Baptist, Mennonite* (Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 2003).

²³ In fact, Bass argued that Wright's view of 'denominational beginnings' finds its foundation in the much-earlier work of Christopher Hill who made similar arguments for the general denominational development in England. Christopher Hill, 'History and Denominational History', *Baptist Quarterly* 22 (1967), 65-71; Bass, 'Thomas Grantham and General Baptist Theology', 8.

²⁴ Stassen, 'Anabaptist Influence in the Origin of the Particular Baptists', 322.

for discussion.²⁵ What is incontrovertible is the current relative emphasis on Particular Baptists at the expense of General Baptists.²⁶

Keachean Studies

Despite the recent developments in historical studies which would seem to lead naturally to the study of one of the leading Particular Baptist theologians of the seventeenth century, Benjamin Keach—and, specifically, his Reformed theology—has received only sporadic scholarly interest. That modern interest began with William Spears' 1953 thesis which pioneered the scholarly study of Keach, although it did so without treating Keach as a 'proper' theologian.²⁷ Some thirty six years later, James Barry Vaughn, in his 1989 thesis, attempted to rescue Keach from 'near oblivion'²⁸ by considering Keach as a 'practical theologian'. Both of these theses served to fill a glaring void in the study of Keach; however, by considering Keach as something less than an influential theologian, they ignored a large amount of his thought and work and, more importantly, set the precedent for the relatively few studies that followed.

Building on the Spears view of Keach (and harmonizing with that of Vaughn), a number of works which analyzed Keach's role in the hymn-singing controversy of the 1690s were published. James Patrick Carnes led this resurgence with his 1984 study. Kenneth Dix and David Copeland followed with explorations of Keach's role in early Protestant hymnody, but they added little to the study of his theological thought. In her thesis, Murdina MacDonald also focused on the hymn-singing contro-

²⁵ See Charles R. Andrews, 'The Maine Wheele that Sets us Aworke', *Foundations* 1 (1958), 29.

²⁶ This trend can easily be seen in the publications of the last decade alone. Those focusing on Particular Baptist theology or personalities include: Howson, *Erroneous and Schismatical Opinions*; Bustin, *Paradox and Perseverance*; James M. Renihan, *Edification and Beauty: the Practical Ecclesiology of the English Particular Baptists, 1675-1705* (Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2008); Roger Hayden, *Continuity and Change: Evangelical Calvinism among Eighteenth-Century Baptist Ministers Trained at Bristol Academy, 1690-1791* (Chipping Norton, Oxon.: Nigel Lynn for Roger Hayden and the Baptist Historical Society, 2006). Added to these are the works focusing on Keach discussed below. Those focusing on General Baptist theology or personalities are limited to a few studies: Bass, 'Thomas Grantham and General Baptist Theology'; Lee, *Theology of John Smyth*.

²⁷ William Eugene Spears, 'The Baptist Movement in England in the Late Seventeenth Century as Reflected in the Work and Thought of Benjamin Keach, 1640-1704', PhD Thesis, Edinburgh University, 1953, 61.

²⁸ James Berry Vaughn, 'Public Worship and Practical Theology in the Work of Benjamin Keach (1640-1704)', PhD Thesis, University of St Andrews, 1989, iii.

versy as one of the key intra-community controversies plaguing the Particular Baptists at the beginning of the eighteenth century.²⁹

Three recent works have begun the process of relocating Keachean studies from the sole realm of hymnody or even merely ‘practical theology’ to seventeenth-century Reformed theology in general. The first of these works, Austin Walker’s substantial biography entitled *The Excellent Benjamin Keach*, provided the first book-length study into Keach’s life and incorporated much of Keach’s thought alongside an analysis of the historical record. Ultimately, Walker provided the historical data to support the argument for the serious study of Keach’s thought. In 2006, James Brooks began that serious study by examining the theological impetus for and ramifications of the oft-discussed hymn-singing controversy. Brooks effectively argued that the participants in this controversy (including Keach) saw themselves as continuing the theological work of the Reformation, moving even this debate outside of Vaughn’s view of mere ‘practical theology’.

David Riker’s contribution to Keachean studies, the third of these recent works, provided the most theological study of Keach to date, and, as such, deserves some additional discussion. In this work, Riker argued that Keach must be located within the theological spectrum which he termed ‘Reformed Orthodoxy’, a term he borrowed from Richard Muller and defined as the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century combination of the Dortian five-point emphasis with the doctrines of the trinity, the dual nature of Christ, and infant baptism. Riker then provided an in-depth analysis of Keach’s covenant theology and his view of baptism, concluding that Keach should best be described as a theologian working within the parameters of Reformed Orthodoxy for the catholic church at large. In the process, Riker correctly argued that Keach is more than a strict biblicist—relying on creeds and church authorities, even tradi-

²⁹ James Patrick Carnes, ‘The Famous Mr. Keach: Benjamin Keach and His Influence on Congregational Singing in Seventeenth Century England’, MA Thesis, North Texas State University, 1984; Kenneth Dix, *Benjamin Keach and a Monument to Liberty* (Dunstable: Eanconberg, 1985); David A. Copeland, *Benjamin Keach and the Development of Baptist Traditions in Seventeenth-Century England* (Lewiston, N.Y.: Edwin Mellen Press, 2001); Murdina D. MacDonald, ‘London Calvinistic Baptists, 1689-1727: Tensions Within a Dissenting Community under Toleration’, DPhil Thesis, University of Oxford, 1983. Hugh Martin had previously published a rudimentary study of Keach’s role in the hymn-singing controversy: Hugh Martin, *Benjamin Keach (1640-1704): Pioneer of Congregational Hymn Singing* (London: Independent Press, 1961).

tion—and that he has been injudiciously labeled a moderate, and indeed, in at least one case, a near-hyper-Calvinist.³⁰

In many ways, Riker's work rightfully sets the precedent for any further study of Keach's theology.³¹ On the issues Riker chose to analyze, his work must be engaged. However, because he limited his focus to two loci of Keach's thought (federalism and baptism, with some obvious additional tangential discussions), Riker's study leaves ample room for further exploration, even in the areas immediately germane to his adopted definition of 'Reformed Orthodoxy'. To that end, this study aims to explore some of those pertinent loci which received merely superficial discussions from Riker—such as Keach's view of the Trinity and Christology—as well as to re-analyze Keach's presentation of federalism and justification, in general.³² These discussions will serve to locate Keach more accurately within his theological spectrum. The focus on those loci is combined with the additional exploration of aspects of Keach's thought which Riker completely omitted, including Keach's use of catechisms and confessions as well as his understanding of eschatology, both of which provide valuable insight into Keach's relationship to his contemporaries. This additional exploration has the potential to completely relocate Keach's thought on that spectrum.

Additionally, when Keach referred to himself as an 'Orthodox Christian', he, most assuredly, did not use the same definition as the one used by Riker. This study contends that a more precise definition—or at least description—of Keach's understanding of 'Reformed Orthodoxy' must be ascertained for Keach to be located accurately. The primary goal of this study, then, is to understand the lenses through which Keach developed and viewed theological issues in order to gain a clearer understand-

³⁰ James Berry Vaughn, 'Benjamin Keach,' in *Baptist Theologians*, eds T. George and D.S. Dockery, 49-76 (Nashville, Tenn.: Broadman Press, 1990), 60. Cf. Vaughn, 'Public Worship and Practical Theology', 217.

³¹ It should be noted that, due to consultation restrictions placed by Riker on his dissertation, the work was unavailable until after the current research was well underway. As such, some overlapping with Riker's study is inevitable; however, sufficient differences exist. These are noted throughout the work and especially in Chapters V & VI.

³² David Bowman Riker, 'A Catholic Reformed Theologian: Federalism and Baptism in the Thought of Benjamin Keach, 1640-1704 [unsubmitted re-draft]', PhD Thesis, University of Aberdeen, 2006, 69-72, 105-7. While the doctrine of justification played a central role in Riker's discussion of Keach's federal theology, his study suffered from a lack of separate discussion. Keach, himself, often discussed justification without direct reference to his federal theology—although the two are clearly inter-related. Because of this, Riker's study failed to emphasize Keach's rather unique *ordo salutis* among other idiosyncrasies.

ing of his view of ‘orthodoxy’. As such, this study will provide Keach’s own placement on the theological spectrum of his day.

This highlights the final major aspect lacking from Riker’s study: the historical context. Riker situated Keach within the era of Reformed Orthodoxy—a time period which spans the better part of two centuries. However, he failed to place Keach within his late seventeenth-century historico-political context, a context which proved to be extremely important for Keach’s theological thought—especially when considering that he wrote much of his work as a leading dissenter during times of official persecution.³³ Aside from a relatively few published ‘authorities’, Riker failed to consider the networks within which Keach moved and which provided the majority of his theological interaction. When Keach’s theology is viewed from a broader angle than Riker chose, these networks provide the key to understanding Keach’s theological development and influence. And, ultimately, this broader view allows for a clearer understanding of Keach’s view of ‘orthodoxy’ and a more accurate placement of Keach, the theologian.

In the end, Keach claimed to ‘have kept all along within the Bounds of that Gravity, and Orthodoxy of Matter, which the Christian Religion requires, and the Reformed Protestants profess’.³⁴ Simply put, by dissecting Keach’s theological thought, this study seeks to define what exactly that claim meant to this Particular Baptist theologian, pastoring a congregation in Southwark in the late seventeenth century.

³³ The fact that Riker completely omitted Walker’s work—despite it being published at least two years before Riker submitted his dissertation—highlights the lack of immediate historical context in this otherwise very helpful work.

³⁴ Benjamin Keach and Thomas De Laune, *Tropologia, or, A key to open Scripture metaphors* (London: John Richardson and John Darby for Enoch Prosser, 1681), Book II: sig. A3r.

CHAPTER II:
KEACH'S SOCIAL NETWORKS,
AUTHORITIES, AND INFLUENCES

Early Social Networks

Keach Family

The development of Benjamin Keach's unique theology began at an early age. Despite scant records of his childhood, Keach's early acumen for theology appears indisputable. Indeed, his son-in-law and early Baptist historian, Thomas Crosby (1665-1768?),¹ recorded that Keach 'applied himself very early to the study of the Scripture, and the attainments of divine knowledge'. By the time Keach was fifteen, he had determined that the Bible was 'entirely silent concerning the *baptism of infants*' and was baptized 'upon the profession of his faith, by Mr. *John Russel*,' the leader of the local General Baptists who, in 1679, signed the *Orthodox Creed*.² Whether this was the first connection between Keach and the General Baptists of Buckinghamshire remains unknown. Though no evidence exists as proof, the possibility that Benjamin's parents, John and Joyce,³ were active among the local Baptists seems plausible because at least two of his brothers also adopted Baptist theology.⁴ Within five years of Benjamin's baptism, his older brother, Joseph (b. 1637), signed the General Baptist statement of faith known as the *Standard Confession* (1660). At least by 1669, Benjamin's eldest brother, Henry (b. 1624), was also active among the General Baptists as the episcopal returns of that year note that around one hundred

¹ For more on Crosby, see below, 28-9.

² Crosby, *History*, IV:269.

³ Some confusion exists regarding the identification of Benjamin's mother. His church book, purportedly recorded in Benjamin's own hand, records his parents as John and Joyce. The register of the Stoke Hammond Parish Church lists Fodora as Benjamin's mother. In that register, Joyce is only listed as the mother of Benjamin's oldest siblings, Henry (b. 1624), Anne (b. 1630), and Josiah (b. 1633). James Berry Vaughn interpreted this data as proof that Joyce died before Benjamin's birth. However, this does not explain Benjamin's own listing of Joyce as his mother. Austin Walker's suggestion that Benjamin's mother was known by both names, Joyce and Fodora, seems more probable. Cf. Vaughn, 'Public Worship and Practical Theology', 6; Austin Walker, *The Excellent Benjamin Keach* (Dundas, ON: Joshua Press, 2004), 39 fn. 6.

⁴ John Keach, Benjamin's father, was a church warden for Stoke Hammond in 1627 and 1640. This may or may not demonstrate religious fervor as most householders served as church wardens at one point or another.

‘Anabaptists’ met at his house and were taught by Joseph Keetch [sic], a bricklayer, among others.⁵ Both Joseph and Henry applied for licenses under the 1672 Declaration of Indulgence for their congregation which by that time met at Soulbury, Buckinghamshire.⁶

The three Keach brothers, none of whom received a university education,⁷ may have all been influenced by the preaching ministry of Matthew Meade (1628/9–1699), the Puritan minister who lived nearby during that time.⁸ Benjamin Keach acknowledged the role of Meade in his own conversion several decades later.⁹ This would not be the last time the paths of Keach and Meade would cross. All three Keach brothers originally joined the General Baptists in the Buckinghamshire area. Within only a few years, Benjamin Keach began preaching publicly.¹⁰ He burst onto the Baptist scene in 1664 when his first publication, a primer, came to the attention of the authorities.¹¹ After several more bouts of persecution at the hands of local authorities, Keach finally moved to London in 1668—not before he developed several personal connections which he maintained in some form throughout his life and which surely affected his theological thought.

⁵ George Lyon Turner, ed. *Original Records of Early Nonconformity under Persecution and Indulgence* (London: 1911), I:84.

⁶ Joseph applied as a leader of the group, and Henry applied for a license for his house to serve as a meeting place. See Turner, ed. *Original Records*, II:838–9.

⁷ As noted, the ecclesiastical returns of 1669 identify Joseph as a bricklayer. Crosby noted that Benjamin was originally designed for a trade and was not formally educated. In a letter dated 26 May 1664, Thomas Disney, then rector of Stoke Hammond, identified Benjamin Keach as a tailor and Henry Keach as a miller. *CSPD Car. II*, 26 May 1664. Cf. William Page, *A History of the County of Buckingham* (London: Constable & Co, 1920), 471–6.

⁸ Matthew Meade had been appointed to the rectory of Great Brickhill, Bucks. That appointment was disputed, and, despite official support from the authorities, Meade never served in that role. Instead, he took a morning lecture in Stepney, London. Both the registry of his marriage to Elizabeth Walton in 1655 and his will confirm that he owned land in Soulbury, Bucks. See *ODNB*. The registry of his marriage lists Meade as being from ‘Solber’, see *Marriage Registry of Matthew Meade*, Guildhall Library, MS 07635 v.2. In his will, he left ‘all my land with the appurtenances commonly called or known by the name of Smevins lying a being in the parish of Soulbury in the county of Bucks ...’ to his son, Samuel. See *Will of Matthew Meade of Stepney*, Prerogative Court of Canterbury, PROB 11/453.

⁹ Benjamin Keach, *A counter-antidote to purge out the malignant effects of a late counterfeit* (London: for H. Bernard, 1694), 3. Keach referred to the pastor of Gyles Shute as ‘the blessed Instrument of my conversion all most forty Years ago’. Austin Walker correctly identified this pastor as Matthew Meade. Walker, *The Excellent Benjamin Keach*, 45.

¹⁰ Crosby, *History*, IV:270.

¹¹ *The tryal of Mr. Benjamin Keach, at the assizes held at Ailsbury in Buckinghamshire, October 8, and 9* (s.n., 1664). See Chapter III.

John Griffith (1621/2-1700) and Jonathan Jennings

In 1666, the Second Earl of Bridgewater, John Egerton (1623-1686),¹² had Keach arrested—along with John Griffith and a prisoner simply referred to as ‘Jennings’—and held in Aylesbury gaol for an unknown period of time.¹³ John Griffith had been largely responsible for evangelizing Buckinghamshire for the General Baptists. Along with Thomas Grantham (1633/4-1692), Griffith served as the most prominent leader of the General Baptists in the Restoration and was often connected with the Dunning’s Alley congregation.¹⁴ Keach’s relationship with Griffith continued through the latter decades of the seventeenth century.¹⁵ Griffith was also a renowned dissenter who, in 1683, was tried alongside the Seventh-Day Baptist leader, Francis Bampfield (1614-1684), for refusing to take the oath of allegiance.¹⁶ The arrest report from 1666 did not identify the third prisoner with anything beyond his last name. It is highly probable that this prisoner was Jonathan Jennings, a cheesemonger who obtained a license in 1672 for the White’s Alley General Baptist congregation.¹⁷ He was also later a leader of the Goswell Street church, a congregation which had some relationship with Benjamin Keach’s Horsleydown congregation despite not being involved in the same association.¹⁸ The fact that Keach developed a relationship with

¹² John Egerton was a staunch Royalist and Laudian. At this time, he was also something of a protégé to Lord Clarendon. His later political career displayed a variety of leanings and ambitions, including some ‘ultra-Anglican’ tendencies. *ODNB*.

¹³ *CSPD Car. II*, Undated 1666, 152. In an interesting coincidence, the Quaker, Isaac Penington, was also imprisoned in Aylesbury gaol at the same time. While there is no evidence that Keach and Penington met at that point, they did engage in a bit of published banter during the following decades. Robert Gibbs, *A History of Aylesbury with its Borough and Hundreds, the Hamlet of Walton, and the Electoral Division* (Aylesbury: 1885), 488-90.

¹⁴ W. T. Whitley, *The Baptists of London, 1612-1928* (London: Kingsgate Press, 1928), 108. This connection must be why Whitley noted that Keach was ‘probably a convert of Griffith’.

¹⁵ Keach and Griffith both signed a letter in support of James Marham in the Lyn persecution, a time (c. 1693) during which Marham, a General Baptist minister, was forced to defend himself in court at extreme expense. See the published letter and an additional letter in Keach’s handwriting sent to Richard Kent, seeking financial support for Marham. *Lyn Persecution Letter*, Angus Library, Regent's Park College, Oxford, Whitchurch Collection, C.17.

¹⁶ John Griffith, *The case of Mr. John Griffith, Minister of the Gospel and now prisoner in Newgate* (London: George Larkin for the Author, 1683).

¹⁷ *CSPD Car. II*, 25 July 1672.

¹⁸ *The Church Book for Goswell Street*, Angus Library, Regent's Park College, Oxford. For an example of relationship between this congregation and Keach’s congregation, see entry dated 6 December 1697.

such prominent leaders at such an early point in his ministry speaks volumes about his perceived potential among the Baptists.

London Networks

Keach left Buckinghamshire in 1668 to become the pastor of the General Baptist church then meeting at Tooley Street in Southwark. He succeeded—after an interim of several years—William Rider (d. 1665?) who had been an active defender of the practice of the laying on of hands on all believers among the General Baptists.¹⁹ Quickly, Keach's social networks began to reflect his new surroundings. No longer was he the promising Baptist leader of a small market town, attracting intense scrutiny from local authorities. Now he lived in a hotbed of dissent with a wealth of educated leadership from whom he could learn and with whom he could converse and dispute. This rather common move for dissenters—from a rural setting to the urban life of Greater London²⁰—had two theoretical benefits: less persecution since Keach would no longer be the main target in a local, market town where he was known well *and* greater opportunities as a dissenting minister. The historical record indeed demonstrates that Keach's move was successful on both accounts.

Having experienced some rather focused persecution early in his career—including his public trial in 1664, the arrest in 1666, and being the focus of 'no small share in the sufferings of these times'²¹—Keach had reason to hope his move to Southwark would alleviate some of that burden. The move appears to have been a success as Keach largely dropped from the scene of official persecution. Even the nearly-ubiquitous certificates of conviction for attending or holding conventicles still extant for a large number of dissenting ministers in the Southwark Borough and the Surrey and Middlesex counties bear no record of Keach's ministry, despite, reportedly having a congregation of some three hundred fifty persons by 1682—not an easy number to hide from the authorities, even in the hotbed of dissent which was South-

¹⁹ Crosby, *History*, IV:272. Crosby inadvertently listed 1688 as the year of Keach's arrival in London; however, he also qualified that year as the 28th year of his life which was 1668. Cf. Whitley, *Baptists of London*, 110. Whitley noted that Rider was last seen publicly in 1660 although he gave no support for this claim. Crosby noted that several years passed between the end of Rider's ministry and the beginning of Keach's. Rider may have died in the plague that hit London in 1665.

²⁰ Others who made this move included John Griffith and Matthew Meade.

²¹ Crosby, *History*, II:185.

wark.²² According to Crosby, Keach did appear before Justice Glover at some point after his relocation to Southwark on charges of re-printing the primer which had been deemed heretical in 1664,²³ but Keach makes no other appearances in official state records as a target of prosecution.²⁴ Even making allowances for the destruction of records and Keach's apparent use of an as yet unknown alias,²⁵ Keach clearly experienced less persecution after his move to London.

The move also proved highly successful as a means to greater opportunities. By inserting him into an already-established network of dissenters, this move necessarily helped to promote Keach as an author, theologian, and Baptist leader and *also* necessarily impacted his theological and political views. While the various groups which can be identified in Keach's Southwark life—his close personal contacts, his publishing contacts, and his literary contacts—were fairly large in terms of sheer numbers of identifiable people, they were inter-connected in such a way as to make his entire social network a relatively tight-knit group of dissent. Identifying the flow of ideas within an individual's social network proves extremely difficult if not impossible, but the connections (coincidental or not) simply cannot be ignored. Keach's social network would have largely determined the information and resources that were available to him both as support for his own views and as fodder for debate. As such, that network deserves further exploration.²⁶

²² In contrast, ample certificates of conviction can be found for the congregations led by Hanserd Knollys, William Kiffin, George Cokayn (d. 1691), John Child, and even William Penn. These certificates can be found at the London Metropolitan Archives (for example: MR/RC/01-10) and the Surrey History Centre (for example: QS2/5 Mich 1680) For discussions of each of these individuals and their relationship to Keach, see below, 17ff. The report of the size of Keach's congregation can be found in the spy report submitted by Constant Oates in 1682 (SP 29/419).

²³ Crosby, *History*, III:146. For more on Keach's trial in 1664, see Chapter III, 57-8.

²⁴ Keach did appear in the state records twice in 1690. He appeared once as a signatory on a petition from the inhabitants of Southwark to the House of Lords. *Petition to the House of Lords by the Inhabitants of Southwark*, Parliamentary Archives, London, HL/PO/JO/10/1/430 6 Dec 1690. The other time, he appeared with an assessed tax for the four shillings in the pound aid of 1694. Derek Keene, Peter Earle, Craig Spence and Janet Barnes, eds, *Four Shillings In The Pound Aid 1693/4* (1992), listings for Middlesex, St Dunstan Stepney, The Hamlet of Bethnal Green, Anchor Street.

²⁵ Crosby noted that Keach lived under an alias for much of his time in Southwark. Certificates of conviction could exist for that alias which Crosby does not reveal. It is, of course, also possible that Keach experienced more persecution than the record indicates. However, one could reasonably expect Crosby to be privy to such information and to include it in his account. Crosby, *History*, III:146.

²⁶ This aspect of Keach's life and thought has been almost completely neglected up to this point.

*Close Personal Contacts*²⁷

Within only a couple of years of his move to Southwark, Keach made a significant conversion from the General Baptist theology of his early ministry to the theology espoused by Particular Baptists. Little is known about the impetus behind that shift. The early twentieth-century Baptist historian, W.T. Whitley, argued that Keach converted because he fell in love with ‘a Particular Baptist girl’, Susannah Partridge, whom he married in 1672.²⁸ In that same passage, Whitley noted that Keach contacted Hanserd Knollys at that time, implying that Knollys may have been responsible for Keach’s conversion. Elsewhere, Whitley named William Kiffin as the person responsible for Keach’s conversion to Particular Baptist theology.²⁹ Unfortunately, Whitley provided no support for either argument, and neither Crosby nor Keach provided any more details. What can be known for sure is that Keach did indeed marry Susannah Partridge on 22 April 1672 with Hanserd Knollys presiding and, from around the same time, he considered himself a Particular Baptist.³⁰

Hanserd Knollys (1598?-1691)

By the time he came into contact with Benjamin Keach, Hanserd Knollys had already established himself as both a leading Particular Baptist minister and a renowned dissenter. Having begun his ministry in the Church of England, Knollys was one of the few Particular Baptist ministers with a university education, receiving a degree from Cambridge in the late 1620s.³¹ By 1645, Knollys had already gathered a congregation of Baptists in London after separating from the congregation led by

²⁷ While this section will expound upon some of the more significant personal relationships Keach had, clearly not all of these individuals can be discussed in detail. The omission of individuals from this section should, thus, not be taken as proof that a relationship did not exist.

²⁸ W. T. Whitley, *The Early History of the General Baptist Church Now Meeting in Borough Road, Southwark*, Angus Library, Regent’s Park College, Oxford, 1-2. Keach’s first wife, Jane Grove, died in 1670 after ten years of marriage. Crosby, *History*, IV:271-3.

²⁹ W. T. Whitley, ed. *Minutes of the General Assembly of the General Baptist Churches in England* (London: Baptist Historical Society, 1909), 29.

³⁰ *Horsleydown Register*. Vaughn unconvincingly argued that this points to the establishment of a relationship between Keach and Knollys ‘some time before that’. Vaughn, ‘Public Worship and Practical Theology’, 21. However, Vaughn gave no evidence for this. It is certainly possible that Keach met Knollys through the influence of Susannah as Whitley seemed to suggest.

³¹ For more on Knollys, see Bustin, *Paradox and Perseverance*; Howson, *Erroneous and Schismatical Opinions*.

Henry Jessey (1601-1663),³² and Knollys joined several London Baptists in signing the *1646 London Confession*.³³ Knollys was known well enough to draw the attention of the London authorities who had him arrested following Venner's Uprising in January of 1660/1.³⁴ Throughout his life, Knollys was associated with some of the more radically-leaning dissenters. For instance, some fourteen members of his congregation signed the Fifth Monarchist document, *A declaration ... concerning the kingly interest of Christ* (1654).³⁵ He also maintained associations with known (or assumed) Fifth Monarchists such as Vavasor Powell (1616-1670),³⁶ Anna Trapnel—the prophethess associated with the movement,³⁷ and John Simpson.³⁸ Knollys was also regularly branded as an antinomian by the more mainstream theologians.³⁹ The relationship between Keach and Knollys which began in or around 1672 continued to be a close one until Knollys' death in 1691 when Keach wrote an elegy for his longtime friend.⁴⁰

³² Jessey was a non-conformist pastor who succeeded Henry Jacob and John Lathrop at their London semi-separatist congregation.

³³ *1646 London Confession*. Knollys, along with William Kiffin, left the Jessey congregation ca. 1644-45. They were not the last to move from the Jessey congregation to a Particular Baptist congregation. Others to follow Knollys' path included Henry Forty and George Barrett. See Whitley, *Baptists of London*, 108. For more on Kiffin, Forty, and Barrett, see below, 19-21.

³⁴ In the *ODNB* entry on Knollys, Kenneth Newport incorrectly dated Knollys' arrest to the first gathering of Venner's followers in April 1657. In actuality, Knollys was arrested following the armed uprising in 1660/1. Hanserd Knollys and William Kiffin, *The life and death of that old disciple of Jesus Christ and eminent minister of the Gospel Mr. Hanserd Knollys* (London: for John Harris, 1692), 24-5. Cf. *ODNB*.

³⁵ For a fuller discussion of the Venner Uprising and the Fifth Monarchist movement, see Chapter VII.

³⁶ Knollys and Kiffin, *The life and death*, 35. Powell was a separatist minister closely associated with the Independents, Particular Baptists, and Fifth Monarchists. He was largely responsible for evangelizing his native Wales. Due to his radical leanings, he was arrested early in the Restoration and remained imprisoned for most of the rest of his life. *ODNB*; T. M. Bassett, *The Welsh Baptists* (Swansea: Ilston House, 1977).

³⁷ Anna Trapnel, *The cry of a stone. Or A relation of something spoken in Whitehall* (London: 1654), 3.

³⁸ John Simpson was one of the major leaders of the Fifth Monarchist Movement, although he did not support Venner's Uprising. Knollys regularly preached at Simpson's church at *All Hallows*. *CSPD Car. II*, 11 Sept 1661.

³⁹ Accusations of this sort may have led Knollys to emigrate from England in the 1630s and definitely forced him to flee the British colonies in North America and return to England in the early 1640s. Knollys and Kiffin, *The life and death*, 17. For more on this aspect of Knollys' theology and its relation to Keach, see Chapter VI. Also see Bustin, *Paradox and Perseverance*; Howson, *Erroneous and Schismatical Opinions*.

⁴⁰ Crosby, *History*, IV:307.

William Kiffin (1616-1701)

After separating from the Jessey congregation and associating with the church that would eventually meet at Devonshire Square, William Kiffin served as the most visible leader of the early Particular Baptists. Unfortunately, the extent and details of Keach's relationship with Kiffin remain somewhat obscure. Certainly, Keach's relationship with Knollys would have provided an easy point of access to Kiffin. The possibility that Keach already knew Kiffin before his move to London—or at least that the two had heard of each other—also exists, given Kiffin's familiarity with the Buckinghamshire Baptists.⁴¹ Regardless, the relationship between the two was clearly well-established by the early 1680s as both served the Particular Baptists as outspoken leaders.⁴² As the patriarch of Particular Baptists, Kiffin had far-reaching Baptist connections.⁴³ He, uniquely among Baptists, was also well-connected politically. As a financially-successful merchant in London, Kiffin's wealth reputedly left him in position to make a loan to Charles II.⁴⁴ Clearly, he had some pull at court, even being named Alderman by James II.⁴⁵ Previously, during the Interregnum, Kiffin had even served in parliament.

In addition to relationships with most of the prominent separatist leaders such as Henry Jessey, John Spilsbury (d. 1668?),⁴⁶ and William Greenhill (1597/8-1671), Kiffin also had some connections with those associated with the more radical wing of dissent such as John Simpson and Christopher Feake (1611/12-1682/3).⁴⁷ Additional-

⁴¹ Kiffin was involved in obtaining the release of twelve General Baptist prisoners from Aylesbury gaol in Buckinghamshire in 1663. See Joseph Ivimey, *A history of the English Baptists* (London: 1811-30), I:35-8. Cf. Crosby, *History*, III:5.

⁴² By 1682, Keach was well-known enough to appear in *Constant Oates Spy Report*, SP 29/419/55-56.

⁴³ Kiffin was credited with evangelizing and coordinating Baptist movements in Wales, Northumberland, Ireland, and the Midlands. *ODNB*.

⁴⁴ Crosby, *History*, III:4.

⁴⁵ This may have been a politically-expedient move by James II, recognizing that Kiffin could not refuse the position without fine, but he also could not serve because of the oath requirements. Either way, money would go into the coffers of a governmental entity. Alfred Beaven, *The Aldermen of the City of London* (London: 1908-13), II:11-60.

⁴⁶ Spilsbury was an early Baptist minister in London and a signatory of the *1644 & 1646 London Confession*. Kiffin probably joined Spilsbury's congregation when he first left Jessey's church.

⁴⁷ As early as 1647, Kiffin met with Greenhill, Jessey, Simpson, Feake, and Knollys to publish *A declaration by congregational societies in and about the city of London...*, an originally-anonymous document intended to defend religious liberty and discuss other issues. William Greenhill was an Independent minister, member of the Westminster Assembly, and close associate of Stephen Marshall, William

ly, one of Kiffin's earliest acquaintances, John Lilburne (1615?-1657), a fellow apprentice during the 1630s, later became a leader of the Leveller movement. Perhaps due to his influence at court, Kiffin rarely was implicated by his associations with radical dissent.⁴⁸ Kiffin's other endeavors, especially those undertaken as a merchant, also provided opportunities for intellectual relationships to develop. For instance, Kiffin held stock in the East India Company along with Matthew Meade.⁴⁹ He also was one of eleven partners in the Bahama Adventurers Company which specialized in trade in the Caribbean. One of the other partners in that company was John Locke (1632-1704), the celebrated philosopher and humanist, with whom Kiffin corresponded.⁵⁰ Kiffin also was an active defender of Baptist beliefs, engaging in numerous debates with some of the more famous theologians of his day, including: Daniel Featley (1582-1645), the Church of England controversialist; Peter Chamberlen (1601-1683), the court physician and seventh day Baptist; and William Penn (1644-1718), the celebrated Quaker.

George Barrett (d. 1700)

As a signatory of the *Second London Confession* and one of the seven ministers who issued the call for the 1689 assembly,⁵¹ George Barrett clearly held a position of leadership among the Particular Baptists in the last decades of the seventeenth century. By the 1690s, Barrett had developed enough respect to be consulted in a media-

Twisse, Joseph Caryl, Thomas Goodwin, John Owen, Sydrach Simpson, etc. *ODNB*. John Simpson and Christopher Feake were both Fifth Monarchist leaders.

⁴⁸ Kiffin generally spoke against any type of armed uprising such as that desired by Fifth Monarchists. See Chapter VII. At times, Kiffin did come under suspicion. E.g., Kiffin was accused of calling for the king to be stabbed. *CSPD Car. II*, Undated 1662.40.

⁴⁹ It was either in his capacity as shareholder in the East India Company or as part of the like-minded Bahama Adventurers Co. that Kiffin petitioned the Council of State for permission to transport thirty horses and six hundred 'dozen of shoes' to Barbados plantations. *SP Colonial America and West Indies*, 1:1574-1660, 424-5. 31 May 1655.

⁵⁰ See the correspondence between Kiffin and Locke in the Bodleian Library, Oxford: *MS Locke* c11, folio 247-48; *MS Locke* f1, 152; *MS Locke* f1, 159; *MS Locke* f2, 133; *MS Locke* f2, 151; *MS Locke* b1, 24-25. Also see the letter at *The National Archives*, *Kew*: CO 1/12, 110; SP 25/7. I am indebted to Larry Kreitzer for this information.

⁵¹ The other six ministers were William Kiffin, Hanserd Knollys, Benjamin Keach, Richard Adams, Edward Man, and John Harris.

tion role for intra-denominational debates.⁵² Barrett's position of respect in the 1690s had taken him the better part of his adult life to develop. He evidently began his ministry as an assistant to Henry Jessey with another future Baptist leader, Henry Forty (d. 1692), also serving as an assistant.⁵³ Barrett signed the Fifth Monarchist manifesto in 1654 as a representative from Jessey's church and became a leader among the Fifth Monarchists, developing a relationship with other millenarian leaders such as Henry Danvers (1619?-1687/8), Praisegod Barebone (c.1598-1679/80), and Clement Ireton (fl. 1667). Barrett was probably the leader of the Fifth Monarchists meeting in Horsleydown which was noted in the 1669 episcopal returns.⁵⁴ According to Whitley, Barrett later served as an assistant to Benjamin Keach at Horsleydown.⁵⁵ If this is correct, Barrett's congregation may have joined with Keach's church at some point in the 1670s or 1680s. By 1689, Barrett had left Keach's congregation and led his own Particular Baptist congregation at Mile End Green, signing the *Second London Confession* as the pastor of that congregation. Barrett also officiated at the wedding ceremony of Thomas Stinton and Elizabeth Keach, Benjamin's daughter, in 1690.⁵⁶

Thomas De Laune (d. 1685)

The only co-author Keach ever used, Thomas De Laune provided Keach some much needed help on the best-selling of Keach's scholarly works, *Tropologia*. Keach credited his co-author with the translation of *Philologia sacra* which comprised the first section of the lengthy tome. In that work, De Laune demonstrated his own mastery of ancient languages, a mastery he almost certainly gained while being educated at his childhood home in Ireland. After his education, De Laune moved to Kingsale

⁵² E.g., *Maze Pond Church Book, 1691-1708*, Angus Library, Regent's Park College, Oxford, opening narrative.

⁵³ Whitley, *Baptists of London*, 108. Originally a member of Henry Jessey's congregation, Forty later pastored a congregation in Abingdon and signed the *The faith and practice of thirty congregations* (1651). Keach later preached Forty's funeral sermon, published as *The everlasting covenant*.

⁵⁴ Turner, ed. *Original Records*, II:990.

⁵⁵ Whitley, *Baptists of London*, 118. Once again, Whitley provided no supporting evidence for this claim.

⁵⁶ *Horsleydown Register*.

where, according to Crosby, he met Mr. Bampffield and Edward Hutchinson.⁵⁷ By this point, De Laune had probably forsaken the Catholicism of his childhood and adopted Baptist views because he soon married Hutchinson's daughter, Hanna, and moved to London. De Laune penned *A plea for the non-conformists* (1684), a popular defense of separation from the Church of England which eventually resulted in De Laune's conviction and imprisonment for sedition. De Laune and his family died in Newgate in 1685.

James Jones (d. 1685?)

One of the lesser-known early leaders of London Baptists, James Jones remains somewhat enigmatic as a pastor-theologian. He has been largely neglected by the general histories of English Baptists.⁵⁸ However, he provided some unique connections into the world of London dissent which may have been crucial for the young Keach. Whitley's observation that by about 1661, James Jones led the church represented by Thomas Munden and Thomas Skippard at the signing of the *1644 London Confession* has been accepted as authoritative. Also accepted as true is Whitley's assertion that this church broke up around 1685 with many members joining Keach's Horsleydown congregation.⁵⁹ Both Keach and Jones shared a close relationship with John Child (1638-1684), the Baptist preacher, sometime Fifth Monarchist, and longtime friend of Keach's from Buckinghamshire who hanged himself after suffering from immense despair following his decision to conform to the Church of England.⁶⁰ Additionally, Jones' church met in St. Olave's Parish which was adjacent to the Southwark location of Keach's Horsleydown church.

⁵⁷ This is probably referring to Francis Bampffield, the Seventh Day Baptist minister. Edward Hutchinson was a Baptist pastor in Ormond, Ireland. Crosby, *History*, II:366.

⁵⁸ He did not appear in the four-volume work by Crosby. Nor was he noted in B.R. White's *The English Baptists of the Seventeenth Century*. The author of the Beechen Grove Baptist Church History lamented the lack of information about James Jones. See Walter Bennewith, *The Beechen Grove Story: a History of Beechen Grove Baptist Church, Watford* (B.G. Press, 1983), 11-12.

⁵⁹ Whitley, *Baptists of London*, 105. In typical Whitley fashion, these claims were unsubstantiated. No external evidence has been found to prove (or disprove) these claims. Because most of the Horsleydown Register was destroyed, the information cannot be confirmed via that means. However, given the other connections between Keach and Jones, this assertion is, at least, plausible.

⁶⁰ *The English spira* (London: T. Fabian, 1693); James Jones, *Modesty and faithfulness in opposition to envy and rashness; or, An answer to a malicious pamphlet [by J. Child] called, A second argument for*

Jones was known to frequent the meetings of dissenters in London, resulting in numerous appearances throughout official government records. He obtained a license in 1672 as a Baptist.⁶¹ In 1681, he was considered important enough to mention on a list of attendees at a conventicle at Edmund Calamy's (1634-1685) meeting house at Currier's Hall. Also in attendance at that meeting were notable non-conformists Richard Steele (1629-1692), John Owen, Henry Danvers, Samuel Annesley (1620-1696), and Mathew Meade.⁶² According to the 1682 report of Constant Oates, the informant and brother of the infamous Titus Oates (1649-1705) of Popish Plot fame, Jones had some two hundred members in his congregation.⁶³ He was the focus of numerous investigations by authorities, being interrupted at his meeting house in February 1682/3 and arrested on 18 April 1683. By the time of that 1683 arrest, Jones was known as 'the coffee-man in Ship Yard in Bartholomew Lane', a reference to the coffee house which he owned and which served as a meeting house for his congregation and for many Baptist (and other non-conforming) ministers.⁶⁴ The writer, Daniel Defoe (1660?-1731),⁶⁵ mentioned James Jones' coffee house and may have frequented it along with Samuel Annesley, his pastor, and Annesley's sons-in-law, John Dunton and Samuel Wesley (1662-1735).⁶⁶

Informal Group of Baptist Elders

Jones' coffee house also served as the meeting-place for larger associations of Baptist churches. For Keach, however, the most significant meetings at Jones' coffee house involved an informal group of Baptist leaders which included Benjamin Keach,

a more full union amongst Protestants (London: s.n., 1683); *ODNB*. For the connection to the Fifth Monarchists, see *Thurloe Papers*, VI:187.

⁶¹ *CSPD Car. II*, 30 Sept 1672.

⁶² *List of Attendees at Curriers Hall Conventicle*, SP Dom:Car. II.417, no. 144i. Given this list of attendees, it is possible that Benjamin Keach may have been in attendance as well.

⁶³ *Constant Oates Spy Report*, SP 29/419/55-56. These numbers are nearly impossible to verify.

⁶⁴ *CSPD Car. II*, 14 Feb 1682, 18 April 1683.

⁶⁵ Defoe, the author of *Robinson Crusoe*, was known as a radical pamphleteer. In 1685, he fought under Monmouth at Sedgmoor, and joined William of Orange's army in 1689. *BDBR*; *ODNB*.

⁶⁶ See Bryant Lillywhite, *London Coffee Houses: a Reference Book of Coffee Houses of the Seventeenth, Eighteenth, and Nineteenth Centuries* (London: G. Allen and Unwin, 1963), 309. For John Dunton, see below, p. 34. Samuel Wesley was a Church of England clergyman who collaborated with Dunton and Defoe on the *Athenian Gazette*. He was the father of John and Charles Wesley.

Hercules Collins, Joseph Stennett, and Richard Adams.⁶⁷ This group evidently met to discuss issues which arose in Particular Baptist life and to set out courses of action for their respective congregations. As such, the group developed a camaraderie which displayed itself in the debates of the last decades of the seventeenth century.

Hercules Collins (d. 1702)

Hercules Collins signed the *Second London Confession* as the pastor of the Particular Baptist Church in Wapping. Having no university education did not prove to be a major hindrance to Collins who relied on his own reading to develop his theology and publish his own theological works. The most famous of those works, *An Orthodox Catechism* (1680), was a Baptist revision of the popular *Heidelberg Catechism*. This placed Collins in a small group of Baptist authors who published catechetical works.⁶⁸ Collins, alongside Benjamin Keach, became involved in written debates about baptism with the Athenian Society and with Gyles Shute in the 1690s.⁶⁹ Collins and Keach also appeared on the same side of the debate over hymn-singing and in response to the harassment of James Marham, the Baptist minister at Lyn in Norfolk, who reportedly went into great debt to defend himself against persecution for his Baptist beliefs.⁷⁰

Joseph Stennett (1663-1713)

Part of the influential Stennett family, Joseph was active among dissenting congregations from an early age. His father, Edward Stennett (1627/8-1705), a physician, had been a member of John Pendarves' (1622/3-1656) Fifth Monarchist congre-

⁶⁷ Isaac Marlow, *An answer to a deceitful book, entituled, A just vindication of mr. William Collins* (London: s.n., 1698), 6. Cf. *BDBR*, II:151. The General Assembly of General Baptist churches (which split from the General Association over Caffynite theology—see below) met at Jones' coffee house. *White's Alley Church Book*. For more on the role of coffee houses in the dissenting/non-conforming underground, see Lillywhite, *London Coffee Houses*.

⁶⁸ Other Baptists who published catechetical works included: Benjamin Keach, Christopher Blackwood, and Nehemiah Coxe & William Collins. See Chapter III.

⁶⁹ Hercules Collins, *Animadversions upon the responses of the Athenian mercury, to the questions about infant-baptism* (London: s.n., 1692); Hercules Collins, *The antidote proved a counterfeit, or, Error detected and believers baptism vindicated* (London: for William Marshall, 1693).

⁷⁰ *Lyn Persecution Letter*, Angus Library, Regent's Park College, Oxford.

gation in Abingdon.⁷¹ Edward became a seventh-day Baptist at some point during the 1650s and led a congregation in Wallingford. During his family's time in Wallingford, Joseph received a grammar school education, aided by his father and his oldest brother. Joseph later succeeded the millenarian and sabbatarian, Francis Bampfield, as pastor of the Pinner's Hall Seventh Day Baptists and also lectured for the General Baptist Church meeting at the Barbican. Beginning in 1698, that General Baptist congregation reacted rather strongly to Joseph's Reformed theology. At that point, the Barbican congregation requested that 'Bro Stennet do refraine for the future to Preach contrary to the sentiment of the Church in the five Points controverted between the Remonstrants & Calvinists'.⁷² Noting his continuing practice of preaching on these points and the detrimental effects that topic had had at White's Alley, the Barbican congregation once again admonished Joseph Stennett but was 'willing to continue him to preach amongst us, provided he will yet promise to forbear preaching up those Controversies between the Remonstrants and Calvinists which hath been found destructive to many Churches'.⁷³ He, along with Benjamin Keach and several others, was involved in the April 1704 assembly of thirteen associated churches at Lorimer's Hall. Perhaps because of the close agreement in their theology on all issues except the Sabbath or perhaps because of their common roles as Baptist leaders, Keach and Stennett had been closely associated for some years and enjoyed a mutual respect. In fact, when Keach was dying in July 1704, he requested Joseph Stennett to preach his funeral sermon, a request that went unfulfilled due to Stennett's own illness at the time of Keach's death.⁷⁴

Richard Adams (d. 1716)

Richard Adams, the Baptist minister with whom Benjamin Keach was closely connected, shared his name with a Presbyterian who ministered in the St. Olave's Pa-

⁷¹ For more on Pendarves, see *ODNB*.

⁷² *Turner's Hall Church Book*, Angus Library, Regent's Park College, Oxford, 26 May 1698, 12 June 1698.

⁷³ *Barbican Church Minute Book*, Angus Library, Regent's Park College, Oxford, 11? April 1700. Joseph's brother, Benjamin, also a minister, received a similar warning from the White's Alley Church in 1684. This was probably the contentious debate to which the Barbican Church Minute Book referred. *White's Alley Church Book*, Guildhall Library, London, 7 Nov 1684.

⁷⁴ Crosby, *History*, IV:309.

rish area of Southwark.⁷⁵ The Baptist Richard Adams studied under the anti-paedobaptist, John Tombes (1602-1676), and had been a member of Jonathan Jennings' General Baptist congregation at White's Alley.⁷⁶ He later converted to Particular Baptist theology and was ordained by Hanserd Knollys, William Collins (d. 1702), and Hercules Collins to serve as joint-elder with William Kiffin at Devonshire Square in 1690.⁷⁷ He may have been the 'Mr. Adams' who, in 1682, Constant Oates reported as leading a gathering of about three hundred Fifth Monarchists. This Adams performed the weddings of two of Keach's daughters: Susannah Keach to Benjamin Stinton in 1699 and Rachel Keach to Peter Carter on 1 January 1699/1700.⁷⁸

Family

In addition to those already-established Baptist leaders he met in London, Keach's own family became an important part of the dissenting network. By the 1690s, the expanded Keach family came to include several leaders who became prominent in their own right.

Elias Keach (1665-1699)

Elias Keach, the only son of Benjamin to survive childhood, followed in his father's footsteps as a Particular Baptist minister and developed significant contacts for the disbursement of his Baptist theology. Elias served the majority of his ministerial career in the Pennsylvania colony, gathering the first Baptist church there—Pennepek (or Lower Dublin) Baptist Church—after having a conversion experience in

⁷⁵ The Presbyterian Richard Adams (1626/7-1698) was Oxford-educated and a close relation of the celebrated Stephen Charnock (1628-1680) and John Howe (1630-1705), who preached the Presbyterian Adams' funeral sermon. See *ODNB*. Also see Turner, ed. *Original Records*, II:965. For the Baptist Richard Adams, who is listed as a Baptist in the 1669 episcopal returns, see Turner, ed. *Original Records*, II:769. The Baptist Adams may also have received a license as a Congregationalist in 1672. Turner, ed. *Original Records*, II:767.

⁷⁶ Adams was called to the church meeting for disciplinary purposes on 7 Nov 1684. See *White's Alley Church Book*, Guildhall Library, London. For more on Tombes, see below, 44.

⁷⁷ Edmund Calamy, *A continuation of the account of the ministers, lecturers, masters and fellows of colleges, and schoolmasters, who were ejected and silenced* (London: s.n., 1727), 594.

⁷⁸ *Horsleydown Register*. Note that the Presbyterian Adams, who may have been acquainted with Keach, was already deceased at the time of these weddings.

the midst of one of his own sermons.⁷⁹ Elias subsequently planted several congregations which worked in close association with each other. After an apparent disagreement over the practice of the laying on of hands on all baptized believers and/or the doctrine of predestination, Elias left the pastorate in the Pennsylvania colony, eventually returning to London and taking a morning lecture at Pinner's Hall where, at times, he spoke to a crowd of 1500.⁸⁰ In April 1693, Elias gathered a congregation in Wapping and, according to his own hand, was 'ordained by imposition of hands in presence of a great congregation by my honoured father and the Rev. brother Hercules Collins'.⁸¹ Elias disseminated some of his father's distinctive doctrinal teachings to the British colonies, both in person while he lived in the colony and by sending his father's books once he returned to England.⁸² He continued as lecturer at Pinner's Hall and as pastor of the Wapping church (which successively met at Curriers' Hall, Tallow Chandlers' Hall, and on Great Alie Street⁸³) until his death in 1699.⁸⁴ The Lower Dublin, Pennsylvania church developed a relationship with the Keaches in London which they maintained with Benjamin after Elias' death. In 1705, the Lower Dublin church even sought Benjamin's help in filling their vacant pulpit.⁸⁵ As late as 1714, this church remained in contact with Benjamin Stinton, Benjamin Keach's son-in-law and successor at Horsleydown.⁸⁶

⁷⁹ See Horatio Gates Jones, 'The Baptists in Pennsylvania. Being a Sketch of the Pennepek or Lower Dublin Baptist Church', *The Historical Magazine* IV [second series] (1868), 76-87. Cf. Ivimey, *History*, II:468.

⁸⁰ Ivimey, *History*, III:408. Elias Keach mentioned this number in his letter to John Watts in the Pennsylvania colony. Elias Keach, 'Letter to Rev. John Watts, 20 February 1693/4.' in *Materials Towards a History of the American Baptists*, ed. M. Edwards, I:109-115 (Philadelphia: Joseph Crukshank and Isaac Collins, 1693/4).

⁸¹ Keach, 'Letter to Rev. John Watts, 20 February 1693/4.'

⁸² Keach, 'Letter to Rev. John Watts, 20 February 1693/4.' Along with this letter, Elias sent three of his father's books: *A counter-antidote*, *The ax laid to the root*, and *The English spira*.

⁸³ Whitley, *Baptists of London*, 123.

⁸⁴ Ivimey was clearly mistaken when he stated that Elias lectured at Pinner's Hall until 1701. Ivimey, *History*, III:408.

⁸⁵ Unfortunately for the colonial church, news of Benjamin Keach's death had not yet reached them.

⁸⁶ *Letter from Pensilvania [sic]*, Angus Library, Regent's Park College, Oxford, Stinton Manuscript, no. 26.

Benjamin Stinton (1675/6-1718)

Part of the Stinton family who had been early members of the Horsleydown congregation, Benjamin Stinton married Susannah Keach on 5 October 1699. By at least 1697, Stinton served as Keach's assistant at Horsleydown and, later, succeeded Keach as pastor.⁸⁷ Like his father-in-law and most dissenting ministers of his day, Stinton did not receive a university education, but Crosby noted that he did receive 'assistance of the famous Mr. [Robert] *Ainsworth*',⁸⁸ the celebrated schoolmaster of a boarding school at Bethnal Green.⁸⁹ Stinton later spearheaded the effort to establish a charity school in Southwark and was influential in the administering of the Particular Baptist Fund in the early eighteenth century. Stinton published few works—one of which was a posthumously-published short catechism, but he did collect historical documents which served as the foundation for the seminal history of the English Baptists written by his brother-in-law, Thomas Crosby.⁹⁰ Stinton's brother, Thomas (b.1668), also married a daughter of Benjamin Keach, Elizabeth in 1690.⁹¹

*Thomas Crosby (1665-1768)*⁹²

Thomas Crosby married Rebecca Keach, the youngest daughter of Benjamin Keach and later cared for his widowed mother-in-law. He was a schoolmaster and has been celebrated as the first Baptist historian. His four-volume work entitled *The History of the English Baptists* remains the seminal work on English Baptist history. Understandably, his lengthy, almost hagiographic, portrait of Benjamin Keach provides unique insight into Keach's character and life events and has proven to be the lasting vision of Keach for centuries. Crosby was active in the Horsleydown congregation during Benjamin Stinton's pastorate and in the period following Stinton's death, final-

⁸⁷ Stinton was a Teacher in Keach's Horsleydown congregation. Benjamin Keach, *The articles of the faith of the church of Christ, or congregation meeting at Horsley-down* (London: s.n., 1697), sig. Av.

⁸⁸ Crosby, *History*, IV:348.

⁸⁹ *ODNB*.

⁹⁰ The Stinton Manuscripts can be found in the Angus Library, Regents Park College, Oxford.

⁹¹ The ceremony was performed by George Barrett. *Horsleydown Register*. Thomas Stinton was a deacon in the Horsleydown church led by Benjamin Keach and Benjamin Stinton in 1697. Keach, *The articles of the faith*, sig. Av.

⁹² The birth and death dates of Crosby are debated. The *ESTC* lists his dates as 1665-1768; *ODNB* lists his death as in or after 1749; Austin Walker lists his dates as 1685-1752.

ly settling with the branch of the church which called John Gill (1697-1771) as its pastor.

Horsleydown Congregation

The congregation which gathered under Benjamin Keach in Horsleydown included an eclectic group of Baptists, ranging from successful physicians to renowned publishers. As with most congregations, the vast majority of members did not leave major footprints in history. A few, however, deserve to be mentioned as part of Keach's social network because of the connections they made available to Keach.

Isaac Marlow (1649-1719) and Family

Before he became Keach's main opponent during the hymn-singing controversy of the early 1690s,⁹³ Isaac Marlow was probably a member of the Horsleydown congregation, although by 1689 he was involved with George Barrett's Mile-End Green congregation whom he represented at the General Assembly in that year.⁹⁴ Marlow was a well-read lay leader among the Particular Baptists. In 1690, Marlow published a thorough treatise on the doctrine of the trinity entitled *A treatise of the holy Trinunity* which demonstrated his familiarity with the thought of Francis Cheynell (d. 1665), the ejected minister and member of the Westminster Assembly. In addition, Marlow published several other works during his lifetime—mostly dealing with the hymn-singing controversy—and left one manuscript unpublished.⁹⁵ Marlow proved to be a troublesome opponent for Keach in the hymn-singing controversy, with the two matching each other nearly stride-for-stride with their respective use of scripture and

⁹³ On this controversy, see Vaughn, 'Public Worship and Practical Theology'; Brooks, 'Benjamin Keach and the Baptist Singing Controversy'; MacDonald, 'London Calvinistic Baptists'.

⁹⁴ This remains only a probability because no definitive proof of Marlow's membership in the Horsleydown congregation actually exists. His wife is listed as one who left the Horsleydown congregation to help establish the Maze Pond Church which arose out of the hymn-singing controversy. This same record lists Isaac Marlow as an external elder who was consulted for advice in November 1691. *Maze Pond Church Book*, Angus Library, Regent's Park College, Oxford. As late as 1690/1, the children born to 'Isaac and Esther Marlowe' are listed in the Horsleydown Register. The minutes from the 1689 General Assembly list Marlow as a representative of Barrett's Mile-End Green congregation. *Narrative of the proceedings [1689]*, 22-3. Cf. MacDonald, 'London Calvinistic Baptists', 52; Vaughn, 'Public Worship and Practical Theology', 131-2.

⁹⁵ The unpublished manuscript is in the Angus Library of Regent's Park College, Oxford. It is in Marlow's handwriting and deals largely with practical ecclesiology.

external authorities. The argumentation proved rather similar despite the two simply arriving at contrasting opinions.⁹⁶ Marlow went on to serve as a respected leader of the Baptists into the early eighteenth century.⁹⁷

Benjamin Harris (c. 1647-1720)

A publisher with a penchant for the politically (and sometimes religiously) radical, Benjamin Harris may have made his debut in the publishing world with Benjamin Keach's *War with the devil* (1673), having only recently gained his freedom from the Stationers' Company.⁹⁸ He quickly made a name for himself as a publisher whose repertoire included at least eleven works by Keach, several works by John Bunyan (1628-1688),⁹⁹ and his own early newspaper, the *Domestick Intelligence*. In 1679, Harris published a pamphlet which openly supported the Duke of Monmouth as successor to Charles II, leading to a conviction in February 1680/1 for printing and spreading seditious libel.¹⁰⁰ Harris moved to Boston, Massachusetts in the middle of the 1680s and prospered as a publisher there, reportedly publishing the first American newspaper, *Publick Occurrences*. He later returned to London and continued his publishing business there with new newspapers and more works by Keach among others. Throughout his adult life, Harris was considered dangerous to the government—at the very least due to 'guilt by association' with some of the more factious leaders of his time. In addition to his support of Monmouth, Harris was reportedly associated with Lord Shaftesbury and the republican activist, Slingsby Bethel (d. 1697), associations which did not leave Harris in the good graces of the establishment. Harris was likely

⁹⁶ The most thorough study of the argumentation methodology of Keach and Marlow can be found in James C. Brooks, 'Benjamin Keach and the Baptist Singing Controversy: Mediating Scripture, Confessional Heritage, and Christian Unity', PhD Thesis, The Florida State University, 2006.

⁹⁷ See Crosby, *History*, IV:171ff.

⁹⁸ The *ODNB* notes that *War with the devil* was Harris's debut publication. The *English Short Title Catalogue* (ESTC), however, lists *Poor Robins character of a Dutch-man* (1672) by William Winstanley as Harris's debut. Plomer supports the *ODNB*. Henry Robert Plomer, *A dictionary of the printers and booksellers who were at work in England, Scotland and Ireland from 1668 to 1725* ([Oxford]: Printed for the Bibliographical Society at the Oxford University Press, 1922), 145.

⁹⁹ Bunyan was an anti-paedobaptist minister who led his church to hold communion with believers whether or not they were baptized post-conversion, a practice referred to as open communion. Bunyan later penned *Pilgrim's progress*, the allegory for which he became most famous.

¹⁰⁰ Roger Morrice, *The Entering Book of Roger Morrice, 1677-1691* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press in association with the Parliamentary History Yearbook Trust, 2007), 5 Feb 1680. *CSPD Car. II*, Feb 1680.

related to (and perhaps in business with) the bookseller, John Harris, who also sold numerous works by Keach in the 1690s.¹⁰¹

*Benjamin Grosvenor (1676-1758)*¹⁰²

The celebrated Presbyterian minister of Crosby Square, London began his public religious life as a member of Keach's Horsleydown congregation, having been baptized by Keach 'about the year 1689'.¹⁰³ Standing out as a young student of doctrine and promising preacher, Grosvenor entered a course of study for dissenting ministerial office. During that time, he changed his views on baptism and church-governance, and, upon his return to Keach's congregation, sought his dismissal. According to Crosby, this was granted at length with little fanfare.¹⁰⁴ Crosby's portrayal may have been, at best, an oversight as it differed considerably from other accounts. For instance, Walter Wilson noted that '[m]ost of the ministers of that period, at least of the Independent and Presbyterian denominations, considered him to have been treated with harshness and injustice'.¹⁰⁵ What actually occurred in Grosvenor's dismissal may be lost to history; however, two clues exist that can shed light on Keach's influence and dealings in this event. First, Crosby made it clear that Keach suffered from occasional 'sudden fits of anger',¹⁰⁶ and Keach was not well respected by several former members of his congregation who left under unpleasant circumstances.¹⁰⁷ Secondly, Wilson recorded that Grosvenor would have succeeded Matthew Meade in Stepney 'had it not been for the unfavourable impression derived from his excommunication by Mr. Keach's church',¹⁰⁸ lending credence to the assertion that

¹⁰¹ See *ODNB*; Plomer, *Dictionary of Printers and Booksellers, 1668-1725*, 146-7.

¹⁰² Wilson incorrectly listed Grosvenor's birth as occurring in 1695. Walter Wilson, *The history and antiquities of dissenting churches and meeting houses in London, Westminster and Southwark* (London: 1808-14), I:344.

¹⁰³ Crosby, *History*, IV:203. Cf. Wilson, *The history and antiquities*, I:344-6.

¹⁰⁴ Crosby, *History*, IV:203.

¹⁰⁵ Wilson, *The history and antiquities*, I:347, fn. L.

¹⁰⁶ Crosby, *History*, IV:307.

¹⁰⁷ For example, Isaac Marlow did not seem to like Keach at all after he led the opposition to Keach's hymn-singing 'initiative'. Note the vitriol in Marlow's tone in his writing about Keach. See especially Marlow, *An answer to a deceitful book*.

¹⁰⁸ Wilson, *The history and antiquities*, I:348, fn. M. This may indicate a close relationship between Keach's congregation and Meade's which, given their other connections, would not be surprising.

Grosvenor's split with the Horsleydown church was something less than amicable. Regardless, the early connection between Keach and Grosvenor remains incontrovertible and demonstrated Keach's far-reaching connections in London dissent.

Publishing Network

Due to the harshness of the laws which defined both the nature of treasonous speech and its punishment, the publishing of dissenting literature in Restoration England proved to be an extremely hazardous venture. The official censorship enforced by the likes of Roger L'Estrange (1616-1704)¹⁰⁹ under the *Act of Uniformity* and the *Licensing Act*, or *An act for preventing the frequent abuses in printing seditious, treasonable and unlicensed books and pamphlets, and for regulating of printing and printing presses*, provided even more reason for the dissenting literary society to hide its activity.¹¹⁰ If Richard Atkyns' suggestion that '[t]here are at least 600 Booksellers that keep Shops in and about *London*, and Two or three Thousand free of the Company of *Stationers* ... [with] An unlicensed Book bear[ing] Treble the price of another'¹¹¹ approximated the actual state of printing in early Restoration London, L'Estrange faced a particularly difficult task. Certainly the general warrant provided to L'Estrange and the threat of capital punishment and harsh fines aided censorship efforts. The literary world of dissent which Keach entered with vibrancy after 1664 thus developed into a close-knit community with personal relations infiltrating nearly all aspects of a given network. Despite the relaxation of censorship seen especially after the Glorious Revolution, those networks remained. Keach's own literary network proved no exception to this rule, and it provided Keach a unique entrance into a fairly specialized network of theologians and political dissenters.¹¹² The connections be-

¹⁰⁹ L'Estrange served the Restoration as licensor and regulator of the press under Clarendon.

¹¹⁰ The Edwardian *Treason Act* had been constantly extended since the reign of Edward III (1312-1377) and, theoretically, could be used to prosecute illicit publication. These two acts of Charles II strengthened the enforcement mechanism associated with state censorship. See, for instance, the arrest and execution of John Twyn (d. 1664). *An Exact Narrative*; ODNB; Plomer, *Dictionary of Booksellers and Printers, 1641-1667*, 183.

¹¹¹ Richard Atkyns, *The original and growth of printing collected out of history, and the records of this kingdom* (London: John Streater for the author, 1664), 16.

¹¹² Perhaps the best overview of the literary culture remains N. H. Keeble, *The Literary Culture of Non-conformity in Later Seventeenth-Century England* (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1987). Cf. J. S. T. Hetet, 'A Literary Underground in Restoration England', PhD Thesis, University of Cambridge,

tween these individuals, Keach, and the non-conforming community at large clearly were more than mere coincidence. While one can hardly delineate the order of causes and effects for Keach—whether Keach’s personal beliefs drew him to this network or this network inculcated beliefs to Keach or, more likely, a combination of the two—the significance of a network of this nature in Keach’s determination of authorities and, ultimately, bounds of orthodoxy can hardly be overlooked.

Throughout his career, Keach used various publishers and booksellers to disseminate his works, even becoming personally involved in the printing and selling of books from his home with the help of his daughters and at least one son-in-law.¹¹³ Several of his chosen publishers appear to have been opportunistic in nature, with little or no traceable relationships forming between the author and the publisher/bookseller. Those mostly single-time publishers and booksellers included: Ebenezer Trasy, William Likly,¹¹⁴ Christopher Hussey,¹¹⁵ John Pike,¹¹⁶ R. Tookey,¹¹⁷ John Richardson,¹¹⁸ and William Bradford.¹¹⁹ Even those seldom-used agents appeared to be connected to the same relatively small network, however. Of his frequent publishers, Benjamin Harris was responsible for the most works. The rest were spread fairly evenly among a number of other printers, publishers, and booksellers.

1987; George Southcombe, ‘The Responses of Nonconformists to the Restoration in England’, DPhil Thesis, University of Oxford, 2005, esp. Introduction.

¹¹³ Isaac Marlow, *An account of the unjust proceedings, in some matters of difference, between Mr. Williams Collins and Isaac Marlow* (London: s.n., 1697), 18. The following works were listed as being sold by Keach from his house: *An answer to Mr. Marlow’s appendix*, *The breach repaired*, *The rector rectified*, *A golden mine opened*, *The counterfeit Christian*, *The Christian Quaker*. Peter Carter, the husband of Keach’s daughter, Rachel, was listed as a seller of one work: Keach’s *The French impostour*.

¹¹⁴ Trasy and Likly appear to have only published one work: Keach’s *The French impostour*.

¹¹⁵ Hussey published several editions of Keach’s *The glorious lover* as well as educational works by Robert Ainsworth, the schoolmaster of Bethnal Green who aided Benjamin Stinton’s educational endeavors.

¹¹⁶ Pike published five different works including, Keach’s *The counterfeit Christian*, all of which dealt with the Protestant religion.

¹¹⁷ Tookey began his printing business in 1700 with works by Thomas Goodwin (printed alongside John Darby and John Richardson), John Bunyan, Daniel Williams, and Keach. He later printed works by John Griffith and Isaac Watts and even a large number of works by John Dunton who called him ‘an honest printer’. Dunton, *The life and errors*, 331.

¹¹⁸ Richardson, along with John Darby and R Tookey, printed *The works of Thomas Goodwin*. Additionally, Richardson printed Matthew Poole’s *Annotations*, Keach and De Laune’s *Tropologia*, and works by Nathaniel Crouch.

¹¹⁹ Bradford published Keach’s *Instructions for children* in the colony of New York.

John Dunton (1659-1732)¹²⁰

Perhaps the most famous and most successful of Keach's booksellers, John Dunton had a penchant for developing relationships with influential authors and theologians. Owing perhaps to his father-in-law, Samuel Annesley, Dunton soon established a publishing business specializing in nonconformist literature and political works. One of his earliest successes was a collection of poems by Samuel Wesley, his future brother-in-law and collaborator in the *Athenian Gazette*. He, Wesley, and another brother-in-law and celebrated mathematician, Richard Sault (d. 1702), formed the *Athenian Society* who would spar with Benjamin Keach and Hercules Collins over the issue of paedobaptism.¹²¹ Dunton was known to have met with Monmouth's supporters while spending time on the continent in 1687. He also published *The bloody assizes* (1689) which immortalized those executed at the behest of Lord Jeffries as martyrs.¹²² Ultimately, one of Dunton's most lasting contributions was his autobiographical work, entitled *The life and errors of John Dunton*, which chronicled not only Dunton's life but also the extensive network of prominent colleagues, many of whom were clients of Dunton. Many of Keach's other printers, publishers, and booksellers also appeared in *The life and errors*, including George Larkin (b. c. 1642 d. after 1703),¹²³ a close friend of Dunton's and printer of two editions of Keach's *Sion*

¹²⁰ A John Dunton signed the Fifth Monarchist manifesto in 1654 as a part of Hanserd Knollys' church. This may have been the father of the bookseller who lived from 1628-1676, although this would have been unlikely because the elder Dunton was an Anglican minister. The identification of the Fifth Monarchist Dunton remains unclear. *A declaration of several of the Churches of Christ, and godly people in and about the citie of London; concerning the kingly interest of Christ, and the present sufferings of his cause and saints in England* (London: for Livewel Chapman, 1654).

¹²¹ The *Athenian Society* was a group of scholars gathered 'for communicating not only [Natural Knowledge], but all other Sciences to all men, as well as to both Sexes' through the use of question and answer from the public at large which they published in a periodical entitled *The Athenian Mercury*. Charles Gildon, *The history of the Athenian Society: for the resolving of all nice and curious questions* (London: for James Dowley, 1692), 3. The question and answer segment involving Benjamin Keach and Hercules Collins was regarding infant baptism and originally appeared on 14 November and 28 November 1691. They prompted three different responses from Keach: *Pedo-baptism disproved* (1691), *The rector rectified* (1692), *An appendix to the answer unto two Athenian Mercuries...* (1692). Collins added his own publication to this discussion. Collins, *Animadversions*.

¹²² This may have been a source for Keach's martyrology in *Distressed Sion relieved*. See Chapter VII, esp. 255-8.

¹²³ Larkin ran afoul of the government on numerous occasions for his dissenting literature. Plomer, *Dictionary of Printers and Booksellers, 1668-1725*, 184.

in distress [1681 & 1682] which were sold by Enoch Prosser.¹²⁴ Another of Keach's main booksellers, John Hancock, junior, also received an entry in *The life and errors*.¹²⁵

Benjamin Alsop (b. c. 1658 d. c. 1703)

The exact identity of the bookseller, Benjamin Alsop—who, along with John Hancock, was responsible for selling Keach's *Troposchemalogia*—remains a bit of a mystery. Citing a provision in Vincent Alsop's will for the care of Benjamin Alsop's two daughters, The *ODNB* lists Benjamin as the only son of Vincent Alsop (d. 1703), the ejected minister and Presbyterian leader. The *BDBR*, on the other hand, lists Benjamin as a probable descendant of Bernard Alsop (1616-1653), citing Plomer's *Dictionary of Printers and Booksellers*, which does not provide any support for its claim.¹²⁶ The disparity could prove significant. If the bookseller is indeed the son of Vincent Alsop, this would have provided Keach a point of personal connection with a source he cited with some regularity. Regardless, Benjamin Alsop remains an interesting character. All sources agree that the bookseller—whose catalogue included works by the Presbyterian leader, Richard Baxter (1615-1691), John Bunyan, the Particular Baptist leader, Nehemiah Coxe (1649-1689), John Owen, and non-conformists Stephen Lobb (d. 1699) and Thomas Manton (1620-1677)—sold his business to John Dunton when he moved abroad to accept a commission in Monmouth's army. When

¹²⁴ Prosser's catalogue included numerous Baptists—William Kiffin, Thomas De Laune, John Griffith—as well as several works on the Popish Plot.

¹²⁵ Dunton, *The life and errors*, 302. The John Hancock who published Keach's works was listed as 'John Hancock, in Castle Alley near the Exchange'. This Hancock also published a work by Edmund Calamy (*The godly mans ark*), a hymn-book by John Reeve (*Spiritual hymns upon Solomons Song*), and one work by Hercules Collins (*Believers-baptism from heaven*). All of these works were published after 1691. Beginning in the 1640s, a 'John Hancock in Popes-head Alley' actively published works concerning dissent, including the 1646 *London Confession* and numerous works by Independent ministers such as Thomas Brooks (1608-1660), Edmund Calamy, and Joseph Caryl (1602-1673). This was John Hancock, senior. From 1673-75, John Hancock, senior and junior co-published works. Apparently, that practice stopped in 1675 after which the two may have run separate businesses. John Hancock, senior (sometimes listed as 'brother to Eliz. Moore') was still alive in 1684. Hancock, senior probably died around 1685. An uncommon gap in publishing occurred between 1685 and 1690 after which the location of Hancock's shop changed to Castle-Alley and the Royal Exchange, probably indicating the death of the elder.

¹²⁶ See Plomer, *Dictionary of Printers and Booksellers, 1668-1725*, 5.

the Monmouth Rebellion failed, Benjamin went into exile. He later received a general pardon from James II on 31 May 1687.¹²⁷

John Darby (d. 1704)

John Darby, called the ‘*Religious Printer* [who] goes to Heaven with the *Ana-baptists*’,¹²⁸ apprenticed under the known radical printer, Simon Dover (d. 1664). Shortly after being convicted of ‘high misdemeanors in the management of [his] trade’, Dover died in April 1664.¹²⁹ Darby married Dover’s widow, Joan, who had worked alongside her first husband as a printer and publisher. The two Darbys together printed and/or published more than one hundred works after 1667,¹³⁰ including works by William Penn, John Owen, Gilbert Burnet, Thomas Goodwin (1600-1680),¹³¹ Thomas Grantham, and Charles Marie de Veil (1630-c. 1691).¹³² Following in his former master’s footsteps, Darby remained under suspicion from the government for the majority of his career.¹³³ He had a son, John, and a son-in-law, Andrew Bell, who were both involved in the bookselling and/or printing business.¹³⁴ When Joan Darby died, she left money for Richard Allen (d. 1717) to disperse among the poor of his General Baptist congregation at Paul’s Alley, the Barbican.

¹²⁷ *CSPD James II*, 31 May 1687 [SP 44/337].

¹²⁸ Dunton, *The life and errors*, 328.

¹²⁹ *CSPD Car. II*, Undated 1663 & April ? 1664. Cf. Henry Robert Plomer, *A dictionary of the booksellers and printers who were at work in England, Scotland and Ireland from 1641 to 1667* (London: 1907), 65.

¹³⁰ Often only ‘J. Darby’ appeared on the title page, a name which could refer to John or Joan Darby after their marriage sometime after 1664.

¹³¹ See below for Thomas Goodwin, 42-3.

¹³² de Veil was a scholar educated in France at an Augustinian seminary. When his branch of the Augustinian order was denounced as ‘Calvinism in Catholic clothing’, he immigrated to England where he entered the Anglican ministry. He made many influential acquaintances during that time, including Robert Boyle and Henry Compton, Bishop of London. At some point in the 1680s, de Veil met and married a Baptist woman and, after meeting with Hanserd Knollys, he became a Baptist and succeeded John Child as minister of the congregation at Gracechurch Street. Whitley, *Baptists of London*, 117.

¹³³ See *CSPD Car. II*, 16 Aug 1667 [suspected of printing illicit material], 20 Jan 1668 [arrest warrant], 7 May 1668 [release from prison]. *Journal of the House of Commons* 9:22 October 1669; *Calendar of Treasury Books* 26:408-11 [records the fine for treason charges against Darby]; *CSPD Car. II*, 29 Sept 1683 [questioned and fined for printing seditious material].

¹³⁴ Andrew Bell published Keach’s *Medium Betwixt Two Extremes* along with numerous other non-conformists: Joseph Stennett, Richard Allen, John Bunyan, Stephen Nye, and John Flavel. He bought the copyright to the *Athenian Oracle* from John Dunton (see below) in 1702.

H[enry] Barnard

Three different works of Keach's were printed by Henry Barnard: *The banquetting-house*, *The everlasting covenant*, and *A counter-antidote*. Barnard did not have a large business, but the business he did have was significant for Keach. Barnard's main author was Isaac Chauncy for whom he printed three works in 1693 and 1694. Barnard also printed the sermon Thomas Harrison preached at Hanserd Knollys' funeral as well as a work on the Sabbath by Isaac Marlow.

William Marshal and John Marshal

Probably related, William and John Marshal combined to print and sell some seven volumes of Benjamin Keach's work between 1694 and 1705, making the Marshals Keach's second most commonly used printer and seller behind only Benjamin and John Harris. Little is known about the Marshals other than their obvious interest in nonconforming Protestant literature. The catalogue of works printed and/or sold by William and John Marshal provides some insight into their own theology and the type of connections—both personal and theological—which Keach could have made in their company. That catalogue included numerous works by John Owen, Thomas Beverley, John Bunyan, Peter Chamberlen, Matthew Meade, and (perhaps most tellingly) the renowned Antinomian, Tobias Crisp.¹³⁵

Book Access

Aside from the possible personal connections established within, and because of, Keach's publishing network, the most important aspect of this inter-woven group of people was the access to theological works it provided. For Keach, being self-educated meant more than simply being personally responsible for his own education. It also meant that he did not have easy access to the major libraries of his day—such as those available at the universities and in the scholarly communities that developed out of university connections. A dissenting minister, especially a relatively poor Baptist dissenting minister, necessarily had to find other methods for obtaining printed ma-

¹³⁵ John Marshal even advertised his shop as one 'where you may be supplied with Dr. Owen's, Mr. Mead's, Mr. Keach's, and Mr. Bunyan's Works'. Nathanael Wyles, *The sinners folly discovered and detected, in making a mock at sin* (London: for John Marshal, 1702), title page. This provides a glimpse of the reputation afforded to Benjamin Keach at this stage of his career. For more on Owen, see below, 39. On Crisp, see Chapter VI.

terials. Certainly for Keach, one of those methods was through the very networks which produced the written literature. Being an accomplished (and popular¹³⁶) author made those connections easier and, conceivably, would have allowed Keach access to a bookseller's catalogue. Running his own bookshop, regardless of the size, would also have provided a means of access to printed material as did his personal connections with authors and theologians themselves. One additional means of access would have been available to Keach by at least the latter part of his ministry, namely a subscription-service library, one of which had developed for Baptists by at least 1700 at the Barbican.¹³⁷

Several publishers and booksellers from Keach's tight-knit network involved themselves in that library, including John Harris and John Darby (senior and junior), all of whom made donations—monetary and literary—to the library. Richard Allen—until 1695, the pastor of the White's Alley Church loosely connected to Keach's Horsleydown congregation and, afterward, pastor of the Paul's Alley, Barbican congregation—subscribed to the library as a borrower.¹³⁸ Interestingly, the list of books donated to the library reads almost like a list of works consulted by Keach, including numerous works by John Owen, Matthew Poole (1624?-1679),¹³⁹ Henry Ainsworth (1569-1622), Charles Marie de Veil, Archbishop Ussher (1581-1656), Thomas Goodwin, etc. Keach's works also were part of the library's collection. While Keach does not appear as a borrower or donor in the extant records from this library, the records do demonstrate a potential point of book access for someone in Keach's position.

¹³⁶ John Dunton claimed to have printed ten thousand copies of Keach's *Travels of True Godliness*, which, along with *War with the devil*, Dunton thought would 'sell to the end of time'. Dunton, *The life and errors*, 177.

¹³⁷ *Some Accounts of a Library*, Dr Williams Library, MS 38.77.

¹³⁸ The limited extant records from the library indicated that Allen borrowed the third volume of Matthew Henry's commentary on one occasion. The church book of the White's Alley congregation recorded numerous interactions with Keach and the Horsleydown congregation. A typical example of these interactions can be found in the entry dated 16 Feb 1696. *White's Alley Church Book*, Guildhall Library, London. The Paul's Alley church also had connections to Keach's network, including an extensive relationship with Joseph Stennett. *Barbican Church Minute Book*, Angus Library, Regent's Park College, Oxford; *Turner's Hall Church Book*, Angus Library, Regent's Park College, Oxford.

¹³⁹ Poole, a Presbyterian minister, was a famous biblical commentator. His *Annotations upon the Holy Bible* was widely used among nonconformists, including Keach.

Literary Connections

That potential access point highlights the final major segment of Keach's network which deserves discussion: the literary connections, or those people with whom Keach debated or conversed in writing and/or those whom Keach cited as authoritative on a given subject. An individual's canon of sources stands as one of the most telling aspects of that person's understanding of orthodoxy. Those sources he/she reads and the authors (both historical and contemporary) with whom he/she interacts generally weighs heavily on his/her beliefs. In this area, Benjamin Keach is surely no exception. A simple reading of Keach's works demonstrates his expansive access to written literature and, thus, his vast network of literary connections. This becomes especially impressive when one considers Keach's modest educational background without university access.

Contemporaries

John Owen (1616-1683)

By far, Keach's most frequently cited source was John Owen, the celebrated Independent minister, theologian, and one-time vice-chancellor of Oxford University. A prolific author, most of Owen's works have remained in print since their original publication, now comprising some twenty-eight modern volumes. In addition to his voluminous writing, Owen also figured prominently in the drafting of the *Savoy Declaration* (1658), the Independent answer to the *Westminster Confession*. From 1673 until his death, Owen served as pastor of the Independent church meeting at Bury-Street, having succeeded the Westminster divine, Joseph Caryl (1602-1673).¹⁴⁰ He also served as one of the six inaugural lecturers for the Merchants' Tuesday morning lectures at Pinners' Hall.¹⁴¹ Keach clearly saw Owen as the quintessential theologian, citing the famous author more than two hundred times by name and countless others by indirect or uncited reference. Although no clear evidence of a Keach-Owen meet-

¹⁴⁰ Wilson, *The history and antiquities*, I:254.

¹⁴¹ The other five lecturers were four Presbyterians—William Bates (1625-1699), Thomas Manton, Richard Baxter, and William Jenkyn (1613-1685)—and one other Independent—John Collins (1632?-1687). Matthew Meade took Owen's position after Owen died. Wilson, *The history and antiquities*, II:252.

ing exists, given the networks of the two theologians, the possibility remains strong.¹⁴² At the very least, Keach almost certainly availed himself of the numerous opportunities to hear Owen's sermons in and around Southwark.

Isaac Chauncy (1632-1712)

Six years after Owen's death, the Independent church at Bury-Street called Isaac Chauncy as their pastor. The son of Charles Chauncy, who served as president of Harvard in the Massachusetts colony from 1654 to 1672, Isaac received an MA at Harvard before returning to England. Chauncy obtained a license to preach 'in his One House or any other Licensed place hee being of the presbyterian Perswaisson [sic]'.¹⁴³ At some point after Charles II revoked the 1672 Indulgence, Chauncy moved to London to practice medicine, only returning to the pastorate when he succeeded David Clarkson as pastor of Bury-Street. Evidently, during the time he spent practicing medicine, Chauncy changed his views on church polity from Presbyterian to Congregational, a view he vehemently defended in his 1697 work entitled *The Divine Institution of Congregational Churches*. In 1690, Chauncy and Hanserd Knollys both signed a significant preface to a new edition of Tobias Crisp's (1600-1643) sermons.¹⁴⁴ In 1691, Chauncy helped establish the 'Happy Union' between the Presbyterians and Independents; however, his implicit support of Crisp's teaching and his renewed attacks against the brand of theology espoused by Richard Baxter and Daniel Williams (c. 1643-1716) helped end that union. After the two groups re-established their own lectures and funds, Chauncy worked alongside Thomas Goodwin at the academy supported by the Congregational Fund. He was succeeded as pastor by his assistant, Isaac Watts (1674-1748). Thanks largely to his stance against Baxterian-

¹⁴² Owen definitely mixed company with the Baptist leader Henry Danvers and (probably) James Jones. *List of Attendees at Curriers Hall Conventicle*, SP Dom: Car. II.417, no. 144i. Owen also knew the open-communion Baptist and Fifth Monarchist, Vavasor Powell, even writing a commendatory preface for Vavasor Powell's *A new and useful concordance to the Holy Bible* (1673).

¹⁴³ Turner, ed. *Original Records*, III:319-20.

¹⁴⁴ Tobias Crisp was a minister in the Church of England whose writings played a significant role in the two English iterations of the *Antinomian Controversy*.

ism—a stance with which Keach agreed wholeheartedly—Chauncy served as a regular authority for Keach.¹⁴⁵

Richard Baxter (1615-1691)

As the pre-eminent leader of the Presbyterians, the prolific writer, Richard Baxter, served as an authoritative source for most theologians of his day. Like his contemporary, John Owen, theologians of all ilks sought either to align with or against the often-polarizing thought of Baxter. Keach proved to be no exception to that rule, generally citing Baxter as a source of poor (even heretical) theology where the doctrine of justification was concerned. Keach vehemently attacked the teaching of justification which came to be known as *Baxterianism* after Richard Baxter, its most outspoken proponent. Elsewhere, however, Keach recognized the sway of Baxter's name, citing him in support of any views they held in common. This citation of Baxter for numerous purposes aligned well with Baxter's stated desires of unifying 'catholic Christianity'. To that end, Baxter somewhat uniquely obtained a license in 1672 as a 'Nonconforming minister' rather than in the name of a particular sect.¹⁴⁶ At that time, Baxter served alongside Owen as an inaugural lecturer for the Pinners' Hall Merchants' Lectures—just one of a number of opportunities Keach would have had to hear Baxter in person.¹⁴⁷ Eventually, Baxter was succeeded in that post by Daniel Williams. Baxter also engaged in numerous debates throughout his career with several proving significant for Benjamin Keach. In the 1670s, Baxter engaged the General Baptist leader, Henry Danvers, in a debate over infant baptism.¹⁴⁸ Later that same decade, Baxter debated the Quaker leader, William Penn. Keach cited Baxter more than one hundred and fifty times in his writings, but no record exists of Baxter ever taking more than a passing notice of Keach.

¹⁴⁵ For a full discussion of Baxterianism and Antinomianism, see Chapter VI, 176-84.

¹⁴⁶ Turner, ed. *Original Records*, I:575.

¹⁴⁷ Baxter spent a significant portion of his ministerial career in and around Southwark. George Walter Thornbury, *Old and New London: a Narrative of its History, its People and its Places* (London: s.n., 1879), II:427-41.

¹⁴⁸ Crosby, *History*, III:90.

Daniel Williams (c. 1643-1716)

The Presbyterian minister originally from Wrexham, Wales, Daniel Williams worked alongside Isaac Chauncy and others to establish the ‘Happy Union’ between the Congregationalists and the Presbyterians after the Glorious Revolution. Like Chauncy, Williams also played a significant role in the rather quick end met by that union after the rekindling of the *Antinomian Controversy* in the 1690s. Williams joined Richard Baxter and Samuel Clark (1626-1701) as the major opponents of the ‘Antinomian’ teachings of Tobias Crisp, et al. Among that group, Williams alone acknowledged in print the role played by Benjamin Keach in that controversy.¹⁴⁹ After the dissolution of the ‘Happy Union’, Williams joined William Bates, John Howe, Vincent Alsop, Samuel Annesley, and Richard Mayo (c. 1630-1695) in establishing the Salters’ Hall lectures. By his second marriage, Williams was a brother-in-law to Joseph Stennett. Recognizing Williams’ standing as an authority among his peers, Keach cited Williams often in his discussions of justification, never in a flattering light.¹⁵⁰

Other Independent and Presbyterian Divines

A number of other noteworthy divines appear frequently enough in the Keachean corpus to give them a noted place in Keach’s canon of authorities. Among those, the colonial minister, John Cotton (1585-1652), garnered the most respect from Keach. After receiving his degree at Cambridge, Cotton spent the latter part of his career in the New England colonies. Before emigrating, Cotton and Thomas Hooker (d. 1647) met with several divines—Thomas Goodwin, Philip Nye (d. 1672), and John Davenport (d. 1670)—ultimately convincing them of the need to dissent from the Church of England.¹⁵¹ For Keach, Cotton’s *The covenant of Gods free grace* (1645) held the most influence, accounting for the vast majority of Keach’s citations.

¹⁴⁹ Daniel Williams, *A defence of Gospel-truth being a reply to Mr. Chancey's first part* (London: for John Dunton, 1693), sig. A3v. This Samuel Clark was a nonconformist minister and well-respected biblical scholar. He is to be distinguished from his grandson and namesake (1684-1750) who was a non-subscriber at the Salters’ Hall debate in 1719. Keach frequently cited the former Clark, condemning him with his ‘Baxterian’ counterparts.

¹⁵⁰ See Chapter VI.

¹⁵¹ See *ODNB*. These men all went on to become Puritan leaders during the Interregnum and Restoration. Hooker and Davenport both went to New England, while Goodwin and Nye remained in England.

After being convinced of the necessity of dissent by John Cotton, Thomas Goodwin went on to become a major figure among the Independents, serving in the Westminster Assembly and on the committee which penned the *Savoy Declaration*.¹⁵² He served as the president of Magdalen College, Oxford during the Interregnum and published prolifically throughout his life. His son and namesake originally collected and edited the elder Goodwin's works for posthumous publication, using those writings and his own original works polemically in order to, among other things, defend Tobias Crisp's views from the charges of Antinomianism in the 1690s. Keach cited both the Goodwins, at times without distinguishing between the two.¹⁵³ Additionally, Keach frequently cited the Westminster Assembly and 'our Annotators'—a term he used to refer to the major Puritan biblical commentators such as Matthew Poole and to notes such as those found in the Geneva Bible—as sources of authority alongside a host of Reformed divines including Stephen Charnock (1628-1680),¹⁵⁴ John Flavel (d. 1691),¹⁵⁵ Jeremy Taylor (d. 1667),¹⁵⁶ Samuel Petto (c.1624-1711),¹⁵⁷ and Jeremiah Burroughs (bap. 1601? d. 1646).¹⁵⁸ While these citations do not show specific theological agreement, at the very least they demonstrate Keach's awareness of the theological

Of these, only Goodwin joined Cotton as a regular authority in the Keachean corpus. Keach cited Cotton 45 times throughout his writing.

¹⁵² This committee also included John Owen, William Bridge, Joseph Caryl, Philip Nye and William Greenhill.

¹⁵³ Keach did occasionally distinguish between the two, referring to the elder Goodwin as 'Dr. Goodwin' and the younger as 'Mr. Goodwin'. Cf. Benjamin Keach, *The display of glorious grace, or, The covenant of peace opened in fourteen sermons* (London: S. Bridge, 1698), 103; Benjamin Keach, *The ax laid to the root, or, one blow more at the foundation of infant baptism, and church-membership* (London: for the author, 1693), 20. Occasionally, Keach referred to John Goodwin (c. 1594-1665), the Arminian-leaning Independent minister, in a similar manner; however, Keach generally cited John Goodwin as an authority of the opposing view. See Benjamin Keach, *A golden mine opened, or, The glory of God's rich grace displayed in the mediator to believers, and his direful wrath against impenitent sinners* (London: the author ... and William Marshall, 1694), 319.

¹⁵⁴ Charnock was a non-conformist minister in Southwark who was well-acquainted with Thomas Goodwin and Richard Baxter. *ODNB*.

¹⁵⁵ Flavel was a non-conformist minister who, from afar, supported the 'Happy Union' of Congregationalists and Presbyterians in London and worked to achieve the same type of union in Devon. *ODNB*.

¹⁵⁶ Taylor was Bishop of Down in the Church of Ireland famous for his devotional writings and his defense of religious liberty. *ODNB*.

¹⁵⁷ Petto was an ejected minister largely associated with Sudbury. He published an influential work on the covenants entitled *The difference between the old and the new covenant...* (1674)

¹⁵⁸ Burroughs was an Independent minister educated at Cambridge. He was an acquaintance of Thomas Goodwin, Edmund Calamy, and William Greenhill.

discussions of his day and his willingness to place himself in those discussions. Additionally, the list of citations also demonstrates a marked (though not absolute) bias toward non-conformity. His few citations of conforming ministers included William Burkitt (1650-1703)—the Anglican curate of Milden, Suffolk against whom Keach penned *The rector rectified* (1692)—and William Smythies (bap. 1635?, d. 1715), curate of St Giles Cripplegate who was known to sympathize with dissent.¹⁵⁹ According to Crosby, Keach also presented a copy of *The Jewish sabbath abrogated* (1700) to the Archbishop of Canterbury, Thomas Tenison (1636-1715), the champion of comprehension immediately following the Glorious Revolution.¹⁶⁰

Other Baptists

Perhaps the most interesting aspect of Keach's canon of authorities is the surprisingly few Baptist sources it included. By far the most common anti-paedobaptist source for Keach was John Tombes, an Oxford-educated conforming minister who, after 1644, 'promoted [believers' baptism] more than any one man of those times'.¹⁶¹ In 1650, Tombes debated the issue of infant baptism with Richard Baxter and later published a three-volume work on the topic entitled *Antipaedobaptism* (1652, 1654, 1657), making him a natural source of authority for Keach and other Baptists. Indeed, Keach cited Tombes more than twenty times by name throughout his corpus. Interestingly, few other Baptist sources come close to rivaling that frequency as a Keachean authority. In fact, when discounting Keach's intra-Baptist debates—such as the hymn-singing controversy—which necessarily required the citation of other Baptists, only a handful of Baptist authors appear as authorities. Keach did cite Henry Danvers almost one hundred times with the majority of those coming in Keach's refutation of Danvers' view of the laying on of hands.¹⁶² Additionally, Keach cited Christopher Black-

¹⁵⁹ For both of these, see *ODNB*.

¹⁶⁰ Crosby, *History*, IV:302. The Lambeth Palace Library has two Keach works in its collection: *Tropologia* and *The Jewish sabbath abrogated*. Unfortunately, no acquisition records exist, nor are there any inscriptions in the books.

¹⁶¹ Crosby, *History*, I:278.

¹⁶² See Benjamin Keach, *Laying on of hands upon baptized believers, as such, proved an ordinance of Christ in answer to Mr. Danvers's former book intituled, A treatise of laying on of hands* (London: Benj. Harris, 1698). For a full discussion of this issue, see Chapter IV, 121-6.

wood (1607/8-1670),¹⁶³ Hanserd Knollys, and Hercules Collins a handful of times each.¹⁶⁴ Notably, Keach only cited John Bunyan twice in his corpus, with both of those citations referencing Bunyan's view of the Sabbath.¹⁶⁵ Although Keach offered no apologies or explanations for his lack of Baptist citations, two issues seem to have played a role. First, at least by his most productive period, Keach was *the* Baptist authority on most issues. He readily entered into debates and published often, making him the Baptist most likely to be cited. Second, as seen in his regular citation of more mainstream theologians such as John Owen and Richard Baxter, Keach constantly sought to place his Baptist theology in the larger context of the English theological landscape. Citing Baptists would not serve that purpose well.

Authorities from the Past¹⁶⁶

Along with his 'favorite' contemporaries, Keach also commanded an extensive working knowledge of publications from previous generations, and he consistently demonstrated a deep respect for those who had forged his path ahead of him. He spoke with reverence about the early generations of Reformers as he did about the Church Fathers. In one of his works, Keach provided a 'Table of Authors', an index of citations of respected authorities which reads like a good library catalogue, with works covering all eras of Church history and stemming from dissent and establishment alike.¹⁶⁷ Like many Protestant theologians of his day, Keach also referenced Roman Catholics (especially Cardinal Bellarmine) with some frequency, although normally these references simply establish the opposing view. In this table, Keach

¹⁶³ Blackwood was a Cambridge-educated minister who later identified with the Particular Baptists. In the early 1640s he lived in Scituate, Massachusetts where he almost certainly would have known Charles Chauncy who moved to the same town around that time. Blackwood was later closely associated with the Particular Baptists in Ireland. See *ODNB*; Crosby, *History*, I:350-2.

¹⁶⁴ Keach's citations of Knollys typically come from his eschatological works. His citations of Hercules Collins are all found in *A counter-antidote* which Keach penned specifically to defend Hercules Collins from Gyles Shute.

¹⁶⁵ Benjamin Keach, *The Jewish sabbath abrogated, or, The Saturday sabbatarians confuted, sermons* (London: s.n., 1700), 117, 129. Keach also listed Bunyan, alongside Owen and Luther, as one who 'shone very bright, and outdid many others'. Benjamin Keach, *Gospel mysteries unveil'd: or An exposition of all the Parables and many express similitudes contained in the four Evangelists* (London: s.n., 1701), I:55.

¹⁶⁶ For a discussion of Keach's view/use of tradition, see Chapter IV, 100-102.

¹⁶⁷ Benjamin Keach, *Light broke forth in Wales, expelling darkness, or, The Englishman's love to the antient Britains* (London: William Marshall, 1696), xxv-xxviii.

admitted to taking approximately one third of his references from secondary sources, most notably the work of Charles Marie de Veil, Norton Knatchbull (1602-1685),¹⁶⁸ and Edward Leigh (1603-1671).¹⁶⁹ If this table is indicative of Keach's 'research methods' (and it seems to approximate his references in the rest of his works), he availed himself of the literary access discussed previously.

The vast majority of Keach's citations from history centered on the work of the early generations of Reformers with John Calvin (1509-1564) and Martin Luther (1483-1546) unsurprisingly receiving the bulk of Keach's attention. Keach cited a variety of works from Calvin including his *Institutes* and his biblical commentaries. The citations of Luther were more limited, stemming mostly (although not exclusively) from Luther's commentary on Galatians and on the revision of Luther published by John Troughton (c.1637-1681).¹⁷⁰ In any case, he clearly held these two reformers—along with a host of other 'greats'¹⁷¹—in very high regard. Keach's use of the English Puritan, William Perkins (1558-1602), as an authority actually rivaled his reliance upon Calvin and Luther, with Theodore Beza (1519-1605) and Heinrich Bullinger (1504-1575) also appearing rather frequently. In addition, he also peppered his writings with a selection of authoritative citations from the more distant past such as Augustine, Tertullian, Chrysostom, Eusebius, Ovid, and Anselm, apparently having actually read these authors rather than merely relying upon secondary sources.

Conclusion

Due largely to the stark contrast from his early provincial context to those of his later metropolitan surroundings, Benjamin Keach developed an interesting and

¹⁶⁸ Knatchbull was a Cambridge-educated biblical scholar who engaged in early biblical criticism. *ODNB*.

¹⁶⁹ Educated at Oxford, Leigh was closely connected to several puritan leaders of his day. He published the highly-acclaimed *Critica sacra*, a lexicon of biblical Hebrew and Greek. *ODNB*.

¹⁷⁰ Troughton was an Oxford-educated, non-conformist minister who received a license as a Presbyterian in 1672. He published a work against Baxter's doctrine of justification entitled *Lutherus Redivivus* which cited Luther extensively.

¹⁷¹ At several points in his writing, Keach listed some of these greats. One such list is as follows: Luther, Melancthon, Calvin, Zanchy, Perkins, Ames, Dr. Usher, Dr. Goodwin, Dr. Owen, Dr. Sibs, Dr. Preston, Norton, Burroughs, Caryl, Pemble, the Assembly. Zwingli stood as a somewhat surprising omission from Keach's list. Indeed, Zwingli hardly appeared at all in Keach's corpus. Benjamin Keach, *A medium betwixt two extremes wherein it is proved that the whole first Adam was condemned and the whole second Adam justified* (London: for Andrew Bell, 1698), 36.

varied group of ‘peers’, constituting a significant intellectual network of mutual scholarly engagement within which his mature theology was able to blossom. Many of the connections he made in his early General Baptist ministry remained a part of his social network even after his move to Southwark. Those connections were greatly extended by the new ones he developed at the center of the dissenting underground’s activity in greater London. The fraternity of dissenting ministers—including those within his extended family, his own congregation at Horsleydown, the dissenting publishing network, and the access to books afforded to dissenters in the city—all served to form an impressive identifiable social network which provided opportunities for Keach to develop his thought. This network—complete with former professors, eager disputants, and libraries—served as a substitute for the university experience denied to Keach and his fellow dissenters. Supportive exchanges as well as contentious debates between late Stuart Puritan divines, and their interactions with other theologians, both contemporary and historical figures, certainly played a significant role in the development of Keach’s understanding and exposition of orthodox Christian beliefs, especially as he sought to place his own thinking within the context of a wider Christian tradition.

Even with the limited glimpse of Keach provided thus far, it is quite clear that Keach acted as more than a mere conduit of information. Indeed, the limited picture has already revealed a Keach who was willing to think independently and critically about the beliefs which were passed on to him—adopting Baptist theology at the age of fifteen and later converting to the theology of the Particular Baptists. The dissection of Keach’s theological thought which follows provides the necessary analysis to help ascertain the extent to which Keach remained independent from his social network and, conversely, the extent to which the social network stimulated new thinking yet placed boundaries on his views of truth and orthodoxy. In the end, this social network (as with almost anyone’s) played a significant role in providing the lenses through which Keach would read Scripture, would determine the issues of importance, and even would obtain and view written works.

CHAPTER III: CATECHISMS AND CONFESSIONS

Because of the almost-exclusive focus on his role in the hymn-singing controversy, some of Keach's more unique and influential writings—his catechisms and confessions—have been ignored. As documents penned to enable the church to 'stand fast in the Faith'¹ and to establish new believers in the 'chief Principles of the Christian Religion',² these works provide unique insights into Keach's understanding of the essentials of orthodoxy. As such, they provide a worthwhile entry point into the study of Keach's thought.

While writing in well-established traditions, this Southwark preacher distinguished himself through his independent character which he demonstrated in his catechetical and confessional writings in two specific ways. While he was willing to interact with and build upon the work of others (both predecessors and contemporaries), Keach preferred to pen his works himself rather than simply using quotations or reprinting other works. He also did not seek to make his beliefs conform to those of his peers. As a Baptist dissenter, Keach differed from the Church of England over such matters as infant baptism, the sacraments, and the role(s) of the laity. However he also differed with some of his fellow Particular Baptists on issues like the singing of hymns and the practice of the laying on of hands on all believers. Rather than avoiding those issues of difference, Keach highlighted them in his catechetical and confessional works, clearly defending his beliefs. On those issues where disagreement appeared, Keach elucidated the importance of each. If he considered them essentials of the faith, he urged his congregation and other readers to stand firm; if they were non-essentials he attempted to persuade but allowed for some disagreement within the community of faith. The end result was a set of writings, practically unprecedented within the Particular Baptist community, which explicated the essentials of Keach's understanding of orthodoxy and which served as the foundation of orthodoxy for countless Baptists in succeeding generations.

¹ Keach, *The articles of the faith*, sig. ar.

² Benjamin Keach, *The child's delight: or instructions for children and youth* (London: for William and Joseph Marshall, 1704?), title page.

History of Catechetical Literature

Continental Catechisms

Martin Luther

Merciful God, what misery I have seen, the common people knowing nothing at all of Christian doctrine, especially in the villages! and unfortunately many pastors are well-nigh unskilled and incapable of teaching; and though all are called Christians and partake of the Holy Sacrament, they know neither the Lord's Prayer, nor the Creed, nor the Ten Commandments, but live like the poor cattle and senseless swine ...³

With such a dire review of the state of the church in 1528, Martin Luther established the absolute necessity for the education of both the laity and the clergy. In his effort to correct this severe ignorance, Luther penned two documents—aptly named the *Larger* and *Shorter Catechisms*—that introduced the Protestant world to the concept of the catechism and set the stage for the development of that literary concept into a genre in its own right.

In addition to the ignorance which so startled Luther in his visitation of 1528, several other factors converged in the early Lutheran Reformation to create an atmosphere in which the educational goals of the church leaders might be met by the new catechetical literature. First, the early Protestants understood Christianity to be a religion of Biblical knowledge—a religion which required the educated assent of the practitioner, thereby necessitating at least a modicum of understanding on the part of the believer. In Luther's view, a person who did not possess a knowledge of the fundamentals of Christianity could not legitimately be called a Christian.⁴ Second, the early Protestant religion centered on the individual layman—as opposed to the clergy-centered religion of the Catholic church against which Luther rebelled. According to Luther's view, '[Christians] are all consecrated as priests by baptism'⁵ and are thus held individually responsible for understanding the essentials of the Christian faith.⁶

³ Henry Wace and C. A. Buchheim, eds, *Luther's Primary Works: Together with his Shorter and Larger Catechisms Translated into English* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1896), 1 (Preface to the Shorter Catechism).

⁴ Berard L. Marthaler, *The Catechism Yesterday and Today: the Evolution of a Genre* (Collegeville, Minn: Liturgical Press, 1995), 23.

⁵ Wace and Buchheim, eds, *Luther's Primary Works*, 164, 171.

⁶ Richard Robert Osmer, 'The Case for Catechism', *Christian Century* 114 (1997), 409.

Even in its more communal outlook, Luther's understanding of Christian knowledge and faith focused on individual households—thus, Luther began each section of the *Shorter Catechism* with the statement 'How the master of the house should teach them simply to his household'.⁷ This emphasis on the individual—or the individual household—both necessitated and was demonstrated by the dissemination of the Scriptures (and other religious materials) in the vernacular. In fact, by 1522, Luther had already completed a German version of the New Testament which reportedly sold more than eighty editions in its first two years.⁸

The fact that so much Christian material was already available in the vernacular by the time of the visitation of 1528,⁹ probably compounded Luther's shock at the extreme lack of understanding on the part of the people—both laity and clergy—and only served as a catalyst for the development of educational tools specifically designed to combat the epidemic ignorance. That educational materials were needed for the young laity and the unlearned could not have come as a surprise to Luther because several years earlier he had been involved in the development of a proto-catechism—*Eyn buchlin fur die leyen vnd kinder*—which included the same basic sections as Luther's later works of 1529, namely the Ten Commandments, the Creed, and the Lord's Prayer.¹⁰ However, the depth of ignorance encountered in 1528 led Luther to a renewed focus on the development of educational tools, and finally enabled him to settle on a particular mode of instruction—the question-and-answer model—which enjoyed unparalleled success. By 1530, this nascent Reformation catechetical genre was already having the desired effect. In response to the success of his catechisms, Luther commented that 'girls as well as boys, are now so well taught in catechism and Scripture that my heart grows warm as I observe children praying more devoutly and

⁷ Wace and Buchheim, eds, *Luther's Primary Works*, 6.

⁸ Richard Robert Osmer, 'The Christian Education of Children in the Protestant Tradition', *Theology Today* 56 (2000), 509.

⁹ In addition to the German translation of the New Testament (1522), Luther had completed the Mass in the German language in 1525. See William P. Haugaard, 'The Continental Reformation of the Sixteenth Century.' in *A Faithful Church: Issues in the History of Catechesis*, eds J.H. Westerhoff and O.C. Edwards, 109-173 (Wilton, Connecticut: Morehouse-Barlow Co., Inc., 1981), 122.

¹⁰ Timothy J. Wengert, 'Wittenberg's Earliest Catechism', *Lutheran Quarterly* 7 (1993), 253.

speaking more eloquently of God and Christ than, in the old days, all the learned monks and doctors'.¹¹

The term *catechism* stems from the Greek word *κατηχέω* and the early church's process of indoctrinating new converts. Luther claimed this early tradition as the foundation of his catechetical works, stating that because of his work 'the catechism [had] come back into use, as it were by right of recovery'.¹² While the concept of instructing new converts in the basics of the Christian faith could be found in the earliest traditions of Christianity, the basis for Luther's question-and-answer form of the catechism did not extend nearly that far back into history. In fact the most likely *original* question-and-answer format was a Bohemian Brethren instructional book dating from circa 1500, *Kinderfragen (Children's Questions)*. This work, which followed the traditional medieval catechesis, employed the new style of education—the aforementioned questions-and-answers—and was translated into German around 1522.¹³ Thus, when Luther oversaw the development of *Eyn buchlin fur die leyen vnd kinder* and penned his own catechisms in 1529, he was not starting from an entirely blank slate; however, none of Luther's predecessors attempted to present a clear explication of the basics of the Christian faith in a single work intended to be used as a memorized interaction between teacher and student. For this ground-breaking move in 1529 combined with the amazing success of these works, Luther has rightly been deemed the founder of the catechetical genre.¹⁴

Geneva

In Geneva, William Farel (1489-1565) and John Calvin included the catechetical process in their reform ordinances of 1537. Referring to the ancient church's practice of teaching the fundamentals of the Christian religion as part of the initiation process, these ordinances mandated

¹¹ Gerald Strauss, 'The Reformation and Its Public in an Age of Orthodoxy,' in *The German People and the Reformation*, ed. R. Po-chia Hsia, 194-214 (London: Cornell University Press, 1988), 199.

¹² I. M. Green, *The Christian's ABC: Catechisms and Catechizing in England c. 1530-1740* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), 13.

¹³ Haugaard, 'The Continental Reformation of the Sixteenth Century.' 119.

¹⁴ See Osmer, 'The Case for Catechism'; de Jong, 'Calvin's Contributions'; Tudor, 'Religious Instruction'.

that there be a brief and simple summary of the Christian faith, to be taught to all children, and that at certain seasons of the year they come before the ministers to be interrogated and examined, and to receive more ample explanation ... until they have been proved sufficiently instructed. But may it be your pleasure to command parents to exercise pains and diligence that their children learn this summary...¹⁵

Further, the Genevan Reformers required that a

definite formulary be composed by which [the children] will be instructed, and on this, with the teaching given them examined, they are to be interrogated about what has been said, to see if they have listened and remembered well. When a child has been well instructed to pass the Catechism, he is to recite solemnly the sum of what it contains, and also to make profession of his Christianity in the presence of the Church. Before this is done, no child is to be admitted to receive the Supper...¹⁶

These ordinances placed several requirements on the Genevan church which, as a by-product, further entrenched the catechetical genre into the foundation of the protestant churches.

The ordinances called for the development of ‘a definite formulary’ for use in the catechetical process. To that end, Calvin penned his first catechism in 1537 and a second (and far more influential) version in 1541. Both of these catechisms largely followed the groundwork laid out by Luther, with the second version utilizing Luther’s question-and-answer format. Calvin even agreed with Luther’s impetus for using the catechism as a pedagogical tool, namely that the Christian church used this tradition until the devil ‘subverted this sacred policy’, ‘miserably rending the Church of God’.¹⁷

The Genevan ordinances also followed Luther’s lead by requiring parents and/or leaders of households to be involved in the catechetical process. The educational system included the student (or initiate, or catechumen) and the pastor primarily, but the responsibility for ensuring that the student learned the necessary tenets of the Christian faith fell on the leader of the household. One of the Genevan Reformers’ stated goals in publishing a catechism was to aid heads of households/parents in the education of those in their charge, both children and servants.

¹⁵ Jean Calvin, *Calvin: Theological Treatises* (London: SCM, 1954), 54.

¹⁶ Calvin, *Calvin: Theological Treatises*, 69.

¹⁷ Calvin, *Calvin: Theological Treatises*, 88.

The ordinances also firmly embedded the catechism into the life of the church by requiring all baptized members to recite the sum of the catechism before gaining admission to the Lord's Supper. Calvin argued that 'Scripture has always joined confession with faith',¹⁸ and, thus, children must be given the opportunity to confess their faith (witnessed to at their baptism). Not only should the church allow her young adherents the opportunity to make such a confession, but she should actually *require* this confession as a prerequisite for entry to the Lord's Supper.

Heidelberg

Calvin's second catechism (1541) enjoyed significant international influence until 1563; however, after 1563, the *Genevan Catechism* no longer stood as *the* international standard. From that point on, that title was reserved for the *Heidelberg Catechism*, authorized by Frederick III, elector of the Palatinate, and composed mainly by Zacharias Ursinus (1534-1583) and Caspar Olevianus (1536-1587). This catechism followed the precedent set by Luther and Calvin, utilizing the question-and-answer method as its pedagogical form. Unlike their predecessors, however, the Heidelberg divines attempted to provide a catechism that would serve as the middle ground between the increasingly contrasted views of Luther and Geneva. Additionally, the *Heidelberg Catechism* pioneered the practice of numbering the questions of the work, thus allowing it to become a readily-accessible reference work in the hands of both the catechumens and the instructors.¹⁹ Within only a few generations, this catechism gained a large international following as it was authorized for use in the Church of Scotland (1591) and arguably formed the basis for the *Westminster Catechisms*.²⁰

¹⁸ Calvin, *Calvin: Theological Treatises*, 54.

¹⁹ Marthaler, *The Catechism Yesterday and Today*, 29.

²⁰ Marthaler, *The Catechism Yesterday and Today*, 31. Marthaler also averred that the *Heidelberg Catechism* served as a precedent for the catechism adopted by the Council of Trent. However, he did not explain the basis for this argument.

England

Literature

England, also, was influenced by the movement in favor of the development of catechetical instruction that swept across the continent. Under the leadership of Thomas Cranmer (1489-1556), the Church of England published its first official catechism in 1549. That publication became the catalyst for a distinctive English catechetical genre which flourished almost immediately. According to Ian Green's groundbreaking study, more than three hundred fifty different catechisms appeared in England between 1549 and 1646 (the year before the publication of the *Westminster Catechisms* designed to replace the Church of England Catechism).²¹ Altogether between one-quarter of a million and three-quarters of a million copies were printed.²² The vast majority of these English catechisms were original works of English theologians rather than mere translations of continental works—the one major exception being the frequent re-publication of translations of the *Heidelberg Catechism*.²³ These catechisms appeared in a variety of publications in England, ranging from works solely dedicated to the religious catechism to primers and *abecedaries* which taught literacy basics alongside religious fundamentals.

During this early period of the catechetical genre, the Church of England employed two official catechisms—the Catechism included in the *Book of Common Prayer* and the Catechism written by Alexander Nowell (ca. 1570).²⁴ However, both catechisms proved to be less than ideal as most instructors found the *Book of Common Prayer Catechism* too short for an in-depth understanding of the basics of the Christian faith, and most found the *Nowell Catechism* to be far too long. Thus, the most common reason for publication cited by authors of unofficial catechisms published between 1549 and 1646 was simply the desire to aid the laity under his (or her) charge

²¹ I. M. Green, "For Children in Yeeres and Children in Understanding": the Emergence of the English Catechism under Elizabeth and the Early Stuarts', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 37 (1986), 400.

²² Green, *The Christian's ABC*, 65-66.

²³ Green, *The Christian's ABC*, 65.

²⁴ Alexander Nowell's catechism was approved by Convocation in 1563, but was not published until at least 1570. At that point, the *middle* catechism was published; Nowell's *Large Catechism* was published in 1572. In its final version, the *Nowell Catechism* included three different works: the large, middle, and little catechisms. Marthaler, *The Catechism Yesterday and Today*, 78.

in the memorization and understanding of the two official catechisms—a study guide for the official documents. Those unofficial catechisms were written by a wide variety of authors, including a housewife, a schoolmaster, and numerous clergymen (both conformists and non-conformists), but the average catechetical author was a local minister who preached regularly and generally authored other works.²⁵

In 1647, the Westminster Assembly published their *Shorter* and *Larger Catechisms* which were intended to serve as directories for catechizing and also as aspects of the attempted uniformity of Christianity throughout the three kingdoms.²⁶ With the establishment of the Commonwealth, these catechisms quickly replaced the *Prayer Book Catechism* as the official catechism in England, only to have the *Prayer Book* reinstated in the Restoration Church. Despite the political and religious turmoil of the latter half of the seventeenth century, the *Westminster Catechisms* became popular, serving as the model for numerous other catechisms, including some of the more radical versions, and being adopted outright by most presbyterians. By the end of the seventeenth century, the catechetical landscape in England had considerably narrowed—with the presbyterians using the *Westminster Catechisms* and the episcopalians following the 1604 version of the *Prayer Book Catechism* (complete with its added section on the sacraments).²⁷

Content and Usage

For the most part, English catechetical works refrained from discussing more contentious theological issues such as predestination or the extent of the atonement.²⁸ In this regard, the English catechisms followed in the line of both Luther and Calvin (at least Calvin's *1541 Catechism*) and demonstrated the same theological moderation that characterized the *Heidelberg Catechism* (though some of the English catechisms, including the official version found in the *Book of Common Prayer*, pre-dated the *Heidelberg Catechism*). The normal English catechist sought to avoid forcing the ca-

²⁵ Green, 'The Emergence of the English Catechism', 403.

²⁶ *Westminster Confession and Catechisms*, LC 69-72, SC 156.

²⁷ Green, *The Christian's ABC*, 289.

²⁸ The specific teachings of Roman Catholicism—which were attacked both explicitly and implicitly throughout the literature—appear to be the major exception to this moratorium.

techumen into more intricate theological discussions. Rather, most of the authors simply aimed to help develop a laity literate in what was deemed to be the basics of the Christian faith. The *1549 Catechism* summarized this common goal by stating that the work was intended as an aid to baptized children who have ‘come to the yeares of discrecion and have learned what their Godfathers and Godmothers promised for them in Baptisme’, namely that ‘with theyr owne mouth and with theyr own consent, openly before the churche, [they] ratifye and confesse the same’. Without this confession—which included the ability to say ‘in theyr mother tong, tharticles of the faith, the lordes praier, the ten cōmaūdemētes’—no baptized child could be confirmed or partake of the Lord’s Supper.²⁹ This represented a shift in the official stance of the Church of England from infant confirmation to confirmation of the more mature child.³⁰ The vast majority of English catechisms served as an aid to the instructor (usually the parish pastor) or the student or both in preparation for the confirmation ritual and/or the first communion. Many English catechists also highlighted the better understanding of the weekly (or more frequent) sermons as a potential benefit of the catechism.³¹

Dissent

The vast array of English catechisms printed from the middle of the sixteenth century onward included works by conformists and non-conformists alike. Because the majority of the authors avoided the explicit discussion of the more contentious issues, the large body of literature appeared surprisingly homogenous on theological issues.³² With the freedoms of the Commonwealth, dissenting authors became bolder as evidenced by several radical works still extant from the 1650s which explicitly question the biblical support for infant baptism. Anti-paedobaptist works by Henry Jessey, Christopher Blackwood, and John Tombes all date from this period. After the

²⁹ *The booke of the common prayer and administracion of the sacramentes and other rites and ceremonies of the churche: after the vse of the Churche of England* (Londini: in officina Edouardi Whitechurch, 1549), sig. Rviiiir.

³⁰ This issue had been under discussion by the leadership of the Church of England for the previous twelve years. Philippa Tudor, ‘Religious Instruction for Children and Adolescents in the Early English Reformation’, *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 35 (1984), 395-96.

³¹ Green, *The Christian's ABC*, 31.

³² Green, *The Christian's ABC*, 39.

Restoration, the more mainstream debates between conformists and non-conformists began to creep into the catechetical literature, and gradually, works by dissenting authors began to stand out from the remainder of the genre. Despite the increase in overt theological debate within the later (Restoration era) catechetical literature, the majority of the catechisms continued to be focused on the basics of the Christian faith, a sort of least-common-denominator between the differing sects of English Christianity. Thus, only a relatively few radical catechisms can be found.³³

Benjamin Keach's Catechisms

Keach's Works

Primers

Benjamin Keach entered the English catechetical landscape in 1664 when he published *The child's instructor; or, A new and easy primer [sic]*. Immediately, Keach's work stood out by explicitly teaching the finer points of radical-leaning theology. The impact of this work was not lost on the local authorities who prosecuted and convicted Keach for printing and teaching 'several Things contrary to the Doctrine and Ceremonies of the Church of England', including 'That Infants ought not to be baptized; That Laymen may preach the Gospel; That Christ shall reign personally upon the Earth in the latter Day, &c.'³⁴ As a result of Keach's trial and conviction under the Lord Chief Justice, Sir Robert Hyde, the hangman destroyed all 1500 copies of the original imprint.³⁵

Keach did not stay out of the catechetical genre for long, publishing additional works soon thereafter, though the specifics of his next publication remain unclear. An apparent 5th edition of Keach's original work appeared in 1679,³⁶ while two other

³³ Green, *The Christian's ABC*, 83.

³⁴ *Trial of Mr. Benjamin Keach*, 1017.

³⁵ Muriel James mistakenly identified this judge as the First Earl of Clarendon, Edward Hyde. In reality, this judge was Edward's cousin, Sir Robert Hyde, a royalist who served as chief justice of common pleas during the Restoration. Cf. Muriel James, *Religious Liberty on Trial: Hanserd Knollys, Early Baptist Hero* (Franklin, Tenn.: Providence House, 1997), 156.

³⁶ If this was the original work which was condemned at the Aylesbury Assizes, Keach must have rewritten it from memory. If this work remains in existence, it has been identified as an edition of one of the later two works. Edward Caryl Starr, *Baptist Bibliography*, 14.

works—both educational primers—appeared within the next fifteen years: *The child's delight* and *Instructions for children; or, the child's and youth's delight*.³⁷

The two works which remain extant—*The child's delight* and *Instructions for children*—both included a version of Keach's catechism couched between other practical lessons including an introduction to the alphabet, rudimentary vocabulary lists, basic grammar, and several aids for the everyday rigors of trades such as sample legal documents, mathematical tables, and lists of weights and measures. Despite the similarities between the two works, *The child's delight* was significantly shorter than *Instructions for Children*, mainly because *Instructions for children* included two additional sections of the catechism: *The little child's catechism* intended for children 'between three and four years Old'³⁸ and *The youth's catechism* for children 'about ten years old'.³⁹ *Instructions for children* also included a unique section of fatherly advice for daughters.⁴⁰

The Baptist Catechism or Keach's Catechism?

Keach has been frequently identified with one additional catechetical work, the *Baptist Catechism*, officially entitled *A brief instruction in the principles of Christian religion*. In fact, the work has often been referred to as *Keach's Catechism*. The General Assembly of Particular Baptists meeting at London in 1693 determined that a catechism should be written, 'containing the substance of the Christian religion, for the instruction of children and servants, and that brother William Collins be desired to draw it up'.⁴¹ Precisely when and why this catechism became affiliated with Benjamin

³⁷ The original dates for these publications are not known. A third corrected edition of *The child's delight* appeared in 1704, while a 1695 edition of *Instructions for children* was published in New York. Multiple editions of both of these primers were published throughout the eighteenth century.

³⁸ Benjamin Keach, *Instructions for children: or, The child's & youth's delight teaching an easie way to spell & read true English* (New York: Will. Bradford, 1695), 1.

³⁹ Keach, *Instructions for children* [1695], 9.

⁴⁰ Keach, *Instructions for children* [1695], 39-48.

⁴¹ Ivimey, *History*, I:533. The original transcripts from this meeting have been lost. Only Ivimey's account remains extant. Austin Walker mistakenly stated that the Bristol Meeting requested the Catechism. See Walker, *The Excellent Benjamin Keach*, 219. James Barry Vaughn inexplicably suggested that Keach based the catechism in *The child's delight* on the *Baptist Catechism* despite *The child's delight* pre-dating the commissioning of the *Baptist Catechism* by at least a decade. See Vaughn, 'Public Worship and Practical Theology', 247.

Keach remains a mystery. In his four volume *History of the English Baptists* published in 1738, Thomas Crosby significantly did not attribute this catechism to Keach.

Citing its heavy reliance on the *Westminster Catechisms* and its similarity in order with Keach's *The articles of the faith*, written for his Horsleydown congregation, James Barry Vaughn has argued that the *Baptist Catechism* 'was largely, if not entirely the work of Keach'.⁴² However, this logic proves to be circular and unconvincing.

The 'Epistle Dedicatory' of the 1764 edition of the *Baptist Catechism* stated it intentionally 'Agree[s] with the shorter Catechism of the [Westminster] Assembly ... because we have commonly made Use of that Catechism in our Families, and the Difference being not much, it will be more easily committed to Memory'.⁴³ If that was the goal of the original author of the *Baptist Catechism*, the reliance on the *Westminster Catechisms* would not prove or disprove Keach's involvement as Vaughn claims. To claim that the *Baptist Catechism* relied upon the *Westminster Catechisms* would actually be an understatement. Of the one hundred fourteen questions in the *Baptist Catechism* only eleven of them did not have an equivalent in the *Westminster Shorter Catechism*. Of those eleven, two had an equivalent in the *Westminster Larger Catechism*,⁴⁴ and four others dealt with baptism—an obvious place of disagreement between the Baptists and the Westminster Assembly.⁴⁵ The other five disparate questions include two different initial questions,⁴⁶ a question affirming the laity's ability/responsibility to read the Scripture for themselves,⁴⁷ and two questions on the fate of the wicked in the afterlife.⁴⁸ The author(s) and/or publishers of the *Baptist Catechism* were so concerned about aligning with the *Westminster Shorter Catechism*, that

⁴² Vaughn, 'Public Worship and Practical Theology', 257.

⁴³ *Baptist Catechism*, To the reader, sig. A3v (?). The signature marks in this volume appear to be out of order, especially in the preface.

⁴⁴ *Baptist Catechism*, Q3 & Q4.

⁴⁵ *Baptist Catechism*, Q99-101, Q103.

⁴⁶ The *Baptist Catechism* began with a question on God and followed it with man's responsibility to God while the *Westminster Shorter Catechism* began with a question on man's 'chief end' and followed with an introduction to the Scriptures.

⁴⁷ *Baptist Catechism*, Q5.

⁴⁸ *Baptist Catechism*, Q42-43. The *Baptist Catechism* also omitted Q92 and Q93 of the *Westminster Shorter Catechism* which dealt with the identification of the sacraments. The *Baptist Catechism* used the term 'ordinance' when referring to baptism and the Lord's Supper. See Q97 & Q102.

they adjusted the footnotes for the Scripture references at several places to coincide with the footnotes in the *Westminster Shorter Catechism*.⁴⁹ In other words, precious little of the *Baptist Catechism* was original to a Baptist author, Benjamin Keach or William Collins—far too little to make a convincing argument for or against a particular author.

The similar order found in Keach's *The articles of the faith* and the *Baptist Catechism* appears even less convincing as an argument for Keach's association with the latter. Keach did not publish *The articles of the faith* until 1697. By that point, the *Baptist Catechism* had already reached at least a fifth edition. Any influence between the two documents would most likely work in the opposite direction—from the *Baptist Catechism* to *The articles of the faith* rather than vice versa as Vaughn suggested nor would it prove common authorship.

Given the publication dates and content of the works in question, combined with the fact that Crosby omitted the *Baptist Catechism* from his 'compleat Catalogue' of Benjamin Keach's works leaves Keach's contribution to this catechism in serious doubt.⁵⁰ What can be known is that Keach's name became synonymous with the *Baptist Catechism* at some point between the publication of Crosby's *History* (1738) and the sixteenth edition of the *Baptist Catechism* (1764) which included a picture of Keach as the frontispiece.⁵¹ Despite almost certainly not being the sole work of Benjamin Keach, the *Baptist Catechism* did align well with the catechetical works known to have been authored by Keach.

Keach's Purposes

Theological⁵²

Benjamin Keach had numerous reasons for publishing his catechetical works, but, as with all of his publications, his over-arching goals were theological in nature.

⁴⁹ *Baptist Catechism*, e.g., Q42, Q43, Q63.

⁵⁰ Crosby, *History*, IV:310.

⁵¹ The fifth edition (1695) does not include this picture. Also, the title of the work changed between the fifth edition and the sixteenth edition. The sixteenth edition includes the primary title *The Baptist Catechism* before the extended title of the fifth edition.

⁵² As Keach's theology will be dissected in the remainder of this work, this section only deals with the theological impetus behind Keach's writing of the types of work in question.

Based on his understanding of two specific doctrines—justification (specifically, the role of knowledge in justification); ecclesiology—Keach not only found a glaring need for his catechetical works, but he actually found a theological and Biblical mandate for these works.

*The Necessity of Knowledge for Justification*⁵³

The catechisms in both of Keach's Primers included early questions on the nature of effectual calling. The prescribed answer provided a glimpse of Keach's understanding of the necessity of education for salvation.

Qu. *What is effectual Calling?*

Ans. Effectual Calling is the work of God's Holy Spirit, whereby he Convincing ns [sic] of Sin and Misery, Enlightning our Minds in the Knowledge of Christ, and renewing our Wills, he doth perswade us to leave and loath our sins, and joyfully to embrace Jesus Christ, as offered to us in the Gospel, 2 *Tim.* 1.9. *Acts* 2. 36, 37, 38, 39, 40. *Acts* 26.18, 1 *Thess.* 1.5.4.5.⁵⁴

Not surprisingly, both of the additional catechisms provided in *Instructions for children* included encouragements for the student to obtain the knowledge of Christ as preparation for justification. At one point, Keach had the child in the middle age range (c. ten years old) inquire about the ability of someone at that age to understand the basics of Christianity:

*But, pray Sir, have any Children so young as I am, attained to the Knowledge of God and Jesus Christ? Doth God, I mean, call any so young?*⁵⁵

The Father, in answer to those questions, responded in the affirmative and provided several examples of young children (between four and six years old) coming to this 'knowledge of God and Jesus Christ'. Likewise, at the end of that same catechism, the Father asked the child whether or not he is 'resolved to get upon [his] knees, and beg Grace and *Knowledge* of Go[d], through Christ, and intreat him for hi[s] Sons sake, to open your Eyes ... ?'⁵⁶

⁵³ For a full discussion of Keach's doctrine of justification, see Chapter VI.

⁵⁴ Keach, *The child's delight*, 31. Cf. Keach, *Instructions for children* [1695], 73-4.

⁵⁵ Keach, *Instructions for children* [1695], 30.

⁵⁶ Keach, *Instructions for children* [1695], 34.

Keach did not focus solely on religious knowledge, arguing that basic literacy also played a significant role in the process of justification because without the ability to read the Bible, a person could easily remain woefully ignorant of both his/her condition in sin and the nature and person of Christ. Tellingly, Keach presented *The Prince of Darkness* as being ‘so greatly set against *Learning* ... Lest by their attaining to the *Knowledge of Letters*, they should take to read the *Holy Bible*, which [the Devil] dreads exceedingly; because when understood, it vanquisheth (at once) his *Darling Ignorance*’.⁵⁷ Keach expected parents to ‘Educate and Catechise’⁵⁸ their children in order that the children may ‘read their Mother-Tongue ... that they may be able to read God’s holy Word’⁵⁹ and thereby come to a knowledge of God and saving faith. Thus, Keach saw the writing of catechisms and primers—basic tools for combating illiteracy—as being mandated by his understanding of justification.

Keach attempted to remain cautiously optimistic regarding the benefits of knowledge. He did not allow that knowledge, by itself, could bring about salvation. He argued that some of the reprobate ‘may attain unto the Knowledg of all the great and essential Principles of the Christian Religion, ... Yet observe, and note it well, they may be utter Strangers to that *Grace, Faith, Love and Regeneration*’.⁶⁰ For knowledge alone could not guarantee salvation.

Ecclesiology

Given that knowledge played a significant, even foundational, role in salvation, one would expect Keach to find an equal impetus for the production of educational materials in the doctrine of the church. Keach, indeed, found that impetus. First and foremost, Keach identified the church as an assembly of Christians who were baptized upon a profession of faith.⁶¹ While his specific definitions of ‘church’ in his

⁵⁷ Benjamin Keach, *The progress of sin, or, The travels of ungodliness* (London: for John Dunton, 1684), 72. Cf. Keach, *A golden mine opened*, 445.

⁵⁸ Benjamin Keach, *The glory of a true church, and its discipline display'd* (London: s.n., 1697), 68.

⁵⁹ Keach, *Gospel mysteries unveil'd*, II:238.

⁶⁰ Keach, *A golden mine opened*, 326.

⁶¹ Keach, *The glory of a true church*, 5.

catechisms did not specify that members must be baptized,⁶² Keach quickly clarified the qualifications of a church member within a few questions:

Fa. *Who ought to be received into God's Church?*

Son. Only true Penitent and believing Persons, *Acts* 2.42, 45. [1] *Pet.* 2.5, 6, 7, 8, 9.⁶³

Elsewhere, Keach defined the true church of Jesus Christ as being ‘those Churches which consist of godly persons owning all the essentials of the true religion, among whom the word of God is truly preached, and the Sacraments are duly administered’.⁶⁴ In order to qualify as a ‘penitent and believing Person’ or one who ‘owns all the essentials of the true religion’, the believer must be able to discuss ‘the chief Principles of the *Christian Religion*’ which Keach purported to include in his catechisms.⁶⁵ Thus, knowledge—and, specifically, the knowledge that could be found in Keach’s catechisms—served as one of the most prominent distinguishing aspects of the true church.

Though knowledge did not guarantee salvation—‘common Grace, and good Education, may, it is true, restrain or bridle youthful Lusts; but the way [to be saved] is to obtain special Grace’⁶⁶—it was an absolute necessity, and the inculcation of knowledge served as one of the steps the church could take to further the Gospel cause. Indeed, this type of education was part of the ‘*Duty of Parents to Children and Servants*’ as those charged with the care of souls, a charge which was transferred to the minister only *after* the conversion of the child/servant.⁶⁷

Interestingly, despite his high view of knowledge and its role in salvation, Keach—nor the Baptists as a whole—did not utilize the catechism as a requirement for the church in preparing candidates for church membership.⁶⁸ Instead, the process

⁶² The catechism in *The child's delight* did not include a question specifically defining the church. In fact, the term *church* only appeared once in the catechism—in answer to the question regarding the correct recipients of the Lord’s Supper—and another six times in some of the additional materials.

⁶³ Keach, *Instructions for children* [1695], 95-6.

⁶⁴ Keach, *A counter-antidote*, 34.

⁶⁵ Keach, *The child's delight*; Keach, *Instructions for children* [1695], see title pages.

⁶⁶ Keach, *Gospel mysteries unveil'd*, II:237.

⁶⁷ Keach, *Gospel mysteries unveil'd*, II:238.

⁶⁸ See the discussion below under *Keach's Uniquenesses*, 65-72.

of becoming a member of a Baptist church generally focused on the candidate's experience rather than on the orthodoxy of his/her beliefs. The process only included the candidate giving 'a satisfactory Acc^t. of their Experience, and their Conversation being found agreeable, and having been baptized'.⁶⁹

Practical

Due to the Act of Uniformity in 1662 and the subsequent closing of the English universities to those outside the Church of England, non-conformists had few educational opportunities during the majority of Benjamin Keach's lifetime. Keach, himself, had no known formal education outside of a short apprenticeship. His love for reading and his influential and well-educated contacts provided ample opportunity for Keach to develop his own wealth of knowledge.⁷⁰ Keach understood, however, that the majority of young Baptists (and other dissenters) did not have the same contacts, opportunities, and/or self-motivation to achieve a similar educational level. He also understood that heads of households—who were charged by God with the education of their children and servants—were not necessarily well-educated or capable of educating those in their charge. Thus, one of Keach's major goals in producing his primers—including his major catechetical works—was to '[direct] Parents in a Right and Spiritual Manner to Educate their CHILDREN'.⁷¹

Keach's primers began with basic grammar lessons, including alphabets, word lists, and verses intended to embed the necessity and good of learning. These verses provided a glimpse into Keach's practical intent:

1
To learn to Read, good Child, give heed,
For 'tis a precious thing;
What may compare with Learning rare?
From hence doth Vertue spring.

⁶⁹ *Minutes and Records of the Unicorn Yard Chapel*, Angus Library, Regent's Park College, Oxford. This record book follows the section of the Horsleydown congregation who, after the death of Keach's successor, did not accept the call of John Gill and consequently formed a separate church in 1719. This same language appears throughout the Baptist record books and even in Keach's writings on the church. See Keach, *The glory of a true church*, 6. Likewise, the Maze Pond Church followed this same general practice. See *Maze Pond Church Book*, Angus Library, Regent's Park College, Oxford.

⁷⁰ See Chapter II, esp. 15-38.

⁷¹ Keach, *Instructions for children [1695]*, title page, emphasis in original.

6
 Take therefore Care, Learning is rare,
 Like Chains of purest Gold;
 Look, look about, and find it out
 Its Worth cannot be told.

7
 Consonants know, and Vowels too,
 Nay, learn rightly to spell;
 Be not a Fool, but go to School
 'Till thou read English well.⁷²

In his dedicatory letter attached to *Instructions for children*, Hanserd Knollys highlighted Keach's practical intent, commending the primer to 'all Religious Parents, who are willing to Catechise their Children' and also to 'all the English School-Masters in and about this City (nay, throughout the Nation) [who should] make use of it for the Instruction of their Scholars'.⁷³

A further glimpse of Keach's practical intent for his primers can be seen in his inclusion of sample legal and book-keeping documents undoubtedly useful to someone entering a trade, a common path for children in dissenting congregations. These sample documents included a bond, a bill of acknowledgement of a debt, a will, a bill of sale, and a letter of attorney. Keach also included a variety of basic measurement tables and conversions, all reflecting a utilitarian concern in a decidedly commercial culture. These works, then, were not exclusively religious in nature, though Keach's religious fervor touched all aspects of his educational attempts. For instance, in the dictionary at the end of his primers, Keach included such entries as *Hallelujah*, *Jesus*, *Israel*, and *Jehoshaphat* alongside more basic entries such as *centre* or *abridge*.

Keach's Uniquenesses

As a dissenter producing catechetical materials, Keach stood out as an anomaly of sorts. He did not pioneer this genre for the dissenters—nor even for the Baptists—but the path remained fairly untrodden. He was, however, uniquely popular

⁷² Keach, *Instructions for children* [1695], sig. [A7?]v-r. The first signature of this edition does not have any identifying marks and may be missing some original pages. This signature reference was determined by using later signature marks: page 11 has a signature mark of Br, page 15 has B3r, and page 35 has Cr.

⁷³ *Instructions for children* [1710?], sig. A2r-A3v. This letter in the 1695 edition has been damaged, although, significantly, the parenthetical statement 'nay, throughout the Nation' reads 'nay, throughout the Nations'. This emendation makes sense given the fact that this 1695 edition was published in the colonies.

among Baptists, and even among the wider field of dissent.⁷⁴ This popularity undoubtedly came not only from Keach's acclaim as a best-selling author but also from the unique offerings Keach's catechetical works provided.

Content

Despite such a large group of peers in catechetical writing, Keach's two works contained some unique (and often curious) content. Unlike the vast majority of the works available at his time, Keach did not base his work specifically on any previous catechism; he penned the words himself, followed an order that suited his own intents, and included the theological issues that most mattered to him. This independent spirit distinguished Keach's primer catechisms from several other Baptist works including Hercules Collins' *An Orthodox Catechism* (1680) and the previously discussed *Baptist Catechism* (1693). Both of these works virtually copied other more famous (and more mainstream) catechisms—Collins' work being directly based on the *Heidelberg Catechism* and the *Baptist Catechism* owing its words almost entirely to the *Westminster Shorter Catechism*. In contrast, Keach even re-worded answers to questions in his works that were common to many (if not most) other catechisms such as 'What is God?' or 'How many Persons are there in the Godhead?', although he maintained the accepted content.

In *Instructions for children*, Keach also uniquely provided three different levels of catechetical training—for the youngest children (aged 'between three and four Years old'), for the middle-aged child (aged 'about Ten Years old'), and for the youth of 'mature Age'. According to Keach's use of this terminology, the latter group included students up to twenty or twenty-five years of age.⁷⁵ Keach's staged-learning process was certainly not unique. In fact, the catechetical literature of that era as a whole included three different levels: an elementary level, an intermediate level, and an advanced level. However, Keach's three levels differed from those of the genre at large in that his two most basic catechisms—the ones for the three to four year olds and the ten year olds—could be considered elementary by other catechists, and his

⁷⁴ See definitions of *popularity* in Green, *The Christian's ABC*. Keach's *Instructions for children* reached thirty editions by 1763.

⁷⁵ In one sermon specifically aimed at the youth of his congregation, Keach noted that some of them were '20, 25 Years of Age'. See Keach, *Gospel mysteries unveil'd*, II:225.

most advanced catechism approximated other intermediate catechisms—the potentially older age of the student notwithstanding. Compared to the most advanced catechisms of his day, Keach’s catechism for those of mature age was shorter—169 questions with relatively short answers of one or two sentences each compared to the *Westminster Larger Catechism’s* 196 questions with longer answers and the extremely long *A Practical Catechism* by Henry Hammond—and went into much less depth, remaining, for the most part, focused on the basics of Christianity. In contrast, Hammond included more than sixty questions and answers on the Beatitudes⁷⁶—a passage of Scripture Keach completely omitted from his catechisms. A generation later, another dissenter, Isaac Watts, approximated Keach’s framework, using a three-staged process with the most advanced form being somewhat akin to Keach’s catechism for the mature youth.

Keach’s two most elementary versions of the catechism in *Instructions for children* deserve special mention as they included some of the most idiosyncratic aspects of his works. Keach envisioned the catechetical process beginning at an extremely early age, with the youngest catechism being aimed at three and four year olds. That particular catechism focused mainly on basic biblical knowledge, with questions such as ‘Who was it that kill’d his Brother?’ or ‘Who was the oldest Man that ever lived?’ The vast majority of these questions required answers of only a single word or phrase, demonstrating Keach’s understanding of the limitations of young children. Those limitations did not keep Keach from introducing these young children to the concept of conversion based on God’s actions:

Fa. What must you do if you would be saved by [him]?

Ch. I must be-lieve in him; and be con-ver-ted.

Fa. Can you believe in him?

Ch. Not without God gives me his spe-ci-al Grace.

Fa. What must you do to ob-tain God’s spe-ci-al Grace?

Ch. I must pray to him for Christ’s sake to give me his Grace that I may be-lieve.⁷⁷

The intermediate catechism was largely without equal in the large sample of catechisms printed in the seventeenth century. This catechism started with an admission by the child that he ‘know[s] but a little [and] understand[s] as a Child, and

⁷⁶ Henry Hammond, *A practical catechism* (London: for Ric: Royston, 1646), 71-90.

⁷⁷ Keach, *Instructions for children [1695]*, 6.

think[s] as a Child'.⁷⁸ In response to a further question from the Father regarding the identity of God, the Child answered out of ignorance again:

Fa. *Who is God?*

Ch. I do not know very well; Is it not an old Man?⁷⁹

The father, then, chastised the child, arguing that his 'little Brother answered better'. Beginning with the seventh question, Keach reversed the roles in this catechism, having the child ask the questions throughout the remaining twenty-four interactions.⁸⁰ The final interactions in these two catechisms displayed Keach's understanding of the normal progress of a child from ignorance at three to Christian understanding at ten. At the end of the most elementary catechism, the youngest child acknowledged a need to pray to God for special grace, declaring that he 'can hold out no longer, [his] Heart is smitten, and [his] Soul trembles ... [he is] resolved to take [his Father's] Advice'⁸¹ and seek after God.

Immediately after the intermediate catechism, the father in Keach's work turned his attention to his daughters. This did not necessarily imply that girls were not intended to participate in the earlier catechizing process, although the child in each of the catechisms was, evidently, a son of the catechist. Keach did address both males and females when preaching to the youth of his congregation and expected the daughters to at least listen to the entire catechetical process.⁸² However, these special instructions included two questions from the daughter which were focused on the daughter's attire and proper behavior befitting a godly woman. Here, again, Keach forged his own path among the catechetical literature of his day.

⁷⁸ Keach, *Instructions for children* [1695], 9.

⁷⁹ Keach, *Instructions for children* [1695], 10.

⁸⁰ Having the child ask pre-determined questions could suggest an increased level of control over children's thinking when compared to the 'normal' method where the catechizer asks the questions of the student. In Keach's middle form, the child's entire thought process was formulated, and the 'natural' flow of the entire process was lost. For another example of this 'reverse' catechizing, see Thomas Grantham, *St. Paul's catechism, or, A brief and plain explication of the six principles of the Christian religion, as recorded Heb. 6.1,2* (London: s.n., 1687).

⁸¹ Keach, *Instructions for children* [1695], 38, italics inverted.

⁸² Keach, *Gospel mysteries unveil'd*, II:235. At one point, the father exhorted his daughter 'to remember what [he has] said to [her] Brothers ...' Keach, *Instructions for children* [1695], 46.

Moreover, Keach did not shy away from the more controversial issues. In *The child's delight*, Keach explicitly argued against Roman Catholicism, stating that the 'Popish Mass ... are Erroneous, Blasphemous, and Idolatrous, and to be abhorred by all true Christians'.⁸³ This catechism also included interactions condemning the '*Popish Doctrine of Transubstantiation*' and '*Purgatory, which the Papists talk of*'.⁸⁴ Keach did not include those direct statements in *Instructions for children*, but he did include other statements aimed against Roman Catholicism. For instance, one question asked whether the bread and wine in the Lord's Supper were 'the real Body and Blood of Christ'; the mature youth responded adamantly: 'No, they are but Signs or Figures of his Body'.⁸⁵

Arguing against Catholicism was not terribly controversial for the majority of Keach's writing career; however, Keach did not end his foray into contentious issues with Roman Catholicism. In *Instructions for children*, he also chose to include questions regarding the correct administration of the ordinance, or sacrament, of baptism. In the ensuing interactions, Keach tackled the issues of method (immersion rather than sprinkling), recipients (believers not infants), and the rite of the laying on of hands which, Keach argued, *necessarily* followed baptism.⁸⁶ In these interactions, Keach not only confronted the non-Baptist doctrines, but, with the question regarding the laying on of hands, he also confronted the teachings of many fellow Baptists. The fact that *The child's delight* avoided the Baptist understanding of baptism altogether combined with its explicit attack of Roman Catholicism—an attack which could be supported by all Protestants—strongly suggested that Keach had two audiences in mind for his catechisms: *The child's delight* for Protestants in general and *Instructions for children* for Baptists specifically. The prefatory letter from the Baptist educator, Hanserd Knollys, being included in *Instructions for children* but not in *The child's delight* supports this claim.

⁸³ Keach, *The child's delight*, 28.

⁸⁴ Keach, *The child's delight*, 39, 42.

⁸⁵ Keach, *The child's delight*, 97.

⁸⁶ For a full discussion of this issue, see Chapter IV, 121-6.

Usage

The intended usage of Keach's catechisms has been mentioned in passing but deserves additional discussion as the intent also sets the Baptist catechisms apart from others—especially those of the established church. Beginning with the 1552 revision of the *Book of Common Prayer*, the catechism served as one of the prerequisites for a church member's entry into the Lord's Supper in the Church of England, even becoming equated with confirmation.⁸⁷ This requirement in England echoed the requirements instituted by Calvin in Geneva, and provided for an official enforcement by the Church hierarchy, meaning that official documents—visitation and Church court records—discussed the effectiveness of the clergy in their catechetical duties.⁸⁸ This official stance and enforcement certainly contributed to the large number of parish priests publishing their own catechisms—in order to help those in their charge prepare for confirmation from the bishop and/or to demonstrate their own compliance with the Church's requirements.

Baptist churches simply did not have a method for enforcing the use of the catechism—especially not at anything resembling a denominational level. Thus, the catechetical process remained conspicuously absent from extant Baptist church record books.⁸⁹ The topic of catechizing did appear in two notable instances in Baptist records. The delegates to the fourth general meeting of the Midland Association of the Particular Baptists (1656) discussed a question regarding a 'gospell minister's worke to instruct his flocke by catechizeing of them'. The delegates concluded that 'a minister of Christ' ought to catechize his flock, meaning he ought to question them 'for the more perfect knowledg of the condition of members soe that by the discovery of weakenes suteable strength may bee added'.⁹⁰ However, no additional discussions of catechisms appeared in the records of that association or the extant record books of its member churches. The concept of catechizing appeared again in 1693 when the Par-

⁸⁷ See James F. Turrell, 'Until Such Time as He Be Confirmed': The Laudians and Confirmation in the Seventeenth-Century Church of England', *The Seventeenth Century* 20 (2005).

⁸⁸ Turrell, 'Laudians and Confirmation', 204-205.

⁸⁹ This includes the church record book of the Maze Pond Church which split from Keach's Horsleydown congregation in 1692 and the two churches formed from the Horsleydown congregation in 1719 after the death of Benjamin Stinton, Keach's successor in the pastorate.

⁹⁰ White, ed. *Association Records of the Particular Baptists of England, Wales and Ireland to 1660*, I:25.

ticular Baptists meeting in London commissioned William Collins to pen the *Baptist Catechism*.⁹¹ Interestingly, the Baptist church record books *did* note the importance of a profession of faith as a prerequisite for membership; however, the catechism was *not* connected to that personal profession.

The lack of official discussion of the catechetical process stemmed mainly from the predominant Baptist view of the catechism and its usage. As seen in the titles of his two primers, Keach intended his catechisms primarily for the use of parents or householders and schoolmasters. Although the Midland Association expected pastors to participate in the catechizing process, the lack of enforcement by this association, combined with the lack of other official groups (associations or single congregations) even discussing this requirement supports this conclusion. Admittedly, this argument arises from silence; however, Keach's suggestion that the parents retain responsibility for the souls of their children until the point of conversion overcomes much of that silence.⁹² The prefatory letter of the *Baptist Catechism* further buttresses this conclusion by referring to the catechism as 'a short Account of Christian Principles, for the Instruction of our Families'.⁹³ Christopher Blackwood agreed with this assertion, proposing his catechisms as a method by which a parent '*mayst instruct thy Family*', leaving the householder responsible for his children and servants.⁹⁴ Manaseth King dedicated his work to the 'Parents or Masters' for the education of their 'Children or Servants'.⁹⁵ Likewise, Hercules Collins, Henry Jessey, Thomas Grantham, and Benjamin Harris all specifically addressed Parents in the prefaces of their respective works.⁹⁶

⁹¹ Ivimey, *History*, I:533.

⁹² Keach, *Gospel mysteries unveil'd*, II:238.

⁹³ *Baptist Catechism*, sig. A3v.

⁹⁴ Christopher Blackwood, *A soul-searching catechism wherein is opened and explained not onely the six fundamental points set down Heb. 6. I. But also many other questions of highest concernment in Christian religion* (London: J.C. for Giles Calvert, 1653), sig. A2r.

⁹⁵ Manaseth King, *A new and useful catechism very necessary and teachable both for children and young Christians* (London: s.n., 1699), iii. King included 'Brother Benjamin Keach's Verses' (italics inverted) as part of the prefatory material, v-vi.

⁹⁶ See Hercules Collins, *An orthodox catechism being the sum of Christian religion contained in the Law and Gospel* (London: s.n., 1680); Henry Jessey, *A catechisme for babes or little ones suitable to their capacity more than others have been formerly* (London: Henry Hills, 1652); Grantham, *St. Paul's catechism*; Benjamin Harris, *The Protestant tutor instructing children to spel and read English, and ground them in the true Protestant Religio [sic]* (London: for Ben. Harris, 1679). This suggests a high

By contrast, John Calvin addressed his *Geneva Catechism* to ‘the faithful Ministers of Christ’.⁹⁷ Lancelot Andrewes addressed the catechists who were also preachers.⁹⁸ Alexander Nowell intended his catechism for the ‘Ecclesiastical Ministers for divers good purposes’.⁹⁹ Even Luther, who, as noted earlier, addressed the heads of households in his catechisms, also placed responsibility for catechizing on bishops and ‘all pastors and preachers’.¹⁰⁰

Certainly other non-Baptist catechists noted the importance of family catechizing, suggesting at the least that parents had a responsibility to see to the education of the young people in their charge—either their own children or their servants. Calvin joined Luther in acknowledging the important role played by parents in the educational process. Some even argued, like the Baptists, that parents or householders had a responsibility to *actually* catechize the young people. In 1693, John Dunton,¹⁰¹ printed an anonymous work entitled *An earnest call to family-catechising and reformation*. In 1683, Richard Baxter—who elsewhere argued that the responsibility for catechizing fell primarily on the minister’s shoulders¹⁰²—noted that catechizing may fall to the parents because ‘[t]hose men whose Church zeal would ruine Non-conformists if they Teach many, either *Boyes* or *Men*, have no Law against Parents teaching their own Children’.¹⁰³ Thus, Keach’s (and the other Baptists’) distinctiveness lay in the *exclusive* focus on the parent’s responsibility rather than the minister’s. For almost all other catechists, the minister bore primary responsibility, supported by the parents willing

view of the laity characteristic of the early English Baptists. See James E. Bradley, ‘Anti-Catholicism as Anglican Anticlericalism: Nonconformity and the Ideological Origins of Radical Disaffection.’ in *Anticlericalism in Britain, c. 1500-1914*, eds N. Aston and M. Cragoe, 67-92 (Stroud: Sutton, 2001).

⁹⁷ Calvin, *Calvin: Theological Treatises*, 88.

⁹⁸ Lancelot Andrewes, *A patterne of catechisticall doctrine* (London: [Thomas Cotes?] for William Garrett, 1630), 1-4.

⁹⁹ Alexander Nowell, *A catechism, or institution of Christian religion to be learned of all youth* (London: E. Cotes for the Company of Stationers, 1663), sig. A3v.

¹⁰⁰ Wace and Buchheim, eds, *Luther's Primary Works*, 1, 24.

¹⁰¹ See Chapter II, 34-5.

¹⁰² Richard Baxter, *Gildas Salvianus; The reformed pastor* (London: Robert White, for Nevil Simmons, 1656), 3.

¹⁰³ Richard Baxter, *The catechizing of families a teacher of housholders how to teach their households[sic]* (London: for T. Parkhurst ..., and B. Simmons, 1683), sig. A4v-r (italics inverted).

cooperation to ensure their charges' attendance and, secondarily, by the parents' actual involvement in the catechizing.

Confessions

Reformation-era confessions of faith served two major purposes: like the catechisms, they served to establish the official beliefs of a given church, sect, or other group of people both for their own identity and for the benefit of other churches and officers of state; they also served to identify (either explicitly or implicitly) the other churches, sects, or groups of people with whom the confessors wished to be associated and/or from whom they wished to be distanced. Thus, John Calvin presented his *Institutes* to King Francis as a 'confession to [him], wherby [he] may learne what maner of doctrine' that the Geneva Church espoused and thus be able to separate true faith from that taught by the priesthood which holds to the 'Masse, Purgatorie, Pilgrimages, and such trifles'.¹⁰⁴ Likewise, the Church of England published its *Articles* under King Henry VIII ostensibly 'to stablyshe chrysten quietnes and unities amonge us, and to auoyde contentious opinios'.¹⁰⁵ The Westminster Assembly published their confession with the goal of bringing about 'Uniformity in Religion'¹⁰⁶ and 'as a great strengthening of the true Reformed Religion against the common enemies thereof'.¹⁰⁷

Given the religious and political climate of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and the development of new religious churches, sects, and groups, the fact that church confessions filled the literary landscape caused little surprise. Established churches throughout Europe found the need to define their beliefs and the boundaries of what they determined to be the true religion. In the midst of this atmosphere, dissenting groups facing the persecution of the establishment felt an ever-increasing need to define their beliefs and defend themselves both by demonstrating their Christian credentials and by distancing themselves from groups and traditions deemed extreme and dangerous. True to form, English separatists in general, and English Baptists spe-

¹⁰⁴ Jean Calvin, *The institution of Christian religion* (London: Reinolde VVolve & Richarde Harison, 1561), sig. Aiiir, Aiiiir.

¹⁰⁵ *Articles of Henry VIII*, title page.

¹⁰⁶ *Westminster Confession and Catechisms*, sig. A3r.

¹⁰⁷ *Westminster Confession and Catechisms*, sig. A4v.

cifically, provided numerous confessions of faith for the review of the establishment—as well as for the education of their constituents. The earliest Baptists under the leadership of John Smyth and Thomas Helwys formulated and published at least four confessions of faith, attempting to demonstrate to the Waterlander Mennonites alternately their similarities or their differences.¹⁰⁸

Once the Baptists returned to England in 1612, they almost immediately faced persecution as Anabaptists, being defamed by a suggested association with the uprising at Münster in 1534-35. Thus, the English Baptists penned and published several official significant confessions from the 1640s onward. The seven London congregations that became known as the Particular Baptists published the first of those, the *1644 London Confession*, as a method of ‘cleering of the truth wee professe’ and of expressly distancing themselves from the Anabaptists with whom they had been ‘falsly’ associated.¹⁰⁹ This same group of Baptists saw fit to re-work and re-publish their confession of faith only two years later in order ‘to make some declaration of [their] innocency’ after having been accused anew of ‘many hainous accusations’.¹¹⁰ The General Baptists¹¹¹ published their first official confession or declaration of faith in 1660 with the expressed goal of ‘inform[ing] all Men (in these dayes of scandal and reproach) of our innocent Belief and Practise’.¹¹² Both groups of Baptists each published another confession—the Particular Baptists developed the *Second London Confession* at a meeting in 1677 and re-published it in 1689 while the General Baptists published their *Orthodox Creed* in 1678—each with similar goals of clearly outlining their beliefs and demarcating lines of association.

In addition to the broad multi-congregational works noted above, Baptist churches also commonly developed their own confessions of faith which usually fit within one of the broader—either Particular or General Baptist—traditions. These congregation-specific documents were intended to establish the boundaries for com-

¹⁰⁸ See William Latane Lumpkin, *Baptist Confessions of Faith* (Chicago: Judson Press, 1959), 97-142.

¹⁰⁹ *1644 London Confession*, sig. A3v, A3r.

¹¹⁰ *1646 London Confession*, sig. A3r.

¹¹¹ The terms ‘General’ and ‘Particular’ Baptists derived from the given group’s views on atonement with the ‘General Baptists’ holding to general atonement and the ‘Particular Baptists’ espousing particular or limited atonement.

¹¹² *Standard Confession*, title page.

munion within the specific congregation and often dealt with points of controversy apropos to the membership of that congregation. The earliest Baptist confessions, those written by Smyth and Helwys, began as single-congregation works, but given their significance in the development of the movement were often used as broader works. Other examples of the numerous congregation-specific confessions include one adopted by the Maze Pond congregation in 1693/4,¹¹³ the confession of the Congregational Church meeting at Horsleydown and led by Joseph Jacob,¹¹⁴ and the Bampton [Devon] Baptist Church's confessional statement.¹¹⁵

Benjamin Keach's Confessional Works

By the time the Particular Baptists signed their *Second London Confession*, Benjamin Keach had established himself as a leading member of the London Baptist clergy. As pastor of the Horsleydown congregation since 1668, Keach had already begun to develop a reputation as a defender of the Baptist faith, having published tracts confronting Richard Baxter's views of infant baptism, and as a popular author, having published several works of poetry and allegory.¹¹⁶ As a significant London leader, Keach was almost assuredly involved in the London meeting that produced the *Second London Confession* in 1677,¹¹⁷ and he played an integral role in organizing the 1689 London meeting that re-adopted the confession after the accession of William and Mary and the Act of Toleration.

In 1697, Keach delved into the confessional genre as an independent author, publishing for his church *The articles of the faith of the church of Christ, or congregation meeting at Horsley-down*, a thirty-nine article confession intended to present

¹¹³ For a fuller discussion of this confession, see below, 81.

¹¹⁴ Joseph Jacob, *The covenant to be the Lord's people, and to walk after the Lord signed by the meeting at Horsly-Down in Southwark* (London: s.n., 1700). As the name suggests, this confessional document included a covenant aspect signed by the congregation. This was not an uncommon aspect of the congregation-specific documents.

¹¹⁵ *Bampton Church Record Book*, Angus Library, Regent's Park College, Oxford, 1. This confessional statement served more as an introduction to and dedication of the records. The letter at the beginning of the manuscript (dated 1733) discussed the acceptance of the *Confession of Faith* which was probably the *Second London Confession*.

¹¹⁶ Keach published *Zion in distress* in 1666 and *War with the devil* in 1673.

¹¹⁷ This was originally published anonymously by the authority of 'the Elders and Brethren of many Congregations of Christians (baptized upon Profession of their Faith) in *London* and the Country'. *Second London Confession*, title page.

the core beliefs of Keach's congregation. In the introduction to this work, Keach outlined four reasons for this publication: 1. in order to leave, after his death, 'an account of that holy Doctrine and Order, in which through Grace [his congregation was] established'; 2. because the 'General and more Large Confession of the Faith of our Churches [the *Second London Confession*], is now out of Print' and was largely unaffordable; 3. in order to demonstrate his church's faith to all men; 4. to encourage his church to 'shew all Tenderness, Charity and Moderation to such as differ from you in those [non-essential] Cases'.¹¹⁸ Keach also included a confession of faith in each of his two primers. More specifically in the last interaction of his advanced catechisms, the youth recited a short confession of faith original to Keach—presumably as a means of summary for the entire catechism.¹¹⁹

At least on some level, Keach distinguished between a confession and a creed. In his 1664 trial, Keach distinguished between the two, informing Judge Hyde that the church has 'but three Creeds; but Thousands of Christians have made a Confession of their Faith'.¹²⁰ Whether Keach held to a firm distinction between a creed and confession or simply found this distinction to be pragmatically advantageous during his trial, remains unclear. In fact, when comparing Keach's two offerings to the confessional genre, differences do arise; but those differences do not necessarily agree with the distinction Keach highlighted during his trial.

The Content of Keach's Confessions

The *Short Confession of our Faith* included in the catechisms did sound strikingly similar to some of the ecumenical creeds from the early Church Councils, using phrases like 'he [Jesus] is verily God of the substance of the Father' and referring to Christ as 'the brightness of his [the Father's] Glory, and express Image of his Person'. Those two phrases certainly borrowed from the wording of the Nicene Creed

¹¹⁸ Keach, *The articles of the faith*, sig. a2r-a3v.

¹¹⁹ Keach, *The child's delight*, 50-51; Keach, *Instructions for children [1695]*, 111-13. These two confessions were almost identical. Other than a few spelling and/or capitalization disparities, the only major differences were that *The child's delight* version included six Scripture references and the *Instructions for children* version inserted 'me' in the phrase regarding Christ's redemption: 'and that he suffered Death, to Redeem *me* and all those who truly Believe in him'. A few other minor differences exist between different editions of the two versions depending on the editions of the works consulted.

¹²⁰ *Trial of Mr. Benjamin Keach*, 1017. Those three creeds, according to the Articles of Religion of the Church of England, were the Nicene Creed, the Athanasian Creed, and the Apostles' Creed.

which referred to Christ as being ‘God from God, light from light, true God from true God’.¹²¹ The final phrase of Keach’s version—‘I also believe the Resurrection of the Dead, the Eternal Judgment, with the Life everlasting, *Amen*.’—substantially recalled the Apostles’ Creed: ‘I believe ... the resurrection of the body, and life everlasting. Amen.’¹²² The length of the *Short Confession* and its format of ‘I believe’ statements also supported Judge Hyde’s claim that Keach had penned a creed. The *Short Confession* dealt exclusively with the same issues found in both the Nicene Creed and the Apostles’ Creed, having one belief statement for each of the Persons of the Godhead and one additional belief statement for the church. Whether the *Short Confession* included in the original version of the primer could rightly be considered *new* hinged on semantics. If, by *new*, Judge Hyde only intended a different wording of the same doctrines, one could hardly argue against his accusation. However, if *new* meant additional teachings not included in the three official creeds of the Church of England, the issue became much more debatable. In the later published versions—both in *The child’s delight* and *Instructions for children*—Keach significantly omitted the controversial phrase about Christ coming again ‘to reign personally upon the Earth’.¹²³ Judge Hyde cited that particular phrase as a statement of Keach’s association with the Fifth Monarchy Movement and, evidently, as part of the new teachings in Keach’s confession.¹²⁴ Keach’s later omission may be seen either as a recognition on his part of the *newness* of that teaching or simply as a pragmatic move due to the political repercussions of phraseology that had become almost synonymous with Fifth Monarchism. Though he continued to hold the same view of the millennium throughout his life,¹²⁵ he may alternately have concluded that it was not an essential aspect of the Principles of Christianity and thus was extraneous to *The Short Confession*.

Keach left the more in-depth issues for his congregation-specific confession which appeared closer in form to *The Thirty-Nine Articles* of the Church of England than to *The Short Confession* in his catechisms. In *The articles of the faith*, Keach

¹²¹ This, of course, was also biblical language.

¹²² Clearly, this language stemmed directly from biblical language as well. Regardless, the similarities to the Church’s confessions remain unmistakable.

¹²³ *Tryal of Mr. Benjamin Keach*, 1018.

¹²⁴ For more on Keach’s relation to Fifth Monarchy ideology, see Chapter VII, 228ff.

¹²⁵ See Chapter VII, 239-41.

tackled most of the same doctrines as the *Second London Confession*. Keach's revision, however, did have some major changes. *The articles of the faith* were significantly shorter than the *Second London Confession*—thirty-four pages (4⁰) versus one hundred-eight pages (8⁰)—despite having seven more articles. Additionally, Keach mainly used his own wording for *The articles of the faith*. The few places where the wording remained identical or nearly-identical probably indicated passages of the *Second London Confession* that had been so often referenced that they had become a part of the normal Particular Baptist religious life. They could possibly be passages of the *Second London Confession* penned by Keach, though no conclusive evidence for this exists.

Particular Baptist Uniquenesses

As one would expect from a recognizable leader of the Particular Baptists, *The articles of the faith* included discussions of the doctrines which set the Particular Baptists apart from other sects, specifically, articles on Baptism (XXI), Man's Free-will (VIII), Effectual Calling (XII), and Justification (XIII). According to *The articles of the faith*, baptism 'ought not to be administred to any but to those who actually profess Repentance towards God, and Faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ' and '[t]hat the Infants of Believers ought not to be baptized'.¹²⁶ This baptism may 'only rightly [be] administred by Immersion, or dipping the whole Body in Water'.¹²⁷ This single article identified the work as Baptist in nature. The other noted articles narrowed the field even further to the theology of the Particular Baptists. In those articles, Keach clarified the doctrine of justification and cognate issues in such a way that could only apply to those who held to the particular or limited view of atonement. Keach included a

¹²⁶ Keach, *The articles of the faith*, Art. XXI. The exclusion of infants of believers was only implied in the three major Particular Baptist Confessions (*1644 London Confession*, *1646 London Confession*, and the *Second London Confession*). Keach, however, moved the doctrine from the implicit to the explicit. The three confessions simply stated that baptism was to be conferred 'onely upon persons professing faith' (*1644 London Confession*, Art. XXXIX; the *1646 London Confession*, Art. XXXIX omitted the word 'onely') or on 'those who do actually professe repentance towards God, faith in, and obedience, to our Lord Jesus' (*Second London Confession*, Art. XXIX).

¹²⁷ Keach, *The articles of the faith*, Art. XXI. In harmony with the other Particular Baptist Confessions, Keach also presented baptism using the death-burial-resurrection motif. See Michael J. Walker, 'Relation of Infants to Church, Baptism and Gospel in Seventeenth Century Baptist Theology', *Baptist Quarterly* 21 (1966), 253.

clear explication of his understanding of salvation including human inability,¹²⁸ passive receipt of salvific grace,¹²⁹ the basic structure of his covenant scheme,¹³⁰ and the doctrine of personal election.¹³¹

Keach's Individuality

In addition to the articles which had become synonymous with Particular Baptist theology of the late seventeenth century, Keach also included articles on several non-essential issues which appeared throughout his published writings: Article XXIII *Of Laying on of Hands* and Article XXVII *Of Singing of Psalms, &c.* Neither of these articles had a comparable entry in the *Second London Confession*. Keach also attributed an entire article—Article XXIX—to the discussion of ministers and their rightful maintenance. The *Second London Confession* discussed this issue, almost in passing, in a subsection in its article on the church. Each of these issues were closely tied to Benjamin Keach who entered into public debates over the laying on of hands and hymn-singing and served as a denominational spokesperson for the practice of paying ministers.¹³²

The Usage of Keach's Confessions

Benjamin Keach clearly had two different sets of intentions for his confessions: the confession included in the catechisms was intended as a statement of unity for all confessing believers while *The articles of the faith* was intended as a method of distinguishing his congregation from other congregations. The youth working through the catechism memorized the *Short Confession* as the answer to the final question. Whereas most catechisms at the time utilized the Apostles' Creed, often spending numerous questions explicating each point of that Creed,¹³³ Keach provided his own

¹²⁸ Keach, *The articles of the faith*, Art. VIII.

¹²⁹ Keach, *The articles of the faith*, Art. XII & XIII.

¹³⁰ Keach, *The articles of the faith*, Art. IX.

¹³¹ Keach, *The articles of the faith*, Art. XXXII.

¹³² For more on the laying on of hands, see Chapter IV, 121-6. The hymn-singing controversy has been discussed in detail by other authors. On the practice of paying ministers, Keach penned a work on behalf of the Assembly entitled *Gospel ministers maintenance vindicated* (1689).

¹³³ E.g., In the *Geneva Catechism* (1545), Calvin spent almost the entire first section explicitly discussing the Apostles' Creed (more than one hundred interactions). See Calvin, *Calvin: Theological Treatises*.

confession as the summary of the entire catechism. Any points of controversy among the Reformed churches—e.g., believers' baptism—were notably omitted from this confession, despite including them elsewhere in the catechism. The point of the confession, then, was similar to the point of the Apostles' Creed: to provide a basic overview of the essentials of the Christian religion.

The articles of the faith, on the other hand, were clearly not intended to be memorized or recited by the church member.¹³⁴ Rather, *The articles of the faith* served as a line of demarcation for church members and prospective church members and as an official foundation for the future teaching of this particular congregation. In this document, Keach refused to avoid the issues of contention between his congregation and others. Keach did, however, attempt to demonstrate the relative importance of some of these issues *and*, simultaneously, allow for some differences. In the 'Epistle Dedicatory' to *The articles of the faith*, Keach noted that there were churches 'of the same Faith' that 'dissent from us' on the issues of 'Imposition of Hands upon baptized Believers as such, and singing of God's Praise, &c.' Keach urged his congregation to 'shew all Tenderness, Charity and Moderation to such as differ from you in those Cases, and not refuse Communion with them'.¹³⁵ Thus, *The articles of the faith* became the official document for identifying the congregation's stance on those issues, including the consequences that dissidence would have on communion.

As the official stance of the Horsleydown congregation, *The articles of the faith* often served as a point of inter-congregational comparison, as was the case with the Maze Pond congregation that split from Horsleydown in 1692. The Maze Pond church wrote their own confessional statement which helps identify the normal usage

es, 92-107. The Heidelberg divines discussed the Apostles' Creed in thirty-seven questions. See *Heidelberg Catechism*, Q22-58. Following the *Heidelbergh Catechism*, Hercules Collins explicated the Apostles' Creed. In his *St. Paul's Catechism*, Thomas Grantham had the Father recite the Nicene Creed in response to the Son's question regarding the necessary components of saving faith. Grantham, *St. Paul's catechism*, Q48.

¹³⁴ The length alone—some forty pages 4^o—suggests that this was not a memorized work. Additionally, the work was not based on a dialogue (or question and answer) format which was typical of the longer works intended for memorization.

¹³⁵ Keach, *The articles of the faith*, sig. a3v. This stood in direct contradiction to Crosby's claim that the imposition of hands served as a 'boundary of communion' for the Horsleydown congregation. These two claims could possibly be harmonized if Keach's church did not allow members to dissent but allowed the congregation to have communion with other congregations that did not practice the imposition of hands. The truth of the former of these contingencies is unknown, while the latter contingency is known to be true. See Crosby, *History*, IV:290.

of these confessional statements. The Maze Pond Confession of Faith, accepted by that congregation on 9 February 1693/4, included twenty-two separate articles. Most of those articles aligned well with *The articles of the faith* of Benjamin Keach's church. However, two major differences existed: The Maze Pond congregation included an article *against* the practice of hymn-singing which had been the source of the conflict leading up to the split in 1692.¹³⁶ This article obviously served as a line of demarcation between the congregations.¹³⁷ The Maze Pond confession also included a clarifying statement which argued that the laying on of Hands was not required for *all* baptized believers. Keach's congregation was one of only a handful of Particular Baptist churches that practiced this ritual; thus, the Maze Pond members again used this article to separate themselves from their former church.¹³⁸ Significantly, Keach published *The articles of the faith* several years *after* the formation of the Maze Pond church. Keach's inclusion of the articles in question could have been instigated by the Maze Pond congregation's choice of articles to include. Without the Horsleydown church record book, the date of origin and impetus for these articles of faith and their publication remains uncertain. Regardless, the practices in question were definitely part of the life of the Horsleydown congregation prior to 1692.

Despite its congregation-specific focus, *The articles of the faith* quickly became a document of international significance, a feat which was aided by its intentionally-minimal price and the fact that another church, Tallow Chandler's Hall which was pastored by Elias Keach, simultaneously adopted *The articles of the faith* as their own confession. Due to Elias's continuing influence in the colonies, the Baptist Church at Middletown, in the Pennsylvania Colony in 1712, adopted 'Elias Keach's Confession of Faith'¹³⁹ which must have been *The articles of the faith* of 1697. The

¹³⁶ *Maze Pond Church Book*, Angus Library, Regent's Park College, Oxford, opening section.

¹³⁷ *Maze Pond Church Book*, Angus Library, Regent's Park College, Oxford, Art. 14.

¹³⁸ *Maze Pond Church Book*, Angus Library, Regent's Park College, Oxford, Art. 17. In the midst of trying to become established as a separate congregation after the hymn-singing controversy split the Horsleydown congregation, the nascent Maze Pond congregation—following the teaching of Isaac Marlow among others—came to the conclusion that laying on of hands was *not* a necessity of church membership. This was evidently a shift for the majority of these church members who had accepted the practice as members of Keach's congregation.

¹³⁹ A. D. Gillette, ed. *Minutes of the Philadelphia Baptist Association, from A.D. 1707, to A.D. 1807: Being the First One Hundred Years of Its Existence* (Atlas, Michigan: Baptist Book Trust, 1976), 13-14.

Keach influence can also be seen in the actions of the entire Philadelphia Baptist Association which later adopted the *Second London Confession* as its official confession of faith.¹⁴⁰ The Philadelphia version copied the *Second London Confession* verbatim except for two ‘extra’ articles—one on the ‘Singing of Psalms &c’ and the other on ‘Laying on of Hands’—both of which were taken directly from *The articles of the faith*.¹⁴¹ Given that the Keach document was evidently not specifically adopted by any other congregation in England, it seems to have had greater influence in the North American colonies than it did in the British Isles.

Keach’s Influence and Legacy

As one would expect of a seventeenth-century Baptist leader, Keach’s catechetical and confessional writings stood out from the crowded landscape of those genres as being unabashedly Baptist in theology. But even within the much more sparse landscape of dissenting, and specifically Baptist, works in those genres, Keach still stood out as one of the few who was consistently willing to discuss—and defend his stance on—controversial issues, even when that discussion meant being isolated from the majority of his peers. Partially due to that willingness and partially due to the general marketability of his works, Benjamin Keach’s catechetical and confessional writings carried significant influence during Keach’s lifetime and in the centuries that followed. One version of his catechism, *Instructions for children*, went through at least thirty printings by the middle of the eighteenth century and portions of it were reprinted in other publications throughout the eighteenth century. His confessional writing not included in the catechisms did not have the same printing success; however, its influence can be seen in the adoption of the unique aspects of the work throughout the British Isles and, especially, in the American colonies through the Philadelphia

¹⁴⁰ The records of the Philadelphia Baptist Association do not mention the actual adoption of the *Second London Confession*. However, by 1724, the *Association Minutes* referred to the *Second London Confession* as an authoritative source. See Gillette, ed. *Minutes of the Philadelphia Baptist Association*, 27. No clear indication was given regarding the addition of the two articles. It should also be noted that the Philadelphia Baptist Association had a large number of Welsh immigrants who may have been influenced by Benjamin Keach’s teachings in their home country, thereby doubling the Keach influence. See Bassett, *The Welsh Baptists*, 56ff.

¹⁴¹ W. J. McGlothlin, *Baptist Confessions of Faith* (London: Kingsgate Press, 1911), 293-9. Those articles remained in use in North America through at least the beginning of the twentieth century.

Baptist Association and its later offspring. Through that avenue, Keach's direct influence could still be seen into the twentieth century.

Throughout all of those writings, Keach rose above the crowd as an independent spirit who held firm convictions about his theological beliefs and was unwilling to avoid those issues even in the face of political persecution and religious isolation. His discussions of those issues—even in the relatively short writings that belong to the catechetical and confessional genres—built upon already-existing works, but always included Keach's original thoughts and words. Thus, with these short writings Keach established himself as a theologian in the broadest Protestant sense of the term, willingly interacting and, at times, disagreeing with—rather than blindly accepting—the theological community to which he belonged.

These works provide significant insight into the issues Keach viewed as essential to the Christian faith despite generally avoiding the deeper intricacies of the important doctrines. The dissection of Keach's understanding of those doctrines—the Godhead, the covenantal system, justification, and eschatology—comprises the remainder of this study. Ultimately his further elucidation of those issues clearly demonstrate Keach's view of orthodoxy. Thus far, his willingness to remain independent of *all* other theologians—seen clearly in his catechisms and confessions—appears to be the *most* significant detail of Keach's view of orthodoxy. In other words, for Keach, orthodoxy was determined solely by beliefs. Mere association with another theologian did not prove orthodoxy or heresy. If it did, Keach would have been far better served by simply reprinting a modified form of orthodox works.

CHAPTER IV: THE GODHEAD

[True believers] steadfastly believe the Doctrine of the Blessed Trinity, that *there are three that bear record in Heaven, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit; and that these three are one; One in essence, yet three Persons or Subsistences.*¹

Despite the fact that he lived at a time when the doctrine of the Trinity was under almost constant attack in English theology and despite being surrounded by those controversies, Keach consistently held the doctrine of the Trinity to be an essential of the Christian faith. Given the obvious significance both to Keach's teaching and to the theological landscape of his time, the lack of any significant discussion of Keach's understanding of this doctrine—even his unquestioned assumptions—leaves a significant void in the understanding of Keach's theology. Additionally, from the earliest days of the Reformation (and even in the medieval church), trinitarianism often served as the first litmus test for orthodoxy—a situation which remained especially true for seventeenth-century Reformed churches. Given Keach's desire to defend matters of orthodoxy, no examination of his standing in that regard would be complete without an historically accurate understanding of Keach's view of the Trinity.

The Doctrine of the Godhead

From the earliest councils of the church, the doctrine of the Godhead, in general, and the Trinity, in specific, served as the focal point of seemingly endless debates. The earliest creeds of christendom—the Apostles', the Nicene-Constantinopolitan, the Athanasian—all stem from discussions regarding the formalization of this doctrine. The emphases of these various creeds clearly identified the principal points of contention at the time of their penning with infamous theologians being branded as heretics by the boundaries of orthodoxy they established: Arius, the Macedonians, etc.

¹ Keach, *A golden mine opened*, 85.

Since those original formulations, Christendom has never been free of Trinitarian controversy with charges of Arianism—the belief that Christ was merely the most prominent among creation and was, therefore, not eternally existent—or, by contrast, Sabellianism—also known as *patripassionism* for the central idea that there was no distinction between the persons of the Trinity, but in fact, all were the same person simply presented in different modes—being levied against potential heretics throughout the ages. Protestantism was not immune from these controversies with perhaps the most famous Trinitarian controversy of the early Reformation being the condemnation and execution of Michael Servetus (1511-1553) in Geneva in 1553.² Not long after the Servetus affair, Trinitarian controversy erupted in nearby Poland when, in 1565, the antitrinitarian Polish Minor Church separated from the Polish Reformed Church. Later, in 1579, the Sienese nobleman, Fausto Sozzini (1539-1604), joined the Polish Minor Church (also known as the Polish Brethren) and wielded significant influence over its subsequent theological positioning. Their distinctly antitrinitarian theology—which combined a suspicion of tradition with an intense biblicism³—became known as *Socinianism* and was codified in the Polish Brethren’s foundational theological document, the *Racovian Catechism*, originally published in 1605.

The Rise of Trinitarian Concerns in England⁴

The response to the *Racovian Catechism* in England was swift and decisive. The first version to be printed in England was dedicated to King James I who, following the execution of two heretics for antitrinitarianism in 1612,⁵ ordered the work to be burned in 1614. Between the burning of the Latin version and the banning of the

² For Servetus’ views, see his provocatively titled work *De Erroribus Trinitatis* (1531).

³ Stephen D. Snobelen, ‘“To us there is but one God, the Father”: Antitrinitarian Textual Criticism in Seventeenth- and Early Eighteenth-Century England.’ in *Scripture and Scholarship in Early Modern England*, eds A. Hessayon and N. Keene, 116-136 (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2006), 116.

⁴ McLachlan remains the classic text for the study of early English Socinianism. See H. John McLachlan, *Socinianism in Seventeenth-Century England* (London: Oxford University Press, 1951), Preface, ii. The recent additions of Mortimer and Dixon also prove indispensable to this study. See Philip Dixon, *‘Nice and Hot Disputes’: the Doctrine of the Trinity in the Seventeenth Century* (London: T & T Clark, 2003); Sarah Mortimer, ‘The Challenge of Socinianism in Mid-Seventeenth Century England’, DPhil Thesis, University of Oxford, 2007.

⁵ Bartholomew Legate (d. 1612) and Edward Wightman (1580?-1612) were executed by the civil authorities at the behest of the Church of England for their heretical views of the Godhead. For a biography of these two condemned heretics, see *ODNB*.

English version of the same work in 1652, however, the theological landscape in England changed dramatically. The intervening decades witnessed the proliferation of numerous theologians and sects willing to question the accepted bounds of orthodoxy. Prior to the upheaval of the Civil Wars, the Church of England had attempted to exact a quick and forceful response to any theological discourse which threatened to impinge upon those boundaries. The events surrounding the earliest publication of the *Racovian Catechism* in England clearly displayed that swift and powerful response. In fact, as a result of that early condemnation, the term *Socinian* became a useful catch-all polemical tool for theologians wishing to dismiss their opponents with simple labels.⁶

The events surrounding the publication of the English version of the *Racovian Catechism* in 1652, a version obviously intended for the English laity, demonstrated the marked changes in English theology. That work provided a tangible example of the dangers of the extreme biblicism and anti-traditionism feared by the establishment.⁷ Indeed, similar discussions of the supreme authority of scripture could be found in both the *Racovian Catechism* and in theological works of English dissent.⁸ Many mainstream theologians followed the example of Francis Cheynell (d. 1665), an Oxford-educated member of the Westminster Assembly and later an ejected minister, who, in his *The rise, growth, and danger of Socinianisme* (1643) argued that the heresy of the Polish Brethren served as the foundation of radical dissent found among ‘the Atheists, Anabaptists, and Sectaries so much complained of ...’.⁹ In other words, by the time the *Racovian Catechism* was translated into English, many of the underlying concepts had already become entrenched in the theological discussions in the British

⁶ According to the *OED*, the term *Socinian* first came into prominence around the same time as the Wightman and Legate executions in 1612.

⁷ Note that the catechism begins with a section on the Holy Scriptures. In the second chapter of that section, the catechism denounces human tradition.

⁸ The early separatist, Henry Barrow (c.1550-1593) appealed to the absolute authority of Scripture as the only pattern for Reformation. Henry Barrow, *The Writings of Henry Barrow 1590-1591* (London: Published for the Sir Halley Stewart Trust [by] Allen & Unwin, 1966), 354. The early Baptist leader, Christopher Blackwood, included this view of the authority of scripture in his *A soul-searching catechism* (1653). Also see *1644 London Confession*, Art. VII. Many later dissenting confessions, including the *Second London Confession*, began with a discussion of the Scriptures.

⁹ Francis Cheynell, *The rise, growth, and danger of Socinianisme together with a plaine discovery of a desperate designe of corrupting the Protestant religion* (London: Samuel Gellibrand, 1643), title page.

Isles, making the defense of the ‘traditional’ bounds of English orthodoxy far more challenging.

For its part, Parliament moved just as swiftly and decisively as James I had. Echoing the government’s response to the original London publication of the *Racovian Catechism* in 1614, Parliament condemned the English translation as ‘Blasphemous, Erronious and Scandalous’ and, on 2 April 1652, ordered the sheriffs of London and Middlesex ‘to seize all the printed Copies of the Book ... and cause the same to be burnt at the Old Exchange *London*, and in the New Palace at *Westminster*’.¹⁰ This time, the condemnation of the *Racovian Catechism* did not have the same effect, however. In addition to the now-entrenched sects of dissenters which had gained a foothold during the Civil Wars, England also had developed an indigenous antitrinitarian tendency thanks almost exclusively to the works of Paul Best (1590-1657)¹¹ and John Biddle (1615/16-1662)¹², both university-educated scholars who published antitrinitarian pamphlets in the mid-1640s.

Paul Best spent considerable time traveling through central and eastern Europe in the early seventeenth century during which time he encountered and adopted the Socinian version of antitrinitarianism.¹³ In his *Mysteries discovered* (1647), published from prison where he was being held on charges of blasphemy, Best averred ‘the Father to be God himself ... and that the Son is our *Messiah*, ... whom God made Lord and Christ, ... Prince and Saviour, ... And that the holy Spirit is the very power of God’.¹⁴ The ideas that the Son was God’s Messiah but not God himself and that the Holy Spirit was not a distinct person, echoed the teachings of the Polish Brethren.¹⁵ Best also echoed the intense biblicism of the Polish Brethren, claiming that ‘for the

¹⁰ *Votes of Parliament touching the book commonly called The Racovian Catechism* (London: John Field, 1652).

¹¹ Best studied at Jesus College, Cambridge, proceeding MA in 1613. *ODNB*.

¹² Biddle was educated at Magdalene Hall, Oxford, proceeding MA in 1641. *ODNB*.

¹³ See McLachlan, *Socinianism*, 149-62. Dixon, *Nice and Hot Disputes*, 44.

¹⁴ Paul Best, *Mysteries discovered, or, A mercuriall picture pointing out the way from Babylon to the holy city* (London: 1647), 4.

¹⁵ *Racovian Catechism*, 47.

Son to be coequall to the Father, or the holy Spirit a distinct coequall person I cannot finde [in Scripture]'.¹⁶

In his *Twelve arguments drawn out of the Scripture, wherein the commonly received opinion touching the deity of the Holy Spirit, is clearly and fully refuted* (1647) and *A confession of faith touching the Holy Trinity, according to the Scripture* (1648), John Biddle demonstrated a purportedly independent antitrinitarianism which he developed prior to reading Socinian publications.¹⁷ Beginning with his labeling of the doctrine of the Trinity as 'the dregs still left behinde' after Luther and Calvin left the scene of the Reformation, Biddle's similarities to the thought of Best and the Socinians were readily apparent. He also blamed that 'Gross Opinion touching three Persons in God' for 'corrupt[ing] almost our whole Religion'.¹⁸ Echoing the works of Best and the Polish Brethren, Biddle argued that 'God is none but the Father'¹⁹ and demonstrated an (at least semi-) Arian view of Christ in his claim that Christ 'hath no other then a humane nature'.²⁰ Biddle differed from Best and the Socinians by arguing that the Holy Spirit actually possessed a personal nature distinct from God. That Spirit, however, was merely the 'principal Minister of God and Christ ... singled out of the number of the other heavenly Ministers or Angels', not the third Person of the Trinity as taught by the Athanasian Creed.²¹

Almost immediately, Biddle and Best experienced the wrath of the heresiographers of their day, with the ministers of London listing them in their catalogue of heresies entitled *A testimony to the truth of Jesus Christ*.²² Additionally, both men were imprisoned on charges of blasphemy. However, unlike Legate and Wightman,

¹⁶ Best, *Mysteries discovered*, 5. cf. *Racovian Catechism*, 1.

¹⁷ McLachlan, *Socinianism*, 163-217. This is important in that it shows that these theologians identified Trinitarianism as a vestige of medieval scholasticism rather than evangelical biblicism. They were not simply joining a fad movement or merely attempting to subvert the establishment.

¹⁸ John Biddle, *A confession of faith touching the Holy Trinity, according to the Scripture* (London: 1648), sig. D4v [sic]. This page should have a signature reference of D5v. The preceding recto page is marked D4. The succeeding recto page is unmarked but should be D5, according to the succession of signatures. By mistake, this verso page has a mark of D4.

¹⁹ Biddle, *A confession of faith*, Art. I.

²⁰ Biddle, *A confession of faith*, Art. III.

²¹ Biddle, *A confession of faith*, Art. VI.

²² *A testimony to the truth of Jesus Christ, and to our Solemn League and Covenant* (London: A.M. for Tho. Underhill, 1648), 6-7.

neither Biddle nor Best was executed for heresy. Instead they were beneficiaries of a political struggle over religious toleration. Biddle, especially, did not disappear into retirement, publishing numerous antitrinitarian works throughout the 1650s including a catechism and an account of the life of Fausto Sozzini. The de facto religious liberty established by the tolerance shown to Biddle and Best, set the stage for the trinitarian controversy which ensued despite Parliament's ambitious attempts to defend England from Socinianism. Indeed, by the end of the seventeenth century, the controversy surrounding the Trinity would reach its pinnacle, enveloping mainstream and dissenting theologies alike.

The Establishment and the Trinity

Recognizing the incipient danger in the newly-formulated English antitrinitarianism, mainline theologians did not leave the theology of Biddle and Best unanswered. The written debates which started in large part in the early 1640s and involved the likes of Francis Cheynell and his fellow Westminster divines, George Walker (1581?-1651) and Thomas Gataker (1574-1654), took on increased fervor when Biddle continued his assault on traditional trinitarianism. Responding to a new catechism published by Biddle in 1654, the eminent Independent theologian, John Owen, issued a salvo entitled *Vindiciæ evangelicæ* (1655), linking Biddle's Socinian denial of the deity of Christ with the controversial view of the atonement espoused by Hugo Grotius (1583-1645), the Dutch jurist associated with the Remonstrants.²³ In this nearly-700-page point-by-point disputation of Biddle, Owen primarily focused on defending the deity of Christ and, therefore, his rightful place as the second Person of the Trinity. In the midst of these arguments, Owen refuted all of the major points of Socinian theology: unitarianism, the non-deity of Christ, and the idea that the Holy Spirit was not a distinct person.²⁴

Matthew Poole, the presbyterian divine famous for his *Annotations upon the Bible*, also joined in the fray in the early 1650s. In his *Blasphæmoktonia*, Poole fo-

²³ For a more in-depth discussion of the atonement, see Chapter VI, 185-92.

²⁴ Interestingly, Owen accepted the vast majority of Biddle's arguments for the authority of Scripture. This further demonstrates the difficulty the English theologians had in refuting Socinianism, couched as it was in acceptable views of Scripture. John Owen, *Vindiciæ evangelicæ or The mystery of the Gospel vindicated, and Socinianisme examined* (Oxford: [Henry Hall? and] Leon. Lichfield ... for Tho. Robinson, 1655), 45-6.

cused on defending the deity of the Holy Spirit. The prefatory ‘Letter to the Christian Reader’ signed by a host of well-known puritan divines—James Cranford, Arthur Jackson, Thomas Manton, and Edmund Calamy—set the stage for Poole’s work which clearly did not pull any punches. From its opening line—‘All Heresies come from Hell’—the letter announced the collective opinion of these divines that ‘[a]mongst all Heresies, none are more dangerous nor infectious then such as assail the Sacred Trinity ...’.²⁵ Poole picked up immediately with the assertion that Socinianism is nothing more than an ages-old heresy brought about by the ‘*Antitrinitarian Devil*’.²⁶ The entire work fell in line with those opening remarks. This antagonism characterized the vast majority of the establishment’s attacks against the Socinians throughout the seventeenth century—a phenomenon clearly evinced by the previous publications of Nicolas Estwick (fl. 1633-1657), a graduate of Christ’s College, Cambridge and minister in Warkton, who opened his *Pneumatologia* (1648) with a denouncement of ‘Mr. *Bidle’s abhorred lines*’,²⁷ the ‘old rotten Heresies’ which he ‘rake[d] out of the grave’.²⁸

Ultimately, the response of the pre-Restoration establishment—an establishment which included many who later would be ejected—remained clear and concise through this iteration of the Trinitarian controversy. Even the Laudian regime issued a canon against Socinianism.²⁹ These theologians built their response on the traditional view of the Trinity as established in the three creeds followed by the Church of England: the Apostles’ Creed, the Nicene Creed, and the Athanasian Creed.³⁰ Of those, the Athanasian Creed contained the most explicit form of the Trinity, declaring

²⁵ Matthew Poole, *Blasphæmoktonia: The blasphemer slaine with the sword of the spirit: or, A plea for the God-head of the Holy Ghost* (London: T.M. for Joh. Rothwell, 1653), sig. A7.

²⁶ Poole, *Blasphemoktonia*, sig. A10r.

²⁷ Nicolas Estwick, *Pneumatologia: or, A treatise of the Holy Ghost* (London: 1648), sig. A4v.

²⁸ Estwick, *Pneumatologia*, 98.

²⁹ Daniel Neal, *The history of the Puritans, or, Protestant nonconformists from the Reformation in 1517, to the Revolution in 1688* (London: Thomas Tegg, 1837), I:629. This canon applied a general ban against Socinian literature and did not mention any doctrines by name. Neal: ‘None of the doctrines of Socinus, nor any of his peculiar sentiments, are mentioned in this canon.’ Also note that, in his *The rise, growth, and danger of Socinianisme*, Francis Cheynell, in what was probably a polemically-charged attempt to brand opponents, argued that Laud (et al) had Socinian leanings.

³⁰ *Thirty Nine Articles [1562]*, Art. 8.

That we worship one God in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity ... For there is one person of the Father, another of the Son, and another of the Holy Spirit. But the Godhead of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit is all one, the glory equal, the majesty coeternal ... He therefore that will be saved must thus think of the Trinity.

Thus, the Independents were in harmony with the establishment when, in the *Savoy Declaration*, they declared that ‘Doctrine of the Trinity is the foundation of all our Communion with God, and comfortable Dependence upon him’.³¹

After the Restoration, the controversy continued. However, with the increased discussion surrounding toleration and religious liberty, the debate took on different tones. By the end of the century, the trinitarianism debate largely turned in-house with William Sherlock (1639/40-1707) and Robert South (1634-1716) leading the way in an increasingly-heated debate which took on added significance as rationalism made headway into English theology and culture as a whole. When Sherlock presented his defense of this doctrine in *A vindication of the doctrine of the holy and ever blessed Trinity* (1690), the debate took on semantic overtones largely centered around the meaning of terms such as *person*, *essence*, *substance*, etc. in the traditional Trinitarian formulation. The controversy developed at an alarming rate and enveloped most of English theology in the late-seventeenth century. By 1694, Matthew Tindal (d. 1733), the lawyer and religious controversialist, could rightly argue that ‘there are so many wrong Trinities, and more every day encreasing, Authors having such different Idea’s of them, that there are almost as many Trinities as Writers, each having a new one of his own...’.³² Indeed, a plethora of noteworthies were caught in the midst of the wave of Trinities (or non-Trinities) being presented for theological thought, including John Milton (1608-1674) whose strict biblicism led him to avoid the term Trinity, Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679), John Locke, and Isaac Newton (1642-1727) all of whom followed their high esteem of human reason to antitrinitarian conclusions.³³

³¹ *Savoy Declaration*, Art. II.

³² Matthew Tindal, *A letter to the reverend the clergy of both universities, concerning the Trinity and the Athanasian creed with reflections on all the late hypotheses* (London: s.n., 1694), 4.

³³ See John Milton, *A treatise on Christian doctrine, compiled from the holy Scriptures alone* (Cambridge: 1825); Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan, or, The matter, forme, & power of a common-wealth ecclesiasticall and civill* (London: for Andrew Ckooke sic, 1651), esp. Chs XVI & XLII; John Locke, *Mr. Locke's reply to the right reverend the Lord Bishop of Worcester's answer to his second letter* (London: H.C. for A. and J. Churchill ... and C. Castle, 1699); Isaac Newton, *The Correspondence of Isaac Newton: 1688-1694* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1961), 389-99. Milton was a friend of Paul

From Mainstream to Baptists

English Baptists jumped into the fray rather early, with the General Baptist minister, John Griffith, debating John Biddle at ‘Capt. Chillingdon’s Church’ over the deity of Christ and his role in the Trinity. According to an informer’s report, that debate occurred on 28 June 1655. Even before that time, the Baptists had struggled with heterodox views of the Godhead. From their inception, the earliest English Baptists had been in contact with the Dutch Mennonites who were influenced by the ‘celestial flesh’ Christology of the Anabaptist leaders, Melchior Hoffman (c. 1495-1543) and Menno Simons (1496-1561). These Mennonites adhered to the idea that Christ did not receive human flesh from his mother, but rather only had a divine, or ‘celestial’, flesh. Appearing in the works of several Baptist theologians throughout their early years including Elias Tookey in the 1620s, this Christology later became synonymous with its principal proponent, Matthew Caffyn (d. 1714). Caffyn, the General Baptist minister from Sussex, taught that ‘*Christ took nothing of his Body, Blood and Bones of the Virgin Mary; but that the Eternal word Changed into Flesh and so died...*’.³⁴ This heterodoxy placed the followers of Caffyn on the opposite side of the Christological spectrum from that of Biddle, Best, and the Socinians—with the Caffynites emphasizing the deity of Christ and the others emphasizing his humanity. This issue led to a split among the General Baptists in 1697 and continued to plague the Baptists at least until the re-unification of the General Baptists in 1704.³⁵

While the General Baptists quarreled and split over Matthew Caffyn, the Particular Baptists struggled with some heterodox views of their own, largely centered around the teachings of Thomas Collier (d. 1691), the Particular Baptist minister connected with Somerset in the latter half of the seventeenth century. Following several

Best, and his theology bore traces of that relationship. See Dixon, *Nice and Hot Disputes*, 44; Mortimer, ‘The Challenge of Socinianism in Mid-Seventeenth Century England’, 12. For a discussion of Hobbes, see Dixon, *Nice and Hot Disputes*, 70-96. For a discussion of Locke’s and Newton’s anti-trinitarian theology, see Dixon, *Nice and Hot Disputes*, 180ff; Stephen D. Snobelen, ‘Isaac Newton, Socinianism and ‘the one supreme God.’ in *Socinianism and Arminianism: Antitrinitarians, Calvinists, and Cultural Exchange in Seventeenth-Century Europe*, eds M. Mulsow and J. Rohls, 241-93 (Leiden: Brill, 2005).

³⁴ Christopher Cooper, *The veil turn'd aside: or, heresy unmask'd* (London: for the author, 1701), 108. For a full discussion of the controversy surrounding the teachings of Matthew Caffyn, see Bass, ‘Thomas Grantham and General Baptist Theology’, 247-64.

³⁵ See *White’s Alley Church Book*, Guildhall Library, London, entries dated 7, 8 June 1693 & General Association meeting in 1704.

controversial interactions in the 1650s and 1660s, the London Particular Baptists charged Collier with heresy in 1677.³⁶ While he attempted to demonstrate his orthodoxy in his *The body of divinity* (1674), Collier's reluctance to use extra-biblical language such as 'Trinity'—a stance which sounded remarkably similar to the Socinian position—continued to make him and his theology suspect.³⁷ Collier did not stand alone in this reluctance. Several General Baptists, including Thomas Grantham, who upheld doctrine against the Caffynites in Sussex, discussed their own misgivings over this type of language.³⁸ However, among the Particular Baptists, Collier's views stood out as anomalous.

The two main groups of Baptists, then, understood the obvious significance of the doctrine of the Trinity and the Godhead in general. These controversies involved a large number of the leaders of these groups, with the General Baptist response to Caffyn being headed by Thomas Grantham and John Griffith and the Particular Baptist response to Collier being headed by William Kiffin, Henry Forty, William Collins, and Nehemiah Coxe.³⁹ These controversies carried added significance for the Baptist community during this period as they struggled to establish themselves as legitimate religious communities and, thereby, avoid persecution from the establishment. The early and persistent charges of heresy on the doctrine of the Trinity from influential heresiographers such as Thomas Edwards (c. 1599-1648) and Ephraim Pagitt (1574-1646)—both of whom grouped the English Baptists with the continental Anabaptists in their assertions of heresy in the 1640s—combined with the similar foundational concepts of the authority of scripture and willingness to question tradition to necessitate an active defense from the English Baptists. Thus, any heterodox views on this doctrine within the Baptist proto-denominations attracted special attention from the leaders.

³⁶ Richard D. Land, 'Doctrinal Controversies of English Particular Baptists (1644-1691) as Illustrated by the Career and Writings of Thomas Collier', DPhil Thesis, University of Oxford, 1979, 305.

³⁷ Thomas Collier, *The body of divinity, or, A confession of faith being the substance of Christianity* (London: for Nath. Crouch, 1674), 43.

³⁸ Thomas Grantham, *A friendly epistle to the bishops and ministers of the Church of England for plain truth and sound peace between the pious Protestants of the Church of England and those of the baptised believers* (London: s.n., 1680), 27.

³⁹ The London Particular Baptists entrusted Nehemiah Coxe (or Cox), son of the early Particular Baptist leader, Benjamin Cox (d. 1663?), with the task of answering the heterodoxy of Thomas Collier. To that end, Cox published *Vindiciae veritatis* in 1677.

Benjamin Keach's Doctrine of the Godhead

The relative silence from the pen of Benjamin Keach stands as the most interesting aspect of his discussion of the Trinitarian Godhead. When the eighteen-year-old Keach began his preaching career in 1658, the Trinitarian controversy remained at the forefront of English theology with the ink still drying on the printed debate between John Owen and John Biddle. The General Baptists—the group which Keach joined in 1655—were also beginning to realize that non-traditional views of the Trinity were gaining a stronghold within their ranks. Keach could hardly have been ignorant of the state of these controversies, having established an early relationship with John Griffith, one of the leading General Baptists involved in the Caffyn controversy.⁴⁰ Additionally, Keach read the works of William Sherlock, even citing him as an authority on the role of baptism in the church.⁴¹ At first glance, then, the fact that Keach did not publish a work devoted exclusively to this doctrine until 1700—his catechetical work entitled *Beams of divine light*—appeared to be a rare case of Keach avoiding, or even ignoring, a controversy. However, when considering the entire corpus of Keach's work, a more accurate picture appears. Though no definitive reasons for Keach's non-entry into the fray of Trinitarian controversies can be given, a few seem likely. As will be seen, Keach focused on the Trinity throughout his writings, including some lengthy sections of his more famous works. The detail to which Keach developed his Trinitarian theology could hardly have been more developed simply by another volume. Additionally, a member of Keach's Horsleydown congregation, Isaac Marlow,⁴² published an impressive work entitled *A treatise of the Holy Trinity* in 1690—at the onset of the debates between Sherlock and South. That work espoused the same Trinitarianism which Keach had previously detailed in his sermons and printed works. Finally, just as the Trinitarian controversy of the 1690s gained momentum, Keach became embroiled in separate debates within his own congregation which

⁴⁰ See Chapter II, 14-15.

⁴¹ Keach cited Sherlock in *Believers baptism, A counter-antidote, Light broke forth in Wales, and The rector rectified*. Each time, Keach noted his agreement with Sherlock's understanding of baptism as a demonstration of the death, burial, and resurrection of the old creature.

⁴² Significantly, Isaac Marlow published this work before playing a significant and antagonistic role in the hymn-singing controversy which split the Horsleydown congregation. See Brooks, 'Benjamin Keach and the Baptist Singing Controversy'. Also Walker, *The Excellent Benjamin Keach*, 275-303.

resulted in the split of his church in 1691 and demanded his attention.⁴³ Even without entering the controversy directly, Keach provided sufficient emphasis on the Trinity to be rightly considered a Trinitarian theologian.

Trinitarian Theology

From his earliest publications, Keach clearly established that he subscribed to a traditional Trinitarian theology. In fact, Keach organized the short confession at the end of the republications of his first primer—presumably the same confession which led Judge Hyde to charge him with formulating a new creed⁴⁴—according to the three persons of the Trinity: the first paragraph discussing the divine essence and the Father, the second discussing Jesus, and the third discussing the Holy Spirit.⁴⁵ Similar to the Apostles' Creed, Keach also included a fourth paragraph which focused on the church. That confession, which Keach reprinted throughout his life in the many editions of *Instructions for children* and *The child's delight*, harmonized well with the confession he published for his congregation in 1697.⁴⁶ In that work, despite ostensibly attempting to reproduce the *Second London Confession* in a more affordable version, Keach took the opening articles—'Of God, and of the Holy Trinity'—almost directly from the Westminster Assembly's *Shorter Catechism* rather than the *Second London Confession* or even the *Westminster Confession*:⁴⁷

We do believe, declare and testify, that there is but One Only Living and True God, who is a Spirit Infinite, Eternal, Immense and Unchangeable in his Being, Wisdom, Power, Holiness, Justice, Goodness, Truth and Faithfulness.

⁴³ *Maze Pond Church Book*, Angus Library, Regent's Park College, Oxford, see opening narrative.

⁴⁴ See Chapter III, esp. 57-8.

⁴⁵ Keach, *Instructions for children* [1695], 111-13.

⁴⁶ Keach published that confession in two separate works in 1697: *The articles of the faith of the church of Christ, or congregation meeting at Horsley-down* and *A short confession of faith, containing the substance of all the fundamental articles in the larger confession, put forth by the elders of the Baptist churches, owning personal election and final perseverance*.

⁴⁷ *Westminster Confession and Catechisms*, SC 159. Keach made two emendations: He added the word 'faithfulness' to the description of God's character, and he changed the term 'substance' to 'essence' in the description of the Trinity. He did not place any importance on either of these emendations.

That there are three Persons in the Godhead, the *Father*, the *Son*, and *Holy Spirit*; and that *these three are One God*, the same in Essence, equal in Power and Glory.⁴⁸

With those two short sentences, and without directly addressing the controversies surrounding the Trinity, Keach said enough to align himself with a specific brand of theology and to distance himself from the theology found in the non-trinitarian—though not anti-trinitarian—*Standard Confession* (1660) adopted by several General Baptist congregations.⁴⁹

Extra-biblical Terminology

Unlike several of his Baptist contemporaries including the signatories of *The faith and practice of thirty congregations* (1651) and the *Standard Confession* (1660) and also Thomas Grantham and Thomas Collier, Keach had no hesitations using extra-biblical terminology to describe the Godhead.⁵⁰ In his confession, Keach employed the traditional terms *person* and *essence*, two of the terms which had historically been used in the trinitarian formulation and which had now—even from the beginning of the Reformation⁵¹—come under fire. Indeed, William Sherlock made the definition, or re-definition, of these terms one of the key aspects of his *A vindication of the doctrine of the holy and ever blessed Trinity* (1690) which sparked a round of the Trinitarian controversy. By the time Keach published his church's confessions, the debate over terminology had exploded to the point that no prominent minister—especially one in London and as connected to controversialists as Keach—could possibly have remained ignorant of the significance of the terms. Keach, somewhat shockingly, never mentioned Sherlock or South by name in association with the Trinitarian controversy.

⁴⁸ Keach, *The articles of the faith*, Art. I & II.

⁴⁹ Significantly, this document lacked any discussion of Christ and the Holy Spirit being co-essential with the Father. It did cite the *Comma Johanneum* as evidence of the Holy Spirit's role. (See below for a discussion of the significance of this passage). However, that language could be ambivalent. This document was signed by Keach's brother, Joseph Keach (Keeich) and the controversial Matthew Caffyn (Caffen).

⁵⁰ See Bass, 'Thomas Grantham and General Baptist Theology', 260ff; Thomas Grantham, *Christianismus primitivus, or, The ancient Christian religion, in its nature, certainty, excellency, and beauty, (internal and external) particularly considered, asserted, and vindicated from the many abuses which have invaded that sacred profession* (London: for Francis Smith, 1678), II, pt 1, 40.

⁵¹ Calvin, *The institution of Christian religion*, I.xiii.2-6. Cf. Owen, *Vindiciæ evangelicæ*, 60.

He did, however, seek to provide some definitions for the traditional terms he chose to retain despite their now-questioned status.

In *A golden mine opened* (1694), Keach provided a list of five separate ‘Scripture-Demonstrations’ which displayed the key concept of distinct persons within the single Godhead. Although Keach never entered the semantic debate with his contemporaries, these five demonstrations—including the Biblical support for the ideas that the different subsistences of the Godhead related to each other, performed distinct roles, discoursed with each other, and imaged each other⁵²—did provide a glimpse into Keach’s understanding of the term ‘person’. Keach later provided a more succinct definition of ‘person’ which he suggested was an intelligent, voluntary agent.⁵³ This definition—by no means a specific one intended for a semantic battle—aligned well with the traditional definition of ‘person’ which was itself a holdover from Aquinas and even Augustine.⁵⁴ Keach simply did not bother himself with the fact that his definition of ‘person’ bore striking similarities to the definition which the Socinians accepted and used in their attacks against the doctrine of the Trinity⁵⁵ and, thus, the same definition which Sherlock had attacked.

Keach handled the term ‘essence’ in much the same way, providing only a very basic definition of the term without becoming entrenched in the semantic debate. That simple definition—‘being’⁵⁶ or ‘nature’⁵⁷—could be found in numerous places throughout his corpus. Always, however, Keach provided these synonyms without discussion. Although, significantly, Keach used the term ‘essence’ only to refer to the divine attributes which belonged to the Godhead as a whole. This understanding of ‘essence’—and its relationship to ‘person’—established clear distinctions between his theology and that of the Remonstrants who argued that these two terms could not be

⁵² Keach, *A golden mine opened*, 92-3. Keach used the term ‘subsistence’ as a synonym for ‘person’. Keach and De Laune, *Tropologia*, II:110. Cf. Keach, *A golden mine opened*, 85. According to the *OED*, the term was synonymous with ‘substance’.

⁵³ Benjamin Keach, *Beams of divine light: or Some brief hints of the being and attributes of God, and of the three persons [i]n the God-Head. Also proving [...] deity of Christ, and [o]f the Holy-Ghost* (London: K. Astwood, 1700), 23.

⁵⁴ Mortimer, ‘The Challenge of Socinianism in Mid-Seventeenth Century England’, 48.

⁵⁵ *Racovian Catechism*, 32. ‘... cum persona nihil aliud sit, nisi essentia individua intelligens’.

⁵⁶ Keach, *The child's delight*, 19-20.

⁵⁷ Keach, *Gospel mysteries unveil'd*, II:55; Benjamin Keach, *The banquetting-house, or, A feast of fat things a divine poem* (London: J.A. for H. Barnard, 1692), 224.

distinguished.⁵⁸ On this point, Keach also distinguished his theology from that of Augustine who indicated a similar reluctance to differentiate between these terms.⁵⁹ To Keach, these terms (and their distinctions) were sufficiently commonplace to warrant their use in congregational hymns.⁶⁰

While certainly too much can be made of an individual's silence on a given aspect of a debate, Keach's silence in these semantic debates must be understood in the light of his previously demonstrated ability to engage in the more academic debates of his time. His joint publication with Thomas De Laune, *Tropologia*, included a large amount of discussion focused on the definitions of terms—both in original languages and in the vernacular. Regardless of his input to those passages (versus the input of De Laune), Keach obviously had resources available to him which would have allowed him to join in this aspect of the Trinitarian debate had he so desired. His decision not to do so, then, belies his chosen position on the issue. This intentional silence placed Keach in the company of one of his favorite authorities, John Owen, who, even in the midst of refuting Biddle's definitions, did not provide a specific definition of the terms 'person' and 'essence'. Instead, Owen, like Keach, chose to accept the traditional use of the terms.⁶¹ Citing his opponents in a debate over paedobaptism, Keach actually summarized his views of extra-biblical language quite well:

That which by a just and necessary Consequence is deduced from Scripture, is as much the Mind of Christ, as what is contained in the express words of Scripture.⁶²

For Keach and his fellow divines, the doctrine of three Persons or subsistences within the single essence of the Godhead was indeed a 'just and necessary Consequence ... deduced from Scripture'.

⁵⁸ Hampton, *Anti-Arminians*, 190.

⁵⁹ Augustine, *The Trinity* (Brooklyn, N.Y.: New City Press, 1991), V.8.10.

⁶⁰ Keach, *The banquetting-house*, 224.

⁶¹ Owen, *Vindiciæ evangelicæ*, en toto.

⁶² Benjamin Keach, *The rector rectified and corrected; or, infant-baptism unlawful* (London: John Harris, 1692), 33. Keach attributed this quotation to his opponents in a section of objections; however, he agreed with this objection in his first answer. Cf. Keach, *Laying on of hands*, 42-43.

The *Comma Johanneum* and the Authority of Scripture

Keach's silence in the Trinitarian controversy extended beyond the semantic debates, reaching even to the increasingly-popular biblical criticism which questioned the clearest Trinitarian statement in Scripture. 1 John 5:7, known as the *Comma Johanneum*, had been a contentious passage since Erasmus omitted it from the first edition of his Greek New Testament in 1516, arguing that most of the ancient manuscripts did not include the passage. This comma—'For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one'—had clear implications for trinitarianism. The Socinians and those who shared their strict biblicism argued forcefully against the authenticity of this passage. Doubts about authenticity spread even to mainline Reformers with Heinrich Bullinger reputedly joining the criticism.⁶³ Even John Calvin noted the doubts surrounding the comma and, thus, chose not to rely upon the passage for his explication of the doctrine of the Trinity.⁶⁴

Keach only acknowledged the controversy surrounding the comma once in his corpus, dismissing the issue as a contrivance of 'blasphemous Hereticks' and citing Cyprian as authoritative evidence for ignoring the biblical criticism.⁶⁵ He followed the lead of the Westminster Assembly,⁶⁶ John Owen,⁶⁷ the *Second London Confession*,⁶⁸ and numerous others in citing the comma as authentic and authoritative proof of the Trinity.⁶⁹ In fact, Keach cited the passage from 1 John nearly a dozen times throughout his writing.⁷⁰ On several occasions, this passage served as the only proof-text for

⁶³ Gilbert Burnet, *Some letters containing an account of what seemed most remarkable in Switzerland, Italy, &c* (Amsterdam: s.n., 1686), 38.

⁶⁴ Jean Calvin, *Commentaries on 1, 2, & 3 John* (Wheaton, Ill: Crossway Books, 1998), 1 John 5.7.

⁶⁵ Keach, *Gospel mysteries unveil'd*, I:172. Marlow also cited the comma as authentic; however, he provided a fairly lengthy refutation of the textual criticism levied against the passage. Isaac Marlow, *A treatise of the Holy Trinitunity* (London: s.n., 1690), 151-7.

⁶⁶ *Westminster Confession and Catechisms*, Art. II.iii.

⁶⁷ Owen, *Vindiciae evangelicae*, 422.

⁶⁸ *Second London Confession*, Art. II.3.

⁶⁹ Muller, *Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics*, IV:234ff. Interestingly, even the non-trinitarian *Standard Confession* cited the comma Johanneum in its article on the Holy Spirit. *Standard Confession*, Art. VII.

⁷⁰ This number includes the clearly erroneous citation of 1 John 5.5 in the second article of Keach's confessions. This citation follows the statement 'these three are One God' and obviously should refer to the *Comma Johanneum*.

his trinitarian argument.⁷¹ Keach's impetus for accepting the passage stemmed more from his understanding of the authority of Scripture than from the fact that it provided a convenient proof-text. He believed his colleagues had correctly identified the Bible as '[t]he supream Judge by which all Controversies of Religion are to be determined, and all Decrees of Councils, Opinions of antient Writers, Doctrines of Men, and private Spirits, are to be examined ...'.⁷² Since other passages of Scripture supported the comma (e.g., Isaiah 6:3), there was no legitimate question of authority or authenticity regarding this scriptural passage. Thus, Keach's pre-critical view of biblical authority was neither naive nor merely convenient.

Tradition

The combination of Keach's willingness to utilize extra-biblical, yet traditional language, his calculated ability to ignore new (and sometimes powerful) criticisms of tradition based on Scriptural evidence, and his view of the authority of Scripture aptly portrayed Keach's love-hate relationship with tradition. David Riker characterizes this relationship as contradictory with Keach attempting to hold two mutually exclusive positions simultaneously: the denial of authority to anything but Scripture and a reverence for and use of tradition in an authoritative manner.⁷³ Indeed, had Keach held to these positions, he would have been terribly inconsistent at the least. However, Keach never actually argued for a denial of authority to anything but Scripture as Riker claims.⁷⁴ When Keach spoke of Scripture as sufficient in and of itself, he did so in order to exclude additional revelation from God, not to exclude tradition

⁷¹ Keach, *A golden mine opened*, 85; Keach, *Instructions for children [1695]*, 74; Benjamin Keach, *A feast of fat things full of marrow containing several Scripture songs taken out of the Old and New Testaments* (London: B.H., 1696), 29.

⁷² *Second London Confession*, Art. I.10.

⁷³ Riker, 'A Catholic Reformed Theologian', 69.

⁷⁴ Riker was a bit inconsistent on this point. On the one hand, he demonstrated that Keach held to *sola Scriptura* which he defined via A.N.S. Lane as giving Scripture a primary position of authority. Riker even went to great lengths to show that Keach never intended his view of Scripture's authority to be *Scriptura nuda*, or extreme biblicism. On the other hand, Riker explicitly argued that 'we have observed Keach denying authority to anything save the Bible'. Riker, 'A Catholic Reformed Theologian', 69.

based on the clear teaching of Scripture.⁷⁵ Rather, he echoed the teachings of James Ussher⁷⁶ and also the *Second Helvetic Confession*⁷⁷ in holding that all tradition must be measured against the clear teaching of Scripture which included its necessary, though not always explicit, consequences.⁷⁸ Additionally, Keach recognized the multi-faceted, often divergent, teachings of tradition. Thus, he was able to use tradition—both ancient and recent—in a selective manner, at times noting the failure of the church because of its over-reliance upon tradition and at other times using that same tradition as a proof for his own views. This use of tradition actually harmonized quite well with the normal use of tradition among those Keach considered authoritative. For example, John Owen argued for this same hierarchy—as did the Westminster Assembly.⁷⁹

Keach actually remained quite consistent in his use of tradition throughout his career and across all aspects of theology. Early in his career while debating the practice of laying on of hands,⁸⁰ Keach argued against those who ‘wholly make use of Tradition’, or, in other words, those who rely on tradition *without* biblical support for their practices.⁸¹ Keach termed this brand of tradition ‘humane’ and denounced its use as a corrupting influence in the church regardless of the issue at hand whether that be paedobaptism,⁸² the keeping of the Jewish Sabbath,⁸³ or simply the popish religion in

⁷⁵ Benjamin Keach, *Christ alone the way to Heaven: or, Jacob's ladder improved* (London: s.n., 1698), 10.

⁷⁶ James Ussher, *A body of divinitie, or, The summe and substance of Christian religion catechistically propounded* (London: M.F. for Tho. Downes and Geo. Badger ... 1645), 18.

⁷⁷ *Second Helvetic Confession*, Cap. 2.

⁷⁸ Brooks missed this point when he argued that Keach followed a Lutheran hermeneutic (i.e., one which gives permission to anything not explicitly denied by Scripture) for his support of hymn-singing. In that controversy, Keach actually followed the same regulative principle which Brooks presented as the contrasting view. Keach simply affirmed that Scripture both explicitly *and* by its natural consequence positively required hymn-singing. Thus, the regulative principle, according to Keach, actually supported his practice. See Brooks, ‘Benjamin Keach and the Baptist Singing Controversy’, 130. Cf. Keach, *The articles of the faith*, Art. XXVII.

⁷⁹ John Owen, *ΣΥΝΕΣΙΣ ΠΙΝΕΥΜΑΤΙΚΗ: or, The causes, waies & means of understanding the mind of God as revealed in his Word* (London: s.n., 1678). See especially Chapter IX: Helps ecclesiastical in the interpretation of the Scripture. Also see *Westminster Confession and Catechisms*, Art. I.10.

⁸⁰ For a full discussion of this debate, see below, 121-6.

⁸¹ Benjamin Keach, *Darkness vanquished: or, Truth in it's primitive purity* (London,: Benjamin Harris, 1675), 20.

⁸² Benjamin Keach, *An appendix to the answer unto two Athenian Mercuries concerning pedo-baptism* (London: for the author, 1692), title page.

general.⁸⁴ The key to the correct use of tradition, in Keach's view, was to keep tradition in its rightful place in the hierarchy of authority, namely second to the Word of God.⁸⁵ Keach made that hierarchy of authority explicit toward the end of his career. Arguing against the Jewish Sabbath, he sought to prove his point first by 'the Word of God', second by 'Universal Tradition', and third by 'the Testimony of most approved Writers'.⁸⁶ That same hierarchy of authority allowed Keach to espouse a traditional formulation of the Trinity: the Word of God, both explicitly and by natural consequence, demonstrated its truth⁸⁷; the tradition of the church from the earliest creeds explicitly taught the doctrine⁸⁸; and the contemporary writers he viewed as authoritative espoused the same view.

Benjamin Keach's Trinitarian Theology Proper

Like the vast majority of divines in the first few generations after the Reformation, Keach recognized the inherent difficulty of making assertions about 'Essential forms' of anything, let alone the 'absolutely incomprehensible' 'Nature, Being and Existence of God'.⁸⁹ That incomprehensibility may very well have been the primary attribute in Keach's understanding of the Godhead, but, as with those other divines, it certainly was not the only attribute which he expounded. In fact, Keach argued that despite the incomprehensible nature of God, every believer must 'labour to know and undestand [sic] as much as he is able'.⁹⁰ Fortunately, God revealed Himself to His human creatures in a manner which the human mind could at least begin to grasp, a process Keach termed 'condescension'.⁹¹ Thus, borrowing language almost

⁸³ Keach, *Jewish Sabbath abrogated*, 258.

⁸⁴ Benjamin Keach, *Antichrist stormed, or, mystery Babylon the great whore, and great city, proved to be the present church of Rome* (London: for Nath. Crouch, 1689), 13.

⁸⁵ Keach, *A golden mine opened*, 80.

⁸⁶ Keach, *Jewish Sabbath abrogated*, 186.

⁸⁷ Keach, *The banquetting-house*, 224.

⁸⁸ Thus Keach could utilize language from the Athanasian Creed and cite Tertullian, Cyprian, et al as authorities without contradicting his views on authority.

⁸⁹ Keach and De Laune, *Tropologia*, III:22.

⁹⁰ Keach, *Gospel mysteries unveil'd*, I:159.

⁹¹ Keach and De Laune, *Tropologia*, II:sig. A2r.

directly from the *Shorter Catechism* of the Westminster Assembly, Keach taught his congregation to declare their belief in God ‘who is a Spirit Infinite, Eternal, Immense and Unchangeable in his Being, Wisdom, Power, Holiness, Justice, Goodness, Truth and Faithfulness’.⁹²

In his *Beams of divine light*, Keach slightly altered this discussion of the divine attributes:

Q. *What are the Blessed Attributes and Properties of God?*
 A. Omniscience, Omnipresence, Omnipotence, Immutability, Simplicity, Infiniteness, Eternity, these are Incommunicable Attributes: Holiness, Wisdom, Justice, Goodness, Faithfulness, Patience, &c.⁹³

This catechetical interaction basically echoed his earlier teaching with two significant emendations. First, he divided the divine attributes into two sections: the incommunicable and communicable. Although Keach never directly explained these two divisions, he clearly held that some aspects of the divine essence (those in the first division) could not be shared in any manner. As such, they only applied to the Godhead, but, importantly, all of these attributes applied equally to each person of the Godhead.⁹⁴ Those attributes in the second division—Holiness, Wisdom, Justice, Goodness, Faithfulness, Patience, &c.—could indeed be shared with the non-divine, but only in degrees. Or, as Archbishop Ussher stated, ‘of some of [these divine attributes] there are some shadows and glimpses in Men and Angels, (as Wisdom, Holiness, Justice, Mercy, &c.)’.⁹⁵ In this respect, Keach remained uncontroversial, basically aligning himself with the majority of the Reformed divines whom he viewed as authorities.⁹⁶

In addition to the division of attributes into two groups, Keach also added the idea of ‘simplicity’ to his description of God in *Beams of divine light*. This concept, which Keach defined as the idea that ‘all God’s Attributes are equal, his Mercy is not

⁹² Keach, *The articles of the faith*, Art. I.

⁹³ Keach, *Beams of divine light*, 3.

⁹⁴ Keach, *Gospel mysteries unveil'd*, I:172; Keach and De Laune, *Tropologia*, III:22.

⁹⁵ Ussher, *A body of divinitie*, 32; Marlow, *A treatise of the Holy Trinity*, 24.

⁹⁶ Cf. Thomas Goodwin, *The works of Thomas Goodwin, D.D.* (London: J.D. and S.R. for T.G., 1681), II:29 [Knowledge of God]; Stephen Charnock, *Several discourses upon the existence and attributes of God* (London: for D. Newman, T. Cockerill, Benj. Griffin, T. Simmons, and Benj. Alsop, 1682), 376-82.

beyond his Justice, nor Justice beyond Mercy, and that his Essence is Himself, and so are his Attributes also',⁹⁷ served to distinguish Keach's theology from some increasingly prominent seventeenth-century variants (such as *Socinianism*, *Arminianism*, and *Baxterianism*).

Keach's use of justice and mercy for his description of divine simplicity—when he clearly could have used any of the divine attributes—indicated his theological position quite well. This significant, albeit unspoken, reliance upon the Westminster divine, Thomas Goodwin,⁹⁸ allowed Keach to defend what he considered to be an orthodox view of justification against 'Socinianism, Quakerism, &c. and all such like Errors'⁹⁹ which taught, in one form or another, that God could simply change his response to sin.¹⁰⁰ If justice and mercy were both equal and harmonized aspects of the divine essence—rather than merely the divine will—those aberrant views of justification were necessarily flawed.¹⁰¹ Keach also used this concept of simplicity to further buttress the idea that all divine attributes applied equally to each Person of the Trinity, as each shared in the divine essence and indeed 'hath the whole Divine Nature or Godhead in him'.¹⁰² Thus, in this catechetical instruction about the divine attributes, Keach intentionally laid the groundwork for the rest of his theological teaching and demonstrated the utmost importance of a correct view of the Godhead.

*'The Order and Oeconomy of the Blessed Trinity'*¹⁰³

Despite his sometimes detailed discussion of the three Persons of the Godhead and the divine attributes, Keach ultimately maintained that any knowledge of the Godhead proper and the divine essence must only be accepted on faith for this know-

⁹⁷ Keach, *Beams of divine light*, 8.

⁹⁸ Goodwin, *Works*, III:595 [Discourse of an Unregenerate Man's Guiltiness Before God]. Goodwin, *Works*, III:3 [Of Christ the Mediator].

⁹⁹ Keach, *A golden mine opened*, 94.

¹⁰⁰ In this, Keach followed John Owen quite closely. See, for instance, John Owen, *A dissertation on divine justice: or, The claims of vindicatory justice asserted. Translated* (London: 1770). For a full discussion of this aspect of Keach's theology, See Chapter VI, 186-92.

¹⁰¹ Keach, *Beams of divine light*, 7-8. Cf. Goodwin, *Works*, II:207 [Of Election].

¹⁰² Keach, *Beams of divine light*, 26. Here Keach cited John Owen, *A brief declaration and vindication of the doctrine of the Trinity as also of the person and satisfaction of Christ* (London: R.W. for Nath. Ponder, 1669), 112.

¹⁰³ Keach and De Laune, *Tropologia*, II:110.

ledge remained too mysterious for human understanding.¹⁰⁴ God, then, and specifically each Person of the Godhead, must be contemplated with respect to His ‘properties and operations’ rather than by His ‘Essential forms ... [because they] are in themselves absolutely incomprehensible’¹⁰⁵ and are shared by each co-essential Person. In order to understand and discuss the Trinity as best as possible, then, Keach proceeded to consider each Person according to His peculiar tasks, especially in their respective tasks regarding salvation.¹⁰⁶ Interestingly, this particular view made for a practical hierarchy within the Godhead with the Father being the ‘first in order, in all the Divine Operations’,¹⁰⁷ the Son obeying the Father,¹⁰⁸ and the Holy Spirit proceeding from the Father and the Son.¹⁰⁹ Keach was careful to maintain this hierarchy only in practical roles rather than in essential existence, thereby avoiding some common Trinitarian heresies.

The Father

Keach did not spend a great deal of time discussing the First Person of the Trinity in and of Himself. In general, Keach applied the discussions of God in the Old Testament primarily to the First Person and only secondarily to the other Persons. Although, to be fair, Keach admitted that understanding the Trinitarian aspect of Old Testament discussions often proved difficult due to the dual use of the label ‘Father’, sometimes referring to the Godhead as a whole and other times referring to the First Person of the Trinity.¹¹⁰ Demonstrating his understanding of progressive revelation, Keach argued that the New Testament helped to clarify the Trinitarian doctrine in general *and* specifically the Trinitarian discussions in the Old Testament. Agreeing with Vincent Alsop, John Owen, and others, Keach argued that the Father served as

¹⁰⁴ Benjamin Keach, *The French impostour detected Or Zach. Housel, tryed the second time by the word of God* (London: for Ebenezer Trasy, 1702), 142.

¹⁰⁵ Keach and De Laune, *Tropologia*, III:22.

¹⁰⁶ For a full discussion of the roles of the different Persons in the work of salvation, see Chapter VI.

¹⁰⁷ Keach, *Gospel mysteries unveil'd*, I:32.

¹⁰⁸ Keach, *A golden mine opened*, 92.

¹⁰⁹ Keach, *A golden mine opened*, 377.

¹¹⁰ Keach, *Gospel mysteries unveil'd*, I:31.

the ‘Fountain and Spring’ of divine actions,¹¹¹ having contrived the entire creation, including the redemption of the fallen world. Never begotten and never sent, the Father—as first in order—involved himself in the planning of all aspects of the created realm, and he set into motion all aspects of those divine plans.¹¹² Without directly involving himself in the controversy of the 1690s, then, Keach came close to agreeing (perhaps unintentionally) with William Sherlock’s controversial explanation of the ‘Unity and Subordination’¹¹³ and the ‘natural Order and Subordination of the Persons in the Trinity’¹¹⁴ with the Father as the first among equals.

The Son

The General Baptists of Buckinghamshire, among whom Keach began his preaching ministry, were well acquainted with the dangers of heterodox Christology. Those General Baptists were largely able to defend their congregations from the Calfynite theology which plagued their fellow Baptists in Kent and Sussex, but that defense resulted in active and often public disputes. Thus, Keach entered the ministry with an acute understanding of the potential inroads of unorthodox views regarding Christ. Throughout his discussion of the peculiar operations of the Second Person of the Trinity, Keach identified the ‘abominable’¹¹⁵ and ‘Destable [sic] and *Damnable*’¹¹⁶ teachings of the ‘*rank Heretick*’,¹¹⁷ Matthew Caffyn, as one of the foremost enemies to the ‘fundamentals of Christian Faith’.¹¹⁸ Keach consistently identified these teachings

¹¹¹ Keach, *A golden mine opened*, 377. Cf. John Owen, *Christologia, or, A declaration of the glorious mystery of the person of Christ, God and man* (London: s.n., 1679); Vincent Alsop, *Anti-sozzo, sive, Sherlocismus enervatus in vindication of some great truths opposed, and opposition to some great errors maintained by Mr. William Sherlock* (London: for Nathanael Ponder ... 1676), 425.

¹¹² Keach, *Gospel mysteries unveil'd*, I:31.

¹¹³ William Sherlock, *A vindication of the doctrine of the holy and ever blessed Trinity and the incarnation of the son of God* (London: for W. Rogers, 1690), 17.

¹¹⁴ William Sherlock and Robert South, *A defence of Dr. Sherlock's notion of a Trinity in unity, in answer to the Animadversions [by R. South] upon his Vindication of the doctrine of the holy and ever blessed Trinity* (London: s.n., 1694), 111.

¹¹⁵ Keach, *Gospel mysteries unveil'd*, I:175.

¹¹⁶ Keach, *Beams of divine light*, 23.

¹¹⁷ Keach, *The display of glorious grace*, 136.

¹¹⁸ Benjamin Keach, *The travels of true godliness, from the beginning of the world to this present day in an apt and pleasant allegory* (London: for John Dunton, 1684), 3. In this list, Keach included the anti-Calfynite assertion that Christ is ‘really God and man ... David’s Lord, and yet David’s Son...’

along with those of ‘the *Arians, Socinians, Eutichians, and ... Quakers*’¹¹⁹ as the major heresies touching the Second Person of the Trinity. Keach correctly understood the vast spectrum covered by these different theologies with the Caffynites and Eutychians denying the humanity of Christ,¹²⁰ the Arians and Socinians denying the deity of Christ,¹²¹ and the Quakers denying the personal existence of Christ.¹²² Despite this spectrum, Keach largely conflated these heretical Christologies and attacked them all with what he deemed a proper view of Christ based on three main tenets: Christ’s deity, Christ’s humanity, and the hypostatic union of those two natures. A correct view of those tenets, Keach held, would protect his readers and congregants from those dangerous heresies. Interestingly, Keach did not cite extra-biblical authorities (ancient or modern) when discussing this doctrine except on very rare occasions. This demonstrated both Keach’s standing as an authority of his own accord—at least by the time he published the works directly considering Christology—and the fact that he understood this doctrine to stand on the proof of Scripture and commonsense alone. Ultimately, Keach held that, throughout history, the credal church had largely espoused a correct Christology with Christ being the Second Person of the Trinity, begotten of the Father, and co-equal and co-essential with the Father and the Spirit.

Deity of Christ

In *Gospel mysteries unveil’d*, Keach provided a series of detailed arguments which he claimed forcefully proved the divine nature of Christ and, thus, silenced the arguments of the Arians and Socinians. Supporting his views with a multitude of Scriptural prooftexts ranging from Proverbs and the Old Testament prophets to the Gospels, New Testament epistles, and Revelation, Keach argued that the Bible unquestionably demonstrated that Jesus of Nazareth had been given the ‘incommunicable Names of God most high’, had ‘all the incommunicable Attributes of God ... ascribed unto him’, and had ‘Spiritual or divine Worship, Honour and adoration’ pre-

¹¹⁹ Keach, *Gospel mysteries unveil’d*, I:176.

¹²⁰ Keach, *A golden mine opened*, 85.

¹²¹ Benjamin Keach, *The marrow of true justification, or, justification without works* (London: for Dorman Newman, 1692), 9.

¹²² Keach, *Gospel mysteries unveil’d*, I:176.

scribed to him by the Father.¹²³ To those three main arguments, Keach added a series of fifteen related biblical arguments which further entrenched that biblical support for the deity of Christ. These same arguments appeared in different forms throughout his other writings.¹²⁴

That the Bible argued for the deity of Christ would have ended the argument in Keach's mind and probably the minds of most of his congregants; however, he also provided a series of logical arguments which would further support the biblical evidence. Interestingly, Keach only cited Thomas Goodwin as an authority on this issue. Additionally, he focused almost entirely on basic, commonsense-style arguments, virtually ignoring the more sophisticated arguments already present in the anti-Trinitarian literature. For example, Keach argued that Christ must be divine in order for divine justice to be satisfied, completely ignoring (at least for the moment) the alternate models of atonement which the Socinians and Arians (among others) had proposed and which rendered this argument all but moot. Additionally, Keach argued that giving worship to Jesus Christ would be idolatry if he were not actually divine. This line of reasoning completely ignored Socinian attempt to avoid the charge of idolatry by arguing that the divine office to which Jesus of Nazareth had been appointed (rather than his person) deserved adoration.¹²⁵

These omissions by Keach did not stem from ignorance of the systems as Keach demonstrated an adept understanding of some of the main peculiarities of each when he defended the co-essentiality of Christ (i.e., that Christ was of the same substance of the Father) against the Arians and the co-eternality of Christ (i.e., that Christ was existent prior to his incarnation) against the Socinians.¹²⁶ Elsewhere in his theological discussions, Keach proved himself knowledgeable of the rest of those models and capable of critically engaging other sources.¹²⁷ That he chose not to do so on several main aspects of the discussion relating to the deity of Christ belies an intentionality suggesting that Keach aimed these arguments at the common laity who could be

¹²³ Keach, *Gospel mysteries unveil'd*, I:171-4.

¹²⁴ See, for instance, Keach, *A golden mine opened*, I:173. Keach, *Beams of divine light*, 19.

¹²⁵ Keach, *Gospel mysteries unveil'd*, I:173. Cf. *Racovian Catechism*, English version, 102.

¹²⁶ Keach, *A golden mine opened*, 85.

¹²⁷ For examples, see Chapter VI.

assumed to have an at-least-rudimentary exposure to the official Christology of the Church of England or the ‘official’ documents of non-conformity such as the Westminster Standards. This combined with his almost complete omission of extra-biblical authorities further demonstrated Keach’s view of himself as an authority on this issue and his commonsensical approach to the doctrine.¹²⁸

The question of the co-eternality of the Son with the Father—an issue which Keach mentioned numerous times, albeit always rather briefly—proved to be one of the more important issues of the Reformation- and post-Reformation-era Trinitarian debates. Although not holding precisely the same Christology, Arminius and the Remonstrants sounded remarkably similar to the Socinians in their denial of the self-existence, or aseity,¹²⁹ of Christ.¹³⁰ Arminius held that only one Person of the Trinity, the Father, could possibly have the divine attribute of self-existence or could properly be considered eternal because the other Persons received this aspect of the divine essence from the Father. Otherwise the three Persons would become three separate deities. The contra-Remonstrants of the seventeenth-century picked up the Lombardian doctrine of co-eternality which had been re-iterated in the previous generations by Calvin,¹³¹ Theodore Beza,¹³² Heinrich Bullinger,¹³³ and the author of the Belgic Confession, Guido de Bres (1522-1567) among others. Keach aligned himself with the doctrine of the contra-Remonstrants, not only in his acceptance of the terms ‘co-essential’ and ‘co-eternal’ but also actually positively ascribing self existence to Christ, lest there be any doubt about his stance on that subject.¹³⁴ This helped buttress Keach’s theology from some of the Trinitarian controversies of his own day. It also safeguarded him from being accused of teaching the version of essential subordination espoused by William Sherlock et al who held that ‘the Son ... [is] in the Father,

¹²⁸ Keach, *Gospel mysteries unveil'd*, I:169-70.

¹²⁹ According to the *OED*, ‘aseity’ means ‘underived or independent existence’. Significantly, the first use of the term noted by the *OED* was in 1691.

¹³⁰ The similarities between the Socinians and the Remonstrants were not missed by their opponents. John Owen specifically charged Hugo Grotius with Socinian beliefs in Owen’s printed debate with Henry Hammond in the 1650s.

¹³¹ Calvin, *The institution of Christian religion*, I.xiii.17, 25.

¹³² Theodore Beza, *Quaestionum et responsionum Christianarum libellus* (London: 1572).

¹³³ *Second Helvetic Confession*, Cap. 11.

¹³⁴ Keach, *Gospel mysteries unveil'd*, I:171, 175.

not only by a mutual consciousness, as the Father and the Son are in the Holy Ghost, but as in [his] Cause ... as in [his] Root, [his] Origine, [his] Fountain, from whence [he] receive[s] the communications of the Divine Essence, and Godhead'¹³⁵—despite Keach's close similarities to some of Sherlock's thought.

Humanity of Christ

That Christ was divine only answered the arguments of one side of the Christological heresy facing Keach and his colleagues. Especially within the General Baptists, the major controversy centered around the semi-Eutychian teachings of Matthew Caffyn which emphasized the deity of Christ at the expense of his humanity. Keach, again aligning with the likes of Heinrich Bullinger and Theodore Beza,¹³⁶ believed that this heterodoxy presented as much of a threat to the orthodox view of the Second Person of the Trinity as the Arian and Socinian views which emphasized Christ's humanity. Again utilizing only Scripture and his own reasoning, Keach argued forcefully against this aberrant theology. If Jesus Christ did not have real human flesh, he did not have a human nature. Without that human nature, Christ could not die (because the divine essence is immortal and eternal) *and* he could not represent humanity in that death. Both of those negations were completely antithetical to Keach's theological understanding. If Christ could not die and did not represent humanity, there was no redemption available for fallen humanity. Additionally, if Christ were not truly human, of the 'Seed of David', God would have reneged on his promise to David to raise up an eternal king from his lineage.¹³⁷

By the time that Keach published his full-fledged Christology, Caffyn's theology had made inroads into several churches which had close connections to Keach. In addition to the personal relationship Keach had with John Griffith, one of Caffyn's main opponents, Jonathan Jennings and Joseph Keach had signed the non-Trinitarian

¹³⁵ Sherlock, *A vindication*, 99. Hampton has noted Sherlock's 'distinctly subordinationist view of the relations between the persons of the Trinity' which this quotation denotes. However, Hampton could have been more forceful with his label. Here, Sherlock has shown (or allowed for) an essential subordination, not merely a subordination of the relations between the persons of the Trinity. See Hampton, *Anti-Arminians*, 140.

¹³⁶ *Second Helvetic Confession*, Cap. 11. Here these Reformed divines specifically mention the Eutychian heresy which was similar to Caffyn's doctrine.

¹³⁷ Keach, *Beams of divine light*, 19-20.

1660 *Standard Confession* alongside Matthew Caffyn. Later, several local churches—White’s Alley and Glasshouse Yard—also struggled with Caffynite theology developing within their congregations.¹³⁸ Perhaps because of these close connections with Caffynite theology, Keach attacked Caffyn and his teachings with a vengeance, actually labeling him a heretic—the only time he used an individual’s name when labeling a heretic in his published works.¹³⁹ Hiding none of his passion, Keach boldly exhorted his readers regarding Matthew Caffyn and his disciples:

O come not near their Meetings, *Nor the Tents of these Men*, until they have purged themselves from the *Heresie* of this Evil Person and Grand Heretick.¹⁴⁰

In order to further inculcate his views on the humanity of Christ, Keach penned a hymn defending this aspect of Christology and even used the opportunity to once again attack Caffynite theology:

A Root as God, as Man also,
A *Branch* here called art;
Which does thy humane nature show,
To whom God did impart ...

The Branch is of the self-same kind
With the Root of the Tree;
The self-same nature we do find
That *Abraham’s* Children be ...

A Branch partakes too of the Sap
Which in the Root does lye;
So in the Virgins Womb was fed
Thy blest Humanity ...

Let *Hereticks* who do deny
Christ of the Virgin took
His spotless, pure humanity,
Ashamed ever look.¹⁴¹

¹³⁸ For the discussion of the churches struggling with Caffyn’s theology, see *Glasshouse Yard Church Book*, Angus Library, Regent’s Park College, Oxford, 28 July 1697; *White’s Alley Church Book*, Guildhall Library, London, 7-8 June 1693 & 19 May 1701.

¹³⁹ Keach did label other theologies as heretical, including the teachings of Quakers and Socinians. But he never used this label for any other individual.

¹⁴⁰ Keach, *Beams of divine light*, 23.

¹⁴¹ Keach, *The banquetting-house*, 83-84.

Hypostatic Union

By Keach's day, the idea of a hypostatic union—'two whole and perfect natures ... joyned together in one person, never to be divided, whereof is one Christ, very God and very man'¹⁴²—was well established in mainstream English theology. The long list of theologians who accepted and used the term included divines from nearly all 'camps' of English theology—both within the establishment and in the more well-respected sects of non-conformity and dissent. Henry Ainsworth, the separatist minister;¹⁴³ Richard Baxter, the ejected Presbyterian divine;¹⁴⁴ Francis Cheynell, the ejected controversialist;¹⁴⁵ Thomas Goodwin, the nonconformist minister;¹⁴⁶ Thomas Manton, another nonconformist minister;¹⁴⁷ Joseph Mede (1586-1638), Church of England biblical scholar;¹⁴⁸ William Perkins, Puritan leader;¹⁴⁹ and John Tillotson (1630-1694), the Archbishop of Canterbury¹⁵⁰ all accepted the term as it had been defined by the Church of England in the *Thirty Nine Articles*. For its part, the official doctrine of the Church of England fell in line with continental Reformers—such as Theodore Beza, Heinrich Bullinger, John Calvin, and Martin Luther—in her acceptance of the hypostatic union although her teaching was sufficiently broad to allow for full adherents to her theology to be seriously charged with Socinianism as was the

¹⁴² *Thirty Nine Articles [1562]*, Art. II.

¹⁴³ Henry Ainsworth, *The orthodox foundation of religion* (London: R.C. for M. Sparke, junior, 1641), 41.

¹⁴⁴ Richard Baxter, *The arrogancy of reason against divine revelations, repressed, or, Proud ignorance the cause of infidelity, and of mens quarrelling with the word of God* (London: T.N. for Tho. Underhil, 1655), 51.

¹⁴⁵ Francis Cheynell, *The divine trinity of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit* (London: 1650), 20.

¹⁴⁶ Thomas Goodwin, Jeremiah Burroughs, Jose Glover, William Kiffin and Hanserd Knollys, *A glimpse of Sions glory, or, The churches beautie specified published for the good and benefit of all those whose hearts are raised up in the expectation of the glorious liberties of the saints* (London: William Larnar, 1641), 31.

¹⁴⁷ Thomas Manton, *One hundred and ninety sermons on the hundred and nineteenth psalm* (London: for Tho. Parkhurst ... Jonathan Robinson ... Brabazon Aylmer ... and Benjamin Alsop, 1681), 951.

¹⁴⁸ Joseph Mede, *The works of the pious and profoundly-learned Joseph Mede, B.D., sometime fellow of Christ's Colledge in Cambridge* (London: Roger Norton for Richard Royston ... 1672), 638.

¹⁴⁹ William Perkins, *A golden chaine* ([Cambridge]: Printed by Iohn Legat, printer to the Vniuersitie of Cambridge, 1600), 49, 161.

¹⁵⁰ John Tillotson, *Sermons on several subjects and occasions by the most Reverend Dr. John Tillotson* (London: for C. Hitch and L. Hawes, J. Hodges, A. Millar, J. and R. Tonson, G. Woodfall [and 11 others in London], 1757), III:290.

case with Burnet and Tillotson along with some of their fellow Latitudinarians.¹⁵¹ Though the intricate explanations provided by these theologians differed, at times considerably, they all accepted some form of the Chalcedonian definition which established the hypostatic union as dogma. Even the dissent of the Quaker, William Penn, displayed the generally accepted usage of the term *hypostatic union* when he complained about the established church's allegiance to that definition.¹⁵²

Like many of those more famous divines, Keach accepted the term 'hypostatic union' without question. In the process he provided only the most basic definition, namely Christ 'taking our Nature into a mystical Union with his Holy Deity'.¹⁵³ He did not discuss the more intricate aspects of this doctrine such as the *communicatio idiomatum*, or the sharing of properties between the two natures of the God-man, which had caused considerable controversy within early Protestantism.¹⁵⁴ That debate remained part of the discussion at the end of the seventeenth century, but, evidently, was not important to Keach's theological disputes.¹⁵⁵ It should be noted that even Keach's basic definition distinguished him from the Socinian teaching that the natures of 'God and man, cannot be ascribed to one and the same individual'.¹⁵⁶

Interestingly, Keach did discuss the use of the hypostatic union as a type of the union between the believer and Christ. Referencing John 17.23, Keach noted that Christ's own teaching

... shews [the believer's union with Christ to be] a wonderful, and mysterious Union, more to be admired, then it can be explained:—And the spring of it rises from the *hypostatical Union* of our Nature, with the Divine Nature, in the person of Christ: O how doth this exalt Believers!¹⁵⁷

¹⁵¹ Martin Greig, 'The Reasonableness of Christianity? Gilbert Burnet and the Trinitarian Controversy of the 1690s', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 44 (1993), 631-3.

¹⁵² William Penn, *An address to Protestants upon the present conjuncture in II parts* (London: s.n., 1679), 141.

¹⁵³ Keach, *A golden mine opened*, 93.

¹⁵⁴ See Robert S. Franks, *The Doctrine of the Trinity* (London: Duckworth, 1953), 140-41. This concept did have its adherents in England. See, for example, John Norris, *Reflections upon the conduct of human life* (London: for S. Manship, 1690), 174.

¹⁵⁵ For Owen's discussion of the Lutheran understanding of the *communicatio idiomatum*, see John Owen, *Pneumatologia, or, A discourse concerning the Holy Spirit* (London: F. Darby for Nathaniel Ponder... 1676), 159.

¹⁵⁶ *Racovian Catechism*, English version, 56.

¹⁵⁷ Keach, *Christ alone*, 65.

In a similar vein, Keach spoke of the ‘Soul’s Marriage Union with Jesus Christ’¹⁵⁸ as only being possible because ‘the Father first Married his Son to the Nature of Man’.¹⁵⁹

This use of the hypostatic union appeared to place Keach in direct conflict with his oft-cited authority, John Owen, and, once again, in line with Sherlock’s usage—although Keach did *not* cite Sherlock or any other authority on this point. Owen had previously derided Sherlock for his confusion—intended or not—of the hypostatic union of the two natures in Christ with the concept of the believer’s union with Christ.¹⁶⁰ Owen used the term ‘mystical or spiritual union’ to refer to the believer’s union with Christ, reserving ‘personal union’ and ‘hypostatic union’ to refer to the union of the two natures in the Second Person of the Trinity. Owen argued the two unions must be understood as distinct; ‘none Pretend unto [personal or hypostatical union] with Jesus Christ’.¹⁶¹ Keach’s exegesis of John 17 came dangerously close to reiterating Sherlock’s theology and falling victim to Owen’s criticism. It certainly went beyond (though not necessarily against) the theology of the *Second London Confession* and its major predecessors which did not specify the use of these terms.¹⁶² In reality, this aspect of Keach’s theology merely highlighted a situation in which Keach utilized less-than-specific semantics. Elsewhere, Keach noted that Christ ‘took not into Union with his Divine Nature, the Single Person of any, but the common Nature of all that Sinned, who shall be Saved’.¹⁶³ Thus, Keach attempted to maintain a distinction between an individual’s union with Christ—which he held as a primary role of the Holy Spirit¹⁶⁴—and the hypostatic union within the God-man. Ultimately, Keach attempted to harmonize his teaching with that of Owen, but his imprecise use of terminology hindered that harmony.

¹⁵⁸ Keach, *Gospel mysteries unveil’d*, III:43.

¹⁵⁹ Keach, *Gospel mysteries unveil’d*, III:17.

¹⁶⁰ John Owen, *A vindication of some passages in a discourse concerning communion with God from the exceptions of William Sherlock, rector of St. George Buttolph-Lane* (London: for N. Ponder, 1674), 97.

¹⁶¹ Owen, *A vindication of some passages*, 97.

¹⁶² *Second London Confession*, Art VIII. Cf. Art. VIII in the *Westminster Confession* and the *Savoy Declaration*.

¹⁶³ Keach, *Christ alone*, 16.

¹⁶⁴ For a full discussion, see below in the section on *The Holy Spirit*, 114-26.

The Holy Spirit

Much as they did in the debates about Christology, antitrinitarians questioned both the deity and the personhood of the Holy Spirit. The fact that the Holy Spirit was in some way related to—or sent by—God stood as the only point on which near-universal agreement could be found. Beyond that, almost all details concerning the Holy Spirit were open to debate. Even among Trinitarians, differing views of the Spirit's roles and relationship to humanity (and especially the Church) led to often-heated discussions. Always keen to focus on the entire Trinity, Keach rarely missed an opportunity to highlight the Spirit's operations, often doing so with characteristic zeal.

Divine Personhood

Much like his Christological concerns, Keach's concerns regarding the Holy Spirit fell between what he considered to be two heretical doctrines. On the one side stood the Socinians who upheld right reason as the standard of judging truth and divine actions. Their extreme biblicism led them to eschew the mystery of Trinitarian pneumatology, arguing that the biblical term Holy Spirit merely referred to the Spirit, or 'virtue or energy',¹⁶⁵ of God. This did not, in any way, imply another, distinct person any more than the idea of a human spirit implied two distinct persons. On the other side of the debate stood the Quakers who, far from eschewing mystery, actually came close to denying any authority to Scripture or reason. For them, the Holy Spirit signified the 'Light Within' which would guide them to all truth. The Quakers, being firmly anti-trinitarian, intermittently referred to this 'Light Within' as 'Christ within' or 'the Spirit of God' without clear distinction.¹⁶⁶ The unifying concept behind both sides of this debate was the idea that the terms Spirit of God and Holy Spirit could not refer to a distinct person.

In light of this focus from those Keach perceived as heretics, Keach spent a surprisingly small amount of space proving the personhood of the Spirit. In contrast to the lengthy arguments on the subject found in the works of renowned pneumatologists

¹⁶⁵ *Racovian Catechism*, English version, 39.

¹⁶⁶ William Penn, *A discourse of the general rule of faith and practice, and judge of controversie* (London: s.n., 1699), 4. Cf. Whitehead's use of the term 'Spirit of Truth'. George Whitehead, *The authority of the true ministry in baptizing with the spirit, and the idolatry of such men, as are doting about shadows and carnal ordinances, and their ignorance of the spirits baptism ... discovered* (London: for Robert Wilson ... 1660), 1.

such as John Owen and Thomas Goodwin,¹⁶⁷ Keach mainly appropriated the arguments he had previously used to distinguish between the Father and the Son for his assertion of a distinct Third Person of the Trinity. Combining those with the baptismal formula in Matthew 28 which refers to the Spirit in the same manner as and in equality with the Father and the Son, Keach argued that no appropriate reading of Scripture could render the Spirit as anything less than a distinct, divine personality.¹⁶⁸ In the process, he conveniently ignored the arguments against that reading of Matthew 28 provided in the *Racovian Catechism* among other places. Displaying an emphasis on the Holy Spirit which, at times, actually rivaled that found in the works of Owen and Goodwin, Keach chose to augment his limited discussion of the Spirit's personhood with a lengthy list of His unique divine operations, definitively proving (at least in Keach's mind) the Spirit's necessary independence. Thus, Keach proved anew the Owenian identification of the Spirit as the 'voluntary Author of all Divine Operations', an identification Keach actually adopted as his own.¹⁶⁹ For Keach, this conclusively refuted both the Socinian idea that the Spirit was merely a term for the 'power or virtue of God'¹⁷⁰ and the Quaker belief that the Spirit was equivalent to either 'the Light within' or 'Christ within'.

*Sanctification*¹⁷¹

Keach did not merely see the different roles and operations of the Spirit as proof of His distinct personhood. Rather, he enumerated them in an effort to better understand the Trinitarian nature of salvation. The roles of the first Two Persons appeared relatively obvious given the discussions surrounding the two. The Father, as the 'Fountain and Spring' of all divine operations, conceived of salvation for His elect people and put that plan into action. The Son alone, as the incarnate God-man, could

¹⁶⁷ Both Owen and Goodwin have been identified as theologians who placed great emphasis on the role of the Holy Spirit. Cf. Muller, *Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics*, IV:114.

¹⁶⁸ Keach and De Laune, *Tropologia*, III:23.

¹⁶⁹ Keach, *Gospel mysteries unveil'd*, I:32. Although Keach did not cite Owen for this quotation, Owen had previously identified the Holy Spirit as 'the voluntary Author of personal divine Operations...'. Owen, *A brief declaration*, 95.

¹⁷⁰ Keach and De Laune, *Tropologia*, III:22. Here Keach cited Owen. See Owen, *A brief declaration*, 94.

¹⁷¹ For a full discussion of Keach's understanding of the sanctification process, see Chapter VI, 203-5.

fulfill the requirements of that plan by redeeming God's people. Like the other two Persons, the Holy Spirit had several distinct—though perhaps less obvious—roles to play in the divine salvific plan. Those roles included renewing and sanctifying the elect, sealing the new covenant, clothing the believer in 'the Garment of Christ's Righteousness',¹⁷² among numerous others. Keach referred to the sum total of these unique operations of the Spirit as 'sanctification', or, more precisely, 'Sanctification of the Spirit'.¹⁷³ Consciously following Stephen Charnock, Keach also used this term synonymously with the believer's 'union with Christ', the achieving of which Keach described as the Spirit's primary role.¹⁷⁴

This Union with Christ provided God's elect with the same 'Derivative Holiness' enjoyed by Christ's human nature. In both cases, the Holy Spirit served as the 'immediate Conveyor of Grace'.¹⁷⁵ Indeed, according to this view, the same Spirit which indwelt the Second Person of the Trinity also indwelt the believer.¹⁷⁶ This view of the believer's union with Christ provided Keach, along with his fellow signatories of the *Second London Confession* and the leading Independent theologians, the primary argument for a believer having assurance of salvation.¹⁷⁷ Were salvation not assured, the Spirit 'must either desert Christ or [the believer]', two absolute impossibilities.¹⁷⁸ Thus, Keach confidently declared, 'this Union cannot be dissolved'.¹⁷⁹

Identifying the Church

One of the most important effects of this divine operation of the Holy Spirit was to identify Saints from hypocrites, or the true, invisible Church from false profes-

¹⁷² Keach, *Gospel mysteries unveil'd*, I:32.

¹⁷³ Keach, *Gospel mysteries unveil'd*, I:244. Cf. Keach, *A golden mine opened*, 174.

¹⁷⁴ Keach, *Gospel mysteries unveil'd*, I:32. Cf. Keach, *The ax laid to the root*, 13.

¹⁷⁵ Keach, *A golden mine opened*, 222.

¹⁷⁶ Keach, *A golden mine opened*, 222.

¹⁷⁷ Cf. Art. XVII in the *Second London Confession* and the *Savoy Declaration*. This was one of the significant emendations the Independents made to the *Westminster Confession*. Although the Westminster Assembly did include this concept in their *Larger Catechism*. *Westminster Confession and Catechisms*, LC 92.

¹⁷⁸ Keach, *A golden mine opened*, 222.

¹⁷⁹ Keach, *A golden mine opened*, 223.

sors.¹⁸⁰ Keach accepted the common Reformed axiom that the visible church would always contain a mixture of true believers and hypocrites,¹⁸¹ and he devoted several sermons and literary works to warn his audience about the dangers of hypocrisy.¹⁸² Even those who openly professed ‘all the Articles of the True Christian Faith’¹⁸³ could actually be mere hypocrites without hope. Membership in the visible church—even a local church only comprised of baptized believers—did not equate to true salvation. On the other hand, the true, or invisible, church was, by its very nature, pure as membership in it was only brought about by the union with Christ performed by the Holy Spirit. Agreeing with the major confessions of his day,¹⁸⁴ Keach, then, employed the term ‘invisible church’ as a synonym for ‘the elect’. Like many of his colleagues, Keach relied on this doctrine to explain the corruption of the established churches including the Church of Rome and the Church of England. He also utilized this doctrine to explain some of the disagreements which arose within and between the gathered churches.¹⁸⁵

This understanding of the overlapping nature of the visible and invisible churches remained problematic because only the visible church could be identified from a human perspective. Thus, despite recognizing the impurity of the visible church, Keach still defined a true church in his congregation’s statement of faith as ‘a number of godly Persons, who upon the Profession of their Faith and Repentance have been baptized, and in a solemn manner have in a Holy Covenant given themselves up to the Lord, and to one another ...’.¹⁸⁶ He clearly desired that all members of

¹⁸⁰ Keach, *A golden mine opened*, 161.

¹⁸¹ Keach, *Gospel mysteries unveil'd*, I:201. Cf. Calvin, *The institution of Christian religion*, IV.i.7. & John Owen, *Gospel grounds and evidences of the faith of God's elect* (London: John Astwood for William Marshal, 1695), 71. Also see *Westminster Confession and Catechisms*, Art. XXV; *Savoy Declaration*, Art. XXVI; *Second London Confession*, Art. XXVI.

¹⁸² A prime example of this can be found in Benjamin Keach, *The counterfeit Christian, or, The danger of hypocrisy opened in two sermons* (London: John Pike ... and by the author ... 1691). Also see Keach’s sermon entitled ‘The Parable of the Marriage Supper Opened’ in *Gospel mysteries unveiled*, III:1-7.

¹⁸³ Keach, *Gospel mysteries unveil'd*, III:6.

¹⁸⁴ Cf. *Thirty Nine Articles [1562]*, Art. 19; *Westminster Confession and Catechisms*, Art. XXV; *Savoy Declaration*, Art. XXVI; *Second London Confession*, Art. XXVI.

¹⁸⁵ Keach even used this doctrine to explain the presence of heretics such as Matthew Caffyn within the General Baptist church of his early life.

¹⁸⁶ Keach, *The articles of the faith*, Art. XXII.

a particular congregation would be ‘Converted Persons, or *lively Stones*; being by the Holy Spirit, united to Jesus Christ’. However, he also provided the church with instructions for dealing with the presence of ‘hereticks and blasphemers’.¹⁸⁷ Ultimately, the congregation was required to admonish the heretic at least twice after which he or she should be excommunicated ‘for the destruction of the Flesh, that his Spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus’.¹⁸⁸ This act of church discipline was intended to help keep the visible church as pure as possible while acknowledging that only the Holy Spirit could ultimately identify those whom He united with Christ.

Following convention, Keach further clarified his definition of the visible church as being those congregations of people united to Jesus Christ by the Holy Spirit ‘among whom the Word of God is duly and truly preach’d; and Holy Baptism, the Lord’s Supper, and all other Ordinances are duly administred, according to the Word of God, and the Institution of Christ in the Primitive Church’.¹⁸⁹ For the most part, this definition only served to strengthen Keach’s relationship to the accepted Reformed doctrine of his day. However, the significant statement—‘and all other Ordinances’—proved to be the very point at which Keach differentiated himself from the theology of the *Second London Confession* and its corollaries, demonstrating a continued reliance upon some of the doctrines of his childhood. Immediately preceding this definition in his *The articles of the faith*, Keach included an article on the ordinance—a term he used interchangeably with sacrament—of baptism, which adhered closely to the symbolic understanding espoused by the *Second London Confession* and, predictably dissented from the other non-Baptist confessions.¹⁹⁰ In Article XXIV, Keach discussed the ordinance of the Lord’s Supper, again aligning his teaching with the *Second London Confession*. In Article XXIII, however, Keach crossed the sometimes-blurred lines which separated the now-distinct groups of Baptists by espousing the practice of ‘Laying on of Hands upon baptized Believers’ and placing it—along with

¹⁸⁷ Keach, *The glory of a true church*, 32-45.

¹⁸⁸ Keach, *The glory of a true church*, 28 (italics inverted). Here Keach cited 1 Cor. 5 and the work of Isaac Chauncy on church discipline.

¹⁸⁹ Keach, *The articles of the faith*, Art. XXII.

¹⁹⁰ For a fuller discussion of Keach’s understanding of baptism and the theological underpinnings of his doctrine, see Riker, ‘A Catholic Reformed Theologian’, Ch. 3; Vaughn, ‘Public Worship and Practical Theology’, Ch. 1.

several other practices—on par with baptism and the Lord’s Supper as an ordinance of the church. A closer reading of the *The articles of the faith* alongside Keach’s entire corpus reveals that Keach held to a variety of ordinances which the church should practice in order to remain true to Christ’s commands. In this area, Keach remained surprisingly inconsistent, at times even approaching a sacramental theology—that these practices actually conveyed grace—despite his own stated opposition to that teaching.¹⁹¹

Defining the Ordinances

Even in his definition of the term *ordinance*, Keach’s inconsistencies come to light. In one of his catechetical works, *The child’s delight*, Keach laid out what appeared to be a definition of the term ‘ordinance’ which thoroughly harmonized with the official Particular Baptist theology and which closely resembled the theology of Ulrich Zwingli. Specifically, Keach’s script questioned the catechumen regarding the ‘Gospel Ordinances called Sacraments’. In the ensuing discussion, the catechumen asserted the existence of only two ordinances, Baptism and the Lord’s Supper. In typical anti-sacramental fashion, this catechism described both ordinances as *signs* used to confirm true believers in their faith.¹⁹² Elsewhere, Keach further entrenched this anti-sacramental view when he balked at the idea that baptism could be considered an instrument of regeneration even to the extent that Calvin had espoused.¹⁹³ For most seventeenth-century Particular Baptists, the ordinance discussion ended with these assertions. In this area, however, Keach did not conform to the Particular Baptist mold.

The ordinance discussion in another of Keach’s catechetical works, the catechism for youth found in *Instructions for children*, provided a clear view of the inconsistency in Keach’s thought. Like the discussion in *The child’s delight*, this catechism for older catechumens identified two ordinances which were intended ‘to confirm

¹⁹¹ Recently, the extent of early Baptist sacramentalism has been reconsidered. See Anthony R. Cross and Philip E. Thompson, *Baptist Sacramentalism*; Anthony R. Cross and Philip E. Thompson, *Baptist Sacramentalism 2*; Stanley Keigh Fowler, *More than a Symbol*; Philip Thompson, ‘A New Question in Baptist History’.

¹⁹² Keach, *The child’s delight*, 38.

¹⁹³ Benjamin Keach, *Believers baptism: or, love to the antient Britains displayed* (London: for John Marshall, 1705), 235-36. Cf. Calvin, *The institution of Christian religion*, IV.xv.

[their] Faith'.¹⁹⁴ In this particular discussion, Keach scripted the questioner with even stronger anti-sacramental language, asserting that 'Faith alone, by the Operations of the holy Ghost, makes us Partakers of the Benefits and glorious Redemption purchased by Jesus Christ'¹⁹⁵ and clearly implying that the ordinances themselves did not play an instrumental role in the process. Almost immediately, Keach's questioner asked the student, '*What Ordinance follows Baptism?*' to which the catechumen replied, 'Laying on of Hands'.¹⁹⁶ This assertion of the existence of more than two ordinances directly contradicted the previous discussion both in Keach's other catechetical works and only a few pages earlier in this same work. Combining this question from the youth's catechism with several passages from the rest of his body of work—including the articles from his congregational confession of faith—revealed Keach's understanding of ordinance as any custom of the church with a Gospel, or New Testament, institution. Or, in simpler terms, any command Christ gave to the church.¹⁹⁷ Thus, Keach could (and did) speak of prayer, ordination of ministers, preaching, and even excommunication as ordinances, in addition to the two most commonly identified among the Reformed churches: Baptism and the Lord's Supper.¹⁹⁸

The Laying on of Hands Controversy

In the midst of this somewhat muddled discussion of the number of ordinances, Keach added to the confusion by utilizing some language which came near to a sacramental—or at least instrumental—theology. In *Tropologia*, he sounded almost Lutheran, likening ordinances to 'Conduit-Pipes ... which through the help of the Spirit lets [sic] out Divine Grace and Comfort, in a gracious and orderly manner, to all his Saints'.¹⁹⁹ While maintaining that the ordinance of baptism did *not* cause regeneration as some within the Church of England taught, Keach appeared to teach that some

¹⁹⁴ Keach, *Instructions for children [1695]*, 86.

¹⁹⁵ Keach, *Instructions for children [1695]*, 83 (italics inverted).

¹⁹⁶ Keach, *Instructions for children [1695]*, 94.

¹⁹⁷ Benjamin Keach and Thomas De Laune, *Troposchemalogia: Tropes and figures; or, A treatise of the metaphors, allegories, and express similitudes, &c* (London: John Darby for the author, 1682), IV:150.

¹⁹⁸ Keach, *A golden mine opened*, 133-4; Keach, *The glory of a true church*, 31; Keach and De Laune, *Troposchemalogia*, IV:173.

¹⁹⁹ Keach and De Laune, *Tropologia*, II:173.

of the ordinances did more than merely signify a spiritual event. Indeed, one of those ordinances, the laying on of hands upon baptized believers,²⁰⁰ served as the center of a rather heated debate in the last few decades of the seventeenth century, involving Keach and numerous other Baptists. Interestingly enough, the vast majority of Baptists involved in the debate were aligned with the General Baptists rather than the mature Keach's fellow Particular Baptists. This specific debate, then, provides some helpful insight into Keach's understanding of the connection between the Holy Spirit and the ordinances.

Like many of the controversies in which he chose to participate, Keach was not involved in the earliest iterations of this dispute. In fact, Keach did not become involved until he published *Darkness vanquished* in 1675, a direct refutation of the work on the doctrine published by Henry Danvers. By that point, numerous Baptists had already entered the fray, including the General Baptist leader, Thomas Grantham. Most discussions of Keach's role in this controversy and, indeed, the Baptist aspect of the controversy in general view the issue as unique to this 'denomination' and isolated from the rest of the English theological landscape.²⁰¹ In actuality, Keach, Danvers, and Grantham, writing in the 1670s, merely revived an earlier debate which dated back to the middle of the sixteenth century and involved theologians from all aspects of the English spectrum—separatists and conformists alike.

The Elizabethan establishment first began to grapple with this doctrine during the Admonition Controversy of the 1570s.²⁰² At that time, opposition to the practice arose among the reform-minded Puritans led by the federalist theologian, Thomas Cartwright (1535-1603) with support of the practice being voiced by John Whitgift (1530/1-1604), the official disputant for the Church who was later installed Archbishop of Canterbury. The discussion of the laying on of hands, or confirmation, largely

²⁰⁰ This ordinance is sometimes discussed alongside the practice of laying hands on ministerial candidates at their ordination. However, the two issues were separate with the latter being relatively uncontroversial and the former being the focus of the ordinance/sacrament debate.

²⁰¹ Vaughn only highlighted Keach's role in this discussion in relation to the position of Henry Danvers. Vaughn, 'Public Worship and Practical Theology', 65-73. Brooks notes the boundaries established within the Baptist groups of Keach's day. Brooks, 'Benjamin Keach and the Baptist Singing Controversy', 7. And Riker only mentions the controversy in passing. Riker, 'A Catholic Reformed Theologian', 45, 218. Bass provides a clearer view of the general context of this debate in his dissertation. Bass, 'Thomas Grantham and General Baptist Theology', 142-90.

²⁰² For a full discussion of this issue, see Turrell, 'Laudians and Confirmation'.

centered on its role in relation to the catechetical work of the Church, with the imposition of hands being the final statement that a person baptized as an infant could enjoy the full privileges of church membership, including receiving the Eucharist. This understanding of the practice allowed Whitgift to cite John Calvin in the establishment's official stance against the Puritans because Calvin had acknowledged the importance of confirmation.²⁰³ The major fear of the Cartwright-led Puritans was that the laying on of hands would cease to be merely a ritual of initiation and would take on the role of a sacrament.²⁰⁴

In the Caroline Church, the Puritan fears regarding this rite began to be realized as the debate over confirmation took on a more sacramental view. Most notably defended by the Laudian, John Cosin (1595-1672), the post-Restoration Bishop of Durham, the somewhat extreme view of this rite held that the imposition of hands actually communicated grace to the recipient rather than merely being a declaration of catechetical acumen or a means of benediction.²⁰⁵ Eventually, this round of the debate reached its climax in the middle of the seventeenth century and involved such prominent theologians as Henry Hammond (1605-1660)²⁰⁶; Jeremy Taylor²⁰⁷; the ejected minister from Devon, Jonathan Hanmer (1606-1687); and Richard Baxter as well as numerous Baptists, including John Griffith, William Rider who was Keach's predecessor in Southwark, and John Gosnold (1626-1678) who pastored the General Baptist congregation meeting at the Barbican. Of the Baptists involved in this period of debate, only John Gosnold maintained a firm opposition against the practice. Thomas Lambe, the leader of the Baptist church at Spitalfields, Bishopsgate, also evidently opposed the practice as some congregants, probably led by John Griffith, split from

²⁰³ It should be noted that Calvin only supported the practice of laying on of hands as a benediction rather than as having any sacramental aspect whatsoever. See Calvin, *The institution of Christian religion*, IV.xix.4.

²⁰⁴ John Fielde and Rudolf Gwalther, *An admonition to the Parliament* (Hemel Hempstead?: J. Stroud?, 1572); Thomas Cartwright, *A repley to an ansvere made of M. Doctor VVhitgifte Agaynste the admonition to the Parliament* (Hemel Hempstead?: John Stroud?, 1573).

²⁰⁵ John Cosin, *The works of the Right Reverend Father in God John Cosin now first collected* (Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1843), V:147.

²⁰⁶ Henry Hammond belonged to the Church of England and was a well-known catechist.

²⁰⁷ Jeremy Taylor was Bishop of Down in the Church of Ireland.

that congregation in 1646 in order to observe the practice.²⁰⁸ Elsewhere, other Baptists, including those meeting at Wells and the Abingdon Association and the Welsh Baptists under the leadership of Vavasor Powell, debated the ordinance with varying results and amounts of animosity.²⁰⁹ Christopher Blackwood stood as one of a very few Particular Baptists who supported the practice and included the ordinance in his catechism published in 1653.²¹⁰ In 1660, a group of General Baptists confessionalized the practice as a ‘duty of all such who are believers ... that they may receive the promise of the holy Spirit’.²¹¹

Thus, by the time Keach entered the theological stage, this debate had a long history, and that history was related closely enough to the established church for Thomas Crosby to suggest that the Baptists adopted this practice directly from their more mainline contemporaries.²¹² Indeed, Crosby may very well have based that opinion on Keach’s clear desire to place himself in the larger-than-Baptist discussion of the ordinance including those in the established church. For example, in his book-length rebuttal of Henry Danvers’ non-sacramental and non-obligatory view of the imposition of hands, first published as *Darkness vanquished* in 1675 and later republished with a short addendum as *Laying on of hands* in 1698, Keach aligned himself almost entirely with the work of the Presbyterian minister, Jonathan Hanmer, and even Richard Baxter, despite their numerous and significant theological disagreements on other issues.²¹³ Keach notably did *not* draw directly upon arguments from John Griffith or William Rider, despite his almost-certain first-hand knowledge of their arguments and his agreement with them. This attempt by Keach to appeal to

²⁰⁸ Henry Danvers, *A treatise of laying on of hands with the history thereof, both from the scripture and antiquity* (London: for Fran. Smith, 1674), 58.

²⁰⁹ White, ed. *Association Records*, 2:54, 70-71; 3:175-76.

²¹⁰ Blackwood, *A soul-searching catechism*, 56-59.

²¹¹ *Standard Confession*, Art. XII.

²¹² Crosby, *History*, III:290.

²¹³ See Chapters V and VI.

more than just the Baptists—a tendency already seen in his catechetical works²¹⁴—belied his desire to attach his congregation and denomination to a larger tradition.²¹⁵

The essence of the disagreement between Keach and Danvers lay in their understanding of the purpose of the practice. Danvers, agreeing largely with the views expressed earlier by John Gosnold, held that the ordinance served four purposes: benediction, healing of diseases, conferral of the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit, and ordination to a ministerial office.²¹⁶ As such, Danvers argued that the practice was not normative for all baptized believers.

Keach, on the other hand, agreed implicitly with the signatories of the General Baptist *Standard Confession* when he argued that Christ instituted the practice of laying on of hands on *all* baptized believers and the early church established the practice, including it as one of the ‘Six Fundamental Principles of Church-Constitution’²¹⁷ delineated in Hebrews 6:1-2.²¹⁸ According to Keach’s thought, the facts that this passage intended the imposition of hands for all believers and all believers were not promised the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit²¹⁹—or any of the other ‘benefits’ highlighted by Danvers—meant that the aim of the practice was ‘a farther Reception of the Holy Spirit of Promise, or for the Addition of the Graces of the Spirit, and the Influences the-

²¹⁴ See Chapter III, 69.

²¹⁵ This tendency led Riker to label Keach a ‘catholic’ theologian. To the extent that this term refers to this aspect of Keach’s thought, Riker is correct. However, it is also important to note that Keach was not interested in conforming to the Church of England or to any other church. He *did* desire to have a unified catholic church, as long as that catholic church agreed with his theology—at least in the fundamentals.

²¹⁶ Danvers, *A treatise of laying on of hands*, 4-5. Gosnold omitted benediction from his list of purposes. John Gosnold, *Of laying on of hands Heb. 6. 2* (London: John Streater, 1656), 1.

²¹⁷ Keach, *Laying on of hands*, 89.

²¹⁸ Keach’s reliance upon the Hebrews 6 passage placed him among a large company of theologians—Baptists and paedobaptists, non-conformists and conformists—who understood this passage to be a delineation of the core Christian beliefs. Among those who accepted this as a sort of early church catechism were Christopher Blackwood, Thomas Grantham, and even the conformist apologist, Ambrose Fisher. At the end of the seventeenth century, the six principles found in this passage served as the basis for the start of a new association of General Baptists which included the congregations meeting at White’s Alley, Glasshouse Yard, Goswell Street, Shad Thames, and the Park in Southwark. For the events leading up to this new association and the establishing documents, see *Church Book for Goswell St*, Angus Library, Regent’s Park College, Oxford. In 1692, this new association disciplined one of the congregations for accepting members who had not received the imposition of hands. See the entry dated 9? Jan 1692.

²¹⁹ Keach, *Laying on of hands*, 11.

reof'.²²⁰ In other words, this was God's normal method for providing the indwelling of the Holy Spirit; or, as Keach had his congregation sing, this was the Spirit's method of bringing believers' souls 'to Jesus's Feet'.²²¹ Keach accepted that God could (and did) give the Holy Spirit to believers without the imposition of hands, but this exception occurred only because 'God [acted in a manner] better than his Word'.²²² Believers should not take this exception for granted.

Despite including this ordinance in his list of fundamentals of the faith, Keach urged his congregation not to 'refuse Communion with [those who differ]'.²²³ He was able to hold these positions in tandem logically by differentiating between the 'Fundamentals of Salvation' and those 'fundamental Principles ... in the Constitution of a true regular Gospel-Church'.²²⁴ The ordinances, particularly the ordinances of baptism and the laying on of hands, fell under the latter but not the former category. As such, Keach allowed for disagreement within the true church although he noted that the task of reformation would not be complete until *all* fundamentals were reclaimed.²²⁵ While most of his dissenting contemporaries agreed that more reformation work remained to be done, this particular view of that work separated Keach from the vast majority of his usual authorities. Keach's stated acceptance of disagreement on the ordinances combined with his willingness to accept that his opponents in this controversy *could* be indwelt by the Holy Spirit without the imposition of hands, however, maintained the possibility of communion between Keach and those other theologians. In the end, his understanding of the role of the Holy Spirit, if not the communication of Him to the believer, left Keach in communion with the major dissenting confessions and even the official stance of the Church of England.

Keach by no means limited his discussion of ordinances to the laying on of hands. His views on believers' baptism were to be found in many of his publications, and his understanding of the ordinance of hymn-singing precipitated a major contro-

²²⁰ Keach, *The articles of the faith*, Art. XXIII.

²²¹ Keach, *The banquetting-house*, 260.

²²² Keach, *Laying on of hands*, 78.

²²³ Keach, *The articles of the faith*, sig. a3v.

²²⁴ Keach, *Gospel mysteries unveil'd*, II:182.

²²⁵ Keach, *Laying on of hands*, Epistle Dedicatory.

versy among the Particular Baptists in the 1690s and even split his own congregation in 1691.²²⁶ While both of those discussions involved sometimes-heated debates, neither of them provided a better glimpse into his understanding of the roles and operations of the Holy Spirit than his view of the laying on of hands. They also did not prove to be as unique to Keach. His obvious view of believers' baptism placed him in line with his fellow Baptists—although his passionate defense of that position made him a *de facto* spokesperson for his denomination. His view of hymn-singing, though more unique than his view on baptism, still only separated him from *some* Particular Baptists. On the other hand, Keach's discussion of the laying on of hands distinguished his theology from most other Baptists and many other Reformed theologians. Thus, this one ordinance demonstrated both Keach's independent thought and provided as clear an understanding as possible of his sometimes-inconsistent Trinitarian pneumatology.

Conclusion

On the major aspects of the Godhead, then, Keach agreed in large part with the major Reformed divines of his day. Citing his usual authorities such as John Owen and Thomas Goodwin, Keach upheld a view of the Trinity that was steeped in dogmatic language which Keach accepted without question. Despite some irregularities in his discussions, his Trinitarianism generally aligned well with the Independents and the Westminster Divines as well as the more conservative strain within the established church. The one point of disparity, his understanding of the communication of the Holy Spirit and the accompanying semi-sacramental view of some of the ordinances, left him at odds with most Particular Baptists and many Independents. In this area, Keach's theology served to blur the lines between the Baptist 'denominations' as well as between the traditional Reformed and Remonstrant parties. His views even forced him to critique accepted Reformed teaching and the work of the early Reformers while calling for a further work of reformation—a work which he saw as part and parcel of his ministerial calling.

²²⁶ For a discussion of Keach's view of baptism, see Riker, 'A Catholic Reformed Theologian'. The discussion of Keach's views on hymn-singing is lengthy, but see especially Brooks, 'Benjamin Keach and the Baptist Singing Controversy'.

CHAPTER V: FEDERAL THEOLOGY

... the Covenant of Grace which is made with Believers in Christ, is an everlasting Covenant, order'd in all things, and sure, and is the only Spring or Fountain of their Salvation, Hope, Desire and Consolation, both in Life and Death.¹

Benjamin Keach consistently announced to his readers and congregants that the biblical idea of covenant served as the very foundation of the Christian religion. Indeed, Keach claimed that discussion of the covenants manifested the entirety of the Gospel to humanity.² Despite its obvious significance to Keach, the concept of the covenant within his writings has largely been overlooked. Of the few works that have focused on Keach's theology, only the most recent work by David Bowman Riker allots significant space to this discussion.³ Even Riker's impressive work fails to place Keach's covenant theology in its Particular Baptist context. Only by considering the larger context of the still-developing covenantal thought of the Reformed Protestant tradition as a whole and the specific thought of the Particular Baptists of the latter half of the seventeenth century, can the significance of Keach's covenantal thought—of this 'Spring or Fountain of ... Salvation, Hope, Desire and Consolation'—be adequately appreciated.

Introduction to Covenant Theology

Defining the Terms

From its inception, the Protestant Reformed faith inherited a tradition of biblical interpretation, focusing on the concept of *covenant*, which dated back at least to

¹ Benjamin Keach, *The everlasting covenant, a sweet cordial for a drooping soul, or, The excellent nature of the covenant of grace opened in a sermon preached January the 29th, at the funeral of Mr. Henry Forty* (London: for H. Barnard 1693), 3 (italics inverted).

² Keach, *The everlasting covenant*, 23.

³ Indeed, this is the focus of Riker's entire work. Riker, 'A Catholic Reformed Theologian'.

Athanasius of Alexandria (d. 373).⁴ Given the importance of the covenant to the biblical accounts,⁵ one would be hard-pressed to conceive of any extensive biblical exegesis that could ignore this concept. Notwithstanding this, the Reformed branch of the Protestant faith developed a unique focus on the covenant to the extent that Reformed theology has often (injudiciously) been seen as synonymous with covenant theology.

Beginning in the nineteenth century, church historians witnessed a resurgence of interest in the history of the Reformed view of covenant with a large amount of scholarship attempting to place the Reformers in one of two supposedly competing camps: either the one that focused on the doctrine of the decrees or the one that focused on the covenant relationship between God and man.⁶ More recently, however, scholars have correctly rejected the exclusiveness of these categories. Rather than simply assigning a specific Reformer to one of two camps, many scholars now see a continuous spectrum on both the concept of covenant itself and the relative importance given to that concept within a given framework.⁷

⁴ As examples: the concept appeared in Augustine's doctrine of *donum superadditum*; Nicholas de Lyra (c. 1270-1349) developed a concept of a 'treaty of reconciliation' as a description of salvation as a whole; Cardinal Bellarmine even referred to the concept. See Richard A. Muller, 'The Covenant of Works and the Stability of Divine Law in Seventeenth-Century Reformed Orthodoxy: A Study in the Theology of Herman Witsius and Wilhelmus à Brakel', *Calvin Theological Journal* 29 (1994), 91; Leonard J. Trinterud, 'The Origins of Puritanism', *Church History* 20 (1951), 42; David A. Weir, *The Origins of the Federal Theology in Sixteenth-Century Reformation Thought* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989); Stephen Strehle, *Calvinism, Federalism, and Scholasticism: a Study of the Reformed Doctrine of Covenant* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1988); Muller, *Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics*.

⁵ If *importance* is defined merely as number of occurrences alone, *covenant* and its related words and concepts command a great deal of biblical importance. To that end, the Latin words *foedus*, *pactum*, and *testamentum* are all used to translate the Hebrew concept of *ברית* and the Greek New Testament concept of *διαθήκη*. In the Vulgate, the term *foedus* appears in 83 verses, *pactum* appears in 103 verses, and *testamentum* appears in 31 verses. See Weir, *The Origins of Federal Theology*, 55-6. Michael McGiffert, 'Grace and Works: The Rise and Division of Covenant Divinity in Elizabethan Puritanism', *The Harvard Theological Review* 75 (1982), 468-9.

⁶ The resurgence can largely be attributed to the three-volume work of Heinrich Heppe, *Dogmatik des deutschen Protestantismus im sechzehnten Jahrhundert* (1857). Cf. Lyle D. Bierma, 'The Role of Covenant Theology in Early Reformed Orthodoxy', *Sixteenth Century Journal* 21 (1990), 453. For a discussion of the literature and/or examples of this categorization see also Muller, *Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics*; Otto Weber, *Foundations of Dogmatics* (Grand Rapids, Mich: Eerdmans, 1981); Heinrich Heppe, *Reformed Dogmatics: Set Out and Illustrated from the Sources* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1950).

⁷ For examples of this non-exclusive approach, see Bierma, 'The Role of Covenant Theology'; Lyle D. Bierma, 'Federal Theology in the 16th Century: Two Traditions?', *Westminster Theological Journal* 45 (1983); Lyle D. Bierma, 'Law and Grace in Ursinus' Doctrine of the Natural Covenant: A Reappraisal.' in *Protestant Scholasticism*, eds C.R. Trueman and R.S. Clark, 96-110 (Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 1999); Muller, *Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics*; Muller, 'Covenant of Works'; John L. Farthing, 'Foedus Evangelicum: Jerome Zanchi on the Covenant', *Calvin Theological Journal* 29 (1994).

Alongside revised understandings of covenant theology, scholars have offered a variety of definitions of this term with emphases ranging from the number of covenants included in the system⁸ to whether the biblical covenant(s) were monopleuric—from the Greek *μονοπλευρον*, meaning *one-sided*, or dipleuric—*two-sided*—in nature to relative importance given to the concept within a particular system. Thus, Everett H. Emerson contentiously argued that John Calvin, ‘like many other Christian theologians, spoke of a divine covenant, but because the covenant is not a basic element for his system, he is not regarded as a covenant theologian.’⁹

David Weir provided a pragmatic set of definitions for three of the more important terms in this discussion: *covenant*, *covenant theology*, and *federalism*.¹⁰ According to Weir, thanks to an increase in theologians’ understanding of Hebrew and the Hebrew Scriptures, the theological concept of *covenant* underwent a major shift in the sixteenth century, a shift which saw translators move away from using the Latin term *testamentum* (English, ‘will, testament’) in their rendering of both the Hebrew term *ברית*, *berith*, and the Greek term *διαθηκη*, *diatheke*; rather, translators began to use the term *foedus* (English, ‘treaty, agreement, covenant’). The English translations of the Bible proved to be an apt stage for this significant shift, with almost all mention of *testament*—‘a formal declaration of will’—being replaced by *covenant*—‘a mutual agreement between two or more persons to do or refrain from doing certain acts ... the undertaking, pledge, or promise of one of the parties’—at least by the time of the publication of the authorized translation [1611].¹¹ This shift largely stemmed from an increasing struggle by theologians to explain the biblical situations where God’s cove-

For examples of scholars who, for the most part, maintain a binary approach, see Trinterud, ‘The Origins of Puritanism’; J. Wayne Baker, ‘Heinrich Bullinger, the Covenant, and the Reformed Tradition in Retrospect’, *Sixteenth Century Journal* 29 (1998).

⁸ Lillback provided examples of authors who defined covenant theology as those who focus on the presence of two and even three covenants. Peter A. Lillback, ‘The Continuing Conundrum: Calvin and the Conditionality of the Covenant’, *Calvin Theological Journal* 29 (1994).

⁹ Everett H. Emerson, ‘Calvin and Covenant Theology’, *Church History* 25 (1956), 136.

¹⁰ See Weir, *The Origins of Federal Theology*; Lillback, ‘The Continuing Conundrum: Calvin and the Conditionality of the Covenant’, 46.

¹¹ Weir, *The Origins of Federal Theology*, 52, 58; *OED*. It is important to note that the ‘mutual agreement’ does not imply an agreement between equals, simply that the terms are assented to by both parties. As an example of this definition, see Isaac Chauncy’s discussion of the term *covenant*. Isaac Chauncy, *Neonomianism unmask’d, or, The ancient gospel pleaded against the other, called a new law or gospel in a theological debate* (London: for J. Harris, 1692), 107-11.

nant involved—or appeared to involve—conditions alongside or instead of grace. What had once been thought only to be a declaration of God’s will (*testamentum*) for humanity slowly came to be seen as the fruits of God’s agreement (*foedus*) with humanity.¹² Theologians—even those in the Reformed branch of Protestantism—did not reach a consensus on the usage of these terms: Richard Baxter, for example, argued that divine covenants were not strictly covenants, but were a mixture of law and covenant.¹³ William Ames noted that the divine *covenant of grace* ‘because it consists of a free donation, and is confirmed by the death of the giver, it is not so properly called a covenant as a testament’.¹⁴ Even the Westminster Assembly noted the close connection (almost the imperceptible difference) between *covenant* and *testament*.¹⁵ Thus, the key to the development of covenant theology was not a new definition of terms—or specific use of the terms—but rather the new (or renewed) theological focus on those terms.

Based on this focus on terminology, Weir, then, argued the term *covenant theology* refers to a system which places this *covenant* concept at the center of its framework, making it the controlling theme for the divine-human relationship.¹⁶ Following Gottlob Schrenk’s *Doppelbund* schema, Weir defined *federalism* or *federal theology* as a specific version of covenant theology, developing at the end of the sixteenth century and maturing in the seventeenth century, which highlights a prelapsarian covenant between God and Adam, serving as the first ‘head’ of humanity, and a postlapsarian covenant between God and Jesus, serving as the second ‘head’ of humanity.¹⁷ Though other definitions of these terms provide more technical details and demonstrate the specific nuances which have kept the scholarly debate over covenant theology alive and well, this general overview lays the foundation for a more detailed dis-

¹² Weir, *The Origins of Federal Theology*, 57.

¹³ Richard Baxter, *Aphorismes of justification with their explication annexed* (London: for Francis Tyton, 1649), 12-13.

¹⁴ William Ames, *The marrow of sacred divinity drawne out of the Holy Scriptures, and the interpreters thereof, and brought into method* (London: Edward Griffin for Henry Overton, 1642), 114.

¹⁵ *Westminster Confession and Catechisms*, Art. VII.

¹⁶ One should note that this definition allows for a great deal of variation within covenant theology. For example, one of the intricacies that has been recently noted is the differing number of covenants within the thought of various Reformers. The key concept for *covenant theology* is the idea that the covenant(s) existing between God and humanity forms the basis of all divine-human relations.

¹⁷ Weir, *The Origins of Federal Theology*, 23-4.

cussion of the development of this theological system. One point of clarification needs to be added to Weir's definition: covenant theology (and federal theology) is generally seen as a subset of predestinarian Reformed theology, to the exclusion of Lutherans in the early generations of the Reformation and to the exclusion of Remonstrants after the Synod of Dort in 1619. This distinction becomes extremely important when dealing with theologians from the end of the sixteenth century and the beginning of the seventeenth century because a vast majority of theologians of the time discussed the covenant concept; however, simply discussing the concept does not place a divine within this specific tradition.¹⁸

Theological Development: From the Continent to England

The Zurich Reformer, Huldrych Zwingli (1484-1531), is largely credited with developing the covenantal concept as an organizing biblical theme—an innovation he adopted during his contentious debates over baptism with the Anabaptists.¹⁹ His successor, Heinrich Bullinger, published the first Reformation-era work explicitly discussing the covenants, entitled *De testamento seu foedere Dei unico & aeterno* [1534]. Almost immediately, other continental theologians began including the cove-

¹⁸ This is particularly germane to the discussion of Baptist theology as both the General Baptists and the Particular Baptists developed theologies of the covenant. However, only the Particular Baptists fell within the predestinarianism of the Reformed tradition, and thus, only their system can rightly be called covenant theology, according to this definition of the term. For a discussion of the General Baptist views of covenant, see Bass, 'Thomas Grantham and General Baptist Theology', 206-11. Along this line, Weir noted that '[a]lmost all Christian theologians ultimately practice some form of covenant theology, in that they must somehow distinguish themselves as Christians and not as believers under the Old Testament dispensation'. Weir, *The Origins of Federal Theology*, 3. For a discussion of other ways the *covenant idea* could be used, especially in early Baptist theology, see Paul S. Fiddes, 'Walking Together': The Place of Covenant Theology in Baptist Life Yesterday and Today,' in *Pilgrim Pathways: Essays in Baptist History in Honour of B. R. White*, eds W.H. Brackney, P.S. Fiddes and J.H.Y. Briggs, 47-74 (Macon, Ga: Mercer University Press, 1999). Fiddes used the term *covenant theology* to cover all aspects of theological discussion of the *covenant* concept. This broad definition may help in relating all Baptists to each other, but it does not aid in the placement of Baptists within their larger traditions.

¹⁹ Some question remains as to whether Zwingli or the Anabaptists first used this concept. Regardless, Zwingli not only used the concept in debates but also began to incorporate the idea as an organizing principle. See Robert Letham, 'The Foedus Operum: Some Factors Accounting for its Development', *Sixteenth Century Journal* 14 (1983); Mark Dever, *Richard Sibbes: Puritanism and Calvinism in Late Elizabethan and Early Stuart England* (Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 2000); Richard L. Greaves, 'The Origins and Early Development of English Covenant Thought', *Historian* 31 (1968); Peter A. Lillback, 'Ursinus' Development of the Covenant of Creation: a Debt to Melancthon or Calvin?', *Westminster Theological Journal* 43 (1981); Thomas Kennedy Ascol, 'The Doctrine of Grace: a Critical Analysis of Federalism in the Theologies of John Gill and Andrew Fuller', PhD Thesis, Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1989.

nant concept in their own theological primers, catechisms, and confessions.²⁰ Numerous formulations of the covenants appeared relatively quickly with perhaps the most notable being the emphasis of a prelapsarian covenant first postulated by the Heidelberg Reformers, Zacharias Ursinus and Caspar Olevianus, although they did not focus on this prelapsarian covenant in their Heidelberg Catechism.²¹ Through most of the sixteenth century, no single view of the covenants held prominence. Most of the earliest Reformers—including Calvin, Zwingli, and Bullinger—held to a unified view of the covenants,²² while some—such as Bern’s Wolfgang Musculus (1497-1563)—taught a two-covenant system, and still others such as the Utrecht’s Gisbertus Voetius (1589-1676)—held to a threefold covenant scheme. Additionally, a great deal of debate also centered on whether the covenants were unilateral declarations from God or bilateral agreements between God and humanity, and whether the biblical covenants were conditional. Despite (or because of) the various views, the covenantal concept quickly became a central focus of Reformed theology, literally becoming a commonplace in Musculus’ *Loci communes* [1560].²³

This focus on the covenant idea that so characterized continental Reformed theology of the late sixteenth century did not avoid England’s shores for long.²⁴ Due largely to the political climate in England at the time, many of the English Protestant leaders found study at the continental Protestant academies an expedient reprieve

²⁰ For other examples, see Zacharias Ursinus, *The summe of Christian religion, delivered by Zacharias Ursinus* (London: James Young, 1645); Calvin, *The institution of Christian religion; Heidelberg Catechism; Second Helvetic Confession*. For a discussion of this development, see Greaves, ‘The Origins and Early Development of English Covenant Thought’; Lillback, ‘Ursinus’ Development of the Covenant of Creation’.

²¹ Ursinus introduced a prelapsarian covenant between God and Adam in his *Catechismus maior* (1561-62, published posthumously in 1584), but he did not emphasize this covenant elsewhere in his theological writings. Olevianus published *De substantia foederis gratuiti inter Deum et electos* in 1585, a work which also highlighted the prelapsarian covenant. Additionally, much of Olevianus’ language—such as *ius creationis*—served as the later basis for full-fledged federal theology. Weir, *The Origins of Federal Theology*, 125; Lyle D. Bierma, ‘The Origins of the Federal Theology in 16th Century Reformation Thought: a Review’, *Calvin Theological Journal* 26 (1991).

²² See, for instance Ulrich Zwingli, ‘Refutation of the tricks of the Anabaptists [1527].’ in *Selected Works*, ed. S.M. Jackson, (Philadelphia, 1527); Calvin, *The institution of Christian religion*, II.x.1; Heinrich Bullinger, *De testamento seu foedere Dei unico & aeterno* (Tiguri: In excusum Christoph. Frosch, 1534). Cf. Letham, ‘The Foedus Operum’, 460; Weir, *The Origins of Federal Theology*, 9; McGiffert, ‘Grace and Works’, 464.

²³ See Derk Visser, ‘The Covenant in Zacharias Ursinus’, *Sixteenth Century Journal* 18 (1987); Bierma, ‘Law and Grace.’; Letham, ‘The Foedus Operum’.

²⁴ See Green, *The Christian’s ABC*, esp. 404-10.

from royal harassment. Inevitably, the theological foci of the continental Reformers, thus, made their way into the theological contemplations and writings of those English expatriates. In the case of the developing federal theme, this primarily occurred through the work of two authors: Thomas Cartwright and Dudley Fenner.

Thomas Cartwright (1535-1603)

Once the Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity at Cambridge, by 1574, Cartwright settled at the University of Heidelberg where he interacted with the teachings of Ursinus,²⁵ Olevianus, and their colleagues. Cartwright assimilated the emphases of the Heidelberg Reformers into his own covenant theology, much of which appeared in his short catechism, appropriately titled *A methodicall short catechisme* [1604], published just after his death.²⁶

In this 26-page work, Cartwright provided an overview of his understanding of a two covenant system: the covenant of works and the covenant of grace.

What are the parts of the word?

The Law, & gracious promise: (otherwise called the Couenant of workes, & the Couenant of grace) which from the comming of *Christ*, is called the Gospel.

Significantly, this work included a covenant between God and Adam ‘in his innocencie’:

What doeth the Lawe (containing the Covenant of workes) craue of us?
All such duties as were required of *Adam* in his innocencie, & all such as are required since by reason of his fall, with reward of life euerlasting to the doers of them, and curses to him that doth them not.²⁷

²⁵ Ursinus had not taught at the University of Heidelberg since 1568, but Visser noted that some direct interaction remains probable, though not necessarily regarding covenant theology. See Visser, ‘The Covenant in Zacharias Ursinus’, 535.

²⁶ This catechism was first attached to an exposition of the Ten Commandments by John Dod and Robert Cleaver. John Dod and Robert Cleaver, *A plaine and familiar exposition of the Ten commandments with a methodicall short cathechisme, containing briefly all the principall grounds of Christian religion* (London: T. C[reede] for Thomas Man, 1604). The catechism was later published separately as *A methodicall short catechisme* (1623). Regarding Cartwright’s dependence upon the Heidelberg Reformers, see Holmes Rolston, III, ‘Responsible Man in Reformed Theology: Calvin Versus the Westminster Confession’, *Scottish Journal of Theology* 23 (1970), 130-31; Michael McGiffert, ‘From Moses to Adam: the Making of the Covenant of Works’, *Sixteenth Century Journal* 19 (1988), 142.

²⁷ Dod and Cleaver, *A plaine and familiar exposition*, sig. Ggv.

Dudley Fenner (1558?-1587)

Dudley Fenner studied at Cambridge beginning in 1575 before traveling to Antwerp where he served in ministry alongside Thomas Cartwright. Fenner's major work relating to the covenant, entitled *Sacra theologia, sive, Veritas quae est secundum pietatem* [1585], included a full discussion of the *Fœdus duplex*²⁸ which was comprised of the *operum fœdus* and the *gratuitæ promissionis fœdus*.²⁹ This work introduced the concept of the covenant of works by name but Fenner did not attach that covenant to Adam's prelapsarian condition other than by allusion and by referencing certain scriptures which suggested that the conditions of the *operum fœdus* were inherent to creation. Instead, Fenner equated this covenant of works with the Sinai covenant: 'Fœdus cum Iudæis ictum, est fœdus operú'.³⁰

Assimilation into English Theology

The development of the dualistic view of the covenants—works and grace—seen in the work of Cartwright and Fenner, served to establish the federal theology of later generations of English theologians. In addition to these two theologians, several other divines and works aided in bringing covenant theology—and specifically federal theology—to the English theological landscape. First and foremost, the notes in the Geneva Bible [1560], which went through more than 120 editions within fifty years,³¹ highlighted the biblical concept of the covenant, albeit almost exclusively as a unifying (and non-federal) theme. In large part, these notes echoed those in William Tyndale's (d. 1536) translation of the Bible [1525-26].³² John Frith (1503-1533), the evangelical martyred under Henry VIII, and John Hooper (d. 1555), the Protestant

²⁸ As with the entirety of this work, Fenner's discussion of the *foedus duplex* displayed his dependence upon Ramist philosophy which included a tendency to categorize into dichotomies. Fenner defended the Ramist philosophy in a work entitled *The arts of logic and rhetoric* (1584). See McGiffert, 'Grace and Works'.

²⁹ Dudley Fenner, *Sacra theologia, sive, Veritas quae est secundum pietatem ad vnicae & versae methodi leges descripta & in decem libros* (T. Dawson, 1585), 282.

³⁰ Fenner, *Sacra theologia*, 282.

³¹ McGiffert, 'Grace and Works', 474.

³² Green, *The Christian's ABC*, 404.

minister executed by Mary I, also emphasized the Bible's covenantal theme.³³ Echoes of their work could be found in the systems espoused by William Perkins, William Ames (1576-1633), and Richard Sibbes (1577-1635), all of whom assimilated some form of federalism into their concepts of the covenants. These theologians and theological works did not present a harmonized view of the covenant, but they did, collectively, serve to keep the covenant theme in the forefront of the English theological horizon. By the end of the sixteenth century, the majority of English theologians—Reformed and otherwise—held to some version of the idea that the covenant relationship between God and humanity embodied the major theme of the Bible.³⁴

Westminster Assembly: the Cementing of Federal Theology

In the middle of the seventeenth century, the Westminster Divines largely cemented the English Reformed view of covenant theology in their confession of faith and catechisms. Tellingly, they included a two covenant system—the covenant of works and the covenant of grace—in the line of Cartwright and Fenner. They explicitly defined the first covenant as a prelapsarian conditional covenant between God and Adam—thus also cementing the idea of federalism:

The first Covenant made with Man, was a Covenant of Works, wherein Life was promised to Adam, and in him to his posterity, upon condition of perfect and personall obedience.³⁵

The scripture prooftexts included in this passage from the *Confession of Faith* closely followed Fenner's *Sacra theologia*.

Both the *Larger* and *Shorter Catechisms* produced by the Westminster Assembly also explicitly defined the biblical covenants as a two covenant system, consisting of the prelapsarian covenant of works and the postlapsarian covenant of grace. Both catechisms described the prelapsarian covenant as having been 'made with *Adam* as a publike person, not for himselfe onely, but for his posterity, all mankinde descending from him by ordinary generation, sinned in him, and fell with him in that

³³ Greaves, 'The Origins and Early Development of English Covenant Thought', 26ff; Trinterud, 'The Origins of Puritanism', 43.

³⁴ Green, *The Christian's ABC*, 411.

³⁵ *Westminster Confession and Catechisms*, Art. VII.ii.

first transgression'.³⁶ This prelapsarian covenant, identified as either the *Covenant of Life* or the *Covenant of Works*, was made 'upon condition of personall, perfect, perpetuall obedience ... upon pain of death'.³⁷

Likewise, the second covenant, or the *Covenant of Grace*, 'was made with Christ, as the second *Adam*, and in him, with all the elect, as his seed'.³⁸ This covenant included with it 'the everlasting Inheritance, with all things belonging to it, therein bequeathed'.³⁹ Technically, this covenant, like the *Covenant of Works*, could be classified as a conditional covenant because God gave this covenant of grace with 'faith as the condition to interest [the sinner] in him'; however, God's provision in that covenant included giving 'his holy Spirit to all his elect to work in them that faith, with all other saving graces ... as the way which he hath appointed them to salvation'.⁴⁰ Indeed, the Assembly specified that saving faith was external to the believer, 'the gift of God'.⁴¹ Despite these statements (or perhaps because of them), the question of whether or not the second covenant could rightfully be considered a conditional covenant *and* whether the conditions had to be met by the believer proved to be one of the centerpieces of religious controversy for the rest of the seventeenth century.

³⁶ *Westminster Confession and Catechisms*, LC 79, SC 160.

³⁷ *Westminster Confession and Catechisms*, LC 78-9, SC 159. Also see LC 81. While both the *Confession* and the *Larger Catechism* used the phrase *covenant of works*, the *Shorter Catechism* only used the phrase *covenant of life*. But these two phrases obviously referred to the same original covenant made with Adam in innocency.

³⁸ *Westminster Confession and Catechisms*, LC 81. The language referring to Adam and Christ as *publike persons* proved to be a central, unifying theme of federal theology, which viewed both Adam and Christ as the *publike*, or representative, persons for their covenant agreements.

³⁹ *Westminster Confession and Catechisms*, Art. VII.iv.

⁴⁰ *Westminster Confession and Catechisms*, LC 82.

⁴¹ *Westminster Confession and Catechisms*, Art. XI.i.

Richard Baxter: A Puritan Alternative⁴²

Thanks to his popularity as a preacher, his works of practical theology, his nearly unparalleled theological acumen, and his role in theological controversies, Richard Baxter stood as the most prominent proponent of an alternative covenant system. In contrast to the Cartwright-Fenner system and that of the Westminster Assembly, Baxter conceived of three separate covenants or laws, terms which he used interchangeably:⁴³ the *Covenant of Nature or Innocence* originally enacted between God and ‘Mankind in Adam’,⁴⁴ the *Covenant of Mediation* between the Father and the Incarnate Son,⁴⁵ and the *Covenant of Grace* between God and humanity.⁴⁶ Significantly, Baxter did not accept the title *Covenant of Works* for the first covenant because, according to him, the new covenant of grace could also be considered a covenant or law of works. Closely approximating the theology of Hugo Grotius, Baxter argued that the

⁴² For two excellent discussions of Baxter’s theology of the covenants, see Hans Boersma, *A Hot Pepper Corn: Richard Baxter’s Doctrine of Justification in its 17th-Century Context of Controversy* (Zoe-termeer, Netherlands: Boekencentrum, 1993); Packer, *The Redemption & Restoration of Man*. Baxter was by no means the only English theologian of his era to hold to a conditional new covenant. Thanks to his indefatigable pen and the fortuitous span of his life, Baxter became the *de facto* spokesperson. Other British theologians who held this view include: William Twisse (1577/8-1646), whom Baxter cited quite often; Thomas Blake (1596/7-1657); John Ball (1585-1640); Anthony Burgess (d. 1664); Samuel Rutherford (c. 1600-1661); and Stephen Gere (1593/4-1664). For a full discussion of the Antinomian Controversies, see Chapter VI, 176-80.

⁴³ ‘Though the word [*Law*] do principally signifie the regulating Imposition of our Duty, and the word *Covenant* doth principally signifie a *mutual Contract*; yet it is the same *Divine Instrument*, which is meant oft and usually in Scripture, by both these Names ... It is called a *Law* in one respect, and a *Covenant* in another, but the thing is the same.’ Richard Baxter, *An end of doctrinal controversies which have lately troubled the Churches by reconciling explication, without much disputing* (London: s.n., 1691), 99.

⁴⁴ Richard Baxter, *Richard Baxter’s catholick theologie plain, pure, peaceable, for pacification of the dogmatical word-warriours* (London: Robert White for Nevill Simmons ... 1675), second part, sect. II.16; Baxter, *An end of doctrinal controversies*.

⁴⁵ The specification regarding the Son being Incarnate at the time of this covenant holds the utmost importance in Baxter’s system as he argued that God could not covenant with himself for it would be ‘God imposing on God, the Law of Mediation’. Richard Baxter, ‘A defence of Christ, and free grace: against the subverters, commonly called, Antinomians or Libertines.’ in *The Scripture Gospel defended* (London: for Tho. Parkhurst, 1690), 10. Thus, God the Father covenanted with the incarnate, Jesus of Nazareth, temporally, not eternally. This allowed Baxter to deny any form of eternal justification. Despite noting the fact that Baxter distinguished between a covenant of redemption and covenant of grace, Riker did not note this intricacy of Baxter’s view. In fact, Riker incorrectly asserted that Baxter considered the covenant of redemption to be eternal. Thus, Riker missed one of the major disparities between Baxter and much of the rest of Reformed theology. Riker, ‘A Catholic Reformed Theologian’, 84, 122.

⁴⁶ Baxter, at times, combined the first covenant with the third as ‘the Law of Nature and Grace’. Richard Baxter, *Rich: Baxter’s confessions [sic] of his faith* (London: R.W. for Tho. Underhil, and Fra. Tyton, 1655), 129.

new covenant did not abrogate the original covenant, rather it was simply a relaxed form. This relaxation of the terms of the original covenant could occur because ‘the Law as a Law simply bind not [the Law-giver] to execute it, nor deprive him of a power to Relax it and Dispense with it’.⁴⁷

Like the Westminster Assembly, Baxter held that the first covenant was indeed a prelapsarian covenant which bound all humanity to its terms, and, because of natural generation, Adam’s failure to uphold that covenant was conveyed to all humanity.⁴⁸ In this sense, Baxter included a federalist view of Adam in his theology of the covenants. However, his agreement with the federal view basically ended there, for he deemed the headship of Christ in the covenant to be a contractual headship only. This distinction meant that Christ’s headship was, like the *Covenant of Grace* itself, conditioned upon the preceding faith of the individual. Additionally, the covenant between God the Father and God the Son, the *Covenant of Mediation*, was not eternal but temporal. This covenant spelled out a ‘peculiar Law to the Mediator’ that He should ‘obey the Law of Innocency’, ‘keep the Law of *Moses*’, and ‘do all that was proper to the Redeemer, in being a Sacrifice for sin, clearing and publishing the New Covenant’.⁴⁹

Particular Baptists

Publishing the *1644* and *1646 London Confessions* as the covenantal systems were being developed, the Particular Baptists included the covenant theme in both editions of that confession; significantly, the confession only spoke of the *new* covenant of grace between God and man.⁵⁰ The fact that they used the term *new* to describe this covenant suggested an original ‘other’ covenant; however, that covenant remained unnamed by any official Particular Baptist document until the *Second London Confession*. The focus in this confession remained on the covenant of grace; however, Article XIX described the law as ‘a covenant of works’ which could not be main-

⁴⁷ Baxter, *Baxter's confession [sic] of his faith*, 129.

⁴⁸ Richard Baxter, *Of the imputation of Christ's righteousness to believers* (London: for Nevil Simmons and Jonathan Robinson, 1675), 66.

⁴⁹ Richard Baxter, *The Scripture Gospel defended, and Christ, grace, and free justification vindicated against the libertines* (London: for Tho. Parkhurst, 1690), 4.

⁵⁰ *1646 London Confession*, Art. X; *1644 London Confession*, Art. X.

tained by sinful humanity.⁵¹ This confession's explication *Of the Law of God* provided a firm foundation for future Particular Baptists to develop a full-fledged federal system.

First, the confession argued that God gave the law to Adam as a 'law of universal obedience', and, in language echoing the *Westminster Confession*, referred to the covenant as binding Adam 'and all his Posterity to personal, entire, exact, and perpetual Obedience'.⁵² The confession then equated the original law given to Adam with that which 'was delivered by God upon Mount *Sinai*, in Ten Commandments' and averred that this 'moral Law doth for ever bind all, as well justified persons as others'.⁵³

In addition to its discussion of the original covenant, the *Second London Confession* included an explicitly federal understanding of the fall of humanity. In Article VI, that confession stated that '[o]ur first *Parents* ... fell from their original righteousness and communion with *God*, and we in them, whereby death came upon all'. Those parents (i.e., Adam and Eve), 'by *God's* appointment, [stood] in the room, and stead of all Mankind, [thus] the guilt of the sin was imputed ...'.⁵⁴ In contrast to this explicit teaching of imputed sin through Adam's and Eve's representation of all humanity, the *1644* and *1646 London Confession* omitted any idea of imputation and federal representation, simply noting Adam's and Eve's fall as the cause 'for the which death came upon all, and reigned over all, so that all since the Fall are conceived in sinne, and brought forth in iniquitie'.⁵⁵ Certainly this move from a covenant theology to an explicitly federal theology could signify a theological transition or development within Particular Baptist theology. The reason for this development—if it was indeed a development and not simply a new acknowledgement—can be found in the cementing of federalism in English Reformed theology thanks to the Westminster Assembly of Divines. The Particular Baptists, who published their first confession before the

⁵¹ *Second London Confession*.

⁵² *Second London Confession*, Art. XIX.1. Cf. *Westminster Confession and Catechisms*, Art. VII.ii.

⁵³ *Second London Confession*, Art. XIX.2-5. This language was taken directly from the *Westminster Confession*, Art. XIX.

⁵⁴ *Second London Confession*, Art. VI.2-3.

⁵⁵ *1644 London Confession*, Art. IV.

Westminster Assembly published theirs, desired to align themselves with the new(er) standard of English Reformed theology.

Henry Jessey

Though not officially a Particular Baptist, the Cambridge-educated minister, Henry Jessey,⁵⁶ had multiple personal and theological ties to the Particular Baptists, making his explication of the covenants important for understanding Keach's theology. Jessey did not publish a large amount of work on covenantal or federal thought. However, in his *A catechisme for babes*, Jessey did reference the imputation of Adam's guilt, noting that, due to Adam's and Eve's sin, 'the loss of the life and glory of God' 'came to them, and to us'.⁵⁷ He also argued for the new covenant being unconditional in its application to humans. Even the requirements for participation in the covenant—'that men beleeve and repent'—were gifts of God's grace in Jessey's understanding.⁵⁸

Christopher Blackwood (1607/8-1670)

One of Keach's fellow converts from General Baptist to Particular Baptist theology, Christopher Blackwood published several works in the early years of the Particular Baptist's Association, including an eighty-plus page catechism, entitled *A soul-searching catechism* (1653), which included a lengthy discussion of Adam's role as representative of all humanity. For Blackwood, Adam's federal role was seen clearest in his prelapsarian covenant with God:

So that a Covenant passed betwixt God and *Adam*, for the violation whereof on *Adams* part, he and his incur'd eternal death: and we hold it equitable in the Courts of men, that for the treason of the Father, the Posterity

⁵⁶ Jessey studied at St John's College, Cambridge.

⁵⁷ Jessey, *A catechisme for babes*, 12. As with Jessey, many of the earliest Particular Baptist theologians discussed the covenantal concept mainly (or exclusively) in their catechetical writings. The inclusion of this concept in the catechism denotes its foundational nature to the author's understanding of the Christian faith; thus, the omission of this concept from other writings should not be taken to denote a lack of significance.

⁵⁸ Henry Jessey, *The exceeding riches of grace advanced by the spirit of grace, in an empty nothing creature, viz. Mrs. Sarah Wight* (London: Matthew Simmons for Henry Overton, and Hannah Allen, 1647), 91-2 [number is inverted on pg 91].

smarts also. *Levi*, in the loynes of *Abraham*, is said to pay tithes, *Heb.* 7.9.⁵⁹

Later, Blackwood explicitly stated that ‘we become guilty by imputation, or by Gods ordination: in one man, God ordained to adorn us all, if he stood; in one man, he ordained to strip us all, if he fell’.⁶⁰

Despite his acknowledgement of a prelapsarian covenant with Adam, Blackwood did not organize his theology around that covenant. Rather, Blackwood organized the biblical system in relationship to two different covenants:⁶¹ ‘a carnal typical Covenant, or Testament, called old’ and a ‘spiritual or new Covenant’.⁶² The old covenant centered around the Mosaical Law and Mount Sinai, and included temporal promises, a time limit for its validity, and a requirement of perfect and rigorous obedience without providing any strength for humanity to fulfill that requirement.⁶³ The new covenant, on the other hand, included the same requirement of perfect obedience but provided the ability to fulfill that requirement. Blackwood also saw the new covenant as replacing the requirement of rigorous obedience with the ‘perfection of sincerity’.⁶⁴ This new covenant included eternal promises and existed eternally with no end to its validity.⁶⁵ With this explication of the covenantal system, Blackwood largely echoed the early system of the Palatinate Reformers—Ursinus and Olevianus—a system he almost certainly encountered while studying at Pembroke College, Cambridge in the 1620s.⁶⁶

⁵⁹ Blackwood, *A soul-searching catechism*, 12.

⁶⁰ Blackwood, *A soul-searching catechism*, 15.

⁶¹ Blackwood acknowledged ‘divers other Covenants which [God] made, as with *Noah*’, David, the Levites, and the Land covenant with the Israel. See Blackwood, *A soul-searching catechism*, 36.

⁶² Blackwood, *A soul-searching catechism*, 37.

⁶³ Blackwood, *A soul-searching catechism*, 40-41.

⁶⁴ Blackwood, *A soul-searching catechism*, 40. This language proved to be extremely similar to the language used by those who held to a completely conditional new covenant such as Richard Baxter. Baxter acknowledged his debt to Hugo Grotius for the development of this view. One can only wonder if Blackwood recognized the same debt to Grotius in his own theology and whether that would have had any impact on his continued support of that system.

⁶⁵ Blackwood, *A soul-searching catechism*, 40-41.

⁶⁶ Blackwood graduated BA in 1625. The Particular Baptist link to Cambridge theology—as seen in the writings of Christopher Blackwood, Henry Jessey, and Hanserd Knollys—has not been researched in detail. This link likely played a role in the development of covenant theology among Particular Baptists.

Hercules Collins (d. 1702)

In 1680, Hercules Collins—since 1677, the pastor of the Wapping Particular Baptist Church—published *An orthodox catechism*, a near-verbatim copy of the *Heidelberg Catechism* written by Ursinus and Olevianus with the addition of fifteen questions and a few word changes intended to facilitate the promulgation of believers' baptism and a few other idiosyncratic practices pertinent to his theology. By adopting the *Heidelberg Catechism*, Collins focused on the organizing role of the covenant concept without mentioning a prelapsarian covenant between God and Adam and merely alluding to the imputation of Adam's sin.⁶⁷ Whether Collins held this version of covenant theology or simply repeated the non-objectionable (i.e., non-paedobaptist) content of the immensely popular *Heidelberg Catechism* is not known. Regardless, this work made the covenant theology of Ursinus and Olevianus accessible, and even desirable, to the Baptist laity.

Nehemiah Coxe (1649-1689)

Like his father, Benjamin Coxe who was instrumental in the publication of the first *London Confession*, Nehemiah Coxe played a significant role in the confessional development of the London Particular Baptists. Having come to prominence in the open-membership church led by John Bunyan, the younger Coxe later served the London Association as a spokesperson, pastor, and theologian. He is largely regarded as a co-author of the *Second London Confession*, and, significantly for this discussion, published a work espousing the federalist theology of John Owen in 1680, the first such work from a Particular Baptist.⁶⁸ Coxe limited his focus in this work to the presence of the covenant before the law. By so doing, he accepted the idea of a prelapsarian covenant between God and Adam and detailed the role(s) of the covenants for Noah and Abraham, but he did not develop the federal theology from a New Testa-

⁶⁷ In what could simply be a by-product of translation, Collins's catechism, unlike the *Heidelberg Catechism*, actually came close to negating the imputation of Adam's sin. Specifically, Collins stated that humanity's corruption came out because 'we are all conceived and born in Sin' while the Heidelberg authors stated simply that humanity's 'corruption came by the fall and disobedience of our first Parents Adam and Eve in Paradise'. Collins, *An orthodox catechism*, 3; *Heidelberg Catechism*, 3.

⁶⁸ Nehemiah Coxe, *A discourse of the covenants that God made with men before the law* (London: J.D., 1681), see preface.

ment perspective (though Christ obviously was mentioned as being foretold in these early covenants).

The Covenant Concept Outside of Reformed Theology

Though the Particular Baptists—and Benjamin Keach—willingly accepted the predestinarianism of Reformed theology, as evidenced by the *Second London Confession*, they did not exist in a theological or social vacuum, free from other influences. Because of its rampant assimilation into the English mindset, the covenant concept garnered attention from theologians of all varieties—from the radical separatist sects on one side to the High Church Anglicans on the other—many of whom used the covenant concept in ways quite different from federal theologians.⁶⁹

George Fox (1624-1691), the founder of the Religious Society of Friends, utilized the concepts of the old and new covenants to buttress his concept of the inner light. For Fox, the new covenant in Christ was a ‘Covenant of light’ which ‘blotted out’ the first covenant of Moses.⁷⁰ Isaac Penington (1616-1679), a member of the Society of Friends followed this same basic covenantal framework in his *The new-covenant of the Gospel distinguished ...*[1660] while arguing that the eternal covenant, seen clearest in Christ, was in effect from the beginning of history with the ‘inward Covenant’ being available to Jews under the Law of Moses as well as to Christians under the Gospel.⁷¹ On the other end of the spectrum from the Quakers, the Anglican Henry Hammond envisioned a two covenant system much like that of the Westminster Assembly, complete with a prelapsarian covenant of works and a postlapsarian covenant of grace. However—and significantly—Hammond’s version of the covenant

⁶⁹ The ‘popularity’ of the covenant concept can be seen in the explosion of documents being published on the covenant. The *ESTC* lists only three works with ‘covenant’ in the title published between 1500 and 1600. That number rises to 988 in the next century.

⁷⁰ See George Fox, *The second covenant, which doth manifestly make known at the end of the first covenant & priesthood* (London: for Thomas Simmons, 1657), 2. Cf. George Fox, *A distinction between the new covenant and the old ...* (London: s.n., 1679).

⁷¹ Isaac Penington, *The new-covenant of the gospel distinguished [sic] from the Old Covenant of the law and the rest or sabbath of believers, from the rest or sabbath of the Jews* (London: for Robert VWilson, 1660), 20-21.

of grace was made with Adam rather than Christ,⁷² leaving the covenant of grace available to all humanity rather than those God ‘hath appointed ... to salvation’ as espoused by the Westminster Divines and most predestinarians.⁷³ The General Baptists, under the leadership of Thomas Grantham, developed a covenantal concept similar to Hammond’s, complete with a wholly conditional covenant available to all humanity.⁷⁴

Theology did not have a monopoly on the covenant concept. Although no aspects of life in seventeenth-century England could be completely distilled from theology, other covenants—primarily political ones such as the *Solemn League and Covenant*⁷⁵—garnered a great deal of publicity in the seventeenth century. Additionally, the ages-old concept of a business covenant⁷⁶—being simply a mutual agreement between two business parties—or a social covenant, such as marriage, kept the covenant concept at the front of the public mind, whether theological or otherwise.⁷⁷ The major unifying theme of these different uses of the term was the absolute finality of a covenant. In other words, ‘covenant’ simply could not be broken without dire consequences. Thus, by the latter half of the seventeenth century, the concept of a hard and fast covenant—both theological and otherwise—was almost ubiquitous in English culture.

⁷² Henry Hammond, *A practicall catechisme* (Oxford: 1645), 6. See Neil Lettinga, ‘Covenant Theology Turned Upside Down: Henry Hammond and Caroline Anglican Moralism: 1643-1660’, *Sixteenth Century Journal* 24 (1993).

⁷³ *Westminster Confession and Catechisms*, LC 82.

⁷⁴ See Bass, ‘Thomas Grantham and General Baptist Theology’, 206-11.

⁷⁵ Obviously, the *Solemn League and Covenant* had religious underpinnings, but it basically served a political, rather than religious, purpose.

⁷⁶ Uses of *covenant* as a business term can be found as early as the thirteenth century. .

⁷⁷ Trinterud argued that the need for a new social doctrine of covenant thanks to changing political climates contributed to the re-organization of the covenant scheme that occurred in the late sixteenth century. See Trinterud, ‘The Origins of Puritanism’, 48. For the purpose of the present study, the cause and effect relationship is an unnecessary tangent. All that needs to be seen at this point is that, by the late seventeenth century, the covenant concept was almost ubiquitous, regardless of the theological leanings and/or literary/social genres of a given author or thinker. Paul Fiddes has identified several other uses of the term *covenant theology*. See Fiddes, ‘Walking Together.’

Benjamin Keach's Covenant Theology⁷⁸

When Benjamin Keach joined the Particular Baptists, the already-extant discussion of covenants within Particular Baptist circles could hardly be considered a fully mature covenant theology, and definitely not a wholly federal scheme. As Keach built upon the Reformed tradition—including the confessional documents of the Westminster Assembly, the writings of contemporary Puritans, and the theology of his Particular Baptist colleagues and predecessors—he developed his own unique understanding of covenant theology which interacted with the common usages of the term ‘covenant’ while remaining intentionally theological in nature. Utilizing his understanding of God’s condescension, Keach argued that because God primarily chose to be understood as a covenant-transactor, He must be considered as such. But, Keach emphatically noted that He must not be limited by the boundaries of the normal conceptions of a covenant transaction. At numerous times throughout his writings on the covenants, Keach identified areas where God moved beyond those human boundaries, and, consequently, he helped push the Particular Baptist community to accept a full-fledged federalist theology.

Identifying the Covenants

Regarding Keach’s understanding of covenant theology, two basic issues need initial clarification. The first concerns the number and names of the covenants Keach saw as governing the divine-human relationship. Secondly, the timing of those covenants in relation to the Fall of humanity has to be established. Without these foundational issues, the rest of Keach’s covenantal system cannot be rightly understood.

Number and Names of the Covenants

Recognizing that the biblical record described numerous covenants, Keach argued that all of those transactions merely repeated one of two ‘organizing’ covenants, namely the old covenant which he variously called the *Covenant of Works*, the *Cove-*

⁷⁸ Because of its use as an organizing principle in covenant theology, the covenant scheme infiltrated all aspects of theology. Thus, any separation of issues from the issue of ‘covenant theology’ is, at the outset, artificial. However, for the purpose of aiding the present study, Keach’s covenant theology will be discussed separately from other aspects. The all-encompassing aspects of his federalism will be noted and cross-referenced in the footnotes.

nant of Life, the *Law of Innocency*, or simply the *Law*⁷⁹ and the new covenant, called the *Covenant of Grace*, the *Covenant of Redemption*, the *Gospel Covenant*, the *Covenant of Peace*, or the *Covenant of Reconciliation*.⁸⁰ Every other covenant noted in the biblical record, though possibly containing some idiosyncrasies, simply repeated the original transactions of one or the other organizing covenant. Thus, Keach could call the covenant with Israel at Mount Sinai ‘one and the same Covenant’⁸¹ as the *Covenant of Works*. Likewise, Keach argued that the Bible only contained ‘one Covenant of Grace’ and that the promises of grace appearing throughout the Bible ‘were [merely] several distinct Additions of it’⁸² which included the promises given to Noah, Abraham, Moses, David, and numerous others. In this respect, Keach approached the theology of William Ames who similarly argued ‘the free, and saving Covenant of God hath beene onely one from the beginning, yet the manner ... of administring this new Covenant, hath not alwayes beene one and the same’.⁸³ In this aspect of covenant theology, Keach moved well beyond his Baptist predecessors—especially the work of Nehemiah Coxe who neither discussed the total number of biblical covenants nor established an over-arching organizational scheme for his covenantal system.

Though Keach used a variety of names for the biblical covenants and obviously deemed the titles a matter of mere semantics, he assigned a great deal more import to the *number* of organizing covenants. At some unknown point, Keach, like many other theologians from across the spectrum of the Reformed tradition ranging from Samuel Rutherford to Richard Baxter and his followers,⁸⁴ held to three organizing co-

⁷⁹ Keach, *The everlasting covenant*, 4; Keach, *The display of glorious grace*, 113-14; Keach, *The marrow of true justification*, 12-13; Keach, *The articles of the faith*, Art. VII.

⁸⁰ Keach, *The everlasting covenant*, 4, 12; Keach, *The ax laid to the root*, I:11; Keach, *The display of glorious grace*, iv-v.

⁸¹ Keach, *The ax laid to the root*, II:14.

⁸² Keach, *The ax laid to the root*, II:18. In discussing Keach’s view of the *Covenant of Grace*, David Copeland noted that Keach first mentioned the *Covenant of Grace* in *Tropologia*. While this is true, two observations should be made. First, *Tropologia* is the earliest extant work of Keach’s which covered a variety of topics and, thus, had room for a larger discussion of the covenant. Second, Keach did mention Christ’s role as mediator in both his early catechetical works which almost certainly originally pre-dated *Tropologia*, although the earliest editions are no longer extant. Cf. Copeland, *Keach and Baptist Traditions*, 40.

⁸³ Ames, *The marrow of sacred divinity*, 193.

⁸⁴ Thus, in addition to the covenant between God and Adam, Samuel Rutherford wrote about the ‘*differences between the Covenant of Suretyship or Redemption made with Christ, & the Covenant of Reconciliation and of Grace made with sinners.*’ Samuel Rutherford, *The covenant of life opened, or, A*

venants: the *Covenant of Works* and two later covenants—an unconditional *Covenant of Redemption* established between God the Father and God the Son and a conditional *Covenant of Grace* established between God and humanity.⁸⁵ However, by at least 1693 (and probably by the time of his conversion to Particular Baptist theology around 1672) Keach aligned himself with the Westminster Assembly, having ‘upon farther search ... [determined that he] cannot see that they [the *Covenants of Grace and Redemption*] are Two distinct Covenants, but both one and the same glorious Covenant of Grace’.⁸⁶

Timing of the Covenants in Relation to the Fall

In terms of absolute timing, Keach understood both of the organizing covenants to have been conceived and transacted from eternity past, having been determined by the three Persons of the Trinity in ‘that great and glorious Council which was held in Eternity’.⁸⁷ According to Keach, God’s actions within time always align with his ‘[p]urpose before time’,⁸⁸ and thus, His determinations in that intra-Trinitarian Council necessarily came to pass. In terms of logical timing, the *Covenant*

treasurie of the covenant of grace (Edinburgh: Andro Anderson for Robert Brown, 1655), 308. Keach correctly attributed this view to Richard Baxter, Daniel Williams, and Samuel Clark. Keach, *The display of glorious grace*, 77. Cf. Daniel Williams, *Gospel-truth stated and vindicated* (London: for John Dunton, 1692), 53.

⁸⁵ This conditional *Covenant of Grace* seemed to contain—in thought, if not in terminology—echoes of Moïse Amyraut (1596-1664), theologian at The Academy of Saumur, who held to a conditional (and universal) *Covenant of Grace* made with Adam immediately after the fall. Cf. G. M. Thomas, *The Extent of the Atonement: a Dilemma for Reformed Theology from Calvin to the Consensus (1536-1675)* (Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 1997), 195.

⁸⁶ Keach, *The everlasting covenant*, 6 & 8. It is interesting to note that none of Keach’s works extant from before 1693 include a three-covenant system. von Rohr assigns the ‘collapsing of the covenant of grace into the covenant of redemption’ as being ‘more characteristic of the Antinomian wing of Puritanism’. See John Von Rohr, *The Covenant of Grace in Puritan Thought* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986), 44. This proves to be a bit of a self-fulfilling characterization, however, since all those who collapse the covenant of grace into the covenant of redemption are then seen as Antinomians. As will be discussed, Keach did (unfairly) fall prey to claims of Antinomianism. See Chapter VI, 210-14.

⁸⁷ Keach and De Laune, *Tropologia*, III:9. Keach cited Zech. 6.13 here. This verse played a significant role in covenant theology as it was used to prove a covenant between two Persons of the Trinity (as with Keach). In this Keach followed Cocceius, et al. However, others—even in the Reformed tradition, notably John Calvin—interpreted this verse to indicate a covenant between two of Christ’s offices (priest and king). See Jean Calvin, *A commentary on the twelve Minor Prophets* (Banner of Truth Trust: Edinburgh, 1986), V:Zech. 6.13. Daniel Williams followed Calvin’s interpretation. Williams, *Gospel-truth stated*, 236.

⁸⁸ Keach, *Gospel mysteries unveil’d*, II:245.

of Works was both conferred *and* broken prior to the development of the *Covenant of Grace*; indeed, the breaking of the first covenant, the *Covenant of Works*, actually necessitated the second covenant, the *Covenant of Grace*. Thus, the divine council where the *Covenant of Grace* was transacted was ‘held upon the account of sinful man, lost man, (whom God then saw dead and fallen) [to determine] how he might be delivered from sin and eternal wrath’.⁸⁹

Humanity came to be sinful and lost only due to the breaking of the *Covenant of Works* which God had entered into with Adam in ‘the time of his Innocency’.⁹⁰ The breaking of that covenant, brought about humanity’s fall from the state of innocence, leaving all humans ‘Children of Wrath ... utterly indisposed and disabled to do any thing that is spiritually good’.⁹¹ Logically, this *original sin* necessarily occurred *prior* to the transactions of the *Covenant of Grace* in which God regarded humanity as *already* sinful. Thus, Keach formulated the federal concept of a prelapsarian covenant between God and Adam as driving the entire covenantal system.

Development of the Covenants

Throughout his works, Benjamin Keach refrained from discussing God’s reason for choosing to establish a prelapsarian covenant with Adam. Rather than delving into any underlying aspects within God’s character or even a discussion of the eternal councils, Keach simply asserted God’s establishment of the prelapsarian covenant with Adam.⁹² On the other hand, Keach found the condition of that covenant—namely, *perfect righteousness*—to be grounded in the ‘Justice, Holiness or Purity of God’s nature’ whose consistency required any person who was to be justified to be ‘wholly without sin, even in *Thought, Word and Actions*’.⁹³

⁸⁹ Keach and De Laune, *Tropologia*, III:9.

⁹⁰ Keach, *The ax laid to the root*, II:15.

⁹¹ Keach, *The articles of the faith*, Art. VII, citing Gen. 6.5 & Rom. 7. See below for the discussion of Keach’s federalism under the heading ‘Publick Persons’, 166-7.

⁹² In his catechisms and confession of faith—including the *Second London Confession* which Keach signed—Keach simply asserted the establishment of the first covenant with Adam. Keach did not provide a biblical or logical reason for the original establishment of the covenant relationship. See Keach, *The child’s delight*, 22; Keach, *Instructions for children* [1695], 61; Keach, *The articles of the faith*, Art. VII; *Second London Confession*, Art. XIX.

⁹³ Keach, *The display of glorious grace*, 16.

Once the original covenant had been asserted, the rest of the covenant system logically followed. Keach described this logical necessity through two different meta-analogies: first, the development of enmity between God and humanity, or a breach in the love relationship established at creation; second, humanity's loss of credit with God.⁹⁴ Both of these meta-analogies borrowed heavily from secular language. In the first, the language of mediator resembled a treaty negotiation, whereas in the second, Keach almost exclusively used commercial language.⁹⁵ In both situations, Keach intended the secular language to aid in the understanding of God's actions rather than to limit God in any way, and in both situations, Keach's use of secular language proved to be rather unique among his contemporaries. While the arguments aligned well with much of the Reformed Protestantism of his day, his choice of words and analogies stood out as innovative.⁹⁶

Enmity Between God and Humanity

According to the first meta-analogy, Adam's breaking of the prelapsarian covenant created an unnatural 'Breach between God and Man'.⁹⁷ 'Before the Fall nought

⁹⁴ Keach mentioned or alluded to other analogies, including the idea of a Testator, but consistently throughout his works, Keach returned to these two. At one point, Keach provided a partial list of those other analogies: '... he is the Covenant it self, our Head, our Mediator, our Priest, our King, our Prophet, our Surety, our Shepherd, our Captain'. Keach, *The everlasting covenant*, 25. Cf. Keach, *A golden mine opened*, 126.

⁹⁵ Both of these metaphors—mediator and surety—stem directly from biblical language. Mediator came from 1 Tim. 2.5 'For there is one God, and one Mediator between God and Men, the Man Christ Jesus' and Heb. 12.24, 'To Jesus the Mediator of the new Covenant...'. Surety came from Heb. 7.22 'By so much was Jesus made a Surety of a better Testament'. However, Keach's discussion of the biblical covenants harmonized well with the example of a bond he included at the end of his Youth Catechism. See Keach, *Instructions for children [1695]*, 131-2. Additionally, the same metaphors appeared throughout Reformed theology. See especially the work of Herman Witsius (1636-1708), a contemporary of Keach who was cited regularly by one of Keach's favorite divines, Isaac Chauncy. Witsius' work was not translated into English until the middle of the eighteenth century; however, Witsius was well-known among the London theological elite, a group which included numerous acquaintances of Keach. In fact, Witsius lived in London for a few months in 1685 while serving as a chaplain to the Dutch embassy, during which time he 'conversed with ... many other divines, both Episcopal and Dissenters in discipline ...' Herman Witsius, *The oeconomy of the covenants between God and man Comprehending a complete body of divinity* (London: for Edward and Charles Dilly, 1775), 'Life of the Author', 20.

⁹⁶ Riker failed to note this innovation, despite the fact that none of the Reformed theologians he used as foils for Keach's theology used this sort of terminology. See Riker, 'A Catholic Reformed Theologian', 109ff.

⁹⁷ Keach and De Laune, *Tropologia*, II:87. Citing Psalm 7.11, Eph. 2.3, and Rom. 8.7.

then was seen/But perfect amity'.⁹⁸ After the Fall, however, the human-divine relationship became characterized by mutual hatred—'And as thou [God] dost him [man] loath and hate,/So he doth thee also'.⁹⁹ This enmity between God and humanity arose from the very core of the two parties involved. For God, hatred of wickedness stood at the very essence of His being.¹⁰⁰ For postlapsarian humanity, rebellion against God, or wickedness, corrupted their very nature. 'Hence *by Nature* Mankind are said to be the *Children of Wrath*'.¹⁰¹ Thus, the Fall created the dilemma: two enemies in need of peace but irreconcilable by their natures.¹⁰²

Keach saw this dilemma as necessitating a Mediator, a term which 'as applied to Christ, is borrowed from Persons, whose Office it is to reconcile such Parties as are at variance, being as it were in the middle betwixt both, solliciting the Cause of each to the other, till they bring them to Concord or Agreement'.¹⁰³ In his explication of this role for Christ, Keach provided twenty-one comparisons demonstrating that Christ indeed fulfilled all aspects of that particular role so that the two parties could find the peace God desired and humanity needed. Jesus Christ's role as mediator necessitated Him finding a way to mollify both parties, namely by bringing humanity back to a place of communion with God *and* developing conditions whereby the 'Glory of [God's] Justice, which must be dealt with in a way of Satisfaction'¹⁰⁴ could be maintained. That justice, being an inherent aspect of the Divine Essence, could not be disregarded or, in any way, amended.¹⁰⁵

⁹⁸ Benjamin Keach, *Spiritual melody, containing near three hundred sacred hymns* (London: for John Hancock, 1691), Hymn 17.

⁹⁹ Keach, *Spiritual melody*, Hymn 17.

¹⁰⁰ See Keach, *A medium betwixt two extremes*, 15.

¹⁰¹ Keach and De Laune, *Tropologia*, II:87 emphasis added, Keach cited Eph. 2.3.

¹⁰² Keach, *The display of glorious grace*, 13-14.

¹⁰³ Keach and De Laune, *Tropologia*, II:86.

¹⁰⁴ Keach and De Laune, *Tropologia*, II:88.

¹⁰⁵ See the discussion on Divine simplicity in Chapter IV, 103-4.

Christ's Unique Qualifications as Mediator

Christ stood uniquely and 'every way qualified and fitted for this Work' of mediator.¹⁰⁶ His unique position as the Second Person of the Trinity meant that 'He is not only God, but Man; not only Man, but God: a blessed Reconciler of Man to God, and of God to Man'.¹⁰⁷ He had to be God so that He could have the necessary wisdom, love for justice, and inclinations for mercy. He had to be human because the mediator must plead for humanity.¹⁰⁸ Additionally, the mediator 'must understand the Nature of that difference ... which was betwixt God and Man'.¹⁰⁹ For Keach, then, Jesus uniquely understands both sides of that breach, and He exists as the only one qualified to mediate these peace negotiations.¹¹⁰

The Choosing of Christ as Mediator

During the 'great and glorious Council which was held in Eternity [past]',¹¹¹ the three Persons of the Trinity determined that the second Person, Jesus Christ, would 'assume Mans nature', serve as Mediator, and 'proclaim Peace and reconciliation to sinners'.¹¹² Thus, all Persons of the Godhead were intimately involved in the choosing of Christ as the appropriate mediator. Harmonizing with both the *Westminster Confession* and the *Second London Confession*, Keach cited Hebrews 10:7 as a reference to Christ's willingness to accept the role assigned in the intra-Trinitarian councils.¹¹³

The Uniquenesses of Christ's Mediatorial Role

In the aspects of this meta-analogy thus far discussed, Christ's role as mediator fulfilled the same requirements as that of any human mediator. However, the bib-

¹⁰⁶ Keach and De Laune, *Tropologia*, II:89.

¹⁰⁷ Keach and De Laune, *Tropologia*, II:87, citing Gal. 4.4-5.

¹⁰⁸ Keach and De Laune, *Tropologia*, II:89.

¹⁰⁹ Keach, *The display of glorious grace*, 38.

¹¹⁰ Keach, *The child's delight*, 24-5.

¹¹¹ Keach and De Laune, *Tropologia*, III:9.

¹¹² Keach and De Laune, *Tropologia*, III:9; Keach, *The display of glorious grace*, 192.

¹¹³ Keach, *The everlasting covenant*, 5; Keach, *The display of glorious grace*, 31. See *Westminster Confession and Catechisms*, Art. VIII; *Second London Confession*, Art. VIII.

lical description of Christ as mediator was an example of God’s condescension to human understanding—an anthropomorphizing of God which necessarily fell short of divine reality; thus, Keach saw both Christ and His peace negotiations as exceeding their human counterparts. In this case, Keach noted three specific instances of this excess.

In normal human negotiations, both parties actively choose the mediator. Given that the negotiations for peace occurred in the divine councils of eternity, humanity did not yet exist—save for in divine omniscience—and thus could not be involved in choosing a mediator for the negotiations.¹¹⁴ Under normal human conditions, this would give the party not involved in choosing the mediator a cause for concern and even a reason to distrust the negotiations. Keach discounted this usual exception, noting that ‘none else could be found in Heaven or Earth; *None able to open the Book, and loose the Seals thereof, but He*’.¹¹⁵

Because the councils occurred prior to humanity having ‘an actual Being’, fallen humanity could not be personally involved—a normal requirement for human negotiations. Indeed, the very role of mediator required the presence of the offending party for ‘*A Mediator is not a Mediator of one but God is one*’.¹¹⁶ Christ solved this dilemma by agreeing to *personate* the Elect, to represent ‘all that were given to him’, and to actually ‘make up that Breach that was between God and Man’.¹¹⁷ Thus, Christ not only mediated the negotiations, but He also involved Himself *as* the offending party.

As the offending party, Christ agreed to fulfill all the requirements of those negotiations—the third instance of excess noted by Keach. These requirements were two-fold: God, the offended party, required that the original covenant be upheld;¹¹⁸

¹¹⁴ Keach, *A golden mine opened*, 202. William Ames presented a similar discussion of the existence of creation in the ‘knowledge of God’. Ames, *The marrow of sacred divinity*, 36. The Westminster Divines agreed with this discussion, albeit implicitly. Cf. *Westminster Confession and Catechisms*, Art. III.

¹¹⁵ Keach and De Laune, *Tropologia*, II:87, citing Rev. 5.5,6.

¹¹⁶ Keach and De Laune, *Tropologia*, II:87, 89, citing Gal. 3.20.

¹¹⁷ Keach, *A golden mine opened*, 202. Keach used the term *personate* to describe this representation. ‘[N]ow Christ undertook in the Covenant of Grace for all the Elect, he personating them, when the Father and he entred into that glorious Compact or Covenant-Transactions...’

¹¹⁸ Keach, *The everlasting covenant*, 17; Keach, *The display of glorious grace*, 34-5. Cf. *Westminster Confession and Catechisms*, Art. VIII.

God desired that He be glorified both as just and holy *and* as merciful and gracious.¹¹⁹ The former term of peace meant that Christ must live perfectly according to the Covenant of Works. The latter term meant that humanity's failures to uphold the original covenant must find recompense—for God to appear as just and holy. Likewise, this term also required that all fallen humans who are participants in the covenant must be accepted without inherent merit—so that God could appear merciful and gracious. Thus, Christ died to uphold the punishment of the original covenant *and* to have His merits graciously imputed to the human participants, the Elect.¹²⁰

God as Offended Creditor

In Keach's second meta-analogy, he used the language of secular commerce, representing humanity as having possessed an original line of credit with God but having lost that credit at the breaking of the *Covenant of Works*. Having proven unworthy of credit, fallen humanity had no right to demand any 'commerce' with God. Humanity 'could not, did not stand, but br[oke] Covenant with God, when he had no Sin, no depraved Nature'¹²¹; thus, *fallen* humanity had no hope of even being given the opportunity (on their own) to enter into another covenant with God. As Keach penned in a hymn:

We once, O Lord, concerned were
In a commerce with thee;
Before we fell, no need was there
Of any Surety.

But we run out, and wasted all,
Which was a mighty store;
And, ah! our credit is so gone,
Thou wilt trust us no more.¹²²

As Keach had his congregation sing, for fallen humanity to have any trade with God, a surety must act on their behalf.

¹¹⁹ Keach, *The display of glorious grace*, 192-3.

¹²⁰ Christ agreed to be 'sacrifice[d] on the Cross in our stead; he must bleed, as well as intercede for Man ...' Keach and De Laune, *Tropologia*, II:89. Also see Keach, *The everlasting covenant*, 8.

¹²¹ Keach, *The everlasting covenant*, 32.

¹²² Keach, *Spiritual melody*, Hymn 18.

The Choosing of Christ as the Surety

As with His role of mediator, Christ was installed as surety for fallen humanity as a ‘Result of God’s eternal Counsel; yet this Office of his may be considered as subsequent to Man’s Obligation’.¹²³ As was seen with the establishment of the second covenant itself, the timing of the establishment of this role for the Second Person of the Trinity occurred absolutely in eternity past and logically *after* the breaking of the *Covenant of Works*. God the Father, as the original creditor, appointed Christ as the surety for fallen humanity because He needed someone in whom He could be completely confident. Despite the Son being chosen by God the Father, Keach followed Owen and the Westminster Assembly in citing John 10 as proof that Christ actually accepted the role as surety for depraved humanity of his own ‘voluntary Act’.¹²⁴

The Significance of the Surety of Christ

Keach’s discussions of Christ’s service as surety proved to be more complex than his discussion of Christ’s mediatorial role, and, at times, he even appeared to contradict himself. Such was the case with the discussion regarding which party Christ served as surety. In *Tropologia*, Keach noted that a normal human surety usually served one party—the debtor—but, on rare occasions, the surety could engage on behalf of both parties. At this point, Keach argued that Christ’s surety fell into that rare occasion; thus, ‘Christ, our spiritual Surety ... undertakes on God’s part to the Creature: *All the Promises of God in him are Yea, and in him Amen, unto the Glory of God, &c.*’ Christ also ‘undertakes on the Creature’s part to God’ by, among other things, praying for the debtor.¹²⁵

On the other hand, while discussing Hebrews 7:22—*Jesus Christ was made a surety of a better covenant*—Keach cited John Owen as proof that ‘God needs no Surety, nor is he capable of having any *Surety*’.¹²⁶ Additionally, when answering the di-

¹²³ Keach and De Laune, *Tropologia*, II:92.

¹²⁴ Keach and De Laune, *Tropologia*, II:93. ‘I lay down my Life freely, no Man taketh it from me ...’ John 10.18. Cf. John Owen, *The doctrine of justification by faith through the imputation of the righteousness of Christ, explained, confirmed, & vindicated* (London: for R. Boulter, 1677), 282; *Westminster Confession and Catechisms*.Art. VIII.iv

¹²⁵ Keach and De Laune, *Tropologia*, II:92, citing Luke 22.32.

¹²⁶ Keach, *The everlasting covenant*, 31. Cf. John Owen, *The Works of John Owen* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1862), XXII:501.

rect question, ‘*Is Christ a Surety to God for us, or of us to God?*’, Keach answered in like manner, stating that ‘God on his part had no need of a Surety to undertake for him’.¹²⁷ Ultimately, even in *Tropologia*, Keach consistently highlighted Christ’s role as surety being on behalf of humanity, ‘upon consideration of [humanity’s] Impotency or Inability to perform the Conditions of the first Covenant since the Fall’.¹²⁸ The single anomalous statement about Christ being a surety on God’s part did show Keach’s understanding of the complexity of these analogies and served to remind his audience that any anthropomorphism of God simply could not capture all the intricacies of the divine-human relationship.¹²⁹

In contrast to most human dealings, in this trope, the creditor took the responsibility for procuring the surety. ‘God [the Father] chose, called, and anointed Christ to this Office’.¹³⁰ Keach adamantly reiterated Christ’s joyful and obedient acceptance of this role, not having any aspect of the surety forced upon him.¹³¹ Thus, the significance of the appointment was not so much that God did the choosing but more so that humanity did *not* take part in that appointment. This office of surety was taken on humanity’s behalf but *not* with humanity’s consent or opinion taken into account. Simply put, the eternal divine council provided no other option for the surety.

In a discussion centering on the potential distinction between the *Covenant of Grace* and the *Covenant of Redemption*—a distinction against which Keach argued vehemently, Keach averred that the one who accepts the role of surety necessarily becomes a party with the debtor to the agreement in question. In this case, Christ, the surety, became a party with the Elect, the debtor. Otherwise, the Elect would have no part in any covenant with God. For Keach, the idea that God the Father made one covenant with God the Son and a separate, distinct covenant with the Elect ignored the

¹²⁷ Keach, *A golden mine opened*, 207.

¹²⁸ Keach and De Laune, *Tropologia*, II:92.

¹²⁹ This discussion cannot be explained simply by a development of Keach’s theology since some of the contradicting statements come in the same work. Additionally, already in *Tropologia*—published in 1681—Keach cited the same work of John Owen that proved so foundational to his argument that Christ only served as surety for humanity in both *The everlasting covenant* (published in 1693) and *A golden mine opened* (published in 1694).

¹³⁰ Keach and De Laune, *Tropologia*, II:93.

¹³¹ Keach, *The everlasting covenant*, 5, citing Heb. 10.7 & Prov. 8.31 (viewing Christ as Wisdom personified).

fact that the Elect had no credit with God.¹³² ‘The Lord [would] not Treat with him any more, nor enter into any Terms of Peace without a Surety’.¹³³ But because ‘Christ and ... his Elect, are but one Party’,¹³⁴ fallen humanity could be included in commerce with God. Thus, the hope for humanity came not from their having a separate covenant with God, but from their being considered a *single* party with their surety, Christ.

The final aspect of this trope which deserves mention at this juncture is Keach’s argument that the full compensation of the surety on behalf of the debtor in no way detracted from the graciousness of the covenant relationship. This, Keach argued, stood in direct contrast to the normal human understanding of a surety’s payment. To prove this point, Keach provided five arguments. First, God the Father, by grace, chose the surety who would act on behalf of fallen humanity. Second, God the Father graciously chose ‘to take satisfaction from another, which he might have exacted from [fallen humanity]’. Third, this gracious dealing occurred only because God the Father parted with His Son who, in turn, graciously laid down his own life. Fourth, Christ fulfilled the entirety of the agreement between God the Father and humanity’s surety, leaving nothing ‘more [for the Elect] to do, but to fall down on [their] Knees, and humbly acknowledg [their] Offences, and accept of a Pardon through Christ’s Mediation, and own him to be [their] Prince and Saviour’. Fifth, and most importantly, even that humility, that broken heart, that faith to accept Christ as prince and saviour were *all* given by the surety to the debtor. In this final point, Keach closely echoed the language of Isaac Chauncy and, consequently, Herman Witsius.¹³⁵

Combination of the Mediator and Surety Analogies

As with a multitude of tropes discussed by Keach, these two meta-analogies did not remain absolutely distinct throughout Keach’s writings. Often, the two terms—*mediator* and *surety*—appeared inseparable and even somewhat synonymous as Keach consistently handled the two issues in tandem, relying heavily upon the

¹³² Keach, *Spiritual melody*, Hymn 18.

¹³³ Keach, *The display of glorious grace*, 16.

¹³⁴ Keach, *A golden mine opened*, 208.

¹³⁵ Keach and De Laune, *Tropologia*, II:94. Also see Keach, *The display of glorious grace*, 20. Cf. Witsius, *The oeconomy of the covenants*, 386; Chauncy, *Neonomianism unmask’d*, 113; Chauncy cited Witsius.

phrase ‘mediator and surety’ much like Owen and numerous other Reformed divines.¹³⁶ However, he did not simply leave his reader to assume the connection between the two analogies. Rather, in a move displaying his theological deftness, Keach combined the two analogies with each of these terms referring to the ‘distinct Parts of the said one entire Covenant’.¹³⁷ Thus, Christ as mediator ‘*First Articled*’ with God the Father in the making of the covenant, and as surety, Christ actually executed that covenant. Keach clearly intended this combination of the two analogies to undermine the somewhat prevalent position—seen in Owen among others—which distinguished between the *Covenant of Grace* and the *Covenant of Redemption*. Though Keach saw his argument for a single *Covenant of Grace* as harmonizing well with his understanding of Reformed theology—in agreement with Isaac Chauncy, Samuel Petto, and the Westminster Assembly,¹³⁸ he also saw himself as making a valuable contribution to the discussion, innovatively using secular terminology to argue the theological concept of the covenant and pushing the metaphors to their rightful ends in order to further buttress the Reformed position.¹³⁹

The Holy Spirit¹⁴⁰

Despite the obvious focus on the First and Second Persons of the Trinity as seen in his two meta-analogies, Keach did not overlook the role of the Holy Spirit in his covenantal system. Nor did Keach limit the Holy Spirit’s activity to the original divine councils which established the covenants. Rather, Keach emphasized the role

¹³⁶ This was not unique to Keach as a large number of covenant theologians dealt with these two biblical terms in tandem. See, for example, Owen, *The doctrine of justification by faith*.

¹³⁷ Keach, *The everlasting covenant*, 15.

¹³⁸ Keach cited these three sources in support of his argument. See Keach, *The display of glorious grace*, 207-20. This position placed Keach at odds with some of his favorite theologians, including Owen who clearly distinguished between the *Covenant of Redemption* (between the Father and Son) and the *Covenant of Grace*. In this, Keach also distinguished himself from the covenant theology of Witsius. See Owen, *The doctrine of justification by faith*, 268; Witsius, *The oeconomy of the covenants*, 223.

¹³⁹ Keach significantly did *not* cite any other author in a sermon on the opening of trade between God and humanity. Keach made a habit of citing other authorities in his published sermons, so this lack of citation speaks loudly—though it is literally an argument from silence. See Keach, *The display of glorious grace*, 259-80. Note also the lack of commercial/secular language in Keach’s favorite sources: Isaac Chauncy and John Owen. See Chauncy, *Neonomianism unmask'd*; Owen, *Works*, see especially his commentary on Hebrews 7, vol. XXII. Also see the source of much of Chauncy’s work, Witsius, *The oeconomy of the covenants*.

¹⁴⁰ For a full discussion of Keach’s pneumatology, see Chapter IV, 114-27.

of the Holy Spirit throughout the covenantal system, even declaring that ‘the Holy Spirit is glorified, and his excellent Operations shew themselves, and shine forth in the Covenant of Grace’.¹⁴¹ For this discussion, Keach borrowed several key concepts from other Reformed divines (including Owen and Chauncy). For instance, both Chauncy and Owen discussed the Holy Spirit’s role in the establishment of the covenants in the divine councils.¹⁴² To that foundation, Keach added his own unique insights on his understanding of the Holy Spirit’s glorious role in the *Covenant of Grace*. Specifically, Keach identified three distinct, yet intimately related, aspects of His involvement in the covenantal scheme: the benefit of the *Covenant of Grace*, the seal of the covenant, and the basis for the union of Christ with the Elect.

Alongside the satisfaction for sins Christ made as the surety of the covenant, Keach identified the Holy Spirit as the primary benefit of the *Covenant of Grace*. According to this view, Christ’s fulfillment of the covenant actually ‘purchased or procured thereby a gracious conveyance of the Holy Spirit’.¹⁴³ Keach equated this conveyance with the in-dwelling of the Holy Spirit which served as the instrument by which the Elect became ‘the Lord’s People’.¹⁴⁴ Because of the Holy Spirit’s role as this instrumental cause, Keach averred that the Third Person of the Trinity sealed the *Covenant of Grace*.¹⁴⁵ Thus, as surely as the divine councils established the *Covenant of Grace* and as surely as the Second Person of the Trinity carried out His role in the covenants, the Holy Spirit would finish the work of the covenant. Keach argued that the terms of the covenant actually ‘obliged [the Holy Spirit] to perform’¹⁴⁶ His part which actually made possible the elect’s interest in Christ’s surety.¹⁴⁷ In other words,

¹⁴¹ Keach, *The everlasting covenant*, 27.

¹⁴² Chauncy, *Neonomianism unmask’d*, 125; Owen, *The doctrine of justification by faith*. Note the lack of this discussion in the Reformed confessions and in most treatises on the covenant. Cf. Rutherford, *The covenant of life opened*; Ames, *The marrow of sacred divinity*; Samuel Petto, *The difference between the old and new covenant stated and explained* (London: for Eliz. Calvert ... 1674). Especially note the lack of this discussion in any of the other Baptist divines.

¹⁴³ Keach, *A golden mine opened*, 204.

¹⁴⁴ Keach, *The display of glorious grace*, 245.

¹⁴⁵ Keach used the term *seal* in a variety of ways: as a royal seal, as a confirmation, as a sign of demarcation, as a preservation. See Keach and De Laune, *Tropologia*, II:309-10. Regardless of the specific use, the term always indicates an absolute certainty

¹⁴⁶ Keach, *A golden mine opened*, 204.

¹⁴⁷ Keach, *The everlasting covenant*, 31.

the Spirit did not stand by as a simple witness to the dealings of the Father and the Son. Rather, He actively involved Himself in every aspect, making the *Covenant of Grace* a thoroughly Trinitarian covenant. For this key concept, Keach did not cite any specific source. Nor did this concept appear in any of the major Reformed confessions, although the idea clearly aligned with the major Reformed divines.¹⁴⁸

Timing of the Covenant of Grace

Much like Owen, Keach surmised a three-fold division of the *Covenant of Works* regarding its actual effects in time. First, Keach discussed the transacting of the covenant terms, or the constitution of the covenant. Second, he separated the revelation or publication of the terms from that constitution. Finally, he argued that the application of the covenant formed the third division. Though they formed one irreducible covenant, each of these divisions could be discussed individually, and each had its own specific relationship to time.¹⁴⁹

The constitution of the *Covenant of Works* occurred, as has already been noted, in the divine council of the Godhead in eternity past. Logically, the second covenant occurred in light of the breaking of the first, but that distinction of before and after existed only in the internal working of God's mind, not in actual time. Thus, Keach could say that 'from Eternity ... [the covenant was] accordingly transacted with Christ, as the Representative of all the Elect'.¹⁵⁰ Likewise, Keach could assert that 'the Covenant of Grace in my Text, is called *an Everlasting Covenant*, and it may refer [sic] before time, as well as after all time; even from Eternity to Eternity'.¹⁵¹ Keach held that the confirmation and final fulfillment of the conditions of the covenant occurred at Christ's death and resurrection, an event which occurred both before the foundation of the world and in time before many (if not most) of the elect had been

¹⁴⁸ The closest direct statements can be found in the *Savoy Declaration* and the *Second London Confession* in Art. XVII: 'This Perseverance of the Saints, depends not upon their own free Will, but upon the immutability of the Decree of Election, flowing from the free and unchangeable Love of God the Father, upon the efficacy of the Merit and Intercession of Jesus Christ and union with him, the Oath of God, the abiding of his Spirit, and the Seed of God within them, and the Nature of the Covenant of Grace; from all which ariseth also the certainty and infallibility thereof.'

¹⁴⁹ Despite Owen's different terminology, Keach's views actually harmonized well with Owen's. See Owen, *The doctrine of justification by faith*, 202.

¹⁵⁰ Keach, *The everlasting covenant*, sig Bv (italics inverted).

¹⁵¹ Keach, *The everlasting covenant*, 11.

born. Thus, for Keach, Christ's death rendered God actually reconciled to the elect and fully satisfied, not merely potentially so.¹⁵² This further demonstrated the disparity between Keach's two-covenant scheme and the three-covenant scheme taught by many of his contemporaries, including Samuel Rutherford who argued that 'the Covenant of Reconciliation is no more eternall, then the creation'.¹⁵³

Though the constitution and transaction of the covenant had its origin in eternity, the publication or revelation of the *Covenant of Grace* occurred completely in time.¹⁵⁴ Keach's understanding of the revelation of the covenant included numerous different editions. The initial announcement necessarily occurred *after* the breaking of the first covenant when God gave Adam the promise of the protoevangelion.¹⁵⁵ Keach enumerated no less than eight different iterations of the *Covenant of Grace*—and he made no claims to being exhaustive in that enumeration.¹⁵⁶ Interestingly, Keach understood this multiple-announcement scheme to apply to both the *Covenant of Grace* and the *Covenant of Works*, identifying almost as many editions of the first covenant as he did for the second.¹⁵⁷ In one instance, Keach actually saw both covenants being announced simultaneously: God announced the first covenant to Abraham and his fleshly seed while He announced the *Covenant of Grace* to Abraham and his spiritual seed.¹⁵⁸ This simultaneous double announcement—which echoed Ames's concept of 'administrations' of the covenant¹⁵⁹—allowed Keach to see a unity in the covenant theme from the Old Testament to the New Testament.¹⁶⁰

The final division of the *Covenant of Grace* could be seen in the personal application of the covenant promises. This application not only happened in time, but it happened individually within the life of each member of the elect. Agreeing with Sa-

¹⁵² Keach, *The articles of the faith*, Art. XIII. This laid the foundation for Keach's understanding of predestinarian justification. See Chapter VI.

¹⁵³ Rutherford, *The covenant of life opened*, 310.

¹⁵⁴ Keach, *The everlasting covenant*, sig. Bv.

¹⁵⁵ Keach, *The everlasting covenant*, 11. Also Ames, *The marrow of sacred divinity*, 194.

¹⁵⁶ Keach, *The ax laid to the root*, II:18.

¹⁵⁷ Thus, the first covenant was given to Adam first and primarily. Then, it was repeated to Abraham, Moses, the Nation of Israel, etc. See Keach, *The ax laid to the root*, II:15.

¹⁵⁸ Keach, *The ax laid to the root*, I:3.

¹⁵⁹ Ames, *The marrow of sacred divinity*, 198ff.

¹⁶⁰ Keach used this unity in his argumentation against paedobaptism.

muel Petto, Keach argued that although all of the foederal conditions of the *Covenant of Grace* had been fulfilled by Christ, the individual member of the elect could not partake of the promises of the covenant until Christ's merits had been applied to the individual.¹⁶¹ Keach even went so far as to call the idea of eternal personal justification 'absurd and improper'.¹⁶² He did, however, maintain that the personal application of Christ's merits was contained in the promises of the covenant.¹⁶³ Thus, Keach could honestly and with logical consistency hold to both the eternal, monergistic view of salvation under the terms of the *Covenant of Grace* and the temporal, personal application of that covenant. Additionally, because the covenant promises included everything necessary for personal application which was brought about by the Holy Spirit,¹⁶⁴ the application of Christ's merits could be considered absolutely certain, 'confirm'd and ratified by Christ's Blood'.¹⁶⁵ This language once again demonstrated Keach's reliance upon the theology of William Ames who argued for a 'certaine foregoing application of our redemption' because 'the Father and the Sonne are said to send the Spirit to performe this application'.¹⁶⁶

Comparison of the Two Covenants

Simply by understanding his two main allegories, one can already ascertain Keach's understanding of how the two covenants compared. However, several specific comparisons deserve to be noted in order to gain a clear understanding of Keach's covenantal thought: the length of validity for each; the respective conditions of each covenant; the participants involved in each covenant.

¹⁶¹ Keach and De Laune, *Tropologia*, II:94. Cf. Petto, *The difference between the old and new covenant*, 264.

¹⁶² Keach, *The display of glorious grace*, 302. For a full discussion of the implications of this doctrine on Keach's understanding of justification, see Chapter VI.

¹⁶³ Keach, *A golden mine opened*, 149.

¹⁶⁴ Keach, *A golden mine opened*, 208.

¹⁶⁵ Keach, *A golden mine opened*, 209.

¹⁶⁶ Ames, *The marrow of sacred divinity*, 112.

Length of Validity

Despite their common beginnings in the councils of eternity past,¹⁶⁷ the two covenants did not have similar endings. The first covenant, the *Covenant of Works*, applied to all humanity,¹⁶⁸ but, as a covenant, it had a definite end. At the point when Christ performed its requirements, ‘the Old Covenant ceas’d or was abrogated’.¹⁶⁹ This idea of abrogation, however, referred to this covenant’s role as a justifying force and not to its role as a ‘Moral Law’.¹⁷⁰ As such, Keach considered the first covenant an ‘unchangable ... Law’¹⁷¹ with continuing authority.

In contrast, the second, or new, covenant had no end, garnering the biblical term, ‘the Everlasting Covenant’.¹⁷² Keach was not a naive reader of Scripture ignorant of the complexities of biblical terminology. Rather, he understood that biblical terms did not always take their apparent meaning. Specifically, Keach understood and acknowledged that the term *everlasting* did not necessarily mean ‘forever’; it could be ‘taken with restriction, and denot[e] only a long period of Time’.¹⁷³ Despite acknowledging this possibility, Keach argued that this was not the case regarding the second covenant. As proof, Keach turned to the fact that Christ already accepted and fulfilled the aspects of the *Covenant of Grace*, leaving no possibility for this covenant to be broken, no possibility for its validity to cease or for it to be abrogated.

Respective Conditions

As with almost every other theologian who discussed these matters, Keach understood the first covenant to be entirely conditional. This covenant ‘was made

¹⁶⁷ Keach never stated precisely when the first covenant was conceived or transacted, only that it was broken before (logically-speaking) the transacting of the second covenant. See the discussion above under the section entitled *Timing of the Covenants in Relation to the Fall*, 148-9.

¹⁶⁸ Keach, *The display of glorious grace*, 14.

¹⁶⁹ Keach, *The everlasting covenant*, 17.

¹⁷⁰ Keach, *The display of glorious grace*, 103, 113-14.

¹⁷¹ Keach, *The display of glorious grace*, 103. Keach clearly distinguished between the Decalogue, a culturally specific law for a particular people—namely Israel, and the moral law itself which was part and parcel of the *Covenant of Works* and applied to all people as a measure of morality. See Keach, *Jewish Sabbath abrogated*, 125-33, esp. 126-7.

¹⁷² Thus, Keach titled the funeral sermon for Henry Forty, ‘The everlasting covenant, a sweet cordial for a drooping soul ...’

¹⁷³ Keach, *A counter-antidote*, 45.

upon mutual Restipulation between God and [Adam]¹⁷⁴ with the requirement of perfect obedience.¹⁷⁵ Keach was no stranger to the common paraphrase of this covenant which demonstrated its conditional quality: *do this and live*. Attempting to classify the second covenant, however, involved a much more complex discussion, especially because Keach rejected the three-covenant system. Those who held to a *Covenant of Grace* as distinct from a *Covenant of Redemption*, traditionally saw the latter as being between God the Father and God the Son and being unconditional, or assured. The former, on the other hand, was seen as being based on the condition of faith (which usually included obedience to God's Law).¹⁷⁶ Much like the Baptist, Thomas Collier, Keach found himself needing to walk a fine theological line, distancing himself from those who held to conditional redemption—which Keach saw as heresy—while at the same time remaining true to the biblical account which linked salvation with faith. Unlike Collier, who was later labeled a heretic by the London Association for, among other things, his Amyrauldian soteriology, Keach ably balanced these doctrines, enabling him to remain an active and influential participant among the London Particular Baptists.¹⁷⁷

Keach avoided the easy out of simply declaring the second covenant to be an unconditional promise.¹⁷⁸ Rather, he presented the complex idea of a 'twofold, or a mixt Covenant'. On the one hand, the *Covenant of Grace* referred to Christ's work, and, as such, 'it was a Conditional Covenant' based 'wholly upon the account of his

¹⁷⁴ Keach, *The display of glorious grace*, 178.

¹⁷⁵ Keach, *The everlasting covenant*, 29.

¹⁷⁶ Keach, *The everlasting covenant*, 30. See Rutherford, *The covenant of life opened*, 309; Williams, *Gospel-truth stated*, 53. In contrast, see Chauncy, *Neonomianism unmask'd*, 120.

¹⁷⁷ Keach, *The ax laid to the root*, To the Reader, ii. Cf. Thomas Collier, *A discourse of the true gospel blessedness in the New Covenant, or, The distinction of the two Covenants, new and old, first and second with the doing away of the first, and the establishment of the second* (London: H. Hills for the author, 1659), 27. It is important to note that by the time Keach came into his influential position among the London Particular Baptists, Collier had fallen into disrepute in Particular Baptist circles. Thus, his works held little influence among the London Particular Baptists. Though Collier's covenantal scheme was similar to Keach's, it was not as fully developed. For instance, Collier did not discuss the federalist notion of a prelapsarian covenant. See Collier, *A discourse of the true gospel blessedness*, 6. Nor did Keach cite Collier on the covenant in any of his works.

¹⁷⁸ This intricacy in Keach's thought was completely overlooked by J. Barry Vaughn who simply stated that '[For Keach, t]he new covenant is absolute...' Vaughn, 'Public Worship and Practical Theology', 64. Riker provided a much more nuanced reading of this detail of Keach's theology. See Riker, 'A Catholic Reformed Theologian', 123.

own Desert, or Merits'.¹⁷⁹ On the other hand, when speaking of humanity's role in the *Covenant of Grace*, Keach claimed 'it is wholly in a way of Free Grace and Favour', 'an absolute Covenant as to us'.¹⁸⁰

Complicating the idea of a 'mixt covenant', Keach also presented a complex understanding of conditions which he divided into two groups: fœderal conditions defined as *intitling conditions* or *procuring conditions*¹⁸¹ and conditions of connexion, also called *fœderalia relata*,¹⁸² referring to necessary coincidentals, a concept for which he was admittedly indebted to Isaac Chauncy.¹⁸³ According to this view, the works which Christ performed to bring about the terms of peace—both as Mediator and Surety—served to fulfill the fœderal conditions required by the *Covenant of Grace*. Following the Westminster Assembly, Keach accepted the idea that this covenant included other conditions. However, any conditions other than those laid on the shoulders of the mediator and surety were merely conditions of connexion which necessarily occurred when the covenant was fulfilled but did not *cause* that fulfillment.¹⁸⁴

As an example, Keach argued that the *Covenant of Grace* included creation as a condition, because no one could possibly participate in the covenant without being created. However, only those who held to universal redemption could argue that creation *causes* a person to participate in the covenant, and Keach (and the vast majority even of his opponents) definitely did not fall into that camp. Other conditions of connexion included the hearing of the Word—because the normal method God used to announce the covenant was the preaching of the Word, living in holiness, and the giving of the Spirit. All of these conditions of connexion come to the human participant

¹⁷⁹ Keach, *The display of glorious grace*, 172.

¹⁸⁰ Keach, *The display of glorious grace*, 172, 178. In the margin next to the second quotation, Keach acknowledged his insistence upon the absolute nature of this covenant. 'I repeat this often because I would have it fastened on the mind of the Reader.' The Westminster Assembly also presented the *Covenant of Grace* as a 'mixt covenant'. See the discussion above in the section entitled *Westminster Assembly: the Cementing of Federal Theology*, 136-7. Also see *Westminster Confession and Catechisms*, LC 82. Isaac Chauncy presented an almost identical view of the 'mixt covenant' and was a source for Keach's system. See Chauncy, *Neonomianism unmask'd*, 113ff.

¹⁸¹ Keach, *The display of glorious grace*, 186-87.

¹⁸² Keach, *The everlasting covenant*, 35.

¹⁸³ Keach followed Dr. C[hauncy?]'s discussion in *Logick*. See Keach, *The display of glorious grace*, 186. Also see Chauncy, *Neonomianism unmask'd*, 116-17. Owen presented a similar discussion, though he did not use the same terminology. See Owen, *The doctrine of justification by faith*, 143.

¹⁸⁴ *Westminster Confession and Catechisms*, LC 81-82.

by an act of free grace, being the fruit—not the cause—of the covenant, contained in the promises of the *Covenant of Grace*. Significantly, Keach also included faith as a condition of connexion:

Tho we have not Christ without Faith, so we have not Faith without Christ, and both are promised and given freely, and Faith it self is not a purchasing and procuring Condition of the Blessings promised, but one of the Blessings of the Covenant, and free and absolute Promises of God ... one is not the *federal Condition* of another, but both come in as the Gift of Grace.¹⁸⁵

This understanding of the covenantal conditions allowed Keach to maintain the necessity of faith, etc. while at the same time continue to hold to his monergistic soteriology where ‘Election to everlasting life is an absolute act of God’s sovereign Grace, without any respect had to our foreseen Faith’.¹⁸⁶

Participants: a Federalist Understanding

Publick Person

The identification of the participants involved in each covenant stands as the final aspect of comparison needing detailed discussion. At first glance, this simple identification appears rather straightforward. God and Adam were the participants in the first, prelapsarian, covenant. In the second covenant, God the Father and God the Son agreed to the terms and ‘struck hands’,¹⁸⁷ signifying their mutual consent. Thus the primary participants of the covenants were God and Adam, in the first, and God the Father and God the Son, in the second.

However, Keach utilized the federal concept of a ‘publick person’ to fully identify the participants.¹⁸⁸ According to this concept, the primary recipients of the covenant—Adam and Jesus Christ—served as the ‘Root, common Head and Repre-

¹⁸⁵ Keach, *Gospel mysteries unveil'd*, I:192.

¹⁸⁶ Keach, *Gospel mysteries unveil'd*, II:240. For a fuller discussion of Keach’s soteriology, see Chapter VI.

¹⁸⁷ Keach, *The everlasting covenant*, 5.

¹⁸⁸ Cf. Owen, *The doctrine of justification by faith*, 310, etc. Nehemiah Coxe followed Owen at this point, stating ‘[t]hat those Covenants which God hath made ... it hath pleased him first to transact with some *publick Person, Head, or Representative*, for all others that should be concerned in them’. Coxe, *A discourse of the covenants*, 12.

sentative'¹⁸⁹ of their respective posterity. Thus, Adam was set up as the publick person representing all humanity,¹⁹⁰ and Christ was established as the representative of all the elect.¹⁹¹ By this concept of representation, these covenants included more than just Adam, Jesus Christ, and God the Father as participants.¹⁹² Indeed, the covenants then necessarily included all of humanity in one or both of the covenants.

Imputation

The effects of Keach's concept of the publick person extended beyond the inclusion of the respective posterities in covenant participation. For Keach, those posterities were not only included in the covenants by representation, they *actually* broke the first covenant with Adam and *actually* upheld the second covenant with Christ. This concept, this imputation, allowed Keach—along with the majority of Reformed Protestants—to see all humanity as fallen not just because of their own actions but simply because of Adam's actions being counted as their own.¹⁹³ Thus, 'both *Jews* and *Gentiles* lie under the guilt of *Adam's* Transgression, it being imputed to them'.¹⁹⁴ Likewise, in order for that imputed guilt to be erased, Christ's righteousness must be imputed to His seed, the elect. This is done 'without inherent Righteousness wrought in [them], or good Works done by [them]'.¹⁹⁵

Implications

Because of its very nature as an organizing concept, any theologians' version of covenant theology necessarily carried with it far-reaching implications. Benjamin

¹⁸⁹ Keach, *The everlasting covenant*, 4.

¹⁹⁰ Keach, *The display of glorious grace*, 14.

¹⁹¹ Keach, *The marrow of true justification*, 15-16.

¹⁹² Keach, *The display of glorious grace*, 213-14.

¹⁹³ E.g., Owen termed this imputation *propter relationem foederalem*. Owen, *The doctrine of justification by faith*, 236. Though this was generally accepted within Reformed circles, Arminians and those leaning toward Arminianism often rejected this imputation. See, for instance, Grantham, *Christianismus primitivus*, II.ii.67.

¹⁹⁴ Keach, *The marrow of true justification*, 5.

¹⁹⁵ Keach, *A golden mine opened*, 86. See Chapter VI.

Keach's covenant theology, or (more properly) his *federalist theology*,¹⁹⁶ served as a foundational concept for his understanding of justification and soteriology and thereby affected all aspects of his theology. Surprisingly, he never connected his covenant theology with his ecclesiology, despite penning a church covenant to be used as a basis for congregational membership.¹⁹⁷ A few more intricate implications deserve mention at this juncture.

For Keach, the covenantal scheme was nothing if not a cause for joyous celebration. The certainty of the everlasting covenant, the peace that resulted from Christ's fulfillment of the covenant stipulations, the re-establishment of a line of credit between God and humanity: these all served as '[a] Sweet CORDIAL for a drooping Soul'.¹⁹⁸ Indeed, without the biblical covenant of grace, humanity had no ground for salvation, hope, desire, or consolation. But because of Christ's work as mediator and surety of this 'better covenant', humanity had reason to rejoice. Keach could honestly entreat his congregation to sing:

That such who guilty be,
Should by another's righteousness
From sin and guilt be free.

All praise and glory unto God,
And to the Son therefore;
And to the Holy Ghost let us
Sing praise for evermore.¹⁹⁹

The nature of his federal scheme also provided the grounds for assurance. Because the second covenant was truly based on free grace where humanity was concerned, the effects of that covenant could not be lost by the elect. Keach's covenantal scheme provided each individual with a measured ability to confirm his/her status as a member of the elect precisely because the works of the Law—which could only truly

¹⁹⁶ According to the definitions discussed at the opening of the chapter, Benjamin Keach subscribed to a federalist theology. He clearly held to a prelapsarian *Covenant of Works* between God and Adam, and he also taught a *publick person* concept of the first and second Adams.

¹⁹⁷ The only instance where Keach connected the organizing covenants with church covenants appeared in a lengthy citation of Isaac Chauncy who, tangentially, argued that church covenants did not necessitate a three-covenant scheme. See Keach, *The display of glorious grace*, 211.

¹⁹⁸ Keach, *The everlasting covenant*, title page.

¹⁹⁹ Keach, *Spiritual melody*, Hymn 19.

be performed by the Holy Spirit—could justify (or verify) a person’s faith to him/herself and to others.

Benjamin Keach’s Uniquenesses?

In *The display of glorious grace*, Benjamin Keach claimed to present a new method for teaching the *Covenant of Grace*.²⁰⁰ In this work, Keach made a point of describing the *Covenant of Grace* as the *Covenant of Peace*. Inasmuch as he referred to this as his innovation, one can hardly argue with his claim.²⁰¹ In this work—and consistently throughout his writings—he focused his covenant theology on the return of peace to two warring parties whose relationship had suffered a major breach or two traders, who, for lack of credit, had no hope of conducting business. Though Keach could not claim innovation of those two analogies—indeed, they were both based on biblical tropes—he did innovatively move those analogies to the forefront of the discussion, utilizing them as organizing features.²⁰² Additionally, by highlighting not only the covenant workings of the Father and the Son but also the extremely important covenantal role of the Holy Spirit, Keach made his covenantal system overtly Trinitarian, a stance which separated Keach’s view from that of the major Reformed confessions of his day and from that of most other divines—especially those of the Baptist persuasion.²⁰³

As for the overarching doctrine of covenant theology, Keach did not see himself as being an innovator at all. Rather, he actually claimed to be a defender of the

²⁰⁰ Keach, *The display of glorious grace*, To the Reader, v.

²⁰¹ Riker assumed that Keach’s claim to innovation referred to the joining of the covenant of grace with the covenant of redemption and, thus, dismissed the claim. Riker’s assumption, however, was fundamentally flawed since Keach (in that work) cited several authors in support of the joining of those two covenants, including Dr. Chauncy and the Westminster Divines. Keach, *The display of glorious grace*, 211, 216. Surely, Keach would not have claimed to be the innovator of an argument which he credited to other authors! See Riker, ‘A Catholic Reformed Theologian’, 126.

²⁰² The term *meta-analogy* has been used in recognition of Keach’s innovative use of these analogies in an organizing manner.

²⁰³ The significance of Keach’s emphasis of the Holy Spirit’s role in the covenantal system has been missed by previous research. Cf. Riker, ‘A Catholic Reformed Theologian’; Vaughn, ‘Public Worship and Practical Theology’; Spears, ‘The Baptist Movement in England’. Vaughn rightly highlighted Keach’s emphasis on union with Christ; however, he inexplicably failed to connect this to either Keach’s covenantal scheme or the covenantal workings of the Holy Spirit. Vaughn, ‘Public Worship and Practical Theology’, 195, 198-215. Of the eight times Riker mentioned union with Christ, the Holy Spirit’s role was only mentioned in three, and none of those provided any exposition of Keach’s view. Riker, ‘A Catholic Reformed Theologian’, 87, 121 (second mention of union with Christ), 129.

Reformed tradition, constantly relying on Reformed divines as support for his arguments. On the issue of covenant theology his two favorite sources were Isaac Chauncy and John Owen,²⁰⁴ two Independent Reformed ministers who, like Keach, held to a federal understanding of the covenants. But Keach did not rely exclusively on those two divines, sometimes aligning his covenantal scheme with other Reformed theologians such as William Ames and Samuel Petto, and, at other times, disagreeing with most Reformed divines, even including Owen and Chauncy. He also sought to demonstrate that his covenant theology harmonized well with the Westminster Assembly. In the end, Keach's basic two-covenant organization aligned him most closely with a specific group of Reformed divines while allowing him to display his own independent thought.

²⁰⁴ Riker called John Owen 'Keach's darling', stating that Owen was Keach's 'most cherished and positively mentioned author'. Riker, 'A Catholic Reformed Theologian', 64. This may be true, but—at least on the issue of the covenants—Keach held Isaac Chauncy in nearly the same esteem.

CHAPTER VI: JUSTIFICATION

Significance of the Doctrine

From the beginning of the Reformation (and even before), justification became ensconced as *the* centerpiece of theological debate, such that ‘by the beginning of the seventeenth century the *articulus iustificationis* appears to have been generally regarded as the *articulus stantis et cadentis ecclesiae*, the “article by which the church stands or falls”.’¹ Even in the British Isles, where the Reformation was often driven more by political than theological motives, the doctrine of justification held a position of preeminence—even determining the boundaries for different political groups within the Church of England.²

What was true in the Church of England, in this case, could also be accurately applied to the English Baptists since their inception. In their earliest days, the English Baptist leader and co-founder, Thomas Helwys (c.1575–c.1614), made the doctrine of justification the subject of one of his first works, published at a time when the rest of the theological world also focused on the doctrine of justification during the buildup to the Synod of Dort.³ Once the Helwys-led group returned to British soil, other Baptists joined the debate regarding specifics of justification beginning with Helwys’ successor, John Murton (c.1587–c.1626), who, in 1620, published his own view of justification.⁴ Thomas Lamb (d. 1673?),⁵ the leader of a congregation meeting at Bell Alley,

¹ Alister E. McGrath, *Iustitia Dei: a History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 208. McGrath cited Reinhard Schwarz for the quotation. R. Schwarz, ‘Luthers Rechtfertigungslehre als Eckstein der christlichen Theologie und Kirche’, *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 10 (1998), 14-46. Keach certainly agreed with McGrath’s assessment, arguing that, according to Luther, ‘Justification est Doctrina stantis & cadentis Ecclesiae’. Keach, *The marrow of true justification*, title page.

² Specifically, in the early seventeenth century, the Laudians, with their distinct anti-predestinarian view of justification, ascended to power within the Church of England.

³ Thomas Helwys, *A short and plaine prooffe by the word, and workes off God, that Gods decree is not the cause off anye mans sinne or condemnation And that all men are redeamed by Christ. As also. That no infants are condemned* (Amsterdam?: s.n., 1611).

⁴ John Murton, *A discription [sic] of what God hath predestinated concerning man in his [brace] creation, transgression, & regeneration* (London?: s.n., 1620).

⁵ Note the uncertainty of Lamb’s death date. There were two Thomas Lambs who were involved with the General Baptists in the middle of the seventeenth century. One Lamb probably died in 1673 and the

Coleman Street, entered the fray with a treatise on justification in 1642.⁶ By 1644, this issue had become such a staple of the early Baptist identity that the congregations organized distinct denominations around the issue. In that year, seven congregations officially cemented that distinction when, in their *1644 London Confession*, they made some aspects of justification key to determining communion.⁷

The Context

Keach's Evangelical and Theological Conversions

When Benjamin Keach began his ministry among the Buckinghamshire Baptists, he entered into a world that was defined by specific views of justification. Then under the leadership of John Russel, later a signatory of the General Baptist *Orthodox Creed* (1679),⁸ the Buckinghamshire Baptists held to a view of the atonement based on the idea that Christ died for all people, a general view of the atonement.⁹ By the time he rose to prominence among the London Baptists in the last two decades of the seventeenth century, however, Keach had repudiated that doctrine of general atonement and become something of a zealot for the Reformed doctrine of justification, including the accompanying view of particular redemption. Because only one of the two works he wrote before he adopted Reformed theology remained extant beyond the 1660s,¹⁰ little about his original understanding of the doctrine of justification or

other in 1686. The author of the publication in question also signed *The humble apology of some commonly called Anabaptists*; however, according to the *ODNB*, nothing is known of him after that time. Greaves provided 1673 as the year of his death but gave no support for that claim. See *ODNB*; *BDBR*.

⁶ Thomas Lamb, *A treatise of particular predestination vvherein ar[e] answered three letters* (London: s.n., 1642).

⁷ Note Articles IV, XVII, XIX. For the purpose of this work, the question of origin of what would become the two distinct denominations is not important. Recently, some questions about the long-accepted view of distinct origins of these two groups, defended ably by B.R. White, have been raised by Stephen Wright. Cf. B. R. White, *The English Baptists of the Seventeenth Century* (Didcot: Baptist Historical Society, 1996); Stephen Wright, *The Early English Baptists, 1603-1649* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2006).

⁸ Arnold H. J. Baines, 'The Signatories of the Orthodox Confession of 1679, pt 4', *Baptist Quarterly* 17 (1957), 171.

⁹ The fact that their pastor signed the *Orthodox Creed* and that Keach felt he had to renounce his previous Arminian errors demonstrated this church's beliefs. *Orthodox Creed*, Art. XVIII.

¹⁰ Those two works were a catechetical work entitled *Child's instructor; or, A new and easy primmer* (1664), which was condemned by Judge Hyde for heresy—all copies were burned; and *Zion in distress*

the development of his beliefs can be known with certainty;¹¹ however, after his conversion, Keach penned no less than eleven works which specifically focused on the doctrine of justification.¹² He used those works and his pulpit to clarify his views of justification, attacking those he deemed to be heretical, preaching his view to his hearers in Southwark and on evangelistic trips commissioned by the General Assembly,¹³ and even perhaps attempting to convert the General Baptist Church in High Wycombe to his new persuasion.¹⁴ Thus, Keach had ample opportunity to expound his full-fledged understanding of justification.

The Impetus for Keach's Exposition

Given the inherent importance of the doctrine of justification, the fact that a significant preacher such as Keach would preach and write on the subject should not be surprising. In fact, one would be hard-pressed to find a preacher or theologian of this era who did not add his own take on justification to the already densely-populated theological landscape. The issue regarding the impetus for Keach's elucidation of his version of justification, thus, is not merely why he discussed the topic, but why he discussed this doctrine *when* he did. For Keach, discovering the impetus for that discussion proves to be rather simple, albeit extremely important for understanding the content of his doctrine.

(1666). Keach did acknowledge his theological shift, and 'disowned' his earlier 'Arminian Errors' in his earliest work. Keach, *A golden mine opened*, 314-15.

¹¹ The best view of Keach's probable early doctrine of justification can be found in the *Standard Confession* (1660), a General Baptist document signed by, among numerous others, Joseph Keach (spelled Keeich on the original document), Benjamin's brother. *Standard Confession*, 12. Clint Bass argued that the *Standard Confession* represents a form of General Baptist theology which followed the teachings of Henry Denne. Denne's theology of 'general election', as evidenced by the writing of James Browne, *Scripture redemption freed from mens restrictions* (1653), allowed the signatories of the *Standard Confession* to hold to both election not based on foreseen faith *and* general atonement. See Bass, 'Thomas Grantham and General Baptist Theology', 198-200.

¹² Those works include: *The grand imposter discovered* (1675) [this was a polemical work against Quaker theology], *Travels of true godliness* (1683), *Gold refin'd* (1689), *The marrow of true justification* (1692), *The everlasting covenant* (1693), *A trumpet blown in Zion* (1694), *A golden mine opened* (1694), *Light broke forth in Wales* (1696), *A medium betwixt two extremes* (1698), *The display of glorious grace* (1698), and *Gospel mysteries unveil'd* (1701). Most of Keach's other works also touch on this doctrine, though somewhat more tangentially.

¹³ *Narrative of the proceedings [1690]*, 7.

¹⁴ In 1697, the High Wycombe church wrote to the elders of the London Association, asking them to curtail Keach's meddling in their affairs. Whitley suggested this meddling centered around predestinarian issues. Whitley, ed. *Minutes*, I:45-47. Cf. W. T. Whitley, *The Church Books of Ford or Cuddington and Amersham in the County of Bucks* (London: printed for the Society by Kingsgate Press, 1912).

Already by the time he published his first work on justification, Keach had gained popularity as an allegorical writer and (perhaps) as an author of children's catechisms and primers.¹⁵ By the 1690s, his most prolific decade with regard to publications discussing justification, his popularity had multiplied nearly exponentially.¹⁶ Additionally, Nehemiah Coxe, whom the Particular Baptists had deployed to confront Thomas Collier's heterodox beliefs, died just as the major controversy over justification in the second half of the seventeenth century was brewing. Thus, when the theology of the Particular Baptists was challenged, Keach was the natural respondent. Keach even acknowledged that his own desires, at times, did not include the publication of certain sermons or works, but the pressure from others forced his capitulation. That pressure, one can reasonably assume, drove Keach into service as an unofficial (at times, official) spokesperson of the Particular Baptists. When he entered into those debates on justification, he envisioned himself as a defender of the Reformed tradition, a claim which provided the first insight into his theological framework.¹⁷

Debates with Quakers

Participants

The timing of Keach's relevant publications could not be more helpful in providing insight into the impetus behind his writings. Keach left no room for doubt as to the purpose of his first work on justification whose title explained Keach's thought:

¹⁵ Keach's allegorical work, *War with the devil*, was a 'best-seller' in 1673. This work continued to be a best-seller throughout the eighteenth century. He had also published his original catechetical work which was burned by the order of Judge Hyde, stopping that work from becoming a best-seller. Keach *did* re-write this work, evidently from memory, and re-published it as *The child's delight*. The date of this re-publication is unknown—although, in 1694, he mentioned having already corrected his Arminian errors; thus, the effect of this work on his reputation in the mid-1670s remains uncertain.

¹⁶ By that point in his career, Keach's writings routinely entered into multiple editions, and he had developed a reputation as more than an allegorical writer. He wrote several polemical works—*The gospel minister's maintenance vindicated* (1689), *Gold refin'd* (1689) (this work was primarily a polemical defense of believers' baptism, but also included lengthy discussions of justification and is, thus, listed among the ten works focusing on justification. In *Light broke forth in Wales* (1696) Keach also dealt extensively with justification in a work ostensibly focused on believers' baptism); an extremely well-received academic work, *Tropologia* (1681); several book-length poems, *The glorious lover* (1679) and *Sion in distress* (1681); and two other best-selling allegories, *The travels of True Godliness* (1683) and *The progress of sin* (1684). These were all in addition to several sermons and other treatises. In short, the late 1670s and 1680s saw Keach earn a reputation as a prolific author.

¹⁷ Keach, *The marrow of true justification*, Epistle Dedicatory, sig. A2r-Bv.

The grand impostor discovered: or, The Quakers doctrine weighed in the ballance, and found wanting, a poem. Published in 1675, this book-length poem came in the midst of a drawn-out debate between the Particular Baptist minister, Thomas Hicks, and several prominent Quakers. That debate included at least four public disputations between 1672 and 1674 and several printed works by both sides.¹⁸ Although Keach did not mention these titles by name in his work, he certainly would have been familiar with the events surrounding the debates—not only because he was already a minister in Southwark at the time but also because he was well acquainted with several of the Baptists who were involved behind the scenes, including Hanserd Knollys, William Kiffin, and Henry Forty.¹⁹

Quaker Doctrine of Justification

The three major Quaker theologians involved in these debates, George Whitehead (1637-1724), William Penn, and Isaac Penington²⁰ were (along with George Fox) the major Quaker theologians of the period. As such the trio largely defined the sect's doctrine of justification, much of it amid debates like the one in question. Quaker theology, with its heavy emphasis on the individual's relationship with God via direct communication and *the Light Within*, was not entirely uniform or systematized. However, several key aspects of their doctrine of justification caused problems for the Particular Baptists, in general, and Benjamin Keach, in specific.

William Penn highlighted the Quaker repulsion at the most prominent Reformed view of justification, a doctrine Penn called the 'Vulgar Doctrine of Satisfaction, being dependent on the Second Person of the Trinity'.²¹ Penn specifically found

¹⁸ Thomas Hicks and William Kiffin, *The Quakers appeal answer'd, or, A full relation of the occasion, progress, and issue of a meeting held in Barbican the 28th of August last past* (London: for Peter Parker, 1674). Also Crosby, *History*, II:294-312.

¹⁹ All of these men signed a statement exonerating Thomas Hicks from charges of falsifying accusations in his debates against the Quakers. For a discussion of Keach's connections to these men, see Chapter II, 17-21. Keach was close enough to Henry Forty to preach his funeral sermon in 1693.

²⁰ Nigel Smith called George Whitehead the most important Quaker in London by the early 1670s. *ODNB*. Mary Geiter argued that Penn, together with Fox, was responsible for creating 'a coherent Quaker philosophy'. *ODNB*. William Braithwaite identified Isaac Penington as 'the best clue to the theological explanation that the Quakerism of the seventeenth century had to give of its religious faith'. William C. Braithwaite, *The Second Period of Quakerism* (Cambridge: University Press, 1961), 380.

²¹ William Penn, *The sandy foundation shaken: or, Those so generally believed ... doctrines, of one God, existing in three distinct ... persons &c. ... refuted* (London: s.n., 1668), 16. See also George

the idea that God could not ‘remit or forgive without a Plenary satisfaction ... inflicting the penalty of infinite wrath and vengeance on Jesus Christ the Second Person of the Trinity’²² to be entirely unbiblical and demeaning to God and ‘very repugnant to the Conditions, Nature, and Tendency of that second Covenant’.²³ Instead, the Quakers held to a complete forgiveness based on nothing more than divine mercy, simply because the law had been abrogated by the second covenant.²⁴

Attacking the idea of justification by anything other than personal, ‘actual obedience unto Righteousness’,²⁵ the Quakers argued that this ‘way of imputation’²⁶ supported licentiousness and portrayed God as a liar or, worse, ‘guilty of what the [S]criptures say is an abomination ... that he justifieth the wicked’.²⁷ Simply put, the Quakers argued that ‘men are not justified, nor made righteous while unsanctified’.²⁸

Antinomianism-Neonomianism

*The Antinomian Controversies*²⁹

As with *The Grand Impostor*, aimed at the Quaker doctrine of justification in 1675, the impetus for Keach’s works on justification in the 1690s could not be more apparent. In this case, the flare-up of a controversy regarding the role of faith and the law in justification, known as the Antinomian Controversy, precipitated this exposition of justification. Two specific details demonstrate Keach’s reasons for writing.

Whitehead, *The divinity of Christ and unity of the three that bear record in Heaven* (London: s.n., 1669), 78-80. Note, specifically, the omission of a satisfaction view of the atonement from Penington’s discussion of the gospel. Isaac Penington, *The everlasting Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ and the blessed effects thereof testified to by experience* (London: s.n., 1678).

²² Penn, *The sandy foundation shaken*, 16 (italics inverted). Cf. George Whitehead, *The Christianity of the people commonly called Quakers, vindicated from antichristian opposition* (London: s.n., 1690), 7.

²³ Penn, *The sandy foundation shaken*, 19-20.

²⁴ Penn, *The sandy foundation shaken*, 19; Isaac Penington and George Fox, *Some principles of the elect people of God in scorn called Quakers* (London: s.n., 1671), 92-4.

²⁵ Penn, *The sandy foundation shaken*, 29.

²⁶ Isaac Penington, *The way of life and death made manifest and set before men* (London: 1658), 27.

²⁷ Penn, *The sandy foundation shaken*, 31. See also George Whitehead, *The glory of Christ's light within expelling darkness* (London: s.n., 1669), 12.

²⁸ Whitehead, *The glory of Christ's light within*, 23.

²⁹ By far the best study of English Antinomianism is Como, *Blown by the Spirit*.

First, Keach was certainly aware of the issues in justification before he entered the fray of this resurgent debate. In 1689, the Particular Baptist churches in London discussed the underlying issues at their annual meeting; the attendees decisively reached a conclusion which effectively clarified their official position regarding eternal justification (one of the essential issues in this controversy).³⁰ Second, Keach made a telling change to his allegorical work, *The travels of true godliness*. In a new letter to the reader signed by Keach and dated May 31, 1700, Keach announced that change as ‘an Account of the present Errors and Heresies of these present Times; with a Detection of *Baxterian* and *Antinomian* Errors’.³¹ Thus, between the first edition of 1684 and the revised edition of 1700, Keach determined that the Baxterian-Antinomian controversy required his measured response. During that interim, the entire Second Antinomian Controversy ran its course, leaving behind enough lingering error, according to Keach, to necessitate continued discussion.

The first edition of this controversy spread through the English Protestant landscape in the middle of the seventeenth century, due largely to the work of several ministers, notably John Eaton (1574/5-1630/1), John Saltmarsh (d. 1647), and Tobias Crisp (1600-1643).³² Despite having been labeled by the heresiographers of that generation as *Antinomians* for their works published under the general heading of ‘free grace’ and their understood stance against the continued authority of the law or the *Covenant of Works*,³³ these men did not form any type of coherent union or sect. At this point, the political climate of the seventeenth century should also be noted. Given the intimate relationship between religious beliefs and politics, and, thus, the all-encompassing importance of a theological power struggle, the practice of labeling opponents as theological heretics served as an extremely effective and practical political weapon. As with all political struggles involving public perception, the effectiveness

³⁰ *Narrative of the proceedings [1689]*, 14.

³¹ That letter, signed by Keach, appeared in the seventh edition of *The travels of true godliness*

³² Como divided the Antinomians into separate camps led by John Traske, John Eaton, John Everarde, and the Grindletonians. Como placed Crisp in the Eaton-led, or ‘Imputative’ Strain. See Como, *Blown by the Spirit*, 176-218. Sadly, Como’s study did not cover the Second Antinomian Controversy, though surely the defenders of Crisp in the 1690s would border on the same camp, at least according to those doing the branding.

³³ See Samuel Rutherford, *A survey of the spirituall antichrist* (London: J.D. & R.I. for Andrew Crooke, 1647).

of a given polemical claim in the seventeenth century stemmed more from the ability to make a charge seem appropriate than from its relation to reality.³⁴ Such was the case with the term ‘Antinomian’.³⁵

Like those labeled Antinomian, the opponents of this theology did not form a cohesive unit. In 1647, Eaton, Saltmarsh, and Crisp (along with several others) fell under the critical eye of the Westminster Assembly, being renounced as heretics in their publication entitled *A testimony to the truth of Jesus Christ, and to our Solemn League and Covenant; as also against the errours, heresies and blasphemies of these times, and the toleration of them*.³⁶ Samuel Rutherford (1600?-1661), a Scottish commissioner to the Westminster Assembly from 1643-1647, led the Assembly’s opposition to Antinomianism. That opposition, however, was largely overshadowed by that of Richard Baxter whose indefatigable writing and fortuitous span of life (which extended to both versions of this controversy) established him as *the* opponent of Antinomianism. Baxter and his followers were not immune from the branding tactics of seventeenth-century political-religious debates—with Baxter’s answer to Antinomianism often being derisively labeled *Neonomianism* for its teaching that Christ’s sacrifice bought a new law.³⁷

Despite the lack of unity on either side—or perhaps because of it, the original debate raged from the 1630s into the 1650s. Having entered the debate in 1649 by

³⁴ For a discussion of this use of the term *Antinomian*, see Tim Cooper, ‘The Antinomians Redeemed: Removing Some of the “Radical” from Mid-Seventeenth-Century English Religion’, *Journal of Religious History* 24 (2000); Cooper, *Fear and Polemic*. It should be noted that this climate was not unique to seventeenth-century England. Even the specific case of charges of Antinomianism can be found in debates between Luther and the *Antinomians* and Calvin and the *Libertines* in the sixteenth century. Cooper noted these very examples, but failed to show the similarities in the ‘brandings’ of opponents. Cooper’s study correctly demonstrated some of the weaknesses of the now-classic study of Antinomianism by Gertrude Huehns, *Antinomianism in English History*. Particularly germane to the present study, Huehns completely misunderstood the Baptist context of the debate. See, for example, her labeling of Thomas Helwys as a Particular Baptist (p. 63—note that the pamphlet Huehns cited in support of this claim was written in 1644, almost three decades after Helwys’ death! Stephen Wright attributed this anonymous pamphlet to Thomas Lambe. Wright, *Early English Baptists*, 116.) Given the issues of justification involved in the study of Antinomianism, this type of error by Huehns is particularly worrisome.

³⁵ Plenty of other terms—including ‘Anabaptist’ and, as has been seen, ‘Socinian’—were also used in this manner. Keach actually commented on the use of the term ‘Antinomian’. See Keach, *The marrow of true justification*, sig. A2r.

³⁶ Crisp and Eaton were condemned for their teaching that Christ and the Law were at odds, while Saltmarsh was specifically condemned for his views on baptism.

³⁷ Richard Baxter, *Universal redemption of mankind, by the Lord Jesus Christ* (London: for John Salusbury, 1694), 425-6.

publishing a work entitled *Aphorismes of justification* in which he, among other things, argued against the ‘frame and fabrick of *Antinomianisme*’,³⁸ Baxter provided several more publications which furiously attacked this doctrine. After a few more years of frenzied publication, Baxter and his supporters felt they had successfully defeated Antinomianism, and the once-intense debate fizzled to a mere afterthought.

The flames of this controversy—which never completely subsided during the Restoration³⁹—roared back to life with amazing vigor when, in 1690, Samuel Crisp re-published the sermons of his father, Dr. Tobias Crisp, under the title *Christ alone Exalted*. Baxter, who was caught by surprise by the revival of Crisp’s teachings, quickly moved to quash this flare-up.⁴⁰ He immediately published *Scripture Gospel defended* (1690) which included a direct rebuttal of Tobias Crisp’s work.⁴¹ Baxter’s attempt to end the revived controversy before it began, however, fell markedly short; the second version of the British Antinomian Controversy lasted eight years with the debates, at times, becoming quite heated. Baxter did not live long enough to see the end of the controversy on this occasion, dying in 1691. His friend, Daniel Williams assumed Baxter’s role as leader of those who opposed Antinomianism, and was prominently joined in this opposition by Samuel Clark.⁴²

Particular Baptist theologians played a relatively minor role in both generations of this controversy. In the late 1630s, Hanserd Knollys had been accused of Antinomianism while living near Boston in the British colonies.⁴³ Knollys returned to London where he soon joined the Independent church led by Henry Jessey and finally emerged as a Particular Baptist leader only to encounter the British form of the Antinomian Controversy in the 1640s. Knollys evidently did not engage prominently in that debate; however, he did sign the introduction to the re-release of Tobias Crisp’s

³⁸ Richard Baxter, *Aphorismes of justification* (Hague: Abraham Brown, 1655), 319.

³⁹ For instance, Stephen Lobb (d. 1699) published a work against Antinomianism entitled *The glory of free grace display’d* (1680). However, these works were rare in comparison to the numbers published in the midst of the First Antinomian Controversy.

⁴⁰ In 1690, Baxter expressed his surprise at the return of Antinomianism: ‘But I see the corrupting Design is of late, grown so high, that what seemed these Thirty Four Years suppressed, now threatneth as a torrent to overthrow the Gospel’. Baxter, ‘Defence of Christ.’ sig. A3v.

⁴¹ Baxter, *The Scripture Gospel defended*, title page.

⁴² For more on these individuals, see Chapter II, 42.

⁴³ Knollys and Kiffin, *The life and death*, 17. Note that this occurred before his conversion to Particular Baptist theology.

sermons in 1690 which re-ignited the Antinomian Controversy in England.⁴⁴ Knollys died just as the second Antinomian Controversy began.⁴⁵

This second generation of the Antinomian Controversy proved to be too intense and too near in proximity (given Baxter's influence in Southwark and the surrounding communities⁴⁶) for Keach, by now a respected leader of the Particular Baptists,⁴⁷ to avoid. He joined Thomas Edwards (d. 1699) as the only two Particular Baptists involved in the printed controversy. Like the Quaker controversy of the 1670s, Keach did not start this debate nor did he play a major role for those who opposed the Neonomian teaching of the Baxterians. Isaac Chauncy, the prominent London Independent minister took the lead for Keach's 'party'. In fact, despite attacking the Baxterian theologians by name, often picking apart their works almost line-by-line, Keach appeared to be almost ignored by the main participants in this debate.⁴⁸ This did not, however, stop Keach from using this debate as his personal whetting stone for honing his understanding of justification.

⁴⁴ To be fair, the labeling of Knollys' theology as Antinomian was rather unjust as he did not believe that the Law had no relevance for the Elect, nor did he believe that the Elect would be free from sin until physical death. See Hanserd Knollys, *The vworld that now is; and the vworld that is to come: or The first and second coming of Jesus Christ* (London: Tho. Snowden, 1681), 54, 39. Also, note that the signed introduction to the re-publication of Tobias Crisp's *Christ alone exalted* [1690] simply vouched for the authenticity of the previously unpublished sermons.

⁴⁵ For a discussion of Knollys' theology, including his role in the First Antinomian Controversy, see Barry H. Howson, 'The Question of Orthodoxy in the Theology of Hanserd Knollys (c. 1599--1691): A Seventeenth-Century English Calvinistic Baptist', Ph.D. Thesis, McGill University, 2000, esp. 119-33; Bustin, *Paradox and Perseverance*.

⁴⁶ Thornbury, *Old and New London*, 2:427-41.

⁴⁷ As a leading signatory of the *Second London Confession*, Keach may have been involved in penning that document. At the least, he was active among the London Association at that time. See *Narrative of the proceedings [1690]*.

⁴⁸ This overlooking of the Particular Baptists can largely be attributed to the fact that this controversy arose out of (and ended) the *Happy Union* between the Presbyterians and the Congregationalists. The lectures sponsored by this union served as the battleground from which the printed debate developed. Peter Toon, *The Emergence of Hyper-Calvinism in English Nonconformity, 1689-1765* (London: Olive Tree, 1967), 54-7. Keach's influence on the Antinomian Controversy has been overstated by some including Walker who painted Isaac Chauncy as 'one of the *other* most important voices' (see Walker, *The Excellent Benjamin Keach*, 348 emphasis added.) That being said, Keach was not entirely overlooked by the Baxterians. Daniel Williams mentioned Keach by name. See Williams, *A defence of Gospel-truth*, sig. A3v. Walker also missed the contributions of Thomas Edwards as another Particular Baptist involved in the controversy. Edwards, not to be confused with the author of *Gangraena* by the same name, published three works in this controversy: *A plain and impartial enquiry*, *A short review*, and *The parasalene dismantled*.

Competing Definitions of Antinomianism

The 1644 anonymous publication, *A declaration against the Antinomians*, identified seven teachings characteristic of Antinomianism:

- I. That God doth never inflict punishment upon the Elect for their sins.
- II. That God is never angry with his children.
- III. That God sees no sin in those that are his.
- IV. That such as are elected, are at all times beloved of God; in what condition soever they be, be they never so great sinners, yea, in the very act of sinne it self.
- V. That sanctification of life in duties of Piety, is nothing at all esteemed of God.
- VI. That the godly finde no difficulties in the way to Heaven, but live in much pleasure and delight in this world.
- VII. That those who belong to God, are able in this world presently to distinguish betwixt Gods people and the wicked.⁴⁹

For the most part, Baxter accepted this definition. However, elsewhere Baxter listed forty characteristics of Antinomian teachings and an astounding one hundred errors of the Antinomians!⁵⁰ Ultimately, Baxter focused intensively on two concepts which he understood to be the pillars of Antinomianism: the idea of the strict imputation of Christ's passive *and* active righteousness; eternal justification.⁵¹

By arguing against the former idea, Baxter actually opposed the Westminster Assembly who clearly stated that '[Christ's] obedience and satisfaction [were] accepted in their [the elect's] stead'.⁵² Additionally, the Assembly argued that God justifies 'not, for any thing wrought in them [the justified], or done by them, but for Christs sake alone ... by imputing the obedience and satisfaction of Christ unto them'.⁵³ In direct opposition, Baxter argued that '[t]o affirm therefore that our Evangelicall or new Covenant-Righteousness is in Christ and not in our selves, ... is such a monstr-

⁴⁹ Anon, *A declaration against the Antinomians, and their doctrine of liberty* (London: for Iohn Iones, 1644), title page (italics inverted).

⁵⁰ Baxter, *Baxter's confession [sic] of his faith*, Chap. VII. Baxter, 'Defence of Christ.' 6-38.

⁵¹ Baxter, *Aphorismes [1655]*, 31-7. For an in-depth look at Baxter's view of imputed righteousness, see Packer, *The Redemption & Restoration of Man*, chap. 10. cf. Boersma, *A Hot Pepper Corn*, 69. For a description of Baxter's view of the covenants, see p. 264-72. Dewey Wallace was only partially correct when he stated that the Antinomian Controversy became primarily concerned with assurance of salvation. For the Baxterians, the issue was also (even primarily) concerned with the *ordo salutis* and justification proper. Dewey D. Wallace, *Puritans and Predestination: Grace in English Protestant Theology, 1525-1695* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1982), 135.

⁵² *Westminster Confession and Catechisms*, Art. XI.

⁵³ *Westminster Confession and Catechisms*, Art. XI.

ous piece of Antinomian doctrine'.⁵⁴ On the latter issue, Baxter stood firmly with the Assembly who argued that '[the elect] are not justified untill the holy Spirit doth in due time actually apply Christ unto them'.⁵⁵

*The Baxterian Doctrine of Justification*⁵⁶

Richard Baxter developed his doctrine of justification from his understanding of the conditional new covenant which, he argued, God offered to all humanity.⁵⁷ At this foundational point, the disparity between Baxterian justification and that of the so-called *Antinomians* was already apparent.⁵⁸ In language remarkably similar to the Dutch jurist, Hugo Grotius,⁵⁹ Baxter argued that Christ's work in the crucifixion and resurrection served to purchase a new covenant with relaxed requirements, focusing not on the perfect obedience as established by the original *Covenant of Nature* but rather on the 'sincerity only of our faith and obedience'.⁶⁰ In a very real sense, Baxter's version of the new covenant between God and humanity required faith as a prerequisite for entrance into the covenant relationship; faith must precede justification.⁶¹ Or,

⁵⁴ Baxter, *Aphorismes* [1655], 72.

⁵⁵ *Westminster Confession and Catechisms*, Art. XI.

⁵⁶ In each of these points, Baxter established the doctrine, but he was followed throughout by Daniel Williams and Samuel Clark, the main Baxterians during the Second Antinomian Controversy.

⁵⁷ See Baxter, *Universal redemption*, 425-6. For a more in-depth discussion of Baxter's covenantal scheme, see Chapter V, 138-9. Hans Boersma provided an excellent study of Baxter's views on justification. Boersma, *A Hot Pepper Corn*. See also Packer, *The Redemption & Restoration of Man*. Baxter's view here explicitly contrasted with that expressed in the major confessions of Reformed theology. See Art. III of *Westminster Confession and Catechisms*; *Savoy Declaration*; *Second London Confession*.

⁵⁸ Tobias Crisp, *Christ alone exalted being the compleat works of Tobias Crisp, D.D.* (London: for William Marshal, 1690), 80-1; Chauncy, *Neonomianism unmask'd*, II:1-2. This language also set Baxter against the major Reformed Confessions. See Art. VIII & XI of *Westminster Confession and Catechisms*; *Savoy Declaration*; *Second London Confession*.

⁵⁹ Although Baxter claimed to have reached his position before reading Grotius, he did acknowledge his affiliation with Grotius' teaching. See Packer, *The Redemption & Restoration of Man*, 207. The quotation cited by Packer is misappropriated. Also see Richard Baxter, *The Grotian religion discovered, at the invitation of Mr. Thomas Pierce in his Vindication* (London: R.W. for Nevill Simmons, 1658), 4. Cf. Hugo Grotius, *Defensio fidei Catholicae de satisfactione Christi adversus Faustum Socinum senensem* (Lugduni Batavorum: excudit Ioannes Patius ... 1617), Chap. III.

⁶⁰ Richard Baxter, *Rich. Baxters apology against the modest exceptions of Mr. T. Blake and the digression of Mr. G. Kendall* (London: A.M. for Thomas Underhill ... and Francis Tyton, 1654), 45.

⁶¹ Baxter, *Aphorismes* [1655], 278. This is the very doctrine Isaac Chauncy charged against the Neonomian in *Neonomianism unmask'd* [1692/3], I:2. Cf. I:26-27. Cf. Crisp, *Christ alone exalted*, 86-91; John Saltmarsh, *Free-grace or, the flowings of Christ's blood freely to sinners* (London: for Giles Cal-

in Baxter's words, faith could be considered 'the Condition, on performance whereof the Gift [justification] is conferred'.⁶² This faith must be placed in the complete person of Jesus Christ, his Kingly, Prophetical, and Priestly offices. Thus, obedience to the law, in addition to the application of Christ's blood, must be present for justification.⁶³

The Baxterian doctrine of justification also took exception to the satisfaction model of atonement commonly held among the Reformed churches.⁶⁴ Again, demonstrating his proximity to Grotian theology, Baxter taught that 'Christ [paid] not the *Idem*, but the *Tantundem*, not the strict debt it self, but a valuable Satisfaction'.⁶⁵ This view of Christ's satisfaction presented Christ as fulfilling only the punishment of death in the stead of the elect, leaving the 'preceptive part of the Law' to be fulfilled by any one who would be justified.⁶⁶ Elsewhere, the Baxterians referenced this aspect of the satisfaction in support of their understanding of imputed righteousness, namely that only Christ's obedient suffering, his passive obedience, could be strictly imputed to the believer.⁶⁷ After years of holding to a passive obedience *only* view of imputa-

vert, 1645), 163. See also C. FitzSimons Allison, *The Rise of Moralism: the Proclamation of the Gospel from Hooker to Baxter* (London: S.P.C.K, 1966), 170-72. Toon, *Emergence of Hyper-Calvinism*, 66-8.

⁶² Richard Baxter, *Of justification four disputations clearing and amicably defending the truth against the unnecessary oppositions of divers learned and reverend brethren* (London: R.W. for Nevil Simmons, 1658), 358. Baxter used the term *legal righteousness* to refer to Christ's obedient suffering and the term *evangelical righteousness* to refer to the believer's fulfillment of the this condition. Baxter, *Aphorismes [1655]*, Baxter made this point throughout the work, see for example Thesis XXIII (82-83). Cf. Williams, *Gospel-truth stated*, 71-2. Samuel Clark, *Scripture-justification, or, A discourse of justification, according to the evidence of Scripture-light* (London: S. Bridge for Tho. Parkhurst, 1698), 19. Baxter argued that his view was preferable, even less novel, than the idea of faith as an instrument of justification, the view held by the major Reformed confessions. See Baxter, *Of justification*, 162. Cf. *Westminster Confession and Catechisms; Second London Confession; Savoy Declaration*. Art. XI: 'Faith thus receiving and resting on Christ and his righteousness, is the alone instrument of justification'.

⁶³ Baxter, *Of justification*, 297.

⁶⁴ The three confessions of English Reformed theology all explicitly stated that Christ 'fully satisfied the justice of God'. See *Savoy Declaration; Westminster Confession and Catechisms; Second London Confession*, Art. VIII.

⁶⁵ Baxter, *Aphorismes [1655]*, 37. Cf. Grotius, *Defensio fidei*.

⁶⁶ Baxter, *Aphorismes [1655]*, 32.

⁶⁷ Baxter, *Aphorismes [1655]*, 33. Baxter's views on this issue are frequently mis-understood, thanks largely to Baxter's ability and willingness to give different (or nuanced) meanings to commonly used terms. As examples of over-simplifications of Baxter's views, see Riker, 'A Catholic Reformed Theologian', 91; Vaughn, 'Public Worship and Practical Theology'; Thomas, *The Extent of the Atonement*, 162. Significantly, Walker incorrectly asserted that Baxterians (including Baxter and Williams) taught that 'nothing of Christ's righteousness was imputed to those who believe on Christ'. Walker, *The Ex-*

tion, Baxter actually changed his mind, finally allowing for some sort of imputation of Christ's active obedience; however, this imputation was considerably different from the imputation of his passive obedience.⁶⁸ The Baxterians further specified that the punishment of death suffered by Christ only constituted an equivalent, rather than an exact, satisfaction of the penalty. Thus, God *chose* to accept the equivalent payment rather than being required by His just nature to do so, a concept Baxter identified with the term *solutio recusabilis*.⁶⁹ This model of the atonement, combined with the conditional aspect of the covenant of grace, left justification in an incomplete or imperfect state, a point not denied by the Baxterians.⁷⁰

The Content of Keach's Doctrine of Justification

Definition of Justification

Keach's definition and understanding of the term *justification* did nothing to cause his readers to doubt his professed placement on the theological landscape. Indeed, Keach followed the first generation of Protestant Reformers in asserting a forensic view of the justification of a sinner, which he defined as 'the acceptance of his [the sinner's] Person, or the pronouncing him Just and Righteous in God's Sight, through the Imputation of the Righteousness of Christ ...'.⁷¹ Armed with this forensic definition of *justification*, Keach maintained a clear distinction between this aspect of salvation and its necessary corollary, sanctification, or the infusion of 'inherent Holiness'⁷² which he claimed was 'not necessary, as antecedent to Justification, but [was]

cellent Benjamin Keach, 344. Keach, himself, understood the position quite well. For his take on this form of imputation, see Keach, *A golden mine opened*, 494.

⁶⁸ Baxter, *Aphorismes [1655]*, 37. Here, Baxter followed Grotius and Bradshaw. The Baxterians presented conflicting views of the imputation of Christ's active righteousness—a situation probably arising from their different definitions of significant terms. Cf. Williams, *Gospel-truth stated*, 37.

⁶⁹ Baxter, *Aphorismes [1655]*, 42; Baxter, *The Scripture Gospel defended*, 82.

⁷⁰ Baxter, *Catholick theologie*, I.ii.87. Cf. Clark, *Scripture justification*, 18.

⁷¹ Keach, *The display of glorious grace*, 83; Keach, *A feast of fat things*, 16-17. As a demonstration of Keach's clearly Reformed stance, note the clear agreement with Calvin. See Calvin, *The institution of Christian religion*, III.xi.2.

⁷² Keach, *Gospel mysteries unveil'd*, II:111.

the Fruit or Product of Union with Christ'.⁷³ By accepting these definitions which had been so influential in the earliest days of the Reformation, Keach acknowledged his intention to preach a monergistic view of justification, based solely on the work of Christ with no conditional dependence placed upon personal holiness. This, Keach argued, properly defined the biblical concept of justification by grace alone.⁷⁴ That grace must be a special grace, a unique work of the Holy Spirit in the Elect, different from those common graces of the Spirit which may serve to convict a person of sin but could never bring a person to depend on the work of Christ for justification.⁷⁵ Invariably, this understanding of justification placed him at odds with the corresponding definitions held by both sets of his antagonists: the Quakers who argued that this form of justification destroyed God's Honour, making Him an abomination in His own sight,⁷⁶ and the Baxterians who claimed that justification necessarily included 'some degree of Obedience' on the part of the justified⁷⁷ and 'that justifying faith is the same thing in Substance with ... Regeneration, Conversion, Sanctification...'.⁷⁸

Model of the Atonement

Throughout his corpus, Benjamin Keach never wavered from the penal substitutionary model of the atonement, common among Reformed theologians. According to this view, God required a 'full Satisfaction to both Law, and Justice, [which] must either be done by us, or by our Surety for us'.⁷⁹ Keach clearly appropriated this view from the Reformed tradition which he inherited, as it appeared in all three of the ma-

⁷³ Keach, *The marrow of true justification*, sig. Bv. Note Calvin's similar distinction in his disagreement with Osiander. Calvin, *The institution of Christian religion*, III.xi.6.

⁷⁴ Keach, *Gospel mysteries unveil'd*, I:25.

⁷⁵ Keach, *The counterfeit Christian*, 4-5.

⁷⁶ Penn, *The sandy foundation shaken*, sig. Bv, 20. Keach correctly understood this aspect of Quaker theology. See Keach, *Gospel mysteries unveil'd*, I:23.

⁷⁷ Williams, *Gospel-truth stated*, sig. A5v.

⁷⁸ Clark, *Scripture justification*, 62. Paradoxically, Clark professed to define justification as 'an Act of God, whereby he accounts us Righteous at present, and treats us as such, and will solemnly Declare and Pronounce us so at the Day of Judgment'. However, he immediately qualified that definition by claiming that 'we are first Righteous and then pardon'd, and not on the contrary, first pardon'd, and then Righteous.' pp. 18-19. Keach correctly identified this aspect of the Baxterian view of justification in the 7th edition of *The travels of true godliness*, 104. Cf. Keach, *A medium betwixt two extremes*, 37, where Keach cited Clark.

⁷⁹ Keach, *The display of glorious grace*, 77.

for British Reformed confessions⁸⁰ as well as in most of the few Particular Baptist writings on the subject.⁸¹ Given the fact that both sets of Keach's antagonists repudiated this view of the atonement, several contentious aspects of this view required additional explanation—explanation often provided by Keach alone among the Particular Baptists.⁸²

Relation to the Law

Keach did make one major change to his own version of substitutionary atonement from that of the Reformed confessions—including the *Second London Confession*. In the confessional version, the discussion of the atonement occurred in the chapter/article entitled 'Of Justification'. Keach, on the other hand, discussed the matter under the heading 'Of the Law', placing the issue in the context of the divine standard of righteousness.⁸³ Keach argued not only that the upholding of the law stemmed from God's unchangeable nature which included inherent justice,⁸⁴ but also that 'the Law of perfect Righteousness' itself actually had its foundation directly in the 'Purity and Holiness of God' and not simply from 'the Sovereignty of his Will' as

⁸⁰ See Art. XI: Of Justification in *Westminster Confession and Catechisms; Savoy Declaration; Second London Confession*.

⁸¹ Given the importance of the doctrine of justification—especially to the Particular Baptists who distinguished themselves from other Baptists precisely over this issue, the number of works dealing specifically with this issue were surprisingly few. This is not to suggest the doctrine was not discussed, simply that it did not garner their sole attention as one might expect. Those few writings by Particular Baptists included Blackwood, *A soul-searching catechism*; Robert Garner, *Mysteries unveiled wherein the doctrine of redemption by Jesus Christ, flowing from the glorious grace and everlasting love of God, the very fountain of life and salvation unto lost sinners, is handled* (London: s.n., 1646), including a dedicatory epistle by Hanserd Knollys; Paul Hobson, *Fourteen queries and ten absurdities about the extent of Christ's death, the power of the creatures, the justice of God in condemning some, and saving others* (London: Henry Hills for William Hutchison, 1655); Thomas Killcop, *The path-way to justification* (London: s.n., 1660), (Killcop actually used this document to repudiate his apparent previous belief in limited atonement); Benjamin Cox, *An appendix, to a confession of faith* (London: s.n., 1646); Hercules Collins, *Mountains of brass, or, A discourse upon the decrees of God* (London: for John Harris, 1690).

⁸² The writings noted above do not provide nearly the depth of discussion provided by Keach. Thus, he became (either explicitly or simply *de facto*) the major Particular Baptist theologian of justification of the seventeenth century.

⁸³ Keach, *The articles of the faith*, Art. XVIII.

⁸⁴ Keach and De Laune, *Tropologia*, II:80. Thus, Keach declared his belief in 'One Only Living and True God ... Unchangeable in his Being, Wisdom, Power, Holiness, Justice, Goodness, Truth and Faithfulness'. Keach, *The articles of the faith*, Art. I. Cf. Keach, *The travels of true godliness*, 96. Cf. Keach, *Spiritual melody*, Second Part, 37. Keach cited Romans 3.25-26 in support of this view of God's unchangeable nature. Cf. Keach, *The articles of the faith*, Art. XVIII. See Chapter IV.

the Quakers and Baxterians believed.⁸⁵ Keach's understanding of divine justice removed any doubt about the possibility of the penalty of an already-enacted law simply being removed without satisfaction, for God 'changeth not, will not alter the thing that is gone out of his Mouth'.⁸⁶ Keach dismissed the Baxterian view as illogical, suggesting that if they were correct, God could have just as easily simply provided the milder, easier form from the beginning 'and so have saved himself of buying it so dear, *i.e.* with the Price of the Blood of his own Son'.⁸⁷ The idea that God could simply ignore justice amounted, in Keach's eyes, to a denigration of God: 'it consist[ed] not with [God's] Glory to remit Sin without fulfilling his Law, and satisfying his Justice'.⁸⁸

Paradoxically, Keach adopted Owen's view that the very substitution of Christ for the sinner required 'a voluntary Compact and Agreement ... [which] required unto it a relaxation of the Law'.⁸⁹ The eternal *Covenant of Redemption* served as that voluntary compact and agreement.⁹⁰ Keach adopted John Owen's carefully articulated distinction that this relaxation applied only to the recipient of the penalty, not to the penalty itself.⁹¹ However, this distinction failed to answer Keach's own logic-based musings, namely if God could accept a substitute why could he not simply remove the penalty? Keach's opponents did not attack him on this issue, and Keach never clarified his position. In this case, Keach did not admit to the logical problems inherent in his view. Elsewhere, however, he explicitly accepted his love-hate relationship with human logic and reasoning when he discussed his understanding of divine mystery

⁸⁵ Keach, *A medium betwixt two extremes*, 41. William Penn stated explicitly 'that since God has proclaim'd himself a Gracious, Merciful, and forgiving God, it's not inconsistent with his Nature to remit, without any other consideration than his own Love ...' Penn, *The sandy foundation shaken*, 16. J.I. Packer noted that Baxter held to an immutable 'law of Nature' and 'supplementary laws' which were enacted by God to specify 'duty in relation to particular circumstances at a particular time. Packer, *The Redemption & Restoration of Man*, 121-22. The new covenant fell under those supplementary laws. Samuel Clark argued that God could simply remove punishment 'so far as God sees consistent with his Honour'. Clark, *Scripture justification*, 19.

⁸⁶ Keach and De Laune, *Tropologia*, II:81; Keach, *Spiritual melody*, II:Hymn 46.

⁸⁷ Keach, *A medium betwixt two extremes*, 41.

⁸⁸ Keach, *Gospel mysteries unveil'd*, II:170.

⁸⁹ Keach, *Gospel mysteries unveil'd*, II:172. Citing John Owen, *Of the death of Christ, the price he paid, and the purchase he made* (London: Peter Cole, 1650). Cf. Keach and De Laune, *Tropologia*, II:89, 94.

⁹⁰ Keach and De Laune, *Tropologia*, II:92. See Chapter V.

⁹¹ Keach and De Laune, *Tropologia*, II:94-95.

and condescension—at one time arguing for ‘true Logicks Laws’, and, only a few lines later emphatically stating:

’Tis unreveal’d to Reason, for no strain
Of lofty Metaphysicks can contain
Those Mysteries; true Wisdom therefore hath
Commanded Reason to give room to Faith.⁹²

Idem or Tantundem

Agreeing with Owen against Baxter and Grotius,⁹³ Keach argued that Christ satisfied divine righteousness and justice by ‘doing and suffering what we were to have done and suffered’.⁹⁴ By so arguing, Keach made atonement more than the mere payment of the ‘Punishment or Penalty due to ns [sic] for our Sins’, including with it Christ’s active obedience as part of the payment ‘which we owed to the Law’.⁹⁵ Thus, in Keach’s view, Christ’s active obedience did more than merely qualify Christ for the role of mediator—a stark contrast to Baxter’s view.⁹⁶ Keach also argued that Christ’s active obedience was more than simply the merits included in the satisfactory *tantundem* payment made by Christ.⁹⁷ Christ’s active obedience actually constituted part of the *idem* payment because the law demanded both active obedience and passive obedience, neither of which could be provided by Adam’s progeny.⁹⁸

⁹² Benjamin Keach, *Distressed Sion relieved, or, The garment of praise for the spirit of heaviness* (London: for Nath. Crouch, 1689), 57.

⁹³ See Owen, *Of the Death of Christ*, esp. Cap. II. Because of their Socinian-leaning view of atonement, the Quakers did not even get involved in this aspect of the discussion.

⁹⁴ Keach, *Gospel mysteries unveil’d*, I:30. Contrary to Alan Clifford’s argument, this view actually could be found in the earliest Reformers, including Calvin—although Keach did not generally cite them in support. See Calvin, *The institution of Christian religion*, II.xvii.5. Cf. Alan C. Clifford, *Atonement and Justification: English Evangelical Theology 1640-1790: an Evaluation* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), 171. Significantly, Herman Witsius argued for the imputation of Christ’s active and passive obedience as well. Witsius, *The oeconomy of the covenants*, 281.

⁹⁵ Keach, *Gospel mysteries unveil’d*, II:56. Keach called this *plenary satisfaction*. Keach, *A golden mine opened*, 94.

⁹⁶ Baxter claimed that Paraeus, Piscator, Olevian, Scultetus, Cargius, and Capellus (among others) held that Christ’s active obedience only served to qualify Christ to be Messiah. See Baxter, *Aphorismes [1655]*, 36.

⁹⁷ Baxter, *Aphorismes [1655]*, 37.

⁹⁸ Keach, *Gospel mysteries unveil’d*, II:56; Keach, *A medium betwixt two extremes*, 41. Keach did not use the terms *idem* or *tantundem*. Thomas Edwards followed Owen as well, actually using the term *idem*. Thomas Edwards, *The paraselene dismantled of her cloud, or, Baxterianism barefac’d* (London: Will. Marshal ... and John Marshal, 1699), 71.

In this argument, Keach expounded on the official Particular Baptist statement of the *Second London Confession*:

Those whom God Effectually calleth, he also freely justifieth ... by imputing Christs active obedience unto the whole Law, and passive obedience in his death, for their whole and sole Righteousness, they receiving, and resting on him, and his Righteousness, by Faith; which faith they have not of themselves, it is the gift of God.⁹⁹

Here, the Particular Baptists explicitly followed the *Savoy Declaration* rather than the confession adopted by the Westminster Assembly who simply stated that justification came ‘by imputing the obedience and satisfaction of Christ unto them’.¹⁰⁰ This specific change by the Congregationalists came on the heels of the original Antinomian Controversy and, according to Baxter, was made by John Owen.¹⁰¹

Extent of the Atonement

The combination of his federalist understanding of the covenants which presented Christ as representing *only* the Elect and his belief that Christ made the exact payment required by divine law, led Keach to the doctrine of limited atonement, or the teaching that Christ made payment only for the Elect.¹⁰² This stood as the *major* doctrinal issue which differentiated the mature Keach from the General Baptist beliefs of his youth. The General Baptist *Standard Confession* (1660) explicitly stated that Christ ‘gave himself a ransom for *all* ... tasting death for *every man* ... a propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the *whole World*’.¹⁰³ Thus, the General Baptists held that ‘no man shall eternally suffer in Hell ... for want of a Christ that dyed for them’.¹⁰⁴ The General Baptists were joined in this view by a large

⁹⁹ *Second London Confession*, Art. XI.1. Hanserd Knollys also alluded to this view in *The world that now is*, I:6-7. Also note Thomas Edwards’ focus on full satisfaction in *The parasalene dismantled*.

¹⁰⁰ *Westminster Confession and Catechisms*, Art. XI.i.

¹⁰¹ ‘And they said, That it was Dr. O’s doing.’ Richard Baxter, *Catholick communion defended against both extreames, and unnecessary division* (London: for Tho. Parkhurst, 1684), ‘An Account...’ appended to end, 8. See Clifford, *Atonement and Justification*. This concept was by no means original to Owen and the Congregationalists. Archbishop James Ussher (1581-1656) argued that believers are justified by Christ ‘doing whatsoever was required of us and by suffering whatsoever was deserved by our sins ...’. Ussher, *A body of divinitie*, 194.

¹⁰² Keach, *Gospel mysteries unveil’d*, II:75-76.

¹⁰³ *Standard Confession*, Art. III (italics inverted). Also see *Orthodox Creed*, Art. XVIII.

¹⁰⁴ *Standard Confession*, Art. IV. Note that this confession did not explicitly identify the model of atonement upheld by its signatories. The relevant articles of this confession used biblical language to

number of mainstream theologians of Keach's day—even some who shared his model of the atonement, including the English contingent to the Synod of Dort.¹⁰⁵

Citing Isaac Chauncy in support, Keach also argued directly against the commonly-held distinction that Christ's payment was sufficient for all but only efficient for some,¹⁰⁶ stating simply that 'whatsoever is not efficient is not sufficient to attain the End thereof'.¹⁰⁷ Keach abhorred the idea—present implicitly in that usual distinction—that Christ's work only rendered God reconcilable and not actually reconciled, derisively labeling its adherents (including the Baxterians) as *Arminians*.¹⁰⁸ In contrast to other Reformed theologians and even other Particular Baptists such as Thomas Edwards,¹⁰⁹ Keach argued that this distinction removed the efficacy of the atonement from God's hand. Relying on multiple biblical references, Keach's version of the

refer to the atonement as a 'ransom' or 'propitiation'. Any language of substitution remained noticeably lacking, though not necessarily repudiated.

¹⁰⁵ For the view of the English delegation to the Synod of Dort, see George Carleton, *The collegiat suffrage of the divines of Great Britaine, concerning the five articles controverted in the Low Countries vvhich suffrage was by them delivered in the synod of Dort, March 6. anno 1619* (London: [by Miles Flesher] for Robert Milbourne, 1629), 47: 'Christ therefore so dyed for all, that all and every one by the meanes of faith might obtaine remission of sins, and eternall life by vertue of that ransome paid once for all mankinde'. For a discussion of the General Baptist view, see Bass, 'Thomas Grantham and General Baptist Theology', 233-35. For a fuller discussion of these issues, including the different opinions presented at the Synod of Dort, see Thomas, *The Extent of the Atonement*, esp. 138-59. In this view, Keach aligned himself with the Particular Baptist and Reformed confessions. *Second London Confession*, Art. III.6: 'neither are any other [than the Elect] redeemed by Christ...'. Cf. *Westminster Confession and Catechisms; Savoy Declaration*. Knollys also argued for limited atonement, an idea which also had support in the *1644 & 1646 London Confession*. See Knollys, *The vworld that now is*, 6-7; *1644 London Confession*, Art. XVII.

¹⁰⁶ This distinction was first proposed by Peter Lombard and was followed by the Heidelberg theologians, William Perkins, and James Ussher. Richard A. Muller, *Christ and the Decree: Christology and Predestination in Reformed Theology from Calvin to Perkins* (Durham, N.C: Labyrinth Press, 1986), 34; Green, *The Christian's ABC*, 354.

¹⁰⁷ Keach, *The display of glorious grace*, 163. See Isaac Chauncy, *The doctrine which is according to godliness grounded upon the Holy Scriptures of truth, and agreeable to the doctrinal part of the English Protestant Articles and Confessions* (London: for the author by H. Hills, 1694), 203-204. Here, Keach also agreed (though not explicitly) with Robert Garner's work written against Henry Denne and Thomas Lambe (et al), in which Garner argued for a strictly limited view of the atonement. Garner, *Mysteris unveiled*.

¹⁰⁸ Keach, *Gospel mysteries unveil'd*, I:19; Keach, *A golden mine opened*, 95; Benjamin Keach, *The grand impostor discovered: or, The Quakers doctrine weighed in the ballance, and found wanting, a poem* (London: s.n., 1675), 249. For his labeling of this view as *Arminian*, see Keach, *The everlasting covenant*, 15. For the Baxterian view see Clark, *Scripture justification*, 18; Baxter, *Universal redemption*, 63. Keach specifically responded to this view in several places: Keach, *A medium betwixt two extremes*, 37-38; Keach, *Gospel mysteries unveil'd*, I:106.

¹⁰⁹ Edwards actually attributed Keach's view to the Papists, see Edwards, *The paraselene dismantled*, 247.

atonement envisioned God as the *sole* actor. As the prophets Jeremiah and Ezekiel promised, God had to be the one to ‘take away the Stony Heart, and ... give ... a Heart of Flesh’, or to ‘Circumcise their Hearts’.¹¹⁰ Because only God could grant repentance, forgiveness, and even faith,¹¹¹ Keach argued that divorcing the idea of sufficiency from divine intent would render the term *sufficient* meaningless. He did happily agree with those of his opponents who argued that Christ died for the good of all humanity, indeed even the good of all creation,¹¹² but he argued that that description of Christ’s death did not go far enough. In his view, Christ ‘died not only *nostro bono*, for our good and profit ... but *nostra vice*, in our room, he died for his Church, for his Elect, as he died not for the Holy Angels’ or the non-Elect.¹¹³

This limitation of Christ’s atoning work did not in any way diminish the infinite value of that work.¹¹⁴ In contrast to the standard systems of his day—including that espoused by Owen¹¹⁵—however, Keach argued that the value of Christ’s work, the shedding of His ‘most precious Blood’,¹¹⁶ could not and *should not* be measured by the number of humans actually saved by it. Rather, the value could only be based upon the inherent worth of the actor.¹¹⁷ Thus, Keach led his congregation in singing:

‘Twas from the worth and dignity
Which in thy Person lay,
Thou didst God’s justice satisfie,
And all our debts defray.

Thou being God as well as Man,
Thy Merits have such worth,

¹¹⁰ Ezekiel 26.26-27; Jeremiah 31.33 as cited in Keach, *The display of glorious grace*, 162-63.

¹¹¹ Acts 5.31; Eph. 2.8-9 as cited in Keach, *The display of glorious grace*, 163. Not surprisingly, Keach made this a frequent topic of his hymns as well. As an example, see Keach, *Spiritual melody*, Hymn 17: ‘Christ a Mediator’.

¹¹² Keach, *The display of glorious grace*, 77.

¹¹³ Keach, *The display of glorious grace*, 91. Cf. Keach and De Laune, *Tropologia*, II:94.

¹¹⁴ Keach, *Gospel mysteries unveil'd*, I:67.

¹¹⁵ For Owen’s view, see Owen, *The Works of John Owen* (London: Banner of Truth Trust, 1965), X:295-6.

¹¹⁶ Keach, *Gospel mysteries unveil'd*, II:61. Cf. Keach, *A golden mine opened*, 247.

¹¹⁷ Thus, Keach agreed with Owen in the understanding that the value of Christ’s work came internally from the Personhood of Christ. Owen, *Works*, X:295-6.

As a compensation full to make,
And liberty bring forth¹¹⁸

Keach used this infinite value of Christ and His work to demonstrate the anti-biblical nature of the Quaker model of atonement which viewed Christ's work merely as what Penn called a 'perfect Example' and moved dangerously close to following the Socinian denial of Christ's deity.¹¹⁹

Ordo Salutis

Though he never specified his precise understanding of the logical order of salvation, or the *ordo salutis*,¹²⁰ like Perkins had in his famous *Golden chaine*, Keach's version can be gathered from his numerous works on justification. Ultimately, Keach developed a two-fold *ordo*—one which described the actions of God outside of time and the other which dealt specifically with the actions of God and humanity within time. The key to both of these parallel sequences of salvation could be found in Keach's federal theology.¹²¹

Outside of Time

Infralapsarian Single Predestination

Because Keach argued that the breaking of the *Covenant of Works* logically preceded the pre-temporal establishment of the *Covenant of Grace*,¹²² he placed himself firmly alongside the infralapsarians who argued that the Elect were chosen out of

¹¹⁸ Keach, *Spiritual melody*, Hymn 19: 'Christ our Surety'. See also, Benjamin Keach, *Spiritual songs being the marrow of Scripture in songs of praise to Almighty God from the Old and New Testament* (London: for John Marshal, 1700), Hymn 16: 'On Christ's Suretiship'.

¹¹⁹ Penn, *The sandy foundation shaken*, 19. See Keach, *The grand impostor discovered*, 248-51; Keach, *A golden mine opened*, 94. For a discussion of Socinianism and both the theory of atonement and the Quakers, see McLachlan, *Socinianism*, 14, 224-6. Cf. Chapter III.

¹²⁰ Reformed theologian, Louis Berkhof (1873-1957), defined *ordo salutis* as the description of 'the process by which the work of salvation, wrought in Christ, is subjectively realized in the hearts and lives of sinners. It aims at describing in their logical order, and also in their interrelations, the various movements of the Holy Spirit in the application of the work of redemption'. Berkhof, *Systematic Theology* (London: Banner of Truth Trust, 1939). For a general discussion of the *ordo salutis* as a concept, see A. T. B. McGowan, 'Justification and the Ordo Salutis.' in *Justification in Perspective*, ed. B.L. McCormack, 147-163 (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2006).

¹²¹ See Riker, 'A Catholic Reformed Theologian', 129-30.

¹²² See Chapter V.

the ‘lost Lump of fallen Man’.¹²³ Thus, Keach’s *ordo salutis* began with God’s decision to create everything, including a humanity which—as part of that creation—began life in a covenant relationship with God. Following that decision, the Trinity, having recognized that the original covenant would be broken by the federal representative of humanity, entered into a divine council wherein the Three Persons established the *Covenant of Grace* as the solution for the broken *Covenant of Works*. Although Keach did not explicitly state the placement of the rest of the divine decrees, his explanation of the *Covenant of Grace* included, as a necessary prerequisite, a decree of election because Christ entered into that covenant as a federal representative only of the Elect.¹²⁴

At this point of the *ordo*, Keach highlighted another significant point of departure from many (if not most) of the predestinarian Reformed theologians whom he normally followed. Those Reformed theologians—including John Owen, many of the Congregationalists, and the Westminster Assembly—explicitly held to decrees of election and reprobation.¹²⁵ Instead of a ‘decree of God ... [whereby] some men and Angels are predestinated unto everlasting life, and others foreordained to everlasting death’,¹²⁶ the Particular Baptists taught a ‘decree of God ... [whereby] some men and Angels are predestinated, or fore-ordained to Eternal Life, through Jesus Christ ... others *being left to act in their sin* to their just condemnation ...’, thereby omitting the decree of reprobation.¹²⁷ The difference may have appeared slight, but it signified a

¹²³ Keach, *A golden mine opened*, 202. Cf. p. 98. In support of his view, Keach cited William Ames’ *The marrow of sacred divinity* (p. 108). Keach, *Gospel mysteries unvail’d*, II:240. With this infralapsarian view, Keach moved beyond the basic statement of the *Second London Confession* (which could be interpreted in an infralapsarian or supralapsarian view) and aligned himself with the more moderate predestinarianism of Francis Turretin rather than the more severe version of Theodore Beza. In the English theological landscape, the infralapsarians included the English delegation to the Synod of Dort and William Ames while the major English supralapsarians included William Perkins (1558-1602), William Pemble (1591/2-1623), and William Twisse (1577/8-1646).

¹²⁴ See Chapter V. Additionally, although Keach did not discuss the decrees of election in his catechisms, he did place the discussion of sin *before* that of effectual calling and redemption. See Keach, *Instructions for children* [1695]; Keach, *The child’s delight*.

¹²⁵ These sources differed in their views on supra- or infralapsarianism. Thomas Goodwin, whom Keach cited for his view of fundamental and actual pardon—corresponding to virtual and actual justification—was a supralapsarian; John Owen held to an infralapsarian view, but he found the double predestination inherent to a decree of reprobation fundamental enough to include it in his shorter catechisms. See John Owen, *Dr. John Owen’s two short catechisms* (London: Will. Marshal, 1700), 14.

¹²⁶ *Westminster Confession and Catechisms*, Art. III.iii; *Savoy Declaration*, Art. III.iii.

¹²⁷ *Second London Confession*, Art. III.3 (emphasis added).

major distinction from their Reformed counterparts. For Keach, this difference proved to be key to his understanding of predestination, even separating him and the second generation of Particular Baptists from some of their earlier leaders.¹²⁸

Keach *did* hold to an eternal decree of election attributable solely to divine sovereignty and an accompanying decree of preterition, which he defined as a decision to pass by some who, thus, would remain in their lost condition;¹²⁹ however, he separated preterition from any adjoining condemnation, arguing that ‘tho the Decree of Election was before the World began ... Reprobation, as an act of God’s Justice, refer[red] to the Creatures Sin and Disobedience, or foreseen Wickedness’.¹³⁰ The view of election as the gracious choosing of some from the fallen lump of humanity allowed Keach to argue that God’s sovereignty alone brought about eternal life while holding that sin caused condemnation.¹³¹ Keach’s infralapsarian doctrine actually moved closer to some of the General Baptist confessions than the works of his Particular Baptist predecessors. For example, the *Standard Confession* espoused a concept of election which occurred ‘before *the foundation of the World*’ and was ‘not in the least arising from fore-seen faith in, or works of righteousness done by the creature’. Likewise, the condemned were ‘*of old ordained to condemnation*’ only after they were considered not ‘simply as men, but ungodly men’.¹³² Keach could easily have agreed with those statements, whereas he specifically disagreed with the views of Christopher Blackwood and Thomas Edwards, sometime leaders of the Particular Baptists who both followed Perkins in teaching a supralapsarian dual decree of election and reprobation.¹³³ This view remained popular among some predestinarian Bapt-

¹²⁸ Vaughn missed this aspect of Keach’s theology when he attempted to connect Keach with the ‘hyper-Calvinism’ of the eighteenth century. Keach’s infralapsarian view, in fact, represented a significant distancing from that tradition. Vaughn, ‘Benjamin Keach.’ 60; Vaughn, ‘Public Worship and Practical Theology’, 217. Cf. Toon, *Emergence of Hyper-Calvinism*, 79ff. Riker also missed this point in his rebuttal of Vaughn. Riker, ‘A Catholic Reformed Theologian’, 62.

¹²⁹ Keach, *The articles of the faith*, Art. XXXII.

¹³⁰ Keach, *Gospel mysteries unveil’d*, II:240. Cf. Keach, *A golden mine opened*, 175.

¹³¹ Keach, *The articles of the faith*, Art. XXXII.

¹³² *Standard Confession*, Art. VIII & IX. Cf. *Orthodox Creed*, Art. X.

¹³³ Blackwood, *A soul-searching catechism*, 6-7. The very fact that Blackwood included the concepts of election and reprobation in his catechisms set him apart from most catechetical writers. Despite its importance in numerous disputes of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, most English catechetical writers of the day largely avoided any discussion of the decree of election (and reprobation), leaving

ists throughout the seventeenth century, although not necessarily among those officially connected to the Particular Baptists.¹³⁴ Whether or not Keach was responsible for the explicit single predestinarian view of the *Second London Confession* cannot be known with certainty. Some of Keach's fellow leaders among the Particular Baptists—such as Hercules Collins—also taught the same single predestinarian and infralapsarian views.¹³⁵ Regardless, by the end of Keach's life, the Particular Baptists were firmly established in this understanding of predestination.

Virtual, or Federal, Justification

For Keach, the fact that God's decrees were inherently unchangeable, 'absolute and not conditional',¹³⁶ meant that some aspect of justification actually occurred in eternity past at the establishment of the unconditional (for the elect) *Covenant of Grace*. Citing Thomas Goodwin, Keach referred to this logical step in the *ordo salutis*—in which those included in that second covenant were, in *some sense*, seen as eternally justified—either as *virtual* or *federal* justification,¹³⁷ a logical step which allowed Keach to combine the biblical assertion that Christ was crucified before the foundations of the world¹³⁸ with his view that Christ's work left God actually reconciled and not merely reconcilable.¹³⁹ Like Samuel Petto, he carefully distinguished be-

the disputes to the more learned. Green, *The Christian's ABC*, 70. See Edwards, *The paraselene dismantled*.

¹³⁴ For an example, see *Reprobation asserted, or, The doctrine of eternal election & reprobation promiscuously handled in eleven chapters* (London: for G.L., 1674). This work presented a more severe version of reprobation than Keach, but it remained more moderate than the work of Blackwood or Owen. This work has traditionally been ascribed to John Bunyan, but there has been recent debate about the authorship. See Richard L. Greaves, 'John Bunyan and the Authorship of *Reprobation Asserted*', *Baptist Quarterly* 21 (1965). Paul Helm, 'John Bunyan and *Reprobation Asserted*', *Baptist Quarterly* 28 (1979). Wallace incorrectly included Bunyan in the group of Particular Baptists. Though Bunyan agreed with much of the Particular Baptist doctrines, he did not sign the official documents or become involved with the Particular Baptist 'denomination'. In fact, he had clear points of dispute with the Particular Baptists. See Wallace, *Puritans and Predestination*, 161. Also note that Keach only cited Bunyan twice, and both of those refer to Bunyan's view on the Sabbath. See Keach, *Jewish Sabbath abrogated*, 117, 129. Keach *did* hold Bunyan in high esteem. See Chapter II, 45.

¹³⁵ Collins, *Mountains of brass*, 3-4.

¹³⁶ Keach, *Gospel mysteries unveil'd*, II:59. Cf. Keach, *The display of glorious grace*, 18.

¹³⁷ Keach, *The display of glorious grace*, 302. See Keach, *The articles of the faith*, postscript, 37-38.

¹³⁸ Keach, *Gospel mysteries unveil'd*, I:204, citing Eph. 1.4-5. Cf. Keach, *Christ alone*, 47.

¹³⁹ Keach, *Gospel mysteries unveil'd*, I:19. See above.

tween this virtual justification outside time and the actual justification within time, which he included later in his *ordo* and which he highlighted in his defense against the Baxterian charges of Antinomianism.¹⁴⁰ That distinction lay in his limiting virtual justification to ‘Christ’s receiving [the Elect’s] Discharge and Justification’¹⁴¹ and placing it completely within the unknowable mysteries of the divine will.¹⁴² Because the Baxterians separated the Covenants of Redemption and Grace, Keach argued they incorrectly combined virtual and actual justification (with both occurring when the individual became a party to the *Covenant of Grace*). Nevertheless, both sides claimed a similar stance on the Elect’s position in God’s eyes prior to conversion.¹⁴³

Within Time

Unlike much of the pre-temporal sequence of the *ordo salutis* which remained hidden in the unknowable mysteries of God’s will, the temporal aspects of Keach’s logical order of salvation could be known with much more certainty. This side of the sequence began with the actual creation (rather than simply the decree of creation¹⁴⁴) and the corresponding beginning of time which moved humanity from a mere aspect of the divine will to a being with actual existence. Keach followed the likes of William Ames, among others, in positing the dual aspect of humanity’s being: the existence in the divine mind and the actual existence on Earth.¹⁴⁵ Once creation actually occurred, the accompanying foreseen events—which left humanity in need of salvation, left divine justice in need of satisfaction, and finally left the Elect justified—also occurred in their appropriate order.

The Fall and Human Depravity

The first post-creation event of import for Keach was Adam’s fall from innocence, an event which Keach, like most Reformed theologians, referred to as both the

¹⁴⁰ See Petto, *The difference between the old and new covenant*.

¹⁴¹ Keach, *A medium betwixt two extremes*, 34.

¹⁴² Keach, *The display of glorious grace*, 164.

¹⁴³ Cf. Williams, *Gospel-truth stated*, 3. Neither side acknowledged the similarities in their views.

¹⁴⁴ To be fair, Keach did not refer to a divine decree of creation, but the concept can obviously be inferred from his writing.

¹⁴⁵ Keach, *The display of glorious grace*, 33.

Fall and the breaking of the *Covenant of Works*.¹⁴⁶ Because Adam served as a ‘publick person’ or federal representative for all of humanity,¹⁴⁷ his original sin had dire consequences for his entire progeny. Primarily, the Fall left all humanity with a ‘depraved Nature’.¹⁴⁸ Adam and all of his progeny had forfeited the ‘free Will to do good’ which naturally accompanied the ‘state of Innocency’ in which Adam had been created.¹⁴⁹ The human became ‘so depraved, corrupted, and carried away to Sin and Vanity’¹⁵⁰ that humans not only had ‘no Power to do that which is spiritual Good’¹⁵¹ but they also had a ‘*Moral Privation*, a want of *Will*’ to do that good.¹⁵² Importantly, the Fall also left humanity *actually* guilty of Adam’s sin and deserving of condemnation.

This view of original sin and the total privation of humanity once again evidenced Keach’s movement away from the General Baptists and other anti-predestinarians who argued against the imputation of Adam’s guilt—though those theologians differed on their views of the effects of Adam’s fall from innocence on all humanity¹⁵³—and generally held to a retained human ability to choose or reject God’s justifying grace. If they held to the existence of original sin at all, some of the more extreme anti-predestinarians taught that the waters of baptism served to remove any of its lingering effects.¹⁵⁴ In any case, these anti-predestinarian beliefs resulted in a humanity capable of choosing his/her own salvific destiny, a concept the mature Keach found repulsive. The disparity on this doctrine between Keach and the Baxterians stemmed from the effects of original sin on humanity rather than its existence or even its definition. The Baxterians agreed with the common Reformed notion of imputed

¹⁴⁶ Keach, *Gospel mysteries unveil'd*, I:11 and II:56. Here, Keach displayed a clearly Augustinian understanding of original sin.

¹⁴⁷ Keach, *The display of glorious grace*, 14. See Chapter V, 166-7.

¹⁴⁸ Keach, *The marrow of true justification*, 5, citing Romans 5.12.

¹⁴⁹ Keach, *Gospel mysteries unveil'd*, II:240.

¹⁵⁰ Keach, *Gospel mysteries unveil'd*, I:104.

¹⁵¹ Keach, *The everlasting covenant*, 32.

¹⁵² Keach, *Gospel mysteries unveil'd*, I:18.

¹⁵³ For examples of the General Baptist stance on original sin, see *Standard Confession*, Art. X; Bass, ‘Thomas Grantham and General Baptist Theology’, 215.

¹⁵⁴ For example, see Henry Hammond, *The daily practice of devotion, or, The hours of prayer fitted to the main uses of a Christian life also lamentations and prayers for the peaceful re-settlement of this church and state* (London: for R. Royston ... 1684), 16. For examples of the General Baptist positions, see John Smyth, *Short confession of faith in XX articles* (1609), Art. 5; Thomas Helwys, *A short confession of faith* (1610), Art. 6-7; Helwys, *A short and plaine prooffe*.

guilt and sin from Adam,¹⁵⁵ but they held that postlapsarian humanity remained able to achieve some sort of righteousness—though, admittedly, not perfect righteousness.¹⁵⁶ Significantly, even this imperfect righteousness preceded justification, according to the Baxterians, and, thus, could not be equated with Keach’s view of the inherent righteousness of sanctification which necessarily followed justification.¹⁵⁷ The Quakers, on the other hand, denied the Reformed doctrine of original sin, instead opting to change the definition of the term itself. Whitehead, Fox, and Penington all explicitly stated that they held to a doctrine of original sin, strangely meaning they believed that ‘the Devil was the *Author and Original of all Sin*’.¹⁵⁸ They did not hold to any concept of imputed sin or guilt.¹⁵⁹

Announcements of the Covenant of Grace

The introduction of original sin into the human-divine relationship, combined with the accompanying imputation of guilt and bondage of the human will to sin, provided the opportunity for God to announce His already-established plan for redemption.¹⁶⁰ Keach saw the proclamation of God’s gracious gift of peace for select members of fallen humanity and pardon from their sins as the key aspect of these announcements.¹⁶¹ In other words this aspect of the *ordo* consisted of God declaring to the world what he had already accomplished in this second covenant and for whom the covenant had been struck.¹⁶² Keach did not equate these divine announcements with a personal invitation to enter into the *Covenant of Grace*. He did, however, make

¹⁵⁵ Clark, *Scripture justification*, 98, ‘... we are made Sinners by the Imputation of the Guilt of Adam’s first Sin...’.

¹⁵⁶ Baxter, *Apology*, 92; Williams, *Gospel-truth stated*, sig. A5v; Clark, *Scripture justification*, 105.

¹⁵⁷ See below in the *ordo salutis*, 203-5.

¹⁵⁸ George Whitehead, *A serious account in XXXV evident reasons (to all who desire satisfaction) why the people of the lord, called Quakers, cannot go to worship at those places called churches and chapels* (London: for Robert Wilson, 1661), 21; Penington and Fox, *Some principles*, 51.

¹⁵⁹ Whitehead, *A serious account*, 21. Also see Samuel Cater and Francis Holcroft, *A relation of some of the most material matters that passed in a publick dispute at Thriploe in Cambridgeshire the 15th day of the 2d month 1676* (London?: s.n., 1676), 6.

¹⁶⁰ See Chapter V, esp. 160-2. Cf. Keach, *The display of glorious grace*, 181.

¹⁶¹ Keach, *The everlasting covenant*, 41.

¹⁶² Keach, *The display of glorious grace*, 123, 165.

room for personal invitations at a point later in his *ordo*, specifically the point of actual justification.

Actual Justification

Keach's all-important distinction between virtual and actual justification found its conclusion at this point in his *ordo salutis*. Having already been included in the establishment of the salvific *Covenant of Grace*—though without their knowledge and not dependent on their actions—the Elect now actually received the grace which had been promised.¹⁶³ This event—and for Keach, justification was indeed an event—included the entirety of conversion which involved a state of preparation for the sinner (initiated by the Holy Spirit but for which the individual would be held responsible), an infusion of grace from the Holy Spirit, and finally a personal belief or faith in Christ's salvific work. Keach did not specify precisely where in that protracted event an individual actually could be considered *justified*. However, that point must have coincided with personal belief, for faith served as both the instrument of that justification and the first evidence of a converted life.¹⁶⁴ This placement of faith in the *ordo* was one of the issues where Keach disagreed with Tobias Crisp (and others who were charged with Antinomianism) who placed justification firmly before faith in the *ordo*.¹⁶⁵

Keach rarely missed an opportunity to highlight the activity of the Holy Spirit, and this point of the *ordo* provided a perfect opportunity to do just that. Keach noted that the Holy Spirit had been involved in the process of salvation from its very inception. In contrast to the covenantal schemes of other divines who often presented the Holy Spirit as nothing more than a bystander brought into the scenario simply because

¹⁶³ Keach, *The grand impostor discovered*, 254.

¹⁶⁴ Keach, *The display of glorious grace*, 165.

¹⁶⁵ Crisp, *Christ alone exalted*, 85. Cf. Como, *Blown by the Spirit*, 201. Thomas Edwards, Keach's fellow anti-Baxterian Particular Baptist, confused the issue by using the term *personal justification* to refer to virtual justification and placing it in the eternal decrees. His view of *actual justification* agreed with Keach's and was simultaneous with belief. He also appeared to present actual justification without any connection to faith. Edwards, *The paraselene dismantled*, 100. Elsewhere, however, he admitted the requirement of faith for actual justification, p. 382.

of His relation to the Triune Godhead,¹⁶⁶ Keach, like the three major confessions he generally followed, noted the Spirit's active role in the entire process, surprisingly emphasizing the Spirit's unique role even more than Owen or Goodwin.¹⁶⁷ At this point of the *ordo* the Holy Spirit took up the mantle of primary agent, bringing the special, salvific grace to the Elect. The Spirit performed the preparatory work which made the hearer able and willing to accept the Gospel, a process which Keach likened to the tilling and plowing that results in the fertile ground of the 'Parable of the Sower' in Matthew 13.¹⁶⁸ This preparatory work involved the already-mentioned infusion of special grace or a 'vital Principle'¹⁶⁹ which allowed the person, once dead in Adam's sin but now made alive, to see his/her sinful condition and to apprehend the spiritual.¹⁷⁰ Once a person could truly apprehend the spiritual, he/she would, without fail, opt 'cheerfully and freely to chuse and accept of Jesus Christ'.¹⁷¹ This spiritual understanding and certain (but free) acceptance of Christ distinguished Keach's view of special grace from his view of common grace which could also lead to a person's

¹⁶⁶ Because of the understanding of one of the covenants being between the Father and the Son, seventeenth-century divines often omitted the Holy Spirit from conversations about the covenants. This does not mean that they did not believe that the covenants involved the Trinity, simply that they did not emphasize the role of the Holy Spirit. See, for instance, Baxter, *Baxter's confession [sic] of his faith*, 290. This is a particularly surprising omission by Baxter when considering his understanding of the *vestigia trinitatis* (vestiges of the Trinity) which he saw as present throughout creation. See Boersma, *A Hot Pepper Corn*, 30. Riker inexplicably presented Keach's view of the *Covenant of Grace* in this light. Riker, 'A Catholic Reformed Theologian', 103. See Chapter V.

¹⁶⁷ Cf. Owen, *Pneumatologia*. Note that Owen only mentioned the Spirit's role in the Elect's union with Christ on three different occasions in this tome. Keach, on the other hand, noted this role of the Spirit no less than eight times in, *A golden mine opened*, a much shorter work not focused specifically on the Spirit. Isaac Chauncy followed Owen closely. See Chauncy, *Neonomianism unmask'd*. Note Chauncy's emphasis on union with Christ without the accompanying emphasis on the Holy Spirit.

¹⁶⁸ Keach, *Gospel mysteries unveil'd*, I:112. Keach saw only the last of the four ground examples in the parable as referring to the Elect.

¹⁶⁹ Keach, *Gospel mysteries unveil'd*, I:128. This term became common in the 1650s, although Keach may have borrowed it from John Owen who used the term as early as 1644. John Owen, *ΘΕΟΜΑΧΙΑ ΑΥΤΕΞΟΥΣΙΑΣΤΙΚΗ*, or, *A display of Arminianisme* (London: I.L. for Phil. Stephens, 1643), 135. The term was not unique to theology as it simply meant 'life-giving force'. See William Harvey, *Anatomical exercitations, concerning the generation of living creatures* (London: James Young for Octavian Pulleyn, 1653), sig. a5r.

¹⁷⁰ Keach, *A golden mine opened*, 402. Significantly, the 'hyper-Calvinist', John Skepp, later agreed with this placement of spiritual union before faith. See John Skepp, *Divine energy or the efficacious operations of the spirit of God upon the soul of man* (London: for Joseph Marshall and Aaron Ward, 1722), 165.

¹⁷¹ Keach, *Gospel mysteries unveil'd*, III:5.

conviction of sin but could never result in his/her spiritual apprehension or union with Christ.

This view of common and special grace—which left common grace out of the *ordo salutis*¹⁷²—allowed Keach to explain difficult passages of scripture such as the ‘falling away’ passage of Hebrews 6 and any anecdotal accounts of apostate believers while still holding to the security, or perseverance, of the true believer, a belief which separated the Particular Baptists from the General Baptists.¹⁷³ Those who experienced only common grace could *appear* to believe and yet fall away, whereas those who experienced special grace could never apostatize because they were not involved in the work from the beginning, and no human action could destroy a completely divine work.¹⁷⁴ The Holy Spirit even provided the free gift of faith which allowed the sinner to believe and take up his/her role in the people of God. Keach referred to this entire process—the infusion of the vital principle, convincing of truth, conviction of sin, and granting of faith—as the sinner’s mystical union with Christ,¹⁷⁵ a process which had been included *in toto* in the terms of the *Covenant of Grace*, and thus was as secure and certain as the *Covenant of Grace* itself¹⁷⁶ and was accomplished by the Holy Spirit.¹⁷⁷

At times, Keach appeared to present the work of the Holy Spirit in uniting the Elect with Christ as synonymous with actual justification.¹⁷⁸ However, when pressing his logical order, Keach held that actual justification occurred *after* the individual’s union with Christ, for that union formed the basis of a person’s participation in the *Covenant of Grace* by providing the faith which necessarily (and simultaneously) ac-

¹⁷² Keach, *The display of glorious grace*, 167. Clifford argued that Owen included common grace in the *ordo*. If he is correct, this proves to be another point where Keach differed from the Reformed leader.

¹⁷³ Keach, *The counterfeit Christian*, 46. The Particular Baptists highlighted perseverance of the Elect as one of the two major issues which separated them from the other Baptists. The other issue was personal Election. See *Narrative of the proceedings [1689]*, title page.

¹⁷⁴ Keach, *The counterfeit Christian*, 46.

¹⁷⁵ Keach, *The display of glorious grace*, 165.

¹⁷⁶ See Chapter V, esp. 158-60.

¹⁷⁷ Thus, he could have his congregation sing about the Holy Spirit’s role. Keach, *Spiritual melody*, Hymn 157.

¹⁷⁸ Keach, *A medium betwixt two extremes*, 37-38. Cf. Keach, *The display of glorious grace*, 81.

accompanied actual justification.¹⁷⁹ Only with that faith, but not *because* of that faith could a person be said to be ‘actually Pardoned [or] Justified’.¹⁸⁰ Thus, despite the necessity of faith, Keach maintained that the Elect remained ‘altogether passive’ in justification. Faith did not produce justification, only Christ, as the *object* of faith, did.¹⁸¹

Both the Baxterians and Quakers took exception to this aspect of Keach’s *ordo salutis*. For the Baxterians, the idea that the Elect remained wholly passive in the salvific process could only be considered blasphemous. A wholly passive person could by no means be considered either to have faith or to be justified at any point in the Baxterian *ordo*—chronological *or* logical.¹⁸² Passivity undermined the requirement of personal, sincere obedience which the Baxterians held as the conditional aspect of the *Covenant of Grace*. The issue for the Baxterians actually proved to be rather complex. On the one hand, the Baxterians argued against passive justification, opting to emphasize the conditional requirements of active obedience. On the other hand, they sometimes appeared to equivocate from this position. For instance, Daniel Williams argued that people were pardoned ‘so soon as [they] believe[d] ... even before there can be time to put forth any other Acts of Obedience’.¹⁸³ Samuel Clark attempted to harmonize these positions by explaining that ‘justification does not properly and strictly consist in *Pardon*’. Rather, Clark and the rest of the Baxterians considered the pardon to be ‘unseparably join’d with *Justification* ... and [an] undivided Companion of it’.¹⁸⁴ According to Clark’s explanation, an explanation with which Baxter agreed, pardon accompanied faith, but justification remained incomplete until Judgement

¹⁷⁹ Keach, *The display of glorious grace*, 165. On this point, Keach disagreed ever so slightly with Hanserd Knollys, who did not make the distinction between actual justification and union with Christ. See Hanserd Knollys, *An exposition of the first chapter of the Song of Solomon* (London,: W. Godbid, 1656), 64-65. Cf. Howson, ‘Hanserd Knollys’, 123. To be fair, Keach had far more publications in which (and from which) his theology could be honed. Keach also differed from what was apparently his major source for Luther’s theology, John Troughton. See John Troughton, *Lutherus redivivus, or, The Protestant doctrine of justification by Christ’s righteousness imputed to believers, explained and vindicated* (London: Sam. Lee, 1678), II:11.

¹⁸⁰ Keach, *Gospel mysteries unveil’d*, III:36 (This edition has two pages marked ‘36’. This quotation can be found on the first of these.). Cf. Keach, *The grand impostor discovered*, 255.

¹⁸¹ Keach, *The articles of the faith*, Art. XII. In this, Keach agreed with many in the Reformed tradition, including Calvin. See Calvin, *The institution of Christian religion*, III.xi.7.

¹⁸² Baxter, *Of justification*, 198-99.

¹⁸³ Williams, *A defence of Gospel-truth*, sig. A3v. Cf. Daniel Williams, *The vanity of childhood & youth* (London: for John Dunton, 1691), 129.

¹⁸⁴ Clark, *Scripture justification*, 18.

Day.¹⁸⁵ Keach, on the other hand, saw justification as a completed act—a final declaration—at the point of actual union with Christ. He left no lapse between pardon and justification, although he did acknowledge a distinction between the two. In Keach's *ordo*, actual union with Christ preceded a faith-enveloped justification.¹⁸⁶ For the Baxterians, the order involved simultaneous faith and pardon followed by works and a progressive completion of justification.

The Quaker objection to Keach's logical order also stemmed from his placement of justification alongside faith and his defense of the monergistic view of salvation. For the Quakers the idea that anyone who remained a sinner could be justified caused grave concerns. On this issue, the Quakers moved beyond the *incomplete justification* idea espoused by the Baxterians. Thus, like the Baxterians, the Quakers required active obedience for justification; however, unlike the Baxterians, the Quakers believed that the new covenant still required *perfect* active obedience *and* that God's children must obtain that perfect obedience. For them, non-imputed justification must be complete this side of heaven.¹⁸⁷ Union with Christ, then, could not precede justification.

Sanctification and Regeneration

Although he carefully distinguished between the two, Keach believed sanctification, or the removal of 'the filth of our Sins', and justification, or the removal of the 'Guilt of our Sins',¹⁸⁸ to be inextricably linked—with justification preceding sanctification in the *ordo*. In agreement with much of the Reformed tradition including the three major relevant confessions, Keach argued that sanctification involved an infusion of holiness to the elect, such that the believer thus became inherently righteous

¹⁸⁵ For an example where Baxter clearly delineates between pardon and justification, see Baxter, *Universal redemption*, 32.

¹⁸⁶ Not surprisingly, this version of the *ordo salutis* aligned with that of Isaac Chauncy and John Owen; see Chauncy, *Neonomianism unmask'd*, 11-12; Owen, *The doctrine of justification by faith*. Keach also aligned well with Reformed theology in general. See McGowan, 'Justification and the Ordo Salutis.' 153-55. Wallace missed this dual *ordo* when he claimed that Owen et al placed justification before actual election. Wallace, *Puritans and Predestination*, 110.

¹⁸⁷ Penn, *The sandy foundation shaken*, 34. Cf. Keach, *The grand impostor discovered*, 254.

¹⁸⁸ Keach, *Gospel mysteries unveil'd*, I:11, 106.

inasmuch as the Holy Spirit worked in and through him/her.¹⁸⁹ Sanctification and holiness, then, were simply good fruits which necessarily accompanied true faith, for indeed ‘no Man can enter into the Kingdom of Heaven that is not born again [regenerate], and made inherently holy [sanctified]’.¹⁹⁰ But they were by no means the cause of that faith or justification.

In order for the infusion of holiness to take hold, a new heart must have been previously given to the believer, a process which Keach referred to as regeneration. This regeneration provided the ground from which ‘true Holiness springs up’¹⁹¹ and, like all of salvation, could only be accomplished by a gracious work of God.¹⁹² To a certain extent, then, regeneration served as the basis for the on-going process of sanctification. However, Keach was careful not to conflate this event with that of justification, for regeneration and sanctification had nothing to do with the appeasing of God’s wrath or the provision of satisfaction for the sins of the Elect. The difference, in Keach’s mind, was simply that regeneration and sanctification involved an inherent change and, thus, could provide occasion for the individual to boast over against the grace of God. Keach also emphasized that regeneration and sanctification—in contrast to justification—remained incomplete this side of heaven. On numerous occasions, Keach charged both other groups with confusing these two aspects of the *ordo*, thereby making justification and regeneration dependent upon the works of the creature rather than solely on the work of God.¹⁹³ In fact, Samuel Clark admitted to Keach’s charges when he said:

I infer, That Justifying Faith is the same thing in Substance with Effectual Calling, Repentance, Regeneration, Conversion, Sanctification, Renovation, Forming of *Christ* in the Soul, repairing the Image of God in the Soul, being partakers of the Divine Nature ...¹⁹⁴

¹⁸⁹ Keach, *The marrow of true justification*, sig. Bv. Cf. Chauncy, *Neonomianism unmask'd*, 103; Calvin, *The institution of Christian religion*, II.iii.11. Cf. Art. XIII in *Westminster Confession and Catechisms; Savoy Declaration; Second London Confession*.

¹⁹⁰ Keach, *Gospel mysteries unveil'd*, I:64; Keach, *Spiritual melody*, Part VII: Hymn 127.

¹⁹¹ Keach, *Gospel mysteries unveil'd*, I:152.

¹⁹² Keach, *A golden mine opened*, 423.

¹⁹³ Against the Baxterians: Keach, *A medium betwixt two extremes*, 38. Against the Quakers: Keach, *The grand impostor discovered*, 255.

¹⁹⁴ Clark, *Scripture justification*, 62.

This conflation of all aspects of the *ordo salutis* into a single concept removed any possibility of meaningful dialogue over the logical order and provided fodder for the opponents of Baxterianism. Keach et al used these types of statements to place the Baxterians in the same party as the Papists,¹⁹⁵ a damning claim in seventeenth-century England.

Role of Faith

Keach's constant reference to faith in relation to justification (and all aspects of salvation) came as no surprise given his proud adherence to the Reformed tradition. As with the other aspects of justification, Keach did not simply leave his readers and congregants to ascertain the role of faith from other divines. Rather, he charged into this aspect of the debate armed with his usual combination of resolve and support from his favorite Reformed sources. His understanding of the role of faith served not only to further establish his place within the Reformed tradition, but it also served to further distance himself from his two main groups of interlocutors. The disparity between Keach and the Quakers on this issue could not be clearer because the Quakers consistently agreed with Penn's assessment 'that by works a man is justified, and not by Faith only'.¹⁹⁶ The distinction between Keach and the Baxterians, however, proved to be more difficult because the Baxterians asserted what Keach deemed to be a nuanced (and heterodox) understanding of the role of faith. The fact that both sides of this debate used the same terms with different meanings only served to confuse the discussion.

From the outset, Keach adopted the Lutheran (and what became the Reformed) understanding of justification by faith alone.¹⁹⁷ Importantly, Keach adopted

¹⁹⁵ For example, Keach, *The marrow of true justification*, 36; Keach, *The display of glorious grace*, 77; Keach, *Travels of true godliness* [7th edn], 97.

¹⁹⁶ Penn, *The sandy foundation shaken*, 28 (italics inverted).

¹⁹⁷ Identifying Luther's support for this idea can be problematic, as the doctrine caused several problems for the Reformer, including the original Protestant debate over antinomianism, which pitted Luther against Johannes Agricola. See Martin Luther, *Luther's Works* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1971), 101-106. Also see J. Wayne Baker, 'Sola Fide, Sola Gratia: The Battle for Luther in Seventeenth-Century England', *Sixteenth Century Journal* 16 (1985); Gordon Stanley Decker, 'Luther's Doctrines of Justification and Sanctification', *Reformed Theological Review* 26 (1967). Regardless, Keach recognized his debt to Luther, even penning a hymn celebrating Luther's bold stance at Worms: 'When I the Tiles on Mouses see/With all their crooked Forms/Makes me to mind how *Luther* bold/Went to the City *Wormes*'. Keach, *A feast of fat things*, cent. II, 25.

his view of Luther largely from the work of John Troughton, who, like Keach, opposed the moralism inherent in Baxter's theology.¹⁹⁸ This largely limited Keach's understanding of Luther to the German Reformer's earliest works on justification by faith, especially his *Commentary on Galatians*. Ironically, these were the same works used by the earliest Antinomians of the Protestant era whom Luther rebuffed. Keach clearly identified his understanding of this doctrine when, in one of his epic poems, he had the sinner who would come to Christ state:

... my own worthiness in every thing
I do renounce, and further vow that I
Upon the Bloud and Righteousness will lie;
On that, and that alone, will I depend
By Faith always until my life shall end.¹⁹⁹

In one of his first allegorical works, Keach listed 'the Doctrine of Justification by Faith alone' as one of the 'principles of divine truths, or fundamentals of Christian Faith'.²⁰⁰ He later included '*Justification ... apprehended and received by Faith alone*' as part of the 'grand Truth, in which mainly the Reformation consisted'. To support this view of the Reformation, he marshaled an impressive list of divines with whom he claimed to agree, including '*Luther, Melancthon, Calvin, Zanchy, Perkins, Ames, Dr. Usher, Dr. Goodwin, Dr. Owen, Dr. Sibs, Dr. Preston, Norton, Burroughs, Caryl, Pemble, the Assembly, and indeed all other Antient and Modern Writers generally*'.²⁰¹

Like each of these divines, Keach recognized that the *sola fide* phrase did not suffice as a full statement of the role of faith.²⁰² He even granted that the Baxterians could agree with *some* idea of this doctrine. Indeed, Baxter stated his support of the idea explicitly in his *Confession of Faith*.²⁰³ Keach, though, noted a stark contrast be-

¹⁹⁸ Keach cited Troughton's *Lutherus redivivus* multiple times throughout his works on justification.

¹⁹⁹ Benjamin Keach, *The glorious lover. A divine poem, upon the adorable mystery of sinners redemption* (London: J.D. for Christopher Hussey, 1679), 253.

²⁰⁰ Keach, *The travels of true godliness*, 3.

²⁰¹ Keach, *A medium betwixt two extremes*, 36.

²⁰² See the discussion of some of the clarifications in McGrath, *Iustitia Dei: a History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification*, 229-55 (ff.).

²⁰³ Baxter, *Baxter's confessional [sic] of his faith*, 88. Clearly Riker has overstated his case for the Antinomians (as solafideists) being closer to Luther than the rest of Reformed Protestantism. Riker, 'A Catholic Reformed Theologian', 91. In fact, Luther specifically argued against the extreme form of Antinomianism charged against Agricola, Luther, *Luther's Works*, 107-19. Certainly Cooper was correct to claim 'that there were two Luthers'. Cooper, 'The Antinomians Redeemed', 252. The seventeenth century Antinomians almost all cited Luther's *Commentary on Galatians* as support, ignoring

tween his understanding of the role of faith and that espoused by the Baxterians and he sought to prove that this dividing line left Keach on the same side as those greats of the Reformed tradition with the Baxterians firmly entrenched in opposition.²⁰⁴ Thus, Keach provided three specific points of clarification: that faith is the gift of the Holy Spirit included as a part of the *Covenant of Grace* fulfilled by Christ; that faith serves as the instrumental cause of justification; and that faith which justifies alone does not stand alone. Each of these distinctions could be found both in the Reformed tradition and in the major Reformed confessions in use during Keach's day.

Benefit of the Covenant of Grace

First and foremost, Keach saw faith as a gift from God obtained by Christ's fulfillment of the *Covenant of Grace* in the stead of the Elect.²⁰⁵ For Keach, and other federal theologians, this allowed faith to be necessarily present within the Elect for actual justification to occur *without* providing any room for the individual believer to boast.²⁰⁶ Again, Keach intentionally presented God as the *sole* actor in salvation,²⁰⁷ and he charged the Baxterians with giving humans an active role in their salvation.²⁰⁸

The Instrumental Cause of Justification

Keach clarified his meaning of *justification by faith alone* by making the common specification that faith served as a mere instrument whereby Christ may be received,²⁰⁹ arguing that 'Faith apprehends Jesus Christ to our Justification'.²¹⁰ Keach,

Luther's writings against Antinomianism. Keach followed this same example, appropriating much from John Troughton's *Lutherus redivivus*.

²⁰⁴ Keach, *Light broke forth in Wales*, xvii.

²⁰⁵ Keach, *The display of glorious grace*, 165. Cf. Chap. XI in the three confessions. See Chapter V.

²⁰⁶ As has been seen, Keach viewed faith in the believer and justification to occur logically simultaneously in the *ordo salutis*.

²⁰⁷ Keach, *A golden mine opened*, 494-5; Keach, *Gospel mysteries unveil'd*, II:69, 71.

²⁰⁸ Keach, *Gospel mysteries unveil'd*, I:25. For the Baxterian view, see the discussions above under *Actual Justification*, 199-203.

²⁰⁹ Keach, *The articles of the faith*, Art. XIII; Keach, *Gospel mysteries unveil'd*, II:114, III:5; Keach, *The display of glorious grace*, 81. Cf. Ussher, *A body of divinitie*, 196; Calvin, *The institution of Christian religion*, III.xi.7; Owen, *The doctrine of justification by faith*, 149. Note also the use of the term 'instrument of justification' in Chap. XI of the three relevant confessions. Significantly, this language was not present in either the 1644 or the 1646 *London Confession*, although the same understanding of

like many other divines, made this point by distinguishing between different types of causes, although Keach utilized a fairly simplistic distinction between a *meritorious* and an *instrumental* cause of justification whereas others—including Calvin and Owen—used a more complex system.²¹¹ Keach saw Christ’s righteousness as the former, for His righteousness alone ‘is perfect, being pleadable at God’s Bar’.²¹² However, that meritorious cause of justification must be applied to the believer and received by him/her. Faith, then, served as the ‘Hand by which the Spirit doth apply’ Christ’s righteousness.²¹³ Thus, faith could not be said to justify in the proper sense of the word. Only ‘Jesus Christ that Faith takes hold of [could] ... Justifie us in the Sight of God’.²¹⁴ Clearly, Keach—explicitly agreeing with his reading of Luther—desired to keep the focus on Christ and His righteousness as the cause of forensic justification.²¹⁵ His version of justification, then, could more aptly be described as *solo Christus* than *sola fide*. Whether or not the average reader or congregant could grasp the difference between faith as an instrumental cause or a condition of justification remains up for debate. Keach’s own hymns may have hindered his teaching on this point. In one such hymn, he had his congregation sing:

‘Tis Faith whereby we do receive
 free Pardon of our Sin;
 ‘Tis he alone who doth Revive
 that Glorious work within:
 But Faith, which *doth us Justify*,
 most Precious Fruit doth bear,
 True Faith, O Lord, doth Purify
 the Heart, if it be there.

faith was (arguably) implicit in that confession. Cf. Art. XXII in *1644 London Confession*; *1646 London Confession*.

²¹⁰ Keach, *Gospel mysteries unveil'd*, I:31.

²¹¹ For example, Calvin detailed four kinds of causes: the cause [later described as ‘efficient cause’], the material cause, the formal or instrumental cause, and the final cause. Calvin, *The institution of Christian religion*, III.xiv.17. John Owen identified five different types of causes: the meritorious, procuring, material, formal, and manifesting. Owen, *The doctrine of justification by faith*, 168.

²¹² Keach, *The display of glorious grace*, 83.

²¹³ Keach, *Gospel mysteries unveil'd*, II:114. Again, note the emphasis on the Spirit.

²¹⁴ Keach, *The display of glorious grace*, 81.

²¹⁵ See Troughton, *Lutherus redivivus*, 8.

He did attempt to clarify this instrumental cause of faith in the immediately following hymn:

Let *sinner*s now to *Jesus* fly,
that *grafted* they may be
In him, by Faith, most speedily,
no other way can we...²¹⁶

Baxter, in his opposition to the concept of faith as the instrumental cause of justification, also claimed to place the focus on Christ. Perhaps seeing some of the inconsistency apparent in Keach's hymns, Baxter argued that an instrumental cause actually must be considered efficient (or meritorious) in some sense of the word. On those grounds, Baxter not only rejected this view of faith, but he also claimed to 'giv[e] less to Faith' than those of Keach's opinion.²¹⁷ By contrast, Baxter claimed that 'Faith justifieth not as an Instrument, but as a Condition'.²¹⁸ However, the Baxterians did nothing more to clarify the issue. In fact, by making faith a condition of a person's inclusion in the *Covenant of Grace*, the Baxterians necessarily made faith an efficient aspect of justification, a point which Keach used against them with great effectiveness, even branding their doctrine as 'one of the grossest parts of *Popery*'.²¹⁹

Justifying Faith is not Alone

The phrase *Fides solum justificat, non autem fides sola*, or 'faith alone justifies but not the faith which is alone', had already become a commonplace within the broad array of Reformed theology by Keach's day. Such was the support of this concept that authors as diverse as Richard Baxter, William Perkins, Christopher Cartwright (d. 1658), and Richard Montagu (d. 1641) could all use the phrase without much clarification. Indeed, Montagu may have only been slightly exaggerating when

²¹⁶ Keach, *A feast of fat things*, Hymn 68 (emphasis added), Hymn 69. In another collection of hymns, *Spiritual melody*, Keach almost always used faith in a clearly instrumental manner.

²¹⁷ Baxter, *Of justification*, 162. See Boersma, *A Hot Pepper Corn*, 185ff.

²¹⁸ Baxter, *Of justification*, 358.

²¹⁹ Keach, *The marrow of true justification*, 28, 37. Also see, Keach, *The display of glorious grace*, 77; Keach, *Travels of true godliness [7th edn]*, 95. Keach branded the Neonomians as Papists—either implicitly or explicitly—quite frequently, even comparing Williams and Clark, by name, to Popery. The quotation in the text referred specifically to Williams while Keach referred to Clark in *A medium betwixt two extremes*, 37. Each time, this charge of Popery stemmed from the Baxterian view of inherent righteousness playing a role in justification.

he said that this phrase was ‘in euery Protestants mouth’.²²⁰ Keach was certainly not the exception to Montagu’s observation. Indeed, he argued—alongside the Westminster Assembly, the Congregationalists, and the Particular Baptists as a whole—that faith ‘is not alone in the person justified’.²²¹ According to this view, true faith always brought with it holiness and good works, but the logical order of these aspects held extreme importance. Faith necessarily preceded the good works for before grace and faith has been ‘sowed or infused into their Hearts’, people (even the Elect) can ‘bring forth nothing but Sin’.²²² That being the case, Keach refused to accept his opponents’ charge that his view made good works unnecessary or promoted licentiousness.²²³ Good works served to justify true faith, or, to declare to the believer and to any witnesses that the faith which brought the works was real, saving faith.²²⁴ This, Keach argued, was the Apostle James’ point,²²⁵ and it proved to be another dividing line between Keach and his two main groups of opponents—both of whom placed good works or inherent righteousness prior to justification. To be fair, however, Baxter did claim that the works which preceded justification were *not* a cause of it.²²⁶

Antinomian?

Only with this understanding of Keach’s view of justification and the *ordo salutis* could a witness to the often-heated debates over justification in the midst of the Second Antinomian Controversy make an informed decision over the correct placement of Keach’s theology. For his part, Keach attacked the Antinomian issue head-on, even attempting to place himself firmly in the middle of the newly-reignited debate. He recognized from the beginning that those of the ‘Baxterian Party’ would label him an Antinomian, using the same broad brush they used to defame Dr. Crisp and others

²²⁰ Richard Montagu, *A gagg for the new Gospell? No: a nevv gagg for an old goose* (London: Thomas Snodham for Matthew Lownes and William Barret, 1624), 145. Cf. Nicholas Tyacke, *Aspects of English Protestantism, c.1530-1700* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2001), 304-305.

²²¹ Art. XI of the three confessions.

²²² Keach, *Gospel mysteries unveil'd*, I:115.

²²³ Keach, *The marrow of true justification*, sig. Bv.

²²⁴ Benjamin Keach, *A trumpet blown in Zion, or, An allarm in God's holy mountain containing an exposition of that metaphorical Scripture, Matth. III, 12* (London: s.n., 1694), 96.

²²⁵ Keach, *A golden mine opened*, 96.

²²⁶ Baxter, *Baxter's confessional [sic] of his faith*, see preface, sig. A3r-(f2)r.

who held to what Keach described as ‘the *True Ancient Protestant Doctrine* about *Justification, &c.*’.²²⁷ While he refused to agree completely with Crisp—or more precisely with the Crisp who was likely ‘mis-represented by his Opposers’—Keach did state that given the options he would ‘rather erre on their side, who strive to exalt wholly the Free Grace of God [i.e., Crisp], than on theirs, who seek to darken it and magnifie the Power of the Creature’.²²⁸ In fact, Keach saw himself as presenting a doctrine of justification which was ‘the medium betwixt two extremes’: one extreme being the Baxterian view which he claimed glorified the creature and free will, even bordering on Arminianism; and the other extreme being true Antinomianism (which he labeled *presumption*),²²⁹ complete with its eternal actual justification and the possibility (or probability) of licentiousness. Given that no one familiar with his work could rightly charge him with still holding to Arminian Errors, or even to Baxterianism, his real battle—especially given the time of his writing—came in his denial of the Antinomian extreme. When taken as a whole, his theology of justification certainly should have also cleared him of those baseless charges.

Specifically, Keach did not agree with the view of eternal justification which the Baxterians charged against him and which the ‘true Antinomians’ held. His explication of the parallel *ordo salutis* and his clarification that the actual union with Christ, though decreed in eternity, did not occur until the Holy Spirit infused the Elect sinner with the vital principle cleared him of this charge and also guarded him from the anti-evangelistic tendencies which appeared among some Particular Baptists in the early eighteenth century.²³⁰ In support of this view, Keach constantly cited Ephesians

²²⁷ Keach, *The display of glorious grace*, To the Reader, v (italics inverted).

²²⁸ Keach, *The marrow of true justification*, sig. A2r-Bv (italics inverted). Keach differed from Crisp on the role of faith and on the description of irresistible grace. Crisp saw justification as preceding faith rather than being enveloped by it, and Crisp saw grace being ‘forced’ onto the believer. Crisp, *Christ alone exalted*, 189. See David Parnham, ‘The Covenantal Quietism of Tobias Crisp’, *Church History* 75 (2006), 530.

²²⁹ Keach, *Gospel mysteries unveil'd*, I:27. Additionally, both the Baxterian and the Antinomian characters in *Travels of True Godliness* expressed their displeasure with the main character. See Keach, *Travels of true godliness [7th edn]*, 96, 101.

²³⁰ Vaughn suggested that Keach leaned in that direction and, at least, opened the door to the anti-evangelistic theology of Joseph Hussey (1660-1726), John Skepp (1675-1721), et al. This view failed to grasp Keach’s dual *ordo salutis* and the significance Keach placed on the union with Christ brought about by the Holy Spirit’s interaction with the individual Elect in actual time. Vaughn, ‘Public Worship and Practical Theology’, 217. Tom Nettles came closer to understanding Keach’s theology—although he still did not highlight the dual *ordo*. Tom J. Nettles, ‘Benjamin Keach (1640-1704).’ in *The British*

2 as proof that God viewed all people—even the Elect—as ‘Children of Wrath’ before the Holy Spirit actually united them to Christ.²³¹ Because of this, Keach regularly emphasized evangelism—both in his own preaching²³² and in his theological framework for the church²³³—and a personal experience of conversion. At times, Keach used the term *conversion* synonymously with *actual justification*, signifying his understanding that a person’s move from a member of the ‘Children of Wrath’ to the ‘Children of God’ occurred at the same time as his/her first being given the faith to believe.²³⁴ Ultimately, Keach taught precisely the doctrine espoused officially by the General Association of Particular Baptists in 1689.²³⁵ The fact that the divine decree of election occurred outside of time and in the unknowable recesses of God’s mind meant that, from the human perspective, everyone was potentially included in the *Covenant of Grace*, everyone was potentially Elect. He instructed local ministers to preach accordingly and the sinners to seek accordingly.²³⁶ This allowed Keach to place a high level of responsibility for conversion on the shoulders of both the sinner and the minister without diminishing his monergistic view of salvation.²³⁷

Because they held to the strict imputation of Christ’s active (in addition to his passive) obedience, those whom the Baxterians opposed as Antinomian actually did move logically closer to supporting potential licentiousness, or at least to legitimating the actual abolition of the law. One could logically argue that imputed active obedience rendered personal holiness redundant. For Baxter and those who had been involved in the First Antinomian Controversy, the fear of this teaching of licentious-

Particular Baptists: 1638-1910, ed. M.A.G. Haykin, I:95-132 (Springfield, MO: Particular Baptist Press, 1998). See the discussion of Vaughn in Riker, ‘A Catholic Reformed Theologian’, 60-63. Also see Toon, *Emergence of Hyper-Calvinism*.

²³¹ Keach, *Gospel mysteries unveil’d*, I:111; Keach, *Travels of true godliness [7th edn]*, 98-99.

²³² The collection of sermons in *Gospel mysteries unveil’d* stands as a prime example of Keach’s evangelistic preaching. Any collection of his sermons—even his funeral orations—provide support for Keach’s views of evangelism.

²³³ See his discussion of the minister’s role in *Gospel mysteries unveil’d*, II:217.

²³⁴ Keach, *Gospel mysteries unveil’d*, I:12.

²³⁵ *Narrative of the proceedings [1689]*. The Particular Baptists may have been following Keach’s lead.

²³⁶ Keach, *Gospel mysteries unveil’d*, III:65. Part of this seeking included obtaining the knowledge necessary for salvation through learning catechisms, listening to sermons, praying, etc. See Chapter III.

²³⁷ Keach, *Gospel mysteries unveil’d*, II:77.

ness had a firm basis in real experiences.²³⁸ The fear of the uprisings of the ‘original’ Antinomians from whom Luther had recoiled stoked the damage which a simple label could bring. In the case of Keach and his version of Reformed theology, the fears were obviously unfounded. Keach guarded against this logical move quite carefully by not only retaining a high theological view of the continued authority of the law as a ‘Rule of Life and Righteousness’²³⁹ for the believer but also by guiding his church to a high practical view, as evidenced by the intense regard for personal holiness held by the Particular Baptist Churches of this period.²⁴⁰ Keach simply argued that the law as a means of justification had been abrogated; it continued to have authority as a declaration of God’s holiness.

By Baxter’s own standards, then, Keach only taught part of the doctrine of Antinomianism: the strict imputation of Christ’s active and passive obedience.²⁴¹ However, Keach’s associations—both in life and in print—allowed him to fall victim to the common seventeenth-century practice of dismissing opponents by labeling them as extremists.²⁴² This was a practice to which the Baptists had become quite accustomed given their own common branding as *Anabaptists*, making it all the more interesting that Keach, himself, used those same tactics against his opponents. Despite his correct understanding of the issues at hand and his ability and willingness to truth-

²³⁸ Anne Hutchinson and her followers had argued for licentiousness in the North American colonies in the 1630s as had the earlier Antinomians on the continent.

²³⁹ Keach, *The articles of the faith*, Art. XVII. On this, Keach agreed with the Westminster Assembly and, explicitly, with Samuel Petto. *Westminster Confession and Catechisms*, Art. XIX; Petto, *The difference between the old and new covenant*, 170.

²⁴⁰ The extant church records of this era are replete with examples of members being chastened and disciplined for failure to live according to the rule of faith, at times even being excommunicated. Although the record book from Keach’s church at Horsleydown no longer exists, the church book for the Maze Pond Church which split from Keach’s congregation contained numerous examples of this type of church discipline. See *Maze Pond Church Book*, Angus Library, Regent’s Park College, Oxford, see entries dated 6 of 6 Month [Aug] 1700, 3 of 7 Month [Sept]. Additionally, Keach advocated this type of discipline in *The glory of a true church* (1697).

²⁴¹ Keach also did not fit the definition provided in *A declaration against the Antinomians*. The first four of the seven characteristics in that definition were answered by Keach’s distinction between virtual and actual justification and his insistence that Elect unbelievers are seen as *Children of Wrath* until such time as they are converted/actually united to Christ by the Holy Spirit. The fifth and sixth were countered by Keach’s view of progressive sanctification *and* the consequent need for church discipline. And the last was explicitly denied by Keach who held that only God knew/could know the identity of the Elect.

²⁴² For example, Keach maintained a close relationship with Hanserd Knollys who was charged with Antinomianism on numerous occasions. Keach also expressed his support for Tobias Crisp. Keach, *A medium betwixt two extremes*, 31; Keach, *The marrow of true justification*, sig. A2r.

fully engage with his opponents (as seen by his correct citations of his opponents), Keach often dismissed the Baxterians as ‘Papists’ and ‘Arminians’²⁴³ disregarding their truthful protestations against such labels. Against the Quakers, simply using that name proved to be extreme enough.

²⁴³ Keach, *A medium betwixt two extremes*, To the Reader, iv.

CHAPTER VII:
MILLENARIAN ESCHATOLOGY

When Benjamin Keach's publisher, John Dunton, eulogized him in his autobiography, Dunton included in his single-paragraph entry a rather odd statement:

here comes Mr *Keach*—mounted upon some Apocalyptical Beast or other, with *Babylon* before him, and *Zion* behind him, and a *Hundred Thousand Bulls and Bears and furious Beast of Prey*, roaring, ramping, and bellowing at him...¹

while much of that language from Dunton clearly referred to Keach's impressive reputation among the dissenting underground, the apocalyptical aspect of it could not be more telling. Despite Keach's lasting influence as a catechist and controversialist, some of his most immediate and deepest (at least in the short term) impact may very well have been due to his eschatological musings. In fact, nearly one hundred years after his death, his explications of biblical prophecy were still being cited as authoritative.²

Despite that influence, Keach's eschatological views have been almost completely ignored by Keachean scholars. Riker, Vaughn, and Brooks all completely omitted any discussion of this aspect of Keach's theology. Walker made only a very short mention of the topic, depending largely on the conclusions of Kenneth Newport who, as shall be seen, left a limited and incorrect reading of Keach's eschatology as the only modern picture of this formidable eschatologist.

While the neglect of this aspect of Keach's theology would be reason enough to pique some curiosities, it hardly justifies what can be a difficult study complete with strange biblical imagery, complicated numerology, and complex exegesis. Despite that inherent difficulty, however, the study proves necessary for evaluating Keach's relationship to the Reformed theology of his day in several ways. From at least the beginning of the Reformation, some of the most contentious boundaries of acceptable theology formed around the theological vision of the end times. This particular boundary proved to be especially germane for the English Baptists who con-

¹ Dunton, *The life and errors*, 236.

² See *Prophetical passages, concerning the present times* (London: for G. Riebau, 1795).

stantly worked hard to distance themselves from the continental Anabaptists. Keach's eschatological scheme also helped determine his right relationship to the radicals of his own day who were often motivated by their own eschatological hope. Thus, an in-depth study of Keach's eschatology serves more of a purpose than simply satisfying curiosities; it actually provides the final point of analysis for determining Keach's relationship to Reformed theology.

Eschatology in the Late Sixteenth and Early Seventeenth Centuries

Chiliasm

From their earliest years, Protestant Reformers inherited a nearly unanimous interest in the doctrine of the end times which they developed in numerous and diverse ways.³ Most agreed with Calvin that

fayth [is] called to thinke upon that visible presence, which he will openly shew at the laste Day. For he shal in visible forme come downe from heauen, euen such as he was seen to goe by: and he shall appere to all men with unspeakeable maiestie of his kyngdome ...⁴

Discussions of the end times could indeed become quite complicated with some of the common themes—such as the identification of the antichrist and other apocalyptic characters, the calculation of key biblical numbers, and the fate of the human soul—being part of the common currency of such discussions. While the early Reformers held various opinions about the interpretation of each of the themes and figures, they agreed to anticipate Christ's imminent return.⁵

Along with their passion for and expectation of the glorious return of Christ, the earliest Reformers also—almost unanimously—condemned any form of chiliasm, or the expectation of a literal, future thousand-year kingdom,⁶ just as the medieval

³ To be fair, they also inherited a reticence (or a perceived reticence) about John's *Apocalypse*. See Irena Backus, 'The Church Fathers and the Canonicity of the Apocalypse in the Sixteenth Century: Erasmus, Frans Titelmans, and Theodore Beza', *Sixteenth Century Journal* 29 (1998). Cf. Gribben, *The Puritan Millennium*.

⁴ Calvin, *The institution of Christian religion*, II.xvi.17.

⁵ See *Second Helvetic Confession*, Cap. 11; *Augsburg Confession*, Art. 17; *Heidelberg Catechism*, Q52; Luther, *Luther's Works*, 48:104. Calvin, *Commentary on Second Peter* 3:10.

⁶ The term 'chiliasm' stems from the Greek word for 'thousand', χίλιας. From the Latin term for 'thousand', *mille*, comes the English set of terms related to 'millennium'.

church had done before them.⁷ Fearing radical theological and political movements, the early Reformers sought to avoid what they saw as the extreme dangers of this heresy. Thus, the *Augsburg Confession* condemned others who ‘nowe a days do sowe abrode iudaical opinions y^l before the Resurrectiō of the deade the wicked shal be oppressed in euery place; & the good men shal occupy & possesse the kingdome of y^e world’.⁸ Only a few years after that confession, the Reformers’ worst fears regarding chiliasm were realized as a group of radicals under the leadership of Jan Mathys and Jan van Leiden attempted to establish the eschatological kingdom in Münster, resulting in anarchy, bloodshed, siege, and the eventual torture and execution of the surviving leaders.⁹ Those infamous events buttressed the anti-chiliasm tendencies of the Reformers, reflected in the confessions that emerged shortly after the uprising at Münster. The *Second Helvetic Confession* (1566) condemned the ‘dreamyng that before the daie of Judgements, there shal bee in the yearth a golden worlde, wherein the godlie (their wicked enemies beeyng oppressed) shall possesse the kyngdomes of the yearth’.¹⁰ Even the early version of *The Articles* of the Church of England condemned those who held to millenarianism as ‘heretickes’.¹¹ Calvin not only agreed with the condemnations proclaimed by those confessions, asserting that the error of chiliasm was ‘so childishe, that it nedeth not or is not worthy of any confutatiō’,¹² but he also

⁷ Chiliasm teachings have appeared in nearly every generation of the Church; however, since the time of Augustine of Hippo, the expectation of a future bodily reign of Christ on Earth for a thousand years had been condemned as heresy.

⁸ *Augsburg Confession*, Art. XVII.

⁹ Led by Mathys and van Leiden, radical Anabaptists attempted to establish the eschatological kingdom at Münster in 1534. The city was besieged by Protestant and Roman Catholic forces, and finally succumbed in 1535 with the surviving leaders being tortured and executed in early 1536. For several centuries Protestant sects struggled to avoid *any* possible connection to the events at Münster. The Particular Baptists made an explicit attempt to distance themselves from the Münster Anabaptists, referring to themselves as those ‘commonly (though falsly) called Anabaptists’. *1644 London Confession*, title page.

¹⁰ *Second Helvetic Confession*, Cap. 11.

¹¹ *Articles agreed on by the bishoppes, and other learned menne in the synode at London, in the yere of our Lorde Godde, M.D.LII. for the auoiding of controuersie in opinions, and the establishment of a godlie concorde, in certeine matiers of religion* ([London]: Richardus Crafonus, 1553), Art. 41.

¹² Calvin, *The institution of Christian religion*, III.xxv.5.

extended that condemnation to all ‘numerical calculations’ based on prophecy which he equated to a mere ‘trifle in ... speculations’.¹³

Despite the fear of Münster being planted firmly in the public mind, the simultaneous yearning for Christ’s bodily return and disdain for chiliasm did not last long for Protestant theologians.¹⁴ Even as prominent theologians pronounced their condemnations, others engaged in those very ‘numeric calculations’. In 1545, the Lutheran theologian, Andreas Osiander (1498-1558), published a work entitled *Vermutung von den letzten Zeiten und dem Ende der Welt aus der heiligen Schrift gezoken*. Within three years, that work had been translated into English under the title *The coniectures of the ende of the worlde*. According to Osiander, the timing of the return of Christ remained beyond the bounds of human knowledge for ‘the daye and hower no ma[n] knoweth’. Speculation, however, was not off-limits for ‘albeit the daye and hower we knowe not, yet the year maye we knowe or coniecture very nighe it’.¹⁵ That year, Osiander believed, would be no later than ‘the yeare of our Lorde, aboute m.cccccc.lxxxviii [1688]’.¹⁶ Within a half century, calculations of end times became commonplace. In 1593, the Scottish mathematician and theologian, John Napier (1550-1617), settled on the year AD 1786 as the absolute latest year for the end.¹⁷ The Church of England minister and presbyterian dissenter, Thomas Brightman (1562-1607), came close to agreeing with Osiander by setting a final date of AD 1686.¹⁸ Despite their willingness to delve into prophetic calculations, each of these individuals avoided the most dangerous heresy of the chiliasts: the future thousand-year kingdom of the church with Christ reigning bodily on Earth.

¹³ Calvin, *Commentary on Daniel 12:11-12*. To be fair, Calvin did discuss the meaning of the different numbers in Daniel (e.g., 2300, 1290, 1335, 70). However, he consistently refused to use these numbers to determine a date for Christ’s imminent return—or any other prophesied event. The glaring omission of a commentary on *Revelation* by Calvin speaks volumes about his views on this topic.

¹⁴ See B. W. Ball, *A Great Expectation: Eschatological Thought in English Protestantism to 1660* (Leiden: Brill, 1975), 192.

¹⁵ Osiander, *The coniectures of the ende of the worlde* (1548), sig. Br, sig. Biir.

¹⁶ Osiander, *The coniectures*, sig. Hv.

¹⁷ John Napier, *A plaine discouery of the whole Reuelation of Saint Iohn: set downe in two treatises* (Edinburgh: Robert Walde, 1593), 12.

¹⁸ Thomas Brightman, *A reuelation of the reuelation that is, the reuelation of St. Iohn opened clearely With a logicall resolution and exposition* (Amsterdam: 1615), 452.

That move toward the heretical boundary was largely pioneered by Johann Alsted (1588-1638), the Protestant professor at Herborn and Weissenburg who actually began his eschatological calculations with the same anti-chiliastic resolve as the early Reformers.¹⁹ By 1627, however, Alsted came to the conclusion that the thousand years mentioned in Revelation 20:2 referred to an as-yet-future time which would end in AD 2694.²⁰ Whether due to the political climate which included numerous wars and almost constant upheaval²¹ or to the theological turmoil inherent in the second and third generations of Protestantism,²² once Alsted openly supported a chiliastic interpretation of biblical prophecy, the proverbial floodgates of millennialism came crashing open. Those floodwaters quickly spread from Alsted's stomping grounds to the British Isles due largely to the work of the Cambridge don, Joseph Mede who made little effort to hide his dependence on Alsted.²³ Mede published his monumental *Clavis apocalyptica* in Latin in 1627, but the work reached its pinnacle of British influence only after the English version was published posthumously in 1643. Within a relatively short period of time, chiliastic speculation itself became an accepted aspect of British Protestant eschatology with such influential theologians as Thomas Goodwin; Nathaniel Homes (1599-1678), the Independent minister associated with congregations at Ivy Lane and Moorfields; John Archer (d. 1639), separatist minister and associate of Thomas Goodwin and Philip Nye; John Durant (bap. 1620, d. 1689), the Independent divine; William Hicks (bap. 1621, d. 1660), the anti-paedobaptist associated with the Fifth Monarchists; John Tillinghast (bap. 1604, d. 1655), the Fifth Monarchist leader; George Hammond (1619/20-1705), the presbyterian ejected minis-

¹⁹ See Robert G. Clouse, 'The Rebirth of Millenarianism.' in *Puritans, the Millennium and the Future of Israel*, ed. P. Toon, 42-65 (Cambridge: James Clarke and Co, 1970), 47. See Robert Baillie, *A dissuasive from the errors of the time* (London: Samuel Gellibrand, 1645), 224.

²⁰ Johann Heinrich Alsted, *The beloved city, or, The saints reign on earth a thousand yeares asserted and illustrated from LXV places of Holy Scripture* (London: 1643), 50. This was the English translation of Alsted's work, published in 1643. Alsted published the original work in 1627.

²¹ Peter Toon argued that 'Alsted may never have become a millenarian had he [sic] not lived through part of the Thirty Years' War'. Peter Toon, *Puritans, the Millennium and the Future of Israel: Puritan Eschatology 1600-1660* (Cambridge: James Clarke and Co, 1970), 128.

²² Protestantism, in general, included a heavy emphasis on the authority of Scripture and a specific set of hermeneutical assumptions including a heightened sense of the 'literal' reading of Scripture. In England, the Puritanism of the late-sixteenth and early-seventeenth centuries personified these emphases, and, not coincidentally, millenarianism arose with a fervor amongst Puritan theologians.

²³ See, for example, Mede, *Works*, III:600.

ter and associate of Edmund Calamy; and even William Sancroft (1617-1693), sometime archbishop of Canterbury, all commending some form of millenarian theology which would have been considered heterodox, at best, by the most prominent first-generation Reformers. The political events of the seventeenth century—particularly in England—left the common theologian and, presumably the laity as well, longing for and speculating about the end times.

Literal Hermeneutic

As eschatological speculation became more acceptable, the Puritans naturally extended their ‘literal’ reading of Scripture to include the apocalyptic passages. In fact, numerous theologians at the beginning of the seventeenth century explicitly argued for the literal interpretation of all Scripture unless that interpretation argued against the rest of Scripture. Thus, the religious writer, Robert Maton (b. 1606/7, d. 1646?), argued in 1642 that ‘it is a currant axiom in our Schooles ... that wee must not forsake the literall and proper sense of the Scripture, unlesse an evident necessity doth require it, or the truth thereof would be endangered by it...’²⁴ The literal interpretation of several controversial texts, including the thousand-year period of Revelation and Daniel’s eternal fifth kingdom, naturally led to a consideration of the chiliastic interpretation of apocalyptic literature as divines wrestled with the very words they found in Scripture. Simply agreeing that a text should be interpreted literally, however, did not remove that passage from controversy. With that agreement, the debate simply shifted from hermeneutics to actual meaning. Combining this literal hermeneutic with the common Reformed goal of having all believers interpreting the Scriptures quickly moved chiliasm from the exclusive repertoire of the underground to that of mainstream theologians despite the misgivings of some very outspoken critics. This new-found acceptance of chiliastic speculation moved beyond the academy, eventually touching almost all aspects of society, even enveloping the well-respected (albeit

²⁴ Robert Maton, *Israel's redemption or the propheticall history of our Saviours kingdome on earth; that is, of the church Catholicke, and triumphant* (London: [by R. Cotes] for Daniel Frere, 1642), 47-8. The author of *A glimpse of Sions glory* (probably Thomas Goodwin) agreed with this view, stating: ‘all texts are to be understood literally, except they make against some other scripture, or except the very coherence and dependence of the Scripture show it otherwise, or it makes against the analogy of faith’ (13-14). For a discussion of the authorship of this work, see Toon, *Puritans, the Millennium and the Future of Israel*.

theologically unorthodox) scientist Isaac Newton and the philosopher John Locke.²⁵ Despite the increased interest, chiliasm retained much of its controversial status. In 1645, Robert Baillie (1602-1662), the Church of Scotland minister, observed that chiliasm

was by all Protestants contemned; onely *Alstedius*, after his long abode in *Transilvania*, began in his last times to fall into likeing with some parts thereof, pretending some passages of *Piscator* for his encouragement. *Alstedius* Heterodox Writings were not long abroad, when Mr. *Meade* at *Cambridge* was gained to follow him: yet both these Divines were farre from dreaming of any personall raigne of Christ upon earth: onely Mr. *Archer*, and his Colleague, *T. G.* at *Arnheim*, were bold to set up the whole *Fabricke* of *Chiliasme*, which Mr. *Burrowes* in his *London Lectures* upon *Hosea* doth presse as a necessary and most comfortable ground of Christian Religion, to be infused into the hearts of all children by the care of every parent at the Catechising of their family.²⁶

Even at the time of Baillie's dismissal of this doctrine as heterodox, the number of theologians who held to a chiliastic understanding of the latter days was obviously growing at least among the non-conformists—a category which enveloped each of the cited English theologians. At the apex of its popularity, chiliasm moved even beyond the grasp of non-conformity, or even Puritanism, and could nearly be considered a commonplace in English theology.²⁷

Common Eschatological Themes

Not only did English theologians make eschatological interpretation and discussion a common task, they also brought a large amount of biblical material into the scene of apocalyptic interpretation. To that end, eschatological writings in the seventeenth century provided interpretations of the obvious biblical passages from Daniel, Ezekiel, and Revelation, but they also provided links to other passages which had not been commonly assigned to the apocalyptic or eschatological genre. For instance, the

²⁵ For example, see Isaac Newton, *Observations upon the prophecies of Daniel, and the Apocalypse of St. John* (Dublin: S. Powell for George Risk, George Ewing and William Smith, 1733). In this work, Newton utilized the Julian Period dates to develop a biblical chronology of the end times. He included a distinct millenarian understanding in his tabulations. Cf. Frank Edward Manuel, *The Religion of Isaac Newton* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1974). Regarding Locke's views, see Warren Johnston, 'The Anglican Apocalypse in Restoration England', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 55 (2004), 499; M. A. Stewart, *English Philosophy in the Age of Locke* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000), 338-9.

²⁶ Baillie, *A dissuasive*, 224.

²⁷ For the best analysis of Anglican use of chiliasm and apocalyptic understanding, see Johnston, 'Anglican Apocalypse'.

Church of England clergyman and sometime chaplain to Archbishop Gilbert Sheldon, Robert Gell (1595-1665), linked the chronologies and dates of the early chapters of Genesis to the dating schemes used to determine the end times.²⁸ The Song of Songs also became almost exclusively interpreted in an apocalyptic manner.²⁹ With nearly every aspect of the Bible applying to eschatology, a large number of themes appeared throughout the commentaries—far too many to discuss in detail. However, a few of those themes helped define the genre in British theology with several proving to be almost universally accepted in seventeenth-century England.

Antichrist

First and foremost, English theologians of all ilks overwhelmingly identified the prophetic figure of the Antichrist with the papacy.³⁰ This anti-papal understanding of prophetic literature came as no surprise as most of the early Reformers held the same view.³¹ Even those who did not directly implicate the pope as an individual, commonly agreed that the papacy remained ‘Antichristian’.³² The Church of England clergyman, Henry Smith (c. 1560-1591), therefore, correctly asserted that ‘He which

²⁸ Robert Gell, *Noah's flood returning: or, a sermon preached August the 7th. 1655* (London: J.L. and are to be sold by Giles Calvert, 1655), see esp. 17, where Gell added the Roman numerals from ‘Mundi Conflagratia’ to obtain the significant number 1657; Charles Hammond, *The worlds timely warning-peece newly corrected and amended* (London: for Fr. Grove, 1660). Cf. Louise Fargo Brown, *The Political Activities of the Baptists and Fifth Monarchy Men in England During the Interregnum* (Washington: 1912), 23-24.

²⁹ Brightman, John Cotton, and Nathaniel Homes all wrote eschatological commentaries on this book. Thomas Brightman, *A commentary on the Canticles or the Song of Solomon wherein the text is analysed, the native signification of the words declared, the allegories explained, and the order of the times whereunto they relate observed* (London: Iohn Field for Henry Overton, 1644); John Cotton, *A brief exposition of the whole book of Canticles, or Song of Solomon lively describing the estate of the church in all the ages thereof, both Jewish and Christian, to this day* (London: Philip Nevil ... 1642); Nathanael Homes, *The works of Dr. Nathanael Homes* (London: J. Legate for the Author, 1652), the 16th part of this collection is entitled ‘Double Commentary on all Canticles’.

³⁰ Richard Baxter provided a lengthy list of those who held this view. Richard Baxter, *Against the revolt to a foreign jurisdiction, which would be to England its perjury, church-ruine, and slavery* (London: for Tho. Parkhurst, 1691), 53. Christopher Hill also included an impressively eclectic list of theologians, representing nearly all sects, who saw the Pope and/or the papacy as the Antichrist. Christopher Hill, *Antichrist in Seventeenth Century England* (London: Oxford University Press, 1971), 30-31.

³¹ For example, Calvin identified the Roman Pontiff as Antichrist. See Calvin, *The institution of Christian religion*, IV.vii.25. Luther agreed with this view. See Martin Luther and Nostradamus, *Dr. Martin Luther's prophecies of the destruction of Rome and the dovnfall of the Romish religion ...* (s.n., 1679), 4. See also Heinrich Bullinger, *In apocalypsim Jesu Christi ... conciones centum* (Basil: 1557); *Geneva Bible*. The *Geneva Bible* capitalized the term ‘Antichrist’, emphasizing the specific identification of a single figure as the Antichrist. See.1 John 2.18, 22; 1 John 4.3; 2 John 1.7.

³² See Baxter, *Against the revolt*, 346.

can swear that the Pope is Antichrist, and that flesh is good on Fridaies, is a Protestant; at least a Christian eury inch'.³³ Additionally, several theologians also saw the Turk or Turkish Empire as the Antichrist.³⁴ The Baptists, John Smyth, in 1609, and Christopher Blackwood, in 1644, displayed a different and growing separatist tendency to see the Antichrist at work in the national church, evidencing itself especially in paedobaptism—although this did not discount the identification of the papacy as the antichrist as well.³⁵ This literary rhetoric regarding the identification of the Antichrist—at all, but especially with the papacy—reached its zenith during the English Civil Wars and the Protectorate. In the Restoration, however, the association of the Antichrist with any particular person or monarchy became almost obsolete, thanks in large part to the return toward Laudianism—which had denied the link between the Pope and the Antichrist in the 1640s—and the Restored Church's renewed policy of censorship.³⁶

Little Horn

The identification of the Antichrist did not monopolize the time of English theologians. During the first half of the seventeenth century, many of the same church

³³ Henry Smith, *The sermons of Mr. Henry Smith, gathered into one volume printed according to his corrected copies in his life time* (London: Thomas Man, Paul Man and Ionah Man, 1631), 416. Both the *Westminster Confession* (Art. XXV) and the *Savoy Declaration* (Art. XXVI) echoed this anti-Roman Catholic sentiment.

³⁴ Martin Luther, *Dris Martini Lutheri colloquia mensalia, or, Dr. Martin Luther's divine discourses at his table, etc* (London: William Du-Gard ... 1652), 298.

³⁵ Christopher Blackwood, *The storming of Antichrist, in his two last and strongest garrisons; of compulsion of conscience, and infants babptisme [sic]* (London: s.n., 1644); John Smyth, *The character of the beast, or, The false constitution of the church discovered in certayne passages betwixt Mr. R. Clifton & Iohn Smyth* (s.n., 1609).

³⁶ See Hill, *Antichrist in Seventeenth Century England*, 146; William Prynne, *Canterburies doome, or, The first part of a compleat history of the commitment, charge, tryall, condemnation, execution of William Laud, late Arch-bishop of Canterbury* (London: John Macock for Michael Spark, Senior, 1646). As Bernard Capp and Warren Johnston noted, the waning of the focus on the Antichrist and on the apocalyptic in print did not necessarily support the claim that millenarianism and apocalyptic fervor also declined. As will be seen, Keach stood against that suggestion. See Capp, 'The Political Dimension of Apocalyptic Thought'; Johnston, 'Anglican Apocalypse', 468. Also see the renewed use of the term 'Antichrist' later in the century. For example, William B. D. Ramsay, *Mirmah, Maroumah, Maroum a discourse consisting of three sermons* (London: J.A. for Benj. Billingsley, 1680); Walter Garrett, *A discourse concerning Antichrist grounded upon the angel's interpretation of the vision, Rev. xvii 3* (London: for the author, 1680); John Hill, *The grand apostacy of the church of Rome, from her primitive purity and integrity with a vindication of the Church of England* (London: for Samuel Heyrick ... 1680).

leaders who solidified the identity of the Pope as the Antichrist also identified Daniel's Little Horn.³⁷ This prophetic figure who Daniel stated would usurp authority from three other 'horns' came to be *the* controversial figure of English rhetoric—even more so than the figure of the Antichrist. In fact, the identification of the Little Horn proved to be the precise point at which any division between theology and politics—no matter how miniscule—disappeared completely, as theologians repeatedly saw the Little Horn among contemporary political leaders. The early Fifth Monarchist pamphleteer, William Aspinwall (fl. 1648-1662), epitomized the rhetorical use of the Little Horn by applying it to Charles I, albeit safely after the regicide.³⁸ Paradoxically, many of those who applauded the regicide as a justified and even godly act, later—after the perceived failure of the Interregnum to establish godly rule—turned their rhetorical attacks against Oliver Cromwell.³⁹ This view by no means garnered a majority of followers, as other theologians variously identified the Little Horn as either the Pope⁴⁰ or the Turks,⁴¹ thereby causing some conflation of the Little Horn with the Antichrist. The identification of the beast(s), the whore, and mystery Babylon of Revelation followed the same pattern—with most (though not all) authors applying these terms to some aspect of the Roman Church and/or the Pope.⁴²

³⁷ Daniel 7.8

³⁸ William Aspinwall, *An explication and application of the seventh chapter of Daniel* (London: R.I. for Livewell Chapman, 1654).

³⁹ For example, the *Thurloe Papers* referenced an intercepted letter which identified Oliver Cromwell as the 'Man of Sin', etc. *Thurloe Papers*, I:621. Also consider the work by John More of Barnelms, *A Trumpet Sounded*, in which the author argued that Aspinwall incorrectly identified Charles I as the Little Horn when, in fact, Cromwell held that distinction.

⁴⁰ Ball, *A Great Expectation*, 78-79.

⁴¹ Ephraim Huit, *The whole prophetic of Daniel explained, by a paraphrase, analysis and briefe comment* (London: for Henry Overton, 1643), 187.

⁴² Cf. Arthur Dent, *The ruine of Rome: or, An exposition vpon the whole Reuelation* (London: Nicholas Okes for Simon Waterson, 1631), 243; Clouse, 'The Rebirth of Millenarianism,' 45-6. Thus, Brightman, Pareus, Goodwin, Cotton, and Durham (among numerous others) all agreed that the two beasts of Revelation 13 referred to aspects of papal Rome. Ball, *A Great Expectation*, 116-17. Interestingly, Edmund Hall, a Presbyterian and clearly *not* a radical sectarian, labeled Cromwell (and his regime) as the beast. See Edmund Hall, *Manus testium movens: or, A Presbyteriall glosse upon many of those obscure prophetick texts in Canticles, Isay, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, Habakkuk, Zachary, Matthew, Romans, and the Revelations* (London: s.n., 1651), 43-45. After the Restoration, some royalists used this term (and 'Antichrist') with reference to the Commonwealth. See Abraham Nelson, *A perfect description of Antichrist, and his false prophet* (London: T.F., 1660); Williams, *The great antichrist revealed, never yet discovered, and proved to be neither pope, nor Turk, nor any single person ...* (London: for Philemon Stephens the younger, 1661).

Two Witnesses and the Great City

On the opposite side of the prophecies from the Antichrist, the whore, and the beast(s), stood the two witnesses of Revelation 11 and the great city in which they would be killed and resurrected, concepts which also received ample attention in the prophetic interpretations.⁴³ Despite the ‘literal interpretation’ of the prophecies which generally characterized the re-emergence of millennialism, the majority of theologians of this era chose to interpret the ‘two witnesses’ in some figurative fashion. Thus, Thomas Brightman saw these terms as referring to the Church of England.⁴⁴ Edmund Hall (d. 1687), Church of England minister at Chipping Norton, and Thomas Goodwin identified the lawful magistracy and lawful ministry as the two witnesses.⁴⁵ The Particular Baptist, Hanserd Knollys, closely followed some of the descriptions provided by Thomas Goodwin, arguing that the two witnesses were ministers and prophets and that the two candlesticks were the congregational churches.⁴⁶ The Fifth Monarchist, John Tillinghast, equated the two witnesses with the true church. A few theologians did indeed identify two literal individuals—often Moses and Elias—as the prophetic witnesses.⁴⁷ Some royalists even identified the two witnesses as Charles I and William Laud.⁴⁸ As with all of the prophetic themes, some anomalous interpretations not only existed but garnered support within the laity. For instance, the radical leader, Lodowicke Muggleton (1609-1698), not only followed a literal interpretation

⁴³ Revelation 11.7-11

⁴⁴ Thomas Brightman, *The revelation of St. John, illustrated with analysis and scholions wherein the fence is opened by the scripture, and the events of things foretold, shewed by histories* (Amsterdam: Thomas Stafford, 1644), 462-63.

⁴⁵ Thomas Goodwin, *Zervbbabels encovragement to finish the temple a sermon preached before the honourable House of Commons at their late solemne fast, Apr. 27, 1642* (London: R. Dawlman, 1642), 55; Hall, *Manus Testium Movens*, 45. Goodwin, somewhat confusingly, saw the two witnesses as identical to the two candlesticks and the two olive trees also found in Revelation. The two candlesticks, Goodwin claimed, are the Churches, and the two olive trees are the ‘eminent Magistrates and Ministers’. Goodwin also identified the congregational church as the resurrected witnesses of Revelation 11. For a full discussion, see Clouse, ‘The Rebirth of Millenarianism.’ 64.

⁴⁶ Hanserd Knollys, *Apocalyptical mysteries, touching the two witnesses, the seven vials, and the two kingdoms, to wit, of Christ, and of Antichrist, expounded* (London: s.n., 1667), 3-5. In this, Knollys appeared to follow Thomas Goodwin almost verbatim. Dennis Bustin surprisingly omitted this connection in his work on Hanserd Knollys, *Paradox and Perseverance*. Barry Howson also failed to make this connection explicit. See Howson, ‘Hanserd Knollys’.

⁴⁷ Benjamin Keach listed this as a common interpretation. Keach, *Antichrist stormed*, 138.

⁴⁸ E.g., Williams, *The great antichrist revealed*.

of the two witnesses (i.e., he identified them as two individuals), but he also declared himself and his cousin, John Reeve (1608-1658), to be those two witnesses.⁴⁹

In these identifications of the two witnesses and the great city, late-sixteenth and early-seventeenth century theologians displayed a clear tendency to interpret prophetic themes with a home-nation-specific spin. Thus, the influential French Protestant theologian, Pierre Jurieu (1637-1713),⁵⁰ understood the great city—the stage of the death and resurrection of the two witnesses—as a reference to the entire Roman Empire, and the street of the great city—the exact site of those events—as France.⁵¹ Joseph Mede interpreted the great city as Rome with a prominent role for the entire Western world.⁵² Johan Alsted saw his own German lands as having a place of importance in the eschatological prophecies.⁵³ Thomas Goodwin argued forcefully against Martin Luther and Conrad Graserus that his homeland, Great Britain, not Rome or Germany, could be the only correct interpretation of the ‘great city’ given her uniqueness among Reformed nations.⁵⁴ As eschatological speculation gained a foothold across the general British population, the British Isles garnered an increasingly important role in prophetic interpretation. Thus, at the height of British millenarianism in the middle of the seventeenth century, nearly all British theologians agreed with Goodwin’s interpretation. Britain served as the center stage of eschatological prophecy—even for those who did not accept the millenarianism of Alsted, Goodwin, et al.⁵⁵

⁴⁹ For a short description of Muggleton see *ODNB*. Also see John Reeve and Lodowick Muggleton, *A letter presented unto Alderman Fouke, Lord Mayor of London, from the two witnesses and prisoners of Jesus Christ in Newgate ... John Reeve and Lodowick Muggleton* (1653).

⁵⁰ Jurieu’s grandfather was Pierre du Moulin, another biblical commentator who wrote on eschatology.

⁵¹ Pierre Jurieu, *The accomplishment of the Scripture prophecies, or, The approaching deliverance of the church* (London: s.n., 1687), II:247.

⁵² Joseph Mede, *The key of the Revelation, searched and demonstrated out of the naturall and proper characters of the visions with a coment thereupon* (London: R.B. for Phil Stephens, 1643), II:16-18.

⁵³ See Clouse, ‘The Rebirth of Millenarianism.’ 48.

⁵⁴ Goodwin, *Works*, II:165.

⁵⁵ Thus, even Brightman saw England as central to his understanding of eschatology. For him, the Church of England was represented in the prophetic Church of Laodicea in Revelation 3. Brightman, *The revelation of St. John*, 178. John Milton also exemplified this Anglo-centric reading of prophecy. John Milton, *Of reformation touching church-discipline in England and the causes that hitherto have hindred it* (London: Thomas Underhill, 1641).

Fifth Kingdom of Daniel's Prophecy

Aside from the controversial thousand-year period of Revelation 20, Daniel 2 proved to be the most prominent lightning rod for controversy. In this section of his prophecy, Daniel identified a fifth and final, everlasting kingdom which would be established by God. That kingdom would crush the previous divided kingdom represented by the image's feet of iron and clay. This fifth kingdom had been, at least since the early Reformation, seen as the kingdom of Christ—even by those who were in no way millenarian. John Calvin, despite being adverse to millenarian speculation, argued convincingly that Daniel's divinely-established fifth kingdom indeed referred to Christ's reign. That reign, according to Calvin, came in the spiritual body of Christ, the church, and would be perpetual, or eternal, because of the permanence of each believer's salvation.⁵⁶ With the increased emphasis on the literal interpretation of prophecy that accompanied the renaissance of millenarianism, the common view of the spiritual reign of Christ came into question. Daniel's fifth kingdom came to be seen as a literal kingdom—just as the previous four kingdoms were viewed as literal, human kingdoms (the Babylonian, the Medo-Persian, the Macedonian or Greek, and the Roman). This brought the eschatological kingdom firmly into the realm of contemporary politics as, now, the theologian could actually see biblical support for (or explanation of) political turmoil. Specifically, the fourth kingdom must be crushed by the literal fifth kingdom.

Dates

Despite the wide variety of interpretations available on nearly every aspect of prophecy, one idea appeared to have nearly unanimous acceptance in the early seventeenth century. According to the theologians of this period, the 'day' of prophecy referred to a literal year. Thus, the 2300 days, the 1290 days, the 1335 days of Daniel's prophecy and the 1260 days of John's *Revelation* actually referred to literal years. This marked a clear distinction between the English theologians and some of the earliest Reformers. Calvin, for instance, noted the apparently worrisome tendency of

⁵⁶ Jean Calvin, *Commentaries of the diuine Iohn Caluine, vpon the prophet Daniell, translated into Englishe* (London: imprinted by Iohn Daye, 1570), 2.39-44.

some to define a prophetic day as a literal year and argued against such an interpretation.⁵⁷ However, beginning with Alsted, the prophetic day-year became commonplace.

Despite the agreement on the meaning of the term ‘day’, the application of the actual numbers found in the biblical prophecies proved to be an area of almost complete disagreement. Given the sheer number of eschatological works written during this time, the fact that almost none of the many different applications of these numbers agreed completely with each other remains quite remarkable. Each of the influential interpreters sought meaningful events to serve as the beginning or milestone markers for the prophetic dates. The vast majority placed the beginning of the 1260 day-long reign of Antichrist in Revelation 12 (which some also equated to the 42 months of Revelation 13) at some point between the death of the Roman Emperors, Julian the Apostate (AD 365) and Valentinian (AD 455/56). One of those commentators, Joseph Mede, somewhat uniquely decided not to choose between those extremes, opting instead to ‘leave [the determination] unto him who is Lord of times and seasons’. He, thus, suggested that the 1260 day-years began at some point between those extremes and would, thus, end between 1625 and 1715.⁵⁸ Most of the other commentators offered a more cemented chronology, though often allowing for possible variations.

Radicalism

The acceptance of millennial speculation as an aspect of popular theology did not remove it entirely from the grasp of radical sects. England in the 1640s—with the proliferation of dissenting sects that accompanied and spurred the Civil Wars—provided the perfect storm for the re-birth of radical millenarianism. Building on the new eschatological expectancy of Protestantism and the ever-present reading of current events into biblical prophecies,⁵⁹ radical millenarians pushed these common themes to their logical limits. The downfall of the Stuart dynasty proved to be fertile ground for the millennial hope expounded by many, if not most, religious leaders.

⁵⁷ Calvin, *Commentaries ... upon the prophet Daniell*, 12.11-12.

⁵⁸ Mede, *Works*, III:662.

⁵⁹ The identification of the antichrist as already present—and even as *the* military enemy—provided a needed motivational force for the Parliamentary Army during the Civil Wars. Hill, *Antichrist in Seventeenth Century England*. The willingness to see contemporary events as fulfillment of biblical prophecies proved to be *the* idiosyncratic characteristic of the English eschatology of this era.

Those leaders who agreed with the chiliastic views of Mede and Alsted interpreted current events as the undeniable movement toward the literal theocratic final kingdom of Daniel's prophecy.⁶⁰ This millennial hope was well represented by the Independent delegation to the Westminster Assembly which included such well-known millenarians as Thomas Goodwin, Philip Nye, William Bridge, William Greenhill, and Joseph Caryl. When these men, along with their even more famous colleague, John Owen, published the *Savoy Declaration*, they included a much more specific statement about millennial expectation than appeared in the *Westminster Confession*.⁶¹ In 1659, many of these men signed *An essay toward settelement upon a sure foundation...*, a document which outlined their expectations for government by 'a certaine number of men qualified and limited according to [God's] Word'.⁶² Most of the signatories rooted their political desire in a millenarian eschatology.

When those expectations failed to be realized, some of the more militant millenarians attempted to harness the hope and yearning for Christ's return in order to mobilize believers and hasten the establishment of that kingdom. As the pre-eminent millennial sect arising from the ashes of the Barbones Parliament and the Interregnum, the Fifth Monarchy Movement held not only to the accepted belief in Christ's imminent return and to the now-acceptable chiliasm of Mede and Alsted but also to the idiosyncratic belief that God's chosen people should—indeed *must*—work toward the establishment of Daniel's fifth monarchy, even if (and especially when) that meant taking up arms against the antichristian fourth monarchy.⁶³ The Fifth Monarchy Movement—with outspoken leaders such as Christopher Feake, Vavasor Powell, Thomas Harrison (bap. 1616, d. 1660), Edmund Chillenden (fl. 1637-1678), and Thomas Venner (fl. 1638-d. 1661)—was responsible (or was believed to be responsible) for numerous anti-government plots in post-Civil War England with the most

⁶⁰ Daniel 2.44, 'In the days of those kings the God of heaven will set up a kingdom which will never be destroyed, and *that* kingdom will not be left for another people; it will crush and put an end to all these kingdoms, but it will itself endure forever.'

⁶¹ *Savoy Declaration*, Art. XXVI. See Gribben, *The Puritan Millennium*, 120-26, 253-58.

⁶² Some of the other signatories included: Henry Jessey, Vavasor Powell, Henry Danvers.

⁶³ Ball, *A Great Expectation*, 3, 167-8; B. S. Capp, *The Fifth Monarchy Men: a Study in Seventeenth-Century English Millenarianism* (London: Faber, 1972), 14; Anthony Dallison, 'Contemporary Criticism of Millenarianism.' in *Puritans, the Millennium and the Future of Israel*, ed. P. Toon, 104-14 (Cambridge: James Clarke and Co, 1970), 111.

famous such plot, Venner's Uprising, actually coming to fruition in January 1660/61.⁶⁴ After the leaders of that revolt were caught and executed, the Fifth Monarchists lost most of their support—with many adherents joining (or returning to) some of the less-radical dissenting sects including all forms of Baptists.⁶⁵ However, enough of the sect remained to plan numerous other plots and generally to pester the British government for several more years.⁶⁶

Standing in direct contrast to the extreme literalism of the Fifth Monarchist Movement, the Quakers (and those of a similar mindset) focused on the spiritual aspect of Christ's return. For this, the Quakers were often accused of being a part of, or at least an offshoot of, the Antichrist himself.⁶⁷ Not easily dissuaded from their views, the Quakers tended to see the Antichrist as an inner enemy which stood against the 'Light in all Men' and hindered humans from enjoying the readily available benefits of 'the Kingdom of heaven within'.⁶⁸ Their eschatological vision focused on a '*Kingdome of another World*'⁶⁹ which had not and would not infiltrate temporal kingdoms.

Benjamin Keach's Eschatology

Reaching his theological maturity just after the eschatological expectation reached an apex, Keach deemed this speculation to be a necessary aspect of theology. Evidencing this, he included statements about the millennium in his very first publica-

⁶⁴ Venner had previously attempted an uprising in 1657. He was arrested and held in the Tower of London for a time. See *CSPD Commonwealth*, 1657: 23 April. For information on Venner's uprising in 1660/61, see the letter from Sir John Finch to Lord Conway. *CSPD Car. II*, 1660-61: Jan. 11.

⁶⁵ *CSPD Commonwealth*, 1657: April 23. Some of the well-known Baptists involved in the Fifth Monarchy Movement included: Edmund Chillenden (General Baptist), John Pendarves (Particular Baptist), Henry Danvers (General Baptist), Vavasor Powell (open-communion Baptist), George Barrett (Particular Baptist). See Bell, *Apocalypse How?*, 176-77; Capp, *Fifth Monarchy Men*, 202-203.

⁶⁶ See *CSPD Commonwealth*, 1681: Oct 8. As late as 1669, Fifth Monarchist meetings were noted in the Episcopal returns. See Turner, ed. *Original Records*, I:144. The classic work by B.S. Capp, entitled *The Fifth Monarchy Men*, remains the best account of the make-up, beliefs, and significance of this radical sect.

⁶⁷ Thomas Hall, *Chiliasto-mastix redivivus, sive Homesus enervatus A confutation of the millenarian sic opinion* (London: for John Starkey, 1657), 8; Keach and De Laune, *Tropologia*, III:40.

⁶⁸ George Fox, *A word from the Lord, to all the world, and all professors in the vworld; spoken in parables* (London: for Giles Calvert, 1654), 6. Cf. Toon, *Puritans, the Millennium and the Future of Israel*, 127.

⁶⁹ Edward Burrough, *A general epistle to all the saints being a visitation of the Fathers love unto the whole flock of God ...* (London: for Robert Wilson, 1660), 15.

tion, the children's catechism which was condemned by Judge Hyde in 1664.⁷⁰ Keach's announcement that '[Christ] shall come again, at the appointed time, to reign personally upon the earth, and to be judge of the quick and dead'⁷¹ which seemed to teach a literal thousand-year reign of Christ and the saints before the final resurrection and Day of Judgement led to Judge Hyde's condemnation of Keach as a 'fifth monarchy man'.⁷² But Keach's eschatology was not so simple as to be discarded by trite characterization as radical. As was his custom across all aspects of theology, Keach did not align himself completely with any one particular view or theologian. Rather, Keach interacted with a variety of commentators, gleaning what he could from them, but ultimately arriving at his own position which he purportedly 'calculated by the H. Scriptures only, without the help of Humane History'.⁷³

That 'Holy Scriptures only' statement succinctly defined Keach's eschatological hermeneutic. Fulfilling his understood role as pastor-theologian, Keach attempted to follow in the line of those he admired among Reformed Protestantism, such as Robert Maton and Thomas Goodwin, by holding to a literal interpretation of all Scripture—including prophecy. As with the immediately preceding generations, this reading of prophecy helped (or forced) Keach to see eschatological significance in current events and to speculate about the clear meaning of Biblical prophecies.

Chiliasm

As he made clear in his earliest, controversial catechism, Keach accepted, without hesitation, the recently-revived doctrine of the millennium taught by Alsted, Mede, Thomas Goodwin, et al. For Keach, the idea of a future millennium was quite simply the only possible reading of the Biblical record. Citing only Scripture references, Keach argued that Christ would reign for a literal thousand years on earth (Rev. 20), that His reign would be personal—not mystical—and in the same risen body which ascended to heaven in sight of the Apostles (Acts 1.10-11), and that the saints would join in His government (Rev. 5 and 20). These biblical statements left Keach

⁷⁰ For a full discussion of this catechism and the trial, see Chapter III, 57-8.

⁷¹ *Tryal of Mr. Benjamin Keach*, 1018. Also see the account of the trial in Crosby, *History*, II:186-203.

⁷² *Tryal of Mr. Benjamin Keach*, 1017-18.

⁷³ Keach, *Antichrist stormed*, 209 (italics inverted).

with ‘no room for any ... doubt’ about what to expect of the future kingdom.⁷⁴ Because of his certainty about Christ’s return to set up an earthly kingdom, Keach intended his chiliastic eschatology to provide hope for his congregation and readers and to encourage them to ‘be ready to meet the Lord in his more glorious appearance ... [whose] hour is near’.⁷⁵ Keach, thus, spent the greater part of five volumes—*Antichrist stormed* (1689), three different editions of *Sion in distress* (1666, 1681, 1682) and *Distressed Sion relieved* (1689)—plus large sections of his two multi-volume general works—*Gospel mysteries unveil’d* (1701) and *Tropologia* (1681)—explicating his complete view of chiliastic eschatology.

Prophetic Themes

Despite writing after the height of British eschatological expectancy and at a time after many dates suggested to be eschatologically significant had passed without the expected fanfare,⁷⁶ Keach still chose to dive headfirst into the prophetic literature, providing a full-fledged explication of prophetic themes and a chronology of eschatological events. Throughout his explication of these themes, one unifying emphasis appeared, namely, his intense anti-Catholic stance.

Anti-Catholic Stance

Keach lived at a paradoxical time concerning anti-Catholic sentiments. Among the general public and especially the more mainstream theologians, these sentiments were waning.⁷⁷ However, among dissenters especially, the return of Catholicism—embodied by the Duke of York—was greatly feared, and Keach was certainly a prod-

⁷⁴ Keach, *Gospel mysteries unveil’d*, III:142.

⁷⁵ Keach, *Antichrist stormed*, sig. A4v.

⁷⁶ Two sets of Thomas Goodwin’s dates had passed (1666/70 and 1653/56). Brightman’s view that the time, times and a half as well as the 1290 day-years of Daniel both terminated in 1650 had also been debunked by a lack of fanfare. Thomas Brightman, *The workes of that famous, reverend, and learned divine, Mr. Tho. Brightman viz* (London: John Field for Samuel Cartwright, 1644), 967.

⁷⁷ This change in attitude can be seen in Richard Baxter’s later publications where he accepts Roman Catholics as part of the universal church. Richard Baxter Baxter, *Richard Baxter's catholick theologie* (London: Robert White for Nevill Simmons ... 1675), II.267. Also see Hill, *Antichrist in Seventeenth Century England*, especially ch. IV.

uct of that dissenting culture.⁷⁸ Like much of the dissenting world, Keach found support for his views in the influential martyrologist John Foxe who famously immortalized the anti-Protestant persecution under Mary I. Keach accepted Foxe's martyr accounts without question.⁷⁹ That same mindset led Keach to use the term 'Roman Catholic' as a pejorative label against the likes of Richard Baxter.⁸⁰ It also led Keach to interpret nearly every prophecy with some anti-Catholic bias.

Antichrist

For Keach, the clearest aspect of apocalyptic prophecy could be found in the identification of the Antichrist. All aspects of and characters associated with the Antichrist (including *Mystery Babylon*, the *Man of Sin*, the *Beast*, the *Whore*) found their primary identification in some aspect of the Roman Catholic church. Conveniently ignoring the Laudians (or, more probably, discarding them as crypto-Catholics)⁸¹ and a variety of other Protestants including some of his Baptist colleagues and predecessors, Keach argued that 'all Protestants' and 'some Papists' agreed in the identification of Rome as the seat of the Antichrist—otherwise known as *Mystery Babylon*.⁸² In Keach's understanding, these two groups differed only in their identification of *Mystery Babylon* with Papal Rome, as the Protestants argued, or Heathen Rome, as the Papists argued.⁸³ Keach went into great detail to demonstrate the impossibility of Heathen Rome fitting the characteristics of Antichrist with his weightiest argument (and the argument he most relied upon in the succeeding sections) being found in the tim-

⁷⁸ As an example of Keach's anti-Catholic bias, see the frontispiece of *The child's delight* in which a child is portrayed praying for the Lord to 'preserve England from popery'.

⁷⁹ Keach and De Laune, *Troposchemalogia*, IV:310-11.

⁸⁰ Keach's linking of the Baxter, et al with the Catholic theology of Bellarmine and the Papists can be seen throughout Keach's works. See, for instance, Keach, *The marrow of true justification*, 28.

⁸¹ See the discussion in Prynne, *Canterburies doome*, 206-207.

⁸² Revelation 17.5. John Smyth argued that the established church was Antichrist. Smyth, *The character of the beast*. Thomas Helwys portrayed the Church of England as Antichrist. Thomas Helwys, *Persecution for religion judg'd and condemned in a discourse between an antichristian and a Christian* (London: s.n., 1662). Christopher Blackwood held that Antichrist was embodied in human traditions. Henry Denne refused to be specific in his identification of the Antichrist, acknowledging Antichrist to be 'that mysticall body of iniquity, which opposeth *Jesus Christ*'. Henry Denne, *The man of sin discovered whom the Lord shall destroy with the brightnesse of his coming* (London: John Sweeting, 1646), 15.

⁸³ Keach, *Antichrist stormed*, 20.

ing of the fall of Heathen Rome. Keach dated this event to the sacking of Rome ca. AD 395 and 410.⁸⁴ If Heathen Rome was the Antichrist and she indeed fell around the end of the fourth century, then the Antichrist's successor was somehow *worse* than the Antichrist and yet not included in Biblical prophecy. This perplexing idea simply made no sense whatsoever to Keach and rendered this Papist argument moot. Keach, thus, summarily discarded its major proponents, condemning them as Papist regardless of their actual relationship to the Roman Catholicism. In the most glaring example of this practice, Keach bid 'adieu to Dr. [Henry] *Hammond* and the Rhemists'.⁸⁵ Keach remained extremely consistent in his identification of the Antichrist in connection to the papacy, even refraining from using the term *antichrist* to identify anything in opposition to Christ as had become common amongst his contemporaries, including John Owen.⁸⁶

Having identified the seat of the Antichrist—or *Mystery Babylon*—as Papal Rome, Keach then made specific identifications of the other related characters. The *Man of Sin*,⁸⁷ or the Head of *Mystery Babylon*,⁸⁸ was the political leader of the Antichrist. This title implied that its holder would be the greatest of sinners, the chief among the worst, or 'the most unparallel'd Man of Sin'.⁸⁹ This, Keach argued, applied only to the Pope, although evidently he meant the office of the papacy as he refused to attach the title to any singular Pope.⁹⁰ Confounding his prophetic interpretation, Keach saw some major overlaps in biblical terminology. In this instance, the terms *Man of*

⁸⁴ Keach, *Antichrist stormed*, 181.

⁸⁵ Keach, *Antichrist stormed*, 35. See Henry Hammond, *A paraphrase, and annotations upon all the books of the New Testament* (London: J.F. and E.T. for Richard Davis, 1671), 927-31. Keach does agree with Hammond in other places, even citing him as an authority at times. It should be noted that Henry Hammond was *not* a Papist. See Henry Hammond, *Of schisme a defence of the Church of England against the exceptions of the Romanists* (London: printed by J. Flesher for Richard Royston ... 1653). The term *Rhemist* refers to those connected with the English Roman Catholic college at Rheims in Northeast France. The Rhemists published an English translation of the Bible in 1582.

⁸⁶ Owen, *Works*, 13:33. Here John Owen refers to 'Antichrists' or false prophets.

⁸⁷ 2 Thessalonians 2.3.

⁸⁸ Keach and De Laune, *Troposchemalogia*, IV:304, 310.

⁸⁹ Keach and De Laune, *Troposchemalogia*, IV:304.

⁹⁰ Keach, *Distressed Sion relieved*, 149. Keach, *Antichrist stormed*, 26. This agreed with the argument of a tract endorsed by Keach. See William Hughes, *The man of sin, or, A discourse of Popery wherein the numerous and monstrous abomination, in doctrine and practice, of the Romish church are by their own hands exposed* (London: J.D. for Robert Boulter, 1677).

Sin, (*last*) *Beast*, and *Little Horn* all referred to the same individual or office.⁹¹ This practice stemmed from Keach's understanding of the overlapping and repetition of prophecies, a concept which Keach borrowed largely from 'the worthily Admired, and Learned [Joseph] Mede'⁹² and which played a significant role in his own chronological calculations.

Agreeing with the majority of commentators, Keach interpreted the four parts of King Nebuchadnezzar's dream image in Daniel 2 and the four beasts of Daniel 7 as referring to the same four monarchies: the Babylonian, the Persian, the Grecian, and the Roman.⁹³ In both prophecies, the Roman kingdom divided into ten parts—the ten toes of Daniel 2 and the ten horns of Daniel 7. These also coincided with the ten horns seen by John in Revelation 17.⁹⁴ In Daniel 7, three of the ten parts of the divided kingdom were then dominated by a single, 'little horn'⁹⁵ whom Keach equated with the *Head of Babylon* or the *Man of Sin*.⁹⁶ Citing Pierre du Moulin (1568-1658)⁹⁷ and Joseph Mede, Keach assigned the division of the Roman kingdom to the year AD 456 when Rome was sacked by Gensericus.⁹⁸ Shortly after that year, the papacy arose as the little horn, taking control of three of the ten kingdoms and fulfilling the prophecy of Daniel 7. The only aspect of these prophecies remaining to be fulfilled was the crushing of the entire fourth monarchy by the divine kingdom—a theme which dominated Keach's eschatology.

⁹¹ Keach and De Laune, *Troposchemalogia*, IV:310.

⁹² Keach, *Antichrist stormed*, 4. Keach acknowledged a great debt to the work of Mede, whose idea of 'Synchronisme of prophecies' probably inspired Keach's decision to apply different prophetic titles to the same historical figure. Mede, *The key of the Revelation*, Part I:i.

⁹³ Keach and De Laune, *Troposchemalogia*, IV:298; Keach, *Gospel mysteries unvail'd*, I:226.

⁹⁴ Keach and De Laune, *Troposchemalogia*, IV:310.

⁹⁵ Daniel 7.8.

⁹⁶ Benjamin Keach, *Zion in distress, or, The sad and lamentable complaint of Zion and her children* (London: s.n., 1666), 7.

⁹⁷ Pierre du Moulin was the grandfather of Pierre Jurieu. *ODNB*.

⁹⁸ Keach, *Antichrist stormed*, 119. See Pierre Du Moulin, *The accomplishment of the prophecies* (Oxford: Joseph Barnes, 1613), 377-80; Mede, *Works*, II:660. These two commentators identified different kingdoms in their list of ten, but both saw the division occurring in AD 456. Du Moulin and Mede even disagreed over which three kingdoms were overtaken by the little horn. But they agreed on the fact that this event *did* happen and on its approximate date. Like Keach, Hanserd Knollys also followed these commentators in this respect. Hanserd Knollys, *An exposition of the whole book of the Revelation* (London: for the author, 1689), 169, 206.

Keach's true anti-Catholic bent could best be seen in his identification of the *Whore*, or *Great Whore*, of Revelation 17, which, Keach argued, must be distinguished from the *Beast* or the *Man of Sin* or the *Little Horn*.⁹⁹ In his view, the Whore represented the entire Roman Catholic Church, thus establishing a contrasting parallel to the true Church of Christ. The Bible pictured the true Church as the Bride of Christ with Christ as her head.¹⁰⁰ In stark contrast, the Roman Catholic Church had the 'Anti-christ [as] the Head, the Whore [as] the Body'.¹⁰¹ In his most comprehensive work on eschatology, *Antichrist stormed* (1689), Keach described himself as being hopeful that 'such who read it will see some further cause to hate the Whore and all her offspring',¹⁰² leaving absolutely no doubt about the anti-catholic lenses through which Keach viewed all apocalyptic Scripture.¹⁰³

Keach's anti-Catholic stance also led to his willingness to accept, without reservation, the claims of Titus Oates regarding the Popish Plot.¹⁰⁴ In his 1689 work, *Distressed Sion relieved*, Keach memorialized 'Dr. Oates':

Therefore is Dr. *Oates* brought on the Stage,
 Degraded and expos'd to brutish rage,
 ...
 Yet let them whip and lash him till he die,
 And practice all their Romish cruelty,
 None of his Evidence he can deny.

⁹⁹ Benjamin Keach, *Sion in distress, or, The groans of the Protestant church* (London: George Larkin for Enoch Prosser, 1682), 66-67. Keach gave five reasons for the distinctions: 1. the Beast is referred to using the masculine 'he', and the Whore is a 'she'; 2. they are discussed distinctly in Revelation 17.3; 3. the Whore rides upon the Beast; thus, they must be distinct; 4. the comparison of the Whore and the Beast with the Church and Christ makes them as distinct from each other as the church is from Christ; 5. the fact that the Beast will remain after the Whore is destroyed (Revelation 19.19).

¹⁰⁰ Ephesians 5.23.

¹⁰¹ Keach, *Sion in distress [2nd edn]*, 67 (italics inverted). Cf. Keach, *Zion in distress [1666]*, 10.

¹⁰² Keach, *Antichrist stormed*, sig. A2r (italics inverted).

¹⁰³ Although many shared Keach's anti-Catholic views (especially in the midst of the endless plots and the Exclusion Crisis), most prominent Protestants remained reserved in their discussion of Roman Catholicism. Baxter's general tolerance of Roman Catholicism has already been seen (see n. 77 above). John Owen broadened his view of Antichrist to include all heretical doctrines, etc. rather than placing the title squarely on the Pope's shoulders. In this area, Keach displayed an intense connection to the theology of the late-sixteenth and early-seventeenth centuries. Keach also demonstrated his connection to the eschatology of Hanserd Knollys who, in 1679, had made the same anti-Catholic identifications. See Hanserd Knollys, *Mystical Babylon unveiled ...* (London: s.n., 1679).

¹⁰⁴ Titus was the son of the General Baptist preacher, Samuel Oates (d. 1683), which may have lent credence to his claims in the eyes of Keach and other Baptists.

'Tis to his Honour and Immortal praise,
And to his name it will high Trophies raise.¹⁰⁵

Keach never renounced his heartfelt—albeit naive—support of Titus Oates and belief in his complex web of lies. Here again, Keach, along with Hanserd Knollys and several other Baptist colleagues, stood out from the general masses of eschatological writers.¹⁰⁶

Two Witnesses and The Great City

The two witnesses which the Apostle John envisioned as standing against the Antichrist in Revelation 11 further displayed Keach's anti-catholic stance. Like most of his contemporaries, Keach did not see these witnesses as actual individuals. Rather, this term referred to the dual witness of 'Gods faithful people',¹⁰⁷ denoted as two 'because of the smallness of their number', 'as comprehending both Ministers ... and people', and 'in respect of their twofold Testimony to a true Gospel Ministry and Magistracy'.¹⁰⁸ Elsewhere, Keach noted that the establishment of truth required at least two witnesses.¹⁰⁹ In this identification, Keach opted not to choose between the interpretations of several sources, instead amalgamating them into one broad identification. Thomas Goodwin described the two witnesses as the godly magistrates and ministers and as the true, congregational churches.¹¹⁰ Hanserd Knollys argued that the two witnesses were not the magistrates and ministers, but rather the 'Lords Ministers and Prophets' and also the congregational churches.¹¹¹ Pierre Jurieu highlighted the smallness of the number of the witnesses, signified by the digit *two*, while still identi-

¹⁰⁵ Keach, *Distressed Sion relieved*, 19-20. Keach referred to Titus Oates as 'Dr. Oates' because Titus Oates claimed to hold a doctor of divinity degree from the Catholic University of Salamanca in Spain. Despite this claim being proven spurious, Oates refused to renounce his use of this title. See *ODNB*.

¹⁰⁶ Christopher Hill claimed that '[t]he Popish Plot no doubt helped to deflate Antichrist as a serious concept ...'. Hill, *Antichrist in Seventeenth Century England*, 150-51. Knollys, *Mystical Babylon unveiled*, 21.

¹⁰⁷ Keach, *Antichrist stormed*, 138.

¹⁰⁸ Keach, *Antichrist stormed*, 138.

¹⁰⁹ Keach, *Antichrist stormed*, 224.

¹¹⁰ Goodwin, *Works*, II:144-53.

¹¹¹ Knollys, *Apocalyptic mysteries*, 3-4.

fyng the witnesses as those faithful to God.¹¹² The common theme which allowed Keach to combine all of these descriptions was the fact that no matter how the witnesses were described, they stood outside of and against the Catholic Antichrist.

Given the prominent role Keach reserved for the Roman Catholic church, his identification of the stage upon which the eschatological scenes would occur came as no surprise. The events necessarily had to take place in a nation/land which—by the beginning of the end times—had experienced the ‘*Beasts Reign and Tyranny*’,¹¹³ or had been controlled by the papacy. This necessarily meant that the Biblical prophecies focused almost exclusively on the Western Church with only a few relatively minor appearances by the Turks from the East. Additionally, and equally as logical, Keach saw a great deal of significance in all attempts at reformation within (or against) Roman Catholicism.¹¹⁴ In his view, no other ‘Nation or Kingdom ... has ... since the beginning of the Reformation ... obtained so great Light as this of *Great Britain*.’¹¹⁵ The original fervor of the Reformation never waned in Great Britain as it had in all other Reformed nations—this despite the constant attacks of the Antichrist against the true ‘Church of God’ in the British Isles.¹¹⁶ In fact, Keach argued that Great Britain actually had a greater number of God’s ‘chosen Jewels’ than any other nation, making the British Isles the *only* possible interpretation. Thus, Keach had his congregation sing of the Antichrist’s awe at the events which already had and, he believed, soon would take place in England:

The Beast and cursed *Babylon*,
Amazed are to hear
What God in *England* late has done,
But stranger things draw near.¹¹⁷

¹¹² Jurieu, *Accomplishment*, II:239.

¹¹³ Keach, *Antichrist stormed*, 173.

¹¹⁴ Keach, *Antichrist stormed*, 204-5. Keach highlighted the reformation attempts made by ‘Waldo, Wickliff, Luther, &c.’

¹¹⁵ Keach, *Antichrist stormed*, 183.

¹¹⁶ Keach, *Antichrist stormed*, 227, also see 152.

¹¹⁷ Keach, *The banquetting-house*, 17.

Keach saw England as the center stage for the outworking of the eschatological events, not the least being the site of the death and resurrection of the two witnesses of Revelation 11, or the ‘Street of the great City’.¹¹⁸

Keach went to great lengths to disprove the theories of some of his contemporaries who identified a different center stage. Jurieu—who, as would be expected from a French Huguenot, matched Keach’s anti-Catholic tendencies—argued quite forcefully that England clearly could *not* be and that France *must* be the site in question.¹¹⁹ In support of this, Jurieu noted that Sweden, Denmark, England and parts of Germany had already ‘withdrawn themselves from the *Jurisdiction* of the *Pope*’.¹²⁰ Thus, France *must* be the ‘*tenth part* of the *City* which must *fall*’,¹²¹ and, as such, she must also be the street where the Witnesses lie dead.¹²² The famous ‘*German Doctor*’,¹²³ a term Keach used to describe Samuel Hartlib (c. 1600-1662), the German-British education reformer and lay theologian, argued that Germany served as the site of the death and resurrection of the two witnesses.¹²⁴ Against these two commentators, Keach accepted the work of Thomas Goodwin who ‘clearly demonstrate[d] that the English Jurisdiction, must of necessity be that street’.¹²⁵ Keach did not, however, go as far as Hanserd Knollys who identified London as the great city rather than Keach’s more general identification of England.¹²⁶

The Fifth Kingdom of Daniel

As a chiliast, Keach held that Daniel’s promised eternal kingdom must be a literal, earthly kingdom (and not merely mystical)¹²⁷ akin to the other four which it

¹¹⁸ Keach, *Antichrist stormed*, 183; Keach, *Gospel mysteries unveil'd*, I:223.

¹¹⁹ Jurieu, *Accomplishment*, II:265-66.

¹²⁰ Jurieu, *Accomplishment*, II:265.

¹²¹ Jurieu, *Accomplishment*, II:267.

¹²² Jurieu, *Accomplishment*, II:267.

¹²³ Keach, *Antichrist stormed*, 181.

¹²⁴ Both Jurieu and Hartlib exemplify the aforementioned tendency of seventeenth-century theologians to interpret prophecy with a home-nation focus. See above under the sub-heading *Two Witnesses and the Great City*, 237-9.

¹²⁵ Keach, *Antichrist stormed*, 142. See Goodwin, *Works*, II:165.

¹²⁶ Hanserd Knollys, *An exposition of the 11th Chapter of Revelation ...* (London: s.n., 1679), 25.

¹²⁷ Keach, *Gospel mysteries unveil'd*, III:142.

would destroy.¹²⁸ Keach variously referred to that fifth kingdom as ‘the Kingdom of Christ’¹²⁹ or ‘the Reign of Christ’.¹³⁰ He adopted this view rather early in his theological career—at some point before his first publication appeared in 1664, maintaining it throughout his life and remaining completely undeterred by the early charges of Fifth Monarchism.¹³¹ Interestingly, Keach once again attempted to combine a variety of views to form his own. Recognizing the tendency of the early Reformers to spiritualize this final kingdom *and* the passing of still more significant dates—not the least of which was 1666—without the second advent of Christ, Keach rather uniquely concocted two distinct (although potentially simultaneous) modes of this kingdom: one specifically spiritual seen in the unparalleled rise of the Church in the last days¹³² and the other the literal political reign of Christ and the saints.¹³³ In other words, Keach envisaged a two-fold inauguration of the final kingdom with a possible period of time separating the two, a period which Keach grounded in the biblical concept of the bridegroom’s tarrying in the parable of the Ten Virgins.¹³⁴ While Keach did not disclose the full version of this dual-inauguration view of the kingdom until the 1701 publication of *Gospel mysteries unveiled*, he laid its foundations at least as early as 1689 in *Antichrist stormed*. In that work, Keach boldly proclaimed that the ‘beginning of this glorious Kingdom state will be small, and hardly discerned, as it is signified by the little Stone, and by other passages and places of Scripture’.¹³⁵ The full display of that ‘glorious Kingdom’ would not appear until Christ returned personally—an event which ‘will be at the beginning of the thousand years reign’.¹³⁶ Keach underscored this understanding of the dual-establishment of the fifth kingdom in order to refute those who held that Christ would return only *after* the thousand-year reign.

¹²⁸ Daniel 2. Keach, *Antichrist stormed*, 167; Keach, *Gospel mysteries unveil'd*, III:95-6.

¹²⁹ Keach, *Antichrist stormed*, sig. A3r (italics inverted).

¹³⁰ Benjamin Keach, *An answer to Mr. Marlow's Appendix* (London: for the author, 1691), 5. In this instance, Keach once again attacked his old nemesis, Richard Baxter, for his denial of this doctrine.

¹³¹ *Tryal of Mr. Benjamin Keach*, 1019. His consistency here is evidenced by the fact that the view appears throughout his publishing career, as late as 1701, only three years before his death.

¹³² Keach, *Gospel mysteries unveil'd*, III:175, III:120.

¹³³ Keach, *Gospel mysteries unveil'd*, III:175.

¹³⁴ Matt. 25.5. For Keach’s exposition of this verse, see Keach, *Gospel mysteries unveil'd*, III:118.

¹³⁵ Keach, *Antichrist stormed*, 167.

¹³⁶ Keach, *Gospel mysteries unveil'd*, III:95.

Some think that all the Kingdoms of the Earth shall be given to the Saints before Christ comes. No doubt but there will be a glorious State of the Church in the last dayes, that now draw very near, ... but the peaceable and universal Reign will not be untill the King comes ...¹³⁷

The recent claims of Kenneth Newport and, consequently, Austin Walker that Keach only saw Christ's return happening after the end of the millennial kingdom miss this important and unique aspect of Keach's millenarianism.¹³⁸ This happened to be the major point of disagreement between Keach and his friend, Hanserd Knollys, who, at least early in his career, believed that Christ would return after the millennium.¹³⁹

Keach also used this dual-inauguration to support his view that the year of the Papacy's demise could be known and, indeed, a chronology of end time events could be developed despite Christ's assertion that even He did not know the day and hour of His return.¹⁴⁰ With the potential period of separation between the two inaugurations, Keach could logically maintain his chronology and remain true to his literal interpretation of the surprise nature of Christ's return. Once the inauguration of the spiritual aspect of the kingdom occurred—an event Keach believed to have occurred in 1688 with the defeat of the Papacy in the Street of the Great City¹⁴¹—Christ's return could

¹³⁷ Keach, *Gospel mysteries unveil'd*, III:175.

¹³⁸ Inexplicably, Kenneth G. C. Newport classified Keach as a post-millennialist, in complete agreement with Hanserd Knollys. Newport did not provide any evidence for this classification. Kenneth G. C. Newport, 'Benjamin Keach, William of Orange and the Book of Revelation: A Study in English Prophetic Exegesis', *Baptist Quarterly* 36 (1995), 47. Austin Walker agreed with Newport but also did not provide any evidence for the claim. Walker, *The Excellent Benjamin Keach*, 202. In actuality, Keach remained remarkably consistent in his understanding of the order of events for the impending millennial kingdom. See Keach and De Laune, *Tropologia*, II:261. Importantly, Keach wrote *Tropologia* seven years before the publication of *Antichrist stormed*, the work in focus in Newport's study. Keach's earliest catechism also showed that Keach's readers—including his critics in the judicial system—understood Keach to be promoting a personal return of Christ prior to the thousand year reign. On this issue see Gribben's helpful appendix in *The Puritan Millennium*.

¹³⁹ See Bustin, *Paradox and Perseverance*, 227; Howson, 'The Question of Orthodoxy in the Theology of Hanserd Knollys (c. 1599-1691): A Seventeenth-Century English Calvinistic Baptist', 311. Knollys was ambiguous on this point. Barry Howson noted that Knollys' view on the timing of Christ's return only appeared with any clarity in *The parable of the kingdom of heaven expounded*. Dennis Bustin, on the other hand, argued that Knollys shifted his view later in his career to Keach's view. However, Bustin presented no convincing support for this view. Even he admitted that Knollys' 'later works did not clearly state a position on this issue' (228), and his earlier works presented Christ's return happening after the thousand-years.

¹⁴⁰ Matthew 24.36.

¹⁴¹ Keach, *Antichrist stormed*, 229-31.

indeed be imminent. It could occur ‘suddenly, even as a Thief in the night’.¹⁴² Thus, Keach exhorted his congregation and his readers to be ready for Christ’s return.¹⁴³

Chronology

With his nearly out-dated and extremely strong anti-Catholic bias serving as a foundation, Keach ventured to make his own prophetic calculations. Like Thomas Goodwin, Keach understood the *Revelation* to have provided ‘from [the] Fourth Chapter, to the end of the Book ... a more general Prophecy from *John’s* Time to the Worlds end’.¹⁴⁴ This historicist view of John’s *Apocalypse* had been accepted by the majority of Puritan commentators, including Brightman, Napier, Mede, du Moulin, etc.¹⁴⁵ As exegete for his congregation and readers, Keach saw his job as identifying the aspects of John’s prophecy which had—since the time of John’s writing—already occurred, and, assuming those identifications to be accurate, correctly predicting the remaining aspects of the prophecy yet to be fulfilled. That lofty goal hinged on the understanding of the all-important mystical numbers found in the Biblical books of Daniel and Revelation.¹⁴⁶ Those numbers—2300 days (Daniel 8.14), 70 weeks (Daniel 9), 1290 and 1335 days (Daniel 12), and 42 months and 1260 days (Revelation 11)—provided Keach the framework necessary for developing a full chronology of end-time events. Keach accepted the commonly-held interpretation of the prophetic day as a calendar year;¹⁴⁷ however, he varied his calculations between a solar year and a lunar year depending on the particular prophecy.¹⁴⁸ Slightly less common was Keach’s understanding of the overall organization of *The Apocalypse* which envisioned the seals, trumpets, and vials as occurring sequentially. The final seal ‘produced or brought in the Seven Trumpets’.¹⁴⁹ Likewise, the seventh trumpet inaugurated the sev-

¹⁴² Keach, *Gospel mysteries unveil’d*, III:119.

¹⁴³ Keach, *The display of glorious grace*, 292-93.

¹⁴⁴ Goodwin, *Works*, II.1.

¹⁴⁵ Ball, *A Great Expectation*, 71. Johnston also demonstrated that many, if not most, in the Anglican church follow this hermeneutic as well. Johnston, ‘Anglican Apocalypse’, 494-95.

¹⁴⁶ Keach, *Antichrist stormed*, 209.

¹⁴⁷ Ball, *A Great Expectation*, 69-70; Benjamin Keach, *Sion in distress, or, The groans of the Protestant Church [sic]* (London: George Larkin for Enoch Prosser, 1681), 42; Keach, *Antichrist stormed*, 213.

¹⁴⁸ Keach, *Antichrist stormed*, 225.

¹⁴⁹ Keach, *Antichrist stormed*, 154-55.

en vials.¹⁵⁰ These three sets of prophecies occurred within the same time periods covered by those mystical numbers.

For Keach, Daniel's 2300 days served as the organizing number for all other prophetic numbers. Thus, Keach's identification of the span of time covered by 2300 prophetic days established the range of potential significant events linked to the other mystical numbers.¹⁵¹ That range began at the end of the first of Daniel's five monarchies, or 'from the year God translated the *Babylonian Monarchy* to the *Medes and Persians*'.¹⁵² By various calculations, Keach accounted for 601 ½ years from the overthrow of the Babylonian Empire by the Medo-Persians until the death of Christ.¹⁵³ That time period included 69 ½ of the 70 weeks of Daniel 9. Without providing a rationale, Keach then subtracted the thirty three years of Christ's life from 1686,¹⁵⁴ accounting for another 1653 years. Adding the 601 ½ years to the 1653, gave Keach a total of 2254 ½ years already passed, leaving 45 ½ of the 2300 still remaining. Thus, the entire range of apocalyptic prophecy ran, according to Keach, from some point in 601 BC to approximately AD 1730.¹⁵⁵ Significantly, he never identified the exact events to occur in or around AD 1730. Keach did allow for some variations in his calculations by reminding his readers that some events that appeared to be instantaneous in Biblical prophecy may actually last for a period of time. For example, accepting Jurieu's logic, Keach agreed that 'we must allow the space of at least 20 or 25 years,

¹⁵⁰ Keach, *Antichrist stormed*, 165.

¹⁵¹ Keach, *Antichrist stormed*, 209-10.

¹⁵² Keach, *Antichrist stormed*, 210.

¹⁵³ The ½ year came from Keach's understanding that Christ would be 'cut off' in the 'midst of the last Week' (Daniel 9.27), leaving two sets of 3 ½ years to be included in the calculations. The other half year would be fulfilled at the end of the 2300 prophetic days. Keach, *Antichrist stormed*, 218-19.

¹⁵⁴ Keach, *Antichrist stormed*, 219-20. Keach, thus, developed his chronology prior to the publication of *Antichrist stormed* in 1689, at least by 1686.

¹⁵⁵ Austin Walker incorrectly suggested that Keach saw the final end of the Antichrist in 1697. Walker, *The Excellent Benjamin Keach*, 202. The evidence for Walker's claim can be found in a passage of *Antichrist stormed* in which Keach complimented the work of the author of *The command of God ...*, whom we now know was Thomas Beverley. Using lunar months and a few other abstract calculations including subtracting five years to convert the 1260 prophetic days to 1222 actual years, Beverley *did* identify 1697 as significant. While Keach complimented this work, he did not adopt it as his own, maintaining a different ending point for the 1260 prophetic days (and never adopting the 1222 actual years). For a discussion of Beverley's eschatology, see Warren Johnston, 'Thomas Beverley and the 'Late Great Revolution': English Apocalyptic Expectation in the Late Seventeenth Century.' in *Scripture and Scholarship in Early Modern England*, eds A. Hessayon and N. Keene, 158-175 (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006).

in which Popery shall be attacked and not be the Aggressor and the Persecutor. And certainly a shorter time cannot serve for the utter destruction of so vast a Kingdom...'¹⁵⁶ This left Keach a modicum of wiggle room in the middle of what otherwise was a very rigid set of calculations.

Keach understood the two periods of Daniel 12 (1290 and 1335 days) to begin simultaneously and end 45 years apart. That only 45 years of the 2300 remained could not be a coincidence. Additionally, the 1335 and 2300 prophetic days must end together. The question, then, for Keach's calculations was to identify correctly the 'abomination of desolation' which Daniel stated would mark the beginning of the 1290 and 1335 day periods. Keach discarded a commonly-held argument linking the abomination of desolation with Julian's attempt to rebuild the Temple in AD 368 because that 1290 year period would have ended in AD 1658 without any of the requisite events occurring.¹⁵⁷ Instead, Keach identified the abomination of desolation as 'some corruption in the Gospel worship, the true worship of God'.¹⁵⁸ Keach saw that corruption first appearing during the bishopric of Syricius, Bishop of Rome from AD 383 to AD 398. Syricius issued two different decrees of clerical celibacy, resulting in marriage officially being forbidden to priests.¹⁵⁹ Thus began the 1290 and 1335 prophetic days. These dates also approximately coincided with the end of the six seals judgments against the pagan emperors and signaled the opening of the seventh seal which produced the seven trumpets.¹⁶⁰ Approximately thirty years later, during Coelestinus' reign as Bishop of Rome, the papacy gained temporal power, marking the beginning of the 1260 prophetic days of Revelation 11 which would end, along with the 1290, in approximately AD 1685. By the time of Gensericus' sacking of Rome in AD 456, the papacy had gained control of three of the ten parts of the dying Roman kingdom, confirming in Keach's mind the identification of the Pope as the Little Horn, the

¹⁵⁶ Keach, *Antichrist stormed*, 179.

¹⁵⁷ Keach, *Gospel mysteries unveil'd*, III:144.

¹⁵⁸ Keach, *Antichrist stormed*, 229.

¹⁵⁹ Keach, *Antichrist stormed*, 229.

¹⁶⁰ Keach, *Antichrist stormed*, sig. A3r.

prophetic significance of the bishoprics of Syricius and Cœlestinus, and the beginning of the trumpets judgments.¹⁶¹

The 1260 prophetic days of Revelation 11 specifically referred to the time that the two witnesses would prophesy. This time period also encompassed the first six trumpets. At the end of that time, the beast would kill the witnesses who would remain dead for 3 ½ prophetic days. According to Keach, the death of the two witnesses—the faithful, true church—occurred in AD 1685 at which point the truly Reformed in England were overcome and ‘Popery came to be inthron’d in this Nation’.¹⁶² Thus, the 3 ½ prophetic days of the witnesses lying dead in the street of the great city began at the same time and would end at some point in AD 1688. As proof of the death of the two witnesses, Keach provided a series of elegiac biographical accounts in his poem, *Distressed Sion relieved*. That list of heroes—which Keach intended to supplement the famous work of Foxe—included Stephen Colledge, the 1st Earl of Essex, Lord Russel, Titus Oates—the only listed individual not martyred—Captain Holmes, Lady Lisle, Lord Argyl, Richard Rumbold, and Elizabeth Gaunt, among numerous others.¹⁶³ Keach highlighted and elaborated upon the resurrection of the witnesses in the same poem, noting that, at the time of his writing, the ‘slain Witnesses are a-getting out of their graves’.¹⁶⁴ That resurrection centered upon the arrival of ‘the Man whom God delights to honour’, the ‘glorious Star’, the ‘desired King’,¹⁶⁵ namely King William III.¹⁶⁶ The still future ascension of the witnesses would signal the blowing of the seventh trumpet which would initiate the seven vials. According to this view, all of the vials were—as of Keach’s time—yet future. Their outpouring would

¹⁶¹ Keach and De Laune, *Troposchemalogia*, IV:325-29.

¹⁶² Keach, *Antichrist stormed*, 231. The catholic James II ascended to the throne in 1685.

¹⁶³ Keach, *Distressed Sion relieved*, 10-40. See the discussion of this list of heroes in the section on Keach’s connections below, 258-9.

¹⁶⁴ Keach, *Distressed Sion relieved*, sig. A7v.

¹⁶⁵ Keach, *Distressed Sion relieved*, sig. A4v-A5v (italics inverted).

¹⁶⁶ Christopher Hill only slightly overstated his case when he suggested that Keach ‘hailed William of Orange as a messianic king’. Hill, *Antichrist in Seventeenth Century England*, 226. These sentiments were not uncommon in Keach’s day, although the object of affection differed depending on the author. During the Restoration, this language could be found to describe Charles II. For example, the author of *The key of prophetic* identified Charles II as this fulfillment of biblical prophecy. See Johnston, ‘Anglican Apocalypse’, 469-70. Keach’s discussion sounds remarkably similar to that espoused by Gilbert Burnet. See Gilbert Burnet, *A sermon preached in the chappel of St. James's, before His Highness the Prince of Orange, the 23d of December, 1688* (London: John Reid, 1689).

correspond to the inauguration of the Kingdom of Christ but not necessarily the thousand-year reign which, Keach allowed, could be delayed.¹⁶⁷

True to his claim, Keach did not base these calculations directly on the work of other commentators. However, he did borrow some of the key organizing concepts, with Mede's synchronism being the most obvious of these 'borrowed' concepts. This idea—already seen in Keach's willingness to apply multiple biblical names to the same historical figure—allowed Keach to see the different prophetic numbers as referring to the same and/or overlapping time periods. Although Keach never acknowledged his indebtedness to Mede for this specific idea—perhaps because of its general acceptance in the more than half century since Mede originally published—he *did* cite Mede most frequently on eschatological issues. Along with Pierre du Moulin, Mede served as Keach's major end-times authority. As with his authorities on other doctrines, Keach was no blind follower of Mede or du Moulin. While his basic concepts agreed with Mede, the specific calculations differed on nearly every point.¹⁶⁸ Keach differed even more dramatically from the calculations of Pierre du Moulin, who did not see the papacy assuming temporal power until AD 755. At that point, du Moulin argued, the 1260 prophetic days began, placing their ending in AD 2015—a stark contrast to Keach's calculations. His understanding of the seals, trumpets, and vials distinguished Keach even further from his contemporaries as, by Keach's own admission, these views were 'quite contrary to what Dr. *Goodwin*, Dr. *More*, *Du Moulin*, and of late *Peter Jurieu* have written'.¹⁶⁹ Keach even had major disagreements with the calculations of Thomas Goodwin, another of his favorite eschatological authorities.¹⁷⁰

Perhaps not surprisingly, Keach's chronology most closely imitated that of fellow Baptist, Hanserd Knollys. Knollys' system included the same view of the seals, trumpets, and vials with the vials being the as-yet-future aspect of the judgments.

¹⁶⁷ Keach, *Antichrist stormed*, sig. A3r.

¹⁶⁸ Not surprisingly, Keach's calculations also differed from those of Pierre Jurieu who noted his own system's close alignment with those of Mede. See Jurieu, *Accomplishment*, sig. **7r.

¹⁶⁹ Keach, *Antichrist stormed*, sig. A3r (italics inverted).

¹⁷⁰ For example, Goodwin saw the 1260 prophetic days ending either in 1550/60 or 1666/70, the 1290 prophetic days ending in 1359/60 or 1653/56, and the 1335 prophetic days ending in 1690/1700. In these dates, one can easily see Goodwin's ambiguity. Keach did not have the same ambiguity. See Ball, *A Great Expectation*, 119-20. Keach cited Goodwin almost as often as Mede.

Their general use of the ‘mystical numbers’ also held a great deal of similarity. Regardless of those similarities, however, Keach only referred to Knollys twice in his eschatological writings, clearly not seeing him as his major source.¹⁷¹ This lack of citation may be because the two Baptists differed on their identification of specific events and, consequently, the beginning and ending of the important periods of time.¹⁷² The two theologians also differed over their view of the timing of Christ’s return with respect to the millennial kingdom. The disparity between Keach and Knollys spoke volumes because of their close relationship throughout Keach’s London career. That Keach differed at all from Knollys—especially on issues as significant as the dating of the mystical numbers—demonstrated Keach’s persistent willingness to assess independently all aspects of his eschatology. This disagreement between Keach and Knollys stands out even greater when considering the lack of support for a millenarian focus among the General Assembly of Particular Baptists. The fact that the two main eschatological commentators in the denomination could not agree probably contributed to the omission of the topic from the denomination’s official documents.¹⁷³

Eschatological Hope

Heavenly Reward

Despite his avowed belief that the Antichrist’s reign would end and the literal, earthly, thousand year reign of Christ would begin in the near future, Keach did not use either of those events as the main source of eschatological hope. Rather, he consistently referred to the hope of a heavenly reward. Indeed, Keach reminded his readers that the earthly kingdom—even the millennial kingdom of Christ—served only as a foretaste of the ‘Glory [the church] shall possess in Heaven for evermore’.¹⁷⁴ The

¹⁷¹ Keach, *Antichrist stormed*, 196-7. The first reference discussed Knollys’ view of the ‘sea’ as the papal kingdom—a view with which Keach agreed. The second reference noted Knollys’ dating of the beginning of the 1260 prophetic days to 428, a slight variation from Keach’s own calculations.

¹⁷² For instance, Knollys identified the beginning of the 1260 prophetic days to the papacy of Sixtus III, the successor of Cœlestinus. See Knollys, *An exposition of ... Revelation*, 143-44.

¹⁷³ Admittedly, this argument stems largely from silence. However, the *Narratives of the General Assembly in 1689* included a discussion of the recent persecution in what could be described as eschatological language—although the connection was not explicit. See Bustin, *Paradox and Perseverance*, 218.

¹⁷⁴ Keach, *Gospel mysteries unveil’d*, II:66.

very fact that the days of the earthly, fifth kingdom were numbered cast its glory in a dim light compared to the unending nature of the heavenly glory. In his fictitious trial account of *The French impostour*, Keach had the apostle Paul highlight this truth:

My *Brother John* speaks indeed of the Saints Reigning with Christ a Thousand Years on Earth, but we know Heaven is the place promised to us all, as an Eternal Habitation: What is a Thousand Years, or Ten Thousand Years on Earth, to our Inheritance, *Eternal in the Heavens*? We have no promise of Eternal Joys, and Glory on Earth, but we have promises of an *Eternity of Blessedness in Heaven*, whither our Spirits go at Death ...¹⁷⁵

To be sure, the fact that biblical prophecy signaled that the ‘Deliverance to the Church and people of God is not far off’¹⁷⁶ excited Keach. But the more exciting proposition—that which he offered as the hope for his congregants and, indeed, the entire true Church of God—was the promised ‘full Injoyment of God to all Eternity’.¹⁷⁷ In fact, in the confession adopted by his congregation in 1697 and subsequently adopted by the congregation led by Elias Keach and even by churches in the British colonies, Keach completely omitted any mention of a thousand-year reign or earthly kingdom.¹⁷⁸

This omission did not belie an abandonment of his chiliastic beliefs. Rather, it demonstrated Keach’s understanding of the controversial nature of millennialism. Throughout his eschatological works, Keach highlighted the disagreements among even those he considered to be orthodox. The fact that those leaders could not agree and that even he and Knollys could not agree entirely must have left a deep impression in Keach’s mind. Regardless of the reason, Keach clearly did not believe that the heavenly reward only applied to those who agreed with his understanding of eschatology (or even with his understanding of numerous doctrines).

Keach did not venture into much speculation about the appearance of Heaven, although he agreed with the majority of mainstream theologians that Heaven was a

¹⁷⁵ Keach, *French impostour*, 53.

¹⁷⁶ Keach, *Antichrist stormed*, 220.

¹⁷⁷ Keach, *The articles of the faith*, Art. XVI.

¹⁷⁸ That confession appeared in two published forms: *The articles of faith* and *A short confession of faith*. Both of these forms were identical in their content; however, they had different appendices attached to them.

physical place.¹⁷⁹ He had no tolerance for the Quaker idea that the kingdom of heaven or the kingdom of God was confined to the inner person or even to the spiritual realm. Throughout his works, Keach made clear that the kingdom of God—whether on earth in its millennial version or in heaven for eternity—involved the material and the immaterial aspects of humanity. The heavenly reward, then, would be enjoyed by physical human resurrected bodies. Accordingly, Keach accepted (without questioning) the physical calculations of Reverend [William] Greenhill who suggested, based on the work of astronomers, that

from the Center of the Earth (which is *Three thousand* to the Surface) up to the Sun, is *above Four Millions of Miles*; to the Firmament, where the sixed [sic] Stars are, above Fourscore Millions of Miles; and from thence to the place of the blessed Saints and Angels, are more Millions than from the Earth to the Firmament; so that, according to their Account, it must be many Millions of Miles from Heaven to Earth.¹⁸⁰

He also echoed the biblical notions that God used ‘pure Gold’ for the streets in Heaven and sundry other jewels as other building materials.¹⁸¹ Beyond that, Keach remained content to consider the incomparable glory of Heaven, for

Terrestrial joys, as dross to me appear;
My joy’s in Heaven, O my treasure’s there.¹⁸²

In much the same manner, Keach could sing with his congregation about the time when

We shall not then, as now, be vext
With Satan, World, and Sin;
Nor with base Hearts be more perplext
When Heaven has took us in.¹⁸³

This fairly conservative discussion of Heaven harmonized well with the official documents of the Particular Baptists. The two different confessions published by the denomination included very little discussion of Heaven. The *1646 London Confession* encouraged the believers ‘to bee under his heavenly conduct and government ... that they may be assured that they are made meet to bee partakers of their inheritance

¹⁷⁹ E.g., *Second Helvetic Confession*, Cap. 11; Calvin, *The institution of Christian religion*, III.xxv.3.

¹⁸⁰ Keach, *Christ alone*, 98.

¹⁸¹ Keach and De Laune, *Tropologia*, II:19. Keach cited Revelation 21.18-20.

¹⁸² Keach, *The glorious lover*, 261.

¹⁸³ Keach, *Spiritual melody*, Hymn 188.

in the Kingdome of God'.¹⁸⁴ The *Second London Confession* delved a bit deeper into the heavenly reward, noting that

the Souls of the Righteous being then made perfect in holyness, are received into paradise where they are with *Christ*, and behold the face of *God*, in light and glory; waiting for the full Redemption of their Bodies.¹⁸⁵

Not surprisingly, Keach's *Articles* sounded remarkably similar to the *Second London Confession*, arguing 'that at Death the Souls of Believers are made perfect in Holiness, and do immediately pass into Glory'.¹⁸⁶

Punishment of Hell

Keach actually went into greater detail about the punishment reserved for the wicked. Again demonstrating his adherence to a literal interpretation of Scripture, Keach (and his congregation) confessed that

the Souls of the Wicked at their Death are cast into Hell, or are in Torment: and ... shall be judged and condemned, and cast into a Furnace of Fire, or into unspeakable Torment, with the Devil and his Angels, for ever and ever.¹⁸⁷

For Keach, the truth of the eternal punishment of the wicked, or non-believers, worked in tandem with the promise of the heavenly reward for believers as encouragement for Keach's hearers to seek the righteousness of 'Visibly owning his [Christ's] Laws, and submitting to his Government'.¹⁸⁸ Obviously Keach—like most of his contemporaries—considered fear to be an extremely effective motivator as Keach even penned hymns about the torments of hell. To be fair, Keach did not expect all of these hymns to be sung in worship services. In *Banqueting-House*, Keach actually noted that the hymns on hell would not be 'so suitable to be sung',¹⁸⁹ but he included them because they were 'congruous with God's Word, and according to the analogy

¹⁸⁴ 1646 *London Confession*, Art. XXXV.

¹⁸⁵ *Second London Confession*, Art. XXXI.

¹⁸⁶ Keach, *The articles of the faith*, Art. XVI. See below for the significance of the term 'immediately', 252-5.

¹⁸⁷ Keach, *The articles of the faith*, Art. XVI.

¹⁸⁸ Keach, *Antichrist stormed*, 24.

¹⁸⁹ Keach, *The banqueting-house*, sig. A3r.

of Faith'.¹⁹⁰ In other words, Keach did not consider this to be a palatable truth, but it was a biblical truth—and was thus worth knowing and teaching. His other works included significant descriptions of the punishment that awaited condemned humanity who would be 'cast into Hell, to be burned alive for ever and ever, even there, where the worm dyeth not, and the fire is not quenched'.¹⁹¹ This same fear tactic could be seen in Keach's catechisms as he instructed the father to remind his young child that

there are great Multitudes of wicked and ungodly Children ... And [if you follow them], you may lie in Hell with them at last.¹⁹²

Keach also used the discussion of eternal reward and punishment as an opportunity to denounce the doctrine of purgatory as merely a 'Popish trick to get money'¹⁹³ for, upon the death of the body, souls immediately go to heaven or hell.

In this discussion as well, Keach largely echoed his 'denomination's' official documents. The *Second London Confession* announced that

the wicked, are cast into hell; where they remain in torment and utter darkness, reserved to the judgement of the great day ... shall be cast into Eternal torments, and punished with everlasting destruction, from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power.¹⁹⁴

In that document, the leaders of the Particular Baptists explicitly stated the goal that remained implicit in Keach's works, namely the desire that this teaching would 'deter all men from sin'.¹⁹⁵ Henry Jessey mimicked these same goals in his own *Catechisme for Babes*. In that work, the young child was asked 'What will become of all naughty people at that day of judgement after death?' To which the catechumen responded, 'All must come to judgment: naughty men, and naughty women, & naughty children, must be in hell torments for ever'.¹⁹⁶ The succeeding question provided the contrasting

¹⁹⁰ Keach, *The banquetting-house*, sig. A3r.

¹⁹¹ Keach, *The everlasting covenant*, 31.

¹⁹² Keach, *Instructions for children [1695]*, 19.

¹⁹³ Keach, *The child's delight*, Q64.

¹⁹⁴ *Second London Confession*, Art. XXXI, XXXII. Interestingly, the *1644/1646 London Confession* did not mention Hell or punishment at all. The closest that confession came to the concept of Hell was a statement about the resurrection of the dead 'both of the just and unjust ... that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad'. *1646 London Confession*, Art. LII.

¹⁹⁵ *Second London Confession*, Art. XXXII.

¹⁹⁶ Jessey, *A catechisme for babes*, 20-1.

destiny of ‘all good men, and ... good women, and ... good children’. Thus, Keach and his fellow Baptists (and like-minded theologians) intended even the fear-inspiring doctrine of eternal punishment to lead to the eschatological hope of deliverance.

The Soul

The articles on eschatology in his congregation’s *The articles of the faith* presented Keach with an opportunity to tackle another issue which had haunted the Baptists since their earliest days: the doctrine of soul mortality, or *thnetopsychism*.¹⁹⁷ In the 1640s, Richard Overton (fl. 1640-1663), an early Baptist and Leveller, published several treatises on the mortality of the soul in which he argued that the idea of the soul’s immortality was a ‘Hell hatch’d Doctrine’¹⁹⁸ and nothing more than ‘fantastical foolish and childish toys, devised by men that would fain live alwayes, and never make an end’.¹⁹⁹ Evidently, at the earliest stages of the Particular Baptists, this heretical doctrine did not warrant discussion as neither the *1644* nor the *1646 London Confession* mentioned the issue. In 1646, however, Thomas Edwards, of *Gangraena* fame, attached the heresy of ‘mortality of the soul’ to the ‘Sectaries ... [such] as Anabaptists, Antinomians, &c.’.²⁰⁰ That association was reinforced in the early 1670s when Quaker leadership repeated the charges amidst their debate with the Baptist, Thomas Hicks. Both William Penn and George Whitehead accused Hicks and his fellow Baptists of teaching ‘the Mortality of the Soul, that it Dyeth ... with the Body’.²⁰¹ That several

¹⁹⁷ In his classic work, *Christian Mortalism from Tyndale to Milton*, Burns traced the tradition of soul mortality in English radical theology. Bryan Ball’s recent work, *The Soul Sleepers* (2008) is an impressive addition to the research. Michael Servetus held a version of this doctrine in the mid-sixteenth century. See Christopher Hill, ‘William Harvey and the Idea of Monarchy.’ in *The Intellectual Revolution of the Seventeenth Century*, ed. C. Webster, 160-81 (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1974), 169.

¹⁹⁸ Richard Overton, *Mans mortalitie: or, A treatise wherein 'tis proved, both theologically and philosophically, that whole man (as a rationall creature) is a compound wholly mortall, contrary to that common distinction of soule and body* (Amsterdam: John Canne, 1644), sig. A3v. Thomas Edwards recorded a disputation ‘held at the Spittle about the Immortality of the soul by some Anabaptists, as Lam [Thomas Lambe], Battee [Timothy Batte], and others on the day of publike Thanksgiving...’. Thomas Edwards, *The first and second part of Gangraena* (London: T.R. and E.M. for Ralph Smith, 1646), pt. II, 14. According to Edwards, Richard Overton served as the moderator for this disputation.

¹⁹⁹ Richard Overton, *Man wholly mortal, or, A treatise wherein 'tis proved, both theologically and philosophically, that as whole man sinned, so whole man died* (London: s.n., 1675), sig. I4v.

²⁰⁰ Edwards, *Gangraena*, pt I, 9.

²⁰¹ George Whitehead, *The dipper plung'd, or, Thomas Hicks his feigned dialogue between a Christian and a Quaker, proved, an unchristian forgery* (London: s.n., 1672), 15. Also see Penn, *Quakerism*,

radical sects, including the Muggletonians, *did* adopt this doctrine meant that the Particular Baptists could not ignore these accusations for long.²⁰²

Keach, himself, answered this spurious charge in his earliest works. In the funeral sermon, *A summons to the grave*, occasioned by the death of John Norcot in March 1675/76, Keach noted the ‘blessed state and condition of soul [that] they gained that are gone thither [to Heaven]!’²⁰³ That sentiment, combined with Keach’s interpretation of Jesus’ promise to ‘the penitent Thief that he should ... be that day with him in Paradiſe’,²⁰⁴ provided enough ammunition for Keach to dismiss the charges. He also dealt with this issue in his earliest catechisms where the catechist declared that ‘the Souls of believers at Death, go immediately to Christ, and the Souls of the wicked into chains of Darkness’.²⁰⁵ Keach’s explanation agreed completely with his denomination’s official statement provided in the *Second London Confession*—borrowed verbatim from the *Westminster Confession* and the *Savoy Declaration*:

The Bodies of Men after Death return to dust, and see corruption; but their Souls (which neither die nor sleep) having an immortal subsistence, immediately return to God who gave them ...²⁰⁶

Had the charges only been made by the Quakers, they may have been considered merely the desperate attempts of a radical sect to appear less radical—or at least to

162; Penn, *Reason and Railing*, 138. For a discussion of this debate and its participants, see Chapter VI, 174-6.

²⁰² See Lodowick Muggleton, *The acts of the witnesses of the spirit in five parts* (London: s.n., 1699), 25, 79.

²⁰³ Benjamin Keach, *A summons to the grave, or, The necessity of a timely preparation for death* (London: for Ben Harris, 1676), 70.

²⁰⁴ Keach, *A summons to the grave*, 69.

²⁰⁵ Keach, *The child's delight*, 42. If Keach’s claim that this work was a re-print, from memory, of his condemned 1664 catechism, this would portray Keach’s earliest theology.

²⁰⁶ *Second London Confession*, Art. XXXI. The Particular Baptists copied this article verbatim from the Westminster Confession. *Westminster Confession and Catechisms*, Art. XXXII; *Savoy Declaration*, Art. XXXI. The Westminster Assembly of Divines also included this teaching in their *Longer Catechism*. See *Westminster Confession and Catechisms*, LC 100. This statement also harmonizes with the ‘traditional medieval view’ presented in the 1679 *Orthodox Creed* adopted by some General Baptists. The need for Baptists to distance themselves from the soul mortality heresy in the 1670s obviously reached across denominational lines. See *Orthodox Creed*, Art. XLIX. Bryan Ball notes the inclusion of this statement in the *Orthodox Creed* but misses the connection with the *Second London Confession*. The fact that the argument reached into both General and Particular Baptist circles further underscores Ball’s point of the rising importance of this doctrine. B. W. Ball, *The Soul Sleepers: Christian Mortalism from Wycliffe to Priestley* (Cambridge: James Clarke & Co., 2008), 90-93.

make others seem more radical. However, the charges against the Baptists regarding this heresy continued to appear from more mainstream sources.

In 1681, Roger L'Estrange, who had been deprived of his role as licenser when the Licensing Act expired in 1679, accused the dissenters of 'breed[ing] and bring[ing] forth the Monsters of *Anabaptism, Antinomianism, Familism*, Nay that huge Monster, and old flying Serpent of the *Mortality of the Soul*'.²⁰⁷ Meanwhile, 'rational Christianity' exemplified in its early stages by the teachings of Thomas Hobbes²⁰⁸ increased the potential appeal to the laity of soul mortality as a doctrine. Thus, divines like Benjamin Keach had to attack the heresy from two fronts: the association with controversial doctrines which would relegate the church/sect to radical status *and* the appeal of the doctrine that would leave its follower in eternal danger. With those realities in mind, Keach penned one of his last polemical works, *The French impostour*, and attempted to end the discussion over soul mortality once and for all. In this work—framed as an hypothetical trial of the proponent of soul mortality, Zachary Housel—Keach defended the typical Reformed view of humanity as consisting of the material (body) and immaterial (soul).²⁰⁹ Relying on all sections of Scripture and numerous contemporary authorities such as John Flavel and Henry More (1614-1687)—the Cambridge Platonist and latitudinarian, Keach attacked the 'pernicious Assertions' that the soul does not, immediately upon the death of the body, enter Heaven or Hell. Using the very words of Zachary Housel and William Coward (b.1656/7, d. 1725?), the physician and fellow soul mortality proponent, Keach dismissed this doctrine as 'such that the Apostle [Paul] calls *Vain*; which tends not only to Rob and Spoil the Soul of its hope Peace, and Comfort, but to cause Men to fear no Hell, they having no Immortal Souls, and so opens a Door to Prophaneness, &c.'²¹⁰ In reality, Keach's work did not silence the dispute. William Coward, along with Henry Layton (1622-1705), the theological controversialist, and Henry Dodwell (1641-1711), the nonjuror and sometime Camden chair of history at Oxford, joined a

²⁰⁷ Roger L'Estrange, *The dissenter's sayings in requital for L'Estrange's sayings: published in their own words, for the information of the people* (London: for Henry Brome, 1681), 5.

²⁰⁸ Hobbes, *Leviathan*, see especially Chap. XLIV.

²⁰⁹ Keach, *French impostour*, 72. Cf. *Second Helvetic Confession*, Cap. 7; Calvin, *The institution of Christian religion*, I.xv.2; *Heidelberg Catechism*, Q1, Q34.

²¹⁰ Keach, *French impostour*, 144.

heated debate over soul mortality during the first decade of the eighteenth century; however, Keach died before he could get embroiled in that debate, leaving *The French impostour* as his only volley.²¹¹

Radicalism?

Despite the charges of Fifth Monarchism leveled against him in 1664, Keach did not waver in his eschatological speculation. He remained remarkably consistent throughout his ministry, holding to and teaching the same doctrines that originally placed him under suspicion—especially his millenarianism which at the least appeared similar to that of the radical sects which wreaked havoc on and bred fear in London during the Interregnum and the Restoration. Scholars have largely dismissed those early allegations against Keach as unwarranted, spurious charges aimed at labeling Keach as a radical.²¹² Though these charges may have been overused and often trumped up by an administration seeking to quash any type of rebellious activity, they were nonetheless serious for the person being charged, especially considering the death penalty that could accompany a conviction.²¹³ According to the official account of Keach's 1664 trial, Judge Hyde never allowed Keach to answer the charges. His continuing troubles with the law and his position in the dissenting community allowed those charges to remain a shadow over Keach throughout his ministry. The question of the extent of his radicalism *still* deserves an in-depth review.

Ideology

Keach's eschatology—including the future thousand-year kingdom and the personal reign of Christ—fell surprisingly close to that of the more radical millenarians such as Christopher Feake, Thomas Venner, and John Archer. Paradoxically, it also harmonized well (on the majority of aspects) with a multitude of more respectable, even mainstream, theologians such as John Owen, Thomas Goodwin, and Philip

²¹¹ Many of the Reformed Confessions also defended the doctrine of soul immortality. See *Westminster Confession and Catechisms*, Art. IV; *Second Helvetic Confession*, Cap. 7; Calvin, *The institution of Christian religion*, I.xv.2. For a discussion of this debate, see Ball, *Soul Sleepers*, 128-38.

²¹² See Crosby, *History*, II:185ff; Riker, 'A Catholic Reformed Theologian', 47, fn. 108.

²¹³ As evidence of the seriousness of these charges at least to the one being charged, see Charles Edwin Whiting, *Studies in English Puritanism from the Restoration to the Revolution 1660-1688* (London: Cass, 1968), 144.

Nye.²¹⁴ Keach's stance on the significant tenet which distinguished radical millenarian eschatology from its more mainstream version—the call to rebellion against the secular state—remained ambiguous. On the surface, Keach clearly advocated a peaceful submission to civil magistrates who should be obeyed 'for Conscience sake'.²¹⁵ In 1689, Keach reminded his reader that

... Non-resistance is our duty still,
When Princes Rule by Law; but not by Will.
When Magistrates pursue that gracious end,
God by advancing of them did intend;
Then to resist them is a horrid thing,
And God to shame will all such Rebels bring.²¹⁶

Had Keach ended with that advice, the term 'pacific millenarian' would certainly have applied; however, his continued discussion raised some doubts as to his actual leanings:

But must Superiors be submitted to,
When they contrive to ruin and undo
Their faithful Subjects, and o'return the State,
And their most sacred Oaths do violate?
Is Government ordained to destroy,
Or to preserve the Rights that Men enjoy?
...
Must Servants yield, and passively consent
Their Master from their Bones the Flesh should rent;
Is it a crime if they won't this indure,
But seek a better Master to procure?
...
To seek such was to save your selves and me,
Which you thought Just, and hop'd would prosperous be
And though God did Success to you deny,
Yet you might act with all Integrity²¹⁷

Clearly, Keach's pacific non-resistance had limits. In this case, it stretched far enough to justify non-resistance to the *Glorious Revolution* and the accession of the eschatologically-significant William of Orange, but not far enough to condemn those who

²¹⁴ These men also hovered close to the radical edge of theology at times. Thomas Goodwin published a sermon entitled *The great interest of states & kingdomes*, and John Owen published one on *The advantage of the kingdome of Christ in the shaking of the kingdoms of the world*. For an understanding of the Anglican view of the Apocalypse in the Restoration, see Johnston, 'Anglican Apocalypse'.

²¹⁵ Keach, *The articles of the faith*, Art. XXXVII.

²¹⁶ Keach, *Distressed Sion relieved*, 31.

²¹⁷ Keach, *Distressed Sion relieved*, 31-2.

considered rebelling (or even actually rebelled) against the antichristian monarchy of James II.

Keach provided more fodder for those who would classify him as a radical when he eulogized several ‘Renowned Worthies’ who were killed at the hands of the Fourth Monarchy.²¹⁸ Those renowned worthies were almost all ‘persecuted’ for not practicing non-resistance. The list of ‘dignitaries’ found in *Distressed Sion relieved* commenced with Titus Oates, the fabricator of the Popish Plot who, by the time Keach’s work was published, had already been convicted of perjury. Rather than causing Keach to question Oates’ story, that perjury conviction only served to reinforce Oates’ status as a persecuted believer in Keach’s eyes.²¹⁹ Keach also included Richard Rumbold, the owner of the Rye House in Hertfordshire intended to be used in the infamous ‘Rye House Plot’ of 1683. Rumbold, an ‘Anabaptist’,²²⁰ had been executed in 1685 for his role in Argyll’s rebellion, and his brother, William, received a pardon from James II for his participation in the Monmouth Rebellion.²²¹ Keach also praised the life of John Hickes, another participant in the Monmouth Rebellion,²²² Henry Cornish, who was executed for his supposed role in several plots against the monarchy,²²³ and Elizabeth Gaunt who was burnt at Tyburn for harboring convicted rebels.²²⁴ In fact, each of the more than thirty martyrs eulogized by Keach had some role in anti-government rebellions. Keach even vindicated the actions of these conspirators because, he said, they believed their cause to be legitimate.²²⁵

²¹⁸ Keach, *Distressed Sion relieved*, Title Page.

²¹⁹ ODNB; William Bedloe, *A narrative and impartial discovery of the horrid Popish plot, carried on for the burning and destroying the cities of London and Westminster, with their suburbs, &c* (London: for Robert Boulter, John Hancock, Ralph Smith, and Benjamin Harris 1679).

²²⁰ CSPD: 1 July 1683.

²²¹ ODNB.

²²² ODNB.

²²³ ODNB; Morrice, *Entring Book*, III:40.

²²⁴ Based on Keach’s description of Elizabeth Gaunt as ‘most dear ... to me’ and the close proximity of their houses, Austin Walker has suggested that the two may have known each other. Unfortunately, there is no evidence for a relationship between these two—though it is possible. The line in *Distressed Sion relieved* could easily be explained by the fact that Sion was actually speaking at the time. Keach, *Distressed Sion relieved*, 37. Austin Walker, ‘Benjamin Keach and the Protestant Cause under Persecution: unpublished lecture’, *The 2nd Annual Andrew Fuller Center for Baptist Studies Conference* (2008). For a discussion of Elizabeth Gaunt [Gant], see Morrice, *Entring Book*, III:45-46.

²²⁵ Keach, *Distressed Sion relieved*, 34.

Certainly too much can be made of Keach's willingness to memorialize such a group of monarchy-opponents. He did condemn their beliefs (albeit with very little force):

And though they [martyred conspirators] were mistaken, let's take care
Not to asperse what dying men declare.
But sober thoughts of them still to retain,
And not with Obloquy their Memory stain.²²⁶

Additionally, if Keach was simply seeking to condemn the Popish Monarchy for its treatment of Protestants, he would have necessarily been limited to these martyrs (or others like them). He did noticeably omit any theological radicals from his list of martyrs—although it must be noted that most executions of radical millenarians occurred before 1680 (the starting point for Keach's list). If the artificial beginning point of 1680 were removed, Keach's list logically could be enlarged to include Thomas Venner, Thomas Harrison, and a multitude of others who claimed that they did 'according to the best light [they] had, and according to the best understanding that the Scripture will afford'²²⁷—an 'explanation' which sounded remarkably similar to Keach's vindication of the persecuted.

Personal Connections²²⁸

In addition to his near-radical ideology, Keach also maintained close connections with several known Fifth Monarchists. One of the closest such relationships was with George Barrett, signatory of the Fifth Monarchist document, *A declaration of several of the Churches of Christ* (1654) alongside Thomas Harrison, John Rogers (b.1627)—the millenarian Independent convert from presbyterianism and outspoken critic of the Commonwealth—and numerous others. Another of Keach's congregants at Horsleydown, Thomas Hill, had also signed the Fifth Monarchist *Declaration* in 1654 as a member of Lt. Col. Fenton's church.²²⁹ Keach's close relationships with

²²⁶ Keach, *Distressed Sion relieved*, 34.

²²⁷ Thomas Venner, *The last speech and prayer with other passages of Thomas Venner* (London: s.n., 1660), 4. Significantly, Keach never used the term 'King Jesus' which had been the rallying cry of many radical millenarians as they opposed the monarchy.

²²⁸ For a full discussion of Keach's connections in dissenting London and Buckinghamshire, see Chapter II, 12-38.

²²⁹ Hill was a member of Keach's church in 1697. See Keach, *The articles of the faith*, sig. Ar.

Hanserd Knollys who was arrested in the aftermath of Venner's uprising on suspicions of Fifth Monarchism and his publisher, Benjamin Harris, who was implicated in numerous suspicious activities would have added to the cloud of suspicion around Keach.²³⁰ Additionally, Keach maintained connections with numerous individuals involved in the Monmouth Rebellion in 1685.²³¹ Though not all of these people could legitimately be labeled radicals, Keach definitely involved himself with some radical-leaning individuals. To an outside observer, Keach could easily be 'guilty by association'.

The list of connections—both personal and ideological—could continue ad infinitum, but none provided more convincing evidence to establish Keach's stance on radical millenarianism. At the least, they demonstrated Keach's willingness to associate with persons of ill-repute regardless of the effect on his own reputation and/or safety from governmental persecution. At the most, they demonstrated Keach's willingness to inch ever closer toward support (even if only in hindsight) of rebellion against the evil, antichristian fourth monarchy. No one has suggested that Keach, himself, would have taken up arms in support of an uprising; but enough circumstantial evidence exists to question whether he would have condemned such an uprising had any been successful. In Keach's mind, God's providence in the Glorious Revolution kept him from having to make that stand.

Conclusion

Ultimately, Keach fell victim to his own critique of eschatological writers, namely that 'all have been mistaken in many things touching this matter, who have wrote of them, some despair of ever attaining to the certain Knowledge of the time of the End of the Wonders'.²³² His own speculations regarding the dating of the end times proved to be equally as mistaken. But they cannot simply be dismissed. At the time Keach was writing, eschatological interpretations and theologians' willingness to

²³⁰ In a message dated 26 September 1661, Captain William Pestell wrote to Secretary Nicholas with concerns about Hanserd Knollys and the other Fifth Monarchy Men. *CSPD Car. II*, 1661: 26 Sept. Cf. Bustin, *Paradox and Perseverance*, 192.

²³¹ Those in Keach's social network with connections to Monmouth included: Benjamin Harris, John Dunton, Benjamin Alsop.

²³² Keach, *Gospel mysteries unveil'd*, III:150.

print them were quickly fading from the scene. Keach's eschatology, then, reached back into the fervor of a previous generation, and highlighted the fact that Keach was the last of a dying breed. From the beginning of his career right to the end, he refused to be silenced by speculations about his radicalism, choosing instead to preach and publish what he considered to be orthodox beliefs. In his eschatology, his choice of authorities (and his choice, at times, not to use *any* non-biblical authorities) demonstrated a somewhat unique side of Keach's thought. In this area, Keach rarely (if ever) cited his favorite Reformed authorities—John Owen and Isaac Chauncy. He did rely on mostly mainstream Reformed thinkers—some of whom were associated with Owen and Chauncy, but the spectrum of those thinkers shifted toward an extreme of the very tradition which Keach claimed to defend. Keach, himself, clearly walked right on that line of extreme eschatological thought. On the one hand, Keach upheld the traditional views of the immortality of the soul, the immediate punishment of Hell and reward of Heaven for the dead, and the future return of Christ. On the other hand, Keach—relying on his detailed numerical speculations—drifted toward radical views of the millennium and the responsibility of a believer to a non-Christian government. His propensity to see eschatological significance in contemporary events and his questionable (at least to certain observers) choice of company only emphasized his radical tendencies.

CHAPTER VIII:
BENJAMIN KEACH AND REFORMED ORTHODOXY

The picture of Benjamin Keach which has emerged from this re-evaluation of his theological thought demonstrates the ease with which oversimplifications can become engrained. In the case of Keachean studies, two oversimplifications have persisted. First, the early studies of Keach by Spears and Vaughn, painted a portrait of a simple-minded, uneducated and often illogical ‘practical theologian’ who, nevertheless, played an influential role in the development of late seventeenth-century Baptist practice. Those studies simply did not place Keach in a position worthy of being investigated as a serious theologian. Indeed, Spears’ pronouncement that Keach ‘was not a theologian in the technical sense of the term’ hovered over Keachean studies for the better part of five decades.¹

Second, the idea that early modern dissenters—and specifically Keach—can be understood merely as biblicists left a glaring neglect of the study of those Keach viewed as authorities and the numerous complexities of his theological thought. To be fair, Keach did see himself, first and foremost, as a teacher of Scripture who was not influenced by the ‘Traditions of Men’.² Unfortunately, that self-identification—one which was intended to distinguish his teaching from that of the Papists and Jews³—has often been used as the final determiner of Keach’s thought, as if saying that Keach was a biblicist somehow distinguished him (or any Particular Baptist) from the teachings of other theologians and sects, including the General Baptists, the Anglicans, the Independents, the Presbyterians, even the Quakers and Socinians. The picture presented in this study vividly demonstrates the need for a more qualified description of Keach’s theology. Indeed, he was a biblicist, but he was more than that.

¹ Spears, ‘The Baptist Movement in England’, 61. Spears dealt with Keach’s view of justification in a mere three pages.

² Keach and De Laune, *Troposchemalogia*, IV:263.

³ Keach used the term ‘traditions of men’ to refer to idea that ‘there are these other unwritten Verities handed down ...’ as the Papists held. See Benjamin Keach, *Tropologia a key, to open scripture metaphors, in four books* (London: J. W. Pasham: for William Otridge, and James Mathews, 1779), preface, xv.

The recent studies by Riker, Walker, and Brooks—which have provided fodder for interaction throughout this work—began the process of re-evaluation, for, at the very least, all three considered Keach as a theologian. This study has provided further proof that such a view of Keach is accurate and, indeed, is necessitated by a serious reading of his works. Yet that leaves two specific tasks unresolved: to specify Keach’s identification of the ‘Orthodoxy of Matter ... the Reformed Protestants profess’ *and* to provide a specific location of Keach within the theological spectrum of those Reformed Protestants.

By his focus on specific issues and his willingness to be involved in theological debates and controversies, Keach identified the areas of utmost concern for his view of orthodoxy. The vast majority of his writings discussed his federal view of the covenants and his understanding of justification, all of which he built on a distinctly Trinitarian foundation, embracing a traditional Christology. Within those major foci, Keach carved out a distinct set of doctrines which he held as truth. While allowing for some disagreement within the broader categories, Keach remained unapologetic about his often independent analysis and unwavering in his commitment to defend that truth. His independent and tenacious attitude displayed itself in his willingness—in the exaggerated language of the controversial theology of his time—to brand even the most respected of theologians (such as Richard Baxter) as nothing short of heretical and to label his previously held General Baptist views on justification as ‘Arminian Errors’ perpetuated by ‘Men of corrupt Principle’.⁴ Yet, at the same time, Keach recognized the value of agreeing with those he anathematizes, even citing Baxter approvingly in his discussion of the Trinity and agreeing with numerous General Baptists regarding the laying on of hands.

Keach’s focus on a given issue or his participation in a debate did not necessarily mean he considered the issue to be an essential of Christianity. The most glaring topic of this sort for Keach was believers’ baptism which obviously played a prominent role in his theology but was not included in his list of essential Christian truths (and thus was not discussed in detail in this study). A simple look at his canon of authorities clearly illustrates his willingness to allow for diverse opinions on this issue even among those he considered to be true Christians. Importantly, Keach even

⁴ Keach, *A golden mine opened*, 315.

published a version of his primer, *The child's delight*, which omitted any mention of believers' baptism, showing his commitment to promoting the knowledge of the essentials of saving faith over and above his desire to promote Baptist doctrine.

Keach allowed for similar disagreements on the issue of the laying on of hands of all believers which—despite not being an essential for saving faith—did receive attention in this study due to its relation to Keach's understanding of the Godhead. Both of those issues highlight Keach's willingness to stand apart from his peers. Paedobaptists were in the majority in his identifiable social networks and in his canon of authorities. Keach's view on the laying on of hands for all believers was a minority conviction even among his Particular Baptist colleagues.

That same independence also appeared in the issues which he did hold as essential to the Christian religion. For example, in his discussion of the Godhead, Keach demonstrated a stubborn adherence to a pre-critical reading of Scripture—illustrated by his acceptance of and reliance upon the *Comma Johanneum*, the controversial passage in 1 John where the Trinity is clearly identified—which he couched in traditional Trinitarian language. This was a conscious decision by Keach who showed himself to be knowledgeable of the textual criticism of that passage and of the other issues surrounding the doctrine of the Trinity. On this doctrine, Keach mediated a controversial understanding of the subordination of the Second and Third Persons of the Trinity, exemplified by the writings of William Sherlock, with a close adherence to the teachings of John Owen who vehemently opposed Sherlock. Most significantly, Keach defended the deity and personhood of Christ and the Holy Spirit against attacks from those outside mainstream Protestantism (the Arians, Socinians, Eutychians, and Quakers) and from those within the Baptist world influenced by Dutch Mennonite theology (Matthew Caffyn). In the end, despite several unique tendencies (such as the role of laying on of hands in the communication of the Holy Spirit, the use of the term *hypostatic union*, and the subordination of the Persons) Keach remained traditionally Trinitarian. While staying largely insulated from the issues being raised around him by the philosophers and events which were precursors to the Enlightenment, Keach disseminated his views to his congregation and readership without apology, despite, at times, blurring the lines between the Baptist 'denominations' as well as between the Remonstrant and anti-Remonstrant parties. His views on the Godhead even forced him to critique some accepted Reformed teaching and the work of the early Refor-

mers, calling for a further work of reformation which he saw as part and parcel of his ministerial calling.

His view of covenant theology—which he conceptualized in terms of a federal system, complete with a prelapsarian ‘governing’ covenant between God and humanity—and of justification placed him among some of the same groups of theologians as his Trinitarianism did. However, his development of these doctrines represented a synthesis of a variety of ideas which did not stem from a single source. His understanding of the covenants most closely approximated to the covenant theology of the Dutch theologian, Herman Witsius, which Keach received via Isaac Chauncy. Despite that agreement with Witsius, Keach still differed from some of his theology—and that of John Owen—specifically on the issue of the number of covenants. Keach held to two organizing covenants, while Owen and Witsius (along with Baxter et al) identified three. These differences fell within the mainstream of Protestant theology as Keach conscientiously aligned himself with Chauncy and, more importantly, with the Westminster divines. In his understanding of the covenants, Keach included a modified conditional covenant of Grace which relied solely on the work of Christ, following the *Westminster Confession* in distinguishing between conditions of connexion and federal conditions. This brand of theology, it should be recalled, can be traced to the second and third generations of Reformers and even to Keach’s own contemporaries. Among his own religious group, Keach stood out as something of an innovator—being the first Particular Baptist to present what could be considered a detailed federalist theology and also the first to consider its implications across the theological and biblical spectrum.

With his views on justification, Keach’s theological positioning begins to move away from the mainstream on two separate fronts. In harmony with his favorite authorities and in explicit contrast to the Socinians and Remonstrants, Keach held to a limited, penal substitutionary view of the atonement. However, Keach held solely to a predestination of election, rather than a predestination of election *and* reprobation as delineated in the *Westminster Confession* and the *Savoy Declaration*. Along with that single predestination view came an explicit infralapsarian understanding of the decrees. Despite Keach’s clear anti-Remonstrant stance, this aspect of his theology pushed him closer to the Remonstrants (and, not coincidentally, the General Baptists) than many of the leading non-conformists, with whom he generally agreed, would have appreciated. In stark contrast, Keach’s apparent support of the ‘Antinomian’

theology of Tobias Crisp left him on the opposite edge of much of mainstream English Reformed theology as it had developed after the Restoration. Because of this, Keach, rather injudiciously, fell victim to charges of Antinomianism and its accompanying licentiousness. Even in this respect, however, Keach found himself in company with several leading English Reformed theologians of his day, including Isaac Chauncy and Thomas Goodwin (to name but two). Displaying his unwillingness simply to regurgitate the theology of others, Keach described a unique *ordo salutis* which incorporated his concept of dual justification (virtual justification from eternity past and actual justification within time) along with his views of original sin and salvation wholly performed by God. That willingness to present his own, independent theology, at the very least, left him vulnerable to attacks from the many opponents he aggravated thanks to his outspokenness and his penchant for debate. He, thus, became a target for charges of radicalism—charges which were only exacerbated by his stance regarding believers' baptism. One of the few groups not turned off by his beliefs about baptism—his fellow Particular Baptists—came to an almost indistinguishable view of justification by the end of Keach's life.

Keach's proximity to radicalism becomes even more entrenched when his understanding of eschatology—another aspect of theology which he considered essential enough to include in his original short confession—is considered. Appearing as independent as ever, Keach relied on a surprisingly small number of extra-biblical citations, opting not to align himself explicitly with any single theologian. That should not be construed to mean that Keach's eschatology bore no similarities to that of others. Indeed, it did, and Keach referenced a broad array of other supporting authors appropriately. However, the major details were a product of his personal synthesis of contemporary works and the prophetic works in Scripture. This 'fresh look' for Keach resulted in an eschatology highly influenced by contemporary events and strongly focused on an earthly fulfillment of the millennial prophecies. Specifically, Keach expected the return of Christ to happen by at least 1730, to usher in an earthly thousand-year political reign, and to be centered on England. This earthly hope allowed—even obligated—Keach to express his sympathies for contemporary political radicals who shared his desire for political renewal. While he allowed for disagreements on the details of eschatology, he held certain aspects—the return of Christ and the resurrection of the dead to be judged—to be essentials of the faith. Given that these could be found in the Apostles' Creed, such convictions did not move Keach

away from the Reformed mainstream. Other details, however, did. Keach's personal connections to political radicals, especially his stated support of Titus Oates and other dissenting martyrs executed for various crimes against the state, intensified his sometimes-slight variations from mainstream Reformed Protestantism. Perhaps understanding the reality of his radical leanings, Keach argued that the essentials of the faith—Trinitarianism, federal theology, justification performed by God alone, and the return of Christ—must be vehemently defended by all believers. The fundamentals of the constitution of a church—especially believers' baptism, the laying on of hands, and hymn-singing—could remain a work in progress.

Placing Keach on a theological spectrum proves to be a more difficult task than the identification of his essentials. Attempting to place his theology in line with some of the early 'great' Reformers—such as Calvin or Zwingli or Luther—would ignore Keach's own expressed connections *and* the significant recent shifts made in the study of Reformation theology. While Keach expressed great admiration for some of the early Reformers, he avoided citing them with any regularity. As seen in his canon of authorities, he clearly sought to place himself among his contemporaries rather than among the 'greats' of the past.

All aspects of Keach's essentials were found in one mainstream confession or another, usually in the *Westminster Confession* and/or the *Savoy Declaration*, and even Keach's important non-essentials were not without precedent (although they were often rare). However, the combination presented by Keach left him outside the boundaries of any single confessional group, including his own Particular Baptists for whom he (somewhat paradoxically) often served as the primary spokesperson. At a time when confessions remained the primary source of theological identification, estrangement from all mainstream confessions automatically led to suspicions of radicalism—something experienced by English Baptists of all ilks in the seventeenth century. Keach's understanding of this phenomenon conceivably prompted him to provide myriad citations to more acceptable theologians, especially John Owen, on any common beliefs. Simply noting those citations and identifying Keach as Owenian, while tempting, must be avoided because of the injustice that would do to Keach's theological complexities. Indeed, the differences between Keach and those other, more mainstream, theologians remain significant enough to undermine his claim 'only' to profess the essentials of Christianity held by Reformed Protestants. Either Keach had an extremely narrow view of Reformed Protestantism which could only

include a handful of theologians—notably, *not* including John Owen nor, perhaps, many other Particular Baptists—or Keach did not live up to his own claim. At any rate, his theology incorporated much of the Westminster- and Savoy-defined orthodoxy (believers' baptism notwithstanding) while still including enough unique aspects—even some flirtations with radical tendencies, to place him outside the mainstream of those groups. In the end, the man whose works many thought would 'sell to the end of time' gained his significance precisely because he did not agree completely with any single group of his contemporary Reformed Protestants. Rather, in many ways, he could be placed within many confessional groups or none at all.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

[ESTC numbers are provided as appropriate]

Keach Works

Keach, Benjamin. *Zion in distress, or, The sad and lamentable complaint of Zion and her children wherein are demonstrated the causes of her miserable calamities, and her faith in God ...: also shewing the dreadful controversie God hath with the beast of Rome.* London: s.n., printed in the fatal year, [1666]. [R18256]

_____. *War with the devil: Or the young mans conflict with the powers of darkness: In a dialogue, discovering the corruption and vanity of youth, ...: To which is added, an appendix, containing a dialogue between an old apostate, and a young professor.* London: printed for Benjamin Harris and are to be sold at the sign of the Stationers-Armes ..., 1673. [R179308]

_____. *Darkness vanquished: or, Truth in it's primitive purity: being an answer to a late book of Mr. Henry Danvers, intituled A treatise of laying on of hands. Wherein his mistakes and cloudy apprehensions about it, are in a faithful and friendly manner rectified, his grand obiects answered, and imposition of hands upon baptised believers, as such with prayer for the spirit of promise is proved, to be a holy and divine institution of Jesus Christ, and accordingly practiced by the apostles and primitive saints. Together with the testimony of many famous writers, both antient, and of later times concerning it.* London: printed and are to be sold by Benjamin Harris in Swithins Rents at the Stationers Arms in Corn-hill near the Royal Exchange, 1675. [R217553]

_____. *The grand impostor discovered: or, The Quakers doctrine weighed in the ballance, and found wanting. A poem, by way of dialogue: wherein their chief, and most concerning principles are laid down, and by the authority of Gods holy word clearly refuted.* London: printed for B. Harris at the Stationers Arms in Sweetings Rents by the Royal Exchange, 1675. [R214705]

_____. *A summons to the grave, or, The necessity of a timely preparation for death demonstrated in a sermon preached at the funeral of that most eminent and faithful servant of Jesus Christ Mr. John Norcot who departed this life March 24, 1675/6.* London: printed for Ben Harris, 1676. [R29890]

_____. *The glorious lover. A divine poem, upon the adorable mystery of sinners redemption.* London: printed by J.D. for Christopher Hussey at the Flower-de-Luce in Little Britain, 1679. [R18445]

_____. *Sion in distress, or, The groans of the Protestant Chruch [sic].* London: printed by George Larkin for Enoch Prosser, 1681. [R27452]

_____. *Sion in distress, or, The groans of the Prostestant [sic] church.* The second corrected and amended edn. London: printed by George Larkin for Enoch Prosser, 1682. [R32996]

_____. *The childs delight: containing a scripture catechism: Wherein all the chief principles of the Christian religion are clearly (tho' briefly) opened. Necessary to establish young people in Gods truth, in opposition to Popery, in these perilous times. Together with many other things, both pleasant and useful, for the Christian education of youth.* London: printed for Thomas Knowles at the corner of Tower-Street and John How without Bishopsgate, 1683. [This edition is not listed in ESTC.]

_____. *The progress of sin, or, the travels of ungodliness wherein, the pedigree, rise (or original) antiquity, subtilty, evil nature, and prevailing power of sin, is fully discovered, in an apt and pleasant allegory: Together with the great victories he hath obtained, and abominable evils he hath done to mankind, by the help of the devil ...: As also, the manner of his apprehension, arraignment, tryal, condemnation, and execution.* London: printed for John Dunton, 1684. [R11998]

_____. *The travels of true godliness, from the beginning of the world to this present day in an apt and pleasant allegory.* The third, carefully corrected edn. London: printed for John Dunton, at the Raven over against the Stocks-Market, 1684. [R17933]

_____. *Antichrist stormed, or, mystery babylon the great whore, and great city, proved to be the present church of rome wherein all objections are fully answered: To which is added, the time of the end, or a clear explanation of scripture prophecies, with the judgment of divers learned men concerning the final ruine of the romish church, that it will be in this present age.* London: printed for Nath. Crouch, 1689. [R19009]

_____. *Distressed sion relieved, or, the garment of praise for the spirit of heaviness wherein are discovered the grand causes of the churches trouble and misery under the late dismal dispensation: With a compleat history of, and lamentation for those renowned worthies that fell in england by popish rage and cruelty, from the year 1680 to 1688.* London: printed for Nath. Crouch, 1689. [R21274]

_____. *Gold refin'd, or, baptism in its primitive purity proving baptism in water an holy institution of jesus christ ...: Wherein it is clearly evinced that baptism ... Is immersion, or dipping the whole body, &c: Also that believers are only the true subjects (and not infants) of that holy sacrament: Likewise mr. Smythies arguments for infant-baptism in his late book entitled, the non-communicant ... Fully answered* London: printed for the author, and are to be sold by Nathaniel Crouch, 1689. [R17190]

_____. *The gospel minister's maintenance vindicated wherein, a regular ministry in the churches, is first asserted, and the objections against a gospel maintenance for ministers, answered.* London: printed, and are to be sold by John Harris at the Harrow, in the Poultry, 1689. [R213604—The ESTC lists Hanserd Knollys as the author because he (along with ten others) signed the preface. At least by the time of Crosby's *History*, this work was attributed to Keach.]

- _____. *An answer to Mr. Marlow's Appendix. Wherein his arguments to prove that singing of psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs, was performed in the primitive church by a special or an extraordinary gift, and therefore not to be practised in these days, are examined, and clearly detected. Also some reflections on what he speaks on the word hymnos, hymnos: and on his undue quotations of divers learned men.* London: printed for the author and sold by John Hancock in Castle-Alley on the west side of the Royal-Exchange and by the author at his house near Horselydown in Southwark, 1691. [R223737]
- _____. *The breach repaired in God's worship, or, Singing of psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs, proved to be an holy ordinance of Jesus Christ with an answer to all objections: as also, an examination of Mr. Isaac Marlow's two papers, one called, A discourse against singing, &c., the other, An appendix: wherein his arguments and cavils are detected and refuted.* London: printed for the Author and sold by John Hancock in Castle-Alley on the West side of the Royal-Exchange and by the Author at his House near Horselydown in Southwark., 1691. [R21273]
- _____. *The counterfeit Christian, or, The danger of hypocrisy opened in two sermons: containing an exposition of that parabolical speech of our Blessed Saviour, Matth. XII, 43, 44, 45.* London: printed and are sold by John Pike ... and by the author ... 1691. [R18720]
- _____. *Pedo-baptism disproved, an answer by B. Keach to two papers, put forth by the Athenian society, called The Athenian Mercury.* London: printed for the author, and sold by John Harris at the sign of the Harrow in the Poultry, 1691. [R12897]
- _____. *Spiritual melody, containing near three hundred sacred hymns. By Benjamin Keach, author of Trhopolgia, pastor of the Church of Christ meeting on Horsly-down, Southwark.* London: printed for John Hancock, in Castle-Alley, near the Royal-Exchange in Cornhill, 1691. [R218957]
- _____. *An appendix to the answer unto two Athenian Mercuries concerning pedo-baptism containing twenty seven syllogistical arguments proving infant-baptism a mere humane tradition: the gentlemen called the Athenian Society desiring in the last of the said Mercuries to have syllogism.* London: printed for the author and sold by John Harris, 1692. [R2646]
- _____. *The banquetting-house, or, A feast of fat things a divine poem, opening many sacred Scripture mysteries.* London: printed by J.A. for H. Barnard, 1692. [R18938]
- _____. *The marrow of true justification, or, Justification without works containing the substance of two sermons lately preached on Rom. 4:5 ... wherein the nature of justification is opened, as it hath been formerly asserted by all sound Protestants, and the present prevailing errors against the said doctrine detected.* London: printed for Dorman Newman, 1692. [R18579]

_____. *The rector rectified and corrected; or, infant-baptism unlawful: Being a sober answer to a late pamphlet, entituled, An argumentative and practical discourse of infant-baptism; published by Mr. William Burkit, rector of Mildin in Suffolk. Wherein all his arguments for pedo-baptism, are refuted, and the necessity of immersion, i.e. dipping, is evidenced; and the people falsly called Anabaptists, are cleared from those unjust reproaches and calumnies cast upon them. Together with a reply to the Athenian gazette, added to their 5th volume about infant-baptism. With some remarks upon Mr. John Flavel's last book, in answer to Mr. Philip Cary.* London: printed and sold by John Harris at the Harrow in the Poultry; and at the author's house near Horsly-down Southwark, 1692. [R27451]

_____. *The ax laid to the root, or, one blow more at the foundation of infant baptism, and church-membership. Containing an exposition of that metaphorical text of holy scripture, mat. 3. 10. Part i.* London: printed for the author, and are to be sold by John Harris, 1693. [R39052]

_____. *The ax laid to the root: Containing an exposition of that metaphorical text of holy scripture, mat. 3.10 part ii.* London: printed for the Author, and are to be sold by John Harris at the Harrow in the Poultry, 1693. [R234745]

_____. *The everlasting covenant, a sweet cordial for a drooping soul, or, The excellent nature of the covenant of grace opened in a sermon preached January the 29th, at the funeral of Mr. Henry Forty, late pastor of a Church of Christ, at Abingdon, in the county of Berks, who departed this life Jan. 25th 1692/3 and was interr'd at Southwark ... to which is added, An elegy on the death of the said minister.* London: printed for H. Barnard 1693. [R10226]

_____. *A counter-antidote to purge out the malignant effects of a late counterfeit, prepared by mr. Gyles shute, an answer to his vindication of his antidote, to prevent the prevalency of anabaptism.* London: printed for H. Bernard, at the Bible in the Poultry, 1694. [R18808]

_____. *A golden mine opened, or, The glory of God's rich grace displayed in the mediator to believers, and his direful wrath against impenitent sinners containing the substance of near forty sermons upon several subjects.* London: printed and sold by the author ... and William Marshall, 1694. [R18541]

_____. *A trumpet blown in Zion, or, An allarm in God's holy mountain containing an exposition of that metaphorical Scripture, Matth. III, 12: lately delivered in two sermons.* London: s.n., 1694. [R17228]

_____. *Instructions for children: or, The child's & youth's delight teaching an easie way to spell & read true English: Containing the father's godly advice; directing parents in a right and spiritual manner to educate their children.: With a Christian catechism, wherein all the chief principles of true Christianity are clearly opened: Together with many other things both pleasant and useful for the education of children.* New York: printed and sold by Will. Bradford at the Bible in New-York, 1695. [W4078]

- _____. *A feast of fat things full of marrow containing several Scripture songs taken out of the Old and New Testaments, with others composed by t[he author]: together [with o]ne hundred of divine hymns, being the first century.* London: printed by B.H., 1696. [R18904]
- _____. *God acknowledged, or, The true interest of the nation and all that fear God opened in a sermon preached December the 11th, 1695: being the day appointed by the king for publick prayer and humiliation.* London: printed for William Marshal ... and John Marshal, 1696. [R18483]
- _____. *Light broke forth in Wales, expelling darkness, or, The Englishman's love to the antient Britains being an answer to a book, intituled [sic] Children's baptism from Heaven, published in the Welsh tongue by Mr. James Owen.* London: printed and sold by William Marshall, 1696. [R32436]
- _____. *The articles of the faith of the church of Christ, or congregation meeting at Horsley-down.* London: s.n., 1697. [R10175]
- _____. *The glory of a true church, and its discipline display'd wherein a true gospel-church is described: Together with the power of the keys, and who are to be let in, and who to be shut out.* London: s.n., 1697. [R19810]
- _____. *Christ alone the way to heaven: Or, Jacob's ladder improved. Containing four sermons, lately preach'd on genesis, xxviii. Xii. Wherein the doctrine of free-grace is display'd, through Jesus Christ. Also, discovering the nature, office, and ministration of the holy angels. To which is added, one sermon on Rom. 8. 1. With some short reflections on Mr. Samuel Clark's new book intituled, Scripture justification.* London: s.n., 1698. [R24422]
- _____. *The display of glorious grace, or, The covenant of peace opened in fourteen sermons lately preached, in which the errors of the present day about reconciliation and justification are detected.* London: printed by S. Bridge and sold by Mary Fabian ... Joseph Collier ... and William Marshall, 1698. [R19782]
- _____. *Laying on of hands upon baptized believers, as such, proved an ordinance of Christ in answer to Mr. Danvers's former book intituled, A treatise of laying on of hands: with a brief answer to a late book called, A treatise concerning laying on of hands, written by a nameless author. The second edn.* London: printed and are to be sold by Benj. Harris, 1698. [R8584]
- _____. *A medium betwixt two extremes wherein it is proved that the whole first Adam was condemned and the whole second Adam justified: being a sermon lately preached on Rom. 8:1 and now published to prevent the further controversy (in one main point) about justification: to which are added reflections on some passages in Mr. Clark's new book called Scripture-Justification.* London: printed for Andrew Bell, 1698. [R29062]

- _____. *Beams of divine light: or Some brief hints of the being and attributes of God, and of the three persons [i]n the God-Head. Also proving [...] deity of Christ, and [o]f the Holy-Ghost.* London: printed by K. Astwood, and sold [by] William Marshall at the Bible in New-gate-street, 1700. [R225534]
- _____. *The Jewish Sabbath abrogated: or, The Saturday Sabbatarians confuted. In two parts. First, proving the abrogation of the old seventh-day Sabbath. Secondly, that the Lord's-Day is of divine appointment. Containing several sermons newly preach'd upon a special occasion, wherein are many new arguments not found in former authors.* London: printed and sold by John Marshall at the Bible in Grace-Church-Street, 1700. [R7556]
- _____. *Spiritual songs being the marrow of Scripture in songs of praise to Almighty God from the Old and New Testament: with a hundred divine hymns on several occasions as now practised in several congregations in and about London: with a table of contents.* London: printed for John Marshal, 1700. [R30480]
- _____. *Gospel mysteries unveil'd: Or an exposition of all the parables and many express similitudes contained in the four evangelists.* London: s.n., 1701. [T121243]
- _____. *The French impostour detected Or Zach. Housel, tryed the second time by the word of God.* London: printed for Ebenezer Trasy also sold by William Likly and Peter Carter, 1702. [T114622]
- _____. *The child's delight: or instructions for children and youth. Wherein all the chief principles of the Christian religions are clearly (though briefly) opened.* The third corrected edn. London: printed for William and Joseph Marshall, and sold by them, 1704?. [T122158]
- _____. *Believers baptism: or, Love to the antient Britains displayed: Wherein, the chief arguments for infant baptism, from the most eminent and learned authors, are collected, stated, and fully answered in the following chapters.* London: printed for John Marshall, at the Bible in Grace-Church-street, 1705. [T121259]
- _____. *Instructions for children: Or, the child's and youth's delight. Teaching an easy way to spell and read true english. Containing the father's godly advice, directing parents in a right and spiritual manner to educate their children. With a scripture catechism. Wherein all the chief principles of true christianity are clearly opened. Together with many other things, both pleasant and useful, for the education of children.* London: Printed for J. How, and Sold by the Booksellers, 1710?. [T121252]
- _____. *Instructions for children: Or, the child's and youth's delight. Teaching an easie way to spell and read true english.* 25th edn. London: printed for John Marshall at the Bible in Gracechurch-Street, 1738. [N51937]

- _____. *The travels of true godliness, from the beginning of the world, to this present day*. 7th edn. Belfast: printed by and for James Magee, and sold at his shop in Bridgestreet, 1752. [T121244]
- _____. *Tropologia a key, to open scripture metaphors, in four books. Together with types of the Old Testament, by the Rev. Mr. Benjamin Keach. The whole carefully revised*. London: printed by J. W. Pasham: for William Otridge, and James Mathews, 1779. [T194778]
- _____. *Preaching from the types and metaphors of the Bible*. Kregel reprint library. Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, 1972.
- Keach, Benjamin, and Thomas De Laune. *Tropologia, or, A key to open Scripture metaphors the first book containing sacred philology, or the tropes in Scripture, reduc'd under their proper heads, with a brief explication of each*. London: printed by John Richardson and John Darby for Enoch Prosser, 1681. [R24884]
- _____. *Troposchemalogia: Tropes and figures; or, A treatise of the metaphors, allegories, and express similitudes, &c. contained in the Bible of the Old and New Testament To which is prefixed, divers arguments to prove the divine authority of the Holy Scriptures wherein also 'tis largely evinced, that by the great whore, mystery Babylon is meant the Papal hierarchy, or present state and church of Rome. Philologia sacra, the second part. Wherein the schemes, or figures in Scripture, are reduced under their proper heads, with a brief explication of each. Together with a treatise of types, parables, &c. with an improvement of them parallel-wise*. London: printed by John Darby, for the author, 1682. [R7039]

Unpublished Manuscripts

Angus Library, Regent's Park College, Oxford

Annals of an Ancient Church: Chiefly Extracts from 'The Records of Minutes Taken of the Proceedings of the Church of Christ Meeting at the Maze Pond, Southwark'

Bampton [Devon] Church Record Book and Minutes

Barbican Church Minute Book

Barbican: Turner's Hall Church Minute Book

Broughton Baptist Church: Church Minute Book, 1653-1684

The Church Book for Goswell Street

D/STI 1, no. 26 Letter from Pensilvania [sic]

Glasshouse Yard Church Book

Maze Pond Church Book, 1691-1708

Minutes and Records of the Unicorn Yard Chapel, 1719-1820

Whitchurch Collection C. 17 Lyn Persecution Letter from Benjamin Keach and Richard Adams to Richard Kent

Dr. Williams' Library, London

MS 38.77 Some Accounts of a Library

Guildhall Library

MS 07635 v.2, 1655 Marriage Registry of Matthew Meade

MS 07635 Woolnoth, Church of England—Parish of St Mary. Registers of Baptisms, Marriages, and Burials

White's Alley Church Book

London Metropolitan Archives

MR/R/C/001-10 Certificates of Conviction

National Archives, Kew

SP 29/419, 1682 *Constant Oates Spy Report*

SP Dom: Car. II.417, no 144i *List of Attendees at Curriers Hall Conventicle*

Parliamentary Archives, London

HL/PO/JO/10/1/430 6 Dec 1690 *Petition to the House of Lords by the Inhabitants of Southwark*

Prerogative Court of Canterbury

PROB 11/453 1699 *Will of Matthew Meade of Stepney*

Public Record Office

PRO RG4/4188 *A Perfect and Compleat Register of Marriages, Nativities, and Burials belonging to the Congregation that Meeteth at Horsly:downe; over whom Benjamin Keach is Overseer*

Surrey History Centre, Woking

Loosely Manuscripts *Miscellaneous Religious Documents*

Surrey Quarter Sessions

Archdeaconry Court of Surrey, Microfilm 1704 *Will of Benjamin Keach*

Primary Published Sources

The agreement of divers ministers of Christ in the county of Worcester, and some adjacent parts, for catechizing or personal instructing all in their parishes, that will consent thereunto. London: printed by R.W. for Nevil Simmons bookseller at Kidderminster, and are to be sold there by him, and at London by William Roybould, at the Unicorn in Pauls Church-yard, 1656. [R208988]

An earnest call to family-catechising and reformation by a reverend divine. London: printed by J.W. for John Dunton, 1693. [R31403]

Alsop, Vincent. *Anti-sozzo, sive, Sherlocismus enervatus in vindication of some great truths opposed, and opposition to some great errors maintained by Mr. William Sherlock.* London: printed for Nathanael Ponder ... 1676. [R37035]

Alsted, Johann Heinrich. *The beloved city, or, The saints reign on earth a thousand yeares asserted and illustrated from LXV places of Holy Scripture, besides the judgement of holy learned men both at home and abroad, and also reason it selfe: likewise XXXV objections against this truth are here answered.* Translated by William Burton. London: s.n., 1643. [R19975]

Ames, William. *The marrow of sacred divinity drawne out of the Holy Scriptures, and the interpreters thereof, and brought into method.* London: printed by Edward Griffin for Henry Overton, 1642. [R23182]

Andrewes, Lancelot. *A patterne of catechisticall doctrine wherein many profitable questions touching christian religion are handled. And the whole decalogue succinctly and judiciously expounded.* London: printed [by Thomas Cotes?] for William Garrett, 1630. [S100175]

Aspinwall, William. *A brief description of the fifth monarchy or kingdome that shortly is to come into the world the monarch, subjects, officers and lawes thereof, and the surpassing glory, amplitude, unity and peace of that kingdome: when the kingdome and dominion, and the greatnesse of the kingdome under the whole heaven shall be given to the people, the saints of the most high, whose kingdome is an everlasting kingdome, and all soveraignes shall serve and obey him : and in the conclusion there is added a prognostick of the time when the fifth kingdome shall begin.* London: printed by M. Simmons and are to be sold by Liverwell Chapman ... 1653. [R16233]

. An explication and application of the seventh chapter of Daniel with a correction of the translation. Wherein is briefly shewed the state and downfall of the four monarchies; but more largely of the Roman monarchy, and the ten horns or kingdomes; and in particular, the beheading of Charles Stuart, who is proved to be the little horn by many characters, that cannot be applied to any before or after him. And what is meant by the carkass of the beast, which yet remains to be burned. Together with a hint of the slaying and rising of the two witnesses. London: printed by R.I. for Livewell Chapman at the Crown in Popes-head Alley, 1654. [R206879]

_____. *The work of the age: or, the sealed prophecies of Daniel opened and applied VVherein is plainly proved that all the governments in the world, except the government of Christ, are but images, or parts of Nebuchadnezzars image, and shall be suddenly broken in pieces by the little stone cut out of the mountain without hand: together with the means how Christ will effect all this. Shewing also that image-government, and image-worship have always been companions. Explaining likewise Daniels mystical numbers, and discovering some misprisions about the little horn, both in the translation and application of the same. Amending sundry places in our common translation, and clearing some chronological points from the common errorrs.* London: printed by R.I. for Livewell Chapman and are to be sold at the sign of the Crown in Popes-head Alley, 1655. [R207510]

_____. *The legislative povver is Christ's peculiar prerogative. Proved from the 9th of Isaiah, vers. 6.7.* London: printed for Livewel Chapman, at the Crown in Popes head alley, 1656. [R205981]

Articles agreed upon by the arch-bishops and bishops of both provinces, and the whole clergie; in the Convocation holden at London, in the year, 1562. London: printed by Bonham Norton and Iohn Bill, Printers to the Kings most excellent Majesty, 1630. [S116712]

Atkyns, Richard. *The original and growth of printing collected out of history, and the records of this kingdome: wherein is also demonstrated, that printing appertaineth to the prerogative royal, and is a flower of the crown of England.* London: printed by John Streater for the author, 1664. [R22866]

Augustine. *The Trinity.* Translated by Edmund Hill. Brooklyn, N.Y.: New City Press, 1991.

Bagshaw, Edward. *The doctrine of the kingdom and personal reign of Christ asserted and explained in an exposition upon Zach. 14, 5, 9.* London: s.n., 1669. [R5233]

Baillie, Robert. *A dissuasive from the errorrs of the time wherein the tenets of the principall sects, especially of the Independents, are drawn together in one map, for the most part in the words of their own authours, and their maine principles are examined by the touch-stone of the Holy Scriptures.* London: printed for Samuel Gellibrand, 1646. [R3465]

Ball, John. *A short treatise: Containing all the principall grounds of Christian religion.* London: printed for William Welby, 1617. [S124283]

The baptist catechism: Or, a brief instruction in the principles of Christian religion. Sixteenth, corrected edn. London: printed for John Robinson, 1764. [T164354]

Barrow, Henry. *The Writings of Henry Barrow 1590-1591.* ed. Leland Henry Carlson. London: Published for the Sir Halley Stewart Trust [by] Allen & Unwin, 1966.

Baxter, Richard. *Aphorismes of justification with their explication annexed: wherein also is opened the nature of the covenants, satisfaction, righteousnesse, faith, works, &c.: published especially for the use of the church of Kederminster in Worcestershire.* London: printed for Francis Tyton, 1649. [R10119]

_____. *Rich. Baxters apology against the modest exceptions of Mr. T. Blake and the digression of Mr. G. Kendall whereunto is added animadversions on a late dissertation of Ludiomaeus Colvinus, alia Ludovicus Molinaes, M. Dr. Oxon, and an admonition of Mr. W. Eyre of Salisbury: with Mr. Crandon's Anatomy for satisfaction of Mr. Caryl.* London: printed by A.M. for Thomas Underhill ... and Francis Tyton, 1654. [R31573]

_____. *Aphorismes of justification, with their explication annexed wherein also is opened the nature of the covenants, satisfaction, righteousnesse, faith, works, &c.: published especially for the use of the church of Kederminster in Worcestershire.* Hague: printed by Abraham Brown, 1655. [R38720]

_____. *Rich: Baxter's confessions [sic] of his faith, especially concerning the interest of repentance and sincere obedience to Christ, in our justification & salvation. VVritten for the satisfaction of the misinformed, the conviction of calumniators, and the explication and vindication of some weighty truths.* London: printed by R.W. for Tho. Underhil, and Fra. Tyton, and are to be sold at the Anchor and Bible in Pauls Church-yard, and at the three Daggers in Fleetstreet, 1655. [R207664]

_____. *Gildas salvianus; the reformed pastor. Shewing the nature of the pastoral work; especially in private instruction and catechizing.* London: printed by Robert White, for Nevil Simmons, book-seller at Kederminster, and are to be sold by William Roybould, at the Unicorn in Pauls Church Yard., 1656. [R2683]

_____. *The Grotian religion discovered, at the invitation of Mr. Thomas Pierce in his Vindication. With a preface, vindicating the Synod of Dort from the calumnies of the new Tilenus; and David, Peter, &c. And the Puritanes, and sequestrations, &c. from the censures of Mr. Pierce.* London: printed by R.W. for Nevill Simmons bookseller in Kederminster, and are to be sold by him there, and by Tho. Brewster at the three Bibles, and by John Starkey at the Miter at the west end of Pauls, 1658. [R209569]

_____. *Of justification: four disputations clearing and amicably defending the truth against the unnecessary oppositions of divers learned and reverend brethren.* London: printed by R.W. for Nevil Simmons ... and are to be sold by him ... and by Nathaniel Elkins, 1658. [R13779]

_____. *Of the imputation of Christ's righteousness to believers in what sence [sic] sound Protestants hold it and of the false divided sence by which libertines subvert the Gospel: with an answer to some common objections, especially of Dr. Thomas Tully whose Justif. Paulina occasioneth the publication of this.* London: printed for Nevil Simmons and Jonathan Robinson, 1675. [R28361]

_____. *Richard Baxter's Catholick theologie plain, pure, peaceable, for pacification of the dogmatical word-warriours who, 1. by contending about things unrevealed or not understood, 2. and by taking verbal differences for real.* London: printed by Robert White for Nevill Simmons ... 1675. [R14583]

_____. *Rich. Baxter's review of the state of Christian's infants whether they should be entered in covenant with God by baptism ... or whether Christ, the Saviour of the world, hath shut all mankind out of his visible kingdom ... 'till they come of age?: occasioned by the importunity of Mr. E. Hutchinson (and of Mr. Danvers and Mr. Tombes) who called him to this review in order to his retractation [sic].* London: printed for Nevil Simons, 1676. [R18045]

_____. *The catechizing of families a teacher of housholders how to teach their households: Useful also to school-masters and tutors of youth.* London: printed for T. Parkhurst ..., and B. Simmons, 1683. [R22783]

_____. *Catholick communion defended against both extreams, and unnecessary division confuted in five parts ...* . London: printed for Tho. Parkhurst, 1684.

_____. 'A defence of Christ, and free grace: against the subverters, commonly called, antinomians or libertines; who ignorantly blaspheme Christ on pretence of extolling him.' in *The scripture gospel defended, and Christ, grace, and free justification vindicated against the libertines ... In two books: The first, a breviat of fifty controversies about justification ...: The second upon the sudden reviving of antinomianism ... And the re-printing of Dr. Crisp's sermons with additions.* Re-paginated addition. London: printed for Tho. Parkhurst, 1690. [R234133]

_____. *The Scripture Gospel defended, and Christ, grace, and free justification vindicated against the libertines ... in two books: the first, a breviat of fifty controversies about justification ...: the second upon the sudden reviving of antinomianism ... and the re-printing of Dr. Crisp's sermons with additions.* London: printed for Tho. Parkhurst, 1690. [R20024]

_____. *Against the revolt to a foreign jurisdiction, which would be to England its perjury, church-ruine, and slavery. In two parts. I. The history of mens endeavors to introduce it. II. The confutation of all pretences for it. Fully stating the controversie, and proving, that there is no sovereign power of legislation, judgment and execution over the whole Church on earth, aristocratical or monarchical, but only Christs: especially against the aristocratists who place it in a council or college.* London: printed for Tho. Parkhurst at the Bible and Three Crowns at the lower end of Cheapside near Mercers Chapel, 1691. [R22132]

_____. *An end of doctrinal controversies which have lately troubled the Churches by reconciling explication, without much disputing.* London: printed for John Salusbury at the Rising Sun in Cornhil, 1691. [R2853]

_____. *The glorious kingdom of Christ, described and clearly vindicated against the bold asserters of a future calling and reign of the Jews, and 1000 years before the conflagration and the asserters of the 1000 years kingdom after the conflagration: opening the promise of the new heaven and earth and the everlastingness of Christ's kingdom against their debasing it, who confine it to 1000 years ...* London: printed by T. Snowden, for Thomas Parkhurst, 1691. [R5007]

_____. *Richard baxter's penitent confession and his necessary vindication in answer to a book called the second part of the mischiefs of separation, written by an unnamed author with a preface to mr. Cantianus d. Minimis, in answer to his letter which extorted this publication.* London: printed for Tho. Parkhurst, 1691. [R13470]

_____. *Universal redemption of mankind, by the Lord Jesus Christ.* London: printed for John Salusbury, 1694. [R6930]

Bedloe, William. *A narrative and impartial discovery of the horrid Popish plot, carried on for the burning and destroying the cities of London and Westminster, with their suburbs, &c. setting forth the several consults, orders and resolutions of the Jesuites, &c. concerning the same. ...* London: printed for Robert Boulter, John Hancock, Ralph Smith, and Benjamin Harris 1679. [R11047]

Bent, James. *The bloody assizes, or, A compleat history of the life of George Lord Jefferies, from his birth to this present time ... to which is added Major Holmes's excellent speech, with the dying speeches and prayers of many other eminent Protestants: none of which were ever before publish'd.* London: printed for J. Dunton ... and sold by R. Janeway, 1689. [R31269]

Bernard, Richard. *A key of knowledge for the opening of the secret mysteries of St Johns mysticall Reuelation.* London: Imprinted by Felix Kyngston, 1617.

Best, Paul. *Mysteries discovered, or, A mercuriall picture pointing out the way from Babylon to the holy city for the good of all such as during that night of generall error and apostasie, 2 Thes. 2.3. Revel. 3.10 have been so long misted with Romes hobgoblin.* London: s.n., 1647. [R9886]

Beverley, Thomas. *The command of God to his people to come out of Babylon, Revel. 18. 4, demonstrated to mean the coming out of the present papal Rome with a most earnest perswasive to all to come out who are in it.* [London]: s.n., 1688. [R18831]

Beza, Theodore. *Tabula Praedestinationis.* Translated by William Whittingham. Geneva: s.n., 1555.

_____. *Quaestionum et responsionum Christianarum libellus.* Translated by Arthur Golding. London: s.n., 1572. [S120376]

_____. *A little catechisme, that is to say, a short instruction touching Christian religion.* London: printed by Hugh Singleton, dwelling in Creede Lane, at the signe of the Gilden Tunn nere vnto Ludgate, 1578. [S120273]

_____. *Master Bezaes sermons vpon the three chapters of the canticke of canticles wherein are handled the chiefest points of religion controverted and debated betweene vs and the aduersarie at this day, especially touching the true Iesus Christ and the true Church, and the certaine & infallible marks both of the one and of the other.* . Translated by Iohn Harmar. Oxford: printed by Ioseph Barnes, and are to be sould [in London by T. Cooke] in Pauls Church-yard at the Tygers Head, 1587. [S101752]

_____. *Theses theologicae.* Translated by John Penry. Edinburgh: printed by Robert Waldegrae, 1591. [S101754]

_____. *The Christian faith.* Translated by James Clark. Lewes: Focus Christian Ministries Trust, 1992.

Beza, Theodore, and Heinrich Bullinger. *A confession of fayth made by common consent of diuers reformed churches beyonde the seas: with an exhortation to the reformation of the Churche. Perused and allowed accordinge to the Queenes Maiesties iniunctions.* London: printed by Henry Wykes for Lucas Harrison, 1568. [S118060]

The Bible and holy scriptures, tr. according to the Ebrue and Greke by W. Whittingham and others. Geneua: R. Hall, 1560. [S101758]

Biddle, John. *A confession of faith touching the Holy Trinity, according to the Scripture.* London: s.n., 1648. [R4053]

Blackwood, Christopher. *The storming of Antichrist, in his two last and strongest garrisons; of compulsion of conscience, and infants babptisme [sic]. Wherein is set down a way and manner for cburch [sic] constitution; together with markes to know right constituted churches, from all other societies in the world. Also the cruelty inequality and injustice of compulsion for conscience, by 29. arguments is opened; with an answer to 26. objections brought for the same. Also 12. arguments against the baptizing of infants; with an answer to 26. objections brought for the same. Wherein is displayed to the view of all, from the testimonies of Scriptures, Fathers, councels; the mischiefs, uncertainties, novelties, and absudities [sic] that do attend the same. Wherein is answered the most valid arguments brought by St. Martiall, in his sermon preached in the Abbey Church at Westminister, for the defence hereof. With an answer to Mr. Blake his arguments, in his book cald Birth-priviledge; and to the arguments of divers others. As also a catechisme, wherein is cleerly opened the doctrine of baptisme, together with a resolution of divers questions and cases of conscience, about baptisme.* London: s.n., 1644. [R7842]

_____. *A soul-searching catechism wherein is opened and explained not onely the six fundamental points set down heb. 6. I. But also many other questions of highest concernment in Christian religion.* Second edn. London: printed by J.C. for Giles Calvert, 1653. [R24658]

Blount, Charles. *An appeal from the country to the city, for the preservation of His Majesties person, liberty, property, and the Protestant religion*. London: s.n., 1679. [R225485]

The booke of the common prayer and administracion of the sacramentes and other rites and ceremonies of the churche: After the vse of the churche of england. Londini: in officina Edouardi Whitechurche. Cum priuilegio ad imprimendum solum, 1549. [S109513]

A brief confession or declaration of faith set forth by many of us, who are (falsely) called Ana-baptists to inform all men (in these dayes of scandal and reproach) of our innocent belief and practise; for which we are not only resolved to suffer persecution, to the loss of our goods, but also life it self, rather than to decline the same. Subscribed by certain elders, deacons, and brethren, met at London, in the first month (called March, 1660.) in the behalf of themselves, and many others unto whom they belong, in London, and in several counties of this nation, who are of the same faith with us. London: printed by G.D. for F. Smith at the Elephant and Castle near Temple-Barr, 1660. [R207992]

Brightman, Thomas. *A reuelation of the reuelation that is, the reuelation of St. Iohn opened clearely With a logicall resolution and exposition. Wherein the sense is cleared, out of the scripture, the euent also of thinges foretold is discused out of the church-histories*. Amsterdam: s.n., 1615. [S106911]

_____. *A commentary on the Canticles or the Song of Solomon wherein the text is analised, the native signification of the words declared, the allegories explained, and the order of the times whereunto they relate observed*. London: printed by Iohn Field for Henry Overton, 1644. [R175602]

_____. *The Revelation of St. John, illustrated with analysis and scholions wherein the fence is opened by the scripture, and the events of things foretold, shewed by histories: together with a most comfortable exposition of the last and most difficult part of the prophecy of Daniel wherein the restoring of the Jewes, and their calling to the faith of Christ, after the utter overthrow of their three last enemies is set forth in lively colours*. Amsterdam: printed by Thomas Stafford and are to be sold at his house ... 1644. [R17431]

_____. *The workes of that famous, reverend, and learned divine, Mr. Tho. Brightman viz., a revelation of the apocalyps, containing an exposition of the whole book of the Revelation of Saint John, illustrated with analysis and scholions: wherein the sense is opened by the Scripture, and the event of things foretold, shewed by history: whereunto is added, a most comfortable exposition of the last and most difficult part of the prophesie of Daniel: wherein the restoring of the Jews, and their calling to the faith of Christ, after the utter overthrow of their three last enemies, is set forth in lively colours: together with a commentary on the whole book of Canticles, or Song of Salomon*. London: printed by John Field for Samuel Cartwright, 1644. [R19776]

Browne, James. *Scripture-redemption freed from men's restrictions: being an answer to a book lately published by Mr. William Troughton (who stiles himself a minister of the gospel at Onlep in Leicester-shire) intituled, scripture-redemption restrained and limited: as also the substance of several conferences and disputes had in England, Wales, and Scotland, with Mr. Heath, Mr. Bartley, Mr. Powel, Mr. Sam. Rutherford, and Mr. James Wood, two rectors of the university of S. Andrews, and many others, about the death of our most dear redeemer, and the controversies which are the constant concomitants of it. Together with a brief reply to Mr. Troughton's rayling accusations in his introduction.* London: printed by J.C. for Will: Larnar, at the signe of the Blackmoor near Fleet-bridge, 1653. [R230501]

Bullinger, Heinrich. *De testamento seu foedere Dei unico & aeterno.* Tiguri: in excusum Christoph. Frosch, 1534. [This edition is available at Queens College, Oxford.]

_____. *An holsome antidotus or counter-poysen, agaynst the pestylent heresy and secte of the Anabaptistes.* Translated by John Véron. London: printed by Humfrey Powell, dwellyng about Holburne Conduit, 1548. [S104813]

_____. *A moste sure and strong defence of the baptisme of children, against [the] pestiferous secte of the Anabaptystes. Set furthe by that famouse clerke, Henry Bullynger.* Translated by John Véron. Imprynted at Worcester: printed by Ihon Oswen, 1551. [S109521]

_____. *In Apocalypsim Jesu Christi ... conciones centum.* Basil, 1557. [This edition is available at Bodleian Library, Oxford.]

Bunyan, John. *The doctrine of the law and grace unfolded: or, A discourse touching the law and grace.* London: printed for Nath. Ponder at the Peacock in the Poultry, 1685. [R34390]

Burnet, Gilbert. *Some letters containing an account of what seemed most remarkable in Switzerland, Italy, &c.* Amsterdam: s.n., 1686. [R25313]

_____. *A sermon preached in the chappel of St. James's, before His Highness the Prince of Orange, the 23d of December, 1688.* London: reprinted at Edinburgh by John Reid, 1689. [R27817]

Burrough, Edward. *A general epistle to all the saints being a visitation of the Fathers love unto the whole flock of God ...: to be read in all the assemblies, of them, that meet together to worship the Father in the spirit and truth.* London: printed for Robert Wilson, 1660. [R14865]

Calamy, Edmund. *A continuation of the account of the ministers, lecturers, masters and fellows of colleges, and schoolmasters, who were ejected and silenced.* 2 vols. London, 1727. [T109851]

Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, James II. 3 vols. Nendeln: Kraus Reprint, 1979.

Calvin, Jean. *The institution of Christian religion, vvrytten in latine by maister Ihon Caluin, and translated into englysh according to the authors last edition. Seen and allowed according to the order appointed in the quenes maiesties iniunctions.* Translated by Thomas Norton. London: Reinolde VVolve & Richarde Harison, 1561. [S107154]

_____. *Commentaries of the diuine Iohn Caluine, vpon the prophet Daniell, translated into Englishe, especially for the vse of the family of the ryght honorable Earle of Huntingdon, to set forth as in a glasse, how one may profitably read the Scriptures, by consideryng the text, meditatyng the sense therof, and by prayer.* Translated by Anthony Gilby. London: imprinted by Iohn Daye, ouer Aldersgate, 1570. [S107376]

_____. *Calvin: Theological Treatises.* Translated by J. K. S. Reid. London: SCM, 1954.

_____. *Commentaries on 1, 2, & 3 John.* Wheaton, Ill: Crossway Books, 1998.

Carleton, George. *The collegiat suffrage of the diuines of Great Britaine, concerning the five articles controverted in the Low Countries VVhich suffrage was by them delivered in the synod of Dort, March 6. anno 1619. Being their vote or voice foregoiing the joint and publique judgment of that Synod.* London: printed [by Miles Flesher] for Robert Milbourne, and are to be sold at his shop in Pauls Churchyard at the signe of the Greyhound, 1629. [S110099]

Cartwright, Thomas. *A replye to an ansvvere made of M. Doctor VVhitgifte Agaynste the admonition to the Parliament.* [Hemel Hempstead?: printed by John Stroud?], 1573. [S107565]

_____. *A Methodicall Short Catechisme Containing Briefly All the Principall Grounds of Christian Religion.* London: printed by B[ernard] A[lsop] for Thomas Man, dwelling in Paternoster Row, at the signe of the Talbot, 1623. [S104939]

Catechesis ecclesiarum: quae in regno Poloniae, et magno Ducatu Lithuaniae, et aliis ad istud regnum pertinentibus provinciis, affirmant, neminem alium praeter Patrem Domini Nostri Iesu Christi, esse illum unum Deum Israelis: hominem autem illum Iesum Nazarenum, qui ex virgine natus est, nec alium, praeter aut ante ipsum, Dei filium unigenitum et agnoscunt et confitentur. Racoviae: [printed by R. Young], 1609. [S5256]

Cater, Samuel and Francis Holcroft. *A relation of some of the most material matters that passed in a publick dispute at Thriploe in Cambridgeshire the 15th day of the 2d month 1676 between Francis Holdcraft and Joseph Odde his assistant, both Presbyterian priests, on the one party, and Samuel Cater with some others of the Friends of truth called Quakers.* London?: s.n., 1676. [R29185]

Chamberlen, Peter and William Kiffin. *A discourse between Cap. Kiffin, and Dr. Chamberlain, about imposition of hands.* London: s.n., 1654. [R206958]

- Charnock, Stephen. *Several discourses upon the existence and attributes of God by that late eminent minister in Christ, Mr. Stephen Charnocke*. London: printed for D. Newman, T. Cockerill, Benj. Griffin, T. Simmons, and Benj. Alsop, 1682. [R231290]
- Chauncy, Isaac. *Neonomianism unmask'd, or, The ancient gospel pleaded against the other, called a new law or gospel in a theological debate, occasioned by a book lately wrote by Mr. Dan. Williams, entituled, Gospel-truth stated and vindicated ...*. London: printed for J. Harris, 1692. [R19390]
- _____. *The doctrine which is according to godliness grounded upon the Holy Scriptures of truth, and agreeable to the doctrinal part of the English Protestant Articles and Confessions to which is annexed a brief account of the church-order of the Gospel according to the Scriptures*. London: printed for the author by H. Hills and are to be sold by Will. Marshal, T. Fabin and H. Barnard, 1694. [R27262]
- _____. *The divine institution of Congregational churches, ministry and ordinances ... asserted*. London: printed for Nathanael Hiller, at the Princes Arms in Leaden-Hall Street, over against St. Mary Ax, 1697. [R38739]
- Cheynell, Francis. *The rise, growth, and danger of Socinianisme together with a plaine discovery of a desperate designe of corrupting the Protestant religion, whereby it appears that the religion which hath been so violently contended for (by the Archbishop of Canterbury and his adherents) is not the true pure Protestant religion, but an hotchpotch of Arminianisme, Socinianisme and popery: it is likewise made evident, that the atheists, Anabaptists, and sectaries so much complained of, have been raised or encouraged by the doctrines and practises of the Arminian, Socinian and popish party*. London: printed for Samuel Gellibrand, 1643. [R16168]
- _____. *The divine trinity of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit: or, The blessed doctrine of the three coessentiall subsistents in the eternall Godhead*. London: printed by T[homas]. R[adcliffe]. and E[dward]. M[ottershed]. for Samuel Gellibrand at the Ball in Pauls Church-yard, 1650. [R34820]
- Clark, Samuel. *Scripture-justification, or, A discourse of justification, according to the evidence of Scripture-light wherein the nature of justification is fully open'd, the great point of justification by works, both of the law and gospel, is clearly stated ...: together with a thesis concerning the interest of Christ's active obedience in our justification*. London: printed by S. Bridge, for Tho. Parkhurst, 1698. [R14403]
- A collection of the state papers of John Thurloe, Esq secretary, first, to the Council of State, and afterwards to the two Protectors, Oliver and Richard Cromwell*. 7 vols. London: printed for the executor of the late Mr. Fletcher Gyles; Thomas Woodward; and Charles Davis, 1742.
- Collier, Thomas. *A brief ansvver to some of the objections and demurs made against the coming in and inhabiting of the Jevvs in this Common-vvealth. With a plea*

on their behalf, or some arguments to prove it not only lawful, but the duty of those whom it concerns to give them their liberty and protection (they living peaceably) in this nation. London: printed by Henry Hills, and are to be sold by Thomas Brewster, at the three Bibles at the West end of Pauls, 1656. [R207629]

_____. *A Confession of the faith of several churches of Christ, in the county of Somerset, and of some churches in the counties neer adjacent.* London: printed by Henry Hills, and are to be sold by Thomas Brewster, at the three Bibles at the west end of Pauls, 1656. [R207324]

_____. *A discourse of the true gospel blessedness in the New Covenant, or, The distinction of the two Covenants, new and old, first and second with the doing away of the first, and the establishment of the second, and likewise the mediatorship of Christ in the New Covenant, with some principles, duties, promises, and priviledges of the New Covenant: a useful companion for all saints at all times.* London: printed by H. Hills for the author, and are to be sold by Giles Calvert ... and Tho. Brewster, 1659. [R35633]

_____. *The body of divinity, or, A confession of faith being the substance of Christianity, containing the most material things relating to matters both of faith and practice: published for the benefit and profit of all, especially those who love the Lord Jesus.* London: printed for Nath. Crouch, 1674. [R23929]

Collier, Thomas, and Robert Towne. *The marrow of Christianity: or, A spirituall discoverie of some principles of truth, meet to be known of all the saints; represented in ten sections.* London: printed for Giles Calvert at the Black spread Eagle, neer the West end of Pauls, 1647. [R233481]

Collins, Hercules. *An orthodox catechism being the sum of Christian religion contained in the Law and Gospel.* London: s.n., 1680. [R23498]

_____. *Mountains of brass, or, A discourse upon the decrees of God begun at a lecture in Devon-Shire-Square, Oct. 29, 1689, and finish'd in a congregation at Wapping, Nov. 5 following.* London: printed for John Harris, 1690. [R32497]

_____. *Animadversions upon the responses of the Athenian mercury, to the questions about infant-baptism.* London: s.n., 1692. [R171442]

_____. *The antidote proved a counterfeit, or, Error detected and believers baptism vindicated containing an answer to a nameless author's book entituled An antidote to prevent the prevalency of anabaptism.* London: printed for William Marshall, 1693. [R26646]

The confession of faith, and the larger and shorter catechisme, first agreed upon by the assembly of divines at westminster. And now appointed by the generall assembly of the kirk of scotland, to be a part of uniformity in religion between the kirks of christ in the three kingdomes. Edinburgh: printed by Gedeon Lithgovv, printer to the Universitie of Edinburgh, 1649. [R174130]

A confession of faith of seven congregations or churches of Christ in London, which are commonly (but uniuſtly) called Anabaptiſts. London: printed by Math. Simmons, and are to be ſold by John Hancock in Popes-head Alley, 1646. [R200559]

The confession of faith, of thoſe churches which are commonly (though falſly) called Anabaptiſts. London: s.n., 1644. [R5039]

A confession of faith put forth by the elders and brethren of many congregations of chriſtians (baptized upon profeſſion of their faith) in London and the country. London: printed for Benjamin Harris and are to be ſold at his ſhop, 1677. [R35609]

Cooper, Chriſtopher. *The vail turn'd aſide: or, heresy unmask'd. Being a reply to a book, entituled, The moderate trinitarian.* London: printed for the author, and ſold by J. Marſhal, 1701. [T103635]

Cosin, John. *The Works of the Right Reverend Father in God John Cosin now firſt collected.* 5 vols. Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1843.

Cotton, John. *A brief expoſition of the whole book of Canticles, or Song of Solomon lively deſcribing the eſtate of the church in all the ages thereof, both Jewish and Chriſtian, to this day.* London: printed for Philip Nevil ... 1642. [R20552]

_____. *An expoſition upon the thirteenth chapter of the Revelation.* London: printed by M.S. for Livewel Chapman at the Crown in Popes head Alley, 1655. [R207258]

Cotton, John and William Aſpinwall. *An abstract of laws and government wherein as in a mirrour may be ſeen the wiſdome & perfection of the government of Chriſts kingdome accomodable to any ſtate or form of government in the world that is not antichriſtian or tyrannicall.* London: printed by M.S. for Livewel Chapman, 1655. [R23786]

Cotton, John and John Humfrey. *The powring out of the ſeven vials, or, An expoſition of the ſixteenth chapter of the Revelation with an application of it to our times.* London: printed for R.S., 1645. [R27279]

Cox, Benjamin. *An appendix, to a confession of faith, or A more full declaration of the faith and judgement of baptized beleevvers. Occaſioned by the inquiry of ſome wel-affected and godly perſons in the country.* London: s.n., 1646. [R201235]

Coxe, Nehemiah. *Vindiciae veritatis, or A confutation of the heresies and groſs errorrs aſſerted by tHomas [sic] Collier in his Additional word to his Body of divinity.* London: printed for Nath. Ponder, at the Peacock in the Poultry near Corn-hill, and in Chancery-lane near Fleet-ſtreet, 1677. [R37684]

_____. *A discourse of the covenants that God made with men before the law wherein the covenant of circumcision is more largely handled, and the invalidity of the plea for p̄dobaptism taken from thence discovered.* London: printed by J.D. and are to be sold by Nathaniel Ponder ... and Benjamin Alsop ... 1681. [R7196]

Crisp, Tobias. *Christ alone exalted being the compleat works of Tobias Crisp, D.D., containing XLII sermons ... which were formerly printed in three small volumes ... to which is now added ten sermons, whereof eight were never before printed faithfully transcribed from his own notes, which is all that will ever be printed of the said Doctor's.* London: printed for William Marshal, 1690. [R29658]

D.H. *An antidote against antinomianisme. The first dosis. The unjustifiableness of justification before faith. Prescribed and administred in a soft answer: I. To seven arguments. II. To the solutions of five objections. III. To the novell distinction of Gods reconciliation to man, without mans reconciliation to God. Penned plainly, for the undeceiving of the plain-hearted Christian; and mildely, for the regaining of our mistaken brother H.D.* London: printed for G.B. and R.W., 1643. [R11942]

Danvers, Henry. *Theopolis, or the city of God new Jerusalem, in opposition to the city of the nations great Babylon; comprehending the blessing and benefit of Christs Kingdom, in the thousand years reign before his personal coming and appearing, after the total ruine of the beast, and his kingdom. In a coment upon the 10th. and 21st. chapters of the revelations. With an additional answer to these two material questions: 1. Whether the thousand years reign is not already past, as Brightman, and others affirm. 2. Whether the natural Jew is not most concerned in the latter day promises prophecies, especially in the pulling down Babylon, and building of Zion, as Maton, and others assert.* London: printed by T. Ratcliff and Nat. Thompson for Nathanie l [sic] Ponder at the Peacock in Chancery-Lane, 1672. [R229614]

_____. *A treatise of laying on of hands with the history thereof, both from the scripture and antiquity: wherein an account is given how it hath been practised in all ages since Christ, the mistakes about it rectified and the sence of Heb. 6.2. cleared.* London: printed for Fran. Smith, 1674. [R8336]

Davye, Thomas. *The baptism of adult believers only, asserted and vindicated; and that of infants disproved. In which is shewn, that the people called Anabaptists are of an apostolick original.* London: printed by John Darby, 1719. [T103548]

A declaration against the antinomians, and their doctrine of liberty. Their chief tenents [sic] briefly and fully answered; and the danger of those erroneoes [sic] points manifested: With a caution to such as are or have been so misled, to persvade with them to turn from that evill into which they are or have been seduced. These being their conclusions, understood by most auditors. I. That god doth never inflict punishment upon the elect for their sins. Ii. That god is never angry with his children. Iii. That god sees no sin in those that are his. Iv.

That such as are elected, are at all times beloved of god; in what condition soever they be, be they never so great sinners, yea, in the very act of sinne it selfe. V. That sanctification of life in duties of piety, is nothing at all esteemed of god. Vi. That the godly finde no difficulties in the way to heaven, but live in much pleasure and delight in this world. Vii. That those who belong to god, are able in this world presently to distinguish betwixt gods people and the wicked. London: printed for Iohn Iones, 1644. [R13070]

A declaration by congregationall societies in, and about the city of London; as well of those commonly called Anabaptists, as others. In way of vindication of themselves. Touching 1. Liberty, 2. Magistracy, 3. Propriety, 4. Polygamie. Wherein their judgments, concerning the particulars mentioned are tendred to consideration, to prevent mis-understanding. [London]: printed by M. Simmons for Henry Overton in Popes-head Alley, 1647. [R204489]

A declaration of the faith and order owned and practised in the Congregational Churches in England agreed upon and consented unto by their elders and messengers in their meeting at the Savoy, October 12, 1658. London: printed by J.P., 1659. [R17076]

A declaration of several of the Churches of Christ, and godly people in and about the citie of London; concerning the kingly interest of Christ, and the present sufferings of his cause and saints in England. London: printed for Livewel Chapman, at the Crown in Popes-head-Alley, 1654. [R207568]

De Laune, Thomas. *A plea for the non-conformists, giving the true state of the dissenters case. And how far the conformists separation from the church of Rome, for their popish superstitions and traditions introduced into the service of God, justifies the non-conformists separation from them for the same: In a letter to Dr. Benjamin Calamy, upon his sermon, called Scrupulous conscience, inviting hereto.* London: printed for the author, 1684. [R12757]

Denne, Henry. *The man of sin discovered whom the Lord shall destroy with the brightnesse of his coming: the root and foundation of antichrist laid open in doctrine.* London: printed for John Sweeting, 1646. [R12601]

Dent, Arthur. *The ruine of Rome: or, An exposition vpon the whole Reuelation Wherein is plainely shewed and proued, that the popish religion, together with all the power and authority of Rome, shall ebbe and decay still more and more throughout all the churches of Europe, and come to an vtter ouerthrow euen in this life, before the end of the world. Written especially for the comfort of Protestants, and the daunting of papists, seminary priests, Iesuites, and all that cursed rabble.* London: printed by Nicholas Okes, for Simon Waterson, 1631. [S115706]

A description of a remarkable vision seen by Thomas Webster, ... on the 7th of August, 1794, ... in Bermondsey Church-Yard, accompanied with an exact representation. ... With the prophecy of Humphrey Tindal. London: Reprinted for G. Riebau; no.439 Strand, 1798. [T111485]

- Dod, John and Robert Cleaver. *A plaine and familiar exposition of the Ten commandements with a methodicall short catechisme, containing briefly all the principall grounds of Christian religion.* London: printed by T. C[reede] for Thomas Man, dwelling in Pater-noster Rowe, at the signe of the Talbot, 1604. [S114953]
- Dunton, John. *The life and errors of John Dunton late citizen of London; written by himself in solitude. With an idea of a new life; wherein is shewn how he'd think, speak, and act, might he live over his days again.* London: printed for S. Malthus, 1705. [T75140]
- Du Moulin, Pierre. *The accomplishment of the prophecies; or The third booke in defence of the Catholicke faith contained in the booke of the high & mighty King James. I. by the grace of God King of Great Brittain and Ireland. Against the allegations of R. Bellarmine; and F.N. Coëffeteau & other doctors of the Romish church.* Translated by John Heath. Oxford: By Ioseph Barnes and are to be sold by Iohn Barnes dwelling neere Holborne Conduit, 1613. [S110979]
- Durham, James. *A commentarie upon the book of the Revelation Wherein the text is explained, the series of the several prophecies contained in that book, deduced according to their order and dependance on each other; the periods and succession of times, at, or about which, these prophecies, that are already fulfilled, began to be, and were more fully accomplished, fixed and applied according to history; and those that are yet to be fulfilled, modestly, and so far as is warrantable, enquired into. Together with some practical observations, and several digressions, necessary for vindicating, clearing, and confirming many weighty and important truths. Delivered in several lectures, by that learned, laborious, and faithfull servant of Jesus Christ, James Durham, late Minister of the Gospel in Glasgow. To which is affixed a brief summary of the whole book, with a twofold index, one of the several digressions, another of the chief and principall purposes and words contained in this treatise.* Edinburgh: printed by Christopher Higgins in Harts Close over against the Trone-Church, 1658. [R216058]
- Eaton, John. *The honey-combe of free justification by Christ alone collected out of the meere authorities of Scripture and common and unanimous consent of the faithfull interpreters and dispensers of Gods mysteries upon the same, especially as they expresse the excellency of free justification.* London: printed by R.B. at the charge of Robert Lancaster, 1642. [R311]
- Edwards, Morgan. *Materials towards a history of the american baptists.* 2 vols. Philadelphia: printed by Joseph Crukshank and Isaac Collins, 1770. [W26047/W26092]
- Edwards, Thomas. *The first and second part of Gangrūna, or, A catalogue and discovery of many of the errors, heresies, blasphemies and pernicious practices of the sectaries of this time, vented and acted in England in these four last yeers also a particular narration of divers stories, remarkable passages, letters: an extract of many letters, all concerning the present sects:*

together with some observations upon and corollaries from all the fore-named premisses. 3rd edn. London: printed by T.R. and E.M. for Ralph Smith, 1646. [R9322]

_____. *The third part of Gangrūna Or, A new and higher discovery of the errors, heresies, blasphemies, and insolent proceedings of the sectaries of these times: with some animadversions by way of confutation upon many of the errors and heresies named.* London: printed for Ralph Smith at the Bible in Cornehill, 1646. [R201273]

Edwards, Thomas [Baptist]. *The paraselene dismantled of her cloud, or, Baxterianism barefac'd drawn from a literal transcript of Mr. Baxter's, and the judgment of others, in the most radical doctrines of faith, compar'd with those of the Orthodox, both conformist and nonconformist, and transferr'd over by way of test, unto the Papist and Quaker.* London: printed, and sold by Will. Marshal ... and John Marshal, 1699. [R9338]

Ellis, Thomas. *The traytors unvail'd or a brief account of that horrid and bloody designe intended by those rebellious people, known by the names of Anabaptists and Fifth Monarchy being upon Sunday the 14th. of April 1661. in Newgate on purpose to oppose his Majesties person and laws.* London: s.n., 1661. [R208541]

The English Spira being a fearful example of an apostate who had been a preacher many years and then apostatized from his religion, miserably hanged himself, October the 13th, 1684: giving an account of his dispair, and divers conferences had with him, by several ministers and others of his friends: together with his answer, and papers written by his own hand. Second edn. London: T. Fabian, 1693. [R37321]

Erasmus, Desiderius. *A playne and godly expositon or declaration of the commune crede (which in the latin tonge is called symbolum apostolorum) and of the x. Commaundementes of goddes law.* Translated by William Marshall. London: in Fletestrete: by me Robert Redman dwellynge at the sygne of ye George next to Saynt Dunstones church for William Marshall, 1534. [S101698]

Erbery, William. *The sword doubled to cut off both the righteous and the wicked; drawn forth in two following discourses.* London: printed by G.D. for Giles Calvert, and are to be sold at the sign of the Black Spread-Eagle at the West End of Pauls, 1653. [R206871]

An essay toward settlement upon a sure foundation being a testimony for God in this perillous time by a few, who have been bewailing their own, and other abominations, and would not be comforted, until their Redeemer, who is holy, be exalted in righteousness, and his name which hath been so much blasphemed, be sanctified in the sight of the nations. [London]: printed for Giles Calvert at the black Spread-Eagle, at the west-end of Pauls, 1659. [R211272]

Estwick, Nicolas. *Pneumatologia: or, A treatise of the Holy Ghost, in which, the God-head of the third person of the Trinitie is strongly asserted by Scripture-arguments, and defended against the sophisticall subtleties [Twelve arguments] of John Bidle*. London: printed by William Du-gard, for Ralph Smith, and are to bee sold at the sign of the Bible in Corn-hill, neer the Royal-Exchange, 1648. [R201957]

An exact narrative of the tryal and condemnation of John Twyn for printing and dispersing of a treasonable book with the tryals of Thomas Brewster, bookseller, Simon Dover, printer, Nathan Brooks, bookbinder, for printing, publishing, and uttering of seditious, scandalous, and malicious pamphlets: at Justice-Hall in the Old-Bayly, London, the 20th, and 22th of February, 1663/4. London: printed by Thomas Mabb for Henry Brome ... 1664. [R15143]

Exell, Joshua. *Plain and exquisite Scripture-proof, that St. John Baptist and the blessed Apostles, and all the primitive baptizers, did baptize by sprinkling, or pouring water upon the person or persons they baptized, and not by dipping the person into water ... also some observations upon Mr. Keach's reflections upon my late treatise, intituled, Plain and express Scripture proofs, that John Baptist did as certainly baptize infants in the church of the Jews as the adult, with the confirmation of the truth reflected against by him*. London: printed for the author, and are to be sold by Thomas Parkhurst ... and by William Langford ... 1693. [R15010]

_____. *A serious enquiry into, and certain producing of plain and express Scripture proofs that John Baptist did as certainly baptize infants when he administered baptism to the church of the Jews as the adult with an answer to several objections, but especially of these two, their coming to him and confessing their sins when they came, and Scripture proofs that John's administrations were for a farther accomplishing to that people, the covenant made with Abraham: and likewise that children, infants, issue, seed and offspring are synonymous terms in the Holy Scripture: and the Scripture: and the confirmation of the truth with various arguments grounded upon express tests of Scripture*. London: printed for R. Man, 1693. [R25389]

_____. *The way of saving union with Christ, as discovered in the Holy Scriptures, in above thirty distinct cases*. London: printed for the author and sold by T. Parkhurst, 1702. [N25251]

The faith and practise of thirty congregations gathered according to the primitive pattern in Rutland, Warwickshire, Northamptonshire, Lincolnshire, Leicestershire, Huntingdonshire, Oxfordshire, and Bedfordshire. London: printed, and are to be sold in Pauls Church-Yard, 1651. [R176929]

Feake, Christopher. *The new non-conformist; who having obtained help of God, doth persist unto this very day; witnessing, both to small and great, some of those glorious things which the Apostles, the prophets, & Moses, did say should come to pass. Or, the voice of a careful shepherd, crying from his watch-tower*

at W.C. unto his little flock at W.L. with a loud voice. London: printed ... for Livewel Chapman, at the Crown in Popes-head-Alley, 1654. [R202090]

Fench, Sir Henry. *The sacred doctrine of diuinitie, gathered out of the word of god, and comprehended in two volumes whereof this first volume, containeth a description of all that holy doctrine according to the rules of art: With a treatise concerning the olde testament, or the promise. The second is to containe a larger explication of the former doctrines: With a discoverie of the most principall heresies and errors contrary thereunto.* London: Felix Kyngston, 1613. [S118341]

Fenner, Dudley. *The artes of logike and rethorike, plainlie set foorth in the English tongue, together with examples for the practise of the same.* [Middelburg]. R. Schilders, 1584. [S92520]

_____. *Sacra theologia, sive, Veritas quae est secundum pietatem ad vnicae & versae methodi leges descripta & in decem libros.* S.I.: T. Dawson, 1585. [S2666]

Fielde, John and Rudolf Gwalther. *An Admonition to the Parliament.* [Hemel Hempstead?: printed by J. Stroud?], 1572. [S112557]

The fifth monarchy, or Kingdom of Christ, in opposition to the beasts, asserted by the Solemn League and Covenant, several learned divines, the late General and Army, (viz.) in their declaration at Muslebrough, August 1650. wherein the old cause is stated, appeals made, the Scottish blood spilt, and the banners yet in Westminster-Hall witnessing the great decision then given on Christs side. Also, by a letter from the officers of the Army in England, to their brethren in Ireland, the 11 of May, 1653. justifying on Christs accompt, the dissolution of the Parliament; and consonant thereunto, the Generals speech to those that succeeded in the government, the fourth of July following. London: printed for Livewel Chapman, 1659. [R207791]

Fox, George. *A word from the Lord, to all the world, and all professors in the vworld; spoken in parables: wherein all may come to read themselves through the parables, and see where they are; also a word to all professors, who cast the pure law of God behind their backs, and turn the grace of God into wantonness, and despite the day of their visitation; with a dreadful voice to all the children of darkness, who hate and deny the light; that all may come to see themselves, and repent, before the fierce wrath of the Lord, which is kindled in England, sweep you all away: by them who are redeemed out of the curse, to serve the living, called Quakers.* London: printed for Giles Calvert, at the Black spread-Eagle, at the west end of Pauls, 1654. [R207560]

_____. *The second covenant, which doth manifestly make known at the end of the first covenant & priesthood, which could not continue by reason of death, or, The new covenant of light, life, and peace wherein the Lord in righteousnesse establisheth the hearts of his people, where they are taught of the Lord: also herein is declared the difference between Christs way, and Judas way.* London: printed for Thomas Simmons, 1657. [R39544]

_____. *A distinction between the new covenant and the old and how that in the old covenant the Jews priests lips were to preserve the Jews peoples knowledge: but in the new and everlasting covenant Christ the high-priest, is the treasure of wisdom and knowledge, and he filleth the earth with the knowledge of the Lord God; and the earth being full of the knowledge of the Lord God, then there is no want of it in the eath. And Christ the high-priest, he doth not only fill the earth with knowledge of the Lord God, but covereth the earth with the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters do the sea; so the earth shall not be seen. So then it may be seen, that the substance in the new covenant is far beyond the figure in the old covenant. Read, hear, see, perceive and understand, receive and possess.* London: s.n., 1679. [R220232]

French Minister. *A new systeme of the apocalypse, or, plain and methodical illustrations of all the visions in the revelation of St. Iohn written by a french minister in the year 1685. And finisht but two days before the dragoons plunderd him of all, except this treatise; to which is added, this author's defence of his illustrations, concerning the non-effusion of the vials, in answer to Mr. Jurieu; faithfully englished.* London, 1688. [R40048]

Garner, Robert. *Mysteris unvaild wherein the doctrine of redemption by Jesus Christ, flowing from the glorious grace and everlasting love of God, the very fountain of life and salvation unto lost sinners, is handled: the most usuall Scriptures explained and reasons answered, which are urged for the universality of the death of Christ for all persons: vvherein the unsoundness of this opinion, together with divers other conclusions as depending upon it, are discovered and the truth unvaild.* [London]: printed for G. Calvert, at the Black Spread Eagle, at the west end of Pauls, 1646. [R33311]

Garrett, Walter. *A discourse concerning Antichrist grounded upon the angel's interpreteration of the vision, Rev. xvii 3 and from thence proceeding to a particular explication of the xiith and xiiith chapters. Shewing, that the Church of Rome is that woman mentioned Rev. xvii. 3. and the bishops of Rome that eighth King spoken of v. 11. who is usually known by the name of Antichrist.* London: printed for the author to be sold by I. Harrison at the Greyhound in Chancery Lane and at his shop in Lincolns-Inn Gate, 1680. [R223642]

Gaunt, Elizabeth. *Mrs Elizabeth Gaunt's last speech who was burnt at London, Oct. 23. 1685. as it was written by her own hand, & delivered to Capt. Richardson keeper of Newgate.* London: s.n., 1685. [R223668]

Gell, Robert. *Stella nova, a nevv starre, leading wisemen unto Christ. Or, A sermon preached before the learned Society of Astrologers, August 1. 1649.* London: printed for Samuel Satterthwaite; and are to be sold at his shop at the signe of the Sun on Garlick-Hill, 1649. [R204208]

_____. *Noah's flood returning: or, a sermon preached August the 7th. 1655. before the right honourable Christopher Pack, Lord Major of the honourable citie of London, and the right worshipfull, the company of Drapers.* London:

printed by J.L. and are to be sold by Giles Calvert ay the Black-spread Eagle, at the West end of Pauls, 1655. [R207451]

Gilbert, Thomas. *A learned and accurate discourse concerning the guilt of sin, pardon of that guilt, and prayer for that pardon written many years ago by the Reverend Mr. Thomas Gilbert; now published from his own manuscript left by him some years before his death with a friend in London.* London: printed for Nath. Hiller, 1695. [R23948]

Gildon, Charles. *The history of the Athenian Society: for the resolving of all nice and curious questions.* London: printed for James Dowley, 1692. [R35698]

Gill, John. *The divine right of infant baptism, examined and disproved; being an answer to a pamphlet, entitled, a brief illustration and confirmation of the divine right of infant baptism.* London: printed for and sold by J. Ward; J. Robinson; and G. Keith, 1749. [T67557]

_____. *Baptism a divine commandment to be observed. Being a sermon preached at Barbican, octob. 9, 1765. At the baptism of the reverend Mr. Robert Carmichael.* London: printed and sold by G. Keith; J. Robinson; and W. Lepard, 1765. [T14011]

Gillette, A. D., ed. *Minutes of the Philadelphia Baptist Association, from A.D. 1707, to A.D. 1807: Being the First One Hundred Years of Its Existence.* Atlas, Michigan: Baptist Book Trust, 1976.

Goodwin, Thomas. *Zervbbabels encovragement to finish the temple a sermon preached before the honourable House of Commons at their late solemne fast, Apr. 27, 1642.* London: printed for R. Dawlman, 1642. [R1423]

_____. *The great interest of states & kingdomes A sermon preached before the Honorable House of Commons, at their late solemne fast, Feb. 25. 1645.* London: printed for R. Dawlman, 1646. [R200620]

_____. *A sermon of the fifth monarchy Proving by invincible arguments, that the saints shall have a kingdom here on earth, which is yet to come, after the fourth monarchy is destroy'd by the sword of the saints, the followers of the lamb.* London: for Livewel Chapman at the Crown in Popes-head-Alley, 1654. [R207633]

_____. *The vworld to come. Or, The kingdome of Christ asserted In two expository lectures of Ephes. 1. 21, 22. verses. Prooving that between the state of this world as now it is, and the state of things after the day of judgement, when God shall be all in all: there is a world to come which is of purpose, and is a more especiall manner appointed for Jesus Christ to be king, and wherein he shall more eminently reign.* London: printed and are to be sold in Popes-head-Alley and in Westminster Hall, 1655. [R207443]

- _____. *The works of Thomas Goodwin, D.D., sometime president of Magdalene Colledge in Oxford. 5 vols. London: printed by J.D. and S.R. for T.G. and are to be sold by Jonathan Robinson, 1681-1704. [T97628]*
- Goodwin, Thomas, Jeremiah Burroughs, Jose Glover, William Kiffin, and Hanserd Knollys. *A glimpse of Sions glory, or, The churches beautie specified published for the good and benefit of all those whose hearts are raised up in the expectation of the glorious liberties of the saints. London: printed for William Larnar, 1641. [R8454]*
- Gosnold, John. *Of laying on of hands Heb. 6. 2. Or, a discourse containing these 4. chapters. 1. Of the several ends of laying on of hands, in the New Testament. 2. What laying on of hands, is not, and cannot be meant. Heb. 6. 2. 3. What laying on of hands, is and must be meant there. 4. That the laying on of hands, practised by some in these days, on all baptized believers, was never instituted, commanded, nor practised at all, by Jesus Christ, or his apostles in all the New Testament. London: printed by John Streater, 1656. [R223702]*
- Graile, John and Humphrey Chambers. *A modest vindication of the doctrine of conditions in the Covenant of Grace, and the defenders thereof, from the aspersions of arminianism & popery, which Mr. W. E. cast on them. By the late faithful and godly minister Mr. John Graile, minister of the gospel at Tidworth in the county of Wilts. Published with a preface concerning the nature of the Covenant of Grace, wherein is a discovery of the judgment of Dr. Twisse in the point of justification, clearing him from antinomianism therein. By Constant Jessop, minister of the Gospel at Wimborn minister in the county of Dorset. Whereunto is added, a sermon, preached at the funeral of the said Mr. John Grail. By Humphrey Chambers, D.D. and pastor of the church at Pewsie. London: printed for Mat. Keinton at the Fountain in Pauls Church-yard, 1654. [R207370]*
- Grantham, Thomas. *Christianismus primitivus, or, The ancient Christian religion, in its nature, certainty, excellency, and beauty, (internal and external) particularly considered, asserted, and vindicated from the many abuses which have invaded that sacred profession, by humane innovation, or pretended revelation comprehending likewise the general duties of mankind, in their respective relations: and particularly the obedience of all Christians to magistrates, and the necessity of Christian-moderation about things dispensible in matters of religion: with divers cases of conscience discussed and resolved. London: printed for Francis Smith, 1678. [R9474]*
- _____. *A friendly epistle to the bishops and ministers of the Church of England for plain truth and sound peace between the pious Protestants of the Church of England and those of the baptised believers written with the advice of divers pastors and brethren of the baptised congregations. London: s.n., 1680. [R10561]*
- _____. *St. Paul's catechism, or, A brief and plain explication of the six principles of the Christian religion as recorded Heb. 6. 1, 2 with some considerations of the principles of natural and universal religion, containing*

also the duties of children to their superiors written chiefly for the instruction of young christians, children and servants in all christian families. London: printed by J. Darby, 1693. [R225413]

Green, Mary Anne Everett. *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the Reign of Charles II.* 28 vols. Nendeln, Liechtenstein: Kraus Reprint, 1968.

Griffith, John. *The case of Mr. John Griffith, Minister of the Gospel and now prisoner in Newgate being a true and impartial account of what he spake at the Sessions-house in the Old Bailey on the 18th of this instant April, 1683 before the Lord-Chief-Justice Saunders and three judges more, the Lord Mayor, recorder, and several aldermen of the city of London.* London: printed by George Larkin for the Author, 1683. [R26762]

Grotius, Hugo. *Defensio fidei Catholicae de satisfactione Christi adversus Faustum Socinum senensem.* Lugduni Batavorum: Excudit Ioannes Patius ... 1617.

Grove, Ralph. *Every Christian's capacity of being saved, asserted from Scripture, in opposition to a book, intituled, A discourse proving God the only author of the promise of conversion, by J. Exell.* Bristol: printed and sold by W. Bonny, R. Warne in Chippenham, George Harvest in Thornbury, and Caleb Exell in Wotton-Underedge [sic], 1711. [T103341]

Hall, Edmund. *Manus testium movens: or, A Presbyteriall glosse upon many of those obscure prophetick texts in Canticles, Isay, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, Habakkuk, Zachary, Matthew, Romans, and the Revelations: which point at the great day of the witnesses rising; Antichrists ruine, and the Jews conversion, neare about this time. VVherein Dr. Homes, with the rest of the independent antichristian time-servers are clearly confuted, and out of their own writings condemned: and against them proved, that the present usurpers in England are that antichristian party who have slain the witnesses, and shall reign but three yeers and an half, which time is almost at an end. To this book must be joyned *Lingua testium*, being its proper preface.* London: s.n., 1651. [R206463]

Hall, Joseph. *The Revelation unrevealed concerning the thousand-yeares reigne of the saints with Christ upon earth. Laying forth the weak grounds, and strange consequences of that plausible, and too-much received opinion. By an unfained lover of truth, peace, order, and just moderation.* London: printed by R.L. for John Bisse and are to be sold at the Bell in S. Pauls Church-yard, 1650. [R202342]

Hall, Thomas. *Chiliasto-mastix redivivus, sive Homesus enervatus A confutation of the millenarian sic opinion, plainly demonstrating that Christ will not reign visibly and personally on earth with the saints for a thousand yeers either before the day of judgement, in the day of judgement, or after it: where you also have many texts of scripture vindicated from the vain glosses of one Dr. Homes, a great Millenarian, and all of his cavils (of any consequence) refelled and answered. With a word to our Fifth Monarch-Men, whose dangerous practises of late, clearly shew that this opinion leads to schisme, and sedition in church and state.* London: printed for John Starkey at the Miter at the west end of Pauls, 1657. [R208344]

_____. *A practical and polemical commentary, or, exposition upon the third and fourth chapters of the latter epistle of Saint Paul to Timothy wherein the text is explained, some controversies discussed, sundry cases of conscience are cleared, many common places are succinctly handled, and divers usefull and seasonable observations raised.* London: printed by E. Tyler for John Starkey, 1658. [R14473]

Hammond, Charles. *The worlds timely warning-peece newly corrected and amended. This being the third time presented or sent to these three nations, England, Scotland, and Ireland; describing the nearnesse of the day of the Lord, by the signes and tokens that our Saviour told his disciples should come to passe, before the last day. Being a dismall looking-glasse for the false prophets of these times to look into, which invent false imaginations, out of their own proud phantasticall brains, to deceive the simple.* London: printed for Fr. Grove at his shop on Snow-hill near the Sarazen's head, 1660. [R226173]

Hammond, Henry. *A Practicall Catechisme.* Oxford: s.n., 1645. [R19257]

_____. *A paraphrase, and annotations upon all the books of the New Testament briefly explaining all the difficult places thereof.* The third edition corrected and enlarged. London: printed by J.F. and E.T. for Richard Davis bookseller in Oxford, 1671. [R217445]

_____. *The daily practice of devotion, or, The hours of prayer fitted to the main uses of a Christian life also lamentations and prayers for the peaceful re-settlement of this church and state.* London: printed for R. Royston ... 1684. [R15616]

Harris, Benjamin. *The protestant tutor instructing children to spel and read english, and ground them in the true protestant religio., and discovering the errors and deceits ...* London: printed for Ben. Harris, 1679. [R31135]

Harrison, Thomas. *A declaration of Maj. Gen. Harrison prisoner in the Tower of London with his rules and precepts, to all publike churches, and private congregations: and an answer thereunto; also, the resolution of the Fifth-Monarchy-Men, Anabaptists, Quakers, and others.* London: printed for Nathaniel Tomkins, 1660. [R209273]

Hartlib, Samuel. *Clavis apocalyptica, or, The revelation revealed in which the great mysteries in the Revelation of St. John and the prophet Daniel are opened: it beeing made apparent that the propheticall numbers com to an end with the year of our Lord 1655.* London: printed by W. D. for Tho. Matthewes, 1651. [R30754]

Harvey, William. *Anatomical exercitations, concerning the generation of living creatures to which are added particular discourses, of births, and of conceptions, &c.* London: printed by James Young for Octavian Pulleyn and are to be sold at his shop at the sign of the Rose in St. Pauls Church-yard, 1653. [R13027]

Hayter, Richard and Joseph Mede. *The meaning of the Revelation, or, A paraphrase with questions on the Revelation of the Holy Apostle and Evangelist John the Divine in which the synchronisms of Mr. Joseph Mede, and the expositions of other interpreters are called in question, and a new exposition given of the prophecies of the revelation, never heard of before, nor extant in any author whatsoever, from the sixth chapter to the eighteenth, with variety of reasons for the exposition.* London: printed by J.R. for John Williams ... 1675. [R21644]

The Heidelbergh catechism of the reformed Christian religion: With priviledge for the benefit of the poor. Amsterdam: printed by Henry Gartman bookseller, 1772. [T112213]

Helwys, Thomas. *A short confession of faith.* 1610.

_____. *A short and plaine prooffe by the word, and workes off god, that gods decree is not the cause off anye mans sinne or condemnation and that all men are redeamed by christ. As also. That no infants are condemned.* Amsterdam?: s.n., 1611. [S118308]

_____. *Persecution for religion judg'd and condemned in a discourse between an antichristian and a christian: Proving by the law of god and of the land, and by king james his many testimonies, that no man ought to be persecuted for his religion, so he testifie his allegiance by the oath appointed by law.* London: printed in the years 1615 and 1620 and now reprinted for the establishing some and convincing others, 1662. [R30775]

Hicks, Thomas and William Kiffin. *The Quakers appeal answer'd, or, A full relation of the occasion, progress, and issue of a meeting held in Barbican the 28th of August last past wherein the allegations of William Pen in two books lately published by him against Thomas Hicks, were answered and disproved, and Tho. Hicks, his quotations out of the Quakers own books attested by several as being appeal'd unto.* London: printed for Peter Parker, 1674. [R2772]

Hill, John. *The grand apostacy of the church of Rome, from her primitive purity and integrity with a vindication of the Church of England, in her separation from her, and the hazard of salvation in communion with her: discoursed in a*

sermon preached at St. Mary le Bow, London on Sunday the 28th of December, 1679. London: printed for Samuel Heyrick ... 1680. [R12819]

Hobbes, Thomas. *Leviathan, or, The matter, forme, & power of a common-wealth ecclesiasticall and civill.* London: printed for Andrew Ckooke [sic], 1651. [R13936]

Hobson, Paul. *Fourteen queries and ten absurdities about the extent of Christ's death, the power of the creatures, the justice of God in condemning some, and saving others, presented by a free-willer to the Church of Christ at Newcastle, and answered by Paul Hobson a member of the said Church. In which answer is discovered, the extent of Christs death, the nature and truth of election, the condition of the creature both before and after conversion, &c. Published in tenderness of love for the good of all, especially for the Churches of Christ.* London: printed by Henry Hills for William Hutchison book-seller in Durham, 1655. [R208520]

Homes, Nathanael. *The Works of Dr. Nathanael Homes.* London: printed for the author, 1652. [R5491]

_____. *Apokalypsis anastaseos The resurrection revealed, or, The dawnsings of the day-star about to rise and radiate a visible incomparable glory far beyond any since the creation upon the universal church on earth for a thousand yeers yet to come, before the ultimate day of the general judgement to the raising of the Jewes, and ruine of all antichristian and secular powers, that do not love the members of Christ, submit to his laws and advance his interest in this design : digested into seven bookes with a synopsis of the whole treatise and two tables, 1 of scriptures, 2 of things, opened in this treatise.* London: printed by Robert Ibbitson and are to be sold by Thomas Pierrepont, 1653. [R4529]

Hughes, William. *The man of sin, or, A discourse of Popery wherein the numerous and monstrous abomination, in doctrine and practice, of the Romish church are by their own hands exposed so to open light, that the very blind may see them, and Antchrist in capital letters engraven on them, particularly in the infinite drove of their adored, but lying wonders and miracles/ by no Roman, but a Reformed Catholick.* London: printed by J.D. for Robert Boulter, 1677. [R8589]

Huit, Ephraim. *The whole prophecie of Daniel explained, by a paraphrase, analysis and briefe comment wherein the severall visions shewed to the prophet are clearly interpreted, and the application thereof vindicated against dissenting opinions.* London: printed for Henry Overton, 1643. [R37498]

Humfrey, John. *Animadversions and considerations upon a sheet, printed for Francis Smith containing a confession of the faith of several catapaedobaptists, whose names are thereunto subscribed. As also the absurdities of the doctrine of arminianism, free-will, and general redemption; and that it is a popish doctrine; and their objections briefly answered.* London: printed for W. Marshal, at the Bible in Newgate-street, 1679. [R224279]

- Jackson, Samuel Macauley, ed. *Selected Works of Ulrich Zwingli*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1901.
- Jacob, Joseph. *The covenant to be the Lord's people, and to walk after the Lord signed by the meeting at horsly-down in Southwark*. London: printed for the use of the Church, 1700. [R213896]
- James I, King of England and Patrick Galloway. *Ane fruitfull meditatioun contening ane plane and facill expositioun of ye 7.8.9 and 10 versis of the 20 chap. of the Reuelatioun in forme of ane sermone. Set down be ye maist christiane King and synceir professour, and cheif defender of the treuth, Iames the 6 King of Scottis*. Imprentit at Edinburgh: be Henrie Charteris, 1588.
- James, John. *The speech and declaration of John James, a weaver, in the press-yard, at Newgate, on Sunday last, to the Fifth-Monarchy-Men, and others; concerning his sermon preached at a private meeting in White-Chappel, taking his text out of the Psalms of David, whose words are here inserted. And the manner of his tryal before the Lord Chief Justice Foster, at the Kings-Bench in Westminster Hall; with the sentence pronounced against him to be drawn, hanged, and quartered, for preaching maliciously and traiterously against the life and safety of our sovereign lord the king, and against the peace and government of this realm*. London: printed for George Horton, 1661. [R230337]
- _____. *The true and perfect speech of John James, a Baptist, and fifth-monarchy-man, on Wednesday last at Tyburn, the place of execution with his prayer and confession, in presence of many hundreds of people, and his desire to the sheriff of London; also a declaration, concerning the charge of high-treason exhibited against him, touching his sermon preached in White-Chappel, taking his text out of the eighth Psalm, and the second verse; his doctrines thereupon; and a true narrative of his proceedings, to the last minute of his being executed under the gallows*. London: printed for George Horton, 1661. [R217015]
- Jessey, Henry. *The exceeding riches of grace advanced by the spirit of grace, in an empty nothing creature, viz. Mrs. Sarah wight lately hopeles and restles, her soule dwelling far from peace or hopes thereof: Now hopefull, and joyfull in the lord, that hath caused light to shine out of darknes ...* . London: printed by Matthew Simmons for Henry Overton, and Hannah Allen, and are to be sold at their shops ... 1647. [R16894]
- _____. *A catechisme for babes or little ones suitable to their capacity more than others have been formerly*. London: printed by Henry Hills, 1652. [R28954]
- Jones, James. *Modesty and faithfulness in opposition to envy and rashness; or, An answer to a malicious pamphlet [by J. Child] called, A second argument for a more full union amongst Protestants*. London: s.n., 1683. [R228697]

A judgment & condemnation of the Fifth-Monarchy-men, their late insurrection Also, how far the guilt of that fact may justly be imputed to those that are commonly distinguished by the names of Independants, Presbyterians, Anabaptists and Quakers. Set forth in a letter to a friend. London: s.n., 1661. [R208005]

Jurieu, Pierre. *The accomplishment of the Scripture prophecies, or, The approaching deliverance of the church proving that the papacy is the antichristian kingdom ... that the present persecution may end in three years and-half, after which the destruction of Antichrist shall begin, which shall be finisht in the beginning of the next age, and then the kingdom of Christ shall come upon earth.* 2 vols. London: s.n., 1687. [R6542]

_____. *A continuation of the accomplishment of the Scripture-prophecies, or, A large deduction of historical evidences proving that the papacy is the real antichristian kingdom to which is added A confirmation of the exposition of the sixteenth chapter of the Revelation concerning the pouring out of the vials.* London: s.n., 1688. [R17274]

_____. *Jurieu's accomplishment of the Scripture prophecies abridged; principally those of the revelation of St. John: wherein are contained many things relative to the late French revolution in 1789, &c.* London: printed for G. G. J. and J. Robinson and R. Faulder, 1793. [T123240]

Kaeis prophâeteias or, The key of prophecie whereby the mysteries of all the prophecies from the birth of Christ until this present, and so forward, are unlocked and opened. But especially how the little horn, and the beast of the bottomless pit, the beast with two horns, and son of perdition do mean, the Parliaments of England and Scotland, which kill'd the two witnesses, and a threefold King, is proved by demonstration. And the speedy resurrection of King Charls the II. out of banishment into advancement, is certainly foreshewn. London: s.n., 1660. [R207288]

Keach, Elias. 'Letter to Rev. John Watts, 20 February 1693/4.' in *Materials Towards a History of the American Baptists*, ed. Morgan Edwards, I:109-115. Philadelphia: printed by Joseph Crukshank and Isaac Collins, 1770.

Keith, George. *The Christian Quaker: or, George Keith's eyes opened Good news from Pensilvania. Containing a testimony against that false and absurd opinion which some hold, viz. that all true believers and saints, immediately after the bodily death attain to all the resurrection they expect, and enter into the fullest enjoyment of happiness. And also, that the wicked, immediately after death, are raised up to receive all the punishment they are to expect. Together with a scriptural account of the resurrection of the dead, day of judgment, and Christ's last coming and appearance without us. Also, where, and what those Heavens are into which the man Christ is gone, and entred into.* London: printed in Pensilvania, and reprinted in London for Benjamin Keach, and are to be sold by him at his house near Horse-lie-down; and John Harris at the Harrow in the Poultry, 1693. [R219221]

Kiffin, William. *The humble apology of some commonly called Anabaptists, in behalf of themselves and others of the same judgement with them: with their protestation against the late wicked and most horrid treasonable insurrection and rebellion acted in the city of London. Together with an apology formerly presented to the Kings most Excellent Majesty.* London: printed by Henry Hills, and are to be sold by Francis Smith, at the sign of the Elephant and Castle without Temple-Bar, 1660. [R202527]

_____. *Remarkable Passages in the Life of William Kiffin.* London: printed for Burton and Smith, 1823.

Killcop, Thomas. *The path-way to justification, plainly proving I. What it is to be justified. II. That justification is by the faith of Jesus, and not by the works of the law. III. They only are justified that believe in Christ. IV. What it is to believe into Jesus Christ. V. The difference between the law of faith and the law of works, also the difference between the work of faith, and the works of the law is plainly stated. VI. Many objections answered.* London: s.n., 1660. [R207954]

King, Manasseth. *A new and useful catechism very necessary and teachable both for children and young christians: Wherein is contained by way of question and answer a brief discovery.* Fourth, corrected and amended edn. London: s.n., 1699. [R29076]

Knollys, Hanserd. *Christ exalted: a lost sinner sought, and saved by Christ: Gods people are an holy people. Being the summe of divers sermons preached in Suffolk.* London: printed by Jane Coe, 1646. [R200588]

_____. *An exposition of the first chapter of the Song of Solomon Wherein the text is analysed, the allegories are explained, and the hidden mysteries are unveiled, according to the proportion of faith: With spiritual meditations upon every verse.* London: printed by W. Godbid and are to be sold by Livewel Chapman at the Crown in Popeshead-alley, 1656. [R179507]

_____. *Apocalyptical mysteries, touching the two witnesses, the seven vials, and the two kingdoms, to wit, of Christ, and of Antichrist, expounded. Wherein is contained some things necessary for the saints in this present generation to know.* London: s.n., 1667. [R225382]

_____. *The parable of the Kingdom of heaven expounded, or, An exposition of the first thirteen verses of the twenty fifth chapter of Matthew.* London: printed for Benjamin Harris, 1674. [R28971]

_____. *An exposition of the 11th Chapter of Revelation wherein all those things therein revealed, which must shortly come to pass, are explained.* London: s.n., 1679. [R17050]

_____. *Mystical Babylon Unvailed wherein is proved, I. That Rome-papal is mystical-Babylon, II. That the Pope of Rome is the beast, III. That the Church of Rome is the great whore, IV. That the Roman-priests are the false prophet:*

also *A call to the people of God to come out of Babylon*. London: s.n., 1679. [R17048]

_____. *The vworld that now is; and the vworld that is to come: or The first and second coming of Jesus Christ Wherein several prophecies not yet fulfilled are expounded*. London: printed by Tho. Snowden, 1681. [R217229]

_____. *An exposition of the whole book of the Revelation: Wherein the visions and prophecies of Christ are opened and expounded: shewing the great conquests of our lord Jesus Christ for his church over all his and her adversaries, pagan, arian and papal; and the glorious state of the Church of God in the new heavens and new earth, in these latter days*. London: printed for the author; and are to be sold by William Marshall at the Bible in Newgate-street, 1689. [R29069]

Knollys, Hanserd and William Kiffin. *The life and death of that old disciple of Jesus Christ and eminent minister of the Gospel Mr. Hanserd Knollys who dyed in the ninety third year of his age*. London: printed for John Harris, 1692. [R25128]

Lamb, Thomas. *A treatise of particular predestination vvherein ar[e] answered three letters. 1. Tending to disprove particular predestination. 2. To shew the contradiction betwixt Christ dying for all, and Gods election of some. 3. To prove that the soule doth not come from the parent, and consequently that there is no originall sinne*. London: s.n., 1642. [R216650]

The last farewel to the rebellious sect called the Fifth Monarchy-men on Wednesday January the ninth Together with their treacherous proceedings, attempts, combats, and skirmishes at VWoodstreet, Bishopsgate-street, Leaden-Hall, and several other places. With the total dispersing, defeating, and utter ruining of that damnable and seditious sect in general. London: s.n., 1661. [R208004]

Lawrence, Henry. *Of Baptisme*. Amsterdam?: s.n., 1646. [R210176]

Latimer, Hugh. *27 sermons preached by the ryght Reuerende father in God and constant matir [sic] of Iesus Christe, Maister Hugh Latimer, as well such as in tymes past haue bene printed, as certayne other commyng to our handes of late, whych were yet neuer set forth in print. Faithfully perused [and] allowed accordyng to the order appoynted in the Quenes Maiesties iniunctions. 1. Hys sermon Ad clerum. 2. Hys fourth sermon vpon the plough. 3. Hys. 7. sermons before kyng Edward. 4 Hys sermon at Stamforde. 5. Hys last sermon before kyng Edward. 6. Hys. 7. sermons vpon the Lordes prayer. 7. Hys other. 9. sermons vpon certayne Gospels and Epistles*. London: by Iohn Day, dwelling ouer Aldersgate, 1562. [S108333]

L'Estrange, Roger. *The dissenter's sayings in requital for L'Estrange's sayings: published in their own words, for the information of the people*. London: printed for Henry Brome, 1681. [R671]

Lobb, Stephen. *The glory of free grace display'd: or, The transcendant excellency of the love of God in Christ, unto believing, repenting sinners, in some measure describ'd Wherein, 1. The doctrine about election, and the covenant of reconciliation is explained. 2. The error of the antinomians, who assert, that the filth of sin was laid on Christ, and that the holiness as well as the righteousness of Christ is made the elects while in the womb, &c. With their abuse of free-grace particularly detected and confuted. 3. In what sense our sins were laid on Christ, and Christ's righteousness made the believers, according to the sacred scriptures, evinced. 4. The glory of irresistible-grace, as exerted in the conversion of a sinner in opposition to the Arminian, cleared. 5. A modest defence of the sober dominican, about physical predetermination.* London: printed by T. S. for B. Alsop, at the Angel and Bible against the stocks-market, 1680. [R218819]

Locke, John. *Mr. Locke's reply to the right reverend the Lord Bishop of Worcester's answer to his second letter wherein, besides other incident matters, what his lordship has said concerning certainty by reason, certainty by ideas, and certainty of faith, the resurrection of the same body, the immateriality of the soul, the inconsistency of Mr. Locke's notions with the articles of the Christian faith and their tendency to scepticism [sic], is examined.* London: printed by H.C. for A. and J. Churchill ... and C. Castle, 1699. [R32483]

Londons allarum, or The great and bloody plot of the Fifth-Monarchy-Men discovered being a perfect relation of their most horrid, damnable, treasonable, and tumultuous rising on Sunday night last: with the names of the gentlemen killed and wounded at St. Pauls, Redcross-street, White-Cross, and Bishops-Gate: as also, the manner of their bloody design, their resolution and intentions; and the number of prisoners taken, and committed to New-Gate, the Gate-House, and other places; together with a further discovery of their wicked design; and a perfect narrative of their bloody proceedings on Wednesday morning last. Likewise, a list of the names of these bloody traytors; and the number kill'd ant taken prisoners on both sides. London: printed for G. Horton for general satisfaction, 1661. [R217727]

Londons glory, or, The riot and ruine of the fifth monarchy men, and all their adherents Being a true and perfect relation of their desperate and bloody attempts and practises in the City of London on Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday last, Jan. the ninth, 1660. Wherein by the loyal and valourous behaviour of the citizens in defence of the Kings Majesty, their own rights and priviledges; they gave a total defeat to those bloody traytors. Together with a perfect list of the names of all those that are taken prisoners, and secured in Newgate, the Powltry Counter and other prisons. London: printed for C.D., 1661. [R209764]

Lumpkin, William Latane. *Baptist Confessions of Faith.* 1st edn. Chicago: Judson Press, 1959.

Luther, Martin. *Dris Martini Lutheri colloquia mensalia, or, Dr. Martin Luther's divine discourses at his table, etc. which in his life time hee held with divers learned men (such as were Philip Melancthon, Casparus Cruciger, Justus Jonas, Paulus Eberus, Vitus Dietericus, Joannes Bugenhagen, Joannes Forsterus, and others) conteining questions and answers touching religion, and many other main points of doctrine, as also many notable histories, and all sorts of learning, comforts, advises prophesies, admonitions, directions and instructions.* Translated by Henry Bell. London: printed by William Du-Gard ... 1652. [R23064]

_____. *Luther's Primary Works: Together with his Shorter and Larger Catechisms. Translated into English.* ed. Henry Wace, and C.A. Buchheim. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1896.

_____. *Luther's Works.* 56 vols. American edn., ed. F. Sherman, and H.T. Lehmann. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1971.

Luther, Martin, and Nostradamus. *Dr. Martin Luther's prophecies of the destruction of Rome and the dovnfall of the Romish religion. And how the Papists for treachery and hypocrisie shall at last become hated, and contemned by all nations. Here are likewise some of the eminent prophecies of that most learned mathematician and prophet Michael Nostred'amus, concerning England and France, and those strange occurrences which are likely to happen to both those countries in these latter dayes, with an account of some of the prophecies of Michael Nostredamus which have been fulfilled here in England already. Licenced May the 7th. 1679,* London: printed for W.W., 1679. [R211089]

Lye, Thomas. *The child's delight together with an English grammar.* London: printed by S. Simmons for Tho. Parkhurst 1671. [R12942]

Manton, Thomas. *XVIII sermons on the second chapter of the 2d Epistle to the Thessalonians containing the description, rise, growth, and fall of Antichrist : with divers cautions and arguments to establish Christians against the apostacy of the Church of Rome: very necessary for these times.* London: printed by J.D. for J. Robinson ... and E. Aylmer, 1679. [R7577]

Marlow, Isaac. *A treatise of the Holy Trinitie [sic]. In two parts. The first, asserting the deity of Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit, in the unity of essence with God the father. The second, in defence of the former, containeth answers to the chieftest objections made against this doctrine.* London: printed for the author, and are to be sold by Richard Baldwin in the Old-Baily, 1690. [R216280]

_____. *An account of the unjust proceedings, in some matters of difference, between Mr. Williams Collins and Isaac Marlow; by several persons who pretend upon plain evidence, to acquit the one, and to give their judgement against the other.* London: s.n., 1697. [R221478]

_____. *An answer to a deceitful book, entituled, A just vindication of mr. William Collins, and of several other elders and ministers, from the unjust*

reflections of mr. Isaac Marlow. To which is hereunto added, A brief discourse, concerning laying on of hands, at the ordination of elders to their pastoral office. London: printed for the author, 1698. [R180371]

Mather, Cotton. *The short history of New-England. A recapitulation of wonderful passages which have occur'd, first in the protections, and then in the afflictions, of New-England: With a representation of certain matters calling for the singular attention of that country.* Boston: printed by B. Green, for Samuel Phillips, at the Brick Shop, at the west end of the Exchange, 1694. [W19425]

Maton, Robert. *Israel's redemption or the propheticall history of our Saviours kingdome on earth; that is, of the church Catholicke, and triumphant. With a discourse of Gog and Magog, or The battle of the great day of God almightie.* London: printed [by R. Cotes] for Daniel Frere, and are to be sold at his shop in little Britaine at the signe of the red Bull, 1642. [R208573]

_____. *A treatise of the fifth monarchy, or, Christs personall reigne on earth one thousand years with his saints explaining the 20 of the revelations and all other Scripture-prophesies that treat of it.* London: printed for John Hancock ... 1655. [R7877]

McGlothlin, W. J. *Baptist Confessions of Faith.* London: Kingsgate Press, 1911.

Mede, Joseph. *The key of the Revelation, searched and demonstrated out of the naturall and proper characters of the visions with a coment thereupon, according to the rule of the same key.* London: by R.B. for Phil Stephens, 1643. [R12329]

_____. *The apostasy of the latter times in which, (according to divine prediction) the world should wonder after the beast, the mysterie of iniquity should so far prevaile over the mysterie of godlinesse, whorish Babylon over the virgin-church of Christ, as that the visible glory of the true church should be much clouded, the true unstained Christian faith corrupted, the purity of true worship polluted, or, The gentiles theology of daemons, i.e. inferiour divine powers, supposed to be mediatours betweene God and man: revived in the latter times amongst Christians in worshipping of angels, deifying and invocating of saints, adoring and templing of reliques, bowing downe to images, worshipping of crosses, &c. all which, together with a true discovery of the nature, originall, progresse, of the great, fatall, and solemne apostasie are cleered: delivered in publick some years since upon I Tim. 4. 1, 2, 3.* London: printed by L.N. for Samuel Man ... 1644. [R19597]

_____. *Paraleipomena: remaines on some passages in the Revelation: whereunto are added Severall discourses concerning the holinesse of churches.* London: printed by J.G. for John Clarke, and are to be sold at his shop, 1650. [R2396]

- _____. *The works of the pious and profoundly-learned Joseph Mede, B.D., sometime fellow of Christ's Colledge in Cambridge.* ed. John Worthington. London: printed by Roger Norton for Richard Royston ... 1672. [R19073]
- Mede, Joseph, Richard More and William Twisse. *The key of the Revelation, searched and demonstrated out of the naturall and proper characters of the visions with a coment thereupon, according to the rule of the same key.* London: by R.B. for Phil Stephens ... 1643. [R12329]
- Melanchthon, Philipp. *The confessyon of the fayth of the Germaynes exhibited to the moste victorious Emperour Charles the. v. in the Councell or assemble holden at Augusta the yere of our Lorde. 1530. To which is added the apologie of Melancthon who defendeth with reasons inuincible the aforesayde confesyon translated by Rycharde Tauerner at the commaundeme[n]t of his master Thomas Cromwel chefe Secretarie to the kynges grace.* [London]: in fletestrete, by me Robert Redman, dwellynge at the sygne of the George nexte to saynt Dunstones Church, 1536. [S109256]
- Milton, John. *Of reformation touching church-discipline in England and the causes that hitherto have hindred it.* London: printed for Thomas Underhill, 1641. [R17896]
- _____. *A treatise on Christian doctrine, compiled from the holy Scriptures alone.* Translated by Charles Richard Sumner. Cambr.: s.n., 1825.
- Montagu, Richard. *A gagg for the new Gospell? No: a nevv gagg for an old goose VVho would needes vndertake to stop all Protestants mouths for euer, with 276. places out of their owne English Bibles. Or an ansvere to a late abridger of controuersies, and belyar of the Protestants doctrine.* London: printed by Thomas Snodham for Matthew Lownes and William Barret, 1624. [S112831]
- More, Henry. *Apocalypsis Apocalypseos, or, The revelation of St. John the Divine unveiled containing a brief but perspicuous and continued exposition from chapter to chapter, and from verse to verse, of the whole book of the Apocalypse.* London: printed by J.M. for J. Martyn and W. Kettilby ... 1680. [R7100]
- _____. *An illustration of those two abstruse books in Holy Scripture: the Book of Daniel, and the Revelation of S. John by continued, brief, but clear notes, from chapter to chapter, and from verse to verse: with very useful and apposite arguments prefixt to each chapter.* London: printed by M. Flesher for Walter Kettilby ... 1685. [R13329]

More, John of Barnelms. *A trumpet sounded: or, the great mystery of the two little horns unfolded Being as a candle set up in the dark lanthorn or Daniel. Consisting of two parts. The first of which was sent to the Lord Protector so called, July 29. 1654. though not published until now. The other, a further illustration, by way of answer to a late book of Mr. William Aspinwal's, who hath endeavoured the proving of the late king to be the little horn Dan. 7. which is indeed the man chiefly relating to the present government.* London: s.n., 1654. [R224008]

Morrice, Roger. *The Entring Book of Roger Morrice, 1677-1691.* 6 vols., ed. Mark Goldie. Woodbridge: Boydell Press in association with the Parliamentary History Yearbook Trust, 2007.

Muggleton, Lodowick. *The acts of the witnesses of the spirit in five parts.* London: s.n., 1699. [R11186]

Murton, John. *A discription [sic] of what God hath predestinated concerning man in his [brace] creation, transgression, & regeneration: as also an answere to Iohn Robinson, touching baptisme.* London?: s.n., 1620. [S768]

Napier, John. *A plaine discouery of the whole Reuelation of Saint Iohn: set downe in two treatises: the one searching and prouing the true interpretation thereof: the other applying the same paraphrastically and historically to the text.* Edinburgh: printed by Robert Walde-graue printer to the Kings Majestie., 1593. [S113080]

A narrative of the proceedings of the General Assembly of divers pastors, messengers and ministring-brethren of the Baptized churches, met together in London, from Septemb. 3. to 12. 1689 from divers parts of England and Wales: owning the doctrine of personal election, and final perseverance. Sent from, and concerned for, more than one hundred congregations of the same faith with themselves. London: s.n., 1689. [R41536]

A narrative of the proceedings of the General Assembly of the elders and messengers of the Baptized churches sent from divers parts of England and Wales, which began in London the 9th of June, and ended the 16th of the same, 1690. Owing the doctrine of personal election and final perseverance. London: [s.n.], 1690. [R202427]

A narrative of the proceedings of the General Assembly of the elders and messengers of the Baptized churches sent from divers parts of England and Wales, which began in London the 2d of June, and ended the 8th of the same, 1691. Owing the doctrine of personal election and final perseverance. London: [s.n.], 1691. [R202428]

A narrative of the proceedings of the general assembly ... met ... on the 17th day of the 3rd month, 1692, and continued unto the 24th. London: s.n., 1692. [R41537]

Nelson, Abraham. *A perfect description of Antichrist, and his false prophet wherein is plainly shewed that Oliver Cromwell was Antichrist, and John Presbiter, or*

John Covenanter his false prophet. London: printed by T.F. and are to be sold at Westminster-Hall Fleetstreet and the old Exchange, 1660. [R203043]

Newton, Isaac. *Observations upon the prophecies of Daniel, and the Apocalypse of St. John.* Dublin: printed by S. Powell for George Risk George Ewing and William Smith, 1733. [T18642]

_____. *The Correspondence of Isaac Newton: 1688-1694.* Vol. 3, ed. H. W. Turnbull. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1961.

Nowell, Alexander. *A catechism, or institution of Christian religion to be learned of all youth, next after the little catechism appointed in the book of common-prayer.* London: printed by E. Cotes, for the Company of Stationers, 1663. [R41315]

Norris, John. *Reflections upon the conduct of human life: to which is annexed a visitation sermon.* London: for S. Manship at the Black Bull in Cornhil, 1690. [R15880]

Olevian, Caspar. *An exposition of the Symbole of the Apostles, or rather of the articles of faith In which the chiefe points of the euerlasting and free couenant betweene God and the faithfull is briefly and plainly handled. Gathered out of the catechising sermons of Gasper Olevian Treuir, and now translated out of the Latine tongue into the English for the benefite of Christ his Church. By John Fielde.* Translated by John Fielde. London: printed by H. Middleton, for Thomas Man, and Tobie Smith, 1581. [S113494]

Olevian, Caspar and Zacharias Ursinus. *A catechisme or briefe instruction in the principles and grounds of the true Christian religion With a short treatise premised concerning the profity and necessitie of catechizing.* London: printed by Edvard Griffin for Henry Fetherstone, 1617. [S115851]

An orthodox creed, or, a protestant confession of faith being an essay to unite and confirm all true protestants in the fundamental articles of the Christian religion, against the errors and heresies of the church of Rome. London: s.n., 1679. [R32217]

Osiander, Andreas. *The coniectures of the ende of the worlde.* Translated by George Joye, Antwerp: S. Mierdman, 1548. [S120761]

Overton, Richard. *Mans mortalitie: or, A treatise wherein 'tis proved, both theologically and philosophically, that whole man (as a rationally creature) is a compound wholly mortall, contrary to that common distinction of soule and body: and that the present going of the soule into heaven or hell is a meer fiction: and that at the resurrection is the beginning of our immortality, and then actual condemnation, and salvation, and not before: With all doubts and objections answered, and resolved, both by scripture and reason; discovering the multitude of blasphemies, and absurdities that arise from the fancie of the soule. Also divers other mysteries, as, of heaven, hell, Christs humane residence, the extent of the resurrection, the new creation, &c. opened, and*

presented to the tryall of better judgments. Amsterdam: printed by John Canne, 1644. [R11330]

_____. *Man wholly mortal, or, A treatise wherein 'tis proved, both theologically and philosophically, that as whole man sinned, so whole man died ... with doubts and objections answered and resolved, both by Scripture and reason ...: also, divers other mysteries, as of heaven, hell, the extent of the resurrection, the new-creation, &c. opened, and presented to the trial of better judgment.* London: s.n., 1675. [R11918]

Owen, John. *QEOMACIA AUTEXOUSIASTIKH, or, A display of Arminianisme: Being a discovery of the old Pelagian idol free-will, with the new goddesse contingency, advancing themselves, into the throne of the God of heaven to the prejudice of his grace, providence, and supreme dominion over the children of men. Wherein the maine errors of the Arminians are laid open, by which they are fallen off from the received doctrine of all the reformed churches, with their opposition in divers particulars to the doctrine established in the Church of England. Discovered out of their owne writings and confessions, and confuted by the Word of God.* London: printed by I.L. for Phil. Stephens at the golden Lion in Pauls Church-yard, 1643. [R233884]

_____. *Of the death of Christ, the price he paid, and the purchase he made. Or, the satisfaction, and merit of the death of Christ cleered, the universality of redemption thereby oppugned: and the doctrine concerning these things formerly delivered in a treatise against universal redemption vindicated from the exceptions, and objections of Mr Baxter.* London: printed by Peter Cole, at the sign of the Printing-Press in Cornhill, near the Royal Exchange, 1650. [R206527]

_____. *The advantage of the kingdom of Christ, in the shaking of the kingdoms of the world: or Providential alterations in their subserviencie to Christ's exaltation Opened, in a sermon preached to the Parliament, Octob. 24. 1651. a solemn day of thanksgiving for the destruction of the Scots army at Worcester, with sundry other mercies.* London: imprinted at Oxford Anno 1651 and re-printed at London: s.n., 1651. [R218595]

_____. *Vindiciæ evangelicæ or The mystery of the Gospell vindicated, and Socinianisme examined, in the consideration, and confutation of a catechisme, called A Scripture catechisme, written by J. Biddle M.A. and the catechisme of Valentinus Smalcius, commonly called the Racovian catechisme. With the vindication of the testimonies of Scripture, concerning the deity and satisfaction of Jesus Christ, from the perverse expositions, and interpretations of them, by Hugo Grotius in his Annotations on the Bible.* Oxford: printed by [Henry Hall? and] Leon. Lichfield printer to the University, for Tho. Robinson, 1655. [R203109]

_____. *A brief declaration and vindication of the doctrine of the Trinity as also of the person and satisfaction of Christ accommodated to the capacity and use of such as may be in danger to be seduced, and the establishment of the truth.* London: printed by R.W. for Nath. Ponder, 1669. [R30760]

- _____. *A vindication of some passages in a discourse concerning communion with God from the exceptions of William Sherlock, rector of St. George Buttolph-Lane.* London: printed for N. Ponder, 1674. [R7728]
- _____. *Pneumatologia, or, A discourse concerning the Holy Spirit wherein an account is given of his name, nature, personality, dispensation, operations, and effects: his whole work in the old and new creation is explained, the doctrine concerning it vindicated from oppositions and reproaches: the nature also and necessity of Gospel-holiness the difference between grace and morality, or a spiritual life unto God in evangelical obedience and a course of moral virtues, are stated and declared.* London: printed by J. Darby for Nathaniel Ponder... 1674. [R16093]
- _____. *The doctrine of justification by faith through the imputation of the righteousness of Christ, explained, confirmed, & vindicated.* London: printed for R. Boulter, 1677. [R13355]
- _____. *SUNESIS PNEUMATIKH: or, The causes, waies & means of understanding the mind of God as revealed in his Word.* London: printed for N. Ponder at the Peacock in the Poultry over against the Stocks-Market, 1678. [R12597]
- _____. *Christologia, or, A declaration of the glorious mystery of the person of Christ, God and man.* London: printed for Nathaniel Ponder, at the Peacock in the Poultry over against the Stocks-Market, 1679. [R12450]
- _____. *Two discourses concerning the Holy Spirit, and His work the one, Of the Spirit as a comforter, the other, As He is the author of spiritual gifts.* London: printed for William Marshall ... 1693. [R2819]
- _____. *Gospel grounds and evidences of the faith of God's elect shewing: I. The nature of true saving faith, in securing of the spiritual comfort of believers in this life, is of the highest importance, II. The way wherein true faith doth evidence it self in the soul and consciences of believers, unto their supportment and comfort, under all their conflicts with sin, in all their tryals and temptations, III. Faith will evidence it self, by a diligent, constant endeavour to keep it self and all grace in due exercise, in all ordinances of divine worship, private and publick, IV. A peculiar way whereby true faith will evidence it self, by bringing the soul into a state of repentance.* London: printed by John Astwood for William Marshal, 1695. [R9544]
- _____. *Dr. John Owen's two short catechisms wherein the principles of the doctrine of Christ are unfolded and explained: proper for all persons to learn before they be admitted to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and composed by him for the use of all congregations in general.* 2nd edn. London: printed for and sold by Will. Marshal, 1700. [R30762]

- _____. *A dissertation on divine justice: or, The claims of vindicatory justice asserted. Translated.* London: s.n., 1770. [This edition is available at the Bodleian Library, Oxford]
- _____. *The Works of John Owen.* 23 vols., ed. W.H. Goold. London: Banner of Truth Trust, 1965.
- _____. *The Oxford Orations of Dr. John Owen.* Callington (Cornwall): Gospel Communication, 1971.
- Pasiphilus, Philalethes. *Confidence corrected, error detected, and truth defended; or some farther reflections upon the two athenian mercuries, lately publish'd about infant-baptism.* London: s.n., 1692. [R223470]
- Penington, Isaac. *The way of life and death made manifest and set before men.* London: printed by J. M[acock]. for Lodowick Lloyd at the Castle in Cornhil, 1658. [R14864]
- _____. *The New-Covenant of the gospel distinguished [sic] from the Old Covenant of the law and the rest or sabbath of believers, from the rest or sabbath of the Jews, which differ as much from each other, as the sign and shadow doth from the thing signified and shadowed out: in answer to some queries of W. Salters, tending to enforce upon Christians the observation of the Jewish sabbath ... whereto are added Some considerations propounded to the Jews, tending towards their conversion to that which is the life and spirit of the law.* London: printed for Robert VWilson, and are to be sold at his shop, 1660. [R40658]
- _____. *The everlasting Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ and the blessed effects thereof testified to by experience: with a few words to England, my native country.* London: s.n., 1678. [R28790]
- Penington, Isaac, and George Fox. *Some principles of the elect people of God in scorn called Quakers.* London: s.n., 1671. [R33049]
- Penn, William. *The sandy foundation shaken: or, Those so generally believed ... doctrines, of one God, existing in three distinct ... persons &c. ... refuted.* London: s.n., 1668. [R38009]
- _____. *Quakerism, a new nick-name for old Christianity being an answer to a book entituled Quakerism no Christianity, subscribed by J. Faldo: in which the rise, doctrine and practice of the abused Quakers are truly, briefly and fully declared and vindicated from the false charges ... made by that adversary with a key opening the true meaning of some of their doctrine.* London: printed [by Andrew Sowle], 1672. [R30094]
- _____. *Reason against railing, and truth against fiction being an answer to those two late pamphlets intituled A dialogue between a Christian and a Quaker, and the Continuation of the dialogue &c. by one Thomas Hicks, an Anabaptist teacher.* London: printed [by Andrew Sowle], 1673. [R25209]

- _____. *An address to Protestants upon the present conjuncture in II parts.* London: printed [by Andrew Sowle], 1679. [R15359]
- _____. *The sandy foundation shaken: or, Those so generally believed and applauded doctrines, of one God, subsisting in three distinct and separate persons, the impossibility of God's pardoning sinners, without a plenary satisfaction, the justification of impure persons by an imputative righteousness, refuted, from the authority of Scripture testimonies, and right reason.* London: printed [by Andrew Sowle], 1684. [R214724]
- _____. *A discourse of the general rule of faith and practice, and judge of controversie.* London: printed and sold by T. Sowle in White-Hart-Court in Gracious-Street, and at the Bible in Leaden-Hall-Street, near the Market, 1699. [R1708]
- Petto, Samuel. *The difference between the old and new covenant stated and explained with an exposition of the covenant of grace in the principal concernments of it.* London: printed for Eliz. Calvert ... 1674. [R31110]
- Poole, Matthew. *Blasphæmoktonia: The blasphemer slaine with the sword of the spirit: or, A plea for the god-head of the Holy Ghost. Wherein the deity of the spirit of God is proved in the demonstration of the spirit, and vindicated from the cavils of John Bidle.* London: printed by T.M. for Joh. Rothwell at the Fountain and Bear in Gold-smiths Row in Cheap-side, 1653. [R209472]
- Powell, Vavasor. *A new and useful concordance to the holy Bible. Begun by V.P. To which is now added near nine thousand scriptures.* London: printed for Francis Smith at the Elephant and Castle near the Royal-Exchange in Cornhil, and at the same sign first shop without Temple-Bar, 1673. [R24469]
- Prophetical passages, concerning the present times, in which the person, character, mission, &c. &c. of Richard Brothers, is clearly pointed at as the Elijah of the present day, ... selected from the writings of Jacob Behmen, C. Poniatonia, Kotterus, Salizarus, B. Keach, &c. Also, the remarkable prophecy of Humphrey Tindal.* London: printed for G. Riebau, 1795. [T42793]
- Prynne, William. *Canterburies doome, or, The first part of a compleat history of the commitment, charge, tryall, condemnation, execution of William Laud, late Arch-bishop of Canterbury containing the severall orders, articles, proceedings in Parliament against him, from his first accusation therein, till his tryall: together with the various evidences and proofs produced against him at the Lords Bar ...: wherein this Arch-prelates manifold trayterous artifices to usher in popery by degrees, are cleerly detected, and the ecclesiasticall history of our church-affaires, during his pontificall domination, faithfully presented to the publike view of the world.* London: printed by John Macock for Michael Spark, Senior, 1646. [R19620]

Ramsay, William B. D. *Mirmah, Maroumah, Maroum a discourse consisting of three sermons: a New-years gift of love to the Protestant Church*. London: printed by J.A. for Benj. Billingsley, 1680. [R27145]

Reeve, John and Lodowick Muggleton. *A letter presented unto Alderman Fouke, Lord Mayor of London, from the two witnesses and prisoners of Jesus Christ in Newgate ... Iohn Reeve and Lodowick Muggleton, the two last spiritual witnesses and true prophets, the only ministers of the everlasting Gospel*. London?: s.n., 1653. [R22813]

_____. *A transcendent spirituall treatise upon severall heavenly doctrines: from the Holy Spirit of the man Jesus, the only true God, sent unto all his elect as a token of his eternall love unto them, by the hand of his owne prophet, being his last messenger, and witness, and forerunner of the visible appearing of the distinct personal God in power and great glory, in the clouds of heaven, with his ten thousands of personall saints, to seperate between the elect world, and the reprobate world, to all eternity: containing those severall heads set downe in the next page following*. London: printed for the authors ..., 1653. [R201087]

Reprobation asserted, or, The doctrine of eternal election & reprobation promiscuously handled in eleven chapters wherein the most material objections made by the opposers of this doctrine are fully answered, several doubts removed, and sundry cases of conscience resolved. London: printed for G.L., 1674. [R30870]

Richardson, Samuel. *An apology for the present government, and governour: with an answer to severall objections against them, and twenty queries propounded for those who are unsatisfied, to consider, and answer, if they please*. London: printed and are to be sold by Gyles Calvert, at at [sic] his shop the west end of Pauls, 1654. [R207900]

Rutherford, Samuel. *A survey of the spirituall antichrist. Opening the secrets of Familisme and Antinomianisme in the antichristian doctrine of John Saltmarsh, and Will. Del, the present preachers of the army now in England, and of Robert Town, Tob. Crisp, H. Denne, Eaton, and others. In which is revealed the rise and spring of Antinomians, Familists, Libertines, Swenckfeldians, Enthysiasts, &c. The minde of Luther, a most professed opposer of Antinomians, is cleared, and diverse considerable points of the law and the Gospel, of the spirit and letter, of the two covenants, of the nature of free grace, exercise under temptations, mortification, justification, sanctification, are discovered. In two parts*. London: printed by J.D. & R.I. for Andrew Crooke, and are to be sold at his shop at the Green-Dragon in Pauls Church-yard, 1647. [R22462]

_____. *The covenant of life opened, or, A treatise of the covenant of grace containing something of the nature of the covenant of works, the sovereignty of God, the extent of the death of Christ ...* Edinburgh: printed by Andro Anderson for Robert Brown, and are to be sold at his shop, 1655. [R20879]

- Saltmarsh, John. *Free-grace or, the flowings of Christ's blood freely to sinners. Being an experiment of Jesus Christ upon one who hath been in the bondage of a troubled conscience at times for the space of about twelve yeers, til now upon a clearer discovery of Jesus Christ, and the Gospel: wherein divers secrets of the soul, of sin and temptations, are experimentally opened, and by way of observation, concerning a natural condition, and a mixed condition of law and Gospel: with a further revealing of the Gospel in its glory, liberty, freenesse, and simplicity for salvation.* London: printed for Giles Calvert, dwelling at the black Spred-Eagle at the West-end of Pauls, 1645. [R208637]
- Servetus, Michael. *De Trinitatis erroribus libri septem.* [Hagenau]: s.n., 1531. [This edition is available at the Bodleian Library, Oxford.]
- Sherlock, William. *A vindication of the doctrine of the holy and ever blessed Trinity and the incarnation of the son of God occasioned by the brief notes on the creed of St. Athanasius, and the brief history of the Vnitarians, or Socinians, and containing an answer to both.* London: printed for W. Rogers, 1690. [R10837]
- Sherlock, William and Robert South. *A defence of Dr. Sherlock's notion of a Trinity in unity, in answer to the Animadversions [by R. South] upon his Vindication of the doctrine of the holy and ever blessed Trinity.* London: s.n., 1694. [R33885]
- Sighs for righteousness: Or the reformation this day calls for, stated, and the spirit, posture, and proceedings of persons and things in this nation, in referrence thereto, examined: In some sad and serious queries, with fear and love, proposed particularly to our rulers, souldiers, teachers, and others whom they do concern. In the words of moderation and soberness, to be considered and weighed in a sense of God, and in the judgement of light and truth, in this travelling and shaking time.* London, 1654. [R207003]
- Skepp, John. *Divine energy or the efficacious operations of the spirit of God upon the soul of man, ... Being an antidote against the Pelagian plague.* London: printed for Joseph Marshall and Aaron Ward, 1722. [T103235]
- Slater, Samuel. *The two covenants from Sinai, and Sion, drawn up catechetically, and plainly. Together with a briefe appendix, directing about the use of the new covenant in a practicall way. Published for the benefit especially of the inhabitants of Eastham, Essex.* London: printed by M.S. for Henry Overton in Popes head Alley, 1644. [R204871]
- Smith, Henry. *The sermons of Mr. Henry Smith, gathered into one volume printed according to his corrected copies in his life time; whereunto is added, Gods arrow against atheists.* London: printed by the assignes of Thomas Man, Paul Man and Ionah Man, 1631. [S1720]
- Smyth, John. *The character of the beast, or, The false constitution of the church discovered in certayne passages betwixt Mr. R. Clifton & Iohn Smyth, concerning true Christian baptisme of new creatures, or new borne babes in Christ, &nd false baptisme of infants borne after the flesh: referred to two*

propositions, 1. That infants are not to be baptized, 2. That antichristians converted are to be admitted into the true church by baptism.
[Middelburg]: printed [by R. Schilders], 1609. [S991]

_____. *Short confession of faith in XX articles.* S.I.: s.n., 1609.

Spittlehouse, John. *An answer to one part of the Lord Protector's speech: or, A vindication of the fifth monarchy-men in reference to an accusation of evil charged upon them in his speech to the Parliament in the Painted Chamber, the 4 of September, 1654.* London: for Livewel Chapman at the Crown in Popes-head-alley, 1654. [R211046]

Tenison, Thomas. *A friendly debate between a Roman Catholick and a Protestant concerning the doctrine of transubstantiation wherein the said doctrine is utterly confuted, and Antichrist is clearly and fully described, and his inevitable destruction predicted: with a challenge to all the Romish doctors that preach and teach the said doctrine, to answer it.* London: printed for Randall Taylor, 1688. [R38802]

Terrill, Edward, and Nathaniel Haycroft. *The Records of a Church of Christ Meeting in Broadmead, Bristol, A.D. 1640 to A.D. 1688.* London: J. Heaton & Son, 1865.

A testimony to the truth of Jesus Christ, and to our Solemn League and Covenant; as also against the errors, heresies and blasphemies of these times, and the toleration of them. Wherein is inserted a catalogue of divers of the said errors, &c. All of them being collected out of their authors own books alleadged in the margin, and laid down in their own words; except one that was maintained in a dispute in Oxford, Decemb. 11. 1646. and six or seven which were asserted before a committee of the Honourable House of Commons in the Star-Chamber, and reported to the House, Sept. 12. 1643. Subscribed by the ministers of Christ within the province of London, Decemb. 14. &c. 1647. London: printed by A.M. for Tho. Underhill at the Bible in Woodstreet, 1648. [R227563]

Tindal, Matthew. *A letter to the reverend the clergy of both universities, concerning the Trinity and the Athanasian creed with reflections on all the late hypotheses, particularly Dr. W's, Dr. S--th's, the Trinity placed in its due light, The 28 propositions, The calm discourse of a Trinity in the Godhead, and the defence of Dr. Sherlock's notions: with a short discourse concerning mysteries.* London: s.n., 1694. [R4527]

To the supreme authority of the nation: an humble petition on the behalf of many thousands of Quakers. Fifth-monarchy men, Anabaptists &c. London: printed by D[avid]. Maxwell, 1660. [R211557]

Tombes, John. *Saints no smiters, or, Smiting civil powers not the work of saints being a treatise, shewing the doctrine and attempts of Quinto-Monarchians, or, Fifth-Monarchy-Men about smiting powers, to be damnable and antichristian.* London: printed by R.D. for Henry Eversden ... 1664. [R6979]

- Trapnel, Anna. *The cry of a stone. Or A relation of something spoken in Whitehall, by Anna Trapnel, being in the visions of God. Relating to the governors, Army, churches, ministry, universities: and the whole nation. Uttered in prayers and spiritual songs, by an inspiration extraordinary, and full of wonder. In the eleventh moneth, called January.* London: s.n., 1654. [R203788]
- Troughton, John. *Lutherus redivivus, or, The Protestant doctrine of justification by Christ's righteousness imputed to believers, explained and vindicated.* London: printed by Sam. Lee near Popes-Head-Alley in Lumbarde- Street, 1678. [R42350]
- The Tryal of Mr. Benjamin Keach, at the Assizes held at Ailsbury in Buckinghamshire, October 8, and 9.* London?: s.n., 1664.
- Turner, George Lyon, ed. *Original Records of Early Nonconformity under Persecution and Indulgence.* 3 vols. London: s.n., 1911.
- Underhill, Edward Bean. *Confessions of faith and other public documents illustrative of the history of the Baptist Churches of England in the 17th century.* London: Haddon Brothers and Co., 1854.
- Ursinus, Zacharias. *The summe of Christian religion, delivered by Zacharias Ursinus first, by way of catechism, and then afterwards more enlarged by a sound and judicious exposition, and application of the same: wherein also are debated and resolved the questions of whatsoever points of moment have been, or are controverted in divinitie.* Translated by David Pareus and Henry Parry. London: printed by James Young, and are to be sold by Steven Bowtell, 1645. [R5982]
- Ussher, James. *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: printed by M.F. for Tho. Downes and Geo. Badger ..., 1645. [R19025]
- Venner, Thomas. *The last speech and prayer with other passages of Thomas Venner, the chief encourager and promoter of the late horrid rebellion immediately before his execution in Coleman-street on Saturday last being the 19th of Ianuary, 1660: together with the names of the rest that were condemned for the same fact.* London: s.n., 1660. [R7065]
- Votes of parliament touching the book commonly called The Racovian Catechism.* London: printed by John Field, Printer to the Parliament of England, 1652. [R211458]
- White, B. R., ed. *Association Records of the Particular Baptists of England, Wales and Ireland to 1660.* 4 vols. London: Baptist Historical Society, 1971.
- White, John. *The way to the true church wherein the principall motiues perswading according to Romanisme and questions touching the nature and authoritie of*

the church and scriptures, are familiarly disputed, and driuen to their issues, where, this day they sticke betweene the Papists and vs: contriued into an answer to a popish discourse concerning the rule of faith and the marks of the church. And published to admonish such as decline to papistrie of the weake and vncertaine grounds, whereupon they haue ventured their soules. Directed to all that seeke for resolution: and especially to his louing councitmen of Lancashire. London: printed [by R. Field] for Iohn Bill and William Barret, 1608. [S101725]

Whitehead, George. *The authority of the true ministry in baptizing with the spirit, and the idolatry of such men, as are doting about shadows and carnal ordinances, and their ignorance of the spirits baptism (of which, water baptism was but a figure) discovered: and herein is shewed, that water baptism is neither of necessity to salvation, nor yet is it now practiced either by authority from heaven, or by any New-Testament-law that is in force upon believers, seeing the substance, and the end of things abolished is come and enjoyed, wherein the types, shadows and fingers, are ended: being a short return to a book entituled, A reply to a scandalous paper, subscribed by one Samuel Bradley, a Baptist teacher, as concerning a dispute that was between some of the people called Quakers, and some Baptists in South-warke. London: printed for Robert Wilson ..., 1660. [R19780]*

_____. *A serious account in XXXV evident reasons (to all who desire satisfaction) why the people of the Lord, called Quakers, cannot go to worship at those places called churches and chappels, and to inform the magistrates and ministers that such consciencious people (as are separated from these places) ought not to be compelled (from their peaceable meetings) to their worship and churches, so called, being a short discovery of the way, worship, and principles of the true ministers and persecuted people of God, in several exceptions against the practices, worship, and principles of the priests, both of the Presbyterians, and Episcopal-men, and others of the same affinity, in some of which principles the Presbyterians are the rather concerned, but in others of them, both are concerned in the general. London: printed for Robert Wilson, 1661. [R20306]*

_____. *The divinity of Christ and unity of the three that bear record in Heaven. With the blessed end and effects of Christ's appearance, confessed and vindicated by his followers called Quakers, to remove the aspersion in several books, written by T. Vincent &c. London: s.n., 1669. [R19836]*

_____. *The glory of Christ's light within expelling darkness: being the sum of the controversie between the people called Quakers, and some of the non-conformist priests, as manifest at two publick disputes; between G. Whitehead and S. Scandret. Whereunto is added A brief and scriptural examination of that private principle of a personal election and reprobation of certain definite numbers from eternity. London: s.n., 1669. [R39125]*

_____. *The dipper plung'd, or, Thomas Hicks his feigned dialogue between a Christian and a Quaker, proved, an unchristian forgery consisting of self-contradictions, and abuses against the truth, and people called Quakers:*

wherein Tho. Hicks hath seconded (though in envy exceeded) his brother Henry Grigg, in his babylonish pamphlet, stiled, *Light from the sun of righteousness: howbeit, they have both notoriously contradicted themselves, and each other, as is hereby evinced*. London: s.n., 1672. [R20065]

_____. *The Christianity of the people commonly called Quakers, vindicated from antichristian opposition. i. In a serious examination of doctor Ford's Preservative against Quakerism &c.* London: printed for Thomas Northcott, in George Yard, in Lombard street, 1690. [R27067]

Whitley, W.T., ed. *Minutes of the General Assembly of the General Baptist Churches in England*. London: Baptist Historical Society, 1909.

_____. *The Church Books of Ford or Cuddington and Amersham in the County of Bucks*. London: printed for the Society by Kingsgate Press, 1912.

Williams, Daniel. *The vanity of childhood & youth wherein the depraved nature of young people is represented and means for their reformation proposed: being some sermons preached in Hand-Alley at the request of several young men, to which is added a catechism for youth*. London: printed for John Dunton, 1691. [R31018]

_____. *Gospel-truth stated and vindicated wherein some of Dr. Crisp's opinions are considered, and the opposite truths are plainly stated and confirmed*. London: printed for John Dunton, 1692. [R24559]

_____. *A defence of Gospel-truth being a reply to Mr. Chancey's first part, and as an explication of the points in debate may serve for a reply to all other answers*. London: printed for John Dunton, 1693. [R26371]

Williams, Gryffith. *The great antichrist revealed, never yet discovered, and proved to be neither pope, nor Turk, nor any single person, nor any one monarch or tyrant in any polity but a collected pack, or multitude of hypocritical, heretical, blasphemous, and most scandalous wicked men that have fulfilled all the propheties of the Scriptures ... and especially have united ... together by a solemn league and covenant to slay the two witnesses of God viz. brace the supream magistrate of the Commonwealth, and the chief pastors and governors of the Church of Christ, and the Christian world is requested to judge whether brace the Assembly of Presbyterians, together with the independents, Anabaptists, and lay-preachers be not the false prophet ... and whether the prevalent faction of the long Parliament ... that killed the two witnesses of Jesus Christ, 1. Charles the First ... 2. William Laud ... be not the visible body of the same antichrist*. London: printed for Philemon Stephens the younger, 1661. [R42735]

Witsius, Herman. *The oeconomy of the covenants between God and man Comprehending a complete body of divinity*. 2nd, revised and corrected edn. London: printed for Edward and Charles Dilly, 1775. [N19403]

Wyles, Nathanael. *The sinners folly discovered and detected, in making a mock at sin: in two discourses from Proverbs XIV. ix. To which is annexed a poem.* London: printed for John Marshal, 1702. [T127459]

Zwingli, Ulrich. 'Refutation of the Tricks of the Anabaptists [1527].' in *Selected Works*, ed. S.M. Jackson. Philadelphia, s.n., 1901.

_____. *Selected Works*. Translated by L.A. McLouth, H. Preble and G.W. Gilmore, ed. S.M. Jackson. Philadelphia: s.n., 1901.

Secondary Sources

- Albacete, Lorenzo. 'Younger than Sin.' *Communio* 22 (1995), 593-612.
- Aldwinckle, Russell F. 'Believer's Baptism and Confirmation.' *Baptist Quarterly* 16 (1956), 123-127.
- _____. 'The Fellowship of Believers and the Nature of Belief.' *Foundations* 23 (1980), 6-21.
- Allison, C. FitzSimons. *The Rise of Moralism: the Proclamation of the Gospel from Hooker to Baxter*. London: S.P.C.K, 1966.
- Andrews, Charles R. 'The Maine Wheele that Sets us Aworke.' *Foundations* 1.3 (1958), 28-40.
- Armstrong, Brian G. *Calvinism and the Amyraut Heresy: Protestant Scholasticism and Humanism in Seventeenth-Century France*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1969.
- Armstrong, Brian G., and Vivienne Larminie. 'Du Moulin, Pierre (1568-1658).' *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/19430, accessed 29 Jan 2009].
- Ascol, Thomas Kennedy. 'The Doctrine of Grace: a Critical Analysis of Federalism in the Theologies of John Gill and Andrew Fuller.' PhD Thesis, Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1989.
- 'a-seity.' *Oxford English Dictionary, second ed.*, Oxford University Press, 1989.
- Ashley, Maurice. *England in the Seventeenth Century*. Newly rev. edn. London: Hutchinson, 1978.
- Asselt, W. J. van. 'Structural Elements in the Eschatology of Johannes Cocceius.' *Calvin Theological Journal* 35.1 (2000), 76-104.
- _____. *The Federal Theology of Johannes Cocceius (1603-1669)*. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- Aston, Nigel and Matthew Cragoe. *Anticlericalism in Britain, c. 1500-1914*. Stroud: Sutton, 2000.
- Backscheider, Paula R. 'Defoe, Daniel (1660?-1731).' *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [http://ezproxy.ouls.ox.ac.uk:2117/view/article/7421, accessed 19 October 2009].
- Baines, Arnold H. J. 'The Signatories of the Orthodox Confession of 1679, pt 1.' *Baptist Quarterly* 17 (1957), 35-42.

- _____. 'The Signatories of the Orthodox Confession of 1679, pt 2.' *Baptist Quarterly* 17 (1957), 74-86.
- _____. 'The Signatories of the Orthodox Confession of 1679, pt 3.' *Baptist Quarterly* 17 (1957), 122-128.
- _____. 'The Signatories of the Orthodox Confession of 1679, pt 4.' *Baptist Quarterly* 17 (1957), 170-178.
- Baker, J. Wayne. *Heinrich Bullinger and the Covenant: the Other Reformed Tradition*. Athens, Ohio: Ohio University Press, 1980.
- _____. 'Sola Fide, Sola Gratia: The Battle for Luther in Seventeenth-Century England.' *Sixteenth Century Journal* 16.1 (1985), 115-133.
- _____. 'Heinrich Bullinger, the Covenant, and the Reformed Tradition in Retrospect.' *Sixteenth Century Journal* 29.2 (1998), 359-376.
- Balke, Willem. *Calvin and the Anabaptist Radicals*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981.
- Ball, B. W. *A Great Expectation: Eschatological Thought in English Protestantism to 1660*. Leiden: Brill, 1975.
- _____. *The Seventh-Day Men: Sabbatarians and Sabbatarianism in England and Wales, 1600-1800*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994.
- _____. *The Soul Sleepers: Christian Mortalism from Wycliffe to Priestley*. Cambridge: James Clarke & Co., 2008.
- Barclay, Robert. *The inner life of the religious societies of the commonwealth: considered principally with reference to the influence of church organization on the spread of Christianity*. 3rd edn. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1879.
- Bass, Clint Conan. 'Thomas Grantham and General Baptist Theology.' DPhil Thesis, University of Oxford, 2008.
- Bassett, T. M. *The Welsh Baptists*. Swansea: Ilston House, 1977.
- Bauckham, Richard. *Tudor Apocalypse: Sixteenth Century Apocalypticism, Millenarianism and the English Reformation: From John Bale to John Foxe and Thomas Brightman*. Appleford, Abingdon, Oxford: The Sutton Courtenay Press, 1978.
- Beaven, Alfred. *The Aldermen of the City of London*. London, 1908.
- Bedouelle, Guy. 'Reflection on the Place of the Child in the Church: "Suffer the Little Children to Come unto Me".' *Communio* 12 (1985), 349-367.

Beeke, Joel R. 'Faith and Assurance in the Heidelberg Catechism and Its Primary Composers: a Fresh Look at the Kendall Thesis.' *Calvin Theological Journal* 27 (1992), 39-67.

_____. *The Quest for Full Assurance: the Legacy of Calvin and His Successors*. Edinburgh: Banner of Truth Trust, 1999.

_____. 'Theodore Beza's Supralapsarian Predestination.' *Reformation & Revival* 12.2 (2003), 69-84.

Beer, Anna R. *Milton: Poet, Pamphleteer and Patriot*. London: Bloomsbury, 2008.

Bell, Mark R. *Apocalypse How?: Baptist Movements During the English Revolution*. Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 2000.

Benedict, Philip. *Christ's Churches Purely Reformed: a Social History of Calvinism*. London: Yale University Press, 2002.

Bennewith, Walter. *The Beechen Grove Story: a History of Beechen Grove Baptist Church, Watford*. B.G. Press, 1983.

Berkhof, Louis. *Systematic Theology*. London: Banner of Truth Trust, 1939.

Berkouwer, Gerrit Cornelis. 'Justification by Faith in the Reformed Confessions.' in *Major Themes in the Reformed Tradition*, ed. Donald K. McKim, 132-141. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992.

Bierma, Lyle D. 'Federal Theology in the 16th Century: Two Traditions?' *Westminster Theological Journal* 45.2 (1983), 304-321.

_____. 'Covenant or Covenants in the Theology of Olevianus.' *Calvin Theological Journal* 22.2 (1987), 228-250.

_____. 'The Role of Covenant Theology in Early Reformed Orthodoxy.' *Sixteenth Century Journal* 21.3 (1990), 453-462.

_____. 'The Origins of the Federal Theology in 16th Century Reformation Thought: a Review.' *Calvin Theological Journal* 26.2 (1991), 483-485.

_____. *German Calvinism in the Confessional Age: the Covenant Theology of Caspar Olevianus*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Books, 1996.

_____. 'Law and Grace in Ursinus' Doctrine of the Natural Covenant: A Reappraisal.' in *Protestant Scholasticism*, eds Carl R. Trueman, and R.S. Clark, 96-110. Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 1999.

Black, J. William. *Reformation Pastors: Richard Baxter and the Ideal of the Reformed Pastor*. Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 2004.

- Boersma, Hans. 'Calvin and the Extent of the Atonement.' *Evangelical Quarterly* 64.4 (1992), 333-355.
- _____. *A Hot Pepper Corn: Richard Baxter's Doctrine of Justification in its Seventeenth-Century Context of Controversy*. Vancouver: Regent College Publishing, 2004.
- Bolam, C. Gordon, Jeremy Goring, H. L. Short, and Roger Thomas, eds. *The English Presbyterians: from Elizabethan Puritanism to Modern Unitarianism*. London: Allen & Unwin, 1968.
- Bomberger, John H. A. *Infant Salvation in Its Relation to Infant Depravity, Infant Regeneration, and Infant Baptism*. Philadelphia: Lindsay & Blakiston, 1859.
- Booth, Abraham. *The Works of Abraham Booth*. ed. Michael A. G. Haykin and Alison E. Haykin. Springfield, Mo.: Particular Baptist Press, 2006.
- Brachlow, Stephen. 'Puritan Theology and General Baptist Origins.' *Baptist Quarterly* 31 (1985), 179-194.
- _____. *The Communion of Saints: Radical Puritan and Separatist Ecclesiology, 1570-1625*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988.
- Brackney, William H. *The Baptists*. New York: Greenwood, 1988.
- _____. *A Genetic History of Baptist Thought: with Special Reference to Baptists in Britain and North America*. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 2004.
- Brackney, William H., Paul S. Fiddes, and John Henry Y. Briggs, eds. *Pilgrim Pathways: Essays in Baptist History in Honour of B.R. White*. Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 1999.
- Brady, David. *The Contribution of British Writers between 1560 and 1830 to the Interpretation of Revelation 13.16-18: (the number of the beast): a study in the history of exegesis*. Tübingen: Mohr, 1983.
- Brady, Thomas A., Jr. 'Number of the Beast in Seventeenth- and Eighteenth-Century England.' *Evangelical Quarterly* 45 (1973), 219-240.
- Braithwaite, William C. *The Second Period of Quakerism*. 2nd edn. Cambridge: University Press, 1961.
- Bray, John S. *Theodore Beza's Doctrine of Predestination*. Nieuwkoop: De Graaf, 1975.
- Breed, Geoffrey R. *Particular Baptists in Victorian England: and their Strict Communion Organizations*. Didcot (England): Baptist Historical Society, 2003.

- Bremer, Francis J. 'Cotton, John (1585-1652).' *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://ezproxy.ouls.ox.ac.uk:2117/view/article/6416>, accessed 19 October 2009].
- Briggs, J. H. Y. *The English Baptists of the Nineteenth Century*. Didcot: Baptist Historical Society, 1994.
- _____. 'The Influence of Calvinism on Seventeenth-Century English Baptists.' *Baptist History and Heritage* 39 (2004), 8-25.
- _____, ed. *Pulpit and People: Studies in Eighteenth Century Baptist Life and Thought*. Milton Keynes: Paternoster Press, 2009.
- Brod, Manfred. 'Pendarves, John (1622/3-1656).' *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://ezproxy.ouls.ox.ac.uk:2117/view/article/21830>, accessed 19 October 2009].
- Bromiley, Geoffrey William. *Baptism and the Anglican Reformers*. London: Lutterworth Press, 1953.
- Brooks, James C. 'Benjamin Keach and the Baptist Singing Controversy: Mediating Scripture, Confessional Heritage, and Christian Unity.' PhD Thesis, The Florida State University, 2006.
- Brown, Douglas. 'Christopher Blackwood: Portrait of a Seventeenth Century Baptist.' *Baptist Quarterly* 32 (1987), 28-38.
- Brown, Louise Fargo. *The Political Activities of the Baptists and Fifth Monarchy Men in England During the Interregnum*. Washington, 1912.
- Brown, Raymond. *The English Baptists of the Eighteenth Century*. London: Baptist Historical Society, 1986.
- Bryce, Mary Charles. 'Evolution of Catechesis from the Catholic Reformation to the Present.' in *A Faithful Church: Issues in the History of Catechesis*, ed. John H. Westerhoff and O. C. Edwards, 204-235. Wilton, Connecticut: Morehouse-Barlow Co., Inc., 1981.
- Buchanan, Colin. *The Savoy Conference Revisited: the Proceedings Taken from the Grand Debate of 1661 and the Works of Richard Baxter*. Cambridge: Grove, 2002.
- Bunge, Marcia. *The Child in Christian Thought*. Grand Rapids, Mich: W B Eerdmans, 2001.
- Burns, Norman T. *Christian Mortalism from Tyndale to Milton*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1972.
- Burrage, Champlin. *The Early English Dissenters in the Light of Recent Research*. 2 vols. Cambridge, 1912.

- Bustin, Dennis C. *Paradox and Perseverance: Hanserd Knollys, Particular Baptist Pioneer in Seventeenth-Century England*. Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2006.
- Butterworth, Charles C. *The English Primers (1529-1545): Their Publication and Connection with the English Bible and the Reformation in England*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1953.
- Campbell, Gordon and Thomas N. Corns. *John Milton: Life, Work, and Thought*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Capill, Murray A. *Preaching with Spiritual Vigour: Including Lessons from the Life and Practice of Richard Baxter*. Fearn: Christian Focus/Mentor, 2003.
- Capp, B. S. *The Fifth Monarchy Men: a Study in Seventeenth-Century English Millenarianism*. London: Faber, 1972.
- _____. 'The Political Dimension of Apocalyptic Thought.' in *The Apocalypse in English Renaissance Thought and Literature: Patterns, Antecedents and Repercussions*, eds Constantinos A. Patrides, and Joseph Wittreich, 93-124. Ithaca, NY: Cornell Univ Pr, 1984.
- Carnes, James Patrick. 'The Famous Mr. Keach: Benjamin Keach and His Influence on Congregational Singing in Seventeenth Century England.' MA Thesis, North Texas State University, 1984.
- Child, R.L. 'The Biblical Doctrine of Initiation.' *The Fraternal* 118 (1960), 18-23.
- _____. 'Christian Initiation: A Baptist Point of View.' *Studia Liturgica* 4 (1965), 156-165.
- Christianson, Paul. 'From Expectation to Militance: Reformers and Babylon in the First Two Years of the Long Parliament.' *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 24.3 (1973), 225-244.
- _____. *Reformers and Babylon: English Apocalyptic Visions from the Reformation to the Eve of the Civil War*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1978.
- Clifford, Alan C. *Atonement and Justification: English Evangelical Theology 1640-1790: an Evaluation*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990.
- Clifton, Robin. 'Rumbold, Richard (c.1622-1685).' *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://ezproxy.ouls.ox.ac.uk:2117/view/article/24269>, accessed 27 Jan 2009].
- Clouse, Robert G. 'The Apocalyptic Interpretation of Thomas Brightman and Joseph Mede.' *Bulletin of the Evangelical Theological Society* 11.4 (1968), 181-193.
- _____. 'Johann Heinrich Alsted and English Millennialism.' *Harvard Theological Review* 62.2 (1969), 189-207.

- _____. 'The Rebirth of Millenarianism.' in *Puritans, the Millennium and the Future of Israel*, ed. Peter Toon, 42-65. Cambridge: James Clarke and Co, 1970.
- Coffey, John. *Politics, Religion and the British Revolutions: the Mind of Samuel Rutherford*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- _____. *Persecution and Toleration in Protestant England, 1558-1689*. Harlow: Longman, 2000.
- _____. *John Goodwin and the Puritan Revolution: Religion and Intellectual Change in Seventeenth-Century England*. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2006.
- Coggins, James Robert. *John Smyth's Congregation: English Separatism, Mennonite Influence, and the Elect Nation*. Waterloo, Ont: Herald Press, 1991.
- Cohen, Alfred. 'Two Roads to the Puritan Millennium: William Erbury and Vavasor Powell.' *Church History* 32 (1963), 322-338.
- Cohn, Norman. *The Pursuit of the Millennium: Revolutionary Millenarians and Mystical Anarchists of the Middle Ages*. London: Pimlico, 1993.
- Collinson, Patrick. *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*. London: Jonathan Cape, 1967.
- _____. 'Fenner, Dudley (c. 1558-1587).' *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/9287>, accessed 21 Jan 2008].
- Como, David R. *Blown by the Spirit: Puritanism and the Emergence of an Antinomian Underground in Pre-Civil-War England*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2004.
- Cooper, Brian G. 'Academic Re-Discovery of Apocalyptic Ideas in the Seventeenth Century.' *Baptist Quarterly* 18 (1960), 351-362.
- _____. 'Academic Re-discovery of Apocalyptic Ideas in the Seventeenth Century.' *Baptist Quarterly* 19 (1961), 29-34.
- Cooper, Tim. 'The Antinomians Redeemed: Removing Some of the "Radical" from Mid-Seventeenth-Century English Religion.' *Journal of Religious History* 24.3 (2000), 247-262.
- _____. *Fear and Polemic in Seventeenth-Century England: Richard Baxter and Antinomianism*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2001.
- Copeland, David A. *Benjamin Keach and the Development of Baptist Traditions in Seventeenth-Century England*. Lewiston, N.Y.: Edwin Mellen Press, 2001.
- 'covenant, n.' *Oxford English Dictionary, second ed.*, Oxford University Press, 1989.

- Cottret, Bernard. *Calvin: a Biography*. Translated by M. Wallace McDonald. Cambridge: William B. Eerdmans, 2000.
- Coward, Barry. *The Stuart Age: England, 1603-1714*. 3rd edn. Harlow: Longman, 2003.
- Cragg, Gerald R. *Puritanism in the Period of the Great Persecution, 1660-1668*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1957.
- Crosby, Thomas. *The History of the English Baptists from the Reformation to the Beginning of the Reign of George I*. 4 vols. London: printed for and sold by the editor, 1738.
- Cross, Anthony R., and Philip E. Thompson. *Baptist Sacramentalism*. Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 2003.
- _____. *Baptist Sacramentalism 2*. Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2008.
- Cross, Claire. *Church and People: England 1450-1660*. 2nd edn. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1999.
- Dale, R. W., and A. W. W. Dale. *History of English Congregationalism*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1907.
- Dallison, Anthony. 'Contemporary Criticism of Millenarianism.' in *Puritans, the Millennium and the Future of Israel*, ed. Peter Toon, 104-14. Cambridge: James Clarke and Co, 1970.
- _____. 'The Latter-Day Glory in the Thought of Thomas Goodwin.' *Evangelical Quarterly* 58.1 (1986), 53-68.
- Daniel, Curt D. 'Hyper-Calvinism and John Gill.' PhD Thesis, University of Edinburgh, 1983.
- Davies, Michael. 'Child, John (1638-1684).' *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://ezproxy.ouls.ox.ac.uk:2117/view/article/5288>, accessed 19 October 2009].
- de Jong, P. Y. 'Calvin's Contributions to Christian Education.' *Calvin Theological Journal* 2 (1967), 162-201.
- De Krey, Gary S. 'Cornish, Henry (d.1685).' *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://ezproxy.ouls.ox.ac.uk:2117/view/article/6332>, accessed 27 Jan 2009].
- De Molen, Richard L. 'Childhood and the Sacraments in the Sixteenth Century.' *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 66 (1975), 49-71.
- Decker, Gordon Stanley. 'Luther's Doctrines of Justification and Sanctification.' *Reformed Theological Review* 26 (1967), 64-70.

- Dever, Mark. *Richard Sibbes: Puritanism and Calvinism in Late Elizabethan and Early Stuart England*. Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 2000.
- Deweese, Charles W. *Baptist Church Covenants*. Nashville, Tenn.: Broadman Press, 1990.
- Dix, Kenneth. *Benjamin Keach and a Monument to Liberty*. Dunstable: Eanconberg, 1985.
- _____. *Strict and Particular: English Strict and Particular Baptists in the Nineteenth Century*. Didcot: The Baptist Historical Society for the Strict Baptist Historical Society, 2001.
- Dixon, Philip. *'Nice and Hot Disputes': the Doctrine of the Trinity in the Seventeenth Century*. London: T & T Clark, 2003.
- Donnelly, John Patrick. *Calvinism and Scholasticism in Vermigli's Doctrine of Man and Grace*. Leiden: Brill, 1976.
- Doran, Susan and Christopher Durston. *Princes, Pastors and People: the Church and Religion in England, 1500-1700*. 2nd edn. London: Routledge, 2003.
- Dowley, T. 'Baptists and Discipline in the Seventeenth Century.' *Baptist Quarterly* 24 (1971), 157-66.
- Dunan-Page, Anne. *Grace Overwhelming: John Bunyan, the Pilgrim's Progress and the Extremes of the Baptist Mind*. New York: Peter Lang, 2006.
- Durston, Christopher, and Jacqueline Eales, eds. *The Culture of English Puritanism, 1560-1700*. Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1996.
- Durston, Christopher, and Judith D. Maltby, eds. *Religion in Revolutionary England*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2006.
- Emerson, Everett H. 'Calvin and Covenant Theology.' *Church History* 25 (1956), 136-144.
- Espinasse, Francis. 'Egerton, John, second earl of Bridgewater (1623-1686).' rev. Louis A. Knafla. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, 2004 [http://ezproxy.ouls.ox.ac.uk:2117/view/article/8588, accessed 19 October 2009].
- Evans, Benjamin. *The Early English Baptists*. 2 vols. London, 1862.
- Farthing, John L. 'Foedus Evangelicum: Jerome Zanchi on the Covenant.' *Calvin Theological Journal* 29.1 (1994), 149-167.
- Ferguson, Sinclair B. 'The Teaching of the Confession.' in *The Westminster Confession in the Church Today: Papers Prepared for the Church of Scotland*

- Panel on Doctrine*, ed. Alasdair I. C. Heron, 28-39. Edinburgh: Saint Andrews Press, 1982.
- Fiddes, Paul S. 'Walking Together': The Place of Covenant Theology in Baptist Life Yesterday and Today.' in *Pilgrim Pathways: Essays in Baptist History in Honour of B. R. White*, eds William H. Brackney, Paul S. Fiddes and John Henry Y. Briggs, 47-74. Macon, Ga: Mercer University Press, 1999.
- Fincham, Kenneth, Peter Lake, and Nicholas Tyacke, eds. *Religious Politics in Post-Reformation England: Essays in Honour of Nicholas Tyacke*. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2006.
- Firth, Katharine R. *The Apocalyptic Tradition in Reformation Britain, 1530-1645*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979.
- Fix, Andrew C. *Prophecy and Reason: the Dutch Collegiants in the Early Enlightenment*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991.
- Fixler, Michael. *Milton and the Kingdoms of God*. London: Faber and Faber, 1964.
- Foreman, Harry. 'Some Seventeenth Century Baptist Educational Textbooks.' *Baptist Quarterly* 30 (1983), 112-124.
- Fowler, Stanley Keith. *More than a Symbol: the British Baptist Recovery of Baptismal Sacramentalism*. Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 2002.
- Franks, Robert S. *The Doctrine of the Trinity*. London: Duckworth, 1953.
- Gatiss, Lee. *From Life's First Cry: John Owen on Infant Baptism and Infant Salvation*. London: Latimer Trust, 2008.
- Geiter, Mary K. 'Penn, William (1644-1718).' *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/21857>, accessed 5 Sept 2008].
- Gibbs, Robert. *A History of Aylesbury with its Borough and Hundreds, the Hamlet of Walton, and the Electoral Division*. Aylesbury, 1885.
- Gillies, Scott A. 'Zwingli and the Origin of the Reformed Covenant 1524-7.' *Scottish Journal of Theology* 54.1 (2001), 21-50.
- Glebe Møller, Jens. 'Beginnings of Puritan Covenant theology.' *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 14.1 (1963), 46-67.
- Gordon, Bruce. *Protestant History and Identity in Sixteenth-Century Europe*. 2 vols. Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1996.
- Greaves, Richard L. 'John Bunyan and the Authorship of *Reprobation Asserted*.' *Baptist Quarterly* 21.3 (1965), 126-131.

- _____. 'The Origins and Early Development of English Covenant Thought.' *Historian* 31.1 (1968), 21.
- _____. *The Puritan Revolution and Educational Thought: Background for Reform*. New Brunswick, N.J: Rutgers Univ. Press, 1969.
- _____. 'Lamb (or Lambe), Thomas (d.1673).' in *Richard L. Greaves, and Robert Zaller, eds Biographical Dictionary of British Radicals in the Seventeenth Century*. II:164-66. Brighton, Sussex: Harvester Press, 1983.
- _____. *John Bunyan and English Nonconformity*. London: Hambledon Press, 1992.
- _____. *Glimpses of Glory: John Bunyan and English Dissent*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 2002.
- _____. 'Blackwood, Christopher (1607/8-1670).' *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/66423>, accessed 24 January 2008].
- _____. 'Charnock, Stephen (1628-1680).' *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://ezproxy.ouls.ox.ac.uk:2117/view/article/5172>, accessed 19 October 2009].
- _____. 'Greenhill, William (1597/8-1671).' *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://ezproxy.ouls.ox.ac.uk:2117/view/article/11429>, accessed 19 October 2009].
- _____. 'Hickes, John (1633-1685).' *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://ezproxy.ouls.ox.ac.uk:2117/view/article/13204>, accessed 27 Jan 2009].
- _____. 'Meade, Matthew (1628/9-1699).' *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://ezproxy.ouls.ox.ac.uk:2117/view/article/18466>, accessed 19 October 2009].
- Greaves, Richard L., and Robert Zaller, eds. *Biographical Dictionary of British Radicals in the Seventeenth Century*. Brighton, Sussex: Harvester Press, 1982.
- Green, I. M. 'For Children in Yeeres and Children in Understanding': the Emergence of the English Catechism under Elizabeth and the Early Stuarts.' *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 37.3 (1986), 397-425.
- _____. *The Christian's ABC: Catechisms and Catechizing in England c. 1530-1740*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.
- Gregory, Jeremy. 'The Eighteenth-Century Reformation: the Pastoral Task of Anglican Clergy after 1689.' in *The Church of England c. 1689-c. 1833: from Toleration to Tractarianism*, eds John Walsh, Colin Haydon, and Stephen Taylor, 67-85. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

- Greig, Martin. 'The Reasonableness of Christianity? Gilbert Burnet and the Trinitarian Controversy of the 1690s.' *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 44.4 (1993), 631-651.
- Grell, Ole Peter, Jonathan Irvine Israel, and Nicholas Tyacke, eds. *From Persecution to Toleration: the Glorious Revolution and Religion in England*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991.
- Gribben, Crawford. *The Puritan Millennium: Literature and Theology, 1550-1682*. 2nd rev. edn. Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2008.
- Griffiths, Steve. *Redeem the Time: the Problem of Sin in the Writings of John Owen*. Fearn: Mentor, 2001.
- Gritz, Paul Linton. 'Samuel Richardson and the Religious and Political Controversies Confronting the London Particular Baptists, 1643 to 1658.' Ph.D. Thesis, Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1987.
- Gurney, John. *Brave Community: the Digger Movement in the English Revolution*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007.
- Hagen, Kenneth. 'From Testament to Covenant in the Early Sixteenth Century.' *Sixteenth Century Journal* 3.1 (1972), 1-24.
- Hall, Basil. 'Calvin Against the Calvinists.' in *John Calvin*, ed. G. E. Duffield, 19-37. Berkshire: The Sutton Courtenay Press, 1966.
- Hampton, Stephen William Peter. *Anti-Arminians: the Anglican Reformed Tradition from Charles II to George I*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Hardon, John A. 'Believers' Baptism and the Sacrament of Confirmation.' *Foundations* 11.2 (1968), 127-135.
- Harris, Tim. *Popular Culture in England, c. 1500-1850*. Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1995.
- Harrison, Peter. *'Religion' and the Religions in the English Enlightenment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Haugaard, William P. 'The Continental Reformation of the Sixteenth Century.' in *A Faithful Church: Issues in the History of Catechesis*, eds John H. Westerhoff, and O. C. Edwards, 109-173. Wilton, Connecticut: Morehouse-Barlow Co., Inc., 1981.
- Hayden, Roger. *Continuity and Change: Evangelical Calvinism among Eighteenth-Century Baptist Ministers Trained at Bristol Academy, 1690-1791*. Chipping Norton, Oxon.: Nigel Lynn for Roger Hayden and the Baptist Historical Society, 2006.

- Haykin, Michael A. G. *Kiffin, Knollys and Keach: Rediscovering English Baptist Heritage*. Leeds: Reformation Today, 1996.
- _____. *The Life and Thought of John Gill (1697-1771): a Tercentennial Appreciation*. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- _____, ed. *The British Particular Baptists, 1638-1910*. Springfield, MO: Particular Baptist Press, 1998.
- _____. 'Kiffin, William (1616-1701).' *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://ezproxy.ouls.ox.ac.uk:2117/view/article/15521>, accessed 19 October 2009].
- Helm, Paul. 'John Bunyan and *Reprobation Asserted*.' *Baptist Quarterly* 28.2 (1979), 87-93.
- _____. 'Calvin and the Covenant: Unity and Continuity.' *Evangelical Quarterly* 55 (1983), 65-81.
- _____. *Calvin and the Calvinists*. Edinburgh: Banner of Truth Trust, 1998.
- Heppe, Heinrich. *Dogmatik des deutschen Protestantismus im sechzehnten Jahrhundert*. 3 vols. Gotha, 1857.
- _____. *Reformed Dogmatics: Set Out and Illustrated from the Sources*. Translated by G.T. Thomson, ed. Ernst Bizer. London: Allen & Unwin, 1950.
- Hessayon, Ariel, and Nicholas Keene, eds. *Scripture and Scholarship in Early Modern England*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006.
- Hesselink, I. John. 'Calvin's Theology.' in *The Cambridge Companion to John Calvin*, ed. Donald K. McKim, 74-92. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Hetet, J.S.T. 'A Literary Underground in Restoration England.' PhD Thesis, University of Cambridge, 1987.
- Hill, Christopher. 'History and Denominational History.' *Baptist Quarterly* 22.2 (1967), 65-71.
- _____. *Antichrist in Seventeenth Century England*. London: Oxford University Press, 1971.
- _____. 'William Harvey and the Idea of Monarchy.' in *The Intellectual Revolution of the Seventeenth Century*, ed. Charles Webster, 160-81. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1974.
- _____. *The Century of Revolution, 1603-1714*. 2nd edn. Wokingham: Van Nostrand Reinhold (UK), 1980.

- _____. *A Turbulent, Seditious, and Factious People: John Bunyan and His Church, 1628-1688*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- _____. *Change and Continuity in Seventeenth-Century England*. Rev. edn. New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 1991.
- _____. *Liberty Against the Law: Some Seventeenth-Century Controversies*. London: Allen Lane, 1996.
- Hill, Christopher, D. H. Pennington, and Keith Thomas, eds. *Puritans and Revolutionaries: Essays in Seventeenth-Century History Presented to Christopher Hill*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978.
- Hoekema, Anthony A. 'Covenant of Grace in Calvin's Teaching.' *Calvin Theological Journal* 2.2 (1967), 133-161.
- Holifield, E. Brooks. *The Covenant Sealed: the Development of Puritan Sacramental Theology in Old and New England, 1570-1720*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974.
- Hotson, Howard. *Paradise Postponed: Johann Henrich Alsted and the Birth of Calvinist Millenarianism*. Dordrecht; Boston; London: Kluwer Academic, 2000.
- Howson, Barry H. 'Eschatology in Sixteenth and Seventeenth Century England.' *Evangelical Quarterly* 70 (1998), 325-350.
- _____. 'The Question of Orthodoxy in the Theology of Hanserd Knollys (c. 1599-1691): A Seventeenth-Century English Calvinistic Baptist.' PhD Thesis, McGill University, 1999.
- _____. *Erroneous and Schismatical Opinions: the Questions of Orthodoxy Regarding the Theology of Hanserd Knollys (c. 1599-1691)*. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- Hudson, W.S. 'Baptists were not Anabaptists.' *The Chronicle* 16 (1953), 71-9.
- _____. 'Who were the Baptists.' *Baptist Quarterly* 16.7 (1956), 303-312.
- _____. 'Who were the Baptists.' *Baptist Quarterly* 17.2 (1957), 53-55.
- Huehns, Gertrude. *Antinomianism in English History: with Special Reference to the Period 1640-1660*. London: Cresset Press, 1951.
- Hughes, Ann. *Gangraena and the Struggle for the English Revolution*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Ivimey, Joseph. *A History of the English Baptists*. 4 vols. London, 1811-30.

- James, Muriel. *Religious Liberty on Trial: Hanserd Knollys, Early Baptist Hero*. Franklin, Tenn.: Providence House, 1997.
- Jewett, Paul K. *Infant Baptism and the Covenant of Grace*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1978.
- Johnson, Galen K. *Prisoner of Conscience: John Bunyan on Self, Community, and Christian Faith*. Carlisle: Paternoster, 2003.
- Johnson, Maxwell E., ed. *Living Water, Sealing Spirit: Readings on Christian Initiation*. Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1995.
- Johnston, Warren. 'The Anglican Apocalypse in Restoration England.' *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 55.3 (2004), 467-501.
- _____. 'Thomas Beverley and the 'Late Great Revolution': English Apocalyptic Expectation in the Late Seventeenth Century.' in *Scripture and Scholarship in Early Modern England*, eds Ariel Hessayon, and Nicholas Keene, 158-175. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006.
- Jones, Horatio Gates. 'The Baptists in Pennsylvania. Being a Sketch of the Pennepek or Lower Dublin Baptist Church.' *The Historical Magazine* IV [second series].2 (1868), 76-87.
- Jones, R. Tudur. 'The Life, Work, and Thought of Vavasor Powell (1617-1670).' DPhil Thesis, University of Oxford, 1947.
- Jordan, W. K. *The Development of Religious Toleration in England*. 4 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1932.
- Kapic, Kelly M. *Communion with God: the Divine and the Human in the Theology of John Owen*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Academic, 2007.
- Karlberg, Mark W. 'The Mosaic Covenant and the Concept of Works in Reformed Hermeneutics: a Historical-Critical Analysis with Particular Attention to Early Covenant Eschatology.' Th.D. Thesis, Westminster Theological Seminary, 1980.
- _____. 'Reformed Interpretation of the Mosaic Covenant.' *Westminster Theological Journal* 43.1 (1980), 1-57.
- _____. 'The Original State of Adam: Tensions within Reformed Theology.' *Evangelical Quarterly* 59.4 (1987), 291-309.
- _____. 'Covenant and Common Grace.' *Westminster Theological Journal* 50.2 (1988), 323-37.
- _____. 'Moses and Christ: the Place of Law in Seventeenth-Century Puritanism.' *Trinity Journal* 10.1 (1989), 11-32.

- _____. 'Covenant Theology and the Westminster Tradition.' *Westminster Theological Journal* 54.1 (1992), 135-52.
- Kavanagh, Aidan. *The Shape of Baptism: the Rite of Christian Initiation*. 2nd edn. Collegeville, Minnesota: Pueblo Pub. Co, 1991.
- Kay, Brian K. *Trinitarian Spirituality: John Owen and the Doctrine of God in Western Devotion*. Milton Keynes: Paternoster Press, 2007.
- Keeble, N. H. *The Literary Culture of Nonconformity in Later Seventeenth-Century England*. Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1987.
- _____. *John Bunyan: Conventicle and Parnassus: Tercentenary Essays*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988.
- _____. *John Bunyan: Reading, Dissenting, Writing*. Oxford: P. Lang, 2002.
- _____. *The Restoration: England in the 1660s*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2002.
- Keene, Derek, Peter Earle, Craig Spence and Janet Barnes, eds. *Four Shillings In The Pound Aid 1693/4: The City of London, the City of Westminster, and Metropolitan Middlesex*, 1992.
- Keene, Nicholas. 'Knatchbull, Sir Norton, first baronet (1602-1685).' *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://ezproxy.ouls.ox.ac.uk:2117/view/article/15703>, accessed 19 October 2009].
- Kelly, James William. 'Flavell, John (bap. 1630, d. 1691).' *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://ezproxy.ouls.ox.ac.uk:2117/view/article/9678>, accessed 19 October 2009].
- Kemp, Geoff. 'Twyn, John (bap. 1619, d. 1664).' *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://ezproxy.ouls.ox.ac.uk:2117/view/article/68209>, accessed 19 October 2009].
- Kendall, R. T. *Calvin and English Calvinism to 1649*. Carlisle: Paternoster, 1997.
- Kennedy, Kevin Dixon. *Union with Christ and the Extent of the Atonement in Calvin*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing, 2002.
- Kevan, Ernest Frederick. *The Grace of Law: a Study in Puritan Theology*. London: Carey Kingsgate Press, 1964.
- Kingdon, David. *Children of Abraham: A Reformed Baptist View of Baptism, the Covenant, and Children*. Sussex: Carey Publications, 1973.
- King-Farlow, John, and David W. Hunt. 'Perspectives on the Fall of Man.' *Scottish Journal of Theology* 35.3 (1982), 193-204.

- Kliever, Lonnie D. 'General Baptist Origins: The Question of Anabaptist Influence.' *The Mennonite Quarterly Review* XXXVI.4 (1962), 290-321.
- Kromminga, D. H. *The Millennium in the Church: Studies in the History of Christian Chilliiasm*. Grand Rapids, Mich: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1945.
- Krych, Margaret A. 'The Catechism in Christian Education.' *Word & World* 10 (1990), 43-47.
- Lake, Peter. 'The Significance of the Elizabethan Identification of the Pope as Antichrist.' *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 31.2 (1980), 161-178.
- _____. 'William Bradshaw, Antichrist and the Community of the Godly.' *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 36.4 (1985), 570-589.
- _____. *Anglicans and Puritans?: Presbyterianism and English Conformist Thought from Whitgift to Hooker*. London: Unwin Hyman, 1988.
- Lake, Peter, and Michael C. Questier, eds. *Conformity and Orthodoxy in the English Church, c.1560-1660*. Woodbridge: Boydell, 2000.
- Lamont, William. *Richard Baxter and the Millennium: Protestant Imperialism and the English Revolution*. London: Croom Helm, 1979.
- _____. 'Muggleton, Lodowicke (1609-1698).' *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/19496>, accessed 29 Jan 2009].
- Land, Richard D. 'Doctrinal Controversies of English Particular Baptists (1644-1691) as Illustrated by the Career and Writings of Thomas Collier.' DPhil Thesis, University of Oxford, 1979.
- Laurence, Anne, W. R. Owens, and Stuart Sim, eds. *John Bunyan and His England, 1628-88*. London: Hambledon Press, 1990.
- Lawrence, Kathleen Rockwell. 'Childhood Religion and the Loss of Innocence.' *Books and Religion* 14.8 (1986), 3, 10.
- Lee, Jason K. *The Theology of John Smyth: Puritan, Separatist, Baptist, Mennonite*. Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 2003.
- Letham, Robert. 'The Foedus Operum: Some Factors Accounting for its Development.' *Sixteenth Century Journal* 14.4 (1983), 456-467.
- _____. 'Faith and Assurance in Early Calvinism: A Model of Continuity and Diversity.' in *Later Calvinism: International Perspectives*, ed. W. Fred Graham, 355-384. Kirksville, MO: Sixteenth Century Journal Publishers, 1994.

- Lettinga, Neil. 'Covenant Theology Turned Upside Down: Henry Hammond and Caroline Anglican Moralism: 1643-1660.' *Sixteenth Century Journal* 24.3 (1993), 653-669.
- Lewalski, Barbara Kiefer. *The Life of John Milton: a Critical Biography*. revised edn. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 2003.
- Lillback, Peter A. 'Ursinus' Development of the Covenant of Creation: a Debt to Melancthon or Calvin?' *Westminster Theological Journal* 43.2 (1981), 247-88.
- _____. 'The Continuing Conundrum: Calvin and the Conditionality of the Covenant.' *Calvin Theological Journal* 29.1 (1994), 42-74.
- _____. *The Binding of God: Calvin's Role in the Development of Covenant Theology*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Academic, 2001.
- Lillywhite, Bryant. *London Coffee Houses: a Reference Book of Coffee Houses of the Seventeenth, Eighteenth, and Nineteenth Centuries*. London: G. Allen and Unwin, 1963.
- Lim, Paul Chang-Ha. *In Pursuit of Purity, Unity, and Liberty: Richard Baxter's Puritan Ecclesiology in its Seventeenth-Century Context*. Boston: Brill, 2004.
- Lim, Walter S. H. *John Milton, Radical Politics, and Biblical Republicanism*. Newark, Del.: University of Delaware Press, 2006.
- Lincoln, Charles Fred. 'The Development of the Covenant Theory.' *Bibliotheca Sacra* 100.397 (1943), 134-63.
- Liu, Dai. *Discord in Zion: the Puritan Divines and the Puritan Revolution 1640-1660*. The Hague: Nijhoff, 1973.
- Lorenzen, Thorwald 'Baptism and Church Membership: Some Baptist Positions and Their Ecumenical Implications.' *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 18 (1981), 561-574.
- Lynch, Beth. *John Bunyan and the Language of Conviction*. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2004.
- MacCulloch, Diarmaid. *The Later Reformation in England, 1547-1603*. 2nd edn. Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2001.
- _____. *The Boy King: Edward VI and the Protestant Reformation*. New York: Palgrave for St. Martin's Press, 2002.
- _____. *The Reformation*. New York: Viking, 2003.
- MacDonald, Finlay A. 'Baptised Children, Confirmation and Holy Communion.' *Scottish Journal of Theology* 33.6 (1980), 551-65.

- MacDonald, Murdina D. 'London Calvinistic Baptists, 1689-1727: Tensions Within a Dissenting Community under Toleration.' DPhil Thesis, University of Oxford, 1983.
- Maclear, James F. 'New England and the Fifth Monarchy: the Quest for the Millennium in Early American Puritanism.' in *Puritan New England: Essays on Religion, Society, and Culture*, eds Alden T. Vaughan, and Francis J. Bremer, 66-91. New York: St Martin's Press, 1977.
- Manley, Kenneth Ross. 'Origins of the Baptists: The Case for Development from Puritanism-Separatism.' *Baptist History and Heritage* 22.4 (1987), 34-46.
- Manuel, Frank Edward. *The Religion of Isaac Newton*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1974.
- Marquart, Kurt E. 'Antinomian Aversion to Sanctification?' *Concordia Theological Quarterly* 67.3-4 (2003), 379-81.
- Marshall, Alan. 'Oates, Titus (1649-1705).' *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/20437>, accessed 19 Jan 2009].
- Marthaler, Berard L. *The Catechism Yesterday and Today: the Evolution of a Genre*. Collegeville, Minn: Liturgical Press, 1995.
- Martin, Hugh. *Puritanism and Richard Baxter*. London: SCM Pr, 1954.
- _____. *Benjamin Keach (1640-1704): Pioneer of Congregational Hymn Singing*. London: Independent Press, 1961.
- McBeth, Leon. *The Baptist Heritage*. Nashville, Tenn: Broadman Press, 1987.
- McCoy, Charles S. 'Johannes Cocceius: Federal Theologian.' *Scottish Journal of Theology* 16 (1963), 352-70.
- _____. 'History, Humanity, and Federalism in the Theology and Ethics of Johannes Cocceius.' in *Covenant Connection* 55-69. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2000.
- McGiffert, Michael. 'Grace and Works: The Rise and Division of Covenant Divinity in Elizabethan Puritanism.' *The Harvard Theological Review* 75.4 (1982), 463-502.
- _____. 'From Moses to Adam: the Making of the Covenant of Works.' *Sixteenth Century Journal* 19.2 (1988), 131-55.
- McGowan, A. T. B. 'Justification and the Ordo Salutis.' in *Justification in Perspective*, ed. Bruce L. McCormack, 147-63. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2006.

- McGrath, Alister E. 'Justification in earlier evangelicalism.' *Churchman* 98.3 (1984), 217-28.
- _____. *Reformation Thought: an Introduction*. 3rd edn. Oxford: Blackwell, 1999.
- _____. *Iustitia Dei: a History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification*. 3rd edn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- McGrath, Gavin John. 'Puritans and the Human Will: Voluntarism within Mid-Seventeenth-Century English Puritanism as Seen in the Works of Richard Baxter and John Owen.' Ph.D. Thesis, University of Durham, 1989.
- _____. *Grace and Duty in Puritan Spirituality*. Bramcote: Grove, 1991.
- McGregor, J. F., and Barry Reay, eds. *Radical Religion in the English Revolution*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984.
- McKim, Donald K. *Major Themes in the Reformed Tradition*. Grand Rapids, Mich: W.B. Eerdmans, 1992.
- _____. *The Westminster Handbook to Reformed Theology*. Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001.
- McLachlan, H. John. *Socinianism in Seventeenth-Century England*. London: Oxford University Press, 1951.
- Middleton, Robert G. 'Believers' Baptism and the Sacrament of Confirmation.' *Foundations* 11.2 (1968), 136-147.
- Morden, Peter J. *Offering Christ to the World: Andrew Fuller (1754-1815) and the Revival of Eighteenth-Century Particular Baptist Life*. Carlisle: Paternoster, 2003.
- Morgan, Edmund Sears. *Visible Saints: the History of a Puritan Idea*. New York: New York University Press, 1965.
- Morris, Herbert. *On Guilt and Innocence*. Univ of California Press, 1976.
- Mortimer, Sarah. 'The Challenge of Socinianism in Mid-Seventeenth Century England.' DPhil Thesis, University of Oxford, 2007.
- Mosteller, James D. 'Baptists and Anabaptists' *The Chronicle* 20 (1957), 3-24, 100-15.
- Mouw, Richard J. 'Baptism and the Salvific Status of Children: an Examination of Some Intra-Reformed Debates.' *Calvin Theological Journal* 41.2 (2006), 238-54.

- Muller, Richard A. 'Covenant and Conscience in English Reformed Theology: Three Variations on a 17th Century Theme.' *Westminster Theological Journal* 42.2 (1980), 308-34.
- _____. 'The Spirit and the Covenant: John Gill's Critique of the Pactum Salutis.' *Foundations* 24.1 (1981), 4-14.
- _____. *Christ and the Decree: Christology and Predestination in Reformed Theology from Calvin to Perkins*. Durham, N.C: Labyrinth Press, 1986.
- _____. 'The Covenant of Works and the Stability of Divine Law in Seventeenth-Century Reformed Orthodoxy: A Study in the Theology of Herman Witsius and Wilhelmus à Brakel.' *Calvin Theological Journal* 29.1 (1994), 75-100.
- _____. *After Calvin: Studies in the Development of a Theological Tradition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- _____. *Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics: the Rise and Development of Reformed Orthodoxy, ca. 1520 to ca. 1725*. 4 vols. 2nd edn. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Academic, 2003.
- _____. 'The Placement of Predestination in Reformed Theology: Issue or Non-issue?' *Calvin Theological Journal* 40.2 (2005), 184-210.
- Mullett, Michael A. 'Radical Sects and Dissenting Churches, 1600-1750.' in *A History of Religion in Britain: Practice and Belief from Pre-Roman Times to the Present*, eds Sheridan Gilley, and W. J. Sheils, 188-210. Oxford: Blackwell, 1994.
- _____. *John Bunyan in Context*. Keele: Keele University Press, 1996.
- Murphy, Andrew R. *Conscience and Community: Revisiting Toleration and Religious Dissent in Early Modern England and America*. University Park, Pa.: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2001.
- Neal, Daniel. *The History of the Puritans, or, Protestant nonconformists from the Reformation in 1517, to the Revolution in 1688; comprising an account of their principles, their attempts for a farther reformation in the church, their sufferings, and the lives and characters of their most considerable divinities*. 3 vols. New edition, revised corrected and enlarged. London: Thomas Tegg, 1837.
- Nettles, Tom J. 'Benjamin Keach (1640-1704).' in *The British Particular Baptists: 1638-1910*, ed. Michael A. G. Haykin, 1:95-132. Springfield, MO: Particular Baptist Press, 1998.
- _____. *Teaching Truth, Training Hearts: the Study of Catechisms in Baptist Life*. Amityville, N.Y.: Calvary Press, 1998.

- Neunheuser, Burkhard. *Baptism and Confirmation*. Translated by John Jay Hughes. London: Burns and Oates, 1964.
- Newport, Kenneth G. C. 'Benjamin Keach, William of Orange and the Book of Revelation: A Study in English Prophetic Exegesis.' *Baptist Quarterly* 36.1 (1995), 43-51.
- _____. 'Knollys, Hanserd (1598-1691).' *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://ezproxy.ouls.ox.ac.uk:2117/view/article/15756>, accessed 19 October 2009].
- Nicholson, J. F. V. 'The Office of "Messenger" Amongst British Baptists in the 17th and 18th Centuries.' *Baptist Quarterly* 17.5 (1958), 206-25.
- Novak, Michael James. 'Thy Will Be Done: The Theology of the English Particular Baptists, 1638-1660.' PhD Thesis, Harvard University, 1979.
- Nuttall, Geoffrey Fillingham. 'Richard Baxter's Correspondence: a Preliminary Survey.' *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 1.1 (1950), 85-95.
- _____. 'Richard Baxter's Apology (1654): Its Occasion and Composition.' *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 4.1 (1953), 69-76.
- _____. *Visible Saints: the Congregational Way, 1640-1660*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1957.
- _____. *The Beginnings of Nonconformity*. London: J. Clarke, 1964.
- _____. *Richard Baxter*. London: Nelson, 1965.
- _____. *The Puritan Spirit: Essays and Addresses*. London: Epworth Press, 1967.
- _____. *The Holy Spirit in Puritan Faith and Experience*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.
- Nuttall, Geoffrey Fillingham, and Owen Chadwick, eds. *From Uniformity to Unity, 1662-1962*. London: S.P.C.K, 1962.
- Oberman, Heiko Augustinus. *The Harvest of Medieval Theology: Gabriel Biel and Late Medieval Nominalism*. 3rd edn. Durham, N.C: Labyrinth Press, 1983.
- Old, Hughes Oliphant. *The Shaping of the Reformed Baptismal Rite in the Sixteenth Century*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992.
- Oliver, Robert W., ed. *John Owen: the Man and His Theology*. Darlington: Evangelical Press, 2002.
- Ong, Walter J. *Ramus, Method and the Decay of Dialogue: From the Art of Discourse to the Art of Reason*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004.

- Osmer, Richard Robert. 'The Case for Catechism.' *Christian Century* 114 (1997), 408-12.
- _____. 'The Christian Education of Children in the Protestant Tradition.' *Theology Today* 56.4 (2000), 506-23.
- Osterhaven, M. Eugene. 'Calvin on the Covenant.' *Reformed Review* 33.3 (1980), 136-49.
- Ottesen, James R. *The Levellers: Overton, Walwyn and Lilburne*. 5 vols. Bristol: Thoemmes, 2003.
- Packer, J. I. 'The Puritan Treatment of Justification by Faith.' *Evangelical Quarterly* 24 (1952), 131-43.
- _____. *The Pilgrim's Principles: John Bunyan Revisited*. London: St Antholin's Lectureship Charity, 1999.
- _____. *The Redemption & Restoration of Man in the Thought of Richard Baxter: a Study in Puritan Theology*. Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 2003.
- Page, William. *A History of the County of Buckingham*. Victoria History of the Counties of England. London: Constable & Co, 1920.
- Parnham, David. 'The Humbling of 'High Presumption': Tobias Crisp Dismantles the Puritan Ordo Salutis.' *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 56.1 (2005), 50-74.
- _____. 'The Covenantal Quietism of Tobias Crisp.' *Church History* 75.3 (2006), 511-43.
- Patrides, Constantinos A. and Joseph Wittreich. *The Apocalypse in English Renaissance Thought and Literature: Patterns, Antecedents and Repercussions*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1984.
- Payne, Ernest A. *The Baptist Movement in the Reformation and Onwards*. London: Kingsgate Press, 1947.
- _____. 'Baptism and Church Membership among the Baptists.' *Theology* 55 (1952), 170-73.
- _____. 'Baptists and the Laying on of Hands.' *Baptist Quarterly* 15 (1954), 203-15.
- _____. 'Who Were the Baptists?' *The Baptist Quarterly* 16 (1956), 339-42.
- _____. 'Contacts Between the Baptists and Anabaptists.' *Foundations* IV (1961), 39-55.
- _____. 'Baptists and Christian Initiation.' *Baptist Quarterly* 26 (1975), 147-57.

- Payne, Jon D. *John Owen on the Lord's Supper*. Edinburgh: Banner of Truth Trust, 2004.
- Peterson, Robert A. *Calvin and the Atonement*. Rev. edn. Fearn: Mentor, 1999.
- Pettegree, Andrew, ed. *The Early Reformation in Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Pettit, Norman. *The Heart Prepared: Grace and Conversion in Puritan Spiritual Life*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1966.
- Plomer, Henry Robert. *A dictionary of the booksellers and printers who were at work in England, Scotland and Ireland from 1641 to 1667*. London, 1907.
- _____. *A dictionary of the printers and booksellers who were at work in England, Scotland and Ireland from 1668 to 1725*. [Oxford]: printed for the Bibliographical Society at the Oxford University Press, 1922.
- Poll, G. J. van de. *Martin Bucer's Liturgical Ideas*. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1954.
- Popkin, Richard H., ed. *Millenarianism and Messianism in English Literature and Thought, 1650-1800: Clark Library lectures, 1981-1982*. Leiden: Brill, 1988.
- Procter, Francis and Walter Howard Frere. *A New History of The Book of Common Prayer: with a Rationale of Its Offices*. London: Macmillan, 1902.
- Raitt, Jill. *The Eucharistic Theology of Theodore Beza: Development of the Reformed Doctrine*. Chambersburg, Pa: American Academy of Religion, 1972.
- _____. 'Theodore Beza: 1519-1605.' in *Shapers of Religious Traditions in Germany, Switzerland, and Poland, 1560-1600*, ed. Jill Raitt, 89-104. London: Yale University Press, 1981.
- Ramsbottom, B. A. *Stranger than Fiction: the Life of William Kiffin*. Harpenden: Gospel Standard Trust, 1989.
- Rehnman, Sebastian. *Divine Discourse: the Theological Methodology of John Owen*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2002.
- Reid, J.K.S. 'Theological Issues Involved in Baptism.' *Expository Times* 61, 201-204.
- Rendell, Kingsley G. *Samuel Rutherford: a New Biography of the Man and His Ministry*. Fearn, Ross-shire, Scotland: Christian Focus, 2003.
- Renihan, James M. *Edification and Beauty: the Practical Ecclesiology of the English Particular Baptists, 1675-1705*. Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2008.
- Reu, J.M. *Dr. Martin Luther's Small Catechism: a History of Its Origin, Its Distribution and Its Use*. Chicago, 1929.

- Riker, David Bowman. 'A Catholic Reformed Theologian: Federalism and Baptism in the Thought of Benjamin Keach, 1640-1704 [unsubmitted re-draft].' PhD Thesis, University of Aberdeen, 2006.
- Rinaldi, Frank W. *The Tribe of Dan: the New Connexion of General Baptists 1770-1891: a Study in the Transition from Revival Movement to Established Denomination*. Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2008.
- Rivers, Isabel. *Reason, Grace, and Sentiment: a Study of the Language of Religion and Ethics in England, 1660-1780*. 2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Roberts, Stephen K. 'Powell, Vavasor (1617-1670).' *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://ezproxy.ouls.ox.ac.uk:2117/view/article/22662>, accessed 19 October 2009].
- Robertson, Geoffrey and Philip Baker. *The Putney Debates: the Levellers. Revolutions*. London: Verso, 2007.
- Rogers, John and Edward Rogers. *Some Account of the Life and Opinions of a Fifth-Monarchy-Man, chiefly extr. from the writings of J. Rogers by E. Rogers*. London: s.n., 1867.
- Rogers, P. G. *The Fifth Monarchy Men*. London: Oxford University Press, 1966.
- Rolston, Holmes, III. 'Responsible Man in Reformed Theology: Calvin Versus the Westminster Confession.' *Scottish Journal of Theology* 23 (1970), 129-56.
- Roschke, Ronald W. 'Catechism on Luther's Catechisms.' *Currents in Theology and Mission* 4 (1977), 68-75.
- Rose, Craig. 'The Origins and Ideals of the SPCK 1699-1716.' in *The Church of England c. 1689-c. 1833: from Toleration to Tractarianism*, eds John Walsh, Colin Haydon, and Stephen Taylor, 172-190. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Rosman, Doreen M. *From Catholic to Protestant: Religion and the People in Tudor England*. London: UCL Press, 1996.
- Roth, John D. 'Family, Community and Discipleship in the Anabaptist-Mennonite Tradition.' *Mennonite Quarterly Review* 75.2 (2001), 147-272.
- Rushbrooke, J. H. *The Faith of the Baptists: Papers on Belief and Polity, Being the Substance of Addresses Delivered at the Assembly of the Baptist Union of Great Britain and Ireland Held in Leeds, May 1926*. London: Kingsgate, 1926.
- Russell, Conrad. *The Origins of the English Civil War*. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1973.

- Sabeau, David. 'Theological Rationalism of Moïse Amyraut.' *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 55.2 (1964), 204-16.
- Schroeder, H. J. *Disciplinary Decrees of the General Councils, Text, Translation, and Commentary*. London: B. Herder Book Co, 1937.
- _____. *Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent: Original Text with English Translation*. St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co, 1941.
- Schwartz, Hillel. 'Early Anabaptist Ideas about the Nature of Children.' *Mennonite Quarterly Review* 47.2 (1973), 102-14.
- Schwarz, R. 'Luthers Rechtfertigungslehre als Eckstein der christlichen Theologie und Kirche.' *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 10 (1998), 14-46.
- Seaver, Paul S. *The Puritan Lectureships: the Politics of Religious Dissent, 1560-1662*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1970.
- Shami, Jeanne. *John Donne and Conformity in Crisis in the Late Jacobean Pulpit*. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2003.
- Sheils, W. J. *Persecution and Toleration*. Oxford: Published for the Ecclesiastical History Society by Basil Blackwell, 1984.
- Smith, David L. *The Stuart Parliaments 1603-1689*. London: Arnold, 1999.
- Smith, Nigel. *Perfection Proclaimed: Language and Literature in English Radical Religion, 1640-1660*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989.
- _____. 'Whitehead, George (1637-1724).' *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/29287>, accessed 8 Sept 2008].
- Smith, R.D. 'Ainsworth, Robert (1660-1743).' *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://ezproxy.ouls.ox.ac.uk:2117/view/article/241>, accessed 19 October 2009].
- Snobelen, Stephen D. 'Best, Paul (1590-1657).' *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://ezproxy.ouls.ox.ac.uk:2117/view/article/2291>, accessed 19 October 2009].
- _____. 'Biddle, John (1615/16-1662).' *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://ezproxy.ouls.ox.ac.uk:2117/view/article/2361>, accessed 19 October 2009].
- _____. 'Isaac Newton, Socinianism and 'the one supreme God'.' in *Socinianism and Arminianism: Antitrinitarians, Calvinists, and Cultural Exchange in Seventeenth-Century Europe*, eds Martin Mulrow, and Jan Rohls, 241-93. Leiden: Brill, 2005.

- _____. ‘“To us there is but one God, the Father”: Antitrinitarian Textual Criticism in Seventeenth- and Early Eighteenth-Century England.’ in *Scripture and Scholarship in Early Modern England*, eds Ariel Hessayon, and Nicholas Keene, 116-136. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2006.
- Solt, Leo F. ‘The Fifth Monarchy Men: Politics and the Millennium.’ *Church History* 30 (1961), 314-24.
- Southcombe, George. ‘The Responses of Nonconformists to the Restoration in England.’ DPhil Thesis, University of Oxford, 2005.
- Spalding, J. C. ‘The Demise of English Presbyterianism 1660-1760.’ *Church History* 28 (1959), 63-83.
- Spears, William Eugene. ‘The Baptist Movement in England in the Late Seventeenth Century as Reflected in the Work and Thought of Benjamin Keach, 1640-1704.’ PhD Thesis, Edinburgh University, 1953.
- Spence, Alan. *Incarnation and Inspiration: John Owen and the Coherence of Christology*. London: T & T Clark, 2007.
- Spierling, Karen E. *Infant Baptism in Reformation Geneva: the Shaping of a Community, 1536-1564*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005.
- Spufford, Margaret. ‘The Importance of Religion in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries.’ in *The World of Rural Dissenters, 1520-1725*, ed. Margaret Spufford, 1-102. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- _____. *The World of Rural Dissenters: 1520-1725*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Spurr, John. *The Restoration Church of England, 1646-1689*. New Haven ; London: Yale University Press, 1991.
- _____. *English Puritanism 1603-1689*. Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1998.
- _____. ‘Taylor, Jeremy (bap. 1613, d. 1667).’ *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://ezproxy.ouls.ox.ac.uk:2117/view/article/27041>, accessed 19 October 2009].
- _____. *The Post-Reformation: Religion, Politics and Society in Britain, 1603-1714*. Harlow: Longman, 2006.
- Starr, Edward Caryl. *A Baptist Bibliography, Being a Register of printed Material by and about Baptists; Including Works Written against the Baptists*. Philadelphia: Published by the Judson Press for the Samuel Colgate Baptist Historical Collection Colgate University, 1947.
- Stassen, Glen Harold. ‘Anabaptist Influence in the Origin of the Particular Baptists.’ *Mennonite Quarterly Review* 36.4 (1962), 322-48.

- Steinmetz, David Curtis. *Reformers in the Wings: from Geiler von Kaysersberg to Theodore Beza*. 2nd edn. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Stewart, M. A. *English Philosophy in the Age of Locke*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000.
- Stoever, William K. B. 'Nature, Grace and John Cotton: the Theological Dimension in the New England Antinomian Controversy.' *Church History* 44.1 (1975), 22-33.
- _____. *A Faire and Easie Way to Heaven: Covenant Theology and Antinomianism in Early Massachusetts*. 1st edn. Middletown, Conn.: Wesleyan University Press, 1978.
- Strauss, Gerald. 'The Reformation and Its Public in an Age of Orthodoxy.' in *The German People and the Reformation*, ed. R. Po-chia Hsia, 194-214. London: Cornell University Press, 1988.
- Strehle, Stephen. *Calvinism, Federalism, and Scholasticism: a Study of the Reformed Doctrine of Covenant*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1988.
- _____. 'Universal Grace and Amyraldianism.' *Westminster Theological Journal* 51.2 (1989), 345-57.
- Sutherland, Martin P. *Peace, Toleration and Decay: the Ecclesiology of Later Stuart Dissent*. Carlisle: Paternoster, 2003.
- Sutton, John. 'Leigh, Edward (1603-1671).' *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://ezproxy.ouls.ox.ac.uk:2117/view/article/16378>, accessed 19 October 2009].
- Svigel, Michael J. *The Phantom Heresy: Did the Council of Ephesus (431) Condemn Chiliasm?* n.d.
- Swatland, Andrew. *The House of Lords in the Reign of Charles II*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Tavard, George H. 'Scripture and Tradition Among Seventeenth-Century Recusants.' *Theological Studies* 25.3 (1964), 343-85.
- Taylor, Adam. *The History of the English General Baptists*. 2 vols. London: printed for the author, by T. Bore, Raven row, Mile-End Turnpike; and sold by Button and Son, Paternoster Row; Maxwell, Temple Bar; J. Mann, Commercial Road, London; Wilkins, Derby; Noble, Boston; &c. &c., 1818.
- Tennant, David F. 'Anabaptist Theologies of Childhood and Education.' *Baptist Quarterly* 28 (1982).

- Terrill, Edward, and Nathaniel Haycroft. *The Records of a Church of Christ Meeting in Broadmead, Bristol, A.D. 1640 to A.D. 1688*. London: J. Heaton & Son, 1865.
- Thomas, G. Michael. *The Extent of the Atonement: a Dilemma for Reformed Theology from Calvin to the Consensus (1536-1675)*. Carlisle, Cumbria: Paternoster, 1997.
- Thomas, R. 'Comprehension and Indulgence.' in *From Uniformity to Unity, 1662-1962*, eds Geoffrey Fillingham Nuttall, and Owen Chadwick. London: S.P.C.K., 1962.
- Thompsett, Fredrica Harris. 'Godly Instruction in Reformation England: The Challenge of Religious Education in the Tudor Commonwealth.' in *A Faithful Church: Issues in the History of Catechesis*, eds John H. Westerhoff, and O. C. Edwards, 174-203. Wilton, Connecticut: Morehouse-Barlow Co., Inc., 1981.
- Thompson, Philip. 'A New Question in Baptist History.' *Pro Ecclesia* 8 (1999), 51-72.
- Thornbury, George Walter. *Old and New London: a Narrative of its History, its People and its Places*. London: s.n., 1879.
- Thorson, Stephen. 'Tensions in Calvin's View of Faith: Unexamined Assumptions in R T Kendall's Calvin and English Calvinism to 1649.' *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 37 (1994), 413-26.
- Thrupp, Sylvia L. *Millennial Dreams in Action: Essays in Comparative Studies*. The Hague: Mouton, 1962.
- Tolmie, Murray. *The Triumph of the Saints: the Separate Churches of London, 1616-1649*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977.
- Toon, Peter. *The Emergence of Hyper-Calvinism in English Nonconformity, 1689-1765*. London: Olive Tree, 1967.
- _____. *Puritans, the Millennium and the Future of Israel: Puritan Eschatology, 1600 to 1660*. Cambridge: James Clarke, 2002 reprint.
- Torrance, James B. 'Strengths and Weaknesses of the Westminster Theology.' in *The Westminster Confession*, ed. Alisdair Heron, 40-53. Edinburgh: St. Andrew Press, 1982.
- Towner, W. Sibley. 'Were the English Puritans "the Saints of the Most High": Issues in the "Pre-Critical" Interpretation of Daniel 7.' *Interpretation* 37.1 (1983), 46-63.
- Trinterud, Leonard J. 'The Origins of Puritanism.' *Church History* 20 (1951), 37-57.

- Trueman, Carl R. *John Owen: Reformed Catholic, Renaissance Man*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007.
- _____. 'Calvin and Calvinism.' in *The Cambridge Companion to John Calvin*, ed. Donald K. McKim, 225-44. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Tudor, Philippa. 'Religious Instruction for Children and Adolescents in the Early English Reformation.' *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* xxxv (1984), 391-413.
- Turrell, James F. "'Until Such Time as He Be Confirmed': The Laudians and Confirmation in the Seventeenth-Century Church of England.' *The Seventeenth Century* 20.2 (2005), 204-22.
- Tuveson, Ernest Lee. *Millennium and Utopia: a Study in the Background of the Idea of Progress*. New York: Harper & Row, 1964.
- Tyacke, Nicholas. *Anti-Calvinists: the Rise of English Arminianism c.1590-1640*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987.
- _____. *The Fortunes of English Puritanism, 1603-1640*. London: Dr. Williams's Trust, 1990.
- _____. *Aspects of English Protestantism, c.1530-1700*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2001.
- Underdown, David. *Revel, Riot, and Rebellion: Popular Politics and Culture in England 1603-1660*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987.
- Underwood, A. C. 'The Place of Conversion in Christian Experience.' *Baptist Quarterly* 6 (1932), 157-63.
- _____. *A History of the English Baptists*. London: Baptist Union Publication Dept., 1947.
- Underwood, T. L. 'Child Dedication Services Among British Baptists in the Seventeenth Century.' *Baptist Quarterly* 23 (1969), 165-69.
- _____. *Primitivism, Radicalism, and the Lamb's War: the Baptist-Quaker Conflict in Seventeenth-Century England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Vaughn, James Barry. 'Public Worship and Practical Theology in the Work of Benjamin Keach (1640-1704).' PhD Thesis, University of St Andrews, 1989.
- _____. 'Benjamin Keach.' in *Baptist Theologians*, eds Timothy George, and David S. Dockery, 49-76. Nashville, Tenn.: Broadman Press, 1990.
- Visser, Derk. 'The Covenant in Zacharias Ursinus.' *Sixteenth Century Journal* 18.4 (1987), 531-44.

- Von Rohr, John. *The Covenant of Grace in Puritan Thought*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986.
- Wakefield, Gordon S. *John Bunyan the Christian*. London: Fount, 1994.
- Walker, Austin. *The Excellent Benjamin Keach*. Dundas, ON: Joshua Press, 2004.
- _____. 'Benjamin Keach and the Protestant Cause Under Persecution.' *The 2nd Annual Andrew Fuller Center for Baptist Studies Conference* (2008).
- _____. 'Benjamin Keach (1640-1704): Tailor Turned Preacher.' in *Pulpit and People*, ed. J. H. Y. Briggs, 25-42. Milton Keynes: Paternoster Press, 2009.
- Walker, Michael J. 'Relation of Infants to Church, Baptism and Gospel in Seventeenth Century Baptist Theology.' *Baptist Quarterly* 21(1966), 242-62.
- Walker, Williston. *The Creeds and Platforms of Congregationalism*. Boston: Pilgrim Press, 1960.
- Wallace, Dewey D. *Puritans and Predestination: Grace in English Protestant Theology, 1525-1695*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1982.
- Walsh, John, Colin Haydon, and Stephen Taylor, eds. *The Church of England, c.1689-c.1833: From Toleration to Tractarianism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Walsh, John, and Stephen Taylor. 'Introduction: The Church and Anglicanism in the 'Long' Eighteenth Century.' in *The Church of England c. 1680-c. 1833*, eds John Walsh, Colin Haydon, and Stephen Taylor, 1-66. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Watts, Michael R. *The Dissenters*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985.
- Weber, Otto. *Foundations of Dogmatics*. Translated by Darrell L. Guder. 2 vols. Grand Rapids, Mich: Eerdmans, 1981.
- Webster, Charles. *The Intellectual Revolution of the Seventeenth Century*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1974.
- Webster, Tom. *Godly Clergy in Early Stuart England: the Caroline Puritan Movement c.1620-1643*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Wendel, François. *Calvin: the Origins and Development of His Religious Thought*. Translated by Philip Mairet. London: Collins, 1963.
- Wengert, Timothy J. 'Wittenberg's Earliest Catechism.' *Lutheran Quarterly* 7 (1993), 247-260.
- Westerhoff, John H. and O. C. Edwards. *A Faithful Church: Issues in the History of Catechesis*. Wilton, Connecticut: Morehouse-Barlow Co., Inc., 1981.

- Whilding, W.E. 'Conversion, Baptism, and Church Membership.' *The Fraternal* 118 (1953), 11-14.
- Weir, David A. *The Origins of the Federal Theology in Sixteenth-Century Reformation Thought*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989.
- West, W. Morris S. 'John Hooper and the Origins of Puritanism.' *Baptist Quarterly* 15 (1954), 346-68.
- _____. 'John Hooper and the Origins of Puritanism.' *Baptist Quarterly* 16 (1955), 22-46, 67-88.
- White, B. R. 'Who Really Wrote the 'Kiffin Manuscript'?' *Baptist History and Heritage* 1.3 (1966), 3-10, 14.
- _____. 'The Organization of the Particular Baptists, 1644-1660.' *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 17 (1966), 209-26.
- _____. 'Baptist Beginnings and the Kiffin Manuscript.' *Baptist History and Heritage* 2.1 (1967), 27-37.
- _____. 'William Kiffin: Baptist Pioneer and Citizen of London.' *Baptist History and Heritage* 2.2 (1967), 91-103.
- _____. 'The Doctrine of the Church in the Particular Baptist Confession of 1644.' *Journal of Theological Studies* 19 (1968), 570-90.
- _____. 'How did William Kiffin Join the Baptists.' *Baptist Quarterly* 23 (1970), 201-207.
- _____. *The English Separatist Tradition: from the Marian Martyrs to the Pilgrim Fathers*. London: Oxford University Press, 1971.
- _____. 'Samuel Eaton (d. 1639) Particular Baptist Pioneer.' *Baptist Quarterly* 24 (1971), 10-21.
- _____. 'Echoes of Medieval Christendom in Puritan Spirituality.' *One in Christ* 16.1-2 (1980), 78-90.
- _____. *The English Baptists of the Seventeenth Century*. London: Baptist Historical Society, 1983.
- _____. 'The Origins and Convictions of the First Calvinistic Baptists.' *Baptist History and Heritage* 25.4 (1990), 39-47.
- White, R.E.O. *The Biblical Doctrine of Initiation*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1960.
- Whiteley, J.B. 'Loughwood Baptists in the Seventeenth Century.' *Baptist Quarterly* 31 (1985), 148-58.

- Whiting, Charles Edwin. *Studies in English Puritanism from the Restoration to the Revolution 1660-1688*. 1st edn. London: Cass, 1968.
- Whitley, W.T. *The Early History of the General Baptist Church Now Meeting in Borough Road, Southwark*. Angus Library, Regent's Park College, Oxford.
- _____. *A Baptist Bibliography: Being a Register of the Chief Materials for Baptist History, Whether in Manuscript or in Print, Preserved in Great Britain, Ireland, and the Colonies*. 2 vols. London: Kingsgate Press, 1916.
- _____. *The Baptists of London, 1612-1928*. London: Kingsgate Press, 1928.
- _____. *A History of British Baptists*. 2d rev edn. London: Kingsgate Press, 1932.
- Wiles, Maurice F. *Archetypal Heresy: Arianism Through the Centuries*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.
- Wilks, Michael. *Prophecy and Eschatology*. Cambridge, Mass: Blackwell, 1994.
- Wilson, A. N. *The Life of John Milton*. London: Pimlico, 2002.
- Wilson, John Frederick. *Pulpit in Parliament: Puritanism During the English Civil Wars, 1640-1648*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969.
- Wilson, Walter. *The History and Antiquities of Dissenting Churches and Meeting Houses in London, Westminster and Southwark*. 4 vols. London, 1808-14.
- Wood, Diana. *The Church and Childhood: Papers Read at the 1993 Summer Meeting and the 1994 Winter Meeting of the Ecclesiastical History Society*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1994.
- Wright, Nigel G. 'Covenant and Covenanting.' *Baptist Quarterly* 39 (2002), 287-90.
- Wright, Stephen. 'Adams, Richard (1626/7-1698).' *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://ezproxy.ouls.ox.ac.uk:2117/view/article/126>, accessed 19 October 2009].
- _____. *The Early English Baptists, 1603-1649*. Woodbridge: Boydell, 2006.
- _____. 'Lambe, Thomas (fl. 1629-1661).' *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/72598>, accessed 14 August 2008].
- Young, Robert H. 'The History of Baptist Hymnody in England from 1612 to 1800.' DMA Thesis, University of Southern California, 1959.
- Zagorin, Perez. *A History of Political Thought in the English Revolution*. Bristol: Thoemmes, 1997.

Zaller, Robert. 'Defoe, Daniel (1660-1731).' in *Biographical Dictionary of British Radicals in the Seventeenth Century*, eds Richard L. Greaves and Robert Zaller. I:219-21. Brighton, Sussex: Harvester Press, 1982.