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FROM THE EDITORS

In this second issue of the *Studies in Puritanism and Piety Journal*, both the articles and the book reviews focus on Puritan theology and piety in its International Reformed context—the ways that Puritanism, particularly Puritan piety, shaped the landscape of post-Reformation Reformed thought and piety, particularly in the Netherlands and Sweden. In these areas, these articles clearly establish the international influence of Puritanism, chiefly through print publications and personal networks, that spread well beyond the borders of Britain. These articles further the vision of the *Studies in Puritanism and Piety Journal* to foster research on the Puritans in the post-Reformation and to make Puritan scholarship accessible to readers and providing opportunities for scholars to present their research.

In his article on “The Reception of Richard Baxter in Sweden,” Torbjorn Aronson (Assistant Professor Church History at Uppsala University, Sweden) examines the under-explored area of how Richard Baxter’s works, particularly his pietistic works, were translated into Swedish, produced by sympathetic printers, and disseminated throughout Sweden in the decades and centuries following his death. Aronson ably links the reception of Baxter’s thought and works with the all-important institutions and themes of the Swedish monarchy and print censorship to show how the promotion of Baxter’s works was linked with the circulation of other devotional books, especially works of Reformed piety.

In his article on William Ames’s understanding of the “Authority of Conscience,” Guochao Zhao (PhD Candidate at Puritan Reformed Theological Seminary) challenges the interpretations of previous historians—particularly John Van Til and James Calvin Davis—about William Ames’s theology regarding the authority of conscience. Through a careful reading of Ames’s most important works on conscience, Zhao establishes that Ames believed that the believer’s conscience was ultimately bound by the will of God as revealed in the Scriptures, and subsequently bound by
human authority, insofar as that human authority’s decrees accorded with the definitive truths of Scripture. Finally, in his article on “spiritual warfare” in Puritan practical divinity works, Reinier W. De Koijer (Pastor of The Protestant Church in the Netherlands, Bilthoven), surveys a vast array of classic Puritan works written by eminent divines to demonstrate that Puritans believed that Satan, the world, and the flesh were allies that worked together against believers in a battle for their souls.

Richard Baxter (1615–1691) was one of the most influential Puritan writers during the seventeenth century and onwards. He has been credited with being a precursor of Lutheran Pietism and his writings were translated into the major languages of Northern Europe. The purpose of this article is to map the reception of Baxter’s writings in Sweden and what circles of people tried to introduce his writings. The role of church censorship will be addressed in relation to the printing process. The monarchy has generally been seen as the force behind the strengthening of church censorship in Sweden in the late seventeenth century. Common denominators between Puritanism, Pietism, and the absolute monarchy in Sweden are brought into light, and changes in censorship attitudes over time are emphasized through the study of the publishing and reception of Richard Baxter’s writings. While this article introduces the reader to these themes, the full extent of Baxter’s influence in Sweden requires a larger study. However, through this limited study several important related topics on the influence of Puritan writers on Swedish Lutheranism and Lutheran Pietism can be addressed and relevant questions for further research proposed.

Sweden played a prominent role in the Protestant sphere of Northern Europe in the seventeenth century. The country rose to be a leading military and political power in the Baltic Sea area in the latter part of the seventeenth century, and at the same time became a fortress of Lutheranism. The Lutheran priesthood was represented in the Swedish parliament and tried over and over again to have the Book of Concord mentioned in constitutional


documents and legislation pertaining to the Church, in order to protect the Church from Reformed and Catholic influences. This pursuit was finally successful and achieved its goal in the new Church law of 1686. The Pietist movement had early followers in Sweden, but during the last years of the seventeenth century and the early decades of the eighteenth, government measures against Pietism were implemented, including an already existing censorship with attempts to control and direct study tours to certain German universities. At the same time influential clergymen and circles at the royal court tried to create space for Pietist ideas and reforms.

Urban Claesson has recently underlined the common goals and pursuits of the absolute monarchy in Sweden and early Pietism, for example, an increased social discipline and a more pious laity. Richard Baxter’s writings included strong appeals for the need of personal repentance and faith in Christ combined with numerous practical directions on how to live a pious and disciplined life. By framing his message in this way, Baxter addressed common concerns among Protestant clergy and laity. The major devotional books of the Swedish laity in the seventeenth century were Luther’s *Smaller Catechism* and the church hymnals used in the different dioceses. Luther’s *Smaller Catechism* was used in the basic education of the population and applied to practical life. Several of the bishops developed educational material that built on the *Smaller Catechism* and that contained both biblical texts and practical applications. The church hymnals contained psalms sung in the worship services, Bible pericopes that were read and explained in the sermons, and prayers for different situations in life. The Swedish laity was quite accustomed to a pious devotional life that was concerned with living faithfully in the midst of life’s trials and challenges.

A consequence of this was that writings of the kind produced by Richard Baxter could be


considered attractive and relevant in Sweden, although his theology differed from Lutheran confessional writings. Unintentionally his writings had potential relevance for Lutherans in Sweden who were on the lookout for devotional writings with this leaning. Baxter’s writings could obviously be seen as fitting for the situation, and so they were brought into the country, translated, and sold during this period.6

With this background, the questions in this article focus on the role of Richard Baxter in Sweden. What books written by Baxter were translated into Swedish? From what languages were the translations made? Which groups were responsible for translating and printing Baxter’s literature in Sweden? What were the themes of Baxter’s books that were translated into Swedish? How were his writings received? Did the growing dominance of Lutheran uniformity and the Swedish monarchy hinder or help the dissemination and reception of Baxter’s writings during the second part of the seventeenth century and early decades of the eighteenth century? What was the relationship between Baxter’s writings and the early circles of Pietism in Sweden? These are the questions that this article tries to answer.

The time period the article covers is 1660–1740. This period marks the zenith of the pursuit of pure Lutheran doctrine and uniformity in the Church of Sweden and was also the period when Baxter’s writings were introduced in Sweden. Different conflicts related to theological issues arose in Sweden during the reign of Queen Christina (1632–1654), ending with her conversion to the Roman Catholic church and the deposition of bishops pursuing a so-called “syncretist” version of Protestantism.7 In 1660, a new guardian regency took charge of the government, as the heir to the throne was still a small child. The guardian regency (1660–1676) and the following absolute rule of Charles XI (1676–1697) were characterized by continual pressure for ecclesiastical conformity and doctrinal uniformity.8

The themes explored in this article have relevance for the interpretation of Puritan influence on Lutheran Pietism and on the question of how

---


7. General surveys of these conflicts can be found in the following literature: Sven Kjöllerström, Kyrkolagsproblemet i Sverige 1571–1682 (Stockholm: Svenska kyrkans Diakonistyrrelsens Bokförlag), 1944; Sven Göransson, Ortodoxi och synkretism i Sverige 1647–1660 (Uppsala: Uppsala universitet, 1950); and Sven Göransson, Den synkretistiska striden i Sverige 1660–1664 (Uppsala: Uppsala universitet, 1952).

writings of edification and spirituality could cross confessional and linguistic borders in Europe in the seventeenth century. Books by English Puritans and by Dutch and German Pietists were brought to Sweden, some of which were translated into Swedish through the contacts that existed between the Northern European Protestant countries. Study tours undertaken by Swedish students of theology contributed to this. In the later part of the seventeenth century and the first part of the eighteenth century a number of future clergymen of the Church of Sweden traveled to England to study for a shorter period of time. In fact, all (except one) of the archbishops of the Church of Sweden between 1670 and 1730 studied in England and returned with an understanding of the English language, experience of English church life, and English devotional literature. They were not allowed to pursue formal theological studies at the universities in England, but obviously got opportunities to get to know different types of theology and spirituality present in England at this time. Church censorship, which could stop the printing of translated theological literature that was considered contradictory to the Lutheran confessional writing and written by non-Lutheran authors existed in Sweden from 1662 onwards. Censorship became a more pronounced threat after the new Church law of 1686. The growing dominance of strict Lutheran confessionalism was manifested through the new Church law (1686), followed by a new catechesis (1689), a new service book (1693), a new mandatory hymnal (1695), and a new edition of the Bible in Swedish (1703). In 1688 a special office, censor librorum, was created in the royal administration with the purpose of leading, monitoring, and coordinating the censorship of the diocesan consistorys.


Its goal was to stop heretical literature of foreign as well as Swedish origin. When Pietist literature in the early 1700s began to flow into the country in larger numbers, *censor librorum* was charged by the king in 1706 with the task of stopping a perceived dangerous trend.\(^\text{12}\) How did these developments influence the spread of Richard Baxter’s writings in Sweden?

The background and reception of Richard Baxter’s writings in Sweden have not been sufficiently analyzed by scholars. Bengt Hellekant’s dissertation *Engelsk uppbryggelselitteratur i svensk översättning intill 1700-talets mitt* (1944) provides some basic facts concerning the printing and sale of Baxter’s books in Sweden. Hellekant’s dissertation is the point of departure for the analyses in this article and contains a number of important bibliographical facts concerning the publishing of English devotional literature in Swedish in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Hellekant’s work was complemented by an article by David Lindquist in 1945.\(^\text{13}\) Recently Tuija Laine has analyzed and provided overviews of translations of English Puritan literature in Sweden in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.\(^\text{14}\) Lindquist and Laine discuss general trends and attitudes toward English devotional literature in Sweden, in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries and add important facts to the discussion of the fate of specific authors and writings. Although Richard Baxter plays a part in their overviews, none of them devotes special attention to him and his writings.

Due to the space available, this article only very briefly deals with questions regarding the role of writings by Baxter in other languages brought to Sweden. However, these questions are relevant. Among the educated classes devotional literature in German and English were read and sometimes sold in Swedish bookstores.\(^\text{15}\)

After a short overview of the life and theology of Richard Baxter, each of Baxter’s writings translated into Swedish during the seventeenth century and the early decades of the eighteenth century will be discussed. In the


\(^{13}\) Lindquist, “Engelsk uppbryggelselitteratur i svensk översättning.”


\(^{15}\) See f.ex. Nordenstrand, *Den äldre svenska pietismens litteratur*, 64–163.
concluding discussion, the answers to the questions in the article will be summarized and suggestions for further research outlined.

Richard Baxter—Life and Theology
Richard Baxter was born in Rowton, Shropshire, approximately 250 kilometers northwest of London, in 1615. He grew up in a pious family and was baptized and confirmed in the Church of England. After having studied under local clergymen and then under Richard Wickstead, chaplain to the Council of Wales and the Marches at Ludlow Castle, Baxter was ordained to the diaconate (with a license to teach) by John Thornborough, bishop of Worcester, in 1638. During his upbringing and theological training, Baxter studied Calvinist authors such as Richard Sibbes (1577–1635), William Perkins (1558–1602), Edmund Bunny (1540–1619), and major Medieval theologians (and philosophers) such as Thomas Aquinas, John Duns Scotus, and William of Ockham.

In 1641, Baxter was invited to become the lecturer in the parish of St. Mary and All Saints’ Church at Kidderminster. During this time, his reputation grew and several of his most important books were written. His catechetical teaching and his sermons transformed the parish and attracted people from surrounding parishes. Baxter invited the ministers of those parishes to take part in an association for mutual edification and instruction, irrespective of their theological differences. Aside from a long interruption from 1642–1647, Baxter served as minister in Kidderminster until 1660.

Baxter’s theology matured during these years into a hypothetical universalism with an emphasis on regeneration, repentance, and sanctification. “Hypothetical universalism” is the belief that Jesus made an atoning sacrifice which was universally sufficient. Anyone who appropriates Jesus’s saving work by faith will be saved. Hypothetical universalism differs from the doctrine of “limited atonement.” “Limited atonement” asserts that God had only one intention in sending Christ to die for the salvation of sinners, namely, the intention to save the elect, those whom God had eternally chosen to be saved. By contrast, hypothetical universalism believes that God had a general as well as a particular intent in Christ’s saving work. Baxter’s hypothetical universalism and rejection of limited atonement led to a major theological conflict with John Owen (1616–1683). John Owen was the foremost expositor of what has been labeled “high Calvinism” in England.

in the second half of the seventeenth century, in which the doctrine of limited atonement was an integral part. Baxter did not accept all the tenets of the Council of Dordt (1619) but advocated a theology that put a stronger emphasis on man’s responsibility to repent and have faith in Christ.\textsuperscript{18} In the English Civil War, Baxter sided with the Parliamentary forces and those who wanted a Presbyterian form of church government. While serving in the Parliamentary army, he evidently considered all forms of church government secondary in importance to the questions related to salvation and regeneration.\textsuperscript{19}

Restoration brought havoc to him as well as to most of the Puritan divines through the Act of Uniformity of 1662, which Baxter could not accept. After having turned down offers to become a bishop in the restored Church of England, Baxter lived a precarious life as an itinerant preacher and was put in jail several times during the 1670s and 1680s. At the same time, he was widely seen as one of the most important leaders of nonconformity in Britain. He lived his last years in London peacefully and continued his written ministry until the end.\textsuperscript{20}

Baxter wrote a large number of books. Parts of them were concerned with practical piety while others, especially those written in the later part of his life, explored eschatological issues and social ethics. A great many of his writings were polemical, engaging with the theological issues of the day.\textsuperscript{21}

\begin{thebibliography}{9}
\end{thebibliography}
Baxter’s works reached Sweden in several forms during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries in their original English editions, in Danish, Dutch, and German translations, and in translations into Swedish.  

Swedish Translations of Baxter’s Writings

Four books by Richard Baxter were translated into Swedish during this period:

- *A Call to the Unconverted to turn and live* (1658) which was published as *En lijten book om Gudz taal, röst och uthroop* in 1683 and was printed in one edition.  

- *Now or never* (1662) which was prohibited from publication by the Stockholm consistory after having been translated in 1696.  

- *A treatise of self-denial* (1659) which was published as *En på Gudz heliga ord grundad underwisning* in 1729 and was printed in a single edition.  

- *The poor man’s family book* (1674) which was published as *En andelig hus-bok* in 1733. It was also printed in a single edition.  

These four books deal with questions related to conversion, repentance, faith, and practical godly living. No books written by Richard Baxter dealing with eschatology, social ethics, or doctrinal polemics were translated into Swedish. The works of Richard Baxter presented to the Swedish public dealt with themes related to pastoral theology. The background of this was probably the obstacles existing for publishing books written by...


non-Lutheran authors and with subjects deemed to be controversial in one way or the other. The first book was published before the office of censor librorum was created. The later books were translated during two decades that brought renewed controversy around Pietism in Sweden and a new, strict law against lay conventicles (1726). During the same period censorship was challenged in a number of ways. The context for the actual translations and printings is thus of great interest. Printed in a single edition only, none of these books evidently became bestsellers.

A Call to the Unconverted was one of Baxter’s most popular writings and was printed in approximately 20,000 copies during its first year of publishing. Its subject was conversion. Baxter showed that man was faced by two ultimate alternatives: holiness-life and sin-death. The title of the book referred to the loving call of God to man in sin, calling him to turn from sin, believe in Christ, and let the work of the Holy Spirit have its way in repentance and faith. The translation and publishing of A Call to the Unconverted in Sweden had an international Protestant context and was supported by establishment figures interested in promoting Baxter’s devotional writings. The book was translated from German by the royal translator, Johan Silvius (1620–1690), and printed by the royal printer, Henrik Keyser II (1640–1699). The German edition had been translated in 1667 from the English original by the Italian Protestant Johannes Tonjola (1634–1700), who pastored an exile congregation in Basle. The initiator of the Swedish translation was Jacob Sneckenberg (1625–1697). Sneckenberg was the son of Olof Pedersson Schnack (1599–1676), mayor of Nyköping, a small town a hundred kilometers south of Stockholm. Jacob Sneckenberg was an example of the widespread phenomenon in early modern Europe of migrants or their descendants being involved in translation.
Olof Pedersson Schnack had immigrated to Sweden from the town of Snaeckenburg in Flanders in the 1620s. He probably came to Nyköping with a larger group of Walloons in this decade. Nyköping had the earliest colony of Walloon artisans and smiths in Sweden in the seventeenth century. An important background to the immigration was the military alliance between Sweden and the United Netherlands in 1614. It provided Sweden with much-needed capital and a skilled labor force for the development of its iron industry. The Walloons who immigrated were Reformed Protestants. Some of them kept their Calvinist beliefs and were granted restricted rights of worship during the seventeenth century. Others were assimilated into the Church of Sweden and accepted its Lutheran confession.

The history of the Olof Schnack family during the seventeenth century was very much a story of success. Sources on the religious life of the Schnack family are with some exceptions lacking. But it is clear that two of the sons of Olof Schnack had international religious contacts, one of them with the Catholic world and the other with early Pietism and Puritanism. Three brothers were born into the family: Peter Schnack (1632–1713), Erik Sneckenberg (1634–1695), and Jacob Sneckenberg. All of them became part of the Swedish nobility through their industriousness. They represented a new type of nobility that achieved their noble name through loyal and dutiful work for the Swedish monarchy in the late seventeenth century.

The family history points to the fact that this Walloon family evidently had strong religious interests and international connections.

---

34. Gustav Elgenstierna, Den introducerade svenska adelns ättartavlor med tillägg och rättelser. Vol VII Schildt–Sture (Stockholm: Norstedt, 1932), 338–42: Peter Schnack was raised to the nobility in 1688 with the noble name Snack after a long career of royal service in the highest echelons of Swedish public administration. He was a close confidant of three Swedish monarchs, among them Queen Christina. Schnack was part of the queen's initial entourage when leaving Sweden after her conversion to Roman Catholicism in 1654 but...
Jacob Schnack was ennobled in 1673 and changed his name to Sneckenberg, referring to the geographical origin of his father. After having studied at the universities of Turku (1641), Uppsala (1644), Greifswald (1649), and Rostock (1649), Sneckenberg began working in the royal treasuries and became a royal secretary. He rose to a final major position in 1673 and also became the guardian of the heirs of the former royal chancellor, Axel Oxenstierna (1583–1654). With this position within the royal administration Sneckenberg had the financial resources and a network of contacts that could help him promote the publishing of a book that could potentially be seen as deviant in relation to the dominant Lutheran theology.

Through his studies at two German universities, Sneckenberg had acquired the language skills and international experience that provided the context for the translation of a major English Puritan writing in German into the Swedish language. The fact that he studied in Rostock for a short while is worth mentioning. Rostock became a center of Lutheran reform after the Thirty-Years War (1618–1648). A number of important reform-minded Lutheran theologians taught or worked in this trading port on the coast of the Baltic Sea immediately following the war, anticipating the Pietist movement. We do not have explicit evidence regarding contact between Sneckenberg and these theologians, but the fact that he ended his university studies in Rostock directly after the end of the war implies that he might have attended lectures and sermons by some of them.

Sneckenberg paid for the translation of A Call to the Unconverted, which was dedicated to a number of high-ranking royal officials, for example, the master of the treasuries, the equivalent of a minister of finance, Sten Bielke (1624–1684), and another member of the Privy Council, returned soon and continued in the service of the subsequent monarchs. One of his sons, Erik Snack (1661–1705) converted to Roman Catholicism in 1688 and went on to a successful military career in the service of Louis XIV, ending as an imperial baron of the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation. By his conversion he disgraced both his father and Charles XI and was deprived of his inheritance.

35. For a general discussion regarding the role of the royal secretaries in the royal administration and their potential as powerbrokers, see Svante Norrhem, Uppkomlingarna. Kanslitjänstemännen i 1600-talets Sverige och Europa (Umeå, Umeå universitet, 1993). Norrhem mentions Jacob Sneckenberg as one example of an influential royal secretary with access to influential informal channels within the royal administration, see pp. 114–15.
Claes Fleming (1649–1685).\textsuperscript{37} Like Sneckenberg himself, these notables held prominent positions within the financial and judicial administration of the realm. Stina Hansson has done a survey of all translated literature that was printed in Sweden during the seventeenth century. She points out that dedications in translated books were common in the beginning of the century but decreased in the later part, and that the 1680s was the decade when they tended to be quite rare.\textsuperscript{38} This means that the dedications in this book in fact could be seen as a kind of statement about the existing high-ranking support for the publication of the book. The Stockholm consistory, responsible for the church censorship of theological writings in Stockholm, made no reservations, and the book was printed in 1683.\textsuperscript{39} The theme of this book by Baxter and support by the establishment for its publication confirm the suggestion by Urban Claesson that common ground existed between the goals and ideals of the Swedish monarchy and Puritan thought and practice closely related to early Pietism.

\textit{Now or never} (1662) was translated into Swedish from a German edition by Georg Gottlieb Burchardi. The title of the Swedish translation is not known, and only the German title is referred to by the Stockholm consistory.\textsuperscript{40} The book has the same theme as \textit{A Call to the Unconverted}, that is, conversion. In \textit{Now or Never} Baxter pleaded with the sinner to repent through a discussion of the character of God, the uncertainty of time, the misery of hell, and the glory of heaven. Georg Gottlieb Burchardi was a German bookseller and publisher who immigrated to Sweden and founded a new printing house in Stockholm in 1693.\textsuperscript{41} His goal was to obtain a royal privilege for the printing of the new church hymnal and a new edition of the Bible in Swedish. Burchardi enjoyed strong backing from a professor of theology and the president of Uppsala University at the time, Jesper Swedenberg (1653–1735).\textsuperscript{42}

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{38} Stina Hansson, \textit{Afsett på svenska. 1600-talets tryckta översättningslitteratur} (Göteborg: Göteborgs universitet, 1981), 118–19.
\textsuperscript{39} Hellekant, \textit{Engelsk uppbyggnadslitteratur i svensk översättning intill 1700-talets mitt}, 74.
\textsuperscript{40} Stockholm, Stockholms stadsarkiv, Stockholms konsistoriums protokoll 14.10 1696. Lindquist, \textit{Studier i den svenska andaktslitteraturen under stormaktstidevarvet med särskild hänsyn till böne-, tröste- och nattvardsböcker}, 197, footnote 6.
\textsuperscript{41} Hansson, \textit{Afsett på svenska. 1600-talets tryckta översättningslitteratur}, 206–9.
\end{footnotesize}
Swedberg was the driving force behind a plan for a new edition of the Bible in Swedish and a new church hymnal.\textsuperscript{43} Swedberg went on a study tour of England, France, Germany, and the Netherlands in 1684–1686. In England he visited Joseph Fell (1626–1686), bishop of Oxford at that time, but also took part in a Quaker meeting. He was impressed by the way the Lord’s Day was honored in England in comparison with Sweden. In Germany he tried to see Philipp Spener while visiting Frankfurt am Main. Spener was unfortunately unwell and a meeting could not be arranged. In his autobiography he also describes seeing a house where a copy of Johann Arndt’s \textit{Paradiesgärtlein} had been miraculously preserved when a Catholic lieutenant once tried to burn the book by throwing it in the furnace. A similar thing happened later in his own life when his episcopal residence in Skara was burned to the ground in 1712. Swedberg concludes his story with great praise of Arndt’s \textit{Paradiesgärtlein}, a book that God had protected.\textsuperscript{44} Swedberg was sympathetically inclined to Pietism, which he clearly exemplified in his autobiography by telling of his favorite authors, which were Christian Scrifter (1629–1693), Johann Arndt (1555–1621), Theophil Grossgebauer (1627–1661), and Johann Schmidt (1594–1658). Later Swedberg became critical of the Pietists’ lay conventicles in Stockholm, but he shared their emphasis on Christian practical life and the importance of sanctification.\textsuperscript{45} He quickly became a close confidant of Charles XI and a royal court preacher.\textsuperscript{46} In 1702 he was appointed bishop of the diocese of Skara in the western part of Sweden and in 1705 was chosen to oversee the Swedish congregation in London.\textsuperscript{47} Swedberg was thus a clergyman of great influence in Sweden at this time and close to the monarchy. He at the same time represented a Lutheranism that was interested in strengthening devotional life in Sweden in accordance with Pietist ideals and with a practical orientation.

Swedberg supported Burchardi financially and advanced his cause at the court. The result was that Burchardi obtained the royal privilege for the printing of the new mandatory hymnal in 1694 but was denied a similar privilege on the printing of the new edition of the Bible. Burchardi built


his printing house while using a new printing press imported from Frankfurt am Main through the financial support of Jesper Swedberg. However, Burchardi was not only interested in printing the new hymnal but developed an extensive publishing activity, in which translations of German Pietist and English Puritan devotional literature became an important part. He was then both an important contributor to the development of Lutheran confessional uniformity, cooperating with the Swedish monarchy and major Swedish ecclesiastical figures, and a transmitter of Pietist and Puritan literature.

The publication of these Pietist and Puritan translations was dependent on approvals from the Stockholm consistory. The consistory became more and more reluctant to approve translations of books written by non-Lutheran authors during the 1690s and the first decade of the eighteenth century, irrespective of the content of the books. This was the context of the translation of *Now or Never* in 1696. As with *A Call to the Unconverted*, this was also a translation of a German edition of the book. In the case of *Now or Never*, Burchardi was not successful. The decision was surprising given the subject of the book and the fact that *A Call to the Unconverted* was given permission to be published. The denial of the request for publication could be interpreted in light of the consistory’s general reluctance to grant rights of publication to books written by non-Lutheran authors. Tuija Laine has suggested that the strict censorship of English devotional literature at the end of the seventeenth century could be explained partly by the religious policies of the Brandenburg Prussian Calvinistic elector who oppressed the Lutherans. The general negative connotation of Calvinism could have led to a kind of image politics, which meant that publications were denied even if no Reformed doctrine remained in the manuscript.

---

49. E.x. Johann Arndt, *Anderike förklarning öfwer alle evangeliske söndags-, högtijs-, och aposteldags texter bella åhret igenom* (Stockholm: Georg Gottlieb Burchardi, 1700), which was a translation of sermons of Johann Arndt edited in German by Philipp Spener. The translation was done by Burchardi himself, which was publicized on the title page. See also Hellekant, *Engelsk uppbyggselitteratur i svensk översättning intill 1700-talets mitt*, 87, 90–91, 93, 100, 140, 170, and Lindquist, "Engelsk uppbyggselitteratur i svensk översättning," 133.
51. Stockholm, Stockholms stadsarkiv, Stockholms konsistoriums protokoll 14.10 1696.
Three years later, in 1699, Burchardi successfully fought the consistory concerning a translation of *Christian thoughts for every day of the month* (originally published in English in 1683), written by the Anglican clergyman Richard Lucas (1648–1715). In spite of serious charges from the consistory against Burchardi, e.g. that he was spreading Reformed theology and Calvinism through his translations, the publisher won the case. In his defense, Burchardi explicitly referred to support from anonymous and high-ranking theologians.\(^{53}\) In this case an earlier assessment of a similar issue may have exerted an influence on the consistory. In the late seventeenth century the issue of Russian-English trade had grown in importance. The English perspective was that English tradesmen ought to have the right to confess and practice their Anglicanism. A theological expert opinion was sought from Johannes Gezelius the Younger (1647–1718), the Superintendent of Livonia, in 1684. Gezelius’s opinion was that Anglicanism was quite close to Lutheranism, while the Reformed churches, as well as Puritans and Presbyterians, belonged outside the Swedish Realm.\(^{54}\) The book by Richard Lucas was published and the Swedish title was *Tijdmätning medelst christelige tanckar*. The theology and style of Lucas had similarities to Baxter’s.\(^{55}\)

The successful efforts to publish a Swedish translation of *Christian thoughts for every day of the month* by Richard Lucas provide additional information about the publishing activities of Burchardi and the circles that supported him. The book contained a dedication to a widow in Stockholm, Anna Maria Kalckberner, whom Burchardi thanked for earlier financial support of his publishing activities. She was the widow of the merchant Johan Adam Kalckberner (d. 1698), who was an early sympathizer of Pietism in Stockholm.\(^{56}\) Kalckberner corresponded with the nephew of August Hermann Francke (1663–1727) and with Johann Anastasius Freylinghausen (1670–1739).\(^{57}\) Johan Adam Kalckberner’s brother, Petrus Adami Kalckberner (1661–1733), was superintendent of the Lutheran church in Brandenburgian, Pomerania, and a correspondent of Francke.

\(^{53}\) Hellekant, *Engelsk uppbyggnads litteratur i svensk översättning intill 1700-talets mitt*, 91. See also Lindquist, “Engelsk uppbyggnads litteratur i svensk översättning,” 133.


\(^{55}\) Hellekant, *Engelsk uppbyggnads litteratur i svensk översättning intill 1700-talets mitt*, 94.

\(^{56}\) Hellekant, *Engelsk uppbyggnads litteratur i svensk översättning intill 1700-talets mitt*, 90–93.

himself. He was born in Sweden and had studied at Uppsala University, but made his ecclesiastical career in the Protestant states of the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation.\textsuperscript{58} After the death of Johan Adam Kalckberner, Anna Maria Kalckberner provided important financial support for the efforts of Buchardi to spread English devotional literature.\textsuperscript{59} A son of the Kalckberners, with the same name as his father, Johann Adam Kalckberner (1697–1768), was sent to study at the university of Halle, the very center of Pietism in Prussia, in 1720.\textsuperscript{60}

The conclusion of this overview is that the Swedish translation of \textit{Now or Never} had an international Protestant context. It was part of the publishing efforts of a German bookseller and printer. Buchardi’s circle also included Stockholm merchants with German Pietist contacts. His publishing efforts were not successful in the case of \textit{Now or Never}, which probably was a result of the generally repressive tendencies of church censorship in the late 1690s. But the wider context of Buchardi’s work included close contacts between him, the Swedish monarchy, and influential Lutheran clergymen. Although church censorship had become severe, this did not mean that common denominators and common concerns had ceased to exist. Swedish absolutism and the pursuit of Lutheran doctrinal conformity did not rule out an interest in the themes of Pietist and Puritan literature among circles close to the court and ecclesiastical establishment. The activities of Buchardi and his efforts to publish a book by Richard Baxter once more confirms the observation made in recent studies of early Pietism in Sweden mentioned in the beginning of this article, that common goals and pursuits of the Swedish monarchy and early Pietism in fact existed.\textsuperscript{61}

After 1706 the repressive tendencies of church censorship became even more severe, resulting in a list put together by \textit{censor librorum} in 1708 consisting of books in foreign languages that were prohibited for publication in Swedish bookstores. Among the books on this list were a number of books written by well-known Pietist authors such as Philipp Spener, August Hermann Francke, and Gottfried Arnold (1666–1714). Also included was


\textsuperscript{59} Hellekant, \textit{Engelsk uppbyggnirlitteratur i svensk översättning intill 1700-talets mitt}, 93.


\textsuperscript{61} E.g., Nordenstrand, \textit{Den äldre svenska pietismsens litteratur}, 3–5.
The Reception of Richard Baxter’s Writings in Sweden

The most popular of Richard Baxter’s writings, *The Saints’ Everlasting Rest* (1650) in its German edition. However, *The Saints’ Everlasting Rest* was finally translated into Swedish in 1765 and published under the title *De heligas ewiga ro*.

A treatise of self-denial (1659) was translated from a German edition by an anonymous writer with the initials “G. W.” in 1729. The Swedish translation comprised only one chapter from the original work. This chapter dealt with the use of the tongue and was of a practical and pedagogical character, listing, for example, twelve rules for preventing an unholy use of the tongue. Bengt Hellekant suggests that the translator could have been the future bishop of Visby (1735–1745) and Gothenburg (1745–1760), Georg Wallin II (1686–1760), who translated other English theological works.

Wallin was, at the time of the translation of A treatise of self-denial, librarian of the University library of Uppsala, and became Professor of Theological Ethics in Uppsala (1732–1735). Wallin went on a study tour of Germany, England, and the Netherlands in 1707–1710. In Germany he visited Greifswald, Rostock, Berlin, Halle, Eisleben, Naumburg, Wittenberg, and Jena, meeting several well-known German theologians at this time, including Johann Friedrich Mayer (1650–1712), Valentin Ernst Löscher (1673–1749), Gottlieb Wernsdorf (1668–1729), Joachim Justus Breithaupt (1658–1732), Johann Franz Buddeus (1667–1729), and August Hermann Francke. This meant that Wallin met theologians that have been labeled “orthodox” and strongly criticized Pietism (Mayer and Löscher), those who tried to find a more conciliatory approach to Pietism (Buddeus) and leaders of Pietism (Francke). Wallin was thus well acquainted with different theological positions within Lutheranism but there is no indication that he publicly associated himself with the Pietist movement in Sweden or in Germany. Instead he often joined the critics of Pietism, but did not withhold

---

63. Hellekant, *Engelsk uppbyggselitteratur i svensk översättning intill 1700-talets mitt*, 76.
admiration for August Hermann Francke. In England Wallin went to Cambridge to see Professor of Hebrew, Henry Sike (1669–1712), and to Oxford, where he met John Potter (1674–1747), regius professor of divinity and later archbishop of Canterbury (1737–1747). Potter was a High Churchman and a Whig. Wallin also took part in a Quaker meeting, where he heard two women preach. According to Wallin’s biographer, Tor Andrae, Wallin did not pay much attention to Anglican theology and liturgy during his visit to England. But back in Sweden, he showed himself well acquainted with the contemporary debate in England concerning liturgical versus spontaneous prayer in regular worship. In a dissertation which he wrote in order to obtain a post as lecturer in theology, he argued for a middle position between, on the one hand, some Pietists and Puritans who only favored spontaneous prayer, and on the other hand, Anglican High Churchmen who only would allow the written liturgical prayer. His general estimation of the Church of England was one of genuine ecumenical interest. In 1718, in a letter answering a question from the Swedish ambassador in London concerning the possibility of a closer relationship between the Church of England and the Church of Sweden, Wallin clearly stated his support for this. With this ecumenical interest, pursuing a middle position within Lutheranism and in relation to the Church of England and the Puritan tradition, an interest in the practical theology of Richard Baxter would not come as a surprise.

It could also be mentioned that Georg Wallin II was at this time married to Margareta Schröder (d. 1773), who was a sister of Herman Schröder (1676–1744). Herman Schröder was one of the leading Pietists of Stockholm and the person who sent the translation of A treatise of self-denial to the Stockholm consistory. Schröder was vicar of one of the Stockholm parishes (Katarina församling, 1718–1729) and was appointed bishop of


Kalmar (1729–1744). According to his memoirs, Schröder grew up in a Lutheran family which originally had emigrated to Sweden from Mecklenburg. Schröder experienced a personal conversion around the turn of the century after contacts with followers of August Hermann Francke. Shortly after that he began a correspondence with Pietists in Halle. He also started to read literature written by Francke. Schröder became a military chaplain in 1710, following the Swedish army in Norway, and during the campaign (1716–1718) developed a personal friendship with the Swedish monarch at the time, Charles XII (reigning 1697–1718). Charles XII was well known for his support of Lutheran pure doctrine and uniformity in the Church of Sweden. In spite of this, and in spite of Schröder’s open defense of Pietism, a mutual understanding developed and Schröder’s estimation of the king’s character and spirituality was very positive. In 1722, Schröder began a correspondence with August Hermann Francke that led to Schröder’s support of the missionary efforts of German Pietism in India. Schröder has been labeled a “conservative” pietist because of his criticism of Johan Conrad Dippel (1673–1734) and his Swedish followers and their radical brand of Pietism.\textsuperscript{69}

A conclusion of this overview is that Richard Baxter’s writings were well known and read among Swedish Lutherans with quite diverse relationships to Pietism, including leaders of the second generation of Pietists in Sweden. The translation was a result of Swedish contacts with the English-speaking world and its publishing was a result of joint Lutheran efforts to spread edifying and important devotional literature among the Swedish population. Baxter’s writings fell into this category, which was explicitly stated by Herman Schröder in his request to the consistory for the publishing of this small book. The Stockholm consistory granted his request in October 1729.\textsuperscript{70}

Four years later, in 1733, another book by Richard Baxter was published in Swedish: \textit{The poor man’s family book} (1674). It was a translation from a popular Danish edition made by the Bishop of Trondheim, Eilar Hagerup (1685–1743), in 1715. The book was intended for poor families and had a

\begin{flushright}

\end{flushright}
catechetical form. The teacher proceeded by means of questions and answers and imaginary conversations between a parson and a landlord and between a parson and a tenant. The subject was conversion and its fruits, especially love toward God and one’s neighbor. Baxter emphasized personal responsibility and one’s duty to co-work with the Spirit of God in the process of salvation. Advice on how to live and examples of prayers to pray in different situations were also part of the message of Baxter. The Swedish translation was made on the initiative of a printer in Stockholm, Johan Laurentius Hornn (d. 1741) in 1731–1732. Hornn also financed the printing of the book. The Stockholm consistory had some reservations but granted the request and attested that The poor man’s family book was in accordance with the Scriptures. The censor was Lars Arnell (1689–1742), a vicar of one of the Stockholm parishes (Jacob och Johannes församling) and known for his support of Lutheran pure doctrine and ecclesiastical uniformity.71

The publishing of these two books by Baxter took place after the law against lay conventicles in 1726 had been enacted, and with the approval of censors known for their loyalty to Lutheran confessional uniformity. This points to common ground that actually existed between the dominant Lutheran establishment and Pietism with regard to Baxter’s theology and practical directions. Both of the books had a Swedish ecclesiastical context. In the case of the publishing of a part of A treatise of self-denial there also existed an international context, through its probable translator Georg Wallin II and through Herman Schröder with his contacts in German Pietism. The Swedish absolute monarchy had ceased to exist in 1718 and a new age of parliamentarian rule had begun.72 The subject of the books was practical piety, saturated with concrete advice and admonishments, where personal responsibility in matters of faith and practice was emphasized. In spite of the fact that the Lutheran ecclesiastical establishment and Pietism in Sweden were involved in a deep controversy during these years, the writings by Baxter were translated and published with the support of both. The

content and context of these publishing processes confirm the continuing relevance of Baxter’s theology in a Lutheran context.\(^\text{73}\)

Tuija Laine has pointed out the increasingly tolerant attitude toward English devotional literature that developed in the Stockholm consistory during the 1720s. After 1726 it only made one attempt to stop the publication of a book containing English devotional material during that decade. This happened in 1727 and the book in question was John Bunyan’s *A Pilgrim’s Progress*. Still, however, in the 1740s the Stockholm consistory showed its teeth by denying printing permission for James Janeway’s (~1636–1674) book on the conversion of children, *Andelig exempel-bok för barn* (*A Token for Children*).\(^\text{74}\)

**Conclusion and Suggestions for Further Research**

Four books by Richard Baxter were translated into Swedish between 1660 and 1740. Three of them were translated from German editions and one from a popular Danish edition, i.e. through translations into a language of another nearby Lutheran state. In the latter part of the seventeenth century, the groups responsible for the publishing process were Swedish notables with an international orientation and a close relationship to the monarchy and also a German publisher working in Stockholm. The translations were part of efforts to spread devotional literature that could deepen piety among the Swedish population in general. The themes of the books point to the existence of shared common goals among reform-minded groups close to early Pietism and the Swedish monarchy, especially the need for a deeper piety and social discipline among the Swedish population. The second group of books was published from 1729 to 1732 due to the initiatives of Swedish pietists intending to spread devotional literature that reflected the ideals of Pietism, in this case literature that contained practical directions for a pious life. None of Richard Baxter’s writings dealing with eschatology, social ethics, or doctrinal polemics were translated into Swedish.

The Stockholm consistory was not consistent in its handling of Baxter’s writings; the earliest translated writing dealt primarily with the need

---

\(^{73}\) See also Claesson, *Kris och kristnande. Olof Ekmans kamp för kristendomens återupprättande vid Stora Kopparberget* 1689–1713, 95–98. Lindquist, “Engelsk uppyggelselitteratur i svensk översättning,” 144–45, discusses the same area of common ground between Lutheran Orthodoxy in Sweden and English Puritan literature without referring to any specific sources. Lindquist also underlines the fact that Anglican High-Church literature was less translated into Swedish than Puritan literature.

for personal repentance and faith in Christ and was granted permission for printing. The second addressed the same theme but was stopped. The first text arrived at the Stockholm consistory before the office of censor librorum had been instituted, the second one after that. The impression, then, is that the translations of Baxter’s writings were not perceived as heretical but that the general repressive tendencies after 1688 limited the possibilities of receiving permission to print translations of books written by non-Lutherans.

The Swedish monarchy in the late seventeenth century has generally been seen as the force behind the strengthening of church censorship. This view has been problematized in this article, and a more multifaceted and complex picture has been presented. People close to the monarchy were in fact interested in promoting literature with a Pietist and Puritan origin.

The 1729–1732 translations were approved by censors known for their loyalty to Lutheran uniformity although tensions existed between them and the Pietists at that time. The practical orientation of Baxter’s writings seems to have attracted a positive response from both groups.

The conclusion of this article is that Richard Baxter’s pastoral theology was acceptable and attractive among Swedish Lutherans of different persuasions throughout the period studied. His theology included a practical spirituality where human responsibility in matters of repentance, faith, and sanctification was emphasized, and this was evidently considered necessary among the Swedish public. From this conclusion it follows that a more thorough assessment of Baxter’s influence in Sweden is worth considering. To make such an assessment possible, a mapping of the dissemination of Baxter’s writings in other languages in Sweden in the seventeenth century and early decades of the eighteenth century is needed along with analyses of sermons and other writings by clergymen who studied in England, and similar material by conservative Pietists who owned or referred to Baxter’s writings.
The concept of conscience is vital for understanding Puritan moral theology. This article aims to clarify the Puritan William Ames’s (1576–1633) view of conscience and authority. In his book, *Liberty of Conscience: The History of a Puritan Idea*, L. John Van Til problematically set up a model of William Perkins (1558–1602) versus Ames to interpret the Puritan views of the authority of conscience. While Perkins embraced liberty of conscience by elevating the authority of conscience under God yet over the state and the church, Ames, bound by the rational Ramist dialectic method, not only rejected Perkins’s view of conscience, but also “stripped the individual of his liberty” in the matter of conscience.\(^1\) According to Van Til, the Westminster divines followed the Perkins school, which is reflected in the Westminster Confession of Faith. On the other hand, the Massachusetts Bay Puritans, emphasized the civil and ecclesiastical authority over individual conscience and were the spokesmen and practitioners of the Amesian school until 1689.\(^2\)

James Calvin Davis, however, depicted a different picture of Ames. For Davis, Ames was not an innovator of the Amesian school but “an accurate representation” of the Calvinist tradition of ambiguity over freedom of conscience.\(^3\) This ambiguity is revealed when Ames, on one hand, asserted “the universality and autonomy of conscience” by “rooting conscience in natural law” instead of biblical teachings, but, on the other hand, questioned the effective operation of conscience on sinners.\(^4\) Likewise, Ames upheld

---

both “the inviolability of conscience” by considering it to be “the internal judgment of God,” and the fact that “conscience may err.” Therefore, he sometimes made contradictory claims that “an erroneous conscience is required at once to follow the dictates of conscience and to ignore them!” Confusingly, Davis lamented that Ames compromised the authority of conscience by subjecting it to the written law of God and civil authority, and concluded that Ames “was decidedly undecided about the liberty he wanted to afford conscientious belief and action.” In short, if the chief complaint of Van Til was Ames’s low view of the authority of conscience, Davis, on the contrary, appreciated Ames’s potential high view of it and was unsatisfied with Ames’s (and indeed the general Calvinist tradition’s) failure to maintain that freedom of conscience.

The two opposite interpretations require clarification of Ames’s teaching on the authority of conscience. As it will be shown, while Van Til’s false dichotomy resulted from his apparently selective reading of both Perkins and Ames, and more critically his exaggeration of the influence of the Ramist method on Ames’s conception of conscience, Davis misinterpreted Ames’s divisions of the law and the unity of divine law, natural law, moral law, and human law. This article, therefore, argues that Ames consistently held human conscience to be bound by the revealed will of God only, which, however, has different manifestations in human history. Both elements of liberty and limitation were there in Ames’s mind in a harmonious way. Seeking only to present the historic teaching of Ames, this article has no interest in judging whether or not Ames held the liberty of conscience in the modern sense, which is both anachronistic and meaningless. This article will first examine Ames’s conception of conscience, which, contrary to Van Til’s reading, reveals more of a Thomist Aristotelian influence. Next, this article will explore how far the revealed will of God, in its various manifestations in natural law, moral law, and human law, binds the conscience in Ames’s theology. Finally, these findings will be summarized in the conclusion.

Ames on the Conception of Conscience

Ames’s systematic explanation of conscience was articulated in his De conscientia. At the outset of this book, Ames defined conscience as “a man’s judgment of himself, according to the judgment of God of him,” which

thus “belongs to the understanding, not to the will.”

8. William Ames, Conscience with the Power and Cases thereof (1639; reprint, Amsterdam: Walter J. Johnson, Inc., 1975), I.1.1. I have modernized the spelling of the quotations for readability. This work is referred to in the text as De conscientia, its Latin title.


He that lives in sin, shall die:  
I live in sin;  
Therefore, I shall die.\textsuperscript{14}

According to Ames, the major proposition, as “a light and a law,” declared the general law, and the minor premise, as “a Booke,” examined the fact or state of man according to that law. The conscience as “a judge” eventually concluded the judgment according to his state and the law declared, either pronouncing one guilty or giving spiritual peace. In this sense, Ames stated, “the force and nature of Conscience therefore is contained in such a syllogism.”\textsuperscript{15} This syllogism functioned importantly in Ames’s conception of conscience, but Van Til overstated this when he argued that by this system “Ames locked conscience to a method.”\textsuperscript{16} Both Sprunger and Van Vliet noticed that Ames was simply following Perkins in his formulation of the conscience syllogism.\textsuperscript{17} In his discussion of the manner that conscience gives judgment, Perkins gave a similar example:

“Every murderer is cursed,” says the mind.  
“You are a murderer,” says conscience assisted by memory.  
Ergo, “You are accursed,” says conscience, and so gives her sentence.\textsuperscript{18}

Clearly, Perkins’s understanding of the conscience, as a part of the faculty of mind, played an important role in his version of the syllogism. Likewise, Ames made the same formulation, arguing that the law was the presumption, the state of man was the assumption, and the judgment was the conclusion. Van Til, therefore, not only seems to have misunderstood the Aristotelian syllogism as the Ramist dialectic method, but also seems to have falsely considered it to be the diverging point between Ames and Perkins. That eventually resulted in an unreasonable accusation that Ames’s adoption of the conscience syllogism forced him to reject Perkins’s definition of conscience and the liberty of conscience Perkins promoted.\textsuperscript{19}

\textsuperscript{14} Ames, 	extit{Conscience}, I.1.8.  
\textsuperscript{15} Ames, 	extit{Conscience}, I. 1.8–11.  
\textsuperscript{16} Van Til, 	extit{Liberty of Conscience}, 50.  
\textsuperscript{18} Perkins, 	extit{Works of William Perkins: Volume 8}, 50.  
\textsuperscript{19} Van Til, 	extit{Liberty of Conscience}, 48–51.
Since the proposition is the key in the syllogism, Ames proceeded to investigate the source of proposition, *synteresis*, which was apparently absent from Perkins's works. Following the schoolmen, Ames asserted that it is this *synteresis* which dictates or gives the proposition or the law of conscience. The introduction of this scholastic term reveals more clearly Ames's continuity with the Thomist tradition in his understanding of conscience.²⁰ In line with Aquinas, Ames defined *synteresis* to be “a habit of the understanding, by which we do assent unto the principles of moral actions, that is, such actions as are our duty.” As a habit, *synteresis* is not conscience itself, Ames clarified, but “only the principle of conscience.” In essence, therefore, it is the “storehouse of principles.”²¹ Ames believed this *synteresis* is possessed by all men without distinction, as is the conscience. Even after the fall, Ames said, “*synteresis* may for a time be hindered from acting, but cannot be utterly extinguished or lost.” Accordingly, “no man is so desperately wicked as to be void of all conscience.”²² Ames argued that the fall did not affect the universal presence of *synteresis*, but brought some change to its content, which he indicated in his distinction between the “natural conscience” and the “enlightened conscience.” While the former “is that which acknowledges for law the principles of nature, and the conclusions arising from them,” the enlightened conscience “is that which doth beside those, acknowledge whatsoever is prescribed in the Scriptures.”²³ The *synteresis* of the natural or unregenerate man stores only the natural moral principles, but the believer’s includes some additional scriptural principles which God “has enjoined.” The exact content and necessity of the additional scriptural principles beside the natural-law principles were not explained by Ames here, but he was clear that “the revealed will of God whereby man knows his duty, contains both these.” This means that *synteresis*, in the broadest sense, is directed by the revealed will of God only, and the natural law principles are also part of the revealed will of God. Ames’s connection of *synteresis* with natural law and the revealed will of God determined the infallibility of *synteresis*, as well as the authority of conscience.

Ames discussed the authority of conscience from both its objective and subjective aspects. Objectively, he argued conscience is bound by the

revealed will of God only. According to Ames, “the perfect and only rule of conscience is the revealed will of God.” He further identified it with “the Law of God” in general, which included both the natural law of God and the scriptural law, including "those things which are commanded in the Gospel." In this sense, “the Law of God only does bind the Conscience of man.”

By binding, Ames meant that “it were a sin to do anything contrary to it (the law of God).” Therefore, strictly speaking, neither any law of men, nor a promise, nor an oath, nor a parent can properly bind the conscience. It is the power and authority of God only to know “the inward workings of the conscience” and to “punish the conscience,” and accordingly, only the will of God can bind the conscience. Contrary to Van Til’s interpretation, therefore, Ames closely followed Perkins by upholding the authority of conscience under God yet over man. Subjectively, Ames also spoke of the office of conscience in respect to the *synteresis*. Ames believed conscience, in this sense, represents the will of God and “stands in the place of God himself.”

In necessary things, therefore, it “binds a man so straightly that the command of no creature can free a man from it.” This binding authority of conscience on man should be understood as a derivative power from the revealed will of God it represents. While the revealed will of God binds the conscience objectively, it also empowers the conscience to bind man subjectively.

What if the conscience fails to deliver the objective will of God? Ames believed this was the response of an erroneous conscience. Different from a doubting and scrupulous conscience, an erroneous conscience happens when it “judges otherwise than the thing is” by *positively erring.* Failing to deliver the objective will of God, an erroneous conscience, however, “binds always so, that he that does against it, sins.” This is because, although an erroneous conscience could not represent the will of God “materially, and truly,” Ames argued, it still functions that way “formally, and by interpretation.” Consequently, “he that contemns (an erroneous) conscience, contemns God himself.” Underpinning the binding authority of an erroneous conscience, therefore, is still the objective will and authority of God. Ames recognized that the case of erroneous conscience results in a kind of

---

necessity of sinning. Indeed, the one who has an erroneous conscience sins either against his conscience with his evil manner, or against God’s law with an evil act. But this necessity, Ames argued, is caused by man’s corrupted practical reason by which the mind fails to draw conclusions rightly out of general principles or to understand the commandments of Scripture sufficiently.\(^\text{30}\) Elsewhere, Ames stated more explicitly “that law which is written and engraved in nature…is in a manner wholly buried by original corruption…. The light of understanding is…obscured with manifold darkness.” Therefore, Ames’s solution for this was a better understanding of God’s written law in the Scripture, as well as the assistance of His grace and the help of teaching.\(^\text{31}\) In short, Ames insisted consistently on the revealed will of God as the only rule of conscience. In book five, Ames further and consistently explicated how the various manifestations of the revealed will of God bind the conscience, which will be the focus of the following section.

**Ames on the Binding of Conscience**

*Conscience and Natural Law*

Ames’s detailed elaboration of the various kinds of laws appeared in his discussion of man’s duties toward his neighbors. Ames used the word “law” (\(\text{lex}\)) and the word “right” (\(\text{ius}\)) interchangeably because the latter for him “implies a power of some authority, commanding this or that to be done.”\(^\text{32}\) Understood broadly, the law is divided into divine law with God as the author and human law invented by man. Following the Thomist tradition, Ames further divided the divine law or the law of God into “Right Natural” (natural law) and “Right Positive” (positive law). Natural law, Ames defined, “is that which is apprehended to be fit to be done or avoided out of the natural instinct of Natural Light; or that which is at least deduced from that Natural Light by evident Consequence.” It thus consists of both “principles known by Nature” and “conclusions deduced from those Principles,” while the positive law is added to the natural law “by some revelation of God.”\(^\text{33}\) Apparently Ames believed that divine law is predominantly natural law, which also is apparent in his identification of the natural law with the eternal law of God. “The Right Natural or Natural Law, is the same, which usually is called the Eternal Law.” Their difference consists merely

---

in the different naming. In relation to God, it is called *eternal* law “as it is from eternity in Him,” but in relation to man, it is called *natural* law “as it is ingrafted and imprinted in the *Nature* of man, by God of *Nature*.“\(^{34}\) In this way, Ames rooted natural law in the eternal, unchanging will of God, which was in line with his Reformed predecessors.\(^{35}\)

Contrary to Davis’s reading, therefore, Ames never held to an independent, natural conscience rooted in natural law, apart from the revealed will of God.\(^{36}\) Rather, Ames believed that because natural law is a participation of the divine law and the eternal will of God, it binds the conscience universally and absolutely. Ames substantiated the binding authority of natural law in the special moral government of God. According to Ames, God governs rational creatures specially by making law, establishing law, and fulfilling the law, from which “arises a covenant between God and them.” Thus, a covenant in essence is “a kind of transaction of God with the creature whereby God commands, promises, threatens, fulfills; and the creature binds itself in obedience to God so demanding.”\(^{37}\) In the initial covenant of creation (works), Ames argued, the law of God is mainly revealed through the law of nature, which was “written in the heart (of man) in the form of disposition [*habitus*], where the first foundation of conscience called *synderesis* is located.”\(^{38}\) Besides, “something positive was added to (though on the same basis as) the law of nature.”\(^{39}\) Therefore, man’s transgression of the outward positive law of God in his abuse of free will implies his profession of disobedience to natural law or the law of God, and thus, “contempt for the whole covenant (of works).”\(^{40}\) In this covenantal way, natural law binds the conscience of all humanity in obedience to God. Ignoring Ames’s covenant framework in which natural law operates, Davis downplayed the “religious obligations” in Ames’s conception of natural conscience. Davis seems to portray Ames as a proponent of the freedom and autonomy of conscience.\(^{41}\) However, that notion would be unthinkable to Ames. In

---

this covenant framework, the worshiping of the biblical God, for Ames, is always “a principle of the law of nature.” In another place, Ames likewise stated that “there are some principles so clear, and written in the hearts of all men…such as this is, that God ought to be loved.” He believed that loving and worshiping God, therefore, is an essential part of natural law that binds the conscience.

**Conscience and Moral Law**

For Ames, since Adam’s covenant-breaking could not utterly extinguish the *synteresis* and the conscience of man, neither could it nullify the binding authority of natural law on conscience. Nevertheless, the fall did hinder the *synteresis* from acting, and accordingly, affected the operation of natural law in conscience. That made the moral law, the written law of God, necessary. According to Ames, moral law “was published by God with his own voice, and twice written in Tables of stone and expressed in the Decalogue.” With God as its author, moral law is by nature closely related to natural law. Except for the positive law of the fourth commandment, Ames asserted, “All the precepts of the Moral Law are out of the Law of Nature.” To support this statement, Ames argued that the precepts in the decalogue, like natural law, concern “all Nations at all times,” for they are “very necessary to human nature, for the attaining of its end.” Moreover, “grounded upon right reason,” these precepts are approved in substance even by the heathen, and they are so perfect in content that if observed duly, all other human laws would not be necessary. Namely, this moral law, for Ames, was the promulgation of the natural law in redemptive history. But why does it need to be promulgated if the moral law is the same as the natural law which has been engraved in the hearts of men? Ames answered this objection by appealing to the fallen condition of man. Such promulgation is necessary because the fall has so blinded our understanding, perverted our will, and disordered our affections that “only some relics of that [natural] law remain in our hearts like to some dim aged picture.” Therefore, Ames concluded that there is “no where found any true right practical reason, pure and complete in all parts, but in the written law of God.”

44. Ames, *Conscience*, I.2.5.
47. Ames *Conscience*, V.1.28.
Likewise, in expositing the decalogue in his commentary on the Heidelberg Catechism, Ames also spoke of the close relationship between moral law and natural law. He first declared that “this Law of God contained in the Decalogue, or ten words [that is, brief sentences], is the most perfect rule for directing the life of man.” By “the most perfect rule,” however, Ames did not intend to emphasize the superiority of moral law over natural law. Rather, as in De Conscientia, Ames sought to defend the perfection of moral law from its origin in natural law:

Because it contains in itself a delineation or draft of that perfection to which man in his first or innocent nature was created, according to the image of God. And therefore, it is also called the Law of Nature, because that rule of life which was written in the heart of man, according to its primitive and pure nature, is explained in this Law.

Ames believed their difference is simply that moral law is a delineation or explanation of natural law with written words. Accordingly, moral law, as the revealed will of God in Scripture, binds the conscience universally and absolutely just as natural law:

Every command of the Law requires the whole obedience of the whole man. That is, inward as well as outward; of the heart as well as the mouth, and of the hand, or work: You shall have no other, etc. Do not make for yourself, etc. These are forms of speaking by which such a universal obedience is formally required.

After the fall, all sinners must turn to this moral law and have the conscience enlightened to make a conscientious judgment. “The interpretation of the Scripture…to discern God’s will for a man’s self in his own conscience,” Ames concluded, “belongs to every man.”

Nevertheless, it should be noticed that Ames contended that moral law in the state of grace bound believers differently than unbelievers. In his Marrow, Ames maintained that natural law in substance “is the same as the moral law of the decalogue.” Presupposing this continuity of the law or the will of God, Ames refuted the view that the law of God has been

52. Ames, The Marrow of Theology, 1.10.16.
abrogated for the faithful. Nevertheless, he admitted that the law of God functioned differently in different stages of redemption history:

It does not have the justifying power it had in the original state of integrity nor the condemning power it had in the state of sin. But it does have the force and vigor of a directing power; and it also retains a certain force of condemnation, for it reproves and condemns sin in the faithful (although it cannot wholly condemn the faithful themselves because they are not under the law but under grace). 53

In other words, while the law of God before the fall bound the conscience through its “justifying power” and after the fall through its wholly “condemning power,” it now, manifested as moral law, binds the believers who are under grace mainly through its “directing power,” as well as through its restricted force of evangelical condemnation. This is because what the law requires for believers in the covenant of grace is no longer legal obedience but evangelical obedience. 54 For that reason Ames reminded his readers that whenever they read about the new man or the new creature in Scripture, this evangelical obedience should always be in their mind. 55 This freedom of conscience from the bondage of guilt, accusation, and condemnation should also be each believer’s presupposition in his reading of Ames’s cases of conscience.

Conscience and Human Law

By human law, Ames chiefly meant civil law. Ames argued that whatever is not just and right is not law. Therefore, all the human laws are derived from the natural law to a certain degree, either as its direct application or by way of conclusion. 56 Since it is enacted by man and limited by human reason, Ames argued, “all human constitutions are of necessity liable to imperfection, error, and injustice.” Specifically, human laws are imperfect in the sense that they contain only a limited part of the natural law, and are subject to “addition, detraction, or correction.” Moreover, since they only aim at making good citizens instead of good men as natural law, human laws in function suppress only the outward actions which “disturb the peace and quiet of the common-wealth.” 57 This continuity and discontinuity of the

54. Ames, The Marrow of Theology, II.1.33.
55. Ames, The Marrow of Theology, 1.10.16.
civil law with the natural law determines how far it could be said to bind
the conscience. In fact, Ames clarified at the outset of his De Conscientia
that “though men be bound in conscience by God to observe in due and just
circumstances the laws of men, yet the same laws of men so far as they are
man’s laws, do not bind the conscience.”58

As shown above, Ames insisted that human law does not bind the
conscience, even though he admitted the necessity of obeying them “in due
and just circumstances.” Does that suggest that Ames held to an ambiguous
and inconsistent teaching, as Davis argues?59 The qualification that “men be
bound in conscience by God” indicated that man’s observance of the human
law ultimately should be attributed to the binding authority of God or the
law of God, which was Ames’s consistent teaching throughout the book.

In his discussion of the obligations between magistrate and subjects in
book 5, Ames addressed this theme again and insisted in the same man-
ner that “nothing but the law of God does properly, directly, immediately,
and by itself bind the conscience…. Yet nevertheless, human laws are to
be observed out of conscience towards God.” That meant, as Ames further
explained, “subjects are bound not to oppose them (human laws) out of
contempt of authority” because the contempt of authority “is by itself a sin
against the law of God.”60 It is in this indirect and derivative sense that Ames
spoke of the binding authority of human laws, which was more clearly mani-
fested in Ames’s distinction between the human laws which “either urge or
declare the Divine (law)” or “directly further the conservation thereof” and
the other human laws which he believed were “purely human.” The former
laws unquestionably “do bind even the conscience” because of their partak-
ing of “the nature, and force of the Divine Law.” The other human laws “may
be either just or unjust, or partly just and partly unjust,” and thus, they “do
not so absolutely bind.”61 But even when such a just law of man did bind
the conscience, Ames explained, “The violation then of such or such a Law,
which is purely human, is not any special kind of sin, in respect of the mat-
ter of Law, but is only so far forth a sin, as it breaks the Law of general
obedience.”62 Namely, the binding power comes not from the law itself, but
from “the law of general obedience” instituted by God. Ames held, therefore,

58. Ames, Conscience, I.2.11.
that human laws may and do bind the conscience, but they only bind derivatively, by the authority of divine law.

This point is also illustrated in Ames’s support of the civil magistrate to suppress the heretics who err in conscience. According to Ames, the magistrate is instituted by God to be “the greatest of human powers,” yet his power is limited by the will of God.63 His primary duty, therefore, is to “promote true Religion, and repress impiety.”64 Naturally, the magistrate should, “according to the calling and power which he has received from God,” restrain the heretics who are “manifestly known and publicly hurtful,” even with the sword, if needed.65 The reason Ames allowed the civil authority to violate the individual conscience was that the magistrate in this case represents the orthodox will of God to correct the false will of God represented by the heretics. Again, Ames believed what matters ultimately is the revealed will of God. The application of this principle could be seen in the trial of the antinomian Anne Hutchinson in the Massachusetts Bay Colony, which Van Til considered to be the proof of Ames’s and his followers’ departure from Perkins.66 But nothing could be further from the truth. Ames was simply following Perkins on this point, who stated explicitly that “it is the Magistrate’s duty to compel recusants, schismatics, heretics, and such like, to the hearing and professing of the word” because the primary care of the magistrate is to have “the true religion be professed, and the contemnors thereof punished.”67 Both of the Puritans, therefore, recognized the true and derivative nature of the binding authority of human laws, whose apparent agreement was somehow missed by Van Til.

Conclusion

The following conclusions may be drawn from the above analysis. First, Ames should never be considered to be an innovator in his conception of conscience and its authority. On one hand, his definition of conscience as an act of practical judgment, his practical syllogism through which conscience operates, and his introduction of synteresis all demonstrate his continuity

64. Ames, Conscience, V.25.8.
67. William Perkins, A Commentarie Or Exposition Upon The Five First Chapters Of The Epistle To The Galatians: penned by the godly, learned, and iudicall diuine, Mr. W. Perkins. Now published for the benefit of the Church, and continued with a supplement vpon the sixt chap- ter, by Rafe Cudworth, Bachelour of Diuiniteit (Cambridge: John legat, 1604), 615.
with the Thomist tradition. On the other hand, Ames closely followed his teacher, Perkins, by maintaining the revealed will of God as “the perfect and only rule of conscience,” which is specifically illustrated in his treatment of erroneous conscience.\(^{68}\) The two Puritans’ distinct definitions of conscience did not affect their essential agreement on the authority of conscience. Therefore, Van Til’s notion of “the Amesian school” must be rejected. Misunderstanding the tradition of practical syllogism, Van Til’s interpretation is problematic, and fails to do justice to both Ames and Perkins.

Second, Ames did not hold an ambiguous view of freedom of conscience; rather, he consistently taught the revealed will of God or the divine law to be the only thing binding human conscience. While he believed that the will of God is revealed in the covenant of works as the natural law written in the heart of man, he also contended that because of the fall of man, it manifests itself in the covenant of grace as the moral law written in tables of stone. Representing the same revealed will of God, he held that the moral law is the same in substance as the natural law, and accordingly, binds the conscience universally and absolutely just as the natural law and the divine law do. The only difference is that, because of the special nature of the covenant of grace, the moral law binds Christians mainly through its “directing power” instead of the “justifying” and “condemning” power for unbelievers. Ames believed that since human laws derived from the natural law, they too may bind the conscience, but only indirectly and derivatively when they are just and right in accordance with the revealed will of God. Ames’s permission for the civil magistrate to punish heretics was the best example on this point. An erroneous conscience does bind the individual, yet the magistrate with a higher calling and authority from God is allowed to compel the erroneous conscience. In this way, Ames consistently upheld the authority of conscience over all purely human authority, yet always under the revealed will of God in its various manifestations. Projecting his modern natural-law theory onto Ames, Davis attempted to segment Ames’s natural-law teaching from its organic unity with divine law and moral law and the important theological context of covenant. His anachronistic proposal of an autonomous, liberal freedom of conscience in Ames was doomed to fail.

In the sizeable spiritual tome of the English Puritan John Downname (1571–1652), *The Christian Warfare*, the author addressed the reality of spiritual warfare in the life of believers:

As soone as we seeke for assurance of saluation in Christ, and endeauour to serue the Lord in a holy and Christian life, wee are to prepare our selues for a combat, vnlesse we would suddenly be surprised. For the spirituall enemies of our salvation bandie themselves against vs as soone as we haue giuen our names vnto God, and taken vpon vs the profession and practice of Christianitie.\(^2\)

Downname posited that spiritual warfare commenced at the beginning of the Christian life. Satan and the world were introduced as enemies. These cooperating adversaries appeared to use two tactics. They engaged themselves as spiritual seducers, but also as ferocious opponents. In both cases, their objective was to draw believers away from the pathway of faith. Downame then proceeded to address in detail the tactics of these enemies, as well as the believer’s need to resist.

This article will focus on a theme that was addressed frequently in the spiritual writings of the Puritans: spiritual warfare.\(^3\) Although they focused primarily on the inner dimension of the Christian’s spiritual warfare, they also addressed external aspects of the life of faith. This article intends to furnish insights as to how spiritual warfare fit within the context of Puritan

---

1. For the question of the definition of Puritanism, the study of Randall J. Pederson is now an indispensable resource. *Unity in Diversity: English puritans and the puritan Reformation, 1603–1689* (Leiden, Brill, 2014).
spirituality, the pastoral counsel proposed to Christian warriors, and the early modern English social context in which they lived.

Puritan literature regarding spiritual warfare could be identified as a form of theology that belonged to the category of “practical divinity.” A substantial quantity of Puritan works published during the final quarter of the sixteenth century and well into the seventeenth century covered practical divinity. They addressed matters of faith, piety, and other more practical aspects of the Christian life. They aimed at providing a broad readership with spiritual counsel by way of instruction and personal application.\(^4\)

This article presents a broad, representative selection of Puritan publications on Christian warfare. It will endeavor to give insight into both the overall Puritan presentation of spiritual warfare, as well as the distinctive characteristics of each author. This article does not intend to cover the field of research beyond the presented resources, but restricts itself to English Puritan writings, and therefore bypasses the contribution of New England authors. It will focus on the following Puritan publications: William Perkins’s: *Of the Combate of the Flesh and Spirit* (1593), *The Combate Betweene Christ and the Devill Displayed: or, A Commentarie Vpon the Temptations of Christ* (1604); William Gouge’s: *The Whole-Armor of God* (1619); John Downame’s: *The Christian Warfare* (1604–1634); Thomas Brooks’s: *Precious Remedies Against Satan’s Devices* (1652); William Gurnall’s: *The Christian in Complete Armour* (1655–1662); John Owen’s: *Of the Mortification of Sin in Believers* (1656), *Of Temptation: The Nature and Power of it* (1658), *The Nature, Power, Deceit and Prevalency of the Remainders of Indwelling Sin in Believers* (1667), *Pneumatologia: or, A Discourse concerning the Holy Spirit* (1674); Isaac Ambrose’s: *War with Devils* (1661); Richard Gilpin’s: *Daemonologia Sacra: or, A Treatise of Satan’s Temptations* (1677); and John Bunyan’s: *Grace Abounding to the Chief of Sinners* (1666), *The Pilgrim’s Progress* (1678), *The Holy War* (1682), and *The Pilgrim’s Progress, The Second Part* (1684).\(^5\)

Perkins, the “father of Puritanism,” presented several elements, which would become characteristic of Puritan views of spiritual warfare. His discussion of Christ’s temptation in the desert (Matt. 4:1–11) depicted the devil as the primary opponent of the faithful, who tried to tempt them to


both sin and spiritual despair. Just as Christ effectively parried His opponent with words from Scripture, so the Christian soldier was summoned to follow this example. Downame is chosen for having published the most voluminous volume about spiritual warfare in Puritan circles during a lifetime of about thirty years, a work in which he not only focused on diabolic but also on worldly temptations. Gouge and Gurnall focused on Ephesians 6, a central scriptural passage in Puritan works on spiritual warfare, from which they emphasized the responsibility of battling believers. Brooks is prominent for having written the most popular volume on the theme of this article, handling spiritual warfare in a pointed, expressive, realistic, and vivid way, while Ambrose had an approach of his own, extending Satan’s activity to the entire human life. Owen believed spiritual warfare was the psychological fight against the believer’s own sinful desires. In an in-depth anthropological-psychological analysis of believers, Owen described both the active power of sinful desires in believers and the spiritual resistance to which they are called. Gilpin and Bunyan are included because they magnified Satan’s power, as they dramatized the role of spiritual despair to haunting effect, but Gilpin’s medical background and Bunyan’s literary imagination seemed to have led them to this emphasis. Moreover, in Bunyan’s presentation of worldly temptations, the experience of Restoration persecution loomed largely.

**Methodology and State of Research**

To evaluate the significance of the Puritan literature regarding spiritual warfare, this article will discuss its multi-faceted context. First, this literature frequently had its origin in sermons addressed to the congregation. A focus on published sermons means that this article does not analyze the personal reaction of church members to the Puritan message about spiritual warfare, but instead concentrates on the message itself. Nevertheless, research of the literary text must be viewed in connection with the ecclesiastical-pastoral situation: these Puritan writings about practical theology emerged within the context of the post-Reformation Church of England with its great diversity of members. Second, this literature was written within the theological context of a Reformed emphasis on pneumatology and the *ordo salutis*. Third, Puritan views of spiritual warfare must

---

also be placed within the context of its spirituality, in which union and communion with the triune God went hand in hand with an awareness of the dangers that confronted the Christian life—particularly temptation, sin, and despair. Puritan preachers and spiritual writers increasingly focused on the significant role of experience within the context of pastoral guidance and the maturation of spiritual life. Included within the emotional context of Christian experience were also “dark” experiences, such as affliction, desertion, and despair. The latter were an essential component of Puritan writings on spiritual warfare. Fourth, knowledge of the social and cultural context is significant, for considering the unique and conflicted position of Puritanism within the English post-Reformation society will guide in a proper evaluation of the polemical pronouncements regarding the Roman Catholic Church, fellow citizens, or English society.

The views of individual Puritans regarding spiritual warfare were occasionally researched. Frank Luttmer discussed the Puritan approach to spiritual warfare within the context of the relationship between Puritan saints and their fellow citizens. Puritans viewed the majority of their fellow citizens as unconverted, and therefore as instruments of the devil. By their worldly lifestyle, they could potentially seduce their Puritan compatriots to sin and even oppose them. However, there was usually not an intense


8. For an analysis of this context, see De Koeijer, *Geestelijke strijd bij de puriteinen*, chap. 8.

manifestation of the latter, for it proved to be possible that, despite a profoundly different world view, they could coexist peacefully.¹⁰

Nathan Johnstone produced the most thorough study of the Puritan approach to spiritual warfare. He analyzed the depiction of Satan in the religious, literary, and political culture of early modern England.¹¹ The significance of Johnstone’s research was that he identified the elements of the assessment of spiritual warfare in English Protestantism. The devil was the primary adversary; temptation was the all-encompassing focal point of his activity; and the knowledge of faith, insight into his tactics, and prayer were the core elements of a spiritual counteroffensive to these attacks. Furthermore, he accurately defined the context of the Protestant view regarding the devil and spiritual warfare by analyzing the pervasive anti-Catholicism and political tension of the English culture. Nevertheless, spiritual warfare was only addressed from the vantage point of resisting Satan, whereas the relationship to fellow citizens and sinful desires was not considered.

However, this study demands further research. For the unique dimension of Puritan writers regarding spiritual warfare was not sufficiently highlighted. Therefore, Puritan views on spiritual warfare must be articulated more clearly by way of the aforementioned selection of representative literature. In light of the extensive corpus of literature, it was precisely the Puritan movement that formulated and thoroughly discussed the subject of spiritual warfare in Protestant circles.

Three Enemies

The three enemies repeatedly encountered in Puritan literature will now be discussed individually: Satan, the world, and the flesh. In their pastoral guidance of Christian believers, Puritan authors linked temptations to both sin and despair to Satan, the arch-enemy of God. They did so specifically by seriously examining the biblical passages of Christ’s temptation in the wilderness (Matthew 4) and Paul’s exhortation to ward off demonic attacks with the spiritual armour of Ephesians 6. Puritan writers highlighted the intimate connection between Satan and the world, because the world functioned as an important medium by which Satan was able to subject believers not only to a variety of temptations to sin, but also to opposition


and even persecution from fellow-citizens and governments. Their view of the Christian was that of a pilgrim, who was traveling through a dangerous world, and was a stranger in conformity to the biblical description of believers in Hebrews 11.\textsuperscript{12} Puritan authors considered the third enemy, the flesh, an evil power within the believer himself. This enemy operated according to the believer’s own hidden desires, but also in cooperation with Satan, making his temptations all the more dangerous. The inner struggle of Paul in Romans 7:13–25 served as an important biblical illustration of spiritual warfare against the flesh.

\textit{Satan}

Modern historical research regarding the place and significance of the devil and demons in pre-modern England focused almost exclusively on witchcraft.\textsuperscript{13} At the same time, research also has revealed that the role of the devil permeated a considerable segment of the pre-modern English biblical culture. Particularly in Puritan literature, several decidedly different aspects were accentuated other than the physical manifestation of the devil in stories about witchcraft.\textsuperscript{14}

Previous research primarily articulated the functional aspect of the Puritan focus on demonology. By way of psychological projection, the devil was presented as a symbol of guilt or unrecognized, hidden desires.\textsuperscript{15} Furthermore, this focus on the devil in Puritan literature was associated with the self-assessment of believers in their relationship with unregenerate fellow citizens. The unregenerate were viewed as Satan’s willing subjects, whereas the community of the godly continually engaged in battle with the


\textsuperscript{13} The two most significant studies are Keith Thomas, Religion and the Decline of Magic: Studies in Popular Beliefs in Sixteenth and Seventeenth Century England (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1971); Stuart Clark, Thinking with Demons: The Idea of Witchcraft in Early Modern Europe (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997). In this context, writings on demonic possession and examples of Protestant exorcism are also worth mentioning. For a history, see, Brian P. Levack, The Devil Within: Possession and Exorcism in the Christian West (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2013). However, demonic possession has received considerably less scholarly attention than the demonic side of witchcraft.

\textsuperscript{14} Johnstone, Devil and Demonism, 60–142.

The development of Puritan belief in the devil emerged from the disappointment that a comprehensive reformation of the English nation had not occurred. This belief fostered an antithetical world view which identified believers as a minority besieged by the opponents of reformation under the leadership of Satan.

The advantage of this assessment of English belief in the devil was that satanic activities were placed within a flexible context of individual and collective needs. The disadvantage was that the focus on Satan was primarily explained by a projection of primarily negative experiences of opposition, disappointment, and vulnerability. Puritan literature discussed Satan, however, as a real adversary in the daily experience of believers. Although this literature posited an intimate connection between the sinful desires of believers and Satan, it did not do so at the expense of their responsibility for their sin. Moreover, Puritan literature on spiritual warfare did not view Satan’s activity in the daily life of believers as determined by their relationship with the unregenerate or as dependent upon this. Instead, it emphasized the experience of demonic temptation within their hearts. Moreover, their striving for reformation could not be reduced to an exclusive thinking in terms of enmity. Their emphasis on the hidden activity of the devil within the church and society was not preeminent due to a supposed spiritual insensibility of a substantial part of the population. It was the rather “positive” experience of the presence of intelligent and pious fellow citizens finding satisfaction in Roman Catholic devotional practices that stimulated the Protestant accent on the satanic deception of these pious Roman Catholics.

Although English Reformation divines adopted traditional notions of demonology from the medieval Catholic Church, they also shifted this previous emphasis. The late medieval view of the devil was that temptation was only one of the activities whereby Satan torments humanity. However, English Protestant theologians and preachers shifted their emphasis and held that internal temptation was the primary and most dangerous component of Satan’s activity. Internal temptation originated with the devil and was broadly connected to specific historical segments of humanity.

16. Luttmer, “Persecutors.”
opinions, and practices: the Roman Catholic Church’s erroneous beliefs and devotional practices; forms of entertainment such as theater, dancing, corrupt literature, and playacting; individuals and communities that were potentially dangerous for the well-being of society; and the governmental structures of the state.  

Puritan preachers focused primarily upon the individual soul. The fact that their congregants were tempted to sin and experienced spiritual despair served as proof of demonic intrigue. In their spiritual literature, they described in detail the impact of the devil’s activity upon the individual soul so that, in the role of helpers in this spiritual conflict, these pastoral guides could provide their believing readers with direction on how they could most effectively confront the adversary. Demonic activities were thus incorporated as a component of a broader construct of daily strife.

Satan’s Character
Puritan authors did not extensively address Satan’s origin and his relationship to the world of angels and demons. Instead, they were far more interested in the effect of demonic activity upon people, and primarily upon believers.

Their indifference toward Satan’s background was particularly evident in John Downname’s exhaustive work on spiritual warfare. The only point he addressed in extensive detail in his work was the power of the devil. He linked this with his spiritual identity—as one belonging to the angelic world—and having dominion over a legion of demons. However, this power was not abstract. Rather, he highlighted certain aspects of Satan’s character that had deep significance for the Christian life: his malice, and particularly his deceitfulness. His malice demonstrated his desire to destroy the believer. His deceit, however, explained how he aimed to achieve the believer’s destruction. His deceit expressed itself by not always being personally engaged. Instead, he generally engaged the believer through his collaborators, the world and the flesh, both of which were highlighted extensively by Downname. Whenever the devil engaged himself as


the accuser, his wickedness and the accompanying destructive intentions became all the more obvious.\textsuperscript{22}

\textit{Season of Satan’s Activities}

Although Puritan authors discussed Satan’s activity primarily as a component of warfare in the Christian life, devilish intrigues could also manifest themselves at the very beginning of conversion.

For example, Isaac Ambrose’s emphasis in \textit{War with Devils} was that the entire life of man was impacted by devilish activities—from the time of birth till the end of life. Thereby he indicated that this chief enemy stalked man throughout his life. He showed how Satan continually attempted to prevent a believer from surrendering to Christ, especially at the time of conversion when the conviction of guilt produced fear of God’s wrath. Whereas the Spirit intermingled this fear with hope and used it constructively to stimulate in sinners a yearning for God’s saving grace, Ambrose argued that Satan-inspired fear contained the eternal perdition of sinners as its main object. The devil sought to achieve his destructive objective by exaggerating the magnitude of various sins so that the scathing wrath of God became an inescapable consequence.\textsuperscript{23}

Ambrose showed that man by nature lived in bondage to God’s adversary, and that conversion culminated in being set free in principle from his dominant sphere of influence. This deliverance did not imply, however, that these devilish activities would cease in the life of the Christian following conversion.

\textit{Satan’s Methodology}

Puritans held that Satan’s favorite method was to seduce believers to commit all manner of sin.

Thomas Brooks dealt extensively with this satanic temptation by practically and descriptively highlighting how the devil went to great lengths to highlight the attractiveness of sin while simultaneously concealing the truth

\textsuperscript{22} For the Puritan presentation of satanic deception as a disguising of evil as good and of falsehood as truth, see David Parry, “As an Angel of Light: Satanic Rhetoric in Early Modern Literature and Theology,” in Gregor Thuswaldner and Daniel Russ, eds., \textit{The Hermeneutics of Hell: Vision and Representation of the Devil in World Literature} (Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017), 54–59. See also his forthcoming \textit{The Rhetoric of Conversion in English Puritan Writing from Perkins to Milton}.

\textsuperscript{23} Isaac Ambrose, \textit{The Compleat Works of Isaac Ambrose} (London: Rowland Reynolds, 1674), 33.
regarding God’s temporal punishments and eternal wrath. Brooks called this Satan’s “presenting the bait and hiding the hook.” Brooks argued that Satan’s scheme was to minimize little missteps. However, for Brooks sinning was unmistakably a cumulative activity. Evil generally originated in the mind and would finally and concretely impact the entire walk of life.24

Satan’s role as accuser also belonged to the sphere of his seductive activities, revealing the true nature of his evil intentions. The devil would come with his accusation when the Christian warrior had yielded to sin in his heart, or when he committed a misdeed. His goal would then be to bring the believer to spiritual despondency and despair so that thereby he might bring about his demise.

William Perkins addressed Satan’s role as the accuser in his book about Christ’s temptation in the wilderness, The Combate Betweenee Christ and the Devill Displayed. There Perkins highlighted the fact that in his first temptation Satan challenged the divinity of Christ. Perkins then applied this temptation of Christ to the believer, highlighting how the devil would also challenge the believer’s spiritual identity as a child of God in order to lead him to despair.25

Downame addressed this too by clustering the direct temptations of Satan around the ordo salutis, particularly referencing the links between eternal election, calling, and sanctification. Downame argued that Satan targeted believers who were weak and prone to despondency by seeking to persuade them that their failings of heart and practice excluded them from God’s eternal election. When the devil challenged the genuineness of one’s faith, Downame directed Christians to the promises of the gospel, and the corresponding faith in these promises. Downame then proceeded to explain the internal and external marks of authentic faith. When a believer had yielded to sin, Satan would abuse this by magnifying sin and minimizing grace, thereby robbing the believer of any hope that he might be pardoned.26

**Satan’s Assault on God’s Character**

Brooks pointed out that when the devil tempted a believer to sin and despair, it was ultimately a proper view of God’s character that was at issue.

---

He argued that Satan would entice a believer to sin by slyly tempting him to dismiss it as harmless by pointing to God’s great mercy. As Brooks related:

Oh! Saith Satan, you need not make such a matter of sin, you need not be so fearful of sin, not so unwilling to sin; for God is a God of mercy, a God full of mercy, a God that delights in mercy, a God that is ready to shew mercy, a God that is never weary of shewing mercy, a God more prone to pardon his people than to punish his people; and therefore he will not take advantage against the soul; and why then, saith Satan, should you make such a matter of sin?\(^{27}\)

Once sin had taken its full effect, however, the adversary would confront the believer with the exact opposite, namely, God’s wrath and justice, and would seek to prevent him from being contrite and repentant, robbing him of the hope of forgiveness and thereby leading him to despair.\(^{28}\)

Brooks posited that in both cases there was a distorted and erroneous presentation of God’s character that would cause the Christian to be either superficially confident or despondent. Furthermore, he stated that God’s justice and punishment of sin powerfully motivated the believer to curb evil. God’s mercy guaranteed forgiveness and prevented the weak Christian from yielding to despondency and despair.

**Satan’s Power**

Puritans highlighted how Satan used immediate mental insinuations in tempting the believer. Ambrose elevated the impact of devilish temptations, thereby depicting the dramatic nature of spiritual warfare.\(^{29}\)

In his *Daemonologia Sacra*, Richard Gilpin affirmed Satan’s power by his extensive and detailed description of Satan’s influence upon the human heart via the senses, as well as through the strong connection he established between satanic intrigues and the mental condition of believers. Gilpin described the devil’s impact on human imagination, which played a significant role in the commission of sin:

*When he propounds an object to our lust, he doth not usually expose it naked under the hazard of dying out for want of prosecution, but*

---


\(^{29}\) Ambrose, *Compleat Works of Isaac Ambrose*, 86.
presently calls in our fancy to his aid, and there raiseth a theatre, on
which he acts before our minds the sin in all its ways and postures.\footnote{Richard Gilpin, \textit{Daemonologia Sacra}, ed. Alexander B. Grosart (London: James Nisbet, 1867), 66.}

According to Gilpin, human imagination was thus capable of stimulating
sin, and through the senses, could have a more powerful effect on the mind
than rational arguments. Since the affections persuaded the mind of the
“pleasures of sin,” their role was significant.

As he analyzed the devil’s influence, Gilpin indicated that Satan could
exercise considerable psychological influence, particularly when the believer
was in a state of melancholy.\footnote{Gilpin, \textit{Daemonologia Sacra}, 209–18.} In his autobiography, \textit{Grace Abounding}, John
Bunyan argued that Satan was capable of frequently bringing the author to
the brink of spiritual despair. In \textit{The Pilgrim’s Progress}, while the confronta-
tion with Apollyon was depicted as a battle of life and death, the events in
the Valley of the Shadow of Death produced great fear in Christian, and
Giant Despair proved to be an intimidating adversary. In \textit{The Holy War},

\textbf{Weak Christians}

The spiritual category of weak Christians was frequently depicted in the
researched literature. Satanic activities appeared to impact them more than
was true for other Christian soldiers.

In the preface of \textit{The Christian Warfare}, Downname wrote that he espe-
cially wished to encourage “weak Christians” in their spiritual warfare. He
argued that such believers were particularly vulnerable to denying that they
were indeed partakers of redemption due to Satanic taunts that would
magnify their sins. They evidently could not counter this sufficiently and
would, therefore, be vulnerable to despair.

Gilpin deemed vulnerable Christians to be particular individuals who
struggled with melancholy (depression)—a spiritual mindset that offered
the devil an ideal angle of attack. Troubling external circumstances and
anxious thoughts could cause every Christian to lose his spiritual equilib-
rium and cause him to yield to unchristian thoughts and deeds. However,
for believers who had a melancholy disposition such circumstances would progressively degenerate to a much deeper (and therefore more perilous) assault—an assault that would focus primarily on the new birth and would render the soul’s relationship with God vulnerable to becoming entirely dysfunctional. Satan would then proceed to avail himself deviously of this melancholy disposition to lead them to the abyss of spiritual disarray.\textsuperscript{33}

It is necessary to understand the perceived identity of these vulnerable believers. Irrespective of age or spiritual maturity, a rather common condition could be addressed here that appeared to foster spiritual despair caused by being confronted with guilt, habitual sins, and a perceived experiential lack of God’s nearness. This could particularly be true for young believers who, after their initial conversion, were vulnerable to Satan’s devices. The latter view would tend to link the category of weak Christians to a specific stage of life and measure of spiritual development, rather than defining their weakness as an existential component. Though such a connection occasionally surfaced, Puritan authors usually linked the difference between strong and weak Christians to their spiritual disposition.

\textit{The World}

Puritan publications on spiritual warfare presented the world as Satan’s primary and most prominent accomplice. The world’s role in this warfare will be assessed in light of the relationship between the Puritans and the context of English society.

Various scholars have arrived at an ambivalent conclusion regarding the place of Puritanism within the wider society. When viewed within the political and social context, the Puritan movement was predominantly moderate. Within the context of the national church, Puritans strove for the ongoing reformation of cities and villages, lived relatively harmoniously with their fellow citizens, and sought to counter trends that were critical of the orthodox Protestant faith.\textsuperscript{34} However, research also has affirmed that these “hotter sort of Protestants” would generate some tension, foster polarization, and pose a potential threat to the peaceful coexistence of
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various segments of the English population by separating themselves from their fellow citizens and being critical of various traditional practices.\footnote{35} Therefore, the presence of citizens who were of Puritan persuasion periodically generated discussions, tensions, and conflicts in English society. When Puritan spiritual separation was combined with forms of participation in the social network of rural and metropolitan communities—which in some regions included governmental responsibilities—there would generally be societal toleration and relatively harmonious coexistence. However, if spiritual separation resulted in societal isolation, and if that were to include being sharply critical of the traditional customs of the community, internal tension also could emerge. The latter occurred in a particular way following the restoration of the monarchy in 1660, when Puritans found themselves largely excluded from the English national church and socially degraded to an insignificant religious subculture.\footnote{36}

The social contrast between Puritans and non-Puritans was primarily based on their divergent theological-spiritual premises. Puritan preachers made a sharp distinction between Christians who had experienced a spiritual new birth and others who did not have the same experience. Whereas the first category had found spiritual freedom, the other group was under the dominion of Satan and sinful lusts. This antithetical view was somewhat tempered by the notion that there would be frequent variants in the spiritual condition of the unregenerate. That condition would vary from hardened fellow citizens who lived openly in sin, and fellow men who were inclined to be melancholy. The largest segment of the population was between these two extremes. According to the Puritans, this middle segment lived in false security since they did not recognize their spiritual misery—albeit that some consciences would be stirred during certain seasons or noteworthy events.\footnote{37}
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**Arena of Temptation and Repression**

Already the title page of *The Christian Warfare* proved that Downame viewed the world as the arena of temptation, and thereby particularly had in mind the spiritual harm that was inflicted by “tentations of prosperitie.” Although the pleasures of life, such as honor, riches, and pleasure were gifts of God that—when responsibly used—could enrich life and also be engaged for the cause of God’s kingdom, they could simultaneously function as manifestations of “worldly and carnall prosperitie,” and thereby open the door to sin. Satan’s relentless activity made this a real danger. However, the complicity of the flesh, as the common denominator of man’s sinful inclinations, was likewise perilous.

In his depiction of the world, Downame established a close link between those matters that led believers into sin and the community of unconverted fellow citizens. He contrasted the community of the godly with a primarily unconverted society in which a worldly lifestyle was predominant.38 Downame’s overarching thought was that these nominal Christians, by their lifestyle, could easily infect true believers.

Bunyan also highlighted the external sociological aspect of the world in his assessment of the repression of the godly. The change in circumstances during that period undoubtedly played a role in this. Following the restoration of the monarchy in 1660, the dissenters encountered political opposition, and in Bunyan’s case, persecution.39

*Grace Abounding* showed how Bunyan was deeply influenced by John Foxe’s *Acts and Monuments* (Foxe’s “Book of Martyrs”). In this book, Bunyan not only discovered that the Church had been oppressed for centuries, but also the power of a sustained profession of faith.40 Once Bunyan’s spiritual deliverance became a reality, he was confronted with being literally imprisoned. Bunyan recognized that death might be imminent. Thus, he vividly described his execution as being “on the ladder, with the rope about my neck.” In the account of his arrest and trial, *A Relation of the Imprisonment*, Bunyan presented himself as a patient defender of the gospel who was prepared to be a martyr.41

Bunyan’s allegories commonly depicted the way the believer was to navigate life through a world of much opposition. At the beginning of The Pilgrim’s Progress, the character Pliable, who represented counterfeit Christianity, declared that persevering Christians would ultimately encounter martyrdom. The lions that guarded the Palace Beautiful were symbols of repression capable of causing the characters Timorous and Mistrust to flee and Christian to be fearful—until, of course, Christian discovered that the lions were chained. However, these chained lions posed such a threat that Timorous and Mistrust abandoned their pilgrimage and Christian became fearful.

The notion of persecution also came to the fore by way of giants such as Apollyon, Pope, Pagan, and Despair. Whereas Bunyan viewed Apollyon and Despair as adversaries that sought to undermine the spiritual well-being of the main character, the other adversaries were more symbolic of physical persecution. When Christian departed from the dark Valley of the Shadow of Death, light reflected along a long history of persecution instigated by Pagan and Pope. However, Pagan had died and Pope was presented as an old and shackled figure. Although Pope granted Christian permission to pass on, he also threatened him with the possibility of a future burning at the stake. Indeed, Bunyan viewed the growing Roman-Catholic influence with the English state church as a troubling development.

The Vanity Fair episode depicted how Bunyan viewed his surrounding world as a place of repression. The indictments leveled against Christian and Faithful in a trial were described in great detail and set before the reader a society that valued societal and religious norms. Faithful was depicted as a martyr whose faith was steadfast.

In The Holy War, the theme of repression was expressed through the army of Bloodmen who, being inspired by Diabolus, aimed for the destruction of Mansoul, thereby symbolizing the lengthy history of persecution and the assaults upon non-conformists after 1660. When the recapture of the city ultimately failed, these Bloodmen were taken prisoner and executed. Bunyan’s conviction was that persecutors would ultimately be persecuted themselves.

42. Greaves, Glimpses of Glory, 246.
The notion of worldly repression was also evident in *The Pilgrim's Progress, The Second Part*. In this case, the target of this repression was primarily Christiana and her traveling companions. Here various giants were symbolic of repression. Giant Grim, also referred to as Giant Bloody-man, represented persecution at the beginning of the 1680s. Giant Maul—who, just like Giant Pope, lived in a cave—represented the Roman Catholic threat of James II and his adversarial legislation toward the nonconformists. The threat of repression appeared to decline near the end of part 2, for the atmosphere of Vanity Fair appeared to be more moderate than in part 1. This was probably indicative of a decline in persecution during the period of the 1680s. Nevertheless, there was the continued threat of an expanding Roman Catholicism, symbolized by a monster that periodically attacked the city, but was ultimately defeated.

**The Flesh**

The flesh was the third enemy in Puritan spiritual warfare. This adversary resided in the inner man of the believer. Satan, however, could exert a strong influence on the Christian warrior because he had an accomplice in the human soul that could readily ignite and result in the commission of sin.

The close relationship between the devil and the flesh was uniquely articulated by Ambrose, who posited that Satan focused his temptations upon the particular sins that each Christian inclined to in his natural disposition. According to Ambrose, Satan would stir one up to focus intensely upon the treasures of this world by holding before him monetary gain, riches, and honor. And to another Satan would stimulate wantonness by all manner of lustful objects that were sexual. The battle against his satanically stimulated flesh would, for the Christian warrior, ultimately be a battle with himself.

John Owen gave the most detailed presentation of this inner confrontation by presenting the most systematic and in-depth analysis of the human soul and its sinful lusts. Owen placed this spiritual warfare in the pneumatological context of the new birth as a real and existential renewal of man by God's Spirit. In his *Pneumatologia* he gave an extensive and detailed description of this anthropological-psychological transformation that occurred when man received a new, supernatural capacity that

would enable him to live as a believer. Within this psychological context, there would at the same time be a two-fold tension. For within the spiritually renewed man there would be a “contrary, inbred, habitual principle of sin and enmity against God.” The word “habitual” was indicative of an unalterable disposition that would relentlessly oppose a spiritual disposition, drawing the Christian life continually into a perilous place. Guided by Romans 7, Owen, in The Nature, Power, Deceit and Prevalency of the Remainders of Indwelling Sin, spoke of indwelling sin as a law. However, he also used other designations such as the “old man,” the flesh, lust, and the “body of death.” The immutable character of the law therefore favored the notion of sinful habit or disposition, which prompted Owen to remark, “Grace changeth the nature of man, but nothing can change the nature of sin.” He distinguished between the “habitual frame of the heart” and the “natural propensity or habitual inclination of the law of sin in the heart.” In this, he intended to say that the heart of the believer was indeed governed by a new habit or disposition, and would therefore no longer be naturally inclined toward sin. However, the remaining, residual, indwelling sin would constantly stir up a desire to commit evil, resulting in continuing spiritual welfare. Due to the constant presence of this corrupt principle, all sorts of sins would not only pose an ongoing threat, but could assert themselves to such an extent that they would gain the upper hand and negatively impact the quality of the Christian life. The fact that this law was active in the inner man of the believer also emphasized that this was a formidable opponent. External sinful temptations would bring forth that which already resided in the Christian. Owen believed that most believers were insufficiently aware of this internal danger, and would therefore be insufficiently watchful. However, he took this inherent principle of sin very seriously.

Owen described in detail how this principle of “indwelling sin” was capable of inhibiting the continual influx of grace and triggering the commission of sin, which could result in spiritual backsliding. Sin was capable of distracting the mind from focusing on the biblical perspective regarding the commission of sin by misinterpreting the nature of grace, so that yielding to sin would be rationalized by the promise of forgiveness. Owen was convinced that evil would thus steadily gain the upper hand. Regarding the

“especial duties” of personal prayer and meditation that forced the mind to govern one’s thoughts, sin would attempt to distract the governing principle of the soul from a concentrated exercise of these duties. Moreover, sin would seek to cause the mind to lose sight of the witness of Scripture as an antidote to the power of sin, such as that to sin was to transgress God’s law and would trigger heavenly retribution; that it directly contradicted God’s love and mercy; that it disregarded Christ’s redemptive work and challenged the indwelling of the Spirit.51

Sin was also actively engaged in the realm of our affections. It could so seduce one’s affections by the presentation of sinful objects that the soul would become “entangled in frequent imaginations about the object of their lust.” Using the imagery of a net, Owen demonstrated the devious tactics of indwelling sin:

And in vain should the deceit of sin spread its snares and nets for the entanglement of the soul, whilst the eyes of the mind are intent upon what it doth, and so stir up the wings of its will and affections to carry it away and avoid it. But if the eyes be put out or diverted, the wings are of very little use for escape; and therefore, this is one of the ways which is used by them who take birds or fowls in their nets. They have false lights or shows of things, to divert the sight of their prey; and when that is done, they take the season to cast their nets upon them.52

After first having distracted the mind from the necessary watchfulness, thereby giving room for corrupt desires to manifest themselves, indwelling sin would, assisted by one’s imagination, render sin attractive and desirable to one’s affections. This mental delusion would, however, conceal the perils of the wickedness of sin.

In Owen’s analysis, however, sin would only actually be committed when, by seducing the mind and entangling the affections, this adversarial disposition succeeded in persuading the will to acquiesce in the commission of evil:

The third success of the deceit of sin in its progressive work is the conception of actual sin…. Now, the conception of sin, in order unto its perpetration, can be nothing but the consent of the will; for as without the consent of the will sin cannot be committed, so where the

will hath consented unto it, there is nothing in the soul to hinder its actual accomplishment.\textsuperscript{53}

This quote underscores how prominent a place the will occupied within the context of Owen's psychology of the soul—not only in his general analysis of the components of the human soul and the new birth, but also regarding the outworking of sin in the life of the Christian. Owen referred to this acquiescence in believers as a partial acquiescence, for the principle of grace caused the soul to be oriented toward that which was good, whereas in unbelievers there would be a wholehearted acquiescence. However, the acquiescence of the will was the result of what preceded it: the distraction of the mind and the entanglement of the affections. When this occurred, the participation of the will inevitably followed.

Owen described the functioning of this process. First, the mind would be seduced by the corrupt reasoning that one could always seek God's pardon. Thereby the mind would fail in being watchful toward sin. Subsequently, it would seek to engage the will by focusing on the pleasure of sin and obscuring the peril of its wickedness. This generally happened either in acute moments of temptation, or gradually during a period of increasing carelessness. Being seduced by the mind, one's entangled affections would occasionally influence the will either by sudden impulses or by a high frequency of attempts. The moment the will acquiesced, the sinful deed would be committed. Owen argued, however, that this did not necessarily have to be the case. The reason for this must be sought in God's renewing grace, which he referred to as “special assisting grace.” Through this grace God could so inhibit sin that the will did not proceed with the actual deed. Although one's ultimate redemption would thereby not be endangered, the quality and the health of one's spiritual life could regress significantly.\textsuperscript{54}

\textit{Satan and Indwelling Sin}

Although Owen primarily focused on the nature of sin, he also devoted several paragraphs to the relationship between sin and the devil in a publication titled \textit{Of Temptation} (1658). Prompted by Matthew 26:41, “Watch and pray, that ye enter not into temptation,” he addressed the nature of temptation, particularly how a believer could be ensnared and how they could either prevent or resist the temptation by watchfulness.\textsuperscript{55}

Satan, the world, or human beings were the means by which temptation could lead the believer into sin. In so doing, the devil could operate independently or enlist the services of worldly issues and persons. However, he could also forge a coalition with the believer’s own corruptions in which he found “a sure party within our own breasts.” Owen did not expand this notion in Of Temptation, but only stated that the devil would greatly exert himself to tempt a believer to commit sin, being provoked to do so by attractive objects or tailor-made opportunities. In the hour of temptation, Satan could bring a believer into situations or confront him with situations in which his inherent sinful desires would be stimulated more than usual. When the tempted believer yielded in such circumstances, indwelling sin would manifest itself.\(^5^6\)

In The Nature, Deceit and Prevalency of the Remainders of Indwelling Sin in Believers, Owen also analyzed the relationship between indwelling sin and Satan. When God’s Spirit implanted new life in regeneration, God’s adversary suffered a fundamental defeat. However, his departure did not mean that he would yield permanently. Rather, from that moment forward, he would seek to regain his mastery over the believer. The believer must, therefore, be continually watchful. But sin would remain active in the believer to lead him to relax his alertness, for this was to the devil’s advantage. He would strive to make the Christian careless and remiss in the exercise of his spiritual duties, such as the reading of Scripture, meditation, and prayer. In conjunction with such a decline, there could be a decline in one’s first love and in the exercise of faith. The principle of sin could also stimulate a desire within the heart, or entangle the soul in worldly affairs that are an invitation for the devil to strike.\(^5^7\)

Thus, there was evidently a mutual relationship between indwelling sin and Satan. God’s preeminent adversary could, with his accomplices, make perilous inroads in a man’s experiential world. Sin, in turn, could open doors to permit the enemy to enter.

**The Christian Warrior**

The other side of the spectrum will now be addressed: Puritan literature regarding spiritual warfare contrasted the three-headed enemy and the person of the Christian warrior.

---

Downname believed that the battling believer could only be correctly evaluated from God’s vantage point. He viewed the relationship between heaven and the Christian warrior as that between God the Father and His child. This relationship, in addition to implying direction and training, also implied true victories in the present and the promise of a definitive triumph in the future. This paternal warranty was embedded in election as proceeding from God’s eternal love—the first link of the *ordo salutis* and the fountain of regeneration, justification, sanctification, and glorification.⁵⁸

The Christian warrior engaged himself within a Christological context. Puritans not only referred to the soteriological significance of Christ’s death and resurrection as the principal victory over all hostile powers, but also to Christ’s temptation in the wilderness. In *The Combate Betweene Christ and the Devill Displayed*, Perkins not only focused on the exemplary significance of Christ’s conduct but also on the redemptive dimension when Christ prevailed over the assaults of the devil. By resisting the three-fold temptation of the devil, Christ came to the foreground as the deliverer of His people, giving His followers the warranty that they would also triumph (albeit in phases). Those who successfully resisted the enemy in this life would experience victory.⁵⁹

The third context to be considered regarding the Christian warrior was a pneumatological one. According to Owen, God’s Spirit would cause the new habit (implanted in regeneration) to grow by strengthening the gracious gifts of faith and love that proceeded from this habitus.⁶⁰ This formal description of the process of sanctification was closely connected to the relational backdrop of the Christian life. Owen dealt with sanctification as proceeding from union with Christ.⁶¹

**Opposing Satan: Grace and Responsibility**

William Gouge and William Gurnall articulated most clearly that the believer was called to be engaged in a relentless battle with Satan. This came as no surprise, for both men took Ephesians 6:10–20 very seriously—the passage containing the apostolic exhortation to resist all demonic powers with spiritual armor. The responsibility of the Christian warrior was

---

expressed most concretely in the two components of this armor that were highlighted by both authors: the shield of faith and the sword of the Spirit.

In response to the satanic suggestion that sinful men cannot possibly believe, Gouge pointed out that faith proceeded from the Spirit, who taught sinners to trust in the Word of God. He then linked this emphasis upon grace to human responsibility and the need to use expectantly the means God employs to produce faith.\(^{62}\)

Gouge articulated this same theme when he addressed the satanic doubt that faith could not possibly prevail. He replied by referring to three matters that were indispensable for persevering in faith—especially the reading of Scripture and personal prayer. When one failed to make use of these means or used them irregularly, the quality of one's spiritual life would decline. The crucial importance of faith for Gurnall was particularly evident in his discussion of Satan's temptation to yield to despair. In this context, Gurnall indicated that faith actively engaged itself by concentrating on God's promise. Over against the devilish temptation which confronted the Christian with the magnitude of his sins, faith would focus upon the immeasurable dimension of grace.\(^{63}\)

The dialectic of grace and human contribution was articulated in Gouge's discussion on how the sword of the Spirit was symbolic of the Word of God. He posited that the Christian was called to oppose the adversary with the words of Scripture. Although the offensive weapon was “of the Spirit,” this emphasis upon the active engagement of faith did not imply independence. One could, therefore, only use this weapon effectively in a spiritual manner by reading, meditation, and faith. Gurnall likewise addressed the use of this offensive weapon even more concretely by formulating biblical replies to all manner of misleading devilish insinuations—including heretical notions regarding the faith, mitigation of sinful practices, and abusing difficult circumstances in life to cast aspersions upon God.\(^{64}\)

The treatment of the subject of prayer revealed how much grace and responsibility were intertwined. Gouge deemed prayer to be a blessed means for using the armor properly, for this proved that the warrior was not striving in his own strength. According to Gurnall, dependence upon God's

grace was especially evident in “deprecatory prayer,” wherein the petition to be cleansed from sin focused upon both the guilt and the defiling power of sin. The believer, having thus prayed, was called, however, to engage himself fully in doing battle with evil.65

Opposing Satan: Practical Exhortations
As an antidote to satanic insinuations that sought to deny the pro me character of the gospel, Puritan authors pointed to God’s salvific promises. Simultaneously, they also addressed the distinctives of spiritual life.

For example, Downname gave clarity to believers regarding their personal interest in salvation by directing them to the promises of the gospel. The application of these promises came in turn: the hearer of the promise first concluded that he had faith, and he then concluded that he was a partaker of the promised salvation. However, this afforded the devil an opportunity to challenge the validity of that conclusion, and compelled Downname to list various internal and external distinctives of true faith.66

Downname also emphasized that the crucial difference between true believers and nominal believers was that sin was incidental for the former and habitual in the latter. At the same time, he sought pastorally to minister to weak Christians by positing that the inner struggle generated by a perceived lack of the marks of faith did, in fact, validate the authenticity of their faith.67

The connection between the promises and the marks of grace was also presented by Brooks. In his treatment of the satanic insinuations that could lead to despondency, he pointed believers to the redeeming work of Christ. The marks of grace also played a role when, for example, the devil insinuated that repeated regression in committing the same sins challenged the authenticity of the Christian’s faith. Brooks countered by asserting that though the lives of believers were imperfect, they nevertheless were determined to battle sin and that temptations could not inflict harm as long as they met with fierce resistance.68

Brooks was most practical when arguing how believers could resist Satan. In short, he argued that believers must be radical in abhorrence and avoidance of sin. For example, he strongly condemned the satanic delusion
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that Christians may involve themselves in circumstances that would readily lead to sin on the grounds that they could immediately retreat. Believers must radically reject such seduction, for it implied a view of man that was far too optimistic.\textsuperscript{69}

**Opposing the World: Distance**

Downname described the relationship between Puritan believers and their fellow citizens as unclear. Although believers must engage in society, Downame emphasized the necessity of maintaining distance between believers and non-believers due to the danger of spiritual corruption.\textsuperscript{70} He spoke of the need for believers to distance themselves from worldly pursuits such as honor, riches, and all manner of pleasure. Believers must prevent their hearts from being more occupied with perishing earthly treasures than God’s gracious gifts—all of which would proceed from the related concepts of being pilgrims and sojourners:

> For who would not contenme a flitting tent, in comparison of a goodly mansion and stately palace…. And who would not preferre his pedling freedome in a country village for a few daies, before his enfranchizement and priviledges in the chiefe city of the countrie which hee may haue for euer?\textsuperscript{71}

Since a pilgrim would focus upon the future reality of heavenly glory; he, as a sojourner, would not permit himself to be distracted by the pleasures of this world. Downname’s objective in his writing was to mobilize the believer to distance himself from all those aspects of his surrounding world that would tempt him to sin. Only then would he emerge victoriously from this spiritual warfare.

Downname also addressed the comparative and utilitarian relationship between the two:

> If the Lord in his rich bountie, hath appointed vnto vs a place of such profit and delight for our exile and banishment, how rich and full of all pleasures is his own countrie, which he reserueth for his owne vse, to show therein his owne glorious presence, & and for the reward of those whom he most graceth with his fauour?\textsuperscript{72}

\textsuperscript{70} Downname, *Christian Warfare*, 421.
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In anticipation of the future heavenly glory, the pilgrim could enjoy this earthly reality and in some measure judge it favorably. However, due to the temporary nature of the earthly realm, such enjoyment would be very provisional.

**Opposing the World: Resistance**

According to Bunyan, persecution provided an opportunity to confess the truth publicly and even to join the long tradition of Christian martyrs. This positive view of martyrdom—combined with the conviction that secular governments were divinely appointed—stimulated Bunyan to embrace the classic notion of “passive resistance.” He believed that one must undergo suffering patiently and that disobeying civil laws was only permitted when they contradicted God’s precepts.

Bunyan’s deferential attitude toward the English government under Charles II, depicted implicitly in Vanity Fair, appeared to conflict with elements of the Holy War, which proved to be much more critical in their assessment of the authorities. The political environment around 1680 had become significantly more challenging for dissenters. The reformation of city governments by royalists brought councilmen to power who were predominantly hostile to them, and the same time the threat of new persecution was looming.

Various allegorical elements in The Holy War appeared to refer to the tense political situation of the early 1680s, while at the same time concealing what they intended to communicate. When Diabolus conquered the city Mansoul, rather than being its mayor he appointed himself as king. If the reader were to have missed the reference to Charles II, he hardly could have missed the implications of this transition—Diabolus reorganized the city and replaced the mayor, Lord Understanding, and the city clerk, Mr. Conscience. The members of the city council, however, were depicted as caricatures of the king’s newly appointed leaders in the reorganized city councils. When Diabolus not only treated ministers with hostility but also permitted the city to be filled with atheistic pamphlets and immoral lyrics and literature, he was exposed as a rebellious tyrant. The political message of The Holy War thus expressed a stinging criticism of the English

government. This behavior was contrasted with that of the godly sovereign, set forth in the person of Immanuel. Immanuel reclaimed Mansoul, issued new laws, imprisoned the Diabolians, and appointed Lord Understanding to a responsible position.⁷⁶

When one understands the spiritual and political opposition to Diabolus, it is clear that Bunyan intended to depict the subversive ridicule of tyrannical government and to call Christians to engage in active and even armed conflict. Bunyan’s frequent criticism of oppressive rulers that surfaced in *The Holy War*—especially by way of the parallels between Diabolus and Charles II—must ultimately be interpreted as references to God’s future judgment upon them.⁷⁷

The notion that Bunyan’s emphasis of intense resistance in *The Holy War* should not be interpreted politically becomes more credible upon evaluating a work that was published in 1684: *Seasonable Counsel: or, Advice to sufferers.*⁷⁸ In contrast with the sharp and provocative tone of his war allegory, the very measured tone of this work is remarkable. Respect for divinely appointed government here coalesced with a fully developed “ethic of suffering” in which the necessity and benefit of suffering were addressed in depth, while at the same time addressing the correct disposition when one suffered. The measured tone of *Seasonable Counsel* could partly be explained in light of political events. In 1683, the so-called “Rye House Plot” was discovered—a conspiracy of radical, non-conformist elements against the English king. Its discovery and the subsequent thorough investigation by the government posed a considerable threat to the position of the dissenters. Bunyan’s connections in radical circles could also have rendered him suspect. By distancing himself from the rebels, he might have attempted to protect himself while simultaneously preventing any cross-examination about his contacts.⁷⁹

For Bunyan, resisting the government meant, at most, a passive resistance when one could not obey an ordinance in light of Scripture. However,

---

while the political connotations of *The Holy War* cannot be denied, it appears that, in the 1680s, Bunyan pressed this further than he had done previously. Particularly because of his connections in radical circles, he might have expected that an eventual rebellion against tyranny, initiated by a coalition of subordinate government entities and spiritual leaders, would have been supported by his fellow believers.80

**Opposing the Flesh: Fighting Against Contrary Self**

In his *Of the Combate of the Flesh and Spirit*, Perkins described the battle of the Christian warrior against the third enemy, the flesh, as an event that impacted the entire human soul: the intellect, the will, and the affections. According to Perkins, opposing the flesh was as a heavy battle. For the flesh was lodged within the walls of the human soul and was capable of relentlessly generating sinful desires. This activity was opposed by the continual operation of God’s Spirit who activated and stimulated the spiritual habitus of the soul, thereby equipping the Christian warrior to achieve a future victory.81

Owen gave a detailed account of how the renewed spiritual propensity of the believer battled with the adversary within his soul. These themes surfaced when he dealt with mortification. He defined this in his *Pneumatologia* as follows:

> There being this universal contrariety, opposition, contending, and warfare, between grace and sin, the Spirit and the flesh, in their inward principles, powers, operations, and outward effects, the work and duty of mortification consists in a constant taking part with grace, in its principle, actings, and fruits, against the principle, actings and fruits of sin.82

By using the term “grace,” Owen indicated that this event was founded upon the redemptive work of Christ and functioned under the auspices of the Holy Spirit. The Spirit was linked with Christ’s victory, the position of the believer, and the practical aspect of this warfare. He united these into one spiritual composite.

Owen was convinced that sinful activities could readily assert themselves as a consequence of being remiss in one’s daily devotion. In his *On the Mortification of Sin in Believers*, based on Roman 8:13, he addressed

spiritual mortification in great detail.\textsuperscript{83} Using the premise that mortification was a process superintended by the Spirit, Owen took issue with Roman Catholic monasticism, which he believed distorted mortification by making it primarily an external exercise undertaken by man using external means, such as vows, penances, and discipline. These practices were subservient to spiritual mortification, such as prayer, fasting, and meditation, to be an end in themselves.\textsuperscript{84}

In seeking to define the process of mortification in practical terms, Owen highlighted the foundational meaning of one’s spiritual habit or disposition by defining it as “grace in its principle,” for it impacted the principle of sin at its very root. Furthermore, it was important that the Holy Spirit enabled this principle of holiness to flourish in the soul, for the stronger it manifested itself in various internal and external activities, the more one’s sinful habit or disposition, along with all its inherent expressions, would be weakened.\textsuperscript{85}

Owen connected this more formal description in which the Spirit and the living principle created by Him were central, with a more relational analysis in which Christ and the life of faith were central. Focus on the cross was of crucial importance for the effective execution of the mortification process. Being united to Christ by faith meant being united to a Redeemer whose death implied the mortal wounding of indwelling sin.\textsuperscript{86}

Based on the premise of his generally formal and his relational formulations of mortification, Owen gave guidelines for the practice of mortification. For the Christian warrior, it was of primary importance that he would be conscious of both the danger and the evil of sin. Owen argued that the believer must view a yielding to sin as a failure to appreciate the redemptive work of the triune God. Thereby the believer preeminently discredited the suffering and death of Christ on the cross. Owen described the latter as an existential event:

\begin{quote}
Look on Him whom thou hast pierced, and be in bitterness. Say to thy soul, “What have I done? What love, what mercy, what blood, what grace have I despised and trampled on!… What can I say to the dear Lord Jesus? How shall I hold up my head with any boldness before 
\end{quote}

him? Do I account communion with Him of so little value, that for this vile lust's sake I have scarce left him any room in my heart?... In the meantime, what shall I say to the Lord? Love, mercy, grace, goodness, peace, joy, consolation, I have despised them all, and esteemed them as a thing of nought, that I might harbour a lust in my heart.\textsuperscript{87}

Owen's perspective was that the cross was of redemptive significance. For the cross was where Christ triumphed over evil and therefore was the focal point and source of inspiration to battle sin effectively. Thus, when the believer, guided by the Spirit, focused spiritually on the dying Christ, this would trigger repentance and faith and would mobilize him to resist evil daily and effectively:

Let faith look on Christ in the gospel as he is set forth dying and crucified for us. Look on him under the weight of our sins, praying, bleeding, dying; bring him in that condition into thy heart by faith; apply his blood so shed to thy corruptions: do this daily.\textsuperscript{88}

Did the process of mortification truly lead to the demise of sin? Owen's answer was apparently no—for mortification was incapable of removing sin from the heart. Owen viewed this as evidence of the imperfection of our earthly reality: that which would be a reality after death could not be achieved in this life. Owen emphasized again that the entire process of mortification was superintended by the Holy Spirit. The Spirit shed light upon the evil of sin, unveiled the fullness of Christ, applied the cross to the heart in its sin-mortifying power, and promised that He would guarantee the victorious outcome of this battle. Although mortification was an all-encompassing and intensive process, the superintendence of the Holy Spirit guaranteed the ultimate termination of this battle.

\textit{Battle in Light of the Victory}

Although Satan and his cohorts were set before the reader in a generally dramatic fashion, some authors from the very outset focused already on the outcome of the conflict.

In his \textit{Of the Combate of the Flesh and Spirit}, Perkins indicated that the dominance of the spirit, being the indestructible creation of God's Spirit, was determinative for the victory of the Christian warrior during

\textsuperscript{87} Owen, \textit{Works of John Owen}, VI:58.
\textsuperscript{88} Owen, \textit{Works of John Owen}, VI:85.
the various phases of the journey of faith as well as the end of his life. For Perkins, the tenor of spiritual warfare was determined from the very outset by the perspective of the ultimate victory—albeit that it certainly could not be labeled as exultant.

Downname also addressed spiritual warfare from the vantage point of victory by pointing to the work of Christ. His redemptive victory not only guaranteed His help along the way, but it also had an eschatological radiance. When Downname proceeded to describe Satan as the most dangerous adversary, he did not thereby minimize one's initiative in the Christian warfare, but rather argued that it would lead to a more balanced pathway to victory. Spiritual warfare would, from the very outset, be both intensive and full of expectation.

Although Brooks emphasized that the prospect of future victory was hopeful, he did not believe that this was an automatic outcome. His emphasis upon the duty of believers suggested that they would achieve the end result only after having been engaged in battle their entire lives. Also, for him the eschatological component stimulated believers to be engaged in battle and encouraged them.

Continuity and Discontinuity
In addressing spiritual warfare, Puritan authors built on a classic spiritual theme that had been addressed by the early Christian desert fathers. The fathers had highlighted that such warfare focused primarily on the external infiltration of demonic forces, which was able to produce eight deadly thoughts.

In the West, the monk John Cassianus (c. 360–435) believed that spiritual warfare was primarily an internal battle between the spirit and the flesh of the human soul. Though Cassianus still believed that one could resist his carnal desires by exercising his free will, Augustine emphasized man’s inability to choose that which was good. His doctrine of original sin also implied that a man’s flesh was in bondage to his sinful desires and therefore operated as a very formidable adversary. This spiritual warfare against such a perilous internal enemy could only have a favorable outcome by God’s omnipotent grace. Although the Puritan position on spiritual warfare
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warfare had similarities with Cassianus’s inner battle against oneself, theologically and anthropologically it was more closely aligned with Augustine’s emphasis on man’s impotency to resist his inner evil and his dependence on God’s grace.

The pastoral continuity and discontinuity with the Western Catholic Church is evident in Jean Gerson (1363–1429), a representative of the late medieval “Frömmigkeitstheologie.” On the one hand, his views were similar to Puritan views because, for Gerson, strife regarding the assurance of faith was the focal point of spiritual warfare. This pertained to readers with a timid disposition who desired to live a godly life, but were oppressed about their own missteps. Gerson desired to comfort troubled readers by impressing upon them that they had the spiritual potential to resist demonic delusion; that is, as long as they trusted humbly in God’s mercy. This gave hope for the future—a hope that was undermined, however, by fear for God’s justice. In contrast to the Puritans, Gerson stated that the believer merited a reward if he guarded against spiritual arrogance by resisting sin, took the counsel of confessors seriously, humbly confessed committed evil, and stood in awe of God’s justice.

Among Protestant reformers, continuity was apparent with Luther who focused spiritual warfare, especially on the so called “high” temptations which bear a strong satanic influence. These “high” temptations were strongly connected with fear of God’s wrath, lack of assurance about one’s eternal election, and despondency. Sometimes Luther wrote about the most dangerous activity by which the devil aimed to lead the believer to spiritual despondency—an excessive fear of the dark side of God’s predestination: his eternal rejection. In writing about resistance against Satan and sin, Luther referred continually to Christ. This Christological focus contained several elements. Primarily, Christ was the only help for His tempted people, because He was the most obvious revelation of God’s mercy. Second,


Luther related his Christological focus to justification, believing that the Christian was repeatedly confronted with his personal sins as well as his lack of power to beat his opponent. Luther, however, continually offered relief to the tempted believer by asserting that he could only stand before God due to Christ’s suffering on the cross.\textsuperscript{98}

**Conclusion**

Puritans addressed temptation, spiritual insecurity, and foreboding despair first by detecting in them Satan’s hidden influence, then by analyzing his devices, and finally by proposing means to resist him. Being influenced by the devil, the world functioned as an intermediary link, and the corrupt human heart functioned as the fertile soil for external temptations. As to the pastoral and psychological guidance of the believer, the Puritan movement emerged as the English variant of European Pietism in which the Christian and his experience had the preeminence.

The Puritans presented a detailed treatment of the devil’s assault upon the inner man. The crucial position of the flesh affirmed that their works were characterized by an emphasis upon the ever-present danger of sin. Although Satan was presented as a mighty and tangible adversary, this was at the same time subordinate to the inner battle occurring in the human soul.\textsuperscript{99} The primary reason for this was that sin would endanger the experiential relationship with God.

While Puritan literature about spiritual warfare warned of the danger of sin, it simultaneously sought to prevent lack of assurance and spiritual despair—particularly in the lives of weak Christians. The authors who addressed spiritual despair most intensely, Gilpin and Bunyan, interacted with the melancholy generated in the period following 1660. While Gilpin emphasized Satan’s role, Bunyan criticized the repressive government. The battle with the devil then became an internal struggle to trust in God’s promises—particularly for weak Christians. Whereas true believers were earnestly admonished, the comfort afforded to weak Christians was central in Puritan literature.

The analysis of the Christian warrior and spiritual resistance made clear how much the Puritan approach to spiritual warfare was determined by the

---
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foundational theological structure of the Trinitarian activity of God’s grace. Although fundamentally in line with the Reformed emphasis on God’s justifying grace, the anthropological-psychological components were unique to the Puritan view of grace. Owen gave the most detailed exposition of this view of the new birth. At the same time, spiritual transformation did not imply a definitive deliverance from sin due to the residual and corrupt habitus that can tempt one to sin. Only when the graces proceeding from the new habit were exercised would the new-life principle gradually prevail. Owen’s focus on the cross of Christ as the death knell for sinful lusts in the daily and real battle of the believer was representative of a noteworthy fine-tuning of Puritan spirituality—an interconnection of Trinitarian theology, *historia salutis*, and experiential piety. The Trinitarian articulation of the life of faith viewed spiritual confrontation in light of the ultimate victory. This visionary perspective was determinative for the climate of spiritual warfare as delineated by the Puritans. However much this warfare might occupy the believer, this God-given perspective yielded certainty, joy, and hope in the reality of his life of faith.
The Protestant reassessment of the gospel thrust the question of whether or not the saints invariably persevere to glory to the foreground in soteriology. This volume grapples with the question of perseverance in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century England. It is sensitive to post-Reformation readings of Augustine, to the international influence of the Synod of Dort, and to the unfolding nature of debates over the subject in an English context. This is a well-researched and compelling work of historical theology that helps readers understand the importance and development of an important part of Reformed teaching that will help serious students to build on the author’s findings.

The author makes the case that debates within the Church of England over the perseverance of the saints focused on Scripture and the other on Augustine. It may surprise some readers as well to learn that even though most Reformed ministers believed in the perseverance of all of the saints, the Reformed confessions did not initially state a position on this issue clearly (196). Collier gives test cases of his narrative by taking representative samples of authors from the period. He develops his theme in seven chapters, stating the question and state of research, and spanning from the Lambeth Articles, the British delegation at the Synod of Dort and the aftermath of the Synod in England, the role of infant baptism in debates over perseverance, and closing with Puritan debates following the English Civil War. His basic contention is that while most Reformed authors believed that elect believers could neither totally nor finally fall away from salvation, some believed that they could fall away totally (though not finally), others
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believed that the elect would persevere to the end while not all of the saints would, and still others distinguished between saving and non-saving benefits among church members. This enables Collier to reassess key figures, such as Richard Montagu, who is usually regarded as “the face of English Arminianism” (93). Collier discovers that Montagu, and several key English Reformed authors before and after his time, affirmed Augustinian views of election and predestination, human depravity and grace, the effectual call of the Holy Spirit, and other distinctive Reformed doctrines, while denying the perseverance of the saints in some fashion.

Alternative readings of Augustine loomed large in these discussions as well. While competing readings of Augustine existed among these authors, the general tone of the Church of England was that Dort’s narrow definition of the perseverance of the saints would unnecessarily exclude one of these readings. Collier shows that the tenor of these debates continued well into the mid seventeenth-century as John Owen and George Kendall opposed the Arminian denials of perseverance represented by John Goodwin, while Richard Baxter pressed for greater moderation on the topic in favor of his particular reading of Augustine (163–194). The author thus illustrates that while Augustine was important for all parties involved, even Puritanism did not have a single unified approach to his doctrine of perseverance. This book is neither a complete nor seamless narrative of the debates over perseverance in early modern England, but it does not pretend to be. Instead, the author illustrates his point well through carefully chosen examples, expanding the reader’s understanding of a complex issue that became woven inextricably into the texture of Reformed orthodox theology as time went on.

The doctrine of the perseverance of the saints affected Reformed piety and practice as well as Reformed thought and confessions. Collier’s study is a superb treatment of the kinds of diversity and development that existed among British Reformed theologians in the Reformed orthodox period. As such, it helps readers better understand the character of this movement as a whole as well as the particular place and self-identity of the Church of England within it. This is a compelling and illuminating read that will grip the interests of all who are interested in Reformed soteriology, British Reformed theology, and post-Reformation uses of the church fathers.

—Ryan M. McGraw, Greenville Presbyterian Theological Seminary

Since the 1980s, there is one subject no study of early modern Christian mysticism can—or should—avoid: feminism. Ultimately, it was scholarship inspired by second-wave feminism that fostered the study of female religious in general and of female mystics in particular. This should not come as a surprise given the peculiar appeal early modern mysticism seemed to exercise among women. In an effort to explain the rise of the female mystic as a pivotal figure since the high Middle Ages, scholars usually turn to the symbolism of women being “empty vessels,” ready to be filled with God’s message. Due to their innate passivity, women were ascribed an exceptional receptivity to divine inspiration and by speaking and writing about their transcendental experiences in some cases even became spiritual leaders, thus sidestepping the Pauline exhortation that “women should remain silent” in public (1 Cor. 14:34). Hence, in addition to their debt to a feminist agenda, gender historians are required to explain these women’s relative agency. Speaking very superficially, older research in early modern women’s studies tends to portray female mystics as forerunners of twentieth-century feminism, who strategically chose to exploit patriarchal contradictions and, authorized by godly speech, to turn patriarchy against itself. This universalization of female self-assertion is no longer convincing. Instead of merging the female religious into a timeless struggle between male oppressors and oppressed females, more recent studies target the particular historical conditions in which these comparatively powerful women emerged.

Although it hardly engages in the discussion of theory and methodology, the collection *Jane Lead and her Transnational Legacy*, edited by Ariel Hessayon, could be seen as making this shift vivid. Jane Lead (1624–1704) was one of the most prolific female writers in early modern England. In her autobiography, Lead recalls her spiritual awakening on Christmas Day 1640 at the age of 16. However, she did not become widely known until the 1680s, assuming leadership of the Philadelphian Society for the Advancement of Divine Philosophy, a London-based congregation of followers of Jacob Boehme (c. 1575–1624). Widowed in 1670, she supposedly started publishing her own work in 1681—an activity that she pursued despite going blind in 1695, eventually having authored at least a dozen printed titles by the time of her death. “In the wake of Second Wave Feminism,” Hessayon states in his introductory essay, “it is unsurprising that within the last 20 years Lead’s reputation has undergone a remarkable ascent from the
depths of disdain to the peaks of veneration” (4). Rather than emphasizing Lead as an individual, this edited collection focuses on the larger contexts of her life. Whether discussing social relations with kin, friends, and neighbors or spiritual circles of mystics, prophets, and theosophists; whether analyzing the dissemination of letters, manuscripts, and books or the dispersal of ideas, concepts, and discourses, virtually all the contributors to the present book seem to be guided by the paradigm of the network.

In three chapters, Hessayon fleshes out the idea of the network. By unfolding Lead’s life in three chronologically divided parts, he sets the biographical ground for the rest of the book. The first of these chapters spans Lead’s birth to the death of her husband in 1670, the second the beginning of her widowhood to her blindness in 1695, and the third considers Lead’s time at the center of the Philadelphian Society until her death in 1704. In what Hessayon says has been a “painstaking reconstruction” (14) of both well-known printed sources and newly discovered archival material, the chapters, taken together, demonstrate Lead’s embeddedness in a variety of ramified networks. Admittedly, the enthusiasm aroused by the sources occasionally allows the narrative to drift off course. For instance, the account of the father of Lead’s future husband, who served as a witness in a court proceeding against an alderman and former mayor of King’s Lynn and who was charged with the sexual assault of two ship-boys, will scarcely yield a deeper understanding of Lead. Notwithstanding, it is precisely this rigid contextualism that provides important insights. Hessayon depicts Lead as a blatant religious dissenter in spite of the attempts to disguise her ties with radicalism in her autobiography, as well as in the biographical writings authored by contemporaries. Or, as Hessayon concludes in a reversal of the imagery Lead herself used extensively: “Lead was not a woman alone in the wilderness” (48).

The chapter written by Sarah Apetrei links Lead’s massive textual production with a commonplace of mysticism, the ineffability of the mystical experience. Firmly grounded in apophatic theologies, mystical writers since at least Pseudo-Dionysius have refused to relate their encounter with the divine in an affirmative way, consequently arguing that transcendent experiences were impossible to articulate by means of worldly language. Mystical theology therefore privileged “ignorant sages”—visionary women, for instance—who distanced themselves from erudite theological writing and stressed that it was the divine guiding their pen. On the basis of two manuscript discoveries that in all likelihood can be attributed to Lead, Apetrei adds to the understanding of her attitude toward writing. Contrary
to what one might suspect, Lead seems to have seen writing as a spiritual exercise and ignored questions of wider circulation while recording her visions. From seven journal entries dated 1676, found in the British Library Sloane manuscripts, Apetrei convincingly deduces a certain haphazardness in Lead’s writing and collecting practices. Apparently, Lead left the publication and preservation of her texts to the men surrounding her.

Amanda L. Capern explores the “domestic and feminised worship under charismatic female leadership” (109) that Lead aimed to promote among her followers. Capern situates Lead’s teachings at the intersection between Puritan pastoral theology and Behmenism. The latter provided feminine imagery that Lead expanded to salvation in the feminine, but the success of Lead’s gendered thinking at least in part depended on the former. Specifically, according to Lead, Calvinist covenant theology helped to downplay the consequences of sin, which so frightened Evangelical Protestants. In a similar vein, Warren Johnston anchors Lead in convictions that prevailed in late seventeenth-century England, while at the same time embracing Lead’s exceptionality. Relying on mystical inspiration, she did not shy away from adding new revelations to scriptural prophecies; moreover, diverging from more common apocalyptic interpretations, she believed that apocalyptic prophecies would be realized exclusively within individual believers and would thus remain unavailable for the majority of the world.

The second half of the present collection of essays is dedicated—as the title makes clear—to the complex circulation of Lead’s writings that transcend simple notions of borders between national territories. More than any other chapter, Lucinda Martin’s essay unravels the transnational genealogy of Lead’s work. Concentrating on Johann Georg Gichtel (1638–1710), a German exile in Amsterdam known for editing Boehme’s theosophical works in the 1680s, she challenges standard accounts of how Lead became popular among German radical Pietists. Whereas the Pietist couple Johann Wilhelm Petersen (1649–1727) and Johanna Eleonora Petersen (1644–1724) are usually perceived as the promoters of Lead’s writings in Germany, Martin argues it was through the epistolary network around Gichtel that her writings were disseminated, earlier than previously assumed. Moreover, Gichtel claimed to have indirectly influenced Lead’s work, spurring her to write *Everlasting Gospel* in reaction to some of his considerations. Far from being a “one-way transfer of ideas from Lead to the Petersens” (206), Martin suggests that a more appropriate term for the exchanges between Lead and Pietism would be “a multi-party conversation” (205).
Stefania Salvadori takes a closer look at the currents in radical Pietism that aspired not only to spiritual purification but also to the material restitution of the first man’s paradisiacal perfection—the return to Adam’s uncorrupted body already in earthly life. Salvadori emphasizes a “transcultural process” (149) in which this conceptual framework was transmitted from Boehme to the German Pietists. For the most part, German readers of Boehme did not access his writings directly. Instead, Boehme’s ideas reached German-speaking audiences through the works by English Behmenists. Salvadori states that one of the Behmenists contributing to radical Pietist debates was Lead, who construed and adapted Boehme’s soteriology. Lead radicalized his doctrine, which did not postulate the restitution until Christ’s second coming. Even though she did not go as far as to imply a complete corporeal transformation before the end of time, she still developed a four-stage mystical ascent in which elected believers, with the help of the heavenly Wisdom Sophia and the Bridegroom Christ, could at least set their corporal refinement into motion.

Lionel Laborie’s essay attests to the meticulousness of current research into female mysticism. Laborie covers the time after Lead’s death, in which the Philadelphian Society and the French Prophets—an English offspring of the Camisard movement, French rather by its name than by its composition—united for a short period of time. Building upon the evidence that, irrespective of their close association with the Philadelphians, the French Prophets never mentioned Lead or her work, Laborie re-evaluates Lead’s role in the congregation. He warns against inflating her significance, for it was to a large extent Richard Roach (1662–1730), a Church of England minister, who shaped Lead’s image as a unifying maternal force. In lieu thereof, Laborie argues, “Lead had left behind a chaotic community” (231).

The two chapters concluding the book examine Lead’s legacy in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. It is, Philip Lockley concedes, “a hazardous historical exercise” (242) to uncover the roots of millenarian cultures. For obvious reasons, prophets, who claim to be inspired by God, do not usually give credit to the traditions that have influenced them. Focusing on the English Atlantic, Lockley retraces how the followers of the influential English prophet Joanna Southcott (1750–1814) created a distinctive prophetic tradition, gradually incorporating Lead into an evolving Southcottian history during the course of the nineteenth century. Bridget M. Jacobs turns to twentieth-century North America, demonstrating the remarkably varying statuses of Lead’s legacy. Members of Mary’s City of David, a Southcottian communal group, succeeded in acquiring the better
part of Lead’s work in the 1930s and 1940s. They viewed themselves as the guardians of Lead’s writings and aimed at conserving them in veneration, while the Pentecostal Latter Rain movement did not treat them as authentic testimony but as “an anonymous voice to which they could add their own voices” (284).

Lumped together, the contributions in Jane Lead and her Transnational Legacy follow the lines of Lead’s different networks, thereby not only correcting flaws of older scholarship but also illuminating connections in the often confusingly fragmented field of religious dissent in early modern England and, chronologically and geographically speaking, beyond. Certainly, the risks of emphasizing one single person are high. The authors, however, manage to focus on Lead without aggrandizing her for the sake of their own specialized interest. They achieve the balancing act of both centering on Lead as well as decentering her—as a mystic, as a writer, and, first and foremost, as a woman.

—Michael Leemann, Georg-August-Universität Göttingen (Germany)


Campegius Vitringa was a leading scholar in eighteenth-century biblical studies. He had a wide influence not only during his life but also afterwards, long into the nineteenth century. Franke, Bengel, Delitzsch, Gesenius, and the Princeton theologians, among others, appreciated him greatly. In the twentieth century Vitringa was largely overlooked. In the postmodern climate of recent decades, however, growing attention has been paid to pre-critical biblical scholarship. Postmodernism has made people aware that everyone has his own prior understanding and that the Enlightenment claim of neutral scholarship is unfounded. Scholars—whatever their personal convictions—are rediscovering the value of the history of interpretation to biblical studies.

Convinced that the insights of a scholar such as Vitringa—who was the heir of centuries of Renaissance scholarship as well as of the theological heritage of the Reformation and Protestant Orthodoxy—may help us to understand the Bible better today. Charles K. Telfer, associate professor of Biblical Languages at Westminster Seminary California, has written a
monograph on Vitringa with a focus on his *magnum opus*, a commentary on Isaiah (1720). After a biographical chapter and an overview of what has been written on Vitringa, Telfer analyzes the *Praefatio* to the first volume of his Isaiah commentary, the second chapter of his *Doctrina Christianae religionis*, and the *canones hermeneuticos*. These *canones hermeneuticos* were the third part of a work published in 1708. Its full title was *Typus doctrinae propheticae, in quo de prophetis et prophetiis agitur, huiusque scientiae praecepta traduntur*. In this work, Vitringa gave rules for the interpretation of the prophetic literature in the Bible. The *canones hermeneuticos* are very insightful for understanding Vitringa's exegetical approach.

Four elements are crucial in Vitringa's hermeneutics: (1) A passage must be viewed in its immediate, broader and ultimately canonical contexts. (2) With regard to the concrete fulfilment of eschatological passages, the interpreter ought to show humility, preferring to keep professing ignorance in the hope that God will give greater light to coming generations in this area. (3) The interpretation that sets forth the most glorious fulfilment of the passage must be preferred. (4) Scripture must be interpreted by Scripture. The last element was the most important for Vitringa. It was inseparably linked with his high, orthodox view of the authority and inspiration of Scripture.

Vitringa believed the meaning of Scripture was what the words of the passage imply in their immediate and canonical contexts. Because he unrestrainedly included the latter as a category, he cannot be seen as a forerunner of the historical-critical approach to Scripture, although he certainly was aware of issues of textual criticism. His emphasis on canonical context stood in the tradition of a Christological reading of the Old Testament. The true meaning of the text had both literal and spiritual dimensions.

Vitringa did appreciate Grotius, but his main critique of him was that Grotius dismissed the normativity of the New Testament perspective. In Vitringa's understanding of Scripture, and especially the Old Testament, he must be seen as a moderate follower of Cocceius. His main critique of the latter is that Cocceius was too quick to connect Old Testament prophecies to the historical situation of European Christians, although this element was not wholly absent in Vitringa's own commentary on Isaiah. Vitringa took an optimistic view of the future of the church of Christ on earth, finding grounds for that conviction in the prophecies of Isaiah.

On several occasions, Vitringa emphasized that the regenerating and enlightening work of the Holy Spirit is necessary to interpret the Scripture rightly. His appeals to the spiritual experience of the interpreter, or
his complaints at the lack thereof, reveal him to be a representative of the
Nadere Reformatie (Dutch Further Reformation). Vitringa himself spent
his entire career at the theological faculty of Franeker University. Before
going to Leiden, he had studied theology at Franeker. He formed a par-
ticular bond with Herman Witsius, a fellow professor. Witsius must be
considered as one of the main representatives of the Nadere Reformatie in
the academic world of the era after Gisbertus Voetius.

Although Telfer does not state it, Witsius can be seen as a Voetian,
albeit one with sympathies for Cocceius. He thus formed a bridge between
the “Voetian” and “Cocceian” streams of the Nadere Reformatie. Telfer also
recognizes the importance of the friendship between Vitringa and Johannes
d’Outrein, who both studied at Franeker. D’Outrein translated the works
of Vitringa into Dutch. It seems that d’Outrein was less critical of Coc-
ceius’s exegetical approach than was Vitringa. However, like Vitringa,
d’Outrein was known for his pietistic emphasis, and it is for that reason
that he is reckoned among the Nadere Reformatie divines.

Telfer shows Vitringa’s contextual sensitivity at every level of exegesis,
his commitment to New Testament normativity in the reading of Isaiah
(in which redemptive history is the ultimate hermeneutical horizon), his
nuanced views of the historical fulfilment of prophecy, and his concern for
pastoral application. A scholar who was widely admired for his mastery of
the original languages and his intense historical focus in exegesis, Vitringa
was also appreciated for his orthodox views, warm-hearted piety, and love
for the church.

Telfer’s monograph will be of interest to Old Testament scholars, church
historians (especially those focusing on piety), and also all who study the
intellectual history of the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries.
—Pieter de Vries, Hersteld Hervormde Kerk
Seminarium Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam

Irmtraut Sahmland and Hans-Jürgen Schrader, eds., Medizin- und kulturge-
schichtliche Konnexe des Pietismus: Heilkunst und Ethik, arkane Traditionen,
Musik, Literatur und Sprache (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2016).
Hardcover, 428 pp., €90.

Religion and healing constitute a growing and blossoming field of academic
research that not only stimulates empirical investigation in disciplines like
anthropology, cultural studies, and study of religions, but also lies at the core of the so-called “body turn” that informs such important disciplinary notions as the somatization of religious ideas, material religion, or religion and the senses (Religionsaisthetik). As the historiography of religion and healing in Europe is still incomplete, it needs to include religious as well as medical orientations and practices, that have remained outside the mainstream of academic interest until very recently. Reaching back into the late 1970s, Christa Habrich’s occupation with pietist medicine and its material culture established the significance of pietist networks during the formative period of Western empirical medicine, as they disseminated and negotiated scientific medical notions and assessed their ethical implications. Habrich’s students—she supervised eighteen doctoral theses on history of medicine during her tenure—represent the state of affairs in this area of research when they and others commemorated her passing in 2013. The conference in 2014 resulted in the present volume of seventeen contributions—eleven on “Pietism and the Art of Healing” and six articles dealing with various other cultural dimensions of Pietism.

This review focuses on the general topic of healing that also addresses pietist notions of medical ethics, the influence of alchemy and pansophy, and animal magnetism or Mesmerism. Irmtraut Sahmland unearths the reception history of the Machiavellus medicus (from 1698 onwards), a satirical approach to the establishment of professional boundary settings. The handbook advises doctors on subjects like the importance of social relations (clergy, marriage strategies), women in key positions of familial care, or non-authorized healers. “Traditional customs, sometimes local usages inform the expectations” of the clients (24). Wealthy or ignorant patients want to apply their own recipes, and the doctors depend on them for the income that they need to implement rational medicine. Sahmland confronts this harsh account of the health market with the professional ethos of Michael Bernhard Valentini and Johann Samuel Carl (1677–1757), the former representing antique medical tradition and the latter “pietist philosophy of nature and religious convictions” (42). Carl placed the morality question within the mind-matter debate of the eighteenth century and called for reconciliation between both ends via medical practice. The physician conducts the liberation of the soul, a transfer from the corporeal into the spiritual, hence emphasizing specific medical notions and practices like the establishment of a rapport between doctor and patient through the consonance of the souls or the self-healing powers of the natura medicatrix. Carl’s self-perception of contributing “to the general reform and perfection
of a society that is considered as morally deficient and in the state of sin” (44) converged with a pointedly separatist style of self-conduct.

In two contributions (Vera Faßhauer; Veronika Marschall) on Carl’s contemporary, Johann Christian Senckenberg (1707–1772), both authors make use of material from Senckenberg’s diaries that are currently digitized and transcribed at the University Library of Frankfurt/Main. Faßhauer is leading the library project, and her familiarity with the sources provides the reader with striking examples of self-observation: “On the occasion of a promenade, nature has sweat abundantly lavished on me” (52). Senckenberg reads his own body symptoms in terms of the Book of Nature. It is interesting to compare Senckenberg’s notes with Adam Bernd’s (1676–1748) explanations of his inner self and physical conditions that continually shift between religious attachment and naturalist interpretations, offering a personal negotiation concerning sin and redemption vs. pathological states and finally leading to remarkable notions of human dignity (Anne Lagny). Faßhauer’s article focuses on Senckenberg’s student years as well as his doubts about the medical profession, and it compares them especially with Albrecht von Haller, thus documenting the conditions of a biographical line in which a successful medical thesis could take the place of the pietist’s rebirth. Marschall’s account gives additional information on Senckenberg’s religious development and about changes in his later convictions. It is accompanied by an extensive and commented extract of his doctoral address, De Pietate Medici (84–98).

Two contributions (Annemarie Kinzelbach and Marion Maria Ruisinger; Rita Wöbkmeyer) tackle the notion of “Pietist medicine” in different ways. Should the term include the town physician, who cannot publicly acknowledge his religious interests or affiliations? Could it basically translate into the idea of self-healing led by nature itself with reference to transatlantic therapeutic practice (95)? Does “pietist” refer to the primacy of the soul in psychodynamic medicine or does it merely suggest a more general and important role of emotions (96)? Is pietist medical culture traceable via the distribution of pharmaceutics from the Halle orphanage or Johann Samuel Carl’s use of pills (103–5, 110)? Carl’s grandson, Johann

---

Friedrich Struensee (1737–1772), was educated in Halle but later on represents an Enlightenment trend of "medical sociality" (160). His biography invites readers to ask for the conditions leading to Wöbcke’s conclusion that no pietist influence would inform his professional medical choices. The separation between personal and professional fields is also a leitmotiv for Jeff Bach’s study of alchemy and empirical medical notions in the Ephrata community, Pennsylvania.

The question of how to translate medical practice, body techniques, and physical evidence across the boundaries of different historical contexts reappears in two other articles (Konstanze Grutschnig-Kieser; Hans-Jürgen Schrader). The pietist model biography of Johann Philipp Kämpf (1688–1753), for example, was revisited in the famous Magazin zur Erfahrungseelenkunde (1793) where it provided empirical testimony of the capacities of the soul. In 1875, the Community of True Inspiration in Amana, Iowa, republished it as an apologetic advance. Schrader retraces different receptions of Hemme Hayen’s (1633–ca. 1689) prophecy account between 1689 and the late twentieth century. His method of exploring theoretical notions and motif patterns—while not entirely new—directs the attention to zones of transition and intersections between Pietism and Theosophy, alchemy, Sturm und Drang, Mesmerism, philosophy of nature, and even the phenomenological school of the Eranos circle (Ernst Benz’s study on visions). Mesmerist notions of sympathy and life magnetism were, according to Schrader, conceptions of Pietist medicine that had been originally transferred from Paracelsian and other Renaissance spiritualist theorems (193). However, considering equally the empirical stance of Erfahrungseelenkunde, the search of Mesmerist physicians for natural laws in the states of the soul, and their laboratory of “God’s physics” (p. 195, quote from Gotthilf Heinrich Schubert) for their supposed function as catalysts towards secularization might introduce a hasty generalization. For the discourse of Romantic Mesmerism attracted a multitude of religious actors who developed various distinctive modes of engaging with the authority of science. In this respect, it could be instructive to consult this volume’s contribution on the exorcism of Gottliebin Dittus (Christoffer H. Grundmann) with Stephanie Gripentrog’s recent study at hand that highlights the integration of Mesmerist notions in Gottliebin’s treatment.

3. Stephanie Gripentrog, “Vom Mesmerismus zur Hypnose: Schlaglichter auf die
These latter points constitute small issues that may call for future research in light of the rich and manifold material presented in this volume. Thanks to the intensive work already conducted in this area, Pietist medical networks are beginning to emerge around personalities in key positions like Carl, Senckenberg, Kämpf, and others. Their biographical accounts stress specific and common patterns of religious and professional ethics which could contribute to the development of typologies in the historiography of religion and healing. Many relations within and outside of these networks—e.g., Christoph Johann Oetinger, who attended Kämpf’s lectures in medical practice, or Johann Wolfgang Goethe, who was treated with universal salt (both presented in Ulf Lückel’s contribution)—are still largely unexplored.

—Tilman Hannemann, University of Bremen


W. J. op ’t Hof and F. W. Huisman have written a study on the life and work of the Utrecht bookseller Hendrik Versteeg (1630–1673). Their intention is to study a number of publishers, who were among the avid promoters of piety, and to present their findings on each person in separate publications.

Hendrik Versteeg was one of the so-called secondary representatives of the Dutch Further Reformation—those, such as booksellers and publishers, who though they were not theologians, have contributed to the dissemination of theological ideas. It is worth studying them because, as Robert Darnton explains through his “book-scientific model” (1939) (the so-called communication circuit), it is not only authors who contribute to the dissemination of ideas, but also the whole chain of contributors.

In the seventeenth century, the term “publisher” was not yet known. The term bookseller, “boekverkoper,” did exist, and such a person could print his own books or have them printed. The book trader flourished in particular through his ability to exchange books with colleagues. Op ’t Hof analyzes the

life and work of the Utrecht bookseller, whereas Huisman mainly focuses on the more historical aspects of his books, such as the vignettes he used and the books that he published. Both authors have made their mark in the area of theology and historical studies. While op’t Hof’s work has focused on the Dutch translations of Puritan writings and other historical subjects, Huisman has focused primarily on Pietistic bibliographic research.

Op’t Hof explores the career of this Utrecht resident, who promoted vigorously the cause of the Further Reformation in turbulent times. His family, life, and official role in the Dutch Reformed Church of Utrecht are all discussed. He emerges as a man who was sincerely committed to the Further Reformation. For example, he took up the translation of a number of Puritan works in order to promote Further Reformation piety. Op’t Hof argues that, besides business interests, he may also have been motivated by personal ones. This idea is reinforced by the fact that Versteeg was an elder in a period when the Utrecht Reformed congregation was particularly characterized by its Further Reformation program, a period in which the aim for piety was translated into practical measures. Finally, the Versteeg funding list, which was reconstructed by Huisman, also demonstrated this.

Versteeg was a small publisher who put about sixty publications on the market. Versteeg may have learned the trade from his brother-in-law, Hermannus Ribbius. When he started his own business as a publisher in 1654, he initially focused on the work of Christopher Love, whose writings he translated. He introduced the writings of this Englishman to the Netherlands. Op’t Hof also describes the relationships Versteeg had with Jacobus Koelman and Jodocus van Lodenstein and their work. There must have been more than a business relationship between them. The publishing history of *Den donder-slach der goddeloosen* (The Thunder of the Wicked) of Cornelis van Niel is also discussed, along with his other business network and his struggle with De Wild, the pirate publisher and his Amsterdam colleague. All in all, an image emerges of a publisher who, after a promising start, was not very successful in his business practices.

There is a growing interest in these so-called secondary representatives of the Further Reformation. There have been other studies of important figures, such as Willem Clerck, Boekholt, the widow of De Groot, and Douci and Van Pelt, who were the Rotterdam publishers of the Erskine brothers. The intrinsic motivation to produce Pietistic publications appeared in the preface of the printer to the reader, from which his motivation becomes clear. Authors, translators, publishers, and booksellers were all important
in the process of disseminating the ideas of the Further Reformation, as the above-mentioned Darnton model indicates.

The authors provide valuable insight into how dedicated publishers handled Pietistic manuscripts. In addition, this book serves as a tool for those who wish to further explore this subject. Just as Willem Teellinck, Godefridus Udemans, and Jodocus van Lodenstein were more important for the Further Reformation than others, so were their booksellers and publishers. Recent treatment of these theologians has opened the way for more focused attention on how their theology was made widely available through the publication of their works.

—Jan Willem Stolk, Independent Researcher


Already in 1739 the so-called “Daily Watchwords” (Losungen) of the Moravians (Herrnhuter Brüdergemeine) were being read in not only “Herrnhut, Herrenhaag, Herendyk, Pilgerruh, Ebersdorf, Jena, Amsterdam, Rotterdam, London, Oxford, Berlin, Greenland, Sainte-Croix, Saint-Thomas, Saint-Jean, Barbados, Palestine, Surinam, and Savannah (Georgia), but also among the Moors in the Carolinas, the savages in Irene (Pennsylvania), the Hottentots (in Guinea), and many other places throughout the world” (161). In all these places there were Moravian settlements or missions. Presently disseminated in more than fifty languages, the Watchwords are a “mark of living ecumenism” (162), crossing denominational boundaries.

Peter Zimmerling, professor of Practical Theology in Leipzig, has published numerous studies, particularly on Count Nikolaus Ludwig von Zinzendorf (1700–1760). In this book he traces the history of the calendars with biblical texts printed on them from 1728 to the present day. Through a procedure of drawing lots—hence the name—a prepared selection of Bible verses was used both for divine guidance and comfort in communities and for individual decision-making among the early Moravians. Their founder, Nicholas Zinzendorf, played a crucial role. The Watchword texts were intended to enable one to live each day with the Scriptures. Each day followers of this tradition would cast lots and choose a selection from the Old Testament, a didactic text from the New Testament, and a prayer or hymn-verse. Zimmerling calls this triad “a condensed liturgy of worship
for each day” (144). Zinzendorf, whom he describes as the “inventor” (11) of this applied Bible piety, conceived the individual verses as a guide to understanding all of Scripture. The passages chosen for a given day, person or group, or for special occasions, were not to take the place of the Bible, but rather to lead readers to it. The fact that the text of the Old and the New Testament illuminate each other and are supplemented by the voice of tradition, emphasized the “self-efficiency of Scripture” (142). From the beginning to the present day all further exegesis in published form was rejected. The importance of the Daily Watchwords in prayer and various forms of worship must not be underestimated. Their omission from meetings in many Protestant churches today would be unimaginable.

Zimmerling’s book gives us a vivid picture of the 250-year history of this booklet, which has become the epitome of evangelical biblical piety. In eleven chapters the author reflects on the past, present, and future of the Watchwords. There is also a foreword by the Chairperson of the Provincial Board and, by way of “conclusion,” an article by the hymn-writer Detlef Block, as well as a concise bibliography. Two chapters illustrate the history of Zinzendorf and the early Moravians, who settled in and around Herrnhut, a little village east of Dresden. In explaining Zinzendorf’s conception of the Bible, Zimmerling outlines a “mini-theology of Watchwords” (123–38). Four chapters are devoted to the “history of the impact of the Watchwords.” Here, by way of survey, the author introduces select individuals and episodes from the early eighteenth to the twentieth centuries. Johann Christoph Blumhardt (1805–1880) and Count Hans von Lehndorff (1910–1987) are portrayed in some detail. Three other persons are presented in separate chapters, each in terms of their relationship to the Watchwords: Otto von Bismarck (1815–1898), Jochen Klepper (1903–1942), and Dietrich Bonhoeffer (1906–1945). The latter two are widely known as authoritative figures in the time of National Socialism and their respective relationship to the Watchwords gives the reader a view into other aspects of their personal beliefs. As Zimmerling explored in other chapters, the period of Kirchenkampf was decisive in the diffusion of the Watchwords. On the basis of thorough research he shows that the German Chancellor Otto von Bismarck made personal notes in editions of the Watchwords over many years.

Zimmerling’s conclusions, however, from which he constructs a profile of Bismarck’s “spirituality” (81), seem far-fetched. Zimmerling stresses the “authenticity” of Bismarck’s conversion (64, 67) and proceeds to his “turning to personal faith in God” (59), which he presents as proven fact. On the
basis of the notes in the Watchword booklets, Zimmerling draws far-reaching conclusions that the chancellor “was no ruthless power seeker” (73). While the extant sources attest to Bismarck’s reading of the Watchwords, Zimmerling’s conclusions are, in some cases, unsustainable. Likewise, he attempts to put Kleppers’s conception of Prussia in as favorable a light as possible.

In the chapter “Reasons for the Success of the Watchwords,” Zimmerling provides a condensed introduction to the procedure for the selection by lot and the emergence of other texts. Two further chapters (147–58; 159–66) offer various perspectives on the current and future significance of the Daily Watchwords. He also explores politicians of various parties in these chapters. In another chapter, “The Book of Watchwords—A Trusted Companion from School Days,” the author shares his own experiences with Watchword texts at decisive points in his life.

Zimmerling seeks to provide an overview in plain language of the history and significance of the Watchwords. However, the book possesses a number of weaknesses. The order of the chapters is somewhat haphazard and the choice of examples often eclectic. In his attempt to write clearly the author occasionally misses his goal; for example, his claim that the Watchwords were comparable to a “Maggi cube” containing, the “quintessence” of Scripture (129). It is regrettable that the author neglected the relatively recent work of Shirley Brückner, which contextualized the Moravian Brotherhood’s practice of drawing lots. While the Watchwords are unique in their own way, we must not forget that they were part of a long history of appropriating the Bible.

—Ruth Albrecht, Institut für Kirchen- und Dogmengeschichte, Universität Hamburg