

THE THEOLOGICAL THOUGHT
OF
JOHN GOODWIN
(1593-1665)

A Thesis

Presented to the Post-Graduate School of Theology
University of Edinburgh

In partial fulfilment
of the requirements for the
Doctor of Philosophy Degree

by

William J. Hinson

1953



FOREWORD

John Goodwin was one of the most interesting, controversial, and liberal figures during the Puritan era. Yet, only one full biography of him has ever been attempted. This was over a hundred years ago and written from a highly partisan point of view. A later study was made, but it was too brief and in too popular a style to be satisfactory. This neglect of Goodwin led Prof. William Haller in The Rise of Puritanism to comment that a study of his career is "an important chapter in the intellectual history of the Puritan Revolution which still remains, and deserves to be written." (p. 391) It was this lack of an adequate study of Goodwin's thought that led to this thesis.

It has not been my intention to cover fully Goodwin's life. To do so would have led us too far from our main purpose which is to see his theological thought against the broader framework of his own age. It would also have made this thesis unduly long. As John Hunt has observed in Religious Thought in England: "A thorough life of John Goodwin would be a history of all the controversies and of all the changes, both in Church and State, which were witnessed between the first assembling of the Long Parliament and the restoration of Charles." (Vol. I, p. 260)

In the thesis I have used American spelling preferences and have followed the style manual issued by the University of Chicago for footnote and bibliographical

entries. The great length of most of the titles of seventeenth century books has necessitated a modification of these forms. The bibliography contains as much of the full title as seemed desirable to use. The shorter titles, which are used in the footnotes, are underscored in the bibliography.

There are many to whom I have been indebted in the writing of this thesis. My two advisers, the Rev. Principal Duthie and the Rev. Professor Rankin have given valuable assistance at every stage. The librarians of the British Museum, Emmanuel and Queen's Colleges, Cambridge, Dr. William's Library, London, and the MacAlpin Collection, Union Theological Seminary, New York, have all been of help in finding rare pamphlets and books. It is, however, to the staffs of the National Library and the New College Library in Edinburgh that I am most deeply indebted. To my typist, Mrs. J. M. Barrie, to whose patience and careful accuracy, I also owe a debt of gratitude. But this thesis could never have been written without the assistance and encouragement of my wife.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
	FOREWORD	ii
Chapter		
I.	PURITAN CHAMPION OF FREEDOM	1
	A. The Early Years	
	1. Time - 1593, place - Norfolk, England	
	2. Education at Queen's College, Cambridge (1612-1627)	
	B. Puritan Preacher and Pastor	
	1. A period of lecturing (1627-1633)	
	2. Pastor of St. Stephens, Coleman Street, Parish Church (1633-1645)	
	C. The Plunge into Controversy	
	1. Early theological disputes	
	2. Into the maelstrom of politics	
	3. Into the struggle over religious toleration	
	D. At the Center of Controversy	
	1. Toleration - a dangerous doctrine	
	2. A man of many "errours"	
	3. At the center of strife between King, Parliament, and Army	
	E. A Controversial Figure to the End	
	1. The warfare not yet ended	
	2. The Restoration, deprivation, and death	
II.	THEOLOGICAL METHOD	73
	A. The Sources and Criteria of Truth	
	1. The Scriptures	
	2. Reason	
	3. The Holy Spirit	
	4. Nature	
	5. Tradition	
	6. Godliness	
	7. Experience	
	B. The Nature of Truth	
	1. Its importance	
	2. The attainment of truth	
	3. The growth of truth	
	4. The unity of truth	
	5. The triumph of truth	

Chapter	Page
III. CALVINISM TO ARMINIANISM	108
A. The Bases for Goodwin's Abandonment of Calvinism	
1. Influences	
2. Calvinism gave a distorted conception of God	
3. Calvinism made void the Gospel	
4. Calvinism destroyed man's responsibility	
B. The Nature of Goodwin's Arminianism	
1. Evangelical Arminianism or a <u>via media</u>	
2. The implications of Goodwin's <u>Arminianism</u>	
IV. DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH	144
A. Congregationalism versus Presbyterianism	
1. From Presbyterian to Congregationalist	
2. Gathered congregations versus a national church	
3. Godliness versus orthodoxy	
4. The inviolability of the individual conscience versus the authority of synods and councils	
5. Freedom of the Spirit versus creedal orthodoxy	
6. Spiritual methods versus coercive methods	
B. Separation of Church and State	
1. The two orders	
2. The denial of any authority to the Civil Magistrate in matters of religion	
V. PLEA FOR TOLERATION	176
A. The Theological Bases of Toleration	
1. The Parallel development of his theological thought and his views on toleration	
2. The relativity of truth undermined the basis for persecution	
3. Liberty of conscience disclaimed the right of persecution	
4. Separation of Church and State took away the means of persecution	
5. Ethical emphasis questioned the necessity for persecution	
B. The Practical Arguments for Toleration	
1. The danger of fighting against God	
2. The danger of persecuting the Saints	
3. The danger of suppressing reformation	
4. The ineffectiveness of persecution	
5. The benefits of toleration	
6. The necessity of toleration	

Chapter	Page
VI. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	218
A. Goodwin's Theological Position	
1. Puritanism modified by Christian Humanism	
2. A rationalist	
3. An evangelical Arminian	
4. An Independent	
5. An exponent of religious liberty	
B. Goodwin's Influence and Importance	
1. As an Arminian	
2. As a Congregationalist	
3. In defense of toleration	
 BIBLIOGRAPHY	 273
I. Primary Sources	
1. Books by John Goodwin	
2. Pamphlets by John Goodwin	
3. Works Edited by John Goodwin	
4. Works Attacking John Goodwin	
5. Other Contemporary Works Concerning John Goodwin	
6. Other Primary Sources	
II. Select Secondary Sources	
III. Miscellaneous	
1. Reference works	
2. Public Documents	
3. Manuscripts	
4. Bibliographies	

Chapter I

PURITAN CHAMPION OF FREEDOM

"There is Crotensis, alias Master John Goodwin, a monstrous Sectary, a compound of Socinianisme, Arminianisme, Libertinisme, Antinomianisme, Independency, Popery, yea and of Scepticisms, . . ." Thomas Edwards.

CHAPTER I

PURITAN CHAMPION OF FREEDOM

A. The Early Years

1. Time - 1593, place - Norfolk, England.-- Nothing is known of the early life of John Goodwin except that he was born somewhere in the county of Norfolk, England, about the year 1593.¹ Few of those living in the England of that day could have foreseen the changes that would take place within the lifetime of such a person. The age of the Tudors, with its consolidation of power and authority of both Church and State in the hands of the monarch, was to give way to the age of the Stuarts when the keynote would be the revolt against authority in both Church and State.² Even in the year 1593 at the very zenith of the age of Elizabeth and Shakespeare there were signs of things to come. In spite of all Elizabeth's efforts to enforce uniformity, Puritanism and non-conformity were still very much alive. This was symbolized by three drastic steps which were taken in this very year. First, there was the execution of three of the leading separatists -- Henry Barrowe, John Greenwood, John Penry.³

1. Cf., Thomas Jackson, The Life of John Goodwin, (Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme and Brown, 1822), p. 2, and "John Goodwin", Dictionary of National Biography.

2. Cf., S. R. Gardiner, The History of England from the Accession of James I to the Outbreak of the Civil War 1603-1642, (Longman Green 1884), Vol. I, p. 32. Godfrey Davies, The Early Stuarts 1603-1660, (revised edition, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1949), p. xix.

3. R. W. Dale, History of English Congregationalism, Hodder and Stoughton, 1907), pp. 142 ff. Ernest A. Payne, The Free Church Tradition in the Life of England, (3d ed. revised, SCM Press, 1951), pp. 40 f.

Second, a stringent uniformity law was passed. "Parliament allowed itself, in 1593, for the first time since the accession of Elizabeth, to pass a statute against Protestants of any kind."¹ Finally, there was added a new weapon to fight the Puritans. Whereas, the chief battle grounds had been the Law-Courts as seen in the execution above, and the House of Commons in the second instance, the Anglicans were to use the pulpit also. In the forefront of this added weapon was Richard Bancroft who was to become Archbishop of Canterbury under James I. In 1593 he issued two of his main attacks upon the Puritans,² but this weapon was to fail as were the other two. The age of Elizabeth, then, was not so calm and secure as it might appear at a quick glance, for there was already a stirring in the land which was to sweep England into two civil wars as well as revolutionary experiments in Church and State.

The year in which John Goodwin was born was not the only thing symbolical of the futile effort to stem the tidal wave of Puritanism which was to sweep away an Arch-bishop and a King in its path, but the place was also significant. Norfolk had long been a centre of non-Conformity. "Norfolk and Suffolk have long been distinguished by the zeal for Protestantism cherished and manifested in their town and villages."³

1. Gardiner, *op.cit.*, Vol. I, p. 38.

2. W. H. Frere, A History of the English Church in the Reigns of Elizabeth and James I, 1558-1625, (Macmillan, 1904), p. 275.

3. John Browne, History of Congregationalism, (Jarrod and Sons, 1877), p. 1.

One of the first Christian martyrs to be burned as a heretic in England was a parish priest at Lynn in Norfolk.¹ It could boast many sons who were Protestant martyrs, including Henry Barrowe. It was also the centre of much separatist activity. Robert Browne, who first enunciated Congregational principles in England, began his work in Norfolk.² Among the names associated with non-Conformity in Norfolk were Henry Robinson, Jeremiah Burroughes, and two Goodwins, Vincent Goodwin and Thomas Goodwin. There is no indication that John Goodwin was related in any way to either of them, but he might well have acquired a leaning toward non-Conformity from his native county before he ever had contact with it at Cambridge. While nothing is known of the early life of John Goodwin, he must certainly have been aware of the growing tension in the air between Anglicans and Puritans as he left for Cambridge University at the age of nineteen.

2. Education at Queen's College, Cambridge (1612-1627). - -

Goodwin was to spend fifteen years, nearly one-fourth of his life, at Cambridge, first as a student and then as a fellow. It is difficult to say exactly what he learned and what changes were made in him, during those years. From the Cambridge of those years and the Goodwin of later years, we can surmise some of the influences at work on him which seem to have been of lasting effect. Cambridge, at this time, was ahead of her sister institution of Oxford in theological learning and intellectual activity and had much to offer a serious student.

1. Ibid., p. 12.

2. Dale, op.cit., pp. 120 ff.

While Queen's College was not the largest or most outstanding college during this period, it had an Erasmus tradition and two able men in Davenant as President and John Preston as fellow. There is evidence of the impact of all three on Goodwin.

The outstanding characteristic about Cambridge during this period seems to have been its Puritan influences. It was, in fact, the centre of training for its preachers and leaders. "Within the purlieus of the Church, making use of Cambridge as its seminary, the reform party under the primacies of Bancroft, Abbot, and Laud built up for itself what can fairly be called a kind of Puritan order of preaching brothers."¹ Haller goes on to conclude, "The university at Cambridge was largely dominated by their influence."² Although Emmanuel College became the outstanding Puritan college there, Queen's also played an important part in the life of the University and of Puritanism. While it would be impossible to call President Davenant of Queen's College (1614-1622) a Puritan, the name can easily be applied to the most important figure in the College during those years, namely John Preston. The differences between the two men is seen by the fact that Davenant after leaving Queen's became a Bishop in the Anglican Church, and Preston, Master of Emmanuel College. Of the two men, Preston was the more influential at Queen's and is even given credit by several writers for being the main attraction

1. William Haller, The Rise of Puritanism, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1938), p. 52.

2. Ibid., p. 82.

at Queen's during this period. In his history of Queen's College, W. G. Searle points out that the average number of students per year in Queen's College from 1600 to 1612 was twenty-eight; whereas from 1612 to 1622, while Preston was a fellow, the average rose to forty one. It may be significant that Goodwin first enrolled in Queen's in the very year, 1612, in which Preston became a fellow. Searle goes on to point out that of 454 students enrolled during Preston's time, 104 were enrolled as his pupils.¹ Preston, who had been converted under the preaching of John Cotton, was to become one of the Puritan preachers and leaders who had many disciples, among whom was Thomas Goodwin, the Independent disturber of the Westminster Assembly. Both his life and his sermons were published upon his death by several of the Puritan leaders.² Whether under the sway of Preston's preaching and teaching or of others, John Goodwin could hardly avoid absorbing a large amount of Puritanism during his fifteen years at Cambridge.

The strength of Puritanism at Cambridge did not prevent humanism from exercising an important influence. The Reformed tradition from Calvin and Zwingli on down, had always had a strong strain of humanism in its make-up. The Reformation may have meant a return to the study and preaching of the Bible, but the main stream of the movement did not thereby

1. W. G. Searle, The History of the Queen's College of St. Margaret And St. Bernard in the University of Cambridge, (Cambridge: University Press, 1871), pp. 438 f.

2. Cf., Haller, op.cit., pp. 70 ff., "John Preston", The Dictionary of National Biography, and J. B. Mullinger, The University of Cambridge, (Cambridge University: University Press), Vol. II, pp. 554 ff.

reject the values of the classics. Likewise, Renaissance Humanism might have had secularizing tendencies within it, yet it also served to stimulate Biblical study. As Lewis Einstein has shown in his study, The Italian Renaissance in England (1902), most of the Italians who brought Renaissance ideas to England, were religious reformers who had to flee their native Italy to avoid persecution. Peter Martyr and Jacob Acontius were only two of a score or more who found a refuge in England. This was true of the most famous humanist of all, and the one who exercised the most influence, Erasmus, for he was a great Biblical scholar and helped introduce Greek and the study of the Bible in the original languages at Cambridge.

During one of his stays in England, Erasmus lectured at Queen's College and seems to have left a permanent influence there. While there is no apparent or direct dependence of John Goodwin upon Erasmus, the Queen's fellow of a century later was more indebted to the heritage left by the great reformer and humanist than he probably realized. There are at least four aspects of Goodwin's thought that seem to have had their origin in the humanist tradition which he met and apparently absorbed while at Cambridge. First, was a thorough knowledge of Latin and Greek, with some Hebrew, and the use of these in the study of the Bible. Secondly, he acquired an excellent background in the classics, particularly Aristotle and the Roman authors. Thirdly, he learned to stress the place and importance of reason. In the fourth place, this was the most likely point at which he began to have a certain amount of tolerance toward people of other views.

The humanistic thinker who influenced Goodwin most was Jacobus Acontius.¹ It is impossible to know the date Goodwin first came to know the writings of Acontius. It was most probably while he was at Cambridge that he read Acontius, for the 1565 Basel edition of Satanæ Stratagemata circulated in England at that time.² There is no question about Goodwin's familiarity with, and admiration for Acontius. In Goodwin's "Epistle to the Reader", in the first English translation of Acontius' main work, Satanæ Stratagemata, he praised the book highly. He said he had not met with any author comparable "for a Christian genius and dexterity" in teaching that "desirable and happy art" of opposing error and setting up truth in its stead. "He entituleth his Book Satans Stratagemes: He might as properly with respect to the matter of it, have stiled it, the Stratagemes of Christ. . . ." ³ There are many passages in Acontius that are strikingly similar to some in Goodwin's writings.

1. Jacobus Acontius (1500?-1566?), was a typically, well-rounded Renaissance man. He was a jurist, philosopher, theologian, and engineer. He was one of the group of Academics who found refuge in Switzerland, where they distinguished themselves in the cause of tolerance. This group included Bernardino Ochino and Sebastian Castellio. Acontius later visited England in 1559 where he was well received. Cf., The Dictionary of National Biography, article "Acontius", and W. K. Jordan, The Development of Religious Toleration in England, (Allen and Unwin, 1932), Vol. I, pp. 303-365.

2. Or it may have possibly been in the 1630's after the first English edition in Latin had been printed at Oxford. In any case, Goodwin's first writings, especially his Treatise of Justification, 1642, showed the influence of Acontius. For a list of the numerous Latin editions, French, German, Dutch, English, translations, see Jordan, op.cit., Vol. I, pp. 303 f.

3. Jacobus Acontius, Darkness Discovered, 1651, epistle dedicatory.

The Reformation and the Renaissance both brought great changes in the life and scholarship at Cambridge, but scholasticism was still very much alive in the University in the first half of the seventeenth century. The medieval curriculum and traditions were slow to die out. The influence of Bacon and Newton had not yet come to help in its destruction. John Milton who came to Cambridge two years before Goodwin left, was critical of what he considered the arid traditionalism and the dead hand of scholasticism which still reigned when he matriculated there.¹

The continuing presence of medieval traditions had two main aspects which were especially important for Goodwin. The first was the central importance, second only to that of theology, in the curriculum of logic and the consequent emphasis on scholastic disputation as a significant part of the training.² While the new logic of Peter Ramus was beginning to replace the logic of Aristotle as the basis for disputation, the endless process of students disputing about everything from the trivial to the deepest mysteries of theology continued. "This veneration of logic was in part an inheritance from the past and in part a characteristic of the epoch. Neither humanism nor Protestantism had diminished the prestige with which medieval theologians invested the art. The study of antiquity greatly enhanced it, and

1. Haller, op.cit., p. 298. David Masson, The Life of John Milton, (Macmillan, 1859), Vol. I, Chapter IV.

2. J. B. Mullinger, op.cit., Vol. I, p. 414.

Protestantism was, in one sense, an appeal to logic for the arbitration of belief, since logic alone could interpret the Bible."¹ As we shall see, John Goodwin, who became one of the leading controversialists of his age, owed much to this early training in logic and disputation.

The second aspect of scholasticism which still remained relatively unchallenged and unchanged was philosophy. The Puritans found themselves in the same position as the Reformers, for there existed no alternative to take its place.² Aristotle was still quoted as the unquestionable authority in this area of metaphysics.³ Renaissance Platonism had begun to make inroads, but Cambridge Platonism was still a decade or so away. The living God of the Bible and Puritan experience was very often seen as the unchangeable, immutable God of Aristotle who was bound by a rigid chain of causes and effects. Reformers of the seventeenth century, as did the reformers of the sixteenth century, found it difficult to shake off many of the scholastic modes of thought. John Goodwin never was able to accomplish this completely either, and for much the same reason. There was no constructive alternative.

Whether for Anglican or Puritan, Calvinism was the dominant theology at this time. At Cambridge the Institutes

1. Perry Miller, The New England Mind: the Seventeenth Century, (New York: Macmillan, 1939), p. 113.

2. Perry Miller and T. H. Johnson, The Puritans, (New York: G. Allen, 1938), p. 26.

3. John Preston's experience at Queen's was typical. "He plunged into natural philosophy, making himself perfect in all the dark untrodden paths of Aristotle's physics and metaphysics: . . ." Haller, op.cit., pp. 70 f.

of Calvin were replacing the Summae of Aquinas; the Commonplaces of Musculus, the Sentences of Peter Lombard.¹ Calvinism reigned supreme in the universities. Only an occasional, isolated voice was lifted against the theology of Calvin. While at Cambridge, Goodwin must have absorbed the prevailing Calvinist position. Along with this heritage, he apparently also acquired an interest in, and leaning toward, Arminianism. During his stay at Cambridge the famous Synod of Dort took place with President Davenant of Queen's College and three other Cambridge faculty members as delegates. Goodwin's later adherence to Arminianism may have come in part as a reaction against the complete indoctrination with Calvinism he received at Cambridge.

The fifteen years John Goodwin spent as a student and fellow at Queen's College of Cambridge University were not marked by any outstanding achievements, but they were important in his preparation for the large contribution he was to make as a minister, theologian and writer in London. While at Cambridge he had acquired a thorough familiarity with the writings of Reformed theologians and the Greek Fathers. He had mastered the art of disputation and become skilled in dialectics. A working knowledge of the classical languages and literature was also an important part of his preparation. Above all, he must have left Cambridge as one used to thinking for himself.²

1. Mullinger, op.cit., Vol. I, p. 414.

2. This was to be one of the outstanding characteristics of Goodwin throughout his life. "No man brought a clearer head and a sounder judgment to the many questions that had helped to bring confusion on the Church and the nation. . . . On all these subjects men were surrounded by a thick mist. The mist was a kind of influence under which they had been educated. They were guided by historical sequences rather than by the reason of

B. Puritan Preacher and Pastor

1. A period of lecturing (1627-1633). -- The immediate occasion for Goodwin's leaving Cambridge was his marriage. It was against the rules of the University for a fellow to continue to hold his fellowship after marriage.¹ After receiving orders in the Church of England, Goodwin seemed to have followed the course of other of his Puritan brethren and spent several years "lecturing" after leaving Cambridge.

It was a common practice of Puritan preachers during this period, after a Cambridge education and fellowship, to become a lecturer or special preacher.² This kept them from having to accept many of the duties and compromises involved in becoming parish priests. It gave them a greater opportunity to concentrate on that part of the ministry which they thought most important, preaching. The ordinary and prescribed services would be performed by the regular parson and the lecturer would preach or lecture on the Bible on Sundays during hours other than those of the regular services of worship, and during the weekdays as well. It was also a common practice for such a lecturer to serve more than one congregation in this capacity. This seems to have been the pattern followed by John Goodwin after he left Cambridge. He

things. John Goodwin saw through the mist." John Hunt, Religious Thought in England, (Strahan and Co., 1870), Vol. I, pp. 259 f.

1. Goodwin's bitter critic, Thomas Edwards, accused him of holding his fellowship for a time even after his marriage. Thomas Edwards, Gangraena, (3d ed. revised, 1646), Part II, p. 84.

2. Cf., Haller, op.cit., pp. 52 f.

preached or lectured at several churches in his native Norfolk before proceeding to Dover and then finally to London.¹

2. Pastor of St. Stephens, Coleman Street, Parish Church, (1633-1645). -- He was in London only a little over a year when an opportunity came to him to succeed a staunch Puritan in one of the leading Churches of London. John Davenport had been pastor of St. Stephens parish church in Coleman Street, London, for several years, but had incurred the disapproval of Bishop Laud for his involvement in the "feoffment" scheme of buying up impropriations, the proceeds of which were to go to Puritan preachers.² Then in 1631 he had been called before the high commission for his efforts to raise money for the distressed ministers of the Palatinate.³ It was with the advice and consent of his Congregation that Davenport left in 1633 for Holland to join the growing band of English refugees there. John Davenport was to stay in Holland only a short time, however, for he was drawn toward the new land across the Atlantic. He had been interested in the new colonies for some time, perhaps due, in part, to his near residence to the great trading companies of the day.⁴ He owned stock in both the Virginia Company and

1. Raynum, Lynn, Yarmouth and Norwich are mentioned as places at which he preached. Here again Edwards accused him of "jugglings and indirect walkings" between the various churches. Edwards, op.cit., Part II, p. 69.

2. "John Davenport", Dictionary of National Biography, and Haller, op.cit., pp. 80 f.

3. Benjamin Brook, The Lives of the Puritans. (James Black, 1813), Vol. I, p. 447.

4. I. M. Calder (ed.), Letters of John Davenport, Puritan Divine. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1937), p. 3.

Massachusetts Bay Company. To this was now added the encouragement of a friend, John Cotton, who wrote of this new land which "reminded him of the new heaven and new earth." Accordingly in 1637 he left for New England, taking a number of his former parishioners with him.

The Puritan John Goodwin succeeded the Puritan John Davenport at this important Church. St. Stephens Church of Coleman Street was situated near the Guildhall, the centre of the trading companies, who were fast assuming great importance in the expanding colonial empire. There must have been a sizable troupe of merchants among its congregation. It was in the heart of London that was becoming the intellectual and financial, as well as the political centre, of England and the empire. It was a pulpit which could and would become of great strategic importance in the struggles that lay ahead. The parishioners of the church had the privilege, which they had received from Queen Elizabeth herself, of electing their own vicars.¹ Either because he had been recommended by Davenport before his departure, or because some of the parishioners had heard him preach somewhere in London and liked him, the congregation chose John Goodwin as their next pastor.

Goodwin was to spend most of his active ministry as pastor of St. Stephens. With the exception of four years during which time he was removed from his church by his Presbyterian opponents, Goodwin filled the pulpit there until his removal at the Restoration. St. Stephens parish church had

1. Ibid., p. 2.

among its membership many solid, influential citizens, especially from the merchant class. Issac Pennington is a good example of the kind of person found among its membership. Pennington was one of the leading members of the congregation and one of the outstanding political figures of London.¹ Besides being an alderman of the city of London for nearly 20 years, he was a member of both the Short and the Long Parliaments and was made Lord Mayor of London during the Civil War. Under the Commonwealth he was a member of the Council of State. Pennington was the person who presented the famous "Root and Branch Petition", signed by 15,000 citizens in and about the City of London, to the Commons on December 11th, 1640. This document sounded the keynote of the opposition to the policies of Archbishop Laud and Charles I, and was the first sign that the City of London was to become a third force, along with the King and Parliament, in the revolutionary days ahead.² John Goodwin's signature, along with that of many of the other members of his congregation, must have been on the petition.

Goodwin's reputation as a preacher and as a champion of the cause of freedom also brought a peculiar assortment of

1. "Issac Pennington", Dictionary of National Biography.

2. It began with the declaration; "That whereas the government of archbishops and lord bishops, deans and archdeacons, &c., . . . have proved prejudicial and very dangerous both to the Church and Commonwealth And whereas the said government is found by woeful experience to be a main cause and occasion of many foul evils, pressures and grievances of a very high nature unto His Majesty's subjects. . . . We therefore most humbly pray, and beseech . . . that the said government, with all its dependencies, roots and branches, may be abolished. . . ." S. R. Gardiner (ed.) The Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution, (3d ed. revised, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1906), pp. 137 f.

people from all over the city to attend his church. There was probably no church any more active or influential than was St. Stephens of Coleman Street during Goodwin's ministry there. Many of the leaders of the period of the Civil War and the Commonwealth attended Goodwin's Church. Among them was William Kiffin a leading Baptist preacher, John Lilburne and William Walwyn, leaders of the Leveller movement, and Thomas Firmin, the outstanding Socinian of the period. His provocative preaching drew around him "a compact and influential group of men in the city of whom he was to be the acknowledged voice and leader."¹ It was not surprising that his staunch Presbyterian opponent, Thomas Edwards, called Goodwin the "Great Red Dragon of Coleman Street." "Among all the preachers in London, his was the most active mind, the boldest voice and the readiest pen. . . ." ²

During these years at St. Stephens, Goodwin was developing a reputation not only as a preacher, but also as a controversialist, theologian, pamphleteer, and eloquent champion of freedom. This growing participation in the struggles of the day was to increase both his reputation and the number of his followers and critics alike. By the early 1640's, Goodwin had become one of the most controversial figures in London. By 1645 his controversies had brought him the loss of his church. The excuse given by the Committee for removing him was that he refused to administer the sacraments of baptism and Lord's Supper to all of his

1. William Haller (ed.), Tracts on Liberty, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1934), Vol. I, p. 31.
 2. Ibid.

parishioners. Actually, it was more likely due to his liberal theological views and his outspoken defence of religious toleration.¹ Probably most of the Presbyterian majority felt as Baillie did upon Goodwin's removal from his Church; "Blessed be God, all the ministers of London are for us. Burton and Goodwin, the only two that were Independent, are by the Parliament removed from their places."²

C. The Plunge into Controversy

1. Early theological disputes.-- Goodwin began his ministry at St. Stephens in the same year that Laud became primate over all of England. Two years later, Goodwin was cited by Laud, along with three others, in his annual account of his province for "breach of the canons of the church in sermons, or practice, or both, etc."³ Then again in 1638 and 1639, he was causing the archbishop anxiety by preaching "some over-nice curiosities" concerning "the imputation of Christ's righteousness in the justification of a sinner."⁴ It would thus seem that John Goodwin early became a centre of controversy, both with his fellow ministers and the church authorities. William Kiffin reports going to hear Goodwin when he first came to London. He went in 1632 finding his ministry "very profitable to me." He went on to point out

1. The fact that the Presbyterians believed in a certain restriction on the admittance of people to the sacraments makes the real reason seem to be other than the one given. Cf., Westminster Confession, Chaps. XXVII-XXIX.

2. Robert Baillie, The Letters and Journals, (Revised edition, Edinburgh, 1842), Vol. II, p. 299.

3. William Laud, The Works of William Laud, (Edited in the Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology, 1860), Vol. V, pp. 332 f.

4. Ibid., pp. 356, 362.

that Goodwin found it necessary to answer "very many objections; and Scriptures brought by others to the contrary."¹

There is one other incident which is known during these years which bears out the same tendency. In 1638-39 Goodwin became involved in a dispute with some of the sectarians concerning the necessity of human learning for a preacher. He had attacked the lack of formal education of one Samuel How, a cobbler who had been preaching in the vicinity and was known as the "unlearned enemy of humane learning."² After the attack How challenged Goodwin to send him a text to preach on. He sent II Peter 3:6 as the text and went to hear the sermon. How preached at Nags-head Tavern near Coleman Street and the sermon was later published under the title, "The Sufficiencie of the spirits teaching, without humane-learning." This ran through many subsequent editions.³ Goodwin, it would seem, disputed with the unlearned as well as the learned.

The time was fast approaching, however, when the controversies would not be confined to the pulpit and back halls, for the Puritans at long last, in the year 1640, got an opportunity to begin to carry out their reforms in the Church and nation. In that fateful year, due to the revolt or Bishops War in Scotland, Charles had been forced to convene Parliament. This same Parliament was destined to be one of the longest and most revolutionary in English history. Soon the tight control

1. William Orme, Remarkable Passages in the Life of William Kiffin, 1823, p. 10.

2. Champlin Barrage, Early English Dissenters, (Cambridge: University Press, 1912), Vol. II, p. 328.

3. Jordan, op.cit., Vol. II, p. 257.

Laud held over the printing of books was to slip from his grasp, and there would be a veritable flood of pamphlets and books. All of the ideas and words held back by Laud's strict censorship were to come pouring forth from the presses of London in an almost deafening babel of voices. John Goodwin was to join with all of his skill and fervour to the mighty chorus of voices seeking to direct the course of events as one development followed another in swift succession in the revolution which was steadily gaining momentum.

One of the first books off the press after the beginning of the Long Parliament was an attack on John Goodwin by a Puritan minister, George Walker, who had gotten into difficulty with the Church authorities for preaching on Sabbath observance, and a qualified obedience to the King. Walker was an opponent of Socinianism of long standing, having accused Anthony Wotton, a Puritan with Arminian leanings, of Socinianism as far back as 1614.¹ In his work Socinianism in the Fundamental Point of Justification - Discovered and Confuted, (1640), he renewed his attack on Socinianism with Goodwin as his target. Walker and Goodwin had already met face to face in a disputation staged by Walker's followers, and short papers of each had been circulated. In this book, Walker sought to attach the label of Socinian to Goodwin, whom he refers to as "Socinian John". He set Goodwin down as a follower of Wotton, having "stolen the most part of his

¹ H. J. McLachlan, Socinianism in Seventeenth Century England, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1951), pp. 43-50.

conclusions, arguments and distinctions" from Wotton's book, De Reconciliatione.¹ Therefore, he concludes, "if this Socinian John . . . will be called (as his disciples stick not to stile him) the shining light of the church in these last days: surely he is but a borrowed light."² Two of Goodwin's statements in the controversy were published in the following year,³ but it was not until the greater freedom of the press in 1642 that he drew a full scale statement of his position on the issue. This was to be Goodwin's first important theological work.

In the preface to his Treatise on Justification (1642), Goodwin remarks that he would not attempt to answer Walker's charges directly as he wished to avoid contention. He was interested only in the truth. In almost a spirit of resignation, Goodwin says that he has grown accustomed to revilings and reproaches and the opposition of men to be "strong and thick" upon him. This did not concern him, however, for he was willing, "yea and more than willing, to imbrace such opportunities, wherein I may exchange error for truth."⁴

From past experience he was able to predict the reaction to this book, for as we have seen he had been debating this issue for several years, and it had even gotten him into trouble with Archbishop Laud. He forecast four reactions to

1. George Walker, Socinianism in the Fundamental Point of Justification - Discovered and Confuted, 1640, pp. 7 f.

2. Ibid., p. 8.

3. John Goodwin, Impedit ira animum, 1641 and Christ lifted up, 1641.

4. John Goodwin, Treatise on Justification, 1642, preface.

his book. The first would cry out against it, "Heresie, Blasphemy, Socinianism, Arminianism, &c." The second would say, "error and novelty", the third would complain, "uselessness and non-necessitie", and the fourth would murmur, "unreasonableness." To each of these he had an answer.

There is more in Treatise on Justification, than comments on the problem of the imputation of Christ's righteousness to believers, although this is its main theme. There is also a constantly recurring demand for intellectual freedom and the quest for truth. "Imputatio Fidei was the most impressive statement that had yet come from a Puritan preacher of a theological formula for toleration, for intellectual freedom in the widest sense."¹

2. Into the maelstrom of politics.-- About the same time as the presentation of the Root and Branch Petition, Goodwin was publishing his first book.² It was to show that he was vitally interested in the movement of events in nearby Westminster. This book was a collection of sermons preached on the Fifth of November, the day of the Gunpowder Plot discovery, "the anniversary remembrance of that great battle fought between Hell and Heaven, about the peace and safety of our nation, on Nov. 5th, 1605, when Hell was overthrown, and Heaven and we rejoiced together."³ Without meeting the

1. William Haller, The Rise of Puritanism, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1938), p. 200.

2. John Goodwin, The Saints Interest in God, 1640. The year before, he had begun his literary career, as did many Puritans, by editing some of the sermons of the deceased Puritan ministers. H. Ramsden, The Gleaning in God's Harvest, edited by John Goodwin, 1639.

3. John Goodwin, The Saints Interest in God, 1640, preface.

existing situation directly he could thus remind his readers of the horror and dangers of Romanism as a threat within and without the Church of England. In these trying days of persecution he was calling for his listeners and readers not to be frightened by unfavorable circumstances but to turn to God who is our salvation. He was not calling for an other-worldly escapism, however, for he believed that God controlled the happenings of history. Using the words of Psalms 68:20, "unto God the Lord belongs the issues from death", he sought to strengthen the wills of his Puritan brethren by staying their eyes on the providence of God. In its pages were also to be found a strong warning to the enemies of the "saints of God." ". . . hence all you that are enemies of the People of the God of Abraham . . . lay aside all thought of violence, to let fall all your desires, and purposes of evil against the generation of the righteous, so greatly beloved on high."¹ He goes on to remind the Laudian persecutors that "persecution of the saints . . . is a worke that never prospered in the hands of any, from the beginning of the world till this day."²

In those tense days, the things needed were faith and patience. These were the two things John Goodwin tried to bring forward in his two books of sermons issued in the following year. The first, entitled, God a Good Master and Protector (1641), reminded his readers that "God is able to protect in times of greatest dangers, in the middle of greatest

1. Ibid., pp. 259 f.
2. Ibid., p. 273.

evils,"¹ using as his text for the sermons, Isaiah 8:13-14, he found again a passage of Scripture which conveyed faith and comfort to the righteous and pronounced judgment and destruction to their enemies.² His faith in the favorable turn of events seems to have been a bit shaken in the meantime, for there was along with an exhortation to patience, a preparation for dark days ahead. This is suggested in his next book, in the title: The Returne of Mercies: or, the Saints' Advantage by Losses. There was a note of pessimism and even resignation in some of the passages, such as the following:

What between God chastising us for our sins on the one hand, and between Satan stirring up persecution and trouble against us for righteousness on the other hand, we are like (with the Rechabites) to dwell in the tents of affliction all our days.³

Yet, for the saints of the Lord there was always hope, even in the midst of such dark and troublesome times. "There is a way to gather grapes of these thorns . . . we can with settled, stable and composed thoughts, look upon afflictions as angels of light, and messengers of grace from him that sends them."⁴ He then proceeds to put forth as the main doctrine "that sometimes the want of some comfort or convenience for a time, is in the providence of God, a means or occasion of the firmer,

1. John Goodwin, God a Good Master & Protector to His People (1641), p. 23.

2. Isaiah 8:13-14: "Sanctify the Lord of Hosts himself: and let him be your fear, and let him be your dread. And he shall be for a sanctuary: but for a stone of stumbling and for a rock of offence to both the houses of Israel, and for a gin and for a snare to the inhabitants of Jerusalem."

3. John Goodwin, The Returne of Mercies, 1641, preface.

4. Ibid.

and more stable, and comfortable enjoying it afterwards."¹
 He, therefore, called for patience and faith in God who will not let service to Him go unrewarded.²

In October and November, 1641, there took place a rebellion in Ireland of the Catholics in which several thousand Protestants were massacred. Thus, while England was celebrating Guy Fawkes Day and John Goodwin was preaching one of his anniversary sermons on that fateful day, word came of a new Catholic plot which this time, had been successful. The reaction was immediate and widespread; a call was made for action. John Goodwin preached a sermon calling for every aid to be given to the Protestant victims, then rushed it to the press to print it under the title of Ireland's Advocate (1641).

Events happened swiftly in 1642. Men began to take sides and prepare for war. An important part of the preparation, besides that of each side seeking to get control of the militia, was the effort of each to win the support of the

1. Ibid., p. 19

2. The dedicatory epistles of both books shed a little light into the obscurity of these earlier years of his ministry. Both are dedicated to distinguished ladies for favours received. The most likely explanation is that they had been his patronesses at least part of the time during his lecturing years. To one of them, Lady Clark Reading, he also expressed his gratitude for defending his reputation. Mrs. Elizabeth Hampden of Westminster, the other patroness, was the mother of the man leading the parliamentary opposition to the policies of the King. John Goodwin and John Hampden saw eye to eye on the great issues of the day. In a time when political affairs and religious matters were so closely related, it would be appropriate that there should be an occasional meeting, in the home of Mrs. Hampden in Westminster, of the man who was in such a large measure responsible for the organization and strategy in Parliament of uprooting the policies followed by the King and his advisers, and of the man who was to be one of the leading persons in organizing public opinion behind that policy.

people. The war of pamphlets began even before the fighting.¹ In this battle of the pamphleteers which went on parallel with the battle of armies and men, John Goodwin played a leading role. "The confusion of conflict between Crown and Parliament gave opportunity for the rise of men skilled in the art of evoking and manipulating opinion . . . the man rising most conspicuously as a leader of public opinion was John Goodwin."²

On the eve of the first battle of the Civil War, Goodwin issued from the press a powerful pamphlet designed to arouse public opinion behind the Parliamentary forces.

There is neither man nor woman of us, neither young nor old, but hath somewhat or other, more or less, a Mite or two at least to cast into the Treasury of the Publike safety. Men that have strength of body for the War, and fingers that know how to fight, let them to the Battell, and not feare to look the enemy in the face. Men and women that have only Purses and Estates, let them turne them into men and swords for the Battell. Men that have heads, but want armes and hands for outward execution, let these study and contrive methods and wayes of proceedings: Head-worke is every whit as necessary in such a time and exigent, as hand-work is. They that have neither hands, nor heads, nor estates, let them find hearts to keep the Mountain of God, to pray the enemies downe, and the Armies of the Lord up: Let them finde tongues to whet up the courage and resolutions of others.³

Goodwin used every possible approach to swing public effort behind Parliament. He appealed to the reasons of men. He sought to answer the objections of those who hesitated to

1. In the collection kept by the London bookseller, George Thomason, there were nearly 2000 pamphlets for the year 1642, almost 3 times the total of the previous year.

2. William Haller (ed.), Tracts on Liberty, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1934), Vol. I, p. 30.

3. John Goodwin, Anti Cavalierisme, 1642, p. 4.

fight against the King as one to whom the subject owed obedience because he was ordained of God. Kings or kingly governments are "an ordinance of man, or an human creation", he argued.¹

Those governments that are "unjust, unreasonable or tyrannical" are not fulfilling the purposes of God and therefore to be opposed. To those whose reverence for the kingly office is such that they refuse to take up arms against the King he issues this warning:

. . . when men or women shall make Idols of Kings and Princes, and great men, and fall downe before them, and worship them with divine worship, as all they in effect doe, who yeeld obedience unto them against God, what doe they else but shake the very foundations of their lives, and present beeing in the world, and call the fixe of Gods iealousie from heaven to consume them: . . .²

He has an answer for the pacifist of that day who hesitated on religious grounds from taking sides in the struggle. He points out that the martyrdom of primitive Christians was under different circumstances and not to be determinative in these days:

. . . the glory and praise of Martyrdome or suffering for Christ, doth not consist in lying down, and suffering proud and wicked men to ride over our heads, in sitting still whilst our estates, liberties, wives, children, friends, are ruined and destroyed before our faces, when God puts an opportunity into our hand to defend them. . . .³

Not only does he try to overcome religious scruples, but he tries to make the fight a holy cause -- a religious crusade. It was a struggle between good and evil.

1. Ibid., p. 7.
 2. Ibid., p. 22.
 3. Ibid., p. 34.

We lie open to the hatred and malice, to the mockings and scoffings, to the rayling and revilings, to the slanders and lyings of the whole malignant party round about us; and that because we hold forth the Lord Jesus Christ in his holiness and purity, in his power and authority over the world, in his truth, and faithfulness, in his mercy, and goodnesse, in his glory, and Majesty, in our lives. . . .¹

Goodwin goes on to tie up the Puritan cause with Protestantism throughout the world. Those of "like precious faith" in kingdoms great and small, "France, Germany, Bohemia, Hungaria, Polonia, Denmarke, Sweden", the news of their zeal would "bee a cheering and refreshing to them", and particularly to "poore bleeding, dying Ireland, it will be as a resurrection from death unto life."² It was a time of particular providence for English Protestants to witness to their faith in such a way to encourage their brethren in all lands.

. . . since you have the commodiousnesse of such a standing, that you may doe good to all . . . the Saints in all their dispartions and quarters throughout so many kingdomes, and such a considerable part of the world as hath beene mentioned, so that you may cause them to rise up before you and call you blessed; I beseech you doe not betray this first-borne opportunitie of Heaven: looke upon it as a great and solemne invitation from God himselfe unto you, to do greater things for the world, at least for the Christian world, then ever you did unto this day. . . .³

The first battle of the Civil War had shown that neither side could win easily. It soon became evident that the city of London held the balance of power and it was under the control of Parliament.⁴ Its tremendous strategic import-

1. Ibid., p. 35.

2. Ibid., p. 50.

3. Ibid.

4. Trevelyan points out that at this time the King would have had a tremendous advantage, "had not London, containing ten times the population and more than ten times the ready money of any other city in England, supplied recruits by the thousand, war loans to any quantity and at any moment, and the best

ance in the mobilization for war was recognized by Charles I, so he turned his attention and army toward London. Goodwin likewise realized the significance of London and as the trained bands of the London militia marched out to meet the Cavaliers he published another sermon entitled, The Butchers Blessing, addressed to the City of London to rally to the defense of its liberties. "To engage you all as one man, to rise up at once in your might for the preservation and defense as well as of your selves as of your citie against that whirlwinde of crueltie and blood which rends and teares the Kingdome in pieces where it falles."¹ He then proceeded to give five reasons why the wrath and the army of Cavaliers were descending upon London: 1. It was the "shield and buckler" of pure religion. 2. It was the chief protection of Parliament. 3. It was the leader in furnishing arms and men and money for the parliamentary cause. 4. It was the main thing standing in the way of the realization of their desires. 5. It was the "great magazine of wealth, riches and treasure." London, therefore, was the main target of royalist ambitions, according to Goodwin, and he called upon its citizens to quit themselves like men in its defense.²

weapons that England or the Continent could furnish for money down." G. M. Trevelyan, England Under the Stuarts, (Methuen and Co., 1949), p. 193.

1. John Goodwin, The Butchers Blessing, (re-printed in 2d ed. of Anti-Cavalierisme, 1643), p. 35.

2. At the very time that this was being circulated, the men of London were joining in such large numbers with the militia that when Charles met them at Turnham Green he was so outnumbered, he turned back to Oxford without seeking a battle.

An answer soon came from Oxford defending the King's cause in reply to Goodwin's Anti-Cavalierisme. The author, Bishop of Ossory, called his reply Vindiciae Regum in which he sought to show the necessity of obedience and the abomination of rebellion against the Lord's anointed. In his dedication to the King he deplored the reluctance of his supporters, especially the clergy, to defend the King's cause with the pen as well as with sword and musket. The Bishop draws his texts from Scriptures concerning Moses and Romans 13. He quotes from the ancient writers such as Aristotle and the Church fathers to try to prove that rebellion against a King is never justified no matter what the circumstance. He cites with approval King James' dictum, "no bishop, no king" and stresses the inviolability of the King, your "political father" and the priest, "your spiritual father." He answers specifically several of Goodwin's points, but attempts to belittle his opponent by referring to him as an "ignorant fellow" and remarks, "who this Goodwin is, I know not; I could wish he were none of the tribe of Levi: 1. Because I find him such an incendiary of warre, and an enemy unto peace, . . . 2. Because his objection is full of falsehoods and false grounds."¹

It took Goodwin only a few weeks to bring out a reply, in which title he injected a note of humour: Os Ossorianum: Or, A Bone For A Bishop to Pick, (1643). Goodwin continued to heap ridicule upon the pretensions and claims of the King. ". . .we heare of Kings by heaps, foure making warre against five, and five against four: but that any of these were put

1. Gryffith Williams, Vindiciae Regum, 1643, pp. 60 ff.

into their Kingdoms by God . . . or by any ordinance of his, is as cleare as the heavens are to us in the darkest night."¹ In that age when the Bible was the main source of authority, he also found it necessary to deal with Scriptural arguments of his royalist critic. The Bishop had quoted most often the phrase, "touch not mine anointed." (Psalms 105:15) Goodwin's reply to this was,

. . . from the scope and carriage of the whole Psalm, that this was not spoken to any people concerning Kings, as if they were the Lords anointed, that might not be touch'd: but unto Kings themselves concerning a people (the people indeed of God) as being his anointed ones, whom it concerned even kings themselves not to touch in any way of injustice or offence.²

3. Into the struggle over religious toleration.-- In the fall and winter of 1643-44, the interest of John Goodwin and much of the nation was to shift from military matters to religious problems, although the two were never very far apart. The Westminster Assembly was settling down to its task of reforming and purifying the worship, government, and discipline of the English Church. In October, 1643, the Assembly began discussions on the highly explosive question of church government. This brought into the open the division which existed within the Puritan fold. It was easier to abolish prelacy than to argue as to what should be in its place. While the overwhelming majority in the Assembly, and probably among the Puritans generally at this time, were Presbyterian in conviction, there was in the Assembly a small,

1. John Goodwin, On Ossorianum: Or, A Bone for a Bishop to Pick, 1643, p. 27.

2. Ibid., p. 63.

able, and determined group of men who had reached a position which came to be called "Independency". It soon became apparent to those who were not confirmed Presbyterians, that there might not be any more room for differences of opinion and practice under the Presbyterians than under the Anglicans. In the words of the Independent, John Milton, "new presbyter, was but old priest writ large".¹ Or as the Anglican historian, Thomas Fuller observed, the Presbyterians "who desired most ease and liberty for their sides when bound with episcopacy, now girt their own government the closest about the conscience of others."²

The event which brought the division and the discussion from the Assembly floor to the press and hence public opinion, was the publication in January 1644 of the Apologeticall Narration of the five leading Independents or "Dissenting Brethren" -- Thomas Goodwin, Phillip Nye, Sidrach Simpson, Jeremiah Burroughs, and William Bridge. This short pamphlet of thirty-two pages, setting forth the Independent position over against the Presbyterian scheme, "operated instantaneously like a declaration of war."³ Immediately there came forth from the press large numbers of replies by the Presbyterians. Then, the second round began with Independent answers to these. It was not to be expected that John Goodwin would remain in-

1. John Milton, Complete Poetry and Selected Prose, (The Modern Library: New York, 1938), p. 84.

2. Thomas Fuller, The Church History of Britain, (Revised edition, 1837), Vol. III, p. 282.

3. W. M. Hetherington, History of the Westminster Assembly of Divines, (4th ed., Edinburgh: James Gemmely, 1878), p. 186.

different to these events. It is impossible to know exactly when Goodwin moved from a leaning toward Presbyterianism to an Independent position.¹ By 1644 there was no question as to where he stood, for he soon entered the fight as a stout champion of the "Congregational way."

Among those who had attacked the Apologetical Narration, was a staunch Presbyterian, Adam Stewart. He had written his attack under the initials A.S. A month or so later there appeared an anonymous reply to him under the title, M.S. to A.S. With a Plea for Libertie of Conscience in a Church Way (1644). John Goodwin has usually been identified as one of the two authors of this important work which made such an eloquent plea for liberty of conscience. One of the Scot members of the Assembly, Robert Baillie, wrote to a friend, "M.S. against A.S. is John Goodwin of Coleman Street."² The argument set forth was that God's will intended that there be "unity amongst the saints", but this unity was no more to be attained through the coercive measures of Assembly, Parliament, and Civil Magistrate than by King, Bishop and Star Chamber. The Church must be "led into this unity, by the hand of the angel of light, not to be frightened in it by an evill

1. It may be as Masson observes, that it is a fair inference that by 1640 Goodwin had Independent tendencies. David Masson, op.cit., Vol. II, p. 583.

2. Baillie, op.cit., Vol. II, p. 180. Masson and Jordan along with both of Goodwin's biographers, Jackson and Clark, attribute the section on religious toleration to him. Certainly the ideas, as well as the way of expressing them, sound like Goodwin's other writings. Cf., Jackson, op.cit., p. 57. Henry W. Clark, The Life of John Goodwin, (Congregational Union of England and Wales, no date), Series: No. 9, pp. 25 f.

angel of fear and terror."¹

If there had been any doubts as to where Goodwin stood on the issue of church government and tolerance, due to the anonymous character of the previous tract, within a few months; a new one placed him openly and solidly on the side of Congregationalism and toleration.² Using the saying of Gamaliel concerning the Christians, found in the fifth Chapter of Acts as his text, he warns the opponents of toleration that in suppressing some particular doctrine they might be fighting against God. He goes on to tell them that fighting against God is a most dangerous thing for man. In this pamphlet, Theomaxia (1644), he weighed Presbyterianism and Independency in the balance on the issue of toleration and decides in favour of Independency. It does not appear too much to say that "Theomaxia immediately confirmed its authors position as the chief exponent of Independency in the Press and as the chief object of attack by the Presbyterians."³ During the next decade, a score more pamphlets were written against him and many harsh epithets from "Gargantua" and the "Great Red Dragon of Coleman Street" to "Schismatics cheater in chief" and "monstrous Sectary" were thrown at him.

Soon there appeared an anonymous pamphlet attacking

1. John Goodwin, M.S. To A.S. With a Plea for Libertie of Conscience in a Church Way, 1644, p. 99.

2. John Goodwin, Theomaxia; Or, The Grand Imprudence of men running the hazard of Fighting Against God, 1644.

3. William Hallor (ed.), Tracts on Liberty, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1934), Vol. I, p. 53.

his Theomaxia which Goodwin took no notice of.¹ He did, however, take up the challenge of William Prynne, one of the group of Erastians in Parliament who believed in a state-controlled religion. His was a,

. . . narrow kind of Erastianism which required the beating down by the state of every aspect of enthusiasm in the interests of order. . . . Prynne, fundamentally conservative in politics and religion, was throughout the revolutionary era obsessed with an hysterical fear of the changes which were rending English society.²

It is not surprising, therefore, that such a champion of toleration as Goodwin should get into controversy with this man who had a "savage and unrelenting intolerance."³ Prynne not only attacked Goodwin's views, he also sought to cast doubt on his character.

Goodwin sought to defend himself and his views in four

1. Anonymous, Faces About, 1644. The point of view of this anonymous pamphleteer is represented by these words from the pamphlet: "Now I assume, The presbyterian way claimeth Origination and Descent from God; yet Master Goodwin doth not onely lift up an hard thought against it, but in these Sermons extremely oppose it, and contest against it. . . ." p. 11. While Goodwin did not bother to answer the pamphlet, "an unworthy auditor of the said (Judicious-pious-Divine) Master John Goodwin" did reply in a pamphlet entitled, As You Were (1644). This pamphlet too, was anonymous, but is commonly attributed to Hezekiah Woodward, an exponent of toleration and educational reform.

2. Jordan, op.cit., Vol. IV, p. 277.

3. The nature of Prynne's position can be seen from the title of his pamphlet against Goodwin: Truth Triumphant Over Falshood, Antiquity Over Novelty: Or. . . . A just and reasonable Vindication of the undoubted Ecclesiasticall Jurisdiction, Right, Legislative, Coercive Power of Christian Emperors, Kings, Magistrates, Purliaments, in all matter of Religion, Church-Government, Discipline, Ceremonies, Manners. . . . (1645). He had only derision for the Church's weapon against sectaries and heretics. "The contemptible sword of excommunication or non-communication, and the bare preaching of God's Word" could never deal with willful, disorderly men and religious fanaticism. William Prynne, Independency Examined, 1644, p. 12.

pamphlets. In Certain Briefe Observations (1644), he answered a pamphlet which Prynne had written entitled, Twelve Considerable Serious Questions touching Church Government (1644).¹

In a second pamphlet Goodwin defended himself against Prynne's attack on Theomaxia. Prynne in turn replied with a pamphlet entitled Truth Triumphant Over Falshood (1645). This, Goodwin promptly answered in two pamphlets, Innocency and Truth Triumphant Together and Calumny Arraign'd and Cast (1645).

In the former, Goodwin gave an impressive argument for religious freedom.² The latter purpose was to protect his reputation against the false accusations and charges Prynne had heaped upon him. This closed the exchange of pamphlets between Goodwin and Prynne, but it did not end Prynne's opposition to him. However, Goodwin was soon to meet an even more bitter and harsh critic.

D. At the Centre of Controversy

1. Toleration - a "dangerous" doctrine.-- At the same time that Goodwin was engaged in an exchange of polemics with Prynne, he was having difficulty with a formidable opponent. The Committee for Plundered Ministers had originally been set

1. This pamphlet was anonymous and has sometimes been attributed to Henry Robinson as well as John Goodwin. If the pamphlet was not actually from Goodwin's hand, it was most likely from a member of Goodwin's circle, as Haller suggests. William Haller, Tracts on Liberty, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1934), Vol. I, p. 53.

2. John Goodwin, Innocency and Truth triumphing together, 1645, preface: "It is a matter of sad contemplation, to see what commotions, tumults, and combustions are presently raised in the minds of men upon the birth of any truth into the world. . . ."

up by Parliament to relieve the distress of Puritan ministers who suffered during the fighting of the Civil War, but it had soon been given the duty and the power of removing "scandalous" ministers from their parishes. As soon as 1644 their attention was focussed on John Goodwin. Although he had been nominated by the House of Lords on the thirtieth of October, 1643, to be a member of the Westminster Assembly,¹ he was looked on with great suspicion by that body. On Nov. 8, 1643, just over a week later, in the Assembly Goodwin was accused along with a Dr. Holmes, who had also been nominated with him, of ordaining a sectarian preacher by the name of Anderson.² This had the appearance of an effort to smear Goodwin, even though Lightfoot records that a reply denying the charges was brought in the next day "which cost much time."³ It demonstrated the suspicion with which Goodwin was viewed by the Assembly. Certainly the Presbyterian majority could have had no high regards for such an outspoken critic of Presbyterianism and staunch defender of Independency and tolerance. Accordingly, in the year 1645, he was removed from his Church at St. Stephens. John Goodwin, however, was not so easily gotten rid of, for his friends furnished him with a new pulpit for launching his ideas, and he continued to use that forum which was rapidly replacing the pulpit as the moulder of

1. House of Lords, Journal, Oct. 30, 1643, Vol. VI, p. 283.

2. John Lightfoot, The Journal of the Proceedings of the Assembly of Divines, Edited by J. R. Pitman, (J. F. Dove, 1824), Vol. XIII of Works of John Lightfoot, p. 45.

3. Ibid.

public opinion - the press.

The main thing that haunted the Presbyterians and embarrassed the Independents was the mushrooming during the civil war of sects of all kinds and descriptions. A compromise settlement of some kind, between the Presbyterians and the Independents, might have been possible if it had not been for the existence of the sectaries. The reader of Baillie's Letters and Journal, is impressed by his almost hysterical fear of the sects. He deplored the fact that while Episcopacy and Popish ceremonies had been removed, the failure to quickly set up the "government of Christ" had led to anarchy which had proven to be "the mother of Heresies and Schismes, and many more evils."¹ Bemoaning the spread of the Anabaptists and Antinomians, he thought there might have been an accommodation with the Independents but "that toleration they aime at we cannot consent."²

In the crucial year of 1646 there appeared a book that would fan the flames of fear even higher. Viewed from any angle, Thomas Edwards', Gangraena: Or, A Catalogue and Discovery of many of the Errors, Heresies, Blasphemies and pernicious Practices of the Sectaries of this time (1646), was a remarkable treatise. In the dedicatory letter of his "Black Bill" to the Parliament, Edwards called upon them as the only group to "cure the maladies and diseases of our church and State", to rid the country of "damnable heresies, horrid blasphemies, Libertinisme and fearful Anarchy." He

1. Baillie, *op.cit.*, Vol. II, p. 180.

2. *Ibid.*, Vol. IV, p. 140.

asserted that in getting rid of the Papists they had only exchanged one evil for another, "with the Reformation have we not a Deformation, and worse things come in upon us then ever we had before?" He goes on to make the prediction that the sects had been growing so in the past four years and had then grown so intolerable, if they "be let alone and rise propotionably for one year longer, we shall need no Cavaliers nor enemies from without to destroy us."¹

One of the individuals Edwards singled out for attack was John Goodwin, to whom he gave the name of "Cretensis". One of the things he criticised Goodwin and his congregation for was that "many of them play at Cards and Tables, are verie loose on the Sabbath days, go to Bowls and other sports on dayes of publicke Thanksgiving, as Mr John Goodwin and severall of his Church, they wear strange long haire, go in such fine fashionable apparell. . . ."² An answer from Goodwin was not long in forthcoming. Entitling his reply, Cretensis, or a Briefe Answer to an Ulcerous treatise, Goodwin accused Edwards of trying to defeat the Independents by drowning them "in the black sea of infamy and reproofe."³ He then asked whether

1. In his catalogue, Edwards lists sixteen sorts of Sectaries beginning with the Independents and ending with the "Scepticks and Questionists." Then he goes on to catalogue 176 errors, heresies and blasphemies wherein is listed everything from, "Tis part of Christian liberty of Christians, not to hear their own ministers, but to go and hear where they will, and whom they think they may profit most by", (no. 125) to, "It is not suitable to God, to pick and chuse amongst men in shewing mercy." (no. 176).

2. Thomas Edwards, Gangraena, 1646, part I, p. 63.

3. John Goodwin, Cretensis: Or, A Briefe Answer To an ulcerous Treatise, 1646, p. 2.

Christ or Paul would "spend their time, or ingage their friends, in gathering up vagrant, loose, scandalous and lying reports against the Saints, and servants of God, under the names of Sectaries, to blesse the vanitie and wickednesse of the world with the venting of them."¹ Edwards in turn brought out a second instalment of his Gangraena catalogue a month or two later. A good portion of this second part is taken up with a scurrilous attack upon Goodwin. He called Goodwin "a compound of an Arminian, Socinian, Libertine, Anabaptist, &c."², "the great lying Oracle of the Sectaries"³, after accusing him of using "six footed words instead of Reasons and Arguments." Edwards concludes: "In one word, I do not think there's any man in the Kingdom hath a more heretical head and heart than Cretensis, and unlesse God give him repentance, . . . I fear if the man lives but one seven years, he will prove as arch an Heretick, and as dangerous a man as England ever bred."⁴

Gangraena had not been Edwards first or only pamphlet in defense of Presbyterianism. He was actually "the most vigorous and forcible of the Presbyterian apologists waging a relentless war on the doctrine of toleration."⁵ Shortly after the appearance of the Apologeticall Narration of the "Five Dissenting Brethren" of the Assembly, Edwards had attacked their position in a pamphlet called Antapologia.⁶

1. Ibid., p. 16

2. Thomas Edwards, Gangraena, 1646, part I, p. 25.

3. Ibid., p. 32.

4. Ibid., p. 35.

5. Jordan, op.cit., Vol. III, p. 281.

6. Thomas Edwards, Antapologia: Or, A Full Answer to the Apologeticall Narration, 1644.

making his position clear. He believed in the divine right of Presbyterianism as an infallible system of government, discipline, and doctrine, from which the state should not allow any deviation. Parliament should "by their power and authority . . . bind men to the decrees of the Assembly; and not . . . to tolerate any other doctrines, churches, worship, or government."¹ Holding such beliefs, it was not a surprise that he viewed toleration with such horror and came into conflict with such a champion of toleration as John Goodwin. Goodwin took up the challenge of this criticism which came from the Presbyterian side. Once again in the pamphlet, The Inexcusableness of that Grand Accusation of the Brethren called Antapologia (1646), Goodwin made an eloquent plea for religious toleration.²

Edwards' charges seemed to have accomplished their purpose for an ordinance "for the suppression of blasphemy and heresy" was presented to the House of Commons.³ As was to be expected, John Goodwin brought out a tract on the issue raised by the ordinance. Entitling it Some Modest and Humble Queries (1646), he asked thirty eight questions in opposition to the proposed law. In presenting his queries Goodwin was to have a place of 'honor' again in the third and last instalment of Edwards catalogue of errors, heresies and blasphemies.

1. Ibid., p. 238.

2. There appeared in print an answer to Goodwin's reply to Edwards' charge, bearing the picturesque title, A Nosegay of Rank-Smelling Flowers, such as Grow in John Goodwin's Garden, by Josiah Ricraft, 1646.

3. House of Commons, Journal, Vol. IV, p. 659.

The Queries also prompted an anonymous reply entitled, A Vindication of a Late Printed Paper (1646). This pamphlet, Goodwin felt, should not be left unanswered. The cause of religious liberty needed to be defended.

One of the provisions in the ordinance read in Parliament was that the denial of the Scriptures as the Word of God was to be punishable by death. In his pamphlet, Hagiomastix (1646), Goodwin raised the question as to the meaning of the phrase, "the Scriptures are the Word of God." He asked what was meant by the Scriptures. Was it the English Translation or the original Hebrew and Greek testaments? If it were the English, then which particular translation? If it were the Greek or Hebrew, then which copy? He went on to point out that at various times there had been doubts in the church as to which books should be included in the Scriptures. Some in the early church had doubts about the book of Revelation, and Luther questioned the place of James in the canon.

Immediately there arose a great huc and cry that Goodwin was undermining the faith of the people in the Bible. There was a demand by various "faithful and joalous Christians" that Parliament have Hagio-mastix burned and its author severely punished.¹ An anonymous pamphleteer in attacking it had

1. John Vicars, Coleman-street Conclave Visited, 1648. The Leveller leader, William Walwyn, wrote of the same book: ". . . much discourse, and great complaint there was about it, in so much as Colonel Leighs Committee had it brought before them, where it was my lot to be, when the passage concerning the Scriptures was read openly by one, that amongst others, informed against it: and where it was called a most impious, blasphemous Book, and ordered to be seized, all of them immediately; . . ." Godfrey Davies and William Haller (ed.) The Leveller Tracts, 1647-1653, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1944), p. 354.

this to say of its author:

For the Vapours you speak of that fill the City, I know none so noysome as those that arise out of the bog of Mr Goodwin's brain, viz. the vapours of Heresies and ungodly opinions; which have more obscured the sun of the Scriptures, and infected the ayre of London, then all the vapours and ditches about the Town; were it possible to get a Bill of spirituall mortality, I fear we should find few Parishes cleor of the pest of his opinions. . . .¹

Goodwin was to issue one more pamphlet in his controversy with the Presbyterians over toleration. In a few pages he summarized his position on Independencie Gods Veritie; Or, The Necessitie of Toleration (1647). He opposed the view:

that the Church of God ought to be tied in one knot, and kneaded in one lump; for the Church of God, though divided into distinct Congregations, as they were in the Primitive time, may speak one and the same thing, although in different manner; and like birds that sing divers notes yet make one harmony agree in one thing though diversely delivered.²

Goodwin went on to rejoice over "What a sweet and heavenly communion we have amongst ourselves, how nothing is attempted prejudiciall to tender consciences; who though perhaps not resolved in some points, yet Christ who alone sought to rule his Church, we know in his good time will informe them."³

2. A Man of many "errours".-- The sections in Mastix on the Scriptures were so severely criticised that Goodwin brought out a work on The Divine Authority of The Scriptures (1648). It was a penetrating study of the whole problem. The book was remarkably modern in its approach to the use, authority, and interpretation of the Scriptures.

1. Moro-Mastix, anonymous, 1646, p. 12.

2. John Goodwin, Independencie Gods Veritie, 1647, p. 5.

3. Ibid., p. 6.

It is the "most attractive of all Goodwin's writings"¹, for it is more a work of apologetics than polemics. He began by recapitulating the argument of his previous work on the distinction between the Scriptures and the Word of God. After thus clearing the ground, he goes on to give the arguments, both "intrinsic" and "extrinsic", for the divine authority of the Scriptures. Most of the arguments are well made and as valid today as they were over 300 years ago. In some of them there runs the evangelical concern so characteristic of the Puritans.² In others he anticipated the deists of the next century, but with a far greater realism.³ This book, however, was too far ahead of its times and it met with immediate condemnation, this time from a whole body of orthodox divines.

The clergymen of London, who were overwhelmingly Presbyterian, held weekly meetings at Sion College in London to discuss ecclesiastical matters. Most probably aroused by Edwards' frightening catalogue of heresies and by the shocking

1. William Haller (ed.), Tracts on Liberty, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1934), Vol. I, p. 83.

2. For example, these are some of the arguments he uses to prove the divine authority of the Scriptures: "5. The mighty efficacy and power they have, by the things which they teach, to enlarge, raise, and lift up the hearts of men, that are fallen, and sunk, and dead within them. 6. The power which they have, . . . to trouble, astonish, and confound the hearts that are high, and full of confidence and security. 7. The transforming power which they have . . . to turn both the hearts and waies of men upside down." John Goodwin, The Divine Authority of the Scriptures Asserted, 1648, p. 64.

3. Ibid., p. 37: "Now such a composition and frame of the Scriptures as this . . . so exactly answer the temper, and modell of the universe . . . is a great argument, that one and the same workman was the Architect, and contriver of them both."

growth of sectaries in and around London, they issued a declaration of orthodoxy and also a blast at certain "errors, heresies, and blasphemies."¹ Perhaps they also wanted to impress Parliament with the necessity for passing the pending bill to outlaw those instruments of Satan. As might have been predicted, John Goodwin was one of its main targets. They accused him of denying that the Scriptures were the Word of God and the foundation of Christianity and of being an abettor of "Errors against the Divine Authority of the Holy Scriptures." They also gave him a place in the list of "Errors about natural man's free will." They extracted several passages from his writings to prove his guilt. Then they attacked as the worst error of all, the "error of toleration, patronising, and promoting all other errors, heresies, blasphemies." Finally they witnessed to their belief in the covenant and the divine right of presbytery, blaming all the present ills on "unlawfull and pernicious" toleration.²

Goodwin replied to their accusations in Sion-Colledg Visited (1648). In his answer, Goodwin charged that they had acted as if the "chaire of Papal infallibility were of late translated from Rome to Sion College."³ He said that it had never been well with Christianity when ministers tried to gain

1. A Testimony To The Truth of Jesus Christ, And To our Solemn League and Covenant, 1647.

2. One historian comments on the "Testimony", "What sad work would these divines have made, had the sword of the magistrate been at their disposal." Daniel Neal, History of the Puritans, (Thomas Tegg and Son, 1837), Vol. II, p. 436.

3. John Goodwin, Sion-Colledg Visited, 1648, p. 3.

control over the truths of God. Their method was condemned as likely to do more harm than good.

The London ministers could not let Goodwin's reply go unanswered, so it fell to the lot of one of their younger men to reply. The method of William Jenkyn in his answer, The Busie Bishop (1648), to a "very feeble pamphlet", was to quote a passage from Goodwin's pamphlet and then heap scorn and ridicule upon it. Although he considered Goodwin the "Father of lies", and having more heresies and errors in him than "are dispersed among some thousands in the world"¹, Jenkyn wearied of the task before completing the refutation and concluded by declaring that what remained of Goodwin's pamphlet consisted of "nothing but three or four prophanations of Scripture, and some four or five nauseous commendations of the author and book."² The answer sent out by Sion College and Jenkyn was not very impressive, but Goodwin, determined to fire one last round in the controversy, wrote a mild pamphlet called, The Yongling Elder or Novice-Presbyter (1648). In it Goodwin seeks to show four defects in Jenkyn's reply: "In point of conscience -- of learning or clerkship -- of judgment, or apprehension, of civility."

Goodwin might well have thought that this was the end of the matter, but there was to come one more attack from the Presbyterian side, and this the most vicious since Edwards' Gangraena. The title itself is enough to convey the spirit,

1. William Jenkyn, The Busie Bishop, 1648, p. 6.

2. Ibid., p. 59.

contents, and purpose of the author, John Vicars, who was "a most furious adversary to the independents." He called it;

Coleman-street Conclave Visited. And, That Grand Impostor, the Schismatics Cheater in Chief (who hath, long, silyly lurked therein) truly and duly discovered. Containing a most palpable and plain Display of Mr John Goodwin's Self-conviction (under his own Handwriting) and of the notorious Heresies, Errours, Malice, Pride, and Hypocrisie of this most huge Garagantua, in falsely pretended Piety; to the lamentable misleading of his too-too credulous Soul-murdered Proselytes of Coleman-street & elsewhere. . . . (1648)

As if the title were not enough to overwhelm his opponent, a portrait of Goodwin with a windmill over his head and a weather-cock upon it, appeared on the frontispiece. On one side a figure labelled "Error", is blowing the windmill, and on the other "Pride" is blowing the weather-cock.¹ At the top are these lines:

The cock my vain and various mind describes;
The milk my venting and inventing lies.

Coming out of Goodwin's mouth are these words:

In all the grists I grind in error's mill,
Unhappy I, I am mistaken still.

Many a person who disliked John Goodwin must have chuckled over this. Goodwin's own reaction showed that he was not without a sense of humour. While refusing to reply to such an abusive attack, he commented in another pamphlet, "As for Rabshaker Vicars, with his pictures, poetry, and wind-mills, I conceive that he hath received already an answer meet for him, in the contempt of learned men -- the neglect of wise

1. In his edition of Tracts on Liberty, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1934), Vol. II, Haller reprints it as a frontispiece.

men -- the sorrow of good men -- and the laughter of boys and children."¹

In spite of the opposition Goodwin had aroused by his views, he also had friends. With the purging of Parliament in the year 1649 of the Presbyterians, and the ascendancy of the Independents, John Goodwin was restored to his old pulpit at St. Stephens from which the Presbyterians had removed him. The situation had changed, however, since he had left St. Stephens in 1645. In the meantime, St. Stephens had been integrated into the London Presbyterian set-up while Goodwin and his "gathered" Congregation had met in the parish church of Abchurch Lane, as well as a rented building. The agreement accepted by the vestry of Stephens in November, 1649, called for the two "churches" to co-exist with similar privileges. This agreement granted to Goodwin's "gathered" Church "the same liberty and accomodation in the public meeting place of Coleman Street as with readiness was granted to them by the people of Abchurch Lane parish."² This included use of the meeting place for communion, and sharing of the public collections and pews.

With his restoration to his former church, and the seeming triumph of the principles of toleration in whose defense he had written so often, Goodwin's interest was pre-occupied more with strictly theological matters during the

1. John Goodwin, The Yongling Elder, or Novice-Probyter, 1648, p. 120.

2. Vestry Minute Book of St. Stephens, Guildhall Library, MS. 4458, November, 1649.

next three years. If his views on toleration were to win for him the support of the sectaries and the opposition of the Presbyterians, his Arminian tendencies were to subject Goodwin to attack from both quarters. Although some of the sect groups had rejected Calvinism, the majority of Puritans of all kinds were essentially Calvinist in their theology. Within a few weeks of his return to St. Stephens, Goodwin became involved in several public disputations on theological issues. The first was held in Coleman Street on Dec. 31, 1649, before "several ministers and some thousands of people." His opponent was Vasavor Powell, a staunch Calvinist who had been an itinerant preacher in Wales and had become a Baptist and later a Fifth Monarchist.¹ The question debated was whether Christ died for all mankind, or only for the elect.

Since the debate was indecisive, a second disputation was held at Allhallows the Great Church on January 14, 1649, to continue the argument. Mr Powell, who proved to be such a powerful preacher in the cities and countryside of Wales, had not been too successful as a debater with Goodwin and had said he felt "very unable and unfit to withstand Mr Goodwin in a way of dispute." So his place was taken in the second round by Mr. John Simpson, who was also a Baptist and a Fifth Monarchy man. Like his friend Powell, Simpson was to die in prison for his views during the Restoration. This disputation centered

1. Cf., Neal, op.cit., Vol. III, pp. 181, 356-60. Also W. Schenk, The Concern for Social Justice in the Puritan Revolution, (Longmans, Green and Co., 1948), p. 138.

around the doctrine of election with Simpson upholding the view that "there are some particular persons hated of God from all eternity, and that there are others loved of God from eternity."¹ Still a third disputation was held on February 11th, where the question debated was, "Whether the Heathen who want the ministry of the Gospel have not sufficient means to believe unto salvation."² Within a few months the debates were published by one who had taken them down in short-hand notes, under the title of Truth's Conflict with Error; Or, Universal Redemption Controverted in three publike disputations, (1650).

During the course of the disputations Goodwin had complained of his health being bad, which might have prevented further meetings. He also felt he had not been given a chance to adequately present his views on the matter, so he published the substance of a speech he had intended giving at the last meeting. In it he gave his views on the "freeness, fulness and effectualness of the Grace of God."³

Under the pressure of such attacks as that of the former member of his church, Samuel Lane⁴, and various charges

1. Truth's Conflict With Error, 1650, p. 59.

2. Ibid., p. 73.

3. John Goodwin, The Remedie of Unreasonableness, 1650.

4. Samuel Lane had been a member of Goodwin's Church. He had left London to serve in the Army, most probably under the influence of Goodwin's preaching, where he had apparently been under the influence of orthodox Calvinist preaching. Upon his return to London he discovered that his old minister to whom he acknowledged great respect and a debt of gratitude, was guilty of deviating from the orthodox Calvinist doctrine. In the preface to his, A Vindication of Free-Grace (1645), Lane explained his reason for printing these criticisms of one whom he admired so much. The first reason he gave was that

as to Arminianism, Socinianism, etc., Goodwin wrote his magnum opus. In 1651, he published a 700-page defense and exposition of his views giving it the suggestive title of Redemption Redeemed. The book was significantly dedicated to Benjamin Whichcote, provost of King's College, together with the rest of the Heads of the Colleges and the Students of Divinity at Cambridge University. In the epistle of dedication he sets forth his aim in dedicating this work to them, "that either you will confirm . . . the great doctrine here maintained, if you judge it to be a truth; or else vouchsafe to deliver me, and many others, from the snare thereof. . . ." ¹

So far as is known, no answer came from Cambridge which maintained a strong silence in the controversy, while the Cambridge Platonists were expounding doctrines in close affinity to the Arminian position.

The first two chapters were a discussion, in the scholastic manner, of the nature and kinds of causes, and the relationship of the first cause, God, to the second cause, created beings. After chapters on the knowledge of God and perfection of God, there came chapters on each of the four kinds of Scriptures that support the universality of the

Goodwin's views on this matter "have been highly approved by many." Secondly he contended that there were thousands who mistakenly held the same views. He went on to add that it was especially dangerous for one so "eminent" as Master John Goodwin preaching such an error thereby confirming many in it, "especially if we consider how highly he hath gratified the maintainers thereof in another way also, as namely, by his earnest pleading for a toleration of any sect whatsoever."

1. John Goodwin, Redemption Redeemed, (edition of 1840), p. xv.

redemption by Christ. Then followed several chapters in the nature of a digression on the doctrine of the perseverance of the saints. Next he defended the doctrine of universal redemption on the grounds of reason, and, finally, he added for those who wished it, quotations from writers, both ancient and modern, who, even if not holding these exact views, expressed similar ones in unguarded sayings.¹ Here in Redemption Redeemed were the full, mature views of Goodwin on the subject gathered into one "massive argument."² This book suggests to the reader that this is the work of a learned, deep thinker who might have been an important theologian of the church had he not become involved in the particular controversies of his day.

The fact that in the very same year that Goodwin published his Redemption Redeemed (1651), three other works appeared attacking Calvinism, did not mean that Calvinism was on its way out, but rather, that it was more and more on the defensive. Goodwin's book itself was to provoke some half a dozen replies from the Calvinistic side. The first attacks naturally came from the pulpits. Goodwin singled out one of them to answer. Dr. Thomas Hill, who was Master of Trinity College at Cambridge, and had been a member of the Westminster Assembly, in a sermon at St. Paul's before the Mayor and

1. In the concluding chapter, Goodwin listed the most common Scriptures and arguments used against the doctrine of universal redemption, and promised a second part to this work to deal with them, but he never succeeded in accomplishing the proposed task.

2. A. W. Harrison, Arminianism, (Duckworth Press, 1937), p. 155.



Aldermen of London, cautioned his listeners against Goodwin's work as being full of errors of Pelagius and Arminius. Goodwin wrote a letter to Dr. Hill asking to have a chance to reply to the charges. When Dr. Hill gave no recognition of his letter, Goodwin published it under the title, Mones Made Angry (1651). In the letter, Goodwin reaffirmed his position that the doctrines he held were but those of the most orthodox Fathers and the most orthodox Reformed writers. He suggested that even "the preachers of this age", while saying at one moment that these views deserve the fire, yet in the same sermon they give testimony to them. He gives as examples the pamphlet issued by the Sion College ministers in attacking him which also had passages approving this doctrine, and likewise Hill himself in the disputed sermon, had made the statement that had Judas believed, he would have been saved.

Another critic used a less public method and sent Goodwin a letter on one disputed point. Dr. Thomas Barlow, who was later to become Bishop of Lincoln, wrote him concerning the point that all men are bound to believe on Christ. In his letter, Barlow paid respect to Goodwin as one in whom he always found "that perspicuity and acuteness, which I often seek and seldom find in the writings of others."¹ Goodwin published a brief reply in a pamphlet entitled, The Pagans Debt and Dowry (1651).

As the title suggests, he wanted to affirm the

1. Thomas Barlow, The Genuine Remains of . . . Dr. Thomas Barlow, (1693), p. 122.

responsibility of heathen for believing in Christ. Making repentance the essence of believing on Christ, he maintained that pagans, through the light of nature where the works of creation and God's continued works of providence, together with the law written in their hearts, may know Christ without knowing the letter of the Gospel. Using as an example, the Jews who lived before the coming of Christ and yet believed in God unto salvation, he maintained that the Gentiles too, were capable of attaining such a faith. He referred the reader to Grotius' work on the truth of Christianity, where he quoted the testimonies of the heathens themselves, to that effect.¹ Although Dr. Barlow never replied to this tract, a Puritan divine, Obadiah Howe did, in The Pagan Preacher Silenced (1655).

The reaction to Goodwin's Redemption Redeemed was not confined to England. Robert Baillie, who had been one of the Scots commissioners and members of the Westminster Assembly, and whom we have already met as a bitter foe of religious toleration, was just as strongly opposed to Arminianism in any form. He wrote a small book, A Scotch Antidote Against the English Infection of Arminianism . . . From the Infection of Mr John Goodwin's Great Book (1652). Goodwin took no notice of this book. He did answer another opponent who was less fair in his method and less restrained in his accusation.

1. Thus, without using the Logos doctrine as a modern writer would do, Goodwin seeks to answer the plaguing question as to the fate of all those who lived before and after Christ to whom the letter of the Gospel never came.

There had appeared in print in the latter part of 1651, a book by Richard Resburie, a vicar in Northamptonshire, called, Some Stop to the Gangrene of Arminianism (1651). Goodwin accused the writer, and with apparent justification, of having a book of sermons which, when they did not sell well, he re-issued with a new title and preface, advertising them as an answer to Goodwin's book. This kind of manoeuvre led Goodwin to quote Erasmus' saying that "Poor Luther made many rich", suggesting that to attack him would, as in the case of Luther, bring honour and applause from his opposition.¹ Mr. Resburie was to make one more effort in the press to expose Goodwin, labelling him as a "Pelagio-Socinian" in a pamphlet called, The lightless-Starre (1652).

During the next few years several books came forth attempting to reply to Goodwin's Redemption Redeemed. The hue and cry against it in the year after its publication was such that members of Goodwin's congregation once more presented their views to the press in The Agreement and Distance of Brethren (1652). This time the church and the Pastor united to give their views on the five disputed points of the Calvinist-Arminian controversy to prevent the sin of slander. It is essentially "apologetical and defensive", with reference to where they stood on certain issues and their reasons or grounds for doing so.² They were careful to point out that

1. John Goodwin, Confidence Dismounted Or, A Letter to Mr Richard Resburie, 1651.

2. Their main source of authority, besides the Scriptures and Goodwin's own book, was, strangely enough, the proceedings of the Synod of Dort.

they accepted much of Calvinism. The statement, however, added up to an essentially Arminian position on all five points.

It is impossible to know whether this apology and defense on the part of Goodwin and his congregation did anything to slow down the flood of criticism which had been descending upon them, but we do know that the criticism of Goodwin's book continued in sermon, pamphlet, and book. Just a few weeks after Dr. Hill preached in St. Paul's against Redemption Redeemed, another guest preacher, John Pawson, in the same place, attacked Goodwin's book in a sermon which was later published under the title of A Brief Vindication of Free Grace (1652). About the same time, a pamphlet appeared by another minister, Henry Jeanes, accusing Goodwin of misrepresenting the views of Dr. William Twisse, who had been the prolocutor of the Westminster Assembly. These sermons and small tracts were not the only replies to Redemption Redeemed. John Owen, who was at that time the vice-chancellor of Oxford and considered the leading Independent theologian, sent forth a volume of nearly five hundred pages attacking Goodwin's views on the perseverance of the saints. Hoping that others would "make it their business to draw the saw of this controversy to and fro with Mr Goodwin" on other matters, Owen singled out this particular point because it had "a more practical influence in the walking of the saints with God than any other by him assaulted."¹

1. John Owen, The Doctrine of the Saints Perseverance Explained and Confirmed, 1654, pp. 12 f.

Owen gave evidence of having considerable respect for the ability of his opponent and seems "almost to envy the copious and powerful diction which enlivens" the pages of Redemption Redeemed.¹ He recognized Goodwin's skilful use of "allegorical amplifications, illustrations, and exaggerations of the things he would insuate", which "take great impressions upon the minds" of his less wary readers."² Well might Owen with his ponderous, "intricate and perplexed" style, envy Goodwin's vivid, powerful mode of expression. Owen was critical, however, of what he considered Goodwin's wrong use of his literary ability, first in using "satirical sarcasms" and "contemptuous rebukes" on his opponents, and for beclouding the issues with his "luxuriant eloquence." Owen accused him of using "the great store" of "words and expression" he had ever "lying by him" to cover up the weakness of many of his arguments.

Another who entered the fray wholeheartedly was George Kendall, who had been a rector in Cornwall, but had resigned to come to London the better to watch John Goodwin that he might "be in a better capacity to oppose him and his doctrine."³ Richard Baxter wrote of him: "He was driven on farther by others, than his own inclinations would have led him. He thought to get an advantage to his reputation, by a triumph over John Goodwin and me."⁴ Perhaps he was successful in his

1. Ibid., preface, p. 3.

2. Ibid., p. 14.

3. Anthony Wood, Athenae Oxonienses, 1723, Vol. II, Col. 326.

4. Richard Baxter, Reliquiae Baxterianae, 1696, Part I, p. 110.

aim for afterwards he was made a doctor of divinity.¹ Kendall wrote two books in answer to Goodwin, one dealing with the problem of universal redemption and the other with that of the perseverance of the saints.² These were very different books from Owen's, for here was more of a popular, than a scholarly approach, in which ridicule was used as freely as dialectics. His own comment was, "though sometimes I sneer, I never snarl, much less do I bite."³ In spite of this contrast, Kendall's work was published with a foreword of recommendation by John Owen and two Oxford professors of divinity.

There was one other writer in the procession, Thomas Lamb, a Baptist preacher who "was confined in almost all the jails in and about London" for his nonconformity; but always preached when free. Robert Baillie reported that his congregation in Coleman Street was the largest and most fruitful of the seven Baptist churches in London, but that it was bothered by the "gangrene of Arminianism"⁴. This infection of Arminian in his congregation may have been responsible for Lamb's reply to his near-neighbour, John Goodwin.⁵ Lamb seemingly wanted to distinguish his own position from that of

1. Thomas Jackson, The Life of John Goodwin, (Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme, and Brown, 1822), p. 286.

2. George Kendall, Sancti Sanctiti: Or, The Common Doctrine of the Perseverance of the Saints, 1654, and A Vindication of the Doctrine Commonly Received in the Reformed Churches, 1653.

3. George Kendall, Sancti Sanctiti: Or, The Common Doctrine of the Perseverance of the Saints, 1654, preface.

4. Robert Baillie, Anabaptism, 1646, p. 94.

5. Thomas Edwards had charged that "Lamb preaches universal grace and the Arminian tenets." Gangraena, 1646, part I, p. 124.

Goodwin's on the doctrine of the perseverance of the saints in writing his pamphlet, Absolute Freedom from Sin by Christs Death for the World (1656).

Due to his declining health¹, Goodwin did not seek to answer individually all of the publications against his Redemption Redeemed. Instead, he wrote one book in which he tried to meet all the objections raised. Its title suggested its contents: Triumviri: Or, The Genius, Spirit, and Deportment Of the Three Men, Mr Richard Resbury, Mr John Pawson, and Mr George Kendall . . . with some Brief Touches . . . upon Dr. John Owen, Mr Thomas Lamb . . . Mr Henry Jeanes, Mr Obadiah How, and Mr Marchamond Nedham (1658). This one omnibus volume he hoped would suffice, for he had found his "adversaries pouring out themselves so numerously, that all hope was taken" from him "of making an answer, though with never so much brevity, unto them all."² His premonitions about his increasing infirmity were to prove correct for this was Goodwin's last work in theological controversy. Only a short tract, and a posthumous work followed. Infirmity had not been the only thing delaying and making more brief his replies; there were other distractions as well. There was a schism in his own congregation, and there were still threats to religious freedom to be met.

1. John Goodwin, An Exposition of The Ninth Chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, 1653, p. 10: "I find old age coming upon me like an armed man, attended with his accustomed retinue of infirmities, weakneses, and disabling from service many ways, as well in the labour and travail of the mind as of the outer man."

2. John Goodwin, Triumviri, 1658, preface.

3. At the centre of the strife between King, Parliament and Army.-- The events and results of the struggle for power between the King, the Parliament, and the Army are too complex and too far removed from our purpose to be discussed. John Goodwin was, however, intimately associated with most of these events. As we have seen, he first wrote on behalf of the parliamentary cause against the King.¹ After it appeared that the Parliament was jeopardizing the liberties wrested from the King's hand by Civil War, the Army became a third force in the struggle for power. Goodwin was to throw his influence and pen behind the Army, against the Parliament first, and then the King. The Army leaders felt that the intrigues between the Presbyterians in Parliament and the King, and the preservation of the gains of the Revolution, required them to take three drastic measures. The first was to fight another civil war; the second to purge Parliament; and the third to execute the King. Goodwin was one of the leading supporters of these measures.

In December, Colonel Pride and his musketeers expelled or arrested more than a hundred members of the House of Commons leaving only an Independent minority.² Within a few weeks Goodwin brought out a pamphlet defending the Army. Giving his pamphlet the suggestive title of Right and Might Well Met (1648), he attempted to answer the objections which had

1. John Goodwin, Anti-Cavalierisme, 1642, and The Butchers Blessing, 1642.

2. Cf., Davies, op.cit., p. 154 and Trowlyan, op.cit., p. 238.

been made to the Army's action and to justify it on the grounds of Scripture, reason, and natural law. He quoted and used many of the arguments the Presbyterians had used to justify the rebellion against the King, and turned them against the Parliament. Prynne had used the analogy of the King to a drunken ship master from whom the crew must grab control to save itself, and now Goodwin applied it to a Parliament drunk with power in turbulent times. Goodwin went on to ask the question as to which was more important to preserve, the "peace and liberties of the Kingdom" or the "rights and privileges of Parliament."¹

At the very time that Goodwin's Right and Might Well Met was circulating in London², the King was being tried for his life. The court trying him condemned him to execution.³ Within a few days of the death of the King there appeared an anonymous pamphlet, Eikon Basilike, purporting to give a "pourtraiture of his Sacred Majestic in his solitudes and sufferings." The book was an immediate success and ran through some fifty editions helping to make Charles a martyr in the eyes of many. Two writers rose, however, to help

1. John Goodwin, Right and Might Well Met, 1648, p. 30.

2. There were two replies to Goodwin's Right and Might Well Met. J. Gere, Might Overcoming Right, 1649, and Francis Nethersole, The Self-Condemed, 1648. Goodwin answered the latter with the pamphlet, The Unrighteous Judge, 1649.

3. The execution of Charles I must remain "inscribed like a gigantic note of interrogation across the pages of English history." Trevelyan, op.cit., p. 241. It is certainly beyond the scope of our purposes to try to answer whether Cromwell was right or wrong when he reputedly uttered as he looked at the dead king, "Cruel necessity."

combat such efforts to make the King's execution appear an act of great tragedy and injustice. Within a few days, John Milton published a treatise on The Tenure of Kings and Magistrates (1649), in which he sought to prove that "it is lawful for any who have the power to call to account a Tyrant or wicked King and after due conviction to depose, and put him to death." The popularity of the Eikon Basilike was so great, however, that in a few months Milton brought out another pamphlet to refute it.¹ The defenders of this action were to find another writer to take up their cause. Just four months after the fateful day there came from the press a "defense of the honourable sentence passed upon the late King" by John Goodwin. In his letter of dedication to the House of Commons, Goodwin said he had published his, The Obstructours of Justice (1649), "to set forth your persons and Honourable proceedings (especially about the late King) right and straight in the minds and affections of the nation."²

Goodwin realized that custom and precedent would count for a great deal, in the calling of a King to the bar of justice, so he made use of Presbyterian writers from John Calvin and John Knox to Rutherford and Prynne, to show such doctrine had also been found among the orthodox. He also cited historical examples from Milton's Tenure of Kings and Magistrates. After paying respect to their demand for precedents, he stated that precedents were not decisive, for every age, having the

1. John Milton, Eikonoklastes, 1649.

2. In it he tried to answer specific objections brought by a group of London ministers and two royalist writers, John Geree, Might Overcoming Right, 1649, and H. Hammond, The Humble Address, 1649.

experience of the wisdom of the former, has a duty to make precedents also. Just because the world, in its "Infancie, youth, middle age", did not provide for its "own peace and safety by the arraignments of their Kings when they turned Tyrants and Destroyers of their people", is no reason why the world, in its "maturity and perfection", ought not to do it.¹ The nation was not yet ready to support such a precedent, however, for in a little over a decade when the strong, restraining hand of Cromwell had gone, monarchy was restored and both Milton's and Goodwin's books were burned while they only narrowly escaped imprisonment.

E. A Controversial Figure to the End

1. The warfare not yet ended.-- The Puritans viewed life as a pilgrimage in which there was continual warfare with the world, the flesh, and the devil. The Christian could never afford to relax but must remain ever vigilant, for often temptations and trials were strongest at the very last. This was to be Goodwin's own experience. The triumph of Independency and the establishment of the Commonwealth under Cromwell's firm, but tolerant hand, seemed to mean that freedom was at last secure. This was not to be the case, and Goodwin had to remain a critic to the end.

In February 1652, John Owen and a number of other outstanding Independent ministers sent to Parliament a petition for the "Propagation of the Gospel" and calling for a church

1. John Goodwin, The Obstructours of Justice, 1649, p. 78.

settlement. Strangely enough one of the signers was John Goodwin, although he later recanted and was to prove the leading opponent of their schemes.¹ The House received the petition well and appointed a committee, largely of these same ministers, to draw a plan for a settlement of religion in England. The committee presented its fifteen proposals within a few weeks, calling for an established church administered by two commissions with both lay and clerical members. The first was to supervise the ordination of ministers and the second commission was for the approval, discipline, and ejection of ministerial candidates and ministers.

The first step of Parliament was to pass a resolution on February 25, 1653, "That the Magistrate hath power in matters of Religion, for the Propagation of the Gospel."² Then it began to debate the specific proposals. The resolution itself was enough to arouse John Goodwin's suspicions and his pen. Goodwin was no more willing for the Independent Rump Parliament to take away the freedom of those of varying opinions to worship, preach, and believe as their consciences dictated, than he had been for the Presbyterian Long Parliament to do so. In less than a week after the resolution, there came from the press Thirty Queries (1653), challenging the right of the civil magistrate to "interpose his power or authority in matters of religion and worship of God."

Within a month, two anonymous replies appeared in

1. Masson, op.cit., Vol. IV, pp. 392 f.
 2. Dale, op.cit., p. 316.

pamphlet form to take up Goodwin's challenge. The argument of the first can be seen in its title, Master John Goodwin's Quere's Questioned (1653). The personal and satirical approach of the second is reflected in its title also, An Apologie for Mr John Goodwin (1653). In his reply¹, Goodwin reaffirmed his principles in regard to freedom of conscience and separation of church and state. To the second he answered that Phillip Nye persuaded him to sign his name to the disputed petition, even though he did so under protest that he did not agree with everything therein. In addition he confessed that, like Peter, it was better to affirm your faith after a denial than to remain in apostasy. There was no need for Goodwin to write further pamphlets on the subject, for the proceedings of the Rump Parliament were brought to an abrupt and violent ending before it could act on more than the first four of the proposals.

Goodwin's next literary efforts had to be in defense of himself and of the freedom of the press. Six London booksellers were attempting to persuade the newly called Parliament to put restraints on the freedom of the press. To promote their cause they issued a tract², giving extracts from various books which they considered heretical or blasphemous. One of the quotations used was from Goodwin's Redemption Redeemed (1651). When Goodwin's attention was called to the tract he replied to it because he found they had "mangled

1. John Goodwin, The Apologist Condemned, 1653.

2. A Second Beacon Fired, 1654.

and misfigured" the quotation from him. Besides this "most unchristian falsification", they were offering advice to the Lord Protector and Parliament "under a pretext of godliness and zeal for Zion", but which would be against both. It was this "pernicious counsel against the liberty of Printing" that Goodwin mustered his arguments. The man who, more than any other, had been the watchdog against all abuses of freedom, stoutly defended the freedom of the press in a pamphlet with a title mindful of its purpose, A Fresh Discovery of the High-Presbyterian Spirit (1654).

Goodwin's criticism of the attempts of the Commonwealth government to restrict religious freedom did not mean that he was unmindful of the gains made under its rule. Accordingly, when the voice of extremists and malcontents was raised against the government of Cromwell, he came to its defense. In a pamphlet entitled, Dis-satisfaction Satisfied (1654), he sought to "allay the discontents, and satisfie the scruples" of those who were discontented with the Commonwealth government.¹ In it he asked: "Whether or not the first rights, liberties, and Interest of the people, better, and more clearly asserted and secure unto them, by the present Government, and by the published articles and constitutions hereof, then ever they were formerly?"²

Even though Goodwin was, on the whole, sympathetic

1. The pamphlet was re-issued later in the year with three more queries added, and under the new title, Peace Protected, and Discontent Disarmed.

2. Ibid., p. 75.

toward the Commonwealth Government, he never hesitated to criticise it when he felt it was threatening the religious liberties of the nation. This he felt he saw in the commissioners or "Triers", which Cromwell set up to pass on the qualifications of all ministers, and eject "any preacher, lecturer, and schoolmaster who are ignorant, scandalous, inefficient, or negligent in their several and respective places." He thought they represented conformity to orthodoxy.¹ In the pamphlet, Triers or Tormenters (1657), he began by confessing that his heart was troubled the first day that he heard of the two commissions. He considered it a matter of "fatal unhappiness" that Christian rulers always thought it their duty to use their power, authority, and sword in trying to improve on Christ's way of spreading the Gospel. His view was that the Triers had too much authority toward determining the ministry of the Church.

To entrust an inconsiderable number of men, subject to the like errors, passions, weaknesses, miscarriages, with all other men, with a negative vote, . . . in and about the placing and displacing, and disposing of all ministers over all the respective congregations, in a great nation, is an unChristian and unheard of prodigio, and must needs be of sad abode and portendance unto the people. . . .²

This was to be the last writing of Goodwin in defense of

1. There seems to have been some basis for his position. "There was no creed or confession of Faith to which the clergy were required to subscribe, but the Triers insisted no doubt on an acceptance of the substance of the Calvinistic theology." Dale, op.cit., p. 322. Richard Baxter, while approving of their work on a whole as good for the Church, wrote that "some few were over-busie and over rigid . . . against all that were Arminians." Baxter, op.cit., part I, p. 72.

2. John Goodwin, Triers or Tormenters, 1657, p. 5.

religious liberty.¹

During the 1650's, Goodwin was troubled by more than the problem of religious freedom. He had a schism in his church caused by some of his congregation accepting Baptist beliefs and joining a Baptist Congregation. Goodwin had hopes of winning back those who had strayed from his fold and took up the weapon he considered most effective in combatting error -- the pen. It was with reluctance that he took time out to get involved in the Anabaptist controversy which was raging then. He said he had rather given seven years hard labour to combatting the Calvinist error than seven weeks to that of baptism. The unity of his church and the souls of those to whom he had ministered were at stake, so he sent forth two pamphlets on the issue. The first was in the form of forty queries designed to ask why persons baptised after profession of faith, should not remain in communion with those who had received baptism in infancy.² The second had a similar theme and was also directed at the separated members of his congregation, raising the question as to whether people who are baptised again under Baptist principles should not still remain in the church where they were before.³

These tracts did not bring back the strayed members, so two years later he issued a full-sized book, Cata-Baptism

1. This pamphlet caused such a stir that Cromwell's journalist, Marchamont Nedham, was assigned the task of answering it and did so in The Great Accuser Cast Down, 1657.

2. John Goodwin, Philadelphia: Or XL Queries, 1653.

3. John Goodwin, Water-Dipping No Firm Footing for Church-Communion, 1653.

(1655), directed at the same end, and at the same time, answering the arguments of a tract by one of the former members, William Allen, who though a layman, seemed to have been well versed in theology. In the dedication made to the Baptists, he asks if they are not guilty of making baptism the essence of Christianity and exalting it even above faith and love, while at the same time, bringing dissension into the Christian Church. Besides trying to refute the arguments of Allen, Goodwin held that there was no scriptural injunction to any one mode or time of baptism, and therefore the Church had a certain freedom in its practices. The Church had, since its early days, practised infant baptism and it should not be rejected without scriptural grounds. This book was apparently more effective, for several of his members returned to the fold.

2. The Restoration, deprivation, and death.-- In the year 1658, the strong hand of Oliver Cromwell was lost by the summons of death, and he was succeeded by his son. We need not tell the story of the year and a half of "incessant constitutional agitation and military intrigues" which led to the Restoration of Charles II in May, 1660. Two provisions of his declaration by which Charles was restored to the throne are all that need concern us. One of his promises was a "free and general pardon" to all, "excepting only such persons as shall thereafter be excepted by Parliament". The other was a declaration of a "liberty to tender consciences."¹

1. "The Declaration of Breda", Cf., Gardiner, op.cit., p. 466.

Goodwin was to be one of those whom Parliament made an exception to the general pardon.¹ Upon the restoration of Charles II events moved swiftly toward the punishment of the chief architects and instruments of the execution of Charles I. Cromwell, and other of the leaders who were already dead, were dug up and hanged for all the people to see. The regicides were hanged and cut to pieces near the site where Charles had been led to the gallows. Finally, parliament moved against those who had defended this unprecedented act.

On Saturday, June 16th, less than three weeks after the triumphal return of Charles II, the House of Commons passed two orders and a resolution to take measures against the two men who had published tracts justifying the King's execution. The first order was to the effect that his Majesty should issue a proclamation calling in all copies of John Milton's Eikonoklastes (1649), and Pro Populo Anglicano Defensio (1651), along with John Goodwin's The Obstructours of Justice (1649). The second was that the Attorney General should be instructed to institute proceedings against the two men. To these orders was attached a resolution that the Sergeant at Arms should take them into custody.² In accordance with the first order, on August 13th, a royal proclamation was issued for calling in and suppressing of both Milton's

1. Even if he had not been deprived under the first, he would certainly have fallen victim to persecution, along with 2200 other nonconformist clergy, and contrary to the second provision, been ejected. In either case it would have meant removal from his church.

2. House of Commons, Journal, Vol. VIII, p. 66. Cf., Masson, op.cit., Vol. VI, pp. 39 ff.

and Goodwin's books.¹ Bishop Kennet recorded in his chronicle, that on August 27, the two books were burned by the common hangman.² From the number of copies of both works still extant, it would seem that many copies did not find their way to the hangman, although subsequent burnings were held in Oxford and elsewhere. The strange thing, however, is that no further action was taken against the two men. Neither the second order nor the resolution were ever carried out.³ There must have been some intervention on their behalf that caused such leniency.

Certainly it was not the indifference of public opinion. Bishop Kennet recorded that when their books were burned by the hangman, there was a demand for the hanging of the two authors.⁴ Bishop Burnet also recorded that the escape of John Goodwin and John Milton from all censure was "to the surprise of all people". He then went on to add his own explanation as to why Goodwin was spared.

Goodwin had so often not only justified, but magnified the putting the king to death, both in his sermons and books, that few thought he could have been either forgot or excused But Goodwin had been so zealous an Arminian, and had sown such division among all the

1. Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, (Great Britain, Public Records Office, 1660-1661), p. 189.

2. Bishop Kennet, A Register and Chronicle Ecclesiastical and Civil, 1728, Vol. I, p. 239.

3. No serious effort seemed to have been made to apprehend them. The proclamation calling their books in stated, "the authors having obscured themselves, that they cannot be apprehended." Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, (Great Britain, Public Records Office, 1660-1661), p. 189.

4. Kennet, op.cit., p. 239. Two years later he made a further entry that "the sparing of John Milton and John Goodwin was much censured." p. 711.

sectaries upon these heads, that it was said this procured him friends.¹

The proceedings against Milton went no further, but Goodwin was not to be let off so lightly. He may have had friends, but he also had enemies.

Parliament now went about the business of exempting from the act of general pardon those whom they thought had some share in the guilt. A list of twenty persons was drawn up, who were to be deprived of all offices of trust in the nation for life. John Goodwin was to find a place on this "select" list. On Monday, June 18, 1660, the House of Commons added to the list Goodwin and Phillip Nye, the eminent Independent preacher and member of the Westminster Assembly.² Apparently Nye and Goodwin were taken to represent the prime offenders among the clergy of sympathizers with Cromwellian principles and policy.³ It must not have been a surprise to anyone, including Goodwin himself, that he was put on the list of twenty persons who were forbidden to ever accept or exercise any office of trust again. Accordingly, on May 29, 1661, Goodwin was removed as vicar of St. Stephens Church, for the second and last time.

The last years of Goodwin's life were as obscure as had been his early years. He disappeared into oblivion after his removal from St. Stephens. There are a few letters

1. Gilbert Burnet, History of His Own Time, (2d ed., Oxford: University Press, 1833), Vol. I, p. 292.

2. House of Commons, Journal, Vol. VIII, p. 68.

3. It is significant that the man who nominated him was Prynne, with whom he had had a lengthy controversy. Prynne was the kind of man who neither forgave nor forgot.

from John Goodwin to his wife written during 1663 and 1664 which are found among the State Papers.¹ They are mostly personal, telling of his lodgings, diet, and comfort, shedding little light on his activities during the last years. Apparently, he spent those years in obscurity and quiet. He probably "never appeared again at St. Stephens of Coleman Street."² The best conjecture as to his death is the year 1665, and possibly as a victim of the plague which raged in and about London in that year.

1. Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, (Great Britain, Public Records Office), Vol. LXXX, p. 272, Vol. XXXII, p. 313, Vol. XC, p. 437.

2. There is, as Jackson points out in his biography of Goodwin, a reference in the parish register to a John Goodwin, vitler, of Whites Alley, who was buried there on the 3rd of September, 1665. This might possibly be the same John Goodwin, but it is doubtful, for the letters to his wife indicate he had moved to Leigh, Sussex.

Chapter II

THE
THEOLOGICAL METHOD

of

John Goodwin

"He had a clear Head, a fluent Tongue,
a penetrating Spirit, and a marvellous Faculty in
Descanting on Scripture. . . " Edmund Calamy.

CHAPTER II

THEOLOGICAL METHOD

A. The Sources and Criteria of Truth

In one of Goodwin's later works, The Banner of Justification-Displayed (1659), he discusses some seventeen factors in the justification of a sinner. Among them are: the grace of God, the resurrection of Christ, the Holy Spirit, faith, the Word of God, the minister of the Word, and the person himself. This kind of broad, many-sided approach to theological problems and issues is typical of John Goodwin's methodology. It arose out of the nature of his mind and his attitude toward truth. He possessed a "flexible, keen, and pragmatic intelligence."¹ His thought was "elastic and organic."² He naturally had an experimental, exploratory approach to theology which never accepted dogmas without looking into their intricacies and implications. Near the end of his ministry he boasted that for forty years he had been trying all doctrines and all ways to truth.³ This open-mindedness made him receptive to truth from any quarter and led him to search for it in all directions. When to this was added a view of truth as complex, evolving, and relative, a varied and constantly shifting theological

1. W. K. Jordan, The Development of Religious Toleration in England, (Allen & Unwin, 1938), Vol. III, p. 411.

2. Ibid., p. 412.

3. John Goodwin, A Fresh Discovery of the High-Presbyterian Spirit, 1654, p. 55.

approach was the result.

1. The Scriptures.-- The pre-eminence of the Scriptures in Goodwin's theology is seen in nearly all of his writings. His numerous and often tedious quotations from the Bible on practically every page of his works suggest both an intimate knowledge with and great respect for it as a source of truth. No matter what the issues -- religious freedom or predestination, the beheading of the king or justification, the authority of parliament or grace -- the main authority inevitably cited was the Holy Scriptures. Goodwin might, and usually did, reinforce his arguments from other sources, but these always supplemented and never replaced the Bible's pre-eminence.

Goodwin's reverence for the Bible is best seen in his book, The Divine Authority of the Scriptures Asserted (1648). Here he gives an interesting and impressive array of reasons for accepting the authority of the Bible. He pays special tribute to its power and wonderful effects in the face of seemingly insurmountable opposition. It is a cause for wonder that,

. . . between the bloody rage and fury of Kings and Princes on the one hand, and the bitter and subtle disputes and oppositions of Philosophers and oratours on the other hand . . . it should not, as between two milstones, have been ground to poudor. But behold the finger and mighty power of God. This Gospel, which was so mightily disadvantaged in it self . . . hath made its way through the midst of all their fierce and fiory oppositions, hath thrown down mountains on the right hand, and mountains on the left, and hath built her self a throne in the midst of the earth. . . .¹

1. John Goodwin, The Divine Authority of the Scriptures Asserted, 1648, p. 292.

All the efforts to stop the spread of the Word of God ~~went~~ to no avail.

It leaped over the walls of their cities, it brake into their forts and castles, yea it found a way into the palaces and chambers of Kings and Emperors themselves, and took hold of those that stood at their right hand, even whilst they were breathing out fury and death against it. When they let it alone it prospered; when they persecuted it, and that unto death, it prospered yet more. . . .¹

His conclusion is that the Scriptures are truly divine.

Have we not foundation and ground in abundance from the mighty and wonderfull works which the Gospel wrought, in, and upon, the hearts of such infinite numbers, both of men and women in the very face, as it were, of such astonishing and devouring oppositions, to build this conclusion, with the greatest confidence that may be, upon; that certainly this Gospel comes from God²

This book is mankind's greatest blessing.³

The 'pagan philosophers' are freely drawn upon by Goodwin in his writings. They never usurp the place of Scripture in his thought. He affirms the clear superiority of the Bible to all secular writings.

All the wisdom, and writings, and learning that ever was in the world besides, cannot shew so much as the appearance, or face of such a generation of proselytes, or children, as the Gospel can; and not so much as one person of like noble principles, and inward parts with thousands of those, who are the genuine and right-born offspring hereof. The tallest and bestgrown men, that ever sprang from the root of Plato, Aristotle, Seneca, Plutarch, or any other of those ancient Fathers of secular learning, were but a race of dwarves, or pygmies in reall worth, and true excellencie of spirit, being compared with a great part

-
1. Ibid., p. 293.
 2. Ibid., p. 295.
 3. Ibid., pp. 223-224.

of that heroic progeny, whose hearts and spirits came by the way of a second birth, out of the loins and bowels of the Gospel.¹

Like all Puritans and most of the theological writers of his age, John Goodwin considered the Scriptures as the main and unerring source of religious truth. He accepted, along with nearly all of his contemporaries, the Bible as the ultimate authority on all theological issues. Its place as the final court of appeal in all theological disputes was seldom questioned by Goodwin or his opponents. The Word of God was almost universally accepted in the middle of the seventeenth century as the infallible guide in matters of faith and doctrine. Few dared question the authority of the Bible, but there the unanimity ended and division began. The great question which separated Puritan from Anglican, and ultimately led to differences within the very ranks of Puritanism, was the inevitable question as to the proper use and interpretation of the Scriptures. It was here that John Goodwin had a distinctive position and made an important contribution to the debate.²

Goodwin attacked the literalistic and dogmatic use of the Bible practised by many of his fellow Puritans. His quarrel with the Puritans was over their views and use of the Bible as a collection of infallible truths and impregnable doctrines. Goodwin saw that when the Bible was

1. *Ibid.*, p. 331.

2. *Op.*, Alan Richardson and W. Schweitzer, Biblical Authority for Today, (SCM Press, 1951), for a modern version of this perennial debate, especially that in regard to Fundamentalism, pp. 141 ff.

treated in this fashion dogmatic presuppositions really determine what is found in the Bible. It leaves no room for Biblical interpretation, but treats the Bible as an arsenal of proof texts.

They substituted for its interpretation their own ready-made theology. They assumed that the Bible formed a homogeneous, self-interpreting, and verbally dictated whole, and that the inferences drawn from it by dialectics and compacted into a technical system were as certain and as sacred as itself. In this way a difference of exegetical opinion became, not only an intellectual error, but a civil crime.¹

The distinction between the Word of God and the literal words and phrases of the Bible is the basis of Goodwin's position.² He brings this out clearly in the very beginning of his masterly treatise on the authority of the Bible.

First, if by Scriptures, be meant the matter and substance of things contained and held forth in the books of the old and new Testament . . . I fully and with all my heart and all my soul beleve them to be . . . none other then the Word of God . . . Secondly, if by Scriptures be meant, all the letters, syllables, words, phrases, sentences, and periods of speech, expressed in the said books . . . whether Translated, or in these Originalls (I mean in such, either Hebrew or Greek copies, as are commonly extant, and used amongst us) I know no ground why I should beleve, that all . . . the said syllables, words, phrases, &c. were in any speciall or extraordinary way given, or appointed by God, to convey those spirituall truths and mysteries unto the understandings and mindes of men, which he hath been graciously pleased to reveal from heaven, for their salvation.³

1. F. W. Farrar, History of Interpretation, (Macmillan, 1886), p. 371.

2. Cf., A. Dakin, Calvinism, (Duckworth, 1940), pp. 189-191, for a comment on Calvin's failure to make this distinction and the consequent tendency toward the doctrine of verbal infallibility by his followers.

3. John Goodwin, The Divine Authority of the Scriptures Asserted, 1648, pp. 13 f.

With this distinction made, Goodwin goes on to conclude that Christ as known through the Scriptures and not the Bible, as such, is the basis of the Christian faith.

. . . the true and proper foundation of Christian Religion, is not inke and paper, not any book, or books, not any writing, or writings whatsoever, whether Translations, or Originalls; but that substance of matter, those gracious counsells of God concerning the salvation of the world by Jesus Christ, which indeed are represented, and declared, both in Translations, and Originalls, but are essentially and really distinct from both, and no waies, for their natures and beings, depending on either of them.¹

This attitude toward the Bible leads Goodwin to take a remarkably liberal and modern attitude toward the Bible. He points out that there are "many errorrs and mistakes in all . . . our English Translations."² In the Hebrew and Greek copies themselves he also acknowledges certain errors.

. . . yea the best, and truest, and most genuine of them, may in time, either thorough the ignorance, or negligence, or malice, whether of Scribes, or Printers, or over-seers of presses, or all, be corrupted: but the word of God, properly so called, is alwaies pure, universally true, and incorruptible.³

Even possible contradictions within the pages of the Bible are admitted.

. . . There is in the Scriptures a magestique kinde of security, under many seeming (yea many seemingly bold, and venturous) contradictions, that yet neither the Honour of their Truth, nor that unitie which they have, in and with themselves, shall at all suffer hereby.⁴

Goodwin goes on to suggest that a period of oral transmission lay behind the Gospels. "Besides, the Gospel it

1. Ibid., p. 17.

2. Ibid., p. 9.

3. Ibid., p. 11.

4. Ibid., p. 55.

self was in the world, and beleevd on in the world, before any of the Evangelists put forth their hand to bless that work, of putting into writing the summe and substance of it."¹

Goodwin takes his stand firmly against the literalism of many of his Puritan opponents and the demand to adhere strictly to every phrase of the Bible.

. . . for if such a thing should be, there would be no place left for interpreting, opening, or expounding the Scriptures, but only for reading of them; and this without conceiving or forming any sense or meaning of them in one kind or other in the mind either of him that readeth them or of him that heareth them read; for a man cannot lightly form the sense of any phrase or passage of Scripture in his mind and understanding but by the opportunity and advantage of some other words, though only inwardly spoken, which are more familiar and better known to him.²

He, therefore, is able to keep the Bible at the center of his thought without treating it woodenly or being shackled by its phrasology.

He does not merely wrest, divide and subdivide his texts, multiplying words. He interprets them with feeling and imagination and with the knowledge of human character he has learned from experience and humane letters as well as from scripture.³

It would be too much to claim that Goodwin had the outlook of modern Biblical criticism in his method of interpreting the Bible, but he does represent a movement in that direction away from the Puritan doctrine of verbal inspiration. It was one of the things which aroused the

1. *Ibid.*, p. 10.

2. John Goodwin, A Being Filled With The Spirit, (Edinburgh: James Nichol, 1867), p. 183.

3. William Haller, The Rise of Puritanism, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1938), p. 373.

opposition of his more Orthodox Calvinist brethren.¹ It helped to spread the suspicion of his Arminianism. A liberal attitude toward Biblical interpretation had become associated with the Arminian position as had a high regard for reason with Socinianism.

If the Bible is taken as the principal and unerring source of theology, the question inevitably arises as to which one of the conflicting interpretations is the true one. It means that other criteria besides "the plain Word of God" must be used in helping to reconcile or, if necessary, to choose between different points of view. Goodwin recognized this problem, but had difficulty in getting his opponents to admit its existence.

Yea, in all matters of doubtful disputation from the Scriptures, for men to pretend or allege the Scriptures as a reason or ground of what they believe signifieth little, unless they should give a good and substantial reason to prove that to be the true sense and meaning of the Scriptures Yea, when two shall contend for their respective opinions, . . . from or by the authority of the Scriptures, if neither of them be able to give any competent account why they interpret or understand the Scriptures so . . . they do but beat the air with contesting, and both their opinions after the contest are but in the same condition of uncertainty or of being rejected in which they were before.²

For most of the Puritan biblicists there was only one true interpretation -- that of the "best Reformed writers."

Goodwin appealed to several aids or criteria in choosing

1. Cf., Thomas Edwards, The Third Part of Gangraena, 1646, p. 115 f., for the horrified reaction of his contemporaries to his liberal views. Also, A Testimony To The Truth Of Jesus Christ and to Our Solemn League and Covenant, 1648.

2. John Goodwin, The Banner of Justification Displayed, (Baynes and Son, 1835 edition), p. 380.

between various interpretations of a particular passage. The one that he used most was reason.

2. Reason.-- John Goodwin had a very high regard for the role and power of reason. As his theological thought matured under the relentless pressure of numerous controversies, he became more and more a rationalist. Scripture remained the main source of his theology, but reason became the principal criterion which judged all matters concerning faith.

. . . Reason ought to be every mans leader, Guide, and Director in his Faith, or about what he is, or ought to beleeve: and that no man ought to leap with his faith, till he hath looked with his Reason men ought to make use of, yea, and ingage to the uttermost, their Reasons or their discursive abilities, in all matters of Faith and Religion whatsoever; and not to swallow any thing by a loose credulity but to look narrowly upon everything with the eye of Reason, before they receive it by the hand of faith.¹

There seems to be plenty of evidence to support the accusation of his bitter critic, Thomas Edwards, that Goodwin "will not beleeve the Scriptures without reason, and hath preached lately with much earnestnesse and violence, that Faith is not to guide Reason, but Reason Faith. . . ."²

For Goodwin there was no conflict between reason and faith. Both are from God. Since God himself is rational, faith need never be asked to accept anything contrary to reason. Indeed, the believer is to reject whatever is irrational as not coming from God.

1. John Goodwin, The Scourge of the Saints Displayed In his colours of Ignorance & blood, 1646, p. 108.

2. Thomas Edwards, The second part of Gangraena, p. 91.

The truth is, I stand bound in duty and conscience towards God, and in faithfulness to mine own soul, neither to believe any things at all, as coming from God, which I have not, or may have, a very substantial ground in reason to believe cometh indeed from him.

. . . 1

The Christian is not even required to believe what is above his reason. He gives as examples the nature of the Virgin birth and of the Trinity:

If it be further said, but reason is not able to apprehend or conceive how three should be really and essentially one, and the same: how a virgin should conceive, and bring forth a son, &c., I answer that no faith or belief in such things as these is required of me, nor would be accepted with God in case it were in me, above what I am able by my reason to apprehend and understand. As I am not able to apprehend by my reason the particular and distinct manner how the three persons subsist in one and the same Divine nature and essence, so neither am I bound to believe it. That which I am bound to believe in this point is only this, that there are three who do thus subsist. . . . 2

Faith is so dependent upon reason that it must accept nothing unless dictated by reason.

As reason makes the decisions for faith, so does it decide what the Scriptures say. Reason accepts the revelation in the Bible for it is from God. It has the duty, however, of understanding and interpreting the contents of the Bible.

Therefore it must needs be by the exercise and acting of my reason and understanding, and by the report which they make of their discoveries in their inquiries, that I come regularly to conclude and to be satisfied that this is the mind of God in such or such a scripture, and none other.³

1. John Goodwin, Redemption Redeemed, (edition, of 1840), p. 29.

2. Ibid., p. 27.

3. Ibid., p. 16.

The reason is the principal instrument whereby the Christian can decide between conflicting interpretations. While acknowledging that the Word of God is that which must decide between doctrine and doctrine as "the fire which must try every man's work", he adds that the Scriptures are only serviceable and useful for the trial of doctrine with the help of men's "reasons, minds, and understandings."¹

In the same way, Goodwin subjects the working of the Holy Spirit to the same critical test of reason. Although the aid of the Holy Spirit is necessary to understanding of the Word of God, it by no means replaces the reasons of men.

In case the Spirit of God shall at any time reveal . . . any spiritual truth, unto men, these must be apprehended, discerned, judged . . . to be the things of God, by the reasons and understandings of men, before they can, or ought to receive or believe them to be the things of God. . . .²

Just as different men interpret the Scriptures differently according to their own understanding, so do men differ in their illuminations by the Spirit. Every spirit cannot be believed without being tested. They must be tried as to whether they be of God. Reason is the touchstone for trying the spirit.

Consistent with his emphasis on reason, Goodwin deprecates those who seek to divorce reason from religion.

. . . yea, amongst the teachers themselves of this wisdom, men should be found who think they do God and men very good service in persuading men wholly to lay aside their reasons, judgments, understandings in matters of religion, and not to make use of or engage

1. Ibid., pp. 14 f.
2. Ibid., p. 24.

any of these in their inquiries after matters of a spiritual or supernatural concernment.¹

Men who lay aside their reasons in order to save their faith are in reality destroying it. Irrational religion is one of the threats to the nation.

Most assuredly, all the ataxies, disorders, confusions, seditions, insurrections, all the errors, blasphemous opinions, apostasies from the truth and ways of holiness, all trouble of mind, and sad workings of conscience in me[n], all unrighteousness and injustice, all bribery and oppression, all unmanlike self-seeking and prevaricating with public interests and trusts, all covetousness and deceit, and whatsoever can be named in this world, obstructive, destructive, to the present comfort and peace, to the future blessedness and glory, of the sons and daughters of men, proceed and spring from this one root of bitterness and of death; they neglect to advance and engage home their reasons, judgments, understandings, in matters of religion²

Goodwin is a thorough-going rationalist for he applies reason to every aspect of thought. He never questions the competence or limits the sphere of reason.

It is a thing as unquestionable as that the sun is up at noonday, that reason and understanding in men are competent to judge of the things of God, at least of some, yea, of many of them, or rather, indeed, of all that are contained in the Scriptures, according to the degree of their discovery and manifestation there³

The majority of the Puritans would not have gone nearly so far in their use of reason as did Goodwin.⁴ It would seem that Goodwin's reputation as a rationalist even

1. Ibid., p. 14.

2. Ibid., p. 29.

3. Ibid., p. 17.

4. Cf., G. F. Nuttall, The Holy Spirit in Puritan Faith and Experience, (2d. ed. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1947), where Goodwin is cited as an exception rather than the rule in his use of reason for testing God's Spirit.

extended to his congregation. An anonymous pamphleteer suggested that none of Mr. Goodwin's church should be eligible for parliament.

Considering first, that for the greatest part of them, they are such high extollers of reason, that in case they should be chosen to the places of parliament-men, they would never give way that any Act should pass the House which should not be grounded upon reason, though of never so spiritual a concernment.¹

If Goodwin's exaltation of reason divided him from many of the Puritans it showed his affinities with one Puritan group -- the Cambridge Platonists.²

This great faith in reason had certain implications for the direction of Goodwin's thought as it had for the Cambridge Platonists.³ Like them, his reliance on reason helped to lead him to a position of religious tolerance. As was true in the case of the Cambridge Platonists, a more rational approach aided in Goodwin's alienation from rigid Calvinism. In both cases an emphasis on reason in religion was connected with an emphasis on morals in religion. Reason did not lead them out of the folds of Puritanism, but it made them uneasy with some of its tenets and an object of

1. A Model of a New Representative, now under Consideration, 1651, quoted in Thomas Jackson, Life of John Goodwin, (Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme and Brown, 1822), p. 215.

2. Cf., John Goodwin, The Divine Authority of the Scriptures Asserted, 1648, where he speaks of the "candle of the Lord" which is lighted in every mans soul in much the same manner as the Cambridge Platonists, proface to reader, p. 22.

3. Frederick J. Powicke, The Cambridge Platonists, (Dent and Sons, 1926), pp. 28 ff, where he lists five such characteristics of their thought growing out of their emphasis on reason. Goodwin is very close to them on each of the five.

suspicion by the more orthodox Puritans.¹

3. The Holy Spirit. -- There was a central emphasis in Puritan thought on the close connection between the Holy Spirit and the Word of God.² The view that the Holy Spirit was the infallible inspirer of all Scripture was almost universally accepted. The continuing work of the Holy Spirit was generally associated with the reading or hearing of the Word. The Spirit enabled the hearer to receive the Word. Most of the Puritans never separated the Spirit from the Word.³

John Goodwin was a typical Puritan on these points. He sees a close connection between the work of the Holy Spirit and the Word of God.

. . . the Spirit of God, according to the counsel and good pleasure of God . . . is wont to join himself with the glorious truths of the gospel, published and proclaimed by his messengers, when he hath an intent or desire to go forth into the world, and to visit the hearts and consciences of the sons and daughters of men . . . the spirit ordinarily cometh unto the souls of men in a golden shower of evangelical truths. . . .⁴

The help of the Spirit is necessary to illumine the understanding of fallen, sinful man.

The Spirit of God hath such a great interest in, and glorious superintendency over, the minds, and spirits, reasons, and understandings of men, that they cannot act or move regularly . . . upon any worthy or comely

1. Cf., Benjamin Whichcote, Moral and Religious Aphorisms, Edited by Samuel Salter, 1753, appendix, The exchange of letters between Tuckney and Whichcote. Also Goodwin's debate with George Walker, Socinianisme, 1640.

2. Nuttall, op.cit., p. 23.

3. Nuttall, op.cit., p. 24.

4. John Goodwin, A Being Filled With the Spirit, (Edinburgh: James Nichol, 1867 edition), p. 18.

terms, especially in matters of a spiritual concernment, but by the gracious and loving interposure and help of this Spirit.¹

At two points Goodwin goes beyond most Puritans, and is close to the Quaker doctrine of the Holy Spirit.²

Whereas the Puritans would restrict the possession of the Spirit to the converted or the elect, Goodwin held that the Spirit was in every man, though its voice be "soft and low" in most men. ". . . there is a kind of standing presence of the Spirit of God with every man. . . ."³ The only possible exceptions were those who were guilty of blasphemy against the Holy Spirit and these were few in number.

". . . no persons whatsoever who have not sinned the sin against the Holy Ghost, which few now living, if any, have done, but have the Spirit of God in some measure or degree in them. . . ."⁴ This view fitted in with his doctrine of universal redemption. Just as any man could be saved, if he chose to do so, for Christ had died for all; so, anyone could be filled with the Spirit, if he took the necessary steps, for the Spirit was in every man. The belief in the universal presence of the Spirit blurred the distinction which most Puritans made between regenerate and unregenerate

1. John Goodwin, Redemption Redeemed, (edition of 1840), p. 23.

2. Cf., Nuttall, op.cit., pp. 150 ff., Goodwin, however, as does Richard Baxter, criticises the Quakers for not subjecting the Spirit to the tests of Scripture and reason. John Goodwin, Cata-Baptism, 1655, par.11, preface.

3. John Goodwin, A Being Filled With the Spirit, (2d. ed. 1867), p. 279.

4. Ibid., p. 26.

man. It conveyed a greater confidence in natural man and natural reason than most Puritans had.

Another point at which Goodwin went beyond the Puritan majority was in his belief that the Spirit continued to reveal new truths in the Scriptures. The Puritans saw the work of the Spirit as conveying and confirming in the heart and mind of the believer fixed truths from the Word of God. Goodwin looked on it as the progressive enlightenment of the Scriptures and the world, through those who become filled with the Spirit. He believed "that there are thousands of Scriptures, that have not yet been opened, or delivered out their treasures, but reserve them as the proper and peculiar glory of the generations of the Churches yet to come."¹ Every minister has the duty to enlarge the body of truth revealed with the help of the Spirit. ". . . no man is competently furnished . . . for the Ministerie of the Gospell . . . who is not as wel able, to make som new discoverie, & to bring forth som what of himselfe in the things of God in one kinde or other, as to preach the common and received truths."² Every day brings forth new revelations.

. . . there is not any day, or any night, that passeth over the head of the world, but that as well the one, as the other, bring with them a blessing of new light, some further knowledg and instruction in one kinde or other, unto the world. By means whereof, things that were covered, come in time, to be

1. John Goodwin, A Treatise of Justification, 1642, preface to the reader.

2. Ibid., preface to the reader.

revealed; and things hid, to be made known¹

Every generation must make its contribution to the knowledge of Christ. He complains that his own generation has failed to do so.

. . . that those to whom God hath graciously revealed himself amongst us, and withall endued with gifts and abilities for such a purpose, have rais'd the line of Evangelicall knowledg among us so little, above what was delivered unto us by our first Reformers. We have done little else with that talent of Gospell-light, which God at first gave us as a stock to set up and Trade withall for him, but only put in a Napkin. We have scarce added an haire's breadth to our stature in the knowledg of Christ, wheras a cubit at least, might well be expected from us.²

As we shall see, this idea of a continuing revelation, and not restricting the work of the Holy Spirit in this regard to the Biblical authors, had tremendous implications for the problem of religious freedom. Such a view shatters all demands for static orthodoxy. Goodwin's own position was closely related to his idea of truth.

4. Nature. -- The Puritans commonly referred to the light of nature. It was only 'God's candle' as compared with the 'sun of the Gospel'; yet both alike declared the glory of God. Puritan leaders, on occasions, appealed to the law of God within the heart as well as within the Bible. The influential leader of early Puritanism, William Perkins, in his debate with Arminius sets forth two criteria by which their arguments are to be judged. "The one is

1. John Goodwin, The Divine Authority of the Scriptures Asserted, 1648, p. 44.

2. John Goodwin, A Treatise of Justification, 1642, preface to the reader.

'the written word of God'; the other, 'those common notions and fundamental axioms which God has implanted in the minds of men.'¹ Puritan preachers often alluded to the revelation of God in nature.²

There is a certain ambiguity in Puritan thought at this point. They believed firmly in the disastrous consequences of man's Fall. Practically all would have said that the light of the book must be added to the light of nature. Nevertheless, most of them would have said, as did Paul to the Athenians, that enough light from nature remains to make men responsible. The question which arose was as to how far nature could lead a man toward God. Could it lead him at least part of the way, or was man totally blind to this light.³ Certainly, few of the Puritans would have gone as far as Goodwin in holding that heathens might possibly be saved without the written word.⁴

Goodwin agreed with his Puritan brethren that the light of the word is a more brilliant and adequate light than that of nature, which is indistinct. In a passage suggestive of the Cambridge Platonists⁵ he brings this out.

1. James Arminius, *Works*, Translated by William Nichols, (Thomas Baker, 1875), Vol. III, p. 267.

2. William Haller, *The Rise of Puritanism*, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1938), pp. 170 f.

3. Cf., T. F. Torrance, *Calvin's Doctrine of Man*, (Lutterworth Press, 1949), pp. 154 ff., for Calvin's view of Man's blindness and Perry Miller and T. H. Johnson, *The Puritans*, (New York: G. Allen, 1938), p. 51, for the similar Puritan view.

4. John Goodwin, *The Pagans Debt, and Dowry*, 1651.

5. Cf., Nathanael Culverwel, *Of the Light of Nature A Discourse*, Edited by John Brown, (Edinburgh: Thomas Constable, 1857), pp. 20 ff. and Whichcote, *op.cit.*, aphorisms 46-47.

"The truth is . . . the book of the Scripture, is written to perfect that which is decayed, blotted, and blurred in the book of nature, that we might come to the knowledge of God with more ease."¹ Having said this, he adds that for those who lack the book of Scripture, the book of nature, if studied, will teach men of God. God is the author of both, so there is no disagreement between them. He has written with His own finger His own truths within the heart and conscience, and without in the works of creation.

There was no doubt in Goodwin's mind but that knowledge of God may be had from nature. ". . . that which may be known of God, God hath written it in fair and legible characters in the works of creation, and withall hath given them eyes of reason and understanding sufficient to read."² He goes on to use the Parable of the Talents to prove that whoever uses those natural signs and abilities, with which God has provided everyone, can be saved.³

Goodwin makes frequent references to the 'law of nature' as well as to the 'light of nature.' Whether it is in regard to the necessity for the heathen to believe,⁴ or the necessity for subjects to overthrow a tyrannical monarch,⁵ he appeals to the law of nature as well as the

1. John Goodwin, A Being Filled With the Spirit, (Edinburgh: James Nichol, 1867 edition), pp. 478 f.
 2. John Goodwin, The Divine Authority of the Scriptures Asserted, 1648, p. 100.
 3. John Goodwin, The Pagans Debt, and Dowry, 1671, pp. 27 ff.
 4. Ibid., p. 37.
 5. John Goodwin, The Obstructors Of Justice, 1649, p. 4.

Scripture. To him the book of nature was as dependable and true as the book of Scriptures. The will and the knowledge of God could be found in both. The Scriptures had the advantage of being plainer and fuller. Nature had the advantage of being accessible to all alike -- believer and unbeliever, pagan and Christian. Arguments from nature could be used to supplement those places where the Scriptures were silent or ambiguous. Appeals could be made to the light and the law of nature to those who did not know or believe the Bible.

5. Tradition.-- The Puritans claimed that they looked only to the "cleere Word of God" for guidance in religious matters. Actually they were much more dependent on tradition than they acknowledged. As we have seen, they interpreted the Scriptures largely through the eyes of the Reformed tradition, and they built their theology on the same foundation. As a Puritan, John Goodwin had a great respect for the Reformed tradition. He was too much of an individualist and a rationalist to accept it unquestioningly or exclusively. Unlike most Puritans he could quote from the Greek Fathers as easily as from the Reformed writers. Calvin and Chrysostom were his two favorite scriptural expositors.¹

At two points Goodwin is closer to the Anglican position than to that of most Puritans. In the first

1. John Goodwin, Redemption Redeemed, (edition of 1840), epistle dedicatory p. xv.

place, he considers the practice of the 'primitive' church of the first three hundred years as more normative than the practice of Reformed Churches. When considering the doctrine of the perseverance of the saints he uses this argument:

And for numbers of men truly holy and conscientious, doubtless the primitive Christians, for three hundred years together and upwards, next after the times of the apostles, will fully balance, with an abundant surplussage, both for numbers and truth of godliness, all those in the reformed churches, who since Calvin's day have adhered to the common doctrine of perseverance.¹

In pleading for the doctrine of universal redemption he comments, "this was the ecumenical sense of the Christian world in her primitive and purest times."² Secondly, he questions the infallibility of the Reformation leaders.

. . . divers interpretations of Scriptures, especially in the old Testament, and of some in the new, delivered by Luther, Calvin, Musculus and other learned and Orthodox Writers of that Centurie, are suspected, yea and more then suspected, even detected of misprision and mistake, by many of the most learned of this age.³

Goodwin does not scorn the use of authorities for he quotes freely from them. He usually presents three kinds of arguments in his works: 1. from the Scriptures 2. according to reason 3. judgment of Christian writers. He comments in one place that in a controversial passage of Scripture which can be decided with the help of the Scripture and reason, it is best "to have recourse to the sense

1. Ibid., p. 243.

2. Ibid., p. xv., epistle dedicatory.

3. John Goodwin, A Treatise of Justification, 1642, preface to the reader.

and judgment of the churches of Christ in all ages. . . .¹
 He leaves the impression, however, that he quotes various writers for the "orthodox" who require the voice of authorities to prove the truth of doctrines. In an almost disdainful tone he comments in adding a chapter citing various writers:

For their sakes who are afraid to believe any thing, what pregnancy of ground soever there be to evince the truth of it otherwise, but only what they know, or at least think, that many other men, and these someways honourable in their sight, have believed before them, I have subjoined this chapter²

Goodwin was anxious not to be considered an innovator in doctrine or a dangerous heretic. In nearly all of his works he takes great pains to prove that his theological doctrines are "neither Heresie nor Blasphemie, neither Socinianisme nor Arminianisme, neither error nor novelty. . . ." ³

6. Godliness.-- With its emphasis on grace, faith and election, Puritanism opposes the idea of works as contributing towards salvation. Good works are important, however, as signs of salvation. One of the persistent demands of the Puritan movement was for more godly ministers and a more righteous nation. Even with this stress on godliness, few of them would have raised it to the status of a theological criterion as does John Goodwin.

1. John Goodwin, A Being Filled With the Spirit, (Edinburgh: James Nichol, edition of 1867), p. 339.

2. John Goodwin, Redemption Redeemed, (edition of 1840), p. 672.

3. John Goodwin, A Treatise of Justification, 1642, preface to the reader.

He used it as a principle of Scriptural interpretation. Where Scripture was ambiguous and opinion divided, that interpretation which did more to promote godliness was to be accepted as the correct one. He also uses it as a test for conflicting theological doctrines.¹

For having this touchstone by an unerring hand given unto me, that the gospel is a truth according unto godliness, i.e., a system or body of truth, calculated and framed by God, in all the veins and parts of it, for the exaltation of godliness in the world, I was directed hereby, in the case of doctrines and opinions, incompatible between themselves, to own and cleave unto that, as the truth, and comporting with the gospel, the face whereof was in the clearest and directest manner set for the promotion and advancement of godliness amongst men²

It does not replace the other criteria. It only supplements them in case the others fail. This criterion of godliness was important in his opposition to the doctrines of imputed righteousness and the perseverance of the saints. Goodwin felt that both tended to lead to Antinomianism.

We have noted Goodwin's affinity to the Cambridge Platonists in this stress on morality. The similarity can be seen in the fact that one of Whichcote's favorite texts was Titus 2:11-12.³ He thought it was the essence of divinity. One of Goodwin's favorite texts was I Timothy 6:3.⁴

1. Cf., John Goodwin, Redemption Redeemed, (edition of 1840), p. 446, and John Goodwin, The Agreement and Distance Of Brethren, (edition of 1671), p. 28.

2. John Goodwin, Redemption Redeemed, (edition of 1840), p. 363.

3. "For the grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men, teaching us that, denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly, in this present world;" A.V.

4. "If any man teach otherwise, and consent not to wholesome words, even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to the doctrine which is according to godliness;" A.V.

He considered it the "touchstone" of the Gospel. One difference can be seen between Goodwin and the Cambridge Platonists at this point. They commonly used the more philosophical term of "virtue", while Goodwin used the more Biblical and pastoral term of "godliness."

7. Experience.-- One historian has characterized Puritanism as a movement of "Augustinian piety."¹ Certainly Puritanism had a deep emotional strain in it. Perhaps that helps explain the springing up of various mystical sects, such as the Seekers and the Quakers, on the edge of the Puritan movement. There was a constant appeal to experience in Puritan writing and preaching. The Puritan preacher was to "teach nothing which he had not first tested in his own experience, and he must teach his people to subject all doctrine to the test of experience."² This emphasis on experience was reflected in an insatiable demand for devotional and hortatory works.³ Goodwin's first books (and his posthumous work on the Holy Spirit) were in this category. After he got caught up in the maelstrom of theological debate, Goodwin left this type of writing to others. The appeal to experience, however, is frequently referred to in all of his writings.

1. Perry Miller, The New England Mind: The Seventeenth Century, (New York: Macmillan, 1939), p. 4.

2. William Haller, The Rise of Puritanism, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1938), p. 299.

3. Douglas Bush, English Literature in the Earlier Seventeenth Century 1600-1660, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1945), p. 294.

Experience is seldom used by him as an independent criterion; usually it is used as corroborative evidence. The appeal is more often used in his writings incorporating sermoniç material. For example, in writing (and preaching) on the authority of the Scriptures he says:

So doe the Scriptures compasse the hearts and souls and consciences of men round about, there is nothing in the inward parts of men, though never so secret or retired, and that is hid from the beams of the light of them. They are as mediators to bring men and their hearts, men and their consciences together; and to make them acquainted the one with the other, who before liv'd, as it were, at a distance, and had little knowledge the one of the other.¹

Further on he adds the comment, "You your selves that hear me this day, cannot (at least a good part of you) but give testimony, and that in your own experience, of the truth and certainty of these things."²

In discussing the doctrine of the perseverance of the saints he appeals to his own personal experience. It also serves as a fair summary of his theological method.

That competent knowledge which God had given me, of the general course of the Scriptures, together with the experimental knowledge I had of mine own heart, the workings, reasonings, and debates thereof, seconded with that long observation which I had made of the spirits, principles, and ways of men in the world . . . in matters of religion, in conjunction with that light of reason and understanding, which I have in common with other men; these together were sufficient to teach me . . . what doctrines, what opinions are of the richest and most cordial sympathy and compliance with godliness³

1. John Goodwin, The Divine Authority of the Scriptures Asserted, 1648, pp. 116 f.

2. Ibid., p. 149.

3. John Goodwin, Redemption Redeemed, (edition of 1840), pp. 363 f.

B. The Nature of Truth

1. Its importance.-- John Goodwin thought that truth was of the greatest importance. It was the summum bonum. "There is no sight so lovely, and taking to the eyes of all ingenious and sincere hearts, as naked truth. . . ."1 For him truth was the link between God and man. It came from God. ". . . truth . . . being nothing else, interpretatively, but God himself, prepared of and by himself, for a beatifical union with the understanding, and from hence, with the heart and affections of men . . ."2 Truth was man's greatest blessing and highest calling. Man was made for truth.

Truth, or God issuing and streaming out his most excellent and incomprehensible nature and being, . . . is of the most natural, kindly, and sovereign accommodation for the understandings of men, and dependently hereupon, for their hearts and affections also, that can be imagined.³

Goodwin would have heartily endorsed the statement of Episcopus at the Synod of Dort, as reported by Hales.

"He gets a great victory that being conquered gains the truth. Amicus Socrates, amicus Plato, amica synodus, sed magis amica veritas."4

Since truth was of God, error was of Satan. Truth was the highest good; error the greatest evil. "The truth is, that error is the great troubler of the world; it is

1. John Goodwin, Certain brief Observations, 1644, p. 1.
 2. John Goodwin, Redemption Redeemed, (edition of 1840), p. 3.
 3. Ibid., p. 3.
 4. John Hales, Works, (Glasgow, 1765), Vol. III, p. 74, Letters.

that fountain of death that issueth and sendeth out all those bitter waters, and streams of sin and unrighteousness in every kind"¹ There was one thing that made error especially dangerous. It brought with it a sad retinue of evils, such as the obstruction of communion with God and a disposition to apostasy.² The evil and stubborn nature of error, and the beauty and divinity of truth made the exchange of error for truth a high moment in the life of any individual.

The principal task for the theologian and preacher was the discovery and spreading of truth, together with the combating of error. John Goodwin claimed that he engaged in the theological controversies reluctantly and only because of his deep devotion to truth.³ He was in the middle of most of the controversies of his age, not because he loved controversy, but because he loved truth.

2. The attainment of truth.-- The pursuit of truth was difficult and costly, Goodwin believed. Truth was neither obvious nor easily attained. "Truth is a jewel which lies out of sight, as it were, in the bowels of many reasons, men must search for it, that will find it out. . . ."⁴ This was especially true of spiritual truths. The long history of the difference in Christian theology was proof that theologians may bring forth error as well as truth

1. John Goodwin, Redemption Redeemed, (edition of 1840), p. 4.

2. Ibid., p. 7.

3. Ibid.

4. John Goodwin, Certain brief Observations, 1644, p. 1.

from the Scriptures, if they are not approached in the right manner.¹

The task was made more difficult by the nature and stubbornness of error. Error caters to the flesh while truth chastens the flesh. Therefore, it is painful to give up error in exchange for truth. It is easier to turn to the errors at hand, than to go through the costly process of seeking truth.² There are always customs and vested interests which are built on error. Most people prefer to remain in error rather than make the effort and adjustment required by forsaking error and following truth.

It is a matter of sad contemplation, to see what commotions, tumults, and combustions are presently raised in the minds of men upon the birth of any truth into the world, concerning which there is the least jealousy that, in case it should reign, it would rack them from their old customs: to see what hurrying up and down; what engaging of parties . . . what rambling over authors old and new; what incensing of Authority; what straining of wits and consciences; what slighting of solid arguments; what evading of substantial and clear interpretations of Scripture . . . what casting abroad of calumnies and reproaches; what misrepresentations of opinions; sayings, actions; what shiftings, blendings, what colourings, what disgracings, what persecution; what appealing to fire, sword, prisons, banishment, confiscation; and all to turn a beam of light and glory into darkness and shame - to keep a new-born truth from ruling over them.³

The entrenched, obstinate, and satanic character of error made the attainment of truth a trying and exacting

1. John Goodwin, An Exposition of The Ninth Chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, (edition of 1835), p. 2.

2. John Goodwin, The Divine Authority of the Scriptures Asserted, 1648, p. 3. epistle dedicatory.

3. John Goodwin. Innocency and Truth triumphing together, 1645, preface.

art, for "truth never gets up into her throne" until her enemy error, "is made her footstool."¹ When to this was added the elusive nature of truth, the strategy for arriving at truth took on great significance. Two influences led Goodwin to see the art of disputation as the best method for unseating error and establishing truth in its place. Training in disputation had an important place in the course of study at Cambridge while Goodwin was a student there.² The second influence in that direction were the writings of Jacobus Acontius. Goodwin wrote an introduction to the English Translation of Acontius' principal work, in which he stated that he knew of no author comparable to Acontius for "teaching that desirable and happy art" of combatting Satan, i.e., error.³ Many passages from Goodwin sound very much like Acontius. He must have used Acontius' book as a manual in the art and method of disputation. The theologian had to be skilled in the subtle dialectics of disputing, for theologizing was essentially an endless process of debating.

This approach to truth meant that Goodwin favored rational and peaceful means of attaining truth.

. . . Truth is not to be drawne out of the pit where she lieth hid, by a long line of calumnies,

1. John Goodwin, A Treatise of Justification, 1642, preface to the reader.

2. Cf., David Masson, The Life of John Milton, (Macmillan, 1859), Vol. I, pp. 232 f., and J. B. Mullinger, The University of Cambridge, (Cambridge: University Press, 1844), Vol. II, p. 414.

3. J. Acontius, Darkness Discovered, (2d. ed. 1651), epistle to reader.

reproaches, and personall aspersions upon him who is supposed to oppose her: but by the golden chaine of solid demonstrations, and close inferences from the Scriptures. The readiest way to over take her, is to follow after her in love.¹

Truth could not be coerced or dictated, it had to be won.

It meant that each person had to be his own theologian.

Goodwin was an individualist in his approach. He was skeptical of councils, assemblies and Synods. He points out, for example, that the revelations of the Old Testament came not to the Sanhedrin, but to individual men. Similarly the Reformation came not out of councils, but from "scattered and single starres."² In arguing for the usefulness of an English translation of the Bible, Goodwin pointed out that "A good and approved Translation in the hand of a plain, and yet considering man . . . serves him instead of a touchstone to try the Doctrine of his Teacher, whether it be gold and silver, or hee and stubble . . ."³ This individualistic, rationalistic approach to truth was important as a basis for Goodwin's demand for religious toleration.

The pursuit of truth was not only difficult, it was costly. Goodwin knew this from personal experience, for it had cost him his reputation, his popularity, and also his pulpit on two occasions. To him, however, truth was worth all the harsh statements, unfair accusations, and

1. John Goodwin, A Treatise of Justification, 1642, preface to the reader.

2. John Goodwin, Theomaxia, 1644.

3. John Goodwin, The Divine Authority of the Scriptures Asserted, 1648, p. 24.

frequent abuses that he received in its service.

. . . Truth delighteth little in the tongues or countenances of men, until she hath secured their judgments, and set up her Throne in their understandings. But this we can with all good assurance, inform thee, concerning her; that, well understood, she will bear any mans charges that shall travel with her through the world; though we must confess withal, that many times her company is very costly. But what she spends in silver, she repays in gold; and with the rubbidge and ruines of mens names, friends, and fortunes, in the World, builds up their Consciences with that peace, which passeth all understanding, and with that joy which is unspeakable, and full of glory.¹

3. The growth of truth. -- If arriving at a sound theology involved disputation between rival theologies, it meant an incessant debate, for truth is always growing. New truths are forever being discovered.

If so great and considerable a part of the world as America . . . was yet unknowne to all the world besides, for so many generations together: well may it be conceived, not only that some, but many truths, yea and those of maine concernment and importance, may be yet unborne, and not come forth out of their Mothers womb (I meane the secrets of the Scriptures) to see the light of the Sun²

The pursuit of truth is an eternal quest. ". . . the infinite and endlesse varietie of the riches and treasure of the Scriptures, and the unknown abyse of truth there,"³ is never exhausted.

Since truth is continually changing, the truths of today may become errors tomorrow, and the errors of today may be considered truths tomorrow. He used this principle

1. John Goodwin, The Agreement and Distance Of Brethren, (edition of 1671), epistle to the reader.

2. John Goodwin, A Treatise of Justification, 1642, preface.

3. Ibid.

to predict the future vindication of his own ideas.

. . . there are now many errors (erroneously so called) in the Christian World, which are made of the greatest and choicest truths: yea and which (doubtlesse) will be redeemed from their captivitie, and restored to their Thrones and Kingdomes, by the diligence, gifts and faithfulnessse of the approaching generation.¹

Goodwin applied it in his criticism of Puritan demands for orthodoxy.

. . . we swallow down many of those misprisions and mistakes in matter of Religion, which were found in our first Reformers, and teach them for Doctrines and Orthodox truths. As if it were not lawfull to thinke that there may be more light in the aire when the Sunne is risen in his might upon the earth, then there was at the first dawning and breaking of the day.²

Goodwin's view of truth was dynamic rather than static.

He was opposed to the orthodox view of theology as a body of fixed truths. The restlessness and continually changing character of his thought reflects this. At times it led him to the borders of skepticism.

4. The unity of truth.-- The progressive nature of truth did not mean that truth itself was imperfect. Only man's apprehension of it was imperfect. Truth was a perfect unity for it comes from God, and God was not an author of confusion but of order. The Bible and nature spoke the same truths.³ The visible and invisible worlds were in a "rational Correspondency" through their common origin in God.⁴ Likewise all theological truths had a logical

1. Ibid.

2. Ibid.

3. John Goodwin, A Being Filled With the Spirit, (edition of 1867), p. 478.

4. Ibid., p. 116.

coherence one with another. Goodwin was not a system builder, however, for his controversial situation led him to write on only a few points of theology.

This belief in the logical unity and coherence of truth had two implications in his thought. In the first place, it made him willing to expend great effort on small, subtle points of theology, as for example, the doctrine of imputed righteousness. He believed that the parts of theology were so interrelated that error anywhere was dangerous. This meant that errors usually travel in "tribes and families."¹ Secondly, the belief in the inter-relatedness and logical coherence of theology made him discontented with the paradoxes of Calvinism and helped in causing him to rebel against certain of its doctrines.

5. The triumph of truth.-- Goodwin had great faith in the ultimate triumph of truth. If given a chance truth would always triumph over error. ". . . it is the nature and property of Truth, having a convenient time allowed her for the exploit, to deal with errors, as Moses rod turn'd into a serpent, did by the rods of the Egyptian Inchanters, when it devoured them."² Truth may be unpopular and held only by a few, or even one individual, but it will eventually find a way to vindicate itself.

Truth may have many Reasons for her, though many times she hath but few friends. But Reasons, give

1. John Goodwin, A Treatise of Justification, 1642, preface.

2. John Goodwin, The Agreement and Distance of Brethren, (edition of 1671), epistle to the reader.

them time, will make friends, and the usurpation of error will cease from the judgements and understandings of men, when her nakednesse and filthinesse shall be discovered.¹

He believed that the truth of his own doctrines was no exception. He expected their triumph within the near future.

Notwithstanding we are full of this belief and expectation, that within the compass of a few years, if not sooner, there will be as great a change in the greatest part of the present Opposers of these our Doctrines, as there was in Paul, when the Churches of Judea heard this of him, "That he which persecuted us in times past, now preacheth the Faith which once he destroyed. . . ." (Gal.1:23.)²

This confidence in the continual growth and the self-vindicating character of truth caused Goodwin to view differences of opinion and even heresy with far less horror than did the Orthodox Calvinists. Goodwin saw the various opinions not as a threat to established truths, as did they, but as a ferment which might possibly lead to growth in the knowledge of God.

1. John Goodwin, A Treatise of Justification, 1642, part 1, p. 180.

2. John Goodwin, The Agreement and Distance of Brethren, (edition of 1671), epistle to the reader.

Chapter III

From

CALVINISM to ARMINIANISM

" . . . John Goodwin headed those, who first brought in Arminianism among the sectaries, for he was for liberty of all sorts." Bishop Burnet.

CHAPTER III

FROM CALVINISM TO ARMINIANISM

A. The Bases for Goodwin's Abandonment of Calvinism

1. Influences.-- The theology of Calvin reigned supreme in England during the early part of the seventeenth century. Anglican and Puritan alike held essentially the same Calvinist doctrinal truths.¹ There had been a few isolated individuals, such as Peter Baro and William Barrett who had dared raise their voices against the harshness of double predestination, but they were sternly and promptly rebuked. Barrett was forced to recant and Baro retired.² Such incidents only emphasized the dominant sway of Calvinism.³ In the period of Goodwin's residence at Cambridge (1612-1627), Calvinism had almost reached the height of its influence in England. Goodwin's comment upon his indoctrination with Calvinism at Cambridge was that he was "fed upon that bread which was commonly prepared by my brethren in the ministry for the people of the land, and children of God amongst them."⁴ The Calvinist theology was the one thing on which all groups within the church

1. Cf., A. Dakin, Calvinism, (Duckworth, 1940), pp. 66 f., and A. W. Harrison, Arminianism, (Duckworth, 1937), p. 122.

2. Cf., A. W. Harrison, op.cit., pp. 122 f.

3. The incident concerning Barrett led to the drawing up of the Lambeth Articles which were more rigidly Calvinist than the Thirty-nine Articles.

4. John Goodwin, Redemption Redeemed, (edition of 1840), p. 1.

were united.¹ The ruling monarch, James I, was a staunch Calvinist. The universities taught it as the true Protestant theology. When to this was added the triumph of Calvinism at the Synod of Dort, Arminianism seemed dead beyond resurrection. Yet, within a few years, Arminianism was to become the ruling theology, even if it were not the popular one, of the Church of England.²

Some of the same influences which were undermining the dogmatic basis of Calvinism must have had some effect on John Goodwin. His Puritanism would keep him from going the way of the Anglican Arminians. He was to travel a different route and arrive at a different kind of Arminianism. Nevertheless, he must have received the first leanings in that direction from the same influences which hastened the conversion of many of the Anglicans to an Arminian position.

One of these influences was the Synod of Dort. For this "momentous Arminian controversy was regarded by Englishmen as almost a domestic problem, and it aroused in England reactions and currents of thought which were to be

1. There was, of course, a difference between Anglicans and Puritans in their attitude toward Calvinism. The Anglicans accepted only the doctrinal system. The Puritans accepted Calvinism in toto, including doctrine, polity, discipline, and liturgy.

2. W. K. Jordan, The Development of Religious Toleration in England, (Allen and Unwin, 1936), Vol. II, p. 117: "The Anglo-Catholic party was never in our period more than an insignificant minority in the Church of England and would probably have had negligible influence within the Church had it not been for the fact that throughout the reign of Charles I they were in firm alliance with the Crown."

of the greatest importance."¹ Goodwin must have been especially interested in its proceedings, for the Master of Queen's College, John Davenant, was a delegate to the Synod.² Perhaps the events at Dort planted the first seeds of doubt in Goodwin's mind. John Hales probably was not the only Englishman who was led to say 'good-night to John Calvin' by what happened in the Calvinist-Arminian controversy in Holland. There were two aspects of Dort which must have influenced a man like John Goodwin as well as John Hales.

Goodwin, along with other Englishmen, learned for the first time, from the Synod of Dort that Calvinism had been seriously questioned by devout, sincere men. It must have made him aware of the existence of a reasonable alternative to the seemingly harsh doctrines of an ossified Calvinism.³ This alternative must have had no attraction for a man of Puritan convictions such as Goodwin, after it had become associated with the via media between Geneva and Rome followed by Anglican High-Churchmen. In an obvious reference to the dilemma caused by this situation, Goodwin wrote of this bread of Calvinism with which he had been fed:

. . . the reverend and high esteem I had of many of those who prepared it, and fed upon it themselves,

1. *Ibid.*, p. 320.

2. By his frequent references to the decisions and opinions expressed there, Goodwin displays an intimate knowledge of the proceedings of the Synod of Dort.

3. John Tulloch, Rational Theology and Christian Philosophy in England in the Seventeenth Century, (Edinburgh: William Blackwood, 1872), Vol. I, p. 25: "Arminianism became the special and formal outlet for all this mental uneasiness in Protestantism."

in conjunction with those harder thoughts which I was occasioned by some undue carriages in many of those who lived upon bread of another moulding . . . together with a raw and ill-digested conceit I had, that there was no better or less-offensive bread to be had from any hand whatsoever, prevailed upon me to content myself therewith for a long time, though not without some regret of discontentment also with it.¹

After Anglican Arminianism had been defeated by the Puritans, Arminianism must have become a more attractive alternative for Goodwin's restlessness under the yoke of Calvinism. It was possible now to be an Arminian without being a High-Churchman and a royalist. It was to take only an incident to lead him fully to accept this Arminian alternative. He could now abandon his Calvinist theology without abandoning his Puritanism.

Secondly, the extremity of some of the statements of the Calvinist majority at Dort must have disturbed the minds of many Englishmen who preferred a milder form of Calvinism. Even the English official representatives were critical of some of the statements.² The harsh treatment given the Remonstrants during and after the Synod must have had a similar effect. This might not have made much of an impression on the Anglican High-Churchmen who were just as uncompromising in their demand for uniformity,³ but a more

1. John Goodwin, Redemption Redeemed, (edition of 1840), p. 1.

2. A. W. Harrison, The Beginnings of Arminianism, (University of London Press, 1926), pp. 346 f. Also certain warnings about handling such fearful opinions sparingly and prudently, were issued by them in their report to the Synod, Cf. The Collegiat Suffrage of the Divines of Great Britiane, 1629.

3. A. W. Harrison, Arminianism, (Duckworth, 1937), p. 97: "The irony of the situation lay in the fact that while Remonstrant preachers were being hunted down in Holland, the English Puritans regarded that country as a harbour of refuge from the persecutions of James I."

tolerant person like Goodwin must have been repelled by it, as he was later by Puritan Calvinistic intolerance. With his rank individualism, Goodwin was, in any case, inherently suspicious of Synods. He wanted ". . . better evidence against a way, or opinion, than either vox populi, or vox Synodi, before I consent unto, or contribute any thing towards the suppression of either . . ." ¹ The methods and demands of rigid orthodox Calvinism, first in Holland, then in England, must have been an important factor in leading Goodwin out of Calvinism into the more tolerant pastures of Arminianism.

There were more subtle influences at work on Goodwin undermining his Calvinism. His familiarity with Chrysostom and other Greek Fathers, who ante-dated Augustine and his doctrine of predestination, must have placed doubts in his mind about the infallibility of Calvinism. Early in his career, Goodwin seems to have had a liking for these writings. He most probably became familiar with their works while at Cambridge.² Goodwin also developed a liking for certain humanist writers which further loosened the hold of Calvinism upon him. He seemed especially indebted to Acontius and Grotius, both of which breathed a different

1. John Goodwin, The Inexcusableness of that Grand Accusation of the Brethren, called Antapologia, 1646.

2. There is still at Queen's College a set of the works of Chrysostom that were there while Goodwin was in residence. This was one of the first of the Greek works to be printed in England. Douglas Bush, English Literature in the Earlier Seventeenth Century 1600-1660. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1945), p. 27.

spirit, if not an entirely different theology, from the orthodox Calvinists.¹

Within Puritan Calvinism itself there was a dynamic spirit and exuberant vitality that led many of its adherents to plunge into the seas of heterodoxy. There were those Puritans whose "very enthusiasm of spiritual feeling" made them question doctrines "which seemed so harsh and unchristian."² Other Puritans did not stop to consider the logic of their Calvinism, but carried Puritanism's practical implications and evangelistic zeal to such an extent that they left Calvinism behind.

Most of the more respectable would, of course, stop far short of any of the heresies, Arminian, antinomian, Arian or what not, which marked the way that led to deism, the religion of nature, democracy and all that followed thereafter. But their zeal for bringing souls to God made them lead the people no little distance on that way."³

John Goodwin was not the kind of man to stop short. He easily and naturally moved on beyond Calvinism.

There seems to be little doubt, but that Goodwin was from the beginning an uneasy Calvinist. In speaking

1. Jacobus Acontius, Dictionary of National Biography, 1885, Vol. I. Acontius "has been styled Arian, Socinian, and even Deist." Grotius is likewise difficult to classify, though not so heterodox as Acontius. W. K. Jordan, op.cit., Vol. II, pp. 344-348.

2. John Tulloch, op.cit., Vol. I, pp. 9 f.: "They felt there must be a flaw somewhere in a system which, however consecutive, terminated in such results. . . . It was inevitable, therefore, that a reaction . . . was all the more likely the more this doctrine had touched the national life of a people and become one of its mainsprings of action. The very stimulus which it thus gave to the religious and moral consciousness was sure in course of time to call forth opposition."

3. William Haller, The Rise of Puritanism, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1938), p. 172.

of his Calvinist diet on which he was fed, he wrote: ". . . I found it ever and anon gravelish in my mouth, and corroding and fretting in my bowels."¹ It took only time and the opportunity before he would make a complete break with Calvinism. The occasion came with an attack on Goodwin's orthodoxy by a former member of his church. This young man, Samuel Lane, accused Goodwin of preaching Arminianism.² Instead of a reply to Lane, Goodwin came out several years later with a full defense of Arminianism.³ These accusations had forced Goodwin to re-examine his own position and he discovered, to the surprise of few of his contemporaries, that he belonged in the Arminian rather than the Calvinist fold. It marked a definite change in Goodwin's life and thought.⁴

Thomas Jackson, Goodwin's biographer, looks on this event as a conversion to Arminianism and dates the conversion in 1650 when Goodwin wrote his Redemption Redeemed. It is true that this is the point at which Goodwin openly renounces Calvinism and freely acknowledges his Arminianism, but Jackson's position overlooks two

1. John Goodwin, Redemption Redeemed, (edition of 1840), p. 1.

2. Samuel Lane, A Vindication of Free-Grace, 1645.

3. John Goodwin, Redemption Redeemed, (edition of 1840), p. 2.

4. John Hunt, Religious Thought in England, (Strahan and Co., 1870), Vol. I, pp. 259 f. "It is hard for us to conceive how great a thing this was for a man in Goodwin's position. Arminianism had been identified with the ecclesiastical extravagance of Laud. Calvinism was regarded as the strength of Puritanism. Arminianism was another name for tyranny, and for all that was slavish and obsequious to the 'powers that be!'"

facts.¹ Goodwin first openly attacked the Calvinist doctrine of predestination two years earlier in his Divine Authority of the Scriptures Asserted.² Goodwin's conversion was really a gradual, and not a sudden one which could be pin-pointed on a certain date. In his challenge to Goodwin several years previously, Lane had stated: "it both hath been often acknowledged by a known member of Mr. Goodwin's Church that about seven years, he Preached the same matter, and that then diverse able divines of the City did affirm to Mr. Goodwin that he preached Arminianism."³

Goodwin's orthodoxy had been under suspicion from the very beginning of his ministry in London. In 1638 and 1639 Goodwin was reprimanded by the bishop of London for disturbing the peace of the church and "perplexing" people's minds by preaching "over-nice curiosities."⁴ By 1640 he had been attacked, in a book written against him, as a Socinian.⁵ When Goodwin entered the public arena of debate in the press at the beginning of the Puritan revolu-

1. John Wesley in the preface to his edition of John Goodwin's Treatise of Justification, (1763), refers to him as a "firm and zealous Calvinist" at the time. Jordan is more accurate in referring to Goodwin as having "proceeded gradually from Calvinistic orthodoxy to an essentially Arminian position." He uses the date of 1647 as about the time when "Goodwin threw off the somewhat tattered mantle of Calvinistic respectability to explore heroically the vast seas of doctrinal heterodoxy."
W. K. Jordan, op.cit., Vol. III, p. 402.

2. John Goodwin, The Divine Authority of the Scriptures Asserted, 1648, pp. 169, 201.

3. Samuel Lane, op.cit., preface.

4. William Laud, The Works of William Laud, Edited in the Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology, 1853, Vol. V, pp. 356, 362.

5. George Walker, Socinianisme, 1640.

tion, the tempo of attack and the assortment of epithets thrown at him increased. In the year 1646, the arch-defender of Presbyterian orthodoxy, Thomas Edwards, heaped upon him an impressive and slanderous list of heresies. "There is Cretensis, alias Master John Goodwin, a monstrous Sectary, a compound of Socinianisme, Arminianisme, Libertinisme, Antinomianisme, Independency, Popery, yea and of Scepticisme, as holding some opinions proper to each of these."¹ To show that he was not alone in this judgment Edwards added this comment of another "learned divine."

. . . A Reverend and learned Divine of another Kingdome, hearing him pray and preach, gave this judgement of him before he turned Independent, that he had hereticum ingenium, his genius seemed to be for Error, and as some men discover a naturall inclination, and a disposition to one evill more then another, some to theft, being given more to stealing, some to lying; so is Master Goodwin to Heresie and Error, seems to be made for a Heretick.²

Goodwin's position in his first theological debate reflected a tendency toward an Arminian position. The doctrine of imputed righteousness was not one of the five points of the Arminian-Calvinist controversy, but it was closely associated with it. The rejection of the imputation of Christ's righteousness, as was Goodwin's case, was generally from an Arminian viewpoint.³ When he was challenged in the matter, Goodwin likewise defended the

1. Thomas Edwards, Gangraena, 1646, part III, p. 114.

2. Ibid., p. 115.

3. R. S. Franks, "Imputation", Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, ed. James Hastings, 1914, Vol. VII. William Cunningham, Historical Theology, (3rd ed., Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1870), Vol. II, p. 49.

doctrine of universal redemption. This marked only the final stage on his pilgrimage from Calvinism to Arminianism.

2. Calvinism gave a distorted conception of God. --

It is significant that the starting point for Goodwin's opposition to the central Calvinist doctrine of double predestination was not the assertion of man's freedom, but the affirmation of God's love, grace, and mercy. To him this doctrine was "most unworthy the most excellent nature of God, and at manifest defiance with sundry his greatest Attributes and Perfection; as, viz. Wisdom, Holiness, Mercy, Justice, &c."¹ This is brought out clearly in his first statement rejecting this doctrine. As was commonly his practice, he uses a parable to set forth his position. It is worth quoting at length.

As if a King having caus'd a mans leggs to be cut of . . . yet if he should urge, presse and perswade such a man as this . . . to runne a race with those that have their limbs, and are swift of foot, and should promise him, with many expressions of love, exceeding great rewards, if he would . . . come as soon to the goal, as they that runne with him; this would be a carriage favouring more of a bloody and unmanlike insolencie over this poor wretch in his misery, then of any reall affection, grace or respect towards him, or of any desire of his good: in like manner to conceive that God applieth himself with such moving and melting expressions of mercy, tenderness of bowels, love, grace, bounty, &c. towards his creature, man, as the Scripture from place to place emphatically asserts that he doth . . . promising unto them life, and glory, and the great things of the world to come, if they will beleove, repent and turn unto him; and yet to suppose withall, that these men, to whom he maketh these rich and sweet applications of himself, are wholly destitute of all power to doe what he requires of them . . . is to represent the

1. John Goodwin, The Agreement and Distance of Brethren, (edition of 1671), p. 6.

glorious God in his greatest expressions of mercy and grace, and love unto the world, rather as laughing the world to scorn in that great misery wherein it is plunged, then as a God any waies truly desirous, or intending to relieve it. . . .¹

It is not the injustice done to human nature in this doctrine that moves Goodwin, in the first instance, to reject it. It is rather the distortion of the character of God in his relationship to man that leads him to oppose it.² He wrote against those who "imagine that they see such a face of God as this, presenting it self in the glasse of the Gospel."³ Goodwin thought the Calvinists made of God a hypocrite and tyrant.⁴

Goodwin does not stress the limits of God's dealings with man, in his method of saving men. He believes God's way is one of reconciliation and love. ". . . his method and designe was, first, to slay that enmity in their natures against him, to reduce them to terms of friendship and love" ⁵ One of Goodwin's favorite texts in

1. John Goodwin, The Divine Authority of the Scriptures Asserted, 1648, p. 169.

2. Frederick Platt, "Arminianism", Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, ed. James Hastings, 1908, Vol. I, lists as one of the two bases of Arminian opposition to Calvinism, "The restless and dominant demand for equity in the Divine procedure It contended, therefore, that moral principles and laws consistently condition the manward activities of the Divine will"

3. John Goodwin, The Divine Authority of the Scriptures Asserted, 1648, p. 169.

4. Arminius made the same criticism. ". . . it imputes hypocrisy to God, as if, in His exhortation to faith addressed to such, He requires them to believe in Christ, whom, however, He had not set forth as a Saviour to them, the savour of life unto life. . . but as the savour of death unto death, a stone of offence, for a cause and a sign which may be spoken against." James Arminius, Works, Translated by William Nichols, (Thomas Baker, 1875), Vol. III, p. 313.

5. John Goodwin, The Divine Authority of the Scriptures Asserted, 1648, p. 198.

this regard was, " . . . God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself . . ." (II Cor. 5:19). He thought of God's approach to man as a ruler offering a treaty rather than as a sovereign exercising his absolute rule over his subjects, which Calvinism seemed to say.

Now God having thus put himself, as it were, in Christ, thus prepared and wrought for his designe. . . in him he comes forth, invites the world to a treaty, and offers rich and gracious terms of love and peace, which are most effectually and likely to take the world off from their hatred and enmity against him, and to bring men over unto him in love. . . . by proposing and promising unto them a free pardon of all their sinnes . . . as purchased by Christ, ready for them, if they will love him, and disavow and abandon, that sinfulness in their hearts and lives, which are enmity to him.¹

Goodwin thought the Calvinist doctrines made of God a heartless tyrant, whereas he was in reality a loving ruler interested in offering peace to his rebellious subjects.

Goodwin was not so much concerned to limit the sovereignty of God as to relate it to God's love and righteousness. God is the sovereign ruler over his creation, but he rules in mercy and goodness.

Though it be not to be denied, but that God hath an absolute sovereignty and lordship over his creature . . . yet it is an horrible indignity and affront put upon him, and no less than a constructive denial of his infinite grace, goodness, mercy, bounty, love, &c., to affirm that he exerciseth or administereth this sovereignty and power upon the hardest terms, and most grievous unto his creature that can lightly be imagined, . . . which, notwithstanding, they affirm, in effect, who maintain that from eternity he left, or purposed to leave, the far greatest part of his most excellent creatures, men, to everlasting misery and ruin, without any possibility of making an escape

1. Ibid., pp. 198 f.

therefrom.¹

Goodwin never questioned the omnipotence of God. He only believed it to be limited by other attributes of God. This meant for him, that God's power is not absolute. It is not in God's power "to lie, deceive, oppress, or do any other thing most unworthy of him."² With his rationalistic bent, Goodwin gave an especially large place to God's wisdom in limiting his power. "For he that is omnipotent must needs be omniprudent also; and he that is omniprudent cannot do any thing in the least degree repugnant to the most rigid and strict principles of the most perfect wisdom and prudence that is."³ An important application of this was made by him to limit God in his relations with man.

. . . it being contrary to the law and rules of true wisdom, or of that infinite wisdom which rules in God, for him to act [towards] his creatures, at least ordinarily, in opposition to those natural and essential properties and principles which himself hath planted in them⁴

In regard to salvation, it means that even in the miraculous conversions God's grace is not coercive. God's power is restrained by his wisdom in such a way that he does not take

1. John Goodwin, Redemption Redeemed, (edition of 1840), p. 124. In a similar vein, Arminius wrote: "... It is quite true that God presides over the whole world and all things created by Himself, and that He administers and governs all things and every thing: yet not only in justice, but also in mercy, inasmuch as He of His infinite wisdom knows what place ought to be assigned to the two." James Arminius, Works, Translated by William Nichols, (Thomas Baker, 1875), Vol. III, p. 272.

2. John Goodwin, Redemption Redeemed, (edition of 1840), p. 555.

3. Ibid., p. 555.

4. Ibid., p. 556.

away man's power to receive or reject his grace.

. . . the utmost line or extent of the liberty or power of God is to proceed no further with men, nor with any man, at any time, in the vouchsafement of grace or means of grace . . . than to leave them a power at least, or possibility, of rejecting the grace offered unto them, and so to ruin and destroy themselves.¹

Finally, in discussing God's wisdom, Goodwin warns of man's limits in trying to understand God's ways. As a reminder he quotes the poignant words of Paul, "O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! how unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out!" (Romans 11:33)

He wanted to bring into proper balance the different attributes of God from the one-sided emphases of Calvinism. To him, those who taught the doctrine of predestination turned "the glory of the abundant grace, love, sweetness and bounty of God, expressed in the Scriptures towards men, into the similitude of the most unnaturall, unreasonable, unconscionable cruelty and blood-thirstinesse of a tyrant. . ."² It even reflected on God's glory:

For what relish or savour of honour or glory unto God can there be, in bringing him upon the great theatre of the world; speaking thus, I will cast out of my favour and devote to everlasting burnings, to torments endless, caseless, intolerable, insupportable, thousand thousands, and ten thousand times ten thousands of my most excellent creatures, men, women, and children . . . without all possibility of escaping, though they shall do the uttermost they are able to please me, and to reconcile themselves unto me. . . .³

1. Ibid.

2. John Goodwin, The Yongling Elder, or Novice-Presbyter, 1648, p. 9.

3. John Goodwin, Redemption Redeemed, (edition of 1840), p. 122.

In opposing Calvinism, he felt that he was rescuing the true Biblical idea of God from those who "bring forth a strange God and a strange Christ. . . ."1

3. Calvinism made void the Gospel. -- If Calvinism brought forth a "strange God", it produced also an empty Gospel. In his parable of the unjust King, Goodwin displays this concern not to make of the Gospel a hollow mockery. As a preacher he wanted to emphasize God's offer as well as God's gift. There were three foci to the Gospel -- repentance, faith and godliness. Repentance in communion with faith justifies, i.e., brings us remission of our sins through the atoning sacrifice of Christ. Just as repentance must be followed by faith, so justification must be followed by sanctification. Good works or godliness must testify to one's faith. Goodwin felt that Calvinism threatened God's plan for man's salvation. It worked at cross purposes to the Gospel at every point.

Goodwin was concerned about the question which has bothered other evangelistic preachers. How can you preach the demand to repent and believe if the hearer really has no choice in the matter?² Goodwin's criticism of Calvinism is that if you make salvation and reprobation a matter of eternal foreordination, you vitiate the message of the

1. Ibid., p. xi, epistle dedicatory.

2. Most Puritan preachers ignored this dilemma and preached as if everyone could be saved if they believed. William Haller, op.cit., p. 178, and S. E. Morrison, The Puritan Pronaos, (New York: New York University Press, 1936), p. 10.

Gospel. When the individual's fate is foreordained by an eternal, immutable decree of God, he has no need of the Gospel. The elect would be saved in any case, and the reprobate damned regardless of the preaching of the Gospel.

. . . Reprobation clearly overthrows the very foundation . . . of the Gospel, breaks the very heart and soul of it. For we cannot understand how God can fairly, or with simplicity of Truth, say unto all and every person of mankind respectively, 'If thou believest thou shalt be saved', in case it be supposed that any of them lie under a peremptory and irreversible Decree of Reprobation. For if so, impossible it is that they should be saved, yea, though they should believe.¹

In dealing with the reprobate in such a fashion, God would be using his Gospel as men "lay scraps for birds or bait hooks for fishes, which they do for none other end but to take and destroy them."² The Gospel of Christ would not be good news, but vain and empty promises. It would have no appeal to men. "It presents the Gospel unto men like a lottery, wherein there are many blanks, but few prizes: in which respect, sober and considering men refuse to adventure their money upon it."³

If faith and repentance were the double gates that led to salvation, the narrow way the Christian had to follow to enter the Kingdom of God was godliness.⁴ Goodwin never

1. John Goodwin, The Agreement and Distance of Brethren, (edition of 1671), p. 13.

2. John Goodwin, Redemption Redeemed, (edition of 1840), p. 535.

3. John Goodwin, The Agreement and Distance of Brethren, (edition of 1671), p. 14.

4. Godliness even played a part in repentance and faith. John Goodwin, The Banner of Justification Displayed, (Baynes and Son, edition of 1835), p. 420: "But he doth not justify them, or make them righteous, by the forgiveness of their sins whilst they remain ungodly; but upon

tired of calling the Gospel a 'doctrine according to godliness.' It weighed heavily with him that several of the Calvinist doctrines tended to discourage godliness. He thought Calvinism could easily lead to antinomianism.¹ It was this fear that moved him to oppose so strongly the doctrines of imputed righteousness and the perseverance of the saints. Goodwin may have had an optimistic view of human reason, but he had a pessimistic attitude toward the world, the flesh, and the devil. Like all Puritans he saw life as a constant warfare against these bitter enemies. Men have to be continually prodded by the threats of eternal judgment and punishment, and, at the same time, encouraged by the hope of salvation. Without these incentives man falls prey to the lustings of the flesh, the strategies of the devil, or the temptations of the world.

The doctrine of eternal election, he felt, destroyed the incentive to be godly. It made salvation completely independent of a man's own efforts and conduct. It seemed to eliminate the necessity for working out your own salvation in fear and trembling.

the alteration and change of the sinful frame of their hearts by believing, he confers this justification upon them, namely, the forgiveness of their sins." But Goodwin was careful to make faith, not works, the key to salvation. Ibid., p. 409: "That faith justifieth is the constant assertion of the Scripture, and the architectonical doctrine of the Gospel." He criticised his Calvinist opponents on the doctrine of justification for confusing the covenant of works with the covenant of grace. Cf., John Goodwin, A Treatise of Justification, 1642, p. 145.

1. John Goodwin, The Divine Authority of the Scriptures Asserted, 1648, p. 197.

We judge such an Election, to be an open Enemy unto Godliness. . . . such a notion as this planted in the Judgements and Souls of men . . . must needs make men very remiss, loose, and indifferent in the service of God. For who will strain and toyl himself in running for such a prise, which he knows he shall as certainly obtain, by going an easie, soft, and ordinary pace?¹

Goodwin had similar doubts about the doctrine of eternal reprobation. He thought it caused the ungodly to see no hope or necessity for them to be godly. There would be no motive for their wanting to improve themselves. They would think it was useless and impossible anyhow. ". . . it is apt to cast a snare of fear upon them that they are Re-probated, and consequently, that it is in vain for them to seek reconciliation with God, or live holily."²

He is even more emphatic in regard to the ill effects of the doctrine of the perseverance of the saints. It lulls men into a false sense of security and makes them careless and negligent about their conduct.

. . . to affirm that true believers can by no commission of sin or sins whatsoever, how vile, horrid, abominable soever . . . either make shipwreck of their faith, or fall away from the grace and favour of God so as to perish, what is it but to provoke the flesh to an outrageousness in sinning, and to encourage that which remains of the old man in them to bestir itself in all ways of unrighteousness?³

Since the Gospel lost its efficacy through the doctrines of Calvinism, it would also mean the denying of the usefulness of the ministry. This was important to Goodwin for he had a characteristically Puritan and, therefore, high

1. John Goodwin, The Agreement and Distance of Brethren, (edition of 1671), p. 5.

2. Ibid., p. 14.

3. John Goodwin, Redemption Redeemed, (edition of 1840), p. 427.

conception of the ministry.

. . . the ministry and preaching of the Gospel, is the great standing ordinance of heaven for the translating of men and women from death to life: for the conveying and carrying them over that great lake or gulf, which lieth between an estate of sin and unbelief on the one hand, and a condition of peace and blessednesse, on the other. . . .¹

The doctrines of the Calvinists if followed to their logical conclusions seemed to him to deny the ministry of the Gospel the rightful place it should have. The minister's effectiveness would be crippled by having to preach a limited and irrelevant Gospel. Goodwin thought the Calvinist beliefs made the minister's task "vain, impertinent and void." It transformed the "exhortation, threatenings and promises" of the Scriptures into "empty and weightless" words.² As a staunch Puritan, Goodwin was opposed to anything that would reflect on the great importance of the ministry.

4. Calvinism destroyed man's responsibility. --

Goodwin was concerned to show that man was without excuse in his own damnation, and not that he was without help in his own salvation. He wanted to affirm man's complete responsibility for being lost, and not his complete responsibility in being saved.³ Goodwin never held the

1. John Goodwin, The Divine Authority of the Scriptures Asserted, 1648, pp. 350 f.

2. John Goodwin, Redemption Redeemed, (edition of 1840), pp. 402 ff.

3. Frederick Platt, "Arminianism", Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, ed. James Hastings, (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1908), Vol. I.: "The task undertaken by Arminius was to re-state what was regarded as the primitive and Scriptural view, held by the Church before Augustine, concerning the relation between God and man in the work of salvation; and in this view the sole responsibility of man for his own damnation was evident."

latter. Above all he wanted to place the responsibility for unbelief on man rather than on God.¹ Romans 1:20 was one of his favorite texts.²

Goodwin believed that literally no man was without excuse in regard to his own salvation. God has clearly revealed his willingness to give full pardon to men for their sins, through Christ's sacrifice, to all who will accept it.³ For those who do not have the opportunity of hearing the words of the Gospel, he reveals through his providence in the natural course of the heavens and the earth this willingness, to forgive and receive in grace those who are led to repent.⁴ In addition, God has made man in his own image,⁵ and endowed him with those faculties

1. Goodwin seems to have been in the main stream of Arminianism in his reasons for opposing Calvinism. Principal Cunningham pointed out the real objections to Calvinism "derived from its alleged inconsistency, -- first, with the holiness, justice, and goodness of God; and, secondly, with men's responsibility for all their acts of disobedience or transgression of God's law, including their refusal to repent and believe the gospel, and being thus the true authors and causes of their own destruction,-- the second of these objections being, in substance, just the same as that which is founded upon the commands, invitations, and exhortations addressed to men in Scripture. William Cunningham, op.cit., pp. 478 f.

2. "For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse." A.V. Other Puritan preachers quoted this text, but they refused to go so far in following its implications as did Goodwin. Cf., William Haller, op.cit., p. 170 f.

3. John Goodwin, The Divine Authority of the Scriptures Asserted, 1648, pp. 198 f.

4. John Goodwin, The Pagans Debt and Dowry, (edition of 1671), p. 13.

5. John Goodwin, A Being Filled with the Spirit, (edition of 1867), p. 101.

of reason and understanding which make it possible for him to receive the Gospel.

. . . if God should not make men capable of believing, I mean, induce men with such principles, abilities, or gifts, of reason, judgement, memory, understanding, by the diligent improvement whereof they might come to be convinced, of a willingness or readiness in him to receive them into grace and favour, upon their repentance and turning unto him . . . they which are condemned would have their mouths open against Gods proceedings with them thereunto, and furnished with an excuse.¹

Any man, therefore, who perishes does so because of his own failure to repent and believe, and not because God irrevocably decreed his reprobation from eternity. Goodwin's view was that Calvinism made God, not man, responsible for man's sin and damnation.²

If man had the full responsibility for his own damnation, he had, at least, partial responsibility for his own salvation. Man had to make a response to the Gospel if he was to be saved. He had to repent of his sins, have faith in God's love through Christ, and he must pursue godliness. In each of these God takes the initiative, but man must make the response with God's help. Thus, in a sense, man was partly responsible for his salvation. Goodwin felt that Calvinism destroyed man's role in salvation, as well as in damnation, by making God wholly responsible for it. The Calvinist doctrines gave man an excuse on the

1. John Goodwin, The Divine Authority of the Scriptures Asserted, 1648, p. 200.

2. Cf., James Arminius, Works, Translated by William Nichols, (Thomas Baker, 1875), Vol. III, p. 281: "For that sentiment is in antagonism to the justice of God, as making God the author of sin, and inferring the inevitable necessity of sin."

one hand, and took away his incentive on the other. If the individual had no part to play in the great drama of salvation as it continued to be played on the stage of history through the centuries, then he was merely a spectator and had nothing to do. He could only wait and hope that he would be one of the chosen few who shared in the victory won there. As an evangelist and an activist, Goodwin was opposed to these seeming implications of the Calvinistic creed. He was more concerned to stress man's responsibility to choose the way he went, than to affirm his freedom of choice.

This does not mean that Goodwin makes man the author of his own salvation. He is careful to emphasize God as the author of salvation; "God is the first and great Father and Founder of that blessed estate into which a sinner is translated by believing, and which the Scripture commonly terms justification."¹ God maintains the initiative in every step. It was his willingness that prompted his efforts to reconcile man. It was his plan in Christ which he uses to reconcile man. It is through His Spirit working in us that man is able to become reconciled to God.² Yet, it is all conditional as far as the individual is concerned. There is "this reservation or proviso, that the actual communication of the said benefit or grace unto particular persons of years capable of believing should be suspended until it should be desired by them. . . ." ³ It is

1. John Goodwin, The Banner of Justification Displayed, (Baynes and Son, edition of 1835), p. 382.

2. Ibid., pp. 282-284.

3. John Goodwin, An Exposition of the Ninth Chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, (Baynes and Son, edition of 1835), p. 136.

conditional upon man's response.

B. The Nature of Goodwin's Arminianism

1. Evangelical Arminianism or a via media. -- Arminianism has usually been characterized as a revolt against the harshness of Calvinism.¹ We have seen that this element was present in Goodwin's leaving Calvinism for Arminianism. But this was only the negative side. Just as Protestantism was more than a mere protest against Roman Catholicism and Puritanism something larger than a protest against Anglican practices, Arminianism was broader than a protest against Calvinist excesses. Sometimes, it degenerated into only a negative criticism. At other times, it was more constructive in its approach. Arminianism, especially in its more evangelical form, can also be viewed as a via media between Calvinism and Socinianism, or Calvinism and Pelagianism.² It was, at its best moments, a mediating system.

Goodwin can best be classified as an evangelical Arminian. He sought to chart a middle course between Calvinism and Socinianism.³ It is interesting, and perhaps

1. Cf., A. W. Harrison, Arminianism, (Duckworth, 1937), preface, and John Tulloch, op.cit., p. 25.

2. Frederick Platt, "Arminianism", Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, ed. James Hastings, (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1908), Vol. I, and William Cunningham, op.cit., Vol. II, p. 510.

3. Goodwin was not, however, consciously striving to find a via media between Calvinism and Socinianism. He merely tried to move from what he regarded as the extreme position of Calvinism to a firm, middle ground, in such a way as to avoid the opposite extremes of Socinianism and Pelagianism. Calvinism was his starting point and continual point of reference.

significant, that a young member of Goodwin's Church who used to take down his sermons in shorthand, later became one of the leading Socinians in England.¹ Goodwin, at least, moved far enough in that direction to have the charge of Socinianism repeatedly brought against him.² The charge was unjust, however. Goodwin defended the necessity of the atonement, the divinity of Christ, and the Godhead of the Holy Spirit. He also attacked John Biddle, a contemporary Socinian, for "enormous and hideous notions about the nature of God."³ A historian of Socinianism comments:

Goodwin's advanced views, his radical outlook, were typical of a movement parallel with Socinianism and not uninfluenced by it. That he was actually a Socinian in doctrine is not true. . . .⁴

While moving in the direction of the Socinian position, Goodwin strove to keep in the center of the Christian tradition. He felt that he held all of the orthodox doctrines except those that were peculiar to Calvinism. Even here, it was his conviction that he was restoring the orthodox Christian beliefs, as opposed to the corruptions and distortions of Calvinism. He defends his view as not having been "rejected or cast out of the church by any council or synod reputed orthodox, at least until the late Synod of

1. H. J. McLachlan, Socinianism in Seventeenth Century England, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1951), p. 52.

2. As has been noted, in the first book written against him, Goodwin was accused of Socinianism. George Walker, op.cit.

3. John Goodwin, A Fresh Discovery Of The High-Presbyterian Spirit, 1654, p. 9.

4. H. J. McLachlan, op.cit., p. 51.

Dort, but were constantly taught by all orthodox antiquity, are at this day more generally taught by the Lutheran party of the reformed churches. . . ."¹ To give him an even greater claim on orthodoxy he adds, "yea, and have many full and clear testimonies of their truth from the pen of Calvin himself, and many others that are counted pillars on his side."² Goodwin accepted the Puritan idea of God's plan of human redemption. It was only in regard to the application and appropriation of that plan that Goodwin disagreed with his more Calvinistic Puritan brethren. He never questioned the necessity for the grace, and the work of the Holy Spirit in man's salvation. It was the Calvinist interpretation of these doctrines which he opposed. Even in the five traditional points of controversy, Goodwin was willing to go at least two-thirds of the way with the Calvinists. This is brought out clearly in The Agreement and Distance of Brethren, (1652), published by Goodwin and his congregation to show their position in regard to the five points of Arminianism. Here it can be seen that the area of agreement with the Calvinists is large and the distance between them not so great.

Goodwin's position in regard to the atonement is typical. He seeks to avoid the Calvinist view which limited the atonement to the elect, on the one side, and the Socinian position which denied the necessity for the atonement.

1. John Goodwin, Redemption Redeemed, (edition of 1840), p. 34.
2. Ibid.

In discussing the atonement, Goodwin and his church find six points of agreement with their Calvinist brethren. They dissent in three others. Among those points in which they feel there is basic agreement are: that Christ died for the sins of men; that whosoever believeth in Christ shall not perish; and that forgiveness of sins and salvation through Christ's death are to be preached to all men.¹ The main point of disagreement is the limiting of Christ's atonement to the elect only.²

The via media which Goodwin took was the Arminian view of universal redemption. He rejected the Calvinist view of the atonement as, in effect, denying the necessity for the atonement for the elect,³ and casting a shadow on the efficacy and value of Christ's death by eliminating the reprobate from its benefits.⁴ This Calvinist restriction on the nature of the atonement also seemed objectionable to some Puritans who thought as Goodwin did, that it would make more difficult the preaching of the Gospel to everyone.⁵

1. John Goodwin, The Agreement and Distance of Brethren, (edition of 1671), p. 30.

2. Ibid., p. 31.

3. John Goodwin, Redemption Redeemed, (edition of 1840), p. 600.

4. Ibid., p. 604: "For they who deny that God intendeth the salvation of all men by Christ, represent him to the generality of men upon no better terms of comparison, than of a flint to him that wanteth water, and of thorns to him whose soul lusteth after grapes." In these two points Goodwin is following the usual Arminian argument. Cf., The Confession or Declaration of the Ministers or Pastors which in the United Provinces are called Remonstrants, 1676, pp. 136 f.

5. Among them were John Davenant and Richard Baxter. Representative of this view, also, was Thomas Lamb, who, while attacking Goodwin on his view of the perseverance of the saints, confessed, "It cannot but be truth, that Christ died for the sins of all and every man, as a ground for

However, most Puritans and the Westminster Assembly,¹ held the stricter view of the atonement limited to the elect.

In regard to the doctrines of election and reprobation, Goodwin represents a middle position between the Calvinist affirmation of predestination and the Socinian denial of divine foreknowledge. As at all other points, he begins with the Calvinist position. Goodwin says he is one with the Calvinists in affirming the basis in Scripture of election and reprobation, also as to their eternal, immutable character, and their application in time to individuals.² The main place of dissent centers around the question as to whether the individual's election is predestined from eternity.³ The Calvinist interpreted election and reprobation in terms of double predestination. Goodwin felt that was carrying it beyond the Scriptural meaning and grounds.

The crucial issue in the predestination controversy was the question of the decrees of God. The Calvinists held that God ordained or decreed from eternity everything that comes to pass, including the election of certain

preaching glad tidings to all and every man, . . . as a ground to conclude unbelief a sin in every man; this Gospel-truth I have preached and disputed for a long time, and been a great sufferer in witness thereof, and do still look upon it as such a glorious Truth as ought to be countenanced and encouraged. . . ." Thomas Lamb, Absolute freedom from sin by Christ's Death for the World, 1656, foreword.

1. The Westminster Confession, Chap. VIII, sect. 6.

2. John Goodwin, The Agreement and Distance of Brethren, (edition of 1671), pp. 1 f.

3. Ibid., pp. 2 f.

individuals and the reprobation of the rest of humanity.¹ Goodwin followed the general Arminian position in saying that God's eternal decrees had to do with certain conditions for salvation rather than with certain individuals.² With the Calvinist and against the Socinian, he said that God foresaw who would be saved. With the Socinian and against the Calvinist, he denied that God fore-ordained who would be saved.

The Calvinist doctrine of double predestination also meant that the destruction of the greater part of mankind was foreordained of God. It was this doctrine of eternal reprobation that offended those outside of Calvinism more than that of election. Some of the more sensitive Puritans sought to soften the harshness of this particular doctrine.³ The most conspicuous example was Richard Baxter.

1. The Westminster Confession, Chap. III, sect. 1, 3. and The Articles of the Synod of Dort, Chap. I, art. 6. Goodwin taunts the Calvinists about "irreconcilable divisions" amongst themselves on the matter of the decrees and lists ten different positions found among them. Cf. John Goodwin, The Agreement and Distance of Brethren, (edition of 1671), pp. 23 f.

2. John Goodwin, Redemption Redeemed, (edition of 1840), p. 120. Cf. The Confession or Declaration of the . . . Remonstrants, 1676, pp. 139 ff.

3. This frequent questioning of the doctrine of reprobation is reflected in John Owen's comment in the preface to an edition of William Twisse's defence of the doctrine: "Of All those weighty parcells of Gospell truth, which the Arminians have chosen to oppose, there is not any about which they so much delight to try and exercise the strength of fleshly reasonings, as that of Gods eternall decree of Reprobation: partly because the Scripture doth not so abound in the delivery of this Doctrine, as of some others . . . and partly because they apprehend the Truth thereof, to be more exposed to the riotous opposition of mens tumultuating carnall Affections, whose help and assistance they by all means court and sollicite in their contests against it." William Twisse, The Riches of Gods Love, 1653.

His position was practically the same as Goodwin's. He said that God foresaw, but did not fore-ordain the unbelief of the reprobate.

In considering the grace of God and man's salvation, Goodwin likewise sought middle ground.¹ The Calvinist attributed man's salvation wholly to the grace of God. The Socinian made it entirely a matter of man's effort. Goodwin followed the Arminian in holding God and man jointly responsible for man's salvation. When comparing his own position to that of the Calvinists, Goodwin lists no fewer than fourteen points of agreement between him and his opponents.² He opposes the belief that the grace of God is the author of salvation both in its plan and in its application. Conversion and belief, justification and sanctification are primarily due to the free grace of God. The point of disagreement between Goodwin and the Calvinists was their view that the free grace of God was limited to the elect and irresistible in bringing about the conversion of man. In opposition to the former, Goodwin set forth

1. J. Stoughton, History of Religion in England, (Hodder and Stoughton, 1881), Vol. IV, pp. 373 f.: "John Goodwin's object was, whilst magnifying the grace of God, to preserve what is demanded by the personality, the free agency, and the responsibility of man. He so clearly explains his opinion and so carefully fences it round, he so distinctly asserts the Divine origin of salvation in every individual, and so vigilantly repels every idea of indigenous rectitude in human nature, suffering from the fall, that no one can charge his creed with any Pelagian or even semi-Pelagian taint."

2. John Goodwin, The Agreement and Distance of Brethren, (edition of 1671), pp. 49-52.

the Arminian doctrine of universal grace.¹ The irresistibility of God's grace he denied and replaced with the idea of sufficient grace for man for salvation, but which did not necessitate men to believe.² Goodwin often used the parable of the talents to illustrate man's ability to use the gifts of the grace of God and the Holy Spirit to attain God's approval.³

Goodwin tried to steer a middle course in regard to the power of man in relation to his salvation. He sought to avoid the extreme pessimism of the Calvinist position, while avoiding the extreme optimism of the Socinians. He agreed essentially with the Calvinists as to the disastrous consequences of the Fall, but held that the second Adam restored the grace of God to every man. He had a sober view of the capabilities of natural man.

. . . notwithstanding this restoration or healing of the natural condition of man by the free grace of God, yet there is not one of a thousand, possibly not one throughout the whole world, but so far corrupts himself with the lusts of the flesh, and ways of the world, that without a second relief from the free grace of God, as, viz. in his patience and long-suffering towards him, ever comes to repent or believe. . . .⁴

1. John Goodwin, The Remedy of Unreasonableness, 1650, pp. 7 f.: "Concerning the extent of this grace, my doctrine hath not been; that it is not imprisoned or confined within the narrow compass of a handful of men; but that, like the sun in the firmament of heaven, it compasseth the whole earth from one end to the other, and stretcheth itself unto all men That it is exceeding full and comprehensive."

2. Ibid.

3. John Goodwin, The Pagans Debt and Dowry, (edition of 1671), pp. 25 f.

4. John Goodwin, Redemption Redeemed, (edition of 1840), p. 33.

Goodwin even held the possibility of the corruption of reason.

Reason and understanding, even of the greatest advance in men, will serve men for other ends and purposes besides the apprehension and discerning of the things of God in the gospel . . . yea, they may be employed against the gospel, and made to war and fight against the truth of it.¹

Yet, he was opposed to the general Calvinist view of total depravity.² ". . . Whereas it was objected that men in their natural estates are by the Scriptures termed darkness, and in this respect presented as unable to comprehend the light of the gospel. . . . I absolutely deny that the Scripture any where termeth natural men darkness."³ Goodwin believed that man's blindness was neither total nor complete. It was "voluntarily contracted" and "wilfully persisted in," which meant that it was curable by a "diligent use of means."⁴ Goodwin made an effort to be a realist about the sinful nature of man, and at the same time to hold out hope to those who sought salvation.

The Calvinist doctrine of the perseverance of the saints was in a similar way modified by Goodwin. He held with the Calvinists that saints have sufficient means and grace to permit them to persevere to the end.⁵ The

1. Ibid., p. 21.

2. The Synod of Dort makes allowance for some light of nature remaining after the Fall, so as to render man inexcusable. It is not enough, however, to attain a saving knowledge of God. Chap. III, art. 4. The Westminster Confession makes no such allowance. Chap. VI, sect. 4.

3. John Goodwin, Redemption Redeemed, (edition of 1840), p. 19.

4. Ibid., pp. 20 ff.

5. John Goodwin, The Agreement and Distance of Brethren, (edition of 1671), pp. 109 f.

belief that perseverance was inevitable was opposed, however, and the possibility of the apostasy of believers was held in its stead.¹ Goodwin had more confidence in the strength and place of the saints than had the Socinians, but had less than had the Calvinists, who identified the saints with the predestined.

Goodwin, as did Arminius, sought to follow a middle way, abandoning what he thought were the excesses of Calvinism, but adhering to the theological doctrines of the ecumenical church. He wanted to avoid the pitfalls of a harsh, unrealistic orthodoxy on the one hand, and heretical Pelagianism or Socinianism on the other. The followers of Arminius were to have difficulty in following this delicate balance. John Goodwin was one of those who succeeded rather well in maintaining the balance.

2. The implications of Goodwin's Arminianism. --The central emphasis of Arminianism was the ethical and mutual character of the relations between God and man.² On the one side, it meant an assertion of the divine justice, and, on the other, of man's freedom. As opposed to the absolutist approach of Calvinism, it set forth conditions modifying the Calvinist stress on the sovereign, divine will; it tried to find a place for free, rational man in his relation to God. Upon his full acceptance of this Arminian

1. John Goodwin, Redemption Redeemed, (edition of 1840), pp. 227 ff.

2. Frederick Platt, "Arminianism", Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, ed. James Hastings, (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1908), Vol. I.

position, Goodwin's thought developed in the direction of its implications. It did not represent a change of direction for him. It meant primarily a stimulus to move further and faster in his abandonment of Calvinism. It made him more receptive to the liberal, humanistic influences which he had already found more congenial to his spirit than orthodox Calvinism. There were three main areas of Goodwin's thought in which these implications of Arminianism made its impact.

The first of these was an increase in his rationalistic bent. On becoming a firm Arminian, he became a firm rationalist. There was a much larger place given to the reason in his book defending the Arminian position,¹ than in any of his earlier writings. After this point, he was a confirmed rationalist. He viewed man's relationship to God as "rational and voluntary."² Reason was faith's principal guide. In fact, religion "is nothing but reason in her exaltation."³ It is in regard to the place and power of reason that Goodwin deviates most from the via media and comes closest to the Socinian position. There was some justification for this criticism: ". . . he tells us of such worthy faculties, reason, understandings, &c., in reference to these enquiries, as if he had never heard any thing of Originall sin, the blindnesse, darknesse, perversnesse, folly, brutishnesse of the Naturall man . . ."⁴

A second place at which Arminianism deepened and

1. John Goodwin, Redemption Redeemed, edition of 1840).

2. Ibid., p. 56.

3. Ibid., p. 555.

4. Richard Resbury, The Lightless-Starro: Or, Mr. John Goodwin discovered a Pelagio-Socinian, 1652, p. 8.

strengthened already existing trends in Goodwin's thought was an emphasis on the ethical element in the Christian faith. It meant not only an ethical interpretation of God's dealings with man, but also ethical demands in man's relationship to God. Just as reason loomed larger in his thoughts, so godliness did; after he became a full and avowed Arminian. This stress on godliness played a significant role in his theological method,¹ and in his doctrine of the church.² Godliness was to be the test of Scriptural interpretation and of the individual's faith.

Another outstanding characteristic of Arminianism was its broad-minded, tolerant spirit. This spirit breathes through most of Goodwin's writings, but the nature of his tolerance was broadened by his acceptance of Arminianism. "Goodwin's doctrinal position had, of course, profoundly significant implications for religious toleration. . . . As we should expect, Goodwin's liberalism in doctrine was to be reflected in his later writings in a broader and more zealous defence of religious liberty."³ There was a certain universalism running through his views. He believed in universal redemption, universal grace, and the universal possession of the Holy Spirit. He did not want to exclude even the heathen from the possibility of salvation. This willingness to include all sorts and conditions of men within the pale of Christ's atonement was applied to include all

1. Supra., Chap. II.

2. Infra., Chap. IV.

3. W. K. Jordan, op.cit., Vol. III, pp. 405-406.

men within the realm of the state's toleration, even those guilty of heresy, apostasy and unbelief.

Here, as at all points, Arminianism led Goodwin to go further in the direction in which he was already moving than he might have done if he had tried to maintain a restless, but orthodox Calvinist theology. None of the Puritan Calvinists went so far in their use of reason, ethical emphasis, and plea for tolerance as did Goodwin. Probably Goodwin would not have gone so far in these respects had he not torn off the tattered mantle of Calvinist orthodoxy.

Chapter IV

John Goodwin's

DOCTRINE of the CHURCH

" . . . in regard of some strange opinions he hath held many years, and others that in time he might fall unto (which in the Presbyterian way he could never enjoy with quiet, nor have liberty to propagate them) therefore he took sanctuary in Independency, falling from our Church, and the Presbyterianiall Government . . . unto the Independent way, as that wherein he might with more safty enjoy his opinions. . . ." Thomas Edwards.

CHAPTER IV

GOODWIN'S DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH

A. Congregationalism versus Presbyterianism

1. From Presbyterian to Congregationalist.-- During the two decades in which they controlled the destiny of England, the Puritans were plagued by divisions within their own ranks. Perhaps there was no issue which proved more divisive than that of church government. The division over this issue ran through Parliament, the Westminster Assembly, the Army, and the Press. John Goodwin played a leading role in this struggle. Like most Puritans, he had been Presbyterian in the beginning, but had become dissatisfied with the course it took after it gained the ascendancy in the nation. He had turned to Congregationalism as a preferable alternative.

The decision seems to have been difficult for Goodwin to make, for he had a leaning toward the Presbyterian government.

I know that I am looked upon as a man very deeply engaged for the Independent cause against Presbytery. But the truth is, I am neither so whole for the former, nor against the latter, as I am generally voted . . . to be. . . . it is in my spirit only that I serve the law of Independency, but in my flesh I serve the law of Presbytery. And if the cause of Presbytery could be so pleaded . . . as to legitimate her birth and pedigree (in my judgment and conscience) . . . it would be . . . as a resurrection from death into life to my flesh, you my spirit . . . would rejoice also, that gain and godliness . . . are so well agreed.¹

1. John Goodwin, The inexcusableness of that Grand Accusation of the Brethren, called Antapologia, 1646, preface.

There were two things which led him to oppose the Presbyterians in spite of his leanings in that direction.

The first was the feeling that it did not promote godliness and a thorough reformation of the church and nation. Goodwin accepted the ambiguity of the New Testament as to church government, and applied the pragmatic test of which best furthered holiness. He thought Congregationalism¹ was superior in this regard, but he was willing to be shown otherwise.

If any of my brethren of opposite judgment, shall give me any reasonable account how I may build up myself in holiness better (or if it be as well,) in the way of Presbytery, than in that wherein I am for the present engaged, I will pull down what I have build, and devote all my strength to the service of that way which, for distinction-sake, is called Presbytery.²

Secondly he opposed the Presbyterian demand for uniformity. He viewed this as a return to episcopacy³ and even papacy. Goodwin felt it necessary to oppose the Presbyterians just as he had opposed the Anglicans. He would

1. The Congregationalists of this period were called Independents, just as they were called Separatists in the earlier period. Actually Independency was a much broader and more political movement and included within its coalition at various times several groups. Cf., W. K. Jordan, The Development of Religious Toleration in England, (Allen and Unwin, 1938), Vol. III, pp. 347 ff. Also G. F. Nuttall, The Holy Spirit in Puritan Faith and Experience, (2d ed., Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1947), p. 12.

2. John Goodwin, Innocency and Truth triumphing Together, 1645, p. 29.

3. John Goodwin, A Briefe Answer To an ulcerous Treatise, 1646, p. 8: "Nor let any man think that I breath the least aire of disparagement in the face of Presbytery, by ranging Episcopacy with it: in as much as Mr. Edwards himselfe, springs an ingagement upon Presbytery to persecute Saints under the vaile of suppressing errors, from the laudable practice of her elder sister Episcopacy."

even criticise the Independents when the occasion arose. In the preface to one of his works against the staunch Presbyterian, Thomas Edwards, Goodwin gave a summary of the things which he opposed:

The persecution of the saints; the rough handling of tender conscience; the lifting up of religion upon a sword's point; violence conformities; uniformities enforced; quenching of proceedings in the knowledge of truth; binding up of judgments in synodical decrees; standing up in ceremonies to the prejudice of substance, (as when the gospel must not be preached because such and such hands have not been imposed) the lording over the heritage of Christ . . . these have been abhorrencies of my former years as well as of my latter.¹

To him, Presbyterianism, at least in its dominant form,² represented all of these things. On the other hand, Congregationalism seemed to offer a freer, more peaceful alternative. Goodwin and his Congregation had signed the Solemn League and Covenant in 1641 and again in 1643. He interpreted it differently, however, from most of those who signed it.

. . . being fully persuaded, resolved, and possess in my judgment, soul, and conscience, that the Way of the Congregation[alists] is the Truth, I conceive a possibility at least, yea and some degrees of a probability, that the churches of God in the three kingdoms,

1. John Goodwin, The inexcusableness of that Grand Accusation of the Brethren, called Antapologia, 1646, preface.

2. Goodwin pointed out that it was the "High" Presbyterians such as Prynne and Edwards that he opposed: "I commonly, if not constantly characterize the Presbyterie; which is the Great contention of the Kingdome, and contestation of my pen, with the signall and proper Epithaton, HIGH." He had sympathy for the less pretentious Presbyterian ministers and laymen: ". . . As for those whether ministers, or others, who are led by the light of their consciences to serve their God (both theirs and mine) in the way of Presbyterie; but are tender in obtruding their judgement or practice, as the pattern in the mount, upon others; my heart is with them, their persons and pietie I reverence and honour" John Goodwin, The Scourge of the Saints Displayed, 1646, preface.

in the sense declared, might be drawn into near conjunction in this, namely, when the beauty and truth of it should be fully manifested and made known to them¹

In 1644 Goodwin had a vision of a religious peace approaching, which would have these characteristics. The first sign would be "When men shall begin to grow to a clearness, singleness, honourableness, and Christian-like greatness, in their ends."² The second characteristic to be looked for was "When apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors, and teachers shall be no more turned into councils, synods, and secular arms."³ Thirdly, "When the generality of men professing godliness and religion, shall be content to furnish themselves with religion . . . and shall make scruple of taking it up by wholesale from synods, councils, and books, only for ease and cheapness sake," it would be a hopeful sign.⁴ Finally, it was to be a time "When Christian States, and men of soundest judgment, greatest learning, parts, and abilities, therein, shall give free liberty to men looked upon as opposite in judgment to the truth, to publish and openly declare the ground and reasons of their judgment in each particular."⁵ Goodwin thought Congregationalism offered hope of fulfilment in all four particulars.

Within a few years Goodwin was to become firmly convinced that "Independency is the only lint that can stanch

1. John Goodwin, The inexcusableness of that Grand Accusation of the Brethren, called Antapologia, 1646, preface.

2. John Goodwin, A Reply of Two of the Brethren, 1644, p. 32.

3. Ibid., p. 33.

4. Ibid., p. 34.

5. Ibid., p. 36.

our wounds, the only dam that can stay the inundation of blood, which is else likely to overwhelm us."¹ He saw Presbyterianism and Anglicanism as impossible alternatives. "For the very name of Presbytery is hateful to the people, and it were too strange a relapse to give them again their Bishops and their liturgy, and if either of the other be permitted, there can be nothing expected but murmurings and clashings, if not open mutinyings."² By this time, a majority in Parliament and the Army were being led to the same conclusion.

2. Gathered Congregations versus a national church.--

Goodwin was opposed to the idea of a national church which included everyone within the nation in its membership. He thought that here Presbyterians were following in the mistaken pathway of the former Church of England. To him it had two objectionable features. First, it meant having within the church those who were in no real sense Christians. Secondly, it meant an alliance between Church and State which led the Church to lean on the State too much, and the State to interfere in Church affairs. Goodwin was equally against both.

Goodwin's position was that to include all sorts and conditions of men within the church, with no regard to their Christian fitness, was to defile the body of Christ and impede the cause of reformation. This is brought out in his debates with both Prynne and Edwards. To Prynne he offered the following challenge:

p. 7. 1. John Goodwin, Independencie God's Veritie, 1647,
2. Ibid.

. . . Neither can Master Prin show any Nation, every member whereof is qualified for to make up a Church; which is the body of Christ, unlesse Master Prin will take in all drunkards, whore-masters, &c. to be members of a Church; whereas the Word sayes, they must be visible Saints; and this cannot be avoided in a Nationall Church.¹

Goodwin wanted those who lived a Christian life, in addition to those professing Christianity, to be included in the body of Christ. Whereas, Prynne and most of the Presbyterians wanted a comprehensive Church.

. . . the Presbyterian system was political in its comprehensiveness. From the parochial presbytery to the national synod it was in intention a complete and national system, and the existence of a single separatist congregation was at once a blot on its beauty and a blow at its very basis.²

To mix saints and sinners indiscriminately in the Church, was to Goodwin, a dangerous practice. In his reply to Edwards he opposed once again the idea of a national church:

As for those, who by the Churches of God in the three kingdoms, understand all the inhabitants of these kingdoms, good and bad . . . and swear unto the most High God . . . that they will endeavor to bring these into the nearest conjunction in religion and form of church government; what do they (in effect) but swear . . . that they will endeavour to bring day and night, Christ and Belial, into the nearest conjunction they can? Certainly wolves and tigers, bears and lions, are as capable of political and civil conjunction with men, as loose, wicked, ungodly and profane men are, without the change of their natures by grace of spiritual . . . communion with the saints.³

It was a common argument of the Presbyterian apologists to use the example of Israel as a precedent for the

1. John Goodwin, Certain Briefe Observations, 1644, p. 8.

2. W. A. Shaw, A History of the English Church . . . 1640-1660, (Longmans, Green, and Co., 1900), Vol. II, p. 34.

3. John Goodwin, The inexcusableness of that Grand Accusation of the Brethren, called Antapologia, 1646, preface.

establishment of an inclusive, national Church. Goodwin, however, pointed out that a distinction must be made between the Old Covenant and the New Covenant. The former was made with a nation, the latter with individuals.

The Nationall Church of the Jewes cannot be a patterne for us now, because the covenant of the Gospell is not made with any one particular Nation, as with the Jewes, but to all persons that embrace the Gospel, and belceve in Christ.¹

Although many of the Congregationalists of his own day approved of a loosely knit national Church such as existed during the Commonwealth, Goodwin was in the main stream of Congregationalism in regard to his view of a "gathered" Church. Its principal features of a community of believers gathered together under the headship of Christ and united in a voluntary covenant are distinctive notes of the Congregational theory of the Church. They are to be found in Robert Browne's classic definition of the Church. "The church planted or gathered, is a companie or number of Christians or beleovers, which by a willing couenant made with their God, are vnder the gouernment of God and Christ, and kepe his laws in one holie communion. . . ."² Browne had set forth these principles in distinction from the Anglican and Reformed doctrines of the Church. Speaking at the first assembly of the World Council of Churches in 1948, nearly three hundred and seventy-five years later, a

1. John Goodwin, Certain Briefe Observations, 1644, pp. 7 f.

2. Robert Browne, A Book which Sheweth the life and manners of all true Christians, 1582, as quoted in, Henry M. Dexter, The Congregationalism of the last Three Hundred Years, As Seen in its Literature, (Hodder and Stoughton, 1880), p.105.

Congregationalist leader put forward the same principles of a "'gathered' church, the church of the Covenant, the church of the community of the Holy Spirit."¹

One of the features of the Congregational system which Goodwin liked was the freedom it gave people to choose their own pastor. He thought no reformation could be "according to the minde" of God and Christ "which injoyes the Saints to sit under, and hold themselves to such Pastors, with whom their hearts cannot close in that relation with any tolerable satisfaction, nor yet are capable of his Ministry, or any edification by it. . . ." ² Later on Goodwin was to criticise his fellow Independents when they set up a committee of "Triers" to purge the ranks of the ministry from corrupt and incompetent ministers.

While upholding the rights and freedom of the local congregation, Goodwin did not mean that they should be isolated from other churches. ". . . these you call independents, confesse that they are accountable for their actions to every neighbour Church that shall in the name of Christ require it, they stand not independent from others but hold communion with all other Churches. . . ." ³ He felt it necessary to have fellowship with other members of the body of Christ. He wanted primarily to protect the individual church from "provinciall, and nationall Synods from whom there is no appeale,

1. The First Assembly of the World Council of Churches, Edited by W. A. Visser 'T Hooft, (SCM Press, 1949), p. 58.
 2. John Goodwin, Theomaxia, 1644, p. 25.
 3. John Goodwin, Certain Briefe Observations, 1644, p. 12.

but to whose judgements all must submit as to an ordinance of Christ, though but to question what is done by them is to be guilty of fraction, schisme, arrogancy. . . ."¹

The Presbyterians criticised this Congregationalist conception of the "gathered" church at several points. They said that "this way taketh care for none in point of holinosse, but her own: She suffereth all the world about her to lie in wickednesse, and to sleep in death, without looking after them, or taking any pitle or compassion on them."² Goodwin's answer to this was that including such people in the church as if they were already Christians was no way to convert them. The method of Congregationalism was different:

. . . She cordially prays for the conversion of the unconverted, she mourns over them, she causes her light to shine before them, she bears their burthens, she in-treats them gently, she feeds their hungry, and cloatheth their naked . . . she recompenceth evill for evill unto none of them, with all such exemplarities of life and conversation"³

Above all "she" used the best means of conversion. ". . . she preacheth the Gospel with as much diligence, and faithfulness, and power, and with as much libertie and freedome unto all to partake with her in this her ministration, as any other way whatsoever. . . ."⁴

Another criticism made by the Presbyterians was that this arrangement would lead to divisions in congregations and families. Typical of the attitude of many of the Presbyterians was this reply of an anonymous pamphleteer to a

1. John Goodwin, Certain Briefe Observations, 1644, p. 12.
 2. John Goodwin, Theomaxia, 1644, p. 38.
 3. Ibid., p. 39.
 4. Ibid.

pamphlet by John Price, who was a leading member of Goodwin's Church.

. . . London was once a City at union within it self, and did serve the Lord with one consent, and carry on the work of the Lord with one shoulder, untill men of your turbulent faction and humour fell to schisme and separation, gathering Churches out of Churches, and than not when declining, but when reforming (a practice never heard of before late years) these and such like practices of yours, have turned Londons ancient love, union and goodness, into hatred, division, and bitternesse one against another.¹

This writer accused the ministers of many of the separated congregations of "stealing sheep out of the flock, brought in by the blessing of God upon other men's labours."²

Goodwin's attitude was that Congregationalism caused no such troubles and dissensions, and where divisions did occur, it could as well be the fault of one "way" as the other. The fact that different members of a family might go to different churches was no more occasion for strife within families than if its members were in separate guilds or companies.³ In any case, wherever the Gospel "comes in power, and is entertained in truth" it brings disturbance. He cites Luke 12:51 to prove that they are the ordinary effects of the Gospel.⁴ Where men are bound together in error the Gospel inevitably has this effect. Such divisions are testimony that the truth is being preached.

1. A Modest and Clear Vindication of the Serious Representation, and late Vindication Of the Ministers of London, anonymus, 1649, p. 6.

2. Ibid.

3. John Goodwin, Theomaxia, 1644, p. 31.

4. Ibid., p. 32, "Thinke yee that I am come to give peace on earth? I tell you, nay, but rather debate. For from henceforth there shall be five in one house divided, three against two, and two against three."

3. Godliness versus Orthodoxy.-- Goodwin held the Congregational principle that the Church should be made up of visible saints. He followed general Congregationalist practice in distinguishing a saint by his godliness rather than by his orthodoxy.¹ Godliness was a more accurate indication of Christianity than a profession of belief in a creed. A saint was more easily distinguished from a sinner than an orthodox believer from a heretic. Moral standards of Christian conduct were easier to define than the theological standards of beliefs. The latter were more relative than the former. Goodwin was willing to allow differences of opinion within the church, but he was not willing to permit the ungodly to be members of the church.²

This requirement of godliness for church membership was even more rigorously applied by Goodwin in the matter of admittance to the Lord's Supper and to baptism. Those guilty of sinful conduct were barred from the Lord's supper and their infants were not to be baptised so long as they remained in such a state. This position got him into trouble with the Presbyterians and was given as the cause for his removal from

1. Modern Congregationalism also speaks of an "insistence on holiness rather than orthodoxy." R. N. Flow (ed.), The Nature of the Church, (SCM Press, 1952), p. 176. "In every century, Congregationalism, in its doctrine of the Church, as indeed in all else, has thus built upon a foundation of what was once called 'visible holiness': what we should now call 'consecrated personality.'" Ibid., p. 179.

2. The Presbyterian view was, however, that error was as sinful and dangerous as vice. It was "no lesse unlawfull for a Christian state to give any libertie or toleration to errours, then to set up in every citie and parish of their dominions, bordels for uncleannesse, stages for playes, and lists for duels." Robert Baillie, Errors and Induration, 1645, as quoted in W. K. Jordan, op.cit., Vol. III, p. 288.

his parish church in 1645.¹ Goodwin's insistence on this point is reflected in one of the articles of the agreement by which he came back as pastor of St. Stephen's Parish Church. His "gathered" church which he brought with him, was to have this right: "That at such times of their communion with Christ at His Supper they may be intire of themselves, and none without their admission and free consent may put themselves among them or offer to communicate with them."²

This strictness in regard to godliness was not opposed by the Presbyterians as much as the leniency toward orthodoxy. They thought that such a loose attitude in regard to creedal orthodoxy bred errors and heresies. Goodwin's own Church was especially suspected. One contemporary wrote of "Feares and Jealousies arising from severall Informations . . . and diverse other symptomes of danger, but especially Skippon's secret Listing of Scismatiques in the City amongst the Congregations of Mr. Goodwin, Mr. Patience, and others" ³

1. The Westminster Confession on the matter of receiving the Lord's Supper warns that "ignorant and wicked men" who receive it are guilty of bringing damnation on themselves, Chap. XXIX, sect. 8. Goodwin seemed to be more rigorous in his demands on this issue than most of his fellow Congregationalists, as well, for The Savoy Declaration has essentially the same position. Here, as at many points, Goodwin was closer to Robert Browne, who wrote in regard to the Lord's Supper: "There must be a separation for those which are none of the church, or be vnmeete to receaue, that the worthis may be onely receaued." Robert Browne, *op.cit.*, p. 60, as quoted in Wiliston Walker, The Creeds and Platforms of Congregationalism, (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1893), p. 23.

2. Vestry Minute Book, St. Stephen's Church, Coleman-Street, (Guildhall Library, Ms. 4458, 11th of November, 1649), p. 161.

3. Clement Walker, Relations and Observations, Part I, 1648, p. 123.

In spite of the danger involved, Goodwin was firmly opposed to rigid demands for orthodoxy within the church.

. . . certain it is that no body . . . or community of people, hath any authority or power from God . . . to establish any such Rule or law, one or more, amongst them, no not by or with the universall consent of overy individual member of this body, according unto which they shall all stand bound to believe every man the same things with an other in all points of Christian Religion, or that any one mans judgement, or the judgement of any number of men amongst them, shall be the standard unto which all the rest shall conform their judgements in matters of Faith or worship. . . .¹

4. The Inviolability of the individual conscience versus the authority of Synods and Councils.-- According to Goodwin's view, God was the only final authority over the individual conscience.² He did not sanction forced belief or an uncompromising orthodoxy. A man's conscience was answerable ultimately to God and not to man. God alone must rule the consciences of men.

. . . God never gives a power unto any man, or any number of men, to enslave or subject the consciences of men in matters appertaining unto himself, either unto themselves & their judgement, or unto any others. . . God reserves the legislative power over the consciences of men unto himself along.³

Goodwin's criticism of the Presbyterians was that they

1. John Goodwin, The Triers (or Tormenters) Tryed and Cast, 1657, p. 19.

2. The Apologeticall Narration, 1643, of the five dissenting Independents of the Westminster Assembly had several such phrases as "vouchsafe our consciences" (p. 3), "be true to our own consciences" (p. 3), "respect to tender consciences" (p. 26). One Independent writer says the Independent, "thinks all the delight in this World without the liberty of his conscience, is a burthen intolerable", and, "reckons Liberty of Conscience to be Englands chiefest good". J. Cook, What the Independents would have, 1647, pp. 13 f., as quoted in G. F. Nuttall, The Holy Spirit in Puritan Faith and Experience, (2d ed., Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1947), p. 36.

3. John Goodwin, The Triers (or Tormenters) Tryed and Cast, 1657, p. 19.

sought to replace God's authority over men's consciences with the authority of Synods and Councils. He was unalterably opposed to the position of the Westminster Assembly that, "It belongeth to synods and councils ministerially to determine controversies of faith, and cases of conscience"1 To Goodwin, such a practice was akin to the papal claim of infallibility. "Is not this to uphold the Papist tenent of beleeving as the Church beleeveth?"2 His position was that the Presbyterian practice not only exercised an authority which belonged only to God, but that it also implied an infallibility of such synods and councils which they did not have. He thought the very attitude of synods doomed them to failure.

. . . when Synods and Councils shall beare themselves inordinately upon their numbers and multitudes, upon their wisdoms, learning, and pietie, and because of these, shall . . . challenge an infallibilitie (for whate doo they lesse, when they command all mens judgments and consciences to bow downe at the feet of their determinations?) this is little lesse then an authorized ground of Divination, that they will miscarry, and that God will not honour them, with the discovery of any of his Truth unto the world.3

God usually revealed himself to individuals rather than to synods. The Reformation itself was a good example:

That light of Evangelicall truth, wherein the Reformed Churches rejoyce at this day, yea, and triumph over Antichristian darkness, did not break out of the clouds of Councils and Synods unto them, but God caused it to shine upon them, from scattered and single starres, as Luther, Calvin, Zuinglius, Martyr4

1. The Westminster Confession, Chap. XXXI, sect. 3.

2. John Goodwin, Certain Briefe Observations, 1644,

p. 4.

3. John Goodwin, Theomaxia, 1644, pp. 45 f.

4. Ibid., p. 45.

A man was ultimately responsible only to God for his faith and not to any group of men or churches.

This position of Goodwin's had important implications for religious freedom. Freedom for the individual conscience in practice meant freedom of belief. It was this that attracted the sects to the Independent coalition. It was the thing which aroused fear and opposition in the Presbyterians. Prynne gave expression to this fear when he wrote:

Whether that Independent Governement which some contend for, if postively and fully agreed on, and laid downe without disguises, and then duly pondered in the ballance of scripture or right reason, be not of its owne nature, a very Seminary of Schisms, and dangerous divisions in the Church, state? a floud-Gate to let in an inundation of all manner of Heresies, Errors, Sects, Religions, distructive opinions, Libertinism and lawlesnesse among us, without any sufficient meanes of preventing or suppressing them when introduced?¹

Goodwin's retort was that he was as much opposed to error as any of the Presbyterians, he differed only in the method of combatting it. He believed the Prosbyterian way meant, in effect, "every man is bound to put out his owne eyes, to yeeld to blind obedience, never to search into the truth. . . ."²

5. Freedom of the Spirit versus Creedal Orthodoxy.---

John Goodwin believed in the free and continual working of the Spirit.³ One of the characteristics he lists of the

1. William Prynne, Twelve Considerable Serious Questions, 1644, pp. 6 f.

2. John Goodwin, Certain Briefe Observations, 1644, p. 4.

3. On one occasion he referred to "That clear, satisfying, and convincing light of truth, which God hath graciously shined into my heart. . . .", John Goodwin, Confidence Dis-mounted, 1651. Cf., The Presbyterian position: "The whole counsel of God, concerning all things necessary for his own

"freeness" of the Spirit is that "in all that he acts and moves and works in men, according to all that variety and manifoldness of working which proceeds from him at any time, he doth proceed by his own laws . . . and not by any thing, any law, engagement, or terms imposed upon him by men."¹ Men were not to try to impose their own authority or beliefs on others so as to leave them no room for the free working of the Spirit. Goodwin upheld the view that truth could come from any quarter.² God still reserved the liberty for himself alone "to blesse the world with the Revelation of truth, whether it be by few, or by many, by those that are learned, or those that are look'd upon as men of small understanding."³ Christ gave the tenor of God's dispensations in this regard when he said: ". . . I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes: even so, Father; for so it seemed good in thy sight."⁴ Goodwin then concludes:

Though God be at libertie, to make the first discovery, or communication of the light of his Truth, unto the world, by greater numbers of men, and those learned and in high

glory, man's salvation, faith, and life, is either expressly set down in scripture, or by good and necessary consequence may be deduced from scripture: unto which nothing at any time is to be added, whether by new revelations of the Spirit, or traditions of men." The Westminster Confession, Chap. I, sect. 6.

1. John Goodwin, A Being Filled With the Spirit, (edition of 1867), p. 31.

2. Goodwin would have approved of the statement of Whichcote to Tuckney in their correspondence, "Truth is Truth, whosoever speakes itt: and I will readily agree with Papist, Socinian, or anie; so farre as hee asserts itt; because itt is not His, but God's." Benjamin Whichcote, Moral and Religious Aphorisms, Edited by Samuel Salter, (revised ed., 1753), p. 85.

3. John Goodwin, Theomaxia, 1644, p. 44.

4. Luke 10:21, A.V.

esteeme for wisdome, as by Councels, Synods, and Conventions of men eminent in their qualifications . . . yet by the more frequent experience of all ages it appeareth, that he taketh pleasure. . .¹

in revealing truth according to Christ's own way and not the latter.

This was one of the reasons why Goodwin opposed the Presbyterians. He thought they tried to restrict the freedom of the Spirit by their demand for creedal orthodoxy. He asks this question:

Whether to enjoin ministers and others, upon pain of death, imprisonment, etc., not to teach any thing in religion, contrary to the present apprehensions of the said enjoiners, be not in effect to say to the Holy Ghost, 'reveal nothing more to others than thou hast revealed to us? Or if thou hast not revealed the truth to us, reveal it not unto any other men?'²

A corollary of the freedom of the Spirit was the government of the Spirit within the Church, and the consequent emphasis on the priesthood of all believers.³ Goodwin defended and upheld the place of the laymen in the Church. His position was based on the text: ". . . is not the manifestation of the Spirit . . . given to every man to profit withal?" He concludes, "if so, who can with a good conscience inhibit such from publishing the Gospel, upon pretence of an unsound-

1. John Goodwin, Theomaxia, 1644, p. 44.

2. John Goodwin, Some Modest and Hurable Queries, 1646, as quoted in Thomas Jackson, The Life of John Goodwin, (Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme, and Brown, 1822), p. 124.

3. This was one of the distinctive notes of Congregational polity. The Platform Polity of the Savoy Declaration had spoken, for example, that others besides Pastors might be "gifted and fitted by the holy Ghost for it, and . . . may publicly, ordinarily and constantly perform" such duties. It is still an important note in contemporary Congregationalism which speaks of being "guided into a common mind by the Holy Spirit" and every member exercising "his spiritual gifts." Proceedings of the Sixth International Congregational Council, Edited by F. L. Fagley, (The Independent Press, 1949), pp. 38 f.

ness in some disputable opinions; or for want of that, which some men call ordination"1 He was critical of the Presbyterians for their attitude toward lay preachers. His idea of the freedom of the Spirit gave him a high regard for the place and importance of laymen in general. ". . . crushing the parts of these Saints which you call Lay-men, is a way to depresse truth to hinder growth in grace and Spirituall communion with Christ. . . ."2 The Presbyterians in turn criticised Goodwin for letting his own laymen preach in his absence and were shocked that butchers, bakers, linen drapers, and others of that sort would be permitted to preach in place of the duly ordained.³

The assertion of the freedom of the Spirit also implies religious tolerance as did freedom of conscience. Accordingly, the Presbyterians opposed it as vigorously. In his study, The Holy Spirit in Puritan Faith and Experience, G. F. Nuttall comments, "The Presbyterians, as we have seen repeatedly, did not share the Congregationalists' primary interest in the Holy Spirit. Consequently neither did they share the Congregationalist' spirit of tolerance."⁴ They said such a doctrine would lead to all kind of errors,

1. John Goodwin, Thirty Queries, 1651, p. 14.

2. John Goodwin, Certain Briefe Observations, 1644, p. 12.

3. Thomas Edwards, The third part of Gangraena, 1646, p. 160. One writer referred to this doctrine of letting those preach who had the gifts as "a Trojan Horse, whence the adversaries of the Truth may break out, and destroy the City of God, A Pandora's Box, from whence all sorts of mischievous and foul poysoning opinions may fly out. . . ." Matthew Poole, A Moderate Enquiry into the Warrantableness of the Preaching of Gifted and Unordained Persons, 1658, epistle to the reader.

4. p. 113.

heresies, and schisms. The unlearned would put their opinions up against the learned divines of the Church.

- An example of the close connection between the freedom of the Spirit and religious toleration is in his attitude toward punishing those who denied the divinity of the Scriptures.

. . . all other arguments and proofes, which are usually . . . brought, to prove the Divinity of the Scriptures, and the Truth of the Gospell, are but Dialecticall, and probable, not demonstrative or conclusive . . . They onely allow the supernaturall and immediate worke of the Spirit asserting and sealing the truth of both in the consciences of men.¹

This being so, he concludes with this question: ". . . are men to be punished, because God hath not imparted unto them his Spirit of Grace, and supernaturall illumination?"² Error must not be too hastily punished for it might be that the Spirit has not yet manifested the truth to the erring person. He believed that to suppress opinions which differed from the orthodoxy, as determined by councils, was to be in danger of fighting against God. The church could only be truly reformed if the revealing, enlightening mind of the Spirit could speak freely to the hearts of men without being restrained by demands for a strict creedal orthodoxy.

A reformation that would not be flattered, and yet be styled a reformation according to the Word of God, must give leave to the wind to blow where it listeth; give liberty to the Spirit of God to do with his own what he pleaseth; to make what discovery of truth, and to what persons, and when and where he pleaseth; and not compel him to traffic only with Councils and Synods for his heavenly commodities.³

1. John Goodwin, The Scourge of the Saints Displayed, 1646, p. 33.

2. Ibid., p. 34.

3. John Goodwin, Twelve considerable serious Cautions, 1646, as quoted in Thomas Jackson, The Life of John Goodwin, (Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme and Brown, 1822), p. 122.

6. Spiritual methods versus coercive methods.--

Goodwin saw the difference in their methods as an important issue between the Presbyterian and Congregational way. Congregationalism relied upon spiritual weapons in its warfare against error and evil. It was the way of peace and reasonableness.

It seeketh not, it attempteth not the molestation, harm, or disturbance of any sort of men that are contrary-minded to it; it thinketh no evil, it speaketh no evil of such: if it conceives them upright and faithful with God and Jesus Christ, it imbraceth them with all love, tenderness and honour, as "partakers of like precious faith" with it self¹

Presbyterianism, on the other hand, used coercive methods and consequently, stirred up strife and discord.

If matters were duly and fairly examined between the two Combatants in this case, the Way we plead for, would be found via lactea, the candid, harmlesse, and peaceable way: and her corrivall or competitresse, via sanguinea, the troubles and strife making way.²

There was no doubt in Goodwin's mind as to which was the better way.

The basis of Goodwin's view of a Church founded on voluntary principles, was that the Gospel could best be defended and spread by spiritual methods. He had great faith in the power and the appeal of the Gospel. "The Gospel stands in no need of any commission or constitution of humane devise or contrivance, to promote or carry on the interest of the world."³ He was impressed by the methods and success of the apostolic church.

1. John Goodwin, Theomaxia, 1644, p. 27.

2. Ibid., pp. 29 f.

3. John Goodwin, The Triers (or Tormenters) Tryed and Cast, 1657, p. 16.

Who, or what were the men with whose assistance and help, the Gospel undertook that great and glorious undertaking we so often mention, the spirituall conquest of the world? . . . were they a numerous, and potent host, or army, that could bear down whole nations and kingdoms before them, and by force of arms, give laws to what state or people they pleased? and plant their doctrine by the terrour of the sword? . . . Nor were prisons, or swords, or such like weapons and engines of the flesh chosen by them, or by any direction from them, for Church officers, or for a life-guard to the Gospel . . . nor was the favour of earthly Princes, or civil magistrates coveted by the Apostles, either for support of the honour and dignity of their calling, or by way of advantage for the planting or propagating of the Gospel, though they were no more in number but, twelve men.¹

He thought this should be the pattern for the Church in his own age. The Gospel could not be forced on anyone. Men must embrace it willingly and personally.² The Church's duty was to be the Church. God would bring the increase.

The fervent and constant prayers of the Saints, with their proper fruits and effects, thorough the gracious audience and condescension of God vouchsafed unto them, are sufficient to render the state and condition of the

1. John Goodwin, The Divine Authority of the Scriptures Asserted, 1648, p. 286.

2. The voluntary and spiritual character of the Church's authority is a constant mark of the Congregational doctrine of the Church. Robert Browne in A Treatise of Reformation Without Tarying For Anie, (1582, p. 25), had written, "the Lordes people is of the willing sorte. They shall come vnto Zion . . . not by force nor compulsion . . . For it is the conscience and not the power of man that will drive vs to seek the Lordes kingdome . . ." The Congregationalists of England who drafted The Savoy Declaration made this affirmation in their preface: "The Spirit of Christ is in himself too free, great and generous a Spirit, to suffer himself to be used by any humane arm, to whip men into belief: he drives not, but gently leads into all truth, perswades men to dwell in the tents of like precious Faith. . . ." A recent international assembly of Congregationalists stated: "It is our fundamental principle that in all the organization of the church at every level, all authority is spiritual or, as our fathers put it, ministerial, not legalistic, coercive and magisterial." Proceedings of the Sixth International Congregational Council, Edited by F. L. Fagley, (Independent Press, 1949), p. 38.

Gospel flourishing and prosperous on the earth for men, whoever they be, to compound the wisdom, counsells and institutions of Christ for the advancement of the Gospell in the world, with their own devises and inventions, and so to incumber and intangle them, is the next way to obstruct the course of the Gospell, and to keep it from running so as to be glorified in the world.¹

Spiritual weapons were the best means the Church could use to combat error and heresy. The 'sword of the Spirit' was the most appropriate method to "slay these enemies of Christ."² It was in regard to this method that Congregationalism excelled, in Goodwin's eyes.

. . . error cannot be healed or suppressed but by the manifestation of the truth, as darkness cannot be destroyed or removed but by the shining of the light; that way which affords the greatest advantages and the best encouragements unto men, both for the searching out, and bringing forth into light the truth being found is the congregational way (and this onely amongst its fellows) that rejoyceth in the method of this warfare and advance, against those enemies of God, and Religion, errors and heresies.³

It was probably this more than anything else that attracted him to Congregationalism.

Will it lift up its head, to quash and crush, to break the hearts and bones of the one half of the most religiously affected, and best conscienced people in the Land . . . for holding some erroneous opinions (perhaps erroneously so called) as if it self were the Lord of infallibility, and had a non ess errare setteled by God, as an inheritance upon it?⁴

As did most Congregationalists, Goodwin would have gone so far with the Presbyterians as to admit the possible use of admonition and excommunication.⁵ He did not have much

1. John Goodwin, The Triers (or Tormentors) Tryed and Cast, 1657, pp. 16 f.

2. John Goodwin, Theomaxia, 1644, p. 34.

3. Ibid., p. 33.

4. Ibid., p. 24.

5. John Goodwin, Cata-Baptism, 1655, preface. The Savoy Declaration of Faith and Order, 1658, Edited by Albert Peel, (Independent Press, 1939), art. XIX, p. 73.

confidence in it, however. Excommunication had to be used carefully for God had nowhere set a time limit on saving a man.¹

This same insistence upon spiritual rather than coercive methods applied to the settling of the dispute between Congregationalism and Presbyterianism. "That way which shall be able to out-reason, not that which shall out-clubbe all other wayes, will at last exalt unitie, and be it selfe exalted by the gathering in all other wayes unto it."² He was strongly opposed to one group suppressing the other.

To me it is a wonder of the first magnitude, how men come to have so much ground of hope as to set their foot upon, of composing difference and distractions, of settling peace and love throughout the Nation, by exalting one way of Discipline, of Church-Government, for the treading downe and trampling under foot all others.³

B. Separation of Church and State

1. The two orders.-- Goodwin's position was that there were two orders or ordinances by which God communicates his "goodness and love to his saints, during the present state of things and the world."⁴ One is the ministry of the Word, and the other is the civil magistracy. The ministry is for the "calling out" of the saints from "this present world and fitting them for future glory."⁵ The Civil magistracy on the other hand, existed for the protection of the saints so that

1. John Goodwin, Theomaxia, 1644, p. 35.

2. Ibid., p. 30.

3. Ibid., p. 30.

4. John Goodwin, The Scourge of the Saints Displayed, 1646, preface.

5. Ibid.

under it "they may lead a quiet and peaceable life, in all godliness and honesty."¹ Each had its own role and sphere of responsibility and was not to encroach on that of the other. There was to be complete separation of church and state.

The complete separation of Church and State which Goodwin stood for, meant a secular State and a spiritual Church. The Church is fashioned and ruled by Christ, and the State by the people. The Church was a communion of visible saints, while the State was a mixed body, or "promiscuous people." The Church looked to the Scripture for guidance, the State to the law of nature.² The Church was to be governed by practising Christians, whereas the State could be adequately governed by pagans.

Presbyterian writers commonly referred to the Old Testament example of Israel to justify the close alliance of the Church and civil magistrates. Goodwin argued that the situation was different under the Gospel, from what it had been under the Law. The basic difference was "that the magistracie of the Old Testament was appointed, instituted, and directed by God himself."³ On the other hand, "The Magistracie under the Gospell is chosen [by men], and they are vested with that power which they have from men."⁴ He pointed out that "if you looked into the state of all nations", you will see that the "power

1. Ibid.

2. William Clarke, The Clarke Papers, Edited by C. H. Firth, (Camden Society, 1891), Vol. II, p. 130.

3. Ibid., p. 116.

4. Ibid.

that is putt in the hand of Kings and princes is moulded and fashioned by the people."¹ Under the new dispensation of the Gospel the State is of men and the Church of God. Civil rulers are responsible to the electors and not to God. This secularization of the State had great significance for both religious liberty and political democracy.

The state was secular and therefore, should be entirely separate from the Church which was spiritual in nature. The Church must keep itself pure by admitting only the converted and keeping itself apart from the corrupt state. The Church looked only to Christ as its head and ruler. "For the Church is a spiritual building, framed of such lively stones as are not of the world, nor of the wisdom of the world. . . ."² The Church "founded only upon the wisdom of God, revealed in the word by his Spirit, is sufficient to constitute and maintain a church without any assistance from the kingdoms of the world -- whose power they leave entire to itself."³ This emphasis on the spiritual nature of the Church did not mean for Goodwin, however, as it did for many of the sects, an otherworldly religion. The Church was still active and important in this world, but it was not of this world.

Goodwin would have completely agreed with his fellow Congregationalist Henry Burton, when he set forth the following principles of the Church:

1. It is a spirituall house, whose onely builder and governour is Christ,
2. It is a

1. Ibid.

2. John Goodwin, *Independencie God's Veritie*, 1647, p. 7.

3. Ibid.

spirituall kingdome, whose onely King is Christ, and not man. 3. It is a spirituall Republick, whose onely Law-giver is Christ and not man. 4. It is a spirituall Corporation, or body, whose onely head is Christ, and not man. 5. It is a Communion of Saints, governed by Christs Spirit, not man's. 6. Christs Church is a Congregation called and gathered out of the world by Christs Spirit and Word, and not by man.¹

Both Goodwin and Burton went on to draw the conclusion from the spiritual nature of the Church and the headship of Christ that no man, or group of men, can exercise external power or control over this spiritual body of Christ.

In completely separating Church and State, Goodwin was running counter to the main current of Puritan thought.² The Presbyterians desired an intimate union between church and state. The more conservative Independents also supported a close alliance of Church and State in a national Church such as existed under Cromwell. Many pious people saw an established Church as the only preservative the nation had against religious chaos. There was in the Congregationalist

1. Henry Burton, A Vindication of Churches, Commonly Called Independent, 1644, pp. 49 f.

2. Generally only the Baptists upheld the separation of Church and State. Among this group, Roger Williams was the leading exponent of this position. In his Bloudy Tenent of Persecution for Cause of Conscience Discussed, he had written, "All civil states, with their officers of justice, in their respective constitutions and administrations, are . . . essentially civil, and therefore not judges, governors, or defenders of the spiritual, or Christian, state and worship." (Edited by E. B. Underhill, The Hanserd Knollys Society, 1848), p. 1. Robert Browne, however, had expressed a view of relative, if not complete separation, in these words: ". . . the outwarde power and ciuill forcings, let vs leaue to the Magistrates: to rule the common wealth in all outwarde justice, belongeth to them: but let the Church rule in spirituall wise, and not in worldlic maner: by a liuelie lawe preached, and not by a ciuill lawe written. . . ." A Treatise of Reformation Without Tarying For Anie. Edited by T. G. Crippen, (Congregational Historical Society, 1903), p. 29.

certain principles which, if developed logically, would lead to a separation of Church and State.¹ Its insistence upon the autonomy of the individual congregation tended to deny the State, as well as any Church hierarchy, any authority over the Church. The placing of the individual conscience above the authority of Church or State also tended to exclude the State from any religious function. "Man is bound to God by individual ties which the State can neither cement nor loosen."² Another such principle was the headship of Christ within the Church which rendered suspect, any secular interference. Goodwin applied all of these principles in developing his views of a spiritual Church and a secular State.

2. The denial of any authority to the Civil Magistrate in matters of religion.-- In separating Church and State Goodwin was primarily interested in protecting the Church from any interference on the part of the civil magistrates.³ He noted that "it hath been a kind of fatall unhappinesse incident to the Rulers of the Earth professing Christianity" to try to claim authority in religious matters.⁴ He was not sure

1. A. S. P. Woodhouse, Puritanism and Liberty, (J. M. Dent, 1938), p. 18.

2. W. K. Jordan, op.cit., Vol. III, p. 352.

3. John Goodwin, Peace Protected, and Discontent Disarmed, 1654, preface, p. 10: "My great design in giving unto Cesar that uttermost of what I know to be Cesars, is, that hereby I may purchase . . . so much the better and freer standing, the more equitable liberty, to deny unto Cesar or take from him, that which I know is not his . . . And if Cesar, who ever he be, careth not to be served upon such an account, as that specified, he must wait for his relief until I be dead."

4. John Goodwin, The Triers (or Tormenters) Tryed and Cast, 1657, preface to the reader.

whether such practices arose from their zeal for God, their desire to increase their power, or from the pressure of ministers, but, in any case, they, in effect, denied the adequacy of Christ's directions and provisions for the Church. Goodwin felt that the Church must use only Christ's methods and Gospel. These were adequate without the strategies and swords of civil authorities. "And yet the professing powers of this world, have in all times had itching desires to be officious unto Jesus Christ in this kinde, and to obtrude upon him their own projections and inventions to accommodate and help him through the world with his worship and Gospell. . . ."¹

Christ was the sole head of the Church and no authority, whether ministerial, synodical, or civil, had any right to usurp this place. Christ never invested any group with power "to umpire in matters of conscience and of God, to determine what shall be preached, and what not, what shall be believed, and what not. . . ."² Goodwin was especially opposed to the Parliament exercising any such authority for it would mean that "the promiscuous multitude of the Land", who were the electors, would have "a greater power then ever Jesus Christ himself had, at least, then ever he exercised."³ Since the State was secular and the Church spiritual, it was impossible that such a "secular root" could bring forth a

1. Ibid., p. 17.

2. John Goodwin, Theomaxia, 1644, p. 50.

3. Ibid.

"spirituall extraction" as to "order the affairs of Christs Kingdom."¹

There was one other danger in Civil magistrates interfering in religious matters. They usually did not know enough about theology to be wise judges in such issues.

The tenets and opinions of great men, in matters of religion, and things appertaining unto God, are commonly the unexamined and presumed notions of the state and times wherein they live; and so are like to be, not of God, but of the world, and to have a face, but no heart or substance of truth in them.²

They were so "full of the cares, distractions, business, and employments of the world" that they did not have the "freedom and composedness of mind and understanding, substantially to examine and try the doctrines of their teachers."³

The Presbyterians attacked these principles as undermining the authority and stability of Church and State.

Their very Principles teach disobedience to Parliaments, Synods, Princes, Magistrates, and all other Superiors, in all their just Lawes and Commands which concerne the Church or Religion; dissolve all relations, all Subordinations and humane Society it selfe, as I have here fully manifested."⁴

The Presbyterians and many of the Independents were influenced by the fact that Parliament had summoned the Westminster Assembly of Divines to consider ways of reforming the church. It had appointed its members; and it gave the Assembly its orders as to the agenda. Upon the completion of the Assembly's work, the Parliament had to ratify it before it could

1. Ibid., pp. 48 f.

2. John Goodwin, An Exposition of The Ninth Chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, (edition of 1835), p. 5.

3. Ibid., p. 6.

4. William Prynne, Truth Triumphant over Falshood, 1645, epistle dedicatory.

go into effect. In turn Parliament gave to the Assembly help in suppressing and combatting error, heresy, corruption, and schism. The important role which the Westminster Assembly expected the Civil Magistrate to play in religious affairs is seen by this provision in The Confession of Faith:

. . . he hath authority, and it is his duty, to take order, that unity and peace be preserved in the church, that the truth of God be kept pure and entire, that all blasphemies and heresies be suppressed, all corruptions and abuses in worship and discipline prevented or reformed, and all the ordinances of God duly settled, administered, and observed. For the better effecting whereof, he hath power to call synods, to be present at them, and to provide that whatsoever is transacted in them be according to the mind of God.¹

This attitude is also reflected in the epistle dedicatory of Gangraena made to the Parliament by Thomas Edwards:

. . . that God would mercifully pardon that too great suffering, countenancing, spreading and prevailing of Errours, Heresies and Schismes which hath been in this Kingdom these four last years, and would fill you with such a love and zeal to his truth and house, that you might throrowly purge out all things that offend, and cause the false Prophets and the unclean spirit to passe out of the land, speedily and effectually. . . .²

Goodwin had a ready answer for those critics who accused him of weakening the Church by denying it the help of civil power.

. . . we suppose that the Lord Christ so far tendered the spirituall safety and peace of his Churches, as to leave them sufficiently furnished, and every wayes appointed with internall provisions, for the effectuall procurement and preservation of them, without any concurrence of any heterogeneall or externall power.³

1. The Westminster Confession of Faith, Chap. XXIII, sect. 3.

2. Thomas Edwards, Gangraena, Part I, 1646, epistle dedicatory.

3. John Goodwin, Theomaxia, 1644, pp. 34 f.

Christ had left the Church adequately supplied with spiritual resources to build and protect his Church without the help of the secular powers. The Church had no need for such physical support. ". . . we presume that Prisons and Swords are no Church-officers, nor any appurtenances to any Ecclesiastique authority in what form of Government soever."¹

To those who said his views threatened the authority of Parliament, Goodwin answered that he was in effect, strengthening it. By calling on Parliament to be concerned only with what was within its own competence, he was saving it from violations of its authority which awakened "the eye of jealousy upon them" and undermined not only their power, but "their honour, peace, and safety also."² Parliament profited more by refusing to interfere in Church affairs than in exercising an unwanted and unnecessary interference. "He that commanded 'to give unto Cesar the things that are Cesars, and unto God the things that are Gods': did Cesar as much (if not more) service, in the latter command, as in the former."³ Caesar could best further his honor and power by a policy of strict neutrality in the affairs of the Church. When a doubtful case arose as to the proper sphere and authority of Caesar or God, Goodwin issued this warning: ". . . they will be found the best and faithfulest Counsellors unto Cesar, who shall advise him rather to surrender unto, then to claim a doubtfull right or priviledge from God."⁴

1. Ibid., p. 34.

2. Ibid., p. 50.

3. Ibid., p. 51.

4. Ibid.

Chapter V

John Goodwin's

PLEA for TOLERATION

"John Goodwin of Coleman Street . . . is openly for a full liberty of conscience to all sects, even Turks, Jews, Papists This way is very pleasant to very many here." Robert Baillie.

CHAPTER V

PLEA FOR TOLERATION

A. The Theological Bases of Toleration

1. The parallel development of his theological thought and his views on Toleration.-- The whole range of the theological thought of John Goodwin was expressed in his doctrine of toleration. All of his theological views received their practical application in the defense of religious toleration. There was a close, and reciprocal relationship between his position on religious freedom and his various theological doctrines. On the one hand, his love of freedom helped carry him first into Congregationalism and later into Arminianism. On the other hand, the liberalizing of his theological position led to the broadening of his views on toleration. Just as his theological tenets were continually being liberalized, so was his doctrine of toleration always growing in that same direction. Three distinct stages in the movement of his thought can be seen.

Before 1644 Goodwin really had no doctrine of toleration. The elements were there in his thought, but they had not been developed into a theory. The three dominant characteristics of his thought, which were the basis for his position on toleration, were already present in the first writings of Goodwin. When fully developed, these theological principles would support a full and complete doctrine of toleration.

The first of these was his attitude toward truth.

In the preface of his first theological book he presented his views of truth as continually growing and best attained by persuasion and disputation.¹ The idea was already present in his thought of a progressive and continuing revelation of truth. This had in it the seeds of intellectual freedom. Haller calls this book "the most impressive statement that had yet come from a Puritan preacher of a theological formula for toleration, for intellectual freedom in the widest sense."² There was, however, no effort to apply this approach directly to the theoretical problem of toleration. He only used it to defend the setting forth of a view on a particular theological doctrine which varied from the orthodox view of most of the Puritans. His position on this special theological issue also reflected the presence of another characteristic of his thought which could form the basis for a theory of toleration.

His views on the doctrine of justification were to prove to be a significant milestone on Goodwin's pilgrimage to Arminianism and his journey to a position of religious liberty. In his doctrine of justification he rejected the Calvinist view of the imputation of Christ's righteousness through the atonement for a conception of the atonement as opening up the possibility of man's being justified and saved if he believed. It is not an objective transaction between God and Christ with men only collecting the benefits. Man

1. John Goodwin, A Treatise of Justification, 1642.

2. William Haller, The Rise of Puritanism, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1938), p. 200.

has a responsibility to accept it in faith. Furthermore, this "justification" did not mean being "clothed with Christ's righteousness." It only meant that man's guilt was removed and it was his duty to proceed in pursuit of truth and righteousness.

This emphasis on the individual's personal, responsible relationship to God was to lead him to both Arminianism and religious tolerance. Religion and belief were individual matters of effort and decision. Salvation could not be merely a matter of predestination, and faith not equated with subscription to a creed. Here was the respect for the individual which is the basis for all freedoms.

One other principle was needed to give Goodwin a firm basis for a doctrine of religious toleration. He had shown a belief in freedom of thought and the freedom of the individual. He was also to take a stand for a free Church. Like most Puritans at the beginning of the Long Parliament, Goodwin had not thought much about the doctrine of the Church. His views were largely negative and founded in opposition to the Anglican Church. Unlike many Puritans, however, he was to follow the same principles through to arrive at a Congregational doctrine of the Church. The elements of his later views on the Church were already present in Goodwin's thought. The first was a determined opposition to those who threatened the liberty and purity of the Church. In 1642 he was a leading opponent of "Popery, Prelacy and prophannesse in the Land" which endangered the liberty of the "Sanctuaries", "publike assemblies" and the "open and free trade to Heav-

en."¹ In anticipation of his later criticism of the "High" Presbyterians, he warned the people of England that "your soules and consciences shall bee compassed about with lies and errors and the Commandements of men . . . instead of those spirituall and glorious truths, which were wont to bee as so many Angels sent from the presence of God to comfort you" if the Cavaliers triumphed.²

At this early stage, there was also present an affirmation of the rights of the individual conscience against the State. He stated that God was the sole ruler of his conscience.

. . . If a King should command me . . . to forbear the doing of anything, which I conceive I am bound in conscience unto God to doe for the publique good, I am not in this case any whit more bound to obey the Kings command, then the Apostle Peter and John were to obey the command of the Rulers and Elders who charged them to give over preaching the Gospell. . . .³

Goodwin would later apply this to Parliament and the Assembly as well as the King. He was now criticising those who "make Idols of Kings and Princes, and great men . . . as all they in effect doe, who yeald obedience unto them against God.

. . ."⁴ Later he would oppose those who expected obedience to synods and councils against the conscience of the individual. In 1642 Goodwin warned against "those men who are ready in a posture of hatred, and malice, and revenge . . . to fall upon us, and our lives and liberties, both spirituall and

1. John Goodwin, Anti-Cavalierisme, 1642, pp. 4 ff.
 2. Ibid., p. 46.
 3. Ibid., p. 9.
 4. Ibid., p. 22.

civill, upon our estates, our Gospell and Religion. . . ."¹

In the year 1644 Goodwin began the defence of both Congregationalism and toleration. During the next four years his views on religious toleration developed largely as a result of his doctrine of the Church. The Congregationalist conception of the Church now became the keystone in his defence of toleration.² In its doctrine of a voluntary and gathered Church he found a basis for resistance to the authority of a Church hierarchy or council and the coercive action of the State. Its emphasis on the spiritual nature of the church gave him a basis for separating Church and State, and also for seriously restricting the rights of the civil magistrate to interfere in religious matters. It provided a larger scope for Goodwin's stress on persuasive, as against suppressive methods of opposing error. From the Congregationalist point of view, it was largely a matter for the local congregation, and this was where persuasive techniques were liable to be most effective. With the help of the Congregational conception of the Church, he was developing a significant and broad doctrine of religious toleration. Only his abandonment of Calvinism for Arminianism was needed to bring his views to full maturity and unlimited toleration.

From 1648 onwards Goodwin's Arminian theology was to aid him in removing the last vestiges of intolerance from his

1. Ibid., p. 3.

2. Op. cit., W. K. Jordan, The Development of Religious Toleration in England, (Allen and Unwin, 1938), Vol. III, p. 399.

thought.¹ Arminianism meant a further development along two lines. In the first place, it was reflected in a more thoroughly rationalistic and relativistic attitude toward truth. When reason became the sole instrument of distinguishing truth from error, methods of coercion and persecution had no validity. If truth is relative and not absolute, then no Church or State could claim the right to suppress an opinion which they could not distinguish with certainty as true or false. Goodwin's distinction between the Bible and the Word of God enabled him to remove the last barrier to full tolerance -- the Puritan belief in the infallible Word and infallible doctrine.² In making this distinction, Goodwin opened up a legitimate place for the use of reason in interpreting the Scriptures thereby denying the possibility of infallible interpretations.

The second result of Goodwin's acceptance of the Arminian position was to widen and deepen his emphasis on religion as essentially an individual affair. The doctrine of universal redemption widened the possibility of salvation to include every individual who repented and had faith in Christ, whether inside or outside the Church. The denial of the doctrine of predestination deepened the emphasis on the individual's responsibility to seek truth and salvation for himself alone. The result was that religion was largely a matter between the individual and his God. The State had no

1. Cf., *Ibid.*, pp. 408 f., and Michael Freund, Die Idee der Toleranz im England der grossen Revolution. (Halle, 1927), p. 210.

2. Freund, op.cit., p. 216.

right to use coercion in a man's relationship to God.

The difference these influences made can be clearly seen in comparing his attitude toward interference in the Church between the two periods, 1644-1647 and 1648 onwards. A definite change can be seen in Goodwin's reaction to interference in doctrinal and pastoral matters. Goodwin had never directly attacked the Westminster Assembly during these earlier years. In 1648, however, he issued a strong and critical pamphlet against the London Synod.¹ He accused them of acting "as if the Chaire of Papall infallibility were of late translated from Rome to Sion Colledge."² Similarly, Goodwin had not openly opposed the Committee for Plundered Ministers, even though it had removed him from his church. When the Independents set up a corresponding body, Goodwin issued a pamphlet against them, using the suggestive title of, The Triers (or Tormenters) Tryed and Cast.

This was also reflected in his attitude toward the State. In 1644, he warned the civil authorities to exercise extreme caution and care before punishing any heresy or blasphemy, for they might be wrong. He advised the civil powers to "have security upon security, conditions as clear as the noon-day, that they are but counterfeits and pretenders only, and stand in no relation at all, but that of enmity and opposition unto God" before suppressing any doctrine or "way."³ Again in 1646, he cautioned the State to examine carefully any

1. John Goodwin, Sion-Colledg visited, 1648.

2. Ibid., p. 4.

3. John Goodwin, Theomaxia, 1644, p. 52.

doctrine before suppressing it, and to be sure that the "righteousness of God" and not the "wrath of men" prompted it.¹ But in 1648, he opened the Whitehall debates on this question by saying, "that God hath nott invested any power in a Civill Magistrate in matters of religion." He went on to add, "That the magistrate hath [not] in any way a concession from God for punishing any man for going alonge with his conscience, I conceive that is nott necessary to be argued upon."²

Perhaps the difference between these two periods can best be described as a position of religious toleration in the former, and of religious liberty in the latter. Jordan's definition of religious toleration as presuming a "positive attitude of mind which enables us charitably and sympathetically to hear another man whom we consider to be in error,"³ accurately characterises Goodwin's point of view in 1644. He wanted a toleration for the Congregationalist doctrine of Church government from the Presbyterians. During his later years, Goodwin had reached such an individualist position that he had moved beyond toleration to a theory of religious liberty. Acton's famous definition of liberty "that every man shall be protected in doing what he believes his duty against the influence of authority and majorities, custom and opinion,"⁴ if

1. John Goodwin, The inexcusableness of that Grand Accusation of the Brethren, called Antapologia. 1646, preface.

2. William Clarke, The Clarke Papers, Edited by C. H. Firth, (Camden Society, 189), Vol. II, p. 74.

3. Jordan, op.cit., Vol. I, p. 16.

4. Lord Acton, History of Freedom, as quoted in Cecil Northcott, Religious Liberty, (SCM Press, 1951), p. 14.

applied to the religious field, would well fit Goodwin's position. He was for religious freedom in the fullest sense of the term.

2. The Relativity of Truth undermined the basis for persecution.-- One of the basic requirements for religious persecution is that the persecutor must believe he is right.¹ It implies the possession of an infallible body of doctrines by the persecuting group.² It also suggests the existence of an infallible judge to decide between truth and error.³ If either the infallibility of the doctrinal criterion, or the ability of an individual or group to apply the test infallibly, is denied, then the basis for persecution is seriously undermined. John Goodwin denied the existence of such a criterion or of such a judge. In doing so, he laid one of the foundation stones necessary for a doctrine of toleration.

The basis for Goodwin's opposition to both of these propositions was his belief in the relative character of theological truth. As we have seen, he viewed all religious

1. R. H. Bainton, The Travail of Religious Liberty, (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1951), p. 17.

2. Jordan, op.cit., Vol. I, p. 24: "Persecution of religious heresy rests fundamentally upon the conviction that there is an ascertained body of religious truth which must be believed in its entirety in order to attain salvation."

3. This fact was recognised by other writers of the period. ". . . Because they that take upon them this supremacy of expounding Scripture whether in doctrine or discipline must say in effect, or infer by their proceedings, that their dictates are the infallible truths of God, otherwise men will be apt to think they had as good believe their own: Secondly, that it is infallibly Gods will to have those dictates of theirs to be forced upon mens consciences; and thirdly, that they are infallibly called thereunto, & guided by Gods Spirit to see them executed . . ." [Henry Robinson], Liberty of Conscience, 1643, pp. 38 f.

knowledge as incomplete, imperfect, and subject to error. Through the continuing work of the Spirit, new truths were always being opened up out of the Scriptures.

. . . who can say unto the Almighty, with due reverence to the unsearchable riches either of his wisdom or of his grace and bounty, Hitherto indeed thou hast advanced thyself in giving wisdom and understanding unto men, but further thou canst not go, thy treasures are exhausted?¹

God's truths in the Scriptures were eternally and infallibly true, but man's understanding and theological formulations of them were partial and relative. Men varied so in their "faculties, principles, or abilities wherewith to apprehend" God's truth that neither unanimity nor infallibility was possible.² When there was added to this, the hidden nature of truth "in the depths, remote from the common thoughts and apprehensions of men,"³ no church or doctrinal system could be entirely free from error. Since neither orthodoxy nor heresy could be absolutely defined and distinguished, persecution was not justified.⁴

Goodwin was even more positive in his denial of the

1. John Goodwin, Redemption Redeemed, (edition of 1840), p. 36.

2. Ibid., p. 23.

3. Ibid., p. 399.

4. John Owen expressed a similar attitude in his, A short defensative about Church-Government, 1646, p. 71: "That it is a most difficult undertaking, to judge of haeresies and haereticks, no easy thing, to show what heresy is in generall; whether this, or that particular errour be an haeresy or no, whether it be an haeresy in this, or that man. . . ." He goes on to add that Papists have such an infallible rule, but Protestants do not possess one. Therefore, "it is a most difficult thing to determine of haeresy; with an assurance, that they are so out of danger of erring, in that determination, as to make it a ground of rigorous proceedings, against those, of whom they have so concluded." p. 72.

ability of any man or group of men, to judge infallibly between truth and error. He pointed out the many differences which were found in the history of theology concerning various doctrinal issues. He delighted in calling the attention of the Presbyterians to disagreements in their very midst. He held up to ridicule Thomas Edwards and his lists of errors and heresies. He called it a "most importune and unsufferable presumption" on Edwards' part to "advance himselfe into a Paper Throne, and from thence, satis pro Imperio . . . pronounce the formidable sentence of Error and Heresie, against all opinions and judgments of men whatsoever, which will not comport with his understanding (or fancie rather) as the standard of all Truth."¹ Above all, he used the parallel between papist and Presbyterian claims to infallibility to impugn the latter.²

Goodwin's position in regard to the nature of truth undermined the whole basis of persecution. It denied the ability of parliaments or synods to discover or know the truth

1. John Goodwin, A Briefe Answer To an ulcerous Treatise, 1646, p. 10.

2. Goodwin was not the only writer to cite the similarity. For example, an anonymous pamphleteer of the period had written, "we protestants are justly broke off them, because we did find that they did not teach right, and so did declare that there was no man, nor number of men whatsoever infallible in their determinations, and that therefore Christians ought not to be lead by any implicate faith, but to search the Scriptures, and be instructed from thence. Shall we our selves now impose our determinations as obligatory to all. . . ." Zeal Examined: Or, A Discourse for Liberty of Conscience, 1652, p. 2. It was a common practice of those writing in support of toleration to draw a parallel between Papist, Prelate and Presbyter. ". . . Persecution is a sinne, a signe of the Church malignant, and no degree therefore dispensable by Popery, Episcopacie, or Presbytery . . . the whole Kingdome did acknowledge it whilst Popery domineered, the greatest part are weary of it in Prelacie; O let Presbytery be forewarned thereby" [Henry] Robinson], Liberty of Conscience, 1643, p. 32.

adequately to judge error. All efforts to punish error or heresy were looked on as false pretensions, for no one could define it with complete finality. If truth and error could not be distinguished with absolute certainty, then there was no alternative but to permit the existence of various religious opinions.

While this would broaden the area of religious toleration until only a few central doctrines were left, it would leave the way open for the persecution of those on the fringe or outside of Christianity. Goodwin tried to meet this problem, first by limiting the essential beliefs to the clear Scriptural doctrines.¹ An example of this was his attitude toward the Trinity. He held that since the Scriptures nowhere affirmed that God was one in three persons, this doctrine was the "voyce of men, not of God," therefore, its denial should not be punished. He warned: "If once this door be opened, that the expositions or Interpretations of Scripture, or deductions from Scripture, made by men, shall be binding upon the Judgments and Consciences of others, under civil mulcts and penalties in any kind, where or when, or in what cases shall it be shut?"²

1. Goodwin did not draw up a list of essentials of faith as the exponents of a limited toleration did. He agreed with the sentiment of Roger Williams when he refused to subscribe to a list of fundamentals necessary for salvation. "To this distinction I dare not subscribe, for then I should everlastingly condemn thousands . . . far be it from any pious breast to imagine that they are not saved. . . ." Roger Williams, The Bloody Tenent of Persecution for Cause of Conscience Discussed, Edited by E. B. Underhill, (Hanserd Knollys Society, 1848), p. 39.

2. John Goodwin, The Scourge Of The Saints Displayed, 1646, p. 27.

Later on, he was to try and restrict this area of certain truths to those which could be known from nature, rather than the Bible. Here again, however, he sought to restrict greatly the number of known and certain truths. In the Whitehall Debates he put forth the position that though "men are capable by the light of nature to conceive that there is a God, yett to conceive this in a right and true manner itt is in the profundities, in the remotest parts, amongst those conclusions which lie farthest off from the presence of men. . . ."1

3. Liberty of conscience disclaimed the right of persecution.-- Another prerequisite for religious persecution is that the Church must claim a sovereignty over the consciences of men. It has usually involved the existence of a comprehensive, inclusive Church. If the individual would not voluntarily conform, then the Church had the right and the duty to force him to do so. There could be no liberty for the individual conscience when a Church compelled every person in the nation to support and attend its services and believe its tenets. Whereas, freedom of the individual conscience is one of the essential requisites for religious freedom.²

Puritanism had a peculiar relationship to this problem. It had an emphasis on the individual's relationship to God which was eminently favorable to liberty of conscience.³ Yet,

1. William Clarke, The Clarke Papers, Edited by C. H. Firth, (Camden Society, 1894), Vol. II, p. 116.

2. Jordan, op.cit., Vol. I, p. 18.

3. A. S. P. Woodhouse, Puritanism and Liberty, (J. M. Dent, 1938), pp. 51 ff.

this individualism was offset by two of its other characteristics, both of which justified persecution. In the background, there was the belief of the more orthodox Puritans in a Church which possessed the exclusive truth and to whom all men owed allegiance. All those who refused to enter its uniformity or submit to its discipline should be forced to do so.¹

The first of these was the Puritan zeal for reform and righteousness, and his abhorrence of error and heresy. Their very fervor for making the nation into a holy community made them intolerant of opinions or conduct which ran counter to their own.² They thought that the reformation which they wanted could be brought about by suppressing error and evil. Hence persecution became not only a duty, but a virtue as well. Error did not have the same rights as truth, nor heresy as orthodoxy. Truth and orthodoxy had to be preserved regardless of the consequences to the individual. The individual conscience was subordinated to the demand for a holy, orthodox Church and nation.

It was this attitude of many of the Puritans which led Goodwin to exclaim: "It is a sad observation, but full of

1. Jordan, *op.cit.*, Vol. III, p. 298.

2. S. R. Gardiner, *History of England 1603-1642*, (Longman Green, 1884), Vol. I., pp. 24 f.: "As a religious belief for individual men, Calvinism was eminently favorable to the progress of liberty. But the Calvinistic clergy, in their creditable zeal for the amelioration of the moral condition of mankind, shared to the full with the national statesmen their ignorance of the limits beyond which force cannot be profitably employed for the correction of evil. . . . Penetrated with the hatred of vice, and filled with the love of all that was pure and holy, they saw no better way of combating evils which they justly dreaded than by directing against them the whole force of society, in the vain hope of exterminating them. . . ."

truth; that Religion never had greater enemies, than 'those of her owne house'; yea than those, who were pretenders in the Highest to her Advancement."¹ It also moved him to issue a pamphlet offering, Twelve Considerable Serious Cautions (1646). The main theme of these "cautions" was that any effort for reformation that was "forward, peremptory, imperious" would not be according to the Word of God. Reformation could come at too great a cost if it meant enslaving men's consciences and violating their freedoms. A true reformation could never come by the magistrate's sword. It would mean inward obedience to Christ rather than outward conformity to the dictates of a persecuting Church.² A reformation would come with preaching, not with laws.

A second factor limiting the freedom of the individual conscience was the view of the orthodox Puritans of the necessity for uniformity. Sects, schisms, and heresies were a threat to the unity and peace of the Church and nation; therefore, they must be suppressed. The individual was subordinate and subject to the will of both. There was the Calvinist insistence on the sovereign will of God, but the Presbyterian fear of disorder and chaos was such that they were willing to forfeit the sole rule of God over the conscience to the Church and the State in the name of peace and order. This is clearly brought out in the chapter in the Westminster Confession on

1. John Goodwin, Sion-Colledg visited, 1648, p. 1.

2. Henry Burton, a fellow Independent expressed the same idea in his pamphlet, A Vindication of Churches, Commonly Called Independent, 1644, p. 1: "A right Reformation is a setting up of Christs spirituall kingdome, first over the hearts and consciences, and then over the severall Churches."

"Christian Liberty, and Liberty of Conscience."¹ In the second section of this chapter there is the affirmation, "God alone is Lord of the conscience. . . ."² This is almost negated by section four, however:

And because the powers which God hath ordained, and the liberty which Christ hath purchased, are not intended by God to destroy, but mutually to uphold and preserve one another; they who, upon pretence of Christian liberty, shall oppose any lawful power, or the lawful exercise of it, whether it be civil or ecclesiastical, resist the ordinance of God.³

Any "erroneous opinions or practices" which are

. . . destructive to the external peace and order which Christ hath established in the church; they may lawfully be called to account, and proceeded against by the censures of the church, and by the power of the civil magistrate.⁴

Goodwin saw the demand of the orthodox for peace and order as threatening freedom of conscience.

. . . the mischiefs of Presbytery, are veiled with Orthodoxy, and preventing Schismes, &c., But if the Saints would pry into the formality, tyranny, enslaving mens judgements and consciences the Presbyteriall way, &c. they would looke upon it as that which is most inconsistent with their spirituall liberty. . . .⁵

He thought uniformity was an impossible and undesirable ideal. Men were too variable in their talents and their understanding of the Scriptures to be poured into one mould.

Various principles united in Goodwin's thought causing him to have an individualistic conception of religion. The Protestant idea of the open Bible was reflected in his insistence that every man had a right, and even the duty, to read

1. The Westminster Confession, Chap. XX.

2. Ibid., sect. 2.

3. Ibid., sect. 4.

4. Ibid.

5. John Goodwin, Certain Briefe Observations, 1644, p: 5.

and interpret the Bible according to his own conscience.¹ The Congregationalist conception of the voluntary church helped him to stress the right of each individual to unite with the church and pastor of his own choosing.² The Arminian belief in every man's own responsibility in regard to his eternal destiny carried him even further in emphasizing the importance of each individual's pursuing salvation in the light of his own conscience.

Commenting on Goodwin's individualism, Jordan says: "Man became noble, self-sustaining, and terribly alone in Goodwin's theory. But in that theory all vestige of reason for religious coercion was destroyed."³ This must be qualified, however. Man was not wholly noble in Goodwin's eyes. Goodwin did not look upon men as inerrantly noble in all their actions. They usually preferred to take the errors which lay at hand instead of putting forth the effort to discover the truth. They more often liked error which catered to the flesh than truth which crucified it. Men frequently took their religion on authority rather than work to acquire their own. Man was not completely self-sustaining either, in Goodwin's theory. It was true that God endowed men with the noble faculty of reason and the ability to discern God's will in the Scriptures; yet, he also needed the grace of God and the enlightenment of the Holy Spirit.⁴ Neither was the

1. John Goodwin, The Divine Authority of the Scriptures Asserted, 1648, pp. 23 f.

2. John Goodwin, The Triers (or Tormenters) Tried and Cast, 1657, p. 6.

3. Jordan, op.cit., Vol. III, p. 405.

4. John Goodwin, Redemption Redeemed, (edition of 1840), p. 23.

individual "terribly alone" with his God, in Goodwin's theory. He had a strong sense of the fellowship of the saints in the Church. There seems to have been a strong bond of fellowship within Goodwin's own Church. He occasionally cautioned the members of his Church in such words as these:

Act ye every man (respectively) the part of a Bishop, Watchman, or Overseer, one towards, or over, another, lest any man fail of, or fall from, the grace of God. . . . Let every mans heart therefore be deeply set within him to take all his present company all along with him (if it be possible) in his way to Heaven, not suffering any person to straggle, or wander from his follows in any by-way of sin or vanity.¹

There is no question, however, of Goodwin's individualism and his staunch defense for a conscience free from all coercing authority. No Church or magistrate had the right to usurp the place of God by demanding a rigid uniformity of belief. There was no place for coercion by religious or civil authorities in Goodwin's thought. The conscience of the individual was beyond the reach of both. Only God could have authority over it. Goodwin would probably have agreed with Henry Burton in saying that "we acknowledge Christ alone to be Lord of our Conscience, and no power of men on earth herein to be joyned with him."² He consistently and strongly opposed all efforts to compromise or take away that liberty.

4. Separation of Church and State took away the means of Persecution.-- A basic requirement for religious persecution is the co-operation of the State with the Church.³ Persecution can be effective only where the secular authority is

1. John Goodwin, Cata-Baptism, 1655, part I, sect. 20.
 2. Burton, op.cit., 1644, p. 38.
 3. Jordan, op.cit., Vol. I, p. 25.

willing to enforce the judgments of the Church. This can be seen in the Calvinist conception of the State as promoting and enforcing the cause of the Church.¹ Without the active aid of the civil powers the Church could go no further than excommunication in its opposition to error. The enforcement of civil penalties and control over the press and pulpit were necessary to combat heretical opinions effectively. An alliance between Church and State was, therefore, an essential for persecution.²

By separating the Church and the State and denying the civil magistrate all right of interference in religious matters, Goodwin took away the means of persecution. His warning to the State was: "The generall rule of restraint which God hath charged upon States, Kingdoms, and Nations, is this: 'Touch not mine anointed, and do my Prophets no harm'. . . ."3

Goodwin had challenged the Presbyterians with this query: "Whether did God ever give any power or authority to civil magistrates, or others, either in the old testament or the new, to make any controverted exposition of any clause or clauses in the law -- punishable either with imprisonment or death?"4 By separating the State from the Church, Goodwin made even this query irrelevant. He made the civil magistrate's practice dependent on the law of nature and not Biblical practice.⁵ As we have seen, he did this by distin-

1. Ernst Troeltsch, The Social Teaching of the Christian Churches, translated by Olive Wyon, (Allen and Unwin, 1931), Vol. II, p. 654.

2. Jordan, op.cit., Vol. I, p. 25: "The Church was able, on the whole, to make persecution effective only by reason of the co-operation of the secular authority."

3. John Goodwin, Theomaxia, 1644, p. 40.

4. John Goodwin, Some Modest and Humble Queries, 1646, p. 12.

5. John Goodwin, Thirty Queries, 1653, p. 3.

guishing between the new dispensation under the Gospel as against the Law of the Old Testament.¹ Israel had been a theocracy, but life under the Gospel was different and voluntary. The state existed for the benefit of men. Goodwin was fond of quoting, in this regard, the passage that the Sabbath was made for man and not man for the Sabbath. The State has a negative role of keeping sinful men from destroying themselves. "I look upon it as the only preventive appointed by God, to keep the world from falling foul upon itself, and being destroyed by its own hands."² The civil magistrate has a positive role in promoting "the welfare, honour, and prosperity of that community of men, which is under his inspection and government."³ This does not include the promotion of religion, however, for that belonged to Christ and his Church alone.

The separation of the Church from all dependence upon the State meant the destruction of all means of coercion in religious matters. The Church had to depend entirely upon spiritual methods and forsake all secular aid. This had

1. Typical of the views of many of the Presbyterians was that of Adam Stewart. "God in the Old Testament granted no Toleration of divers Religions, or Disciplines; and the New Testament requireth no lesse union amongst Christians, then the old amongst the Jews. . . . It is the Civill Magistrates part to take away Heresies, Superstitions, and Corruptions in manners after the examples of the Kings of Juda. . . ." Some Observations and Annotations Upon the Apologeticall Narration, 1644, pp. 62 f. "The Church, the Presbyterians submitted, is robbed of half its strength unless it enjoys the assistance of the Christian magistrate." Jordan, *op.cit.*, Vol. III, p. 299.

2. John Goodwin, The Scourge Of The Saints Displayed, 1646, preface.

3. John Goodwin, Thirty Queries, 1653, p. 4.

been the way of the New Testament.¹ Goodwin opposed those "who devise new stratagems, methods, or inventions to aid the Gospel, and to prevent dangers or inconveniencies incident to it, beyond or besides all that Christ either proscribed or directed to be done. . . ."2

5. Ethical emphasis questioned the necessity for persecution.-- A persecuting Church must feel that it has the exclusive, infallible truth in order to have a basis for persecution. It must also assume that it has a right to exercise its jurisdiction and enforce its rule over all the people of the nation. In addition it requires the assistance of the State to carry out its punishments and penalties. There is one other characteristic which is common to most persecuting Churches. It must believe that right belief is necessary for salvation, or, at least, of the greatest importance. Historically there have been three ways by which this requirement has been undermined.³ One has been mysticism which by-passed creeds to go directly into the presence of and communion with God. Another has been an ethical emphasis which has made right conduct more important than right belief, Christian life of greater significance than orthodoxy. The third was a

1. In the same spirit another writer of the period had written concerning Paul: ". . . he did not imprison, fine, nor out off eares, his weapons were only spirituall, the power and might of Jesus Christ; gentle exhortation and friendly admonition was the only meanes the Apostles practised, which prevailed then so mightly, and ought for that very reason to be still continued. . . ." [Henry Robinson], op.cit., p. 3.

2. John Goodwin, The Triers (or Tormenters) Tryed and Cast, 1657, p. 4.

3. Bainton, op.cit., p. 217.

complete indifference to religion as a whole. This has been a common modern approach. John Goodwin belonged to the second group.

The medieval mystics who emphasized inner experience, and the Renaissance humanists who stressed ethical conduct did not so much attack directly the necessity for right belief, as to undermine it by discounting it. In a similar manner, Goodwin did not use this importance of godliness as against orthodoxy as an argument for religious liberty. It was usually inferred rather than stated. Occasionally, he did put the two side by side as in his "Admonition to the remainder of the Flock and Sheep of Christ, yet under my hand and charge" in Cata-Baptism (1655). Here he suggests to his congregation that if any of them have an opinion which differs from that held by the rest and it be a matter "not near the center or heart, (as matters of doubtful dispute amongst Christians, for the most part, are)" that they should keep it to themselves or acknowledge it not to be of great importance.¹ Above all they should not contend with any man to the breach of love and peace. His final conclusion was: "He that contendeth not as well, yea and as much, for love and peace, as for truth, is no good souldier of Jesus Christ, or of the truth."²

Goodwin believed that not only was growth in grace more important than dogma, but doctrines themselves had to be subjected to the ethical test. Godliness was a principal

1. John Goodwin, Cata-Baptism, 1655, Part I, para. 20.
2. Ibid.

criterion of truth as well as the main requirement for Church membership. Creeds became of secondary importance. It was sincerity of belief, not correctness of belief which was of greater importance. If men are "upright and faithful with God," then they are to be accepted and treated with "all love, tenderness and honour. . . ."1 This was demonstrated by his attitude toward those Presbyterian ministers who did not try to force their opinions on others but tried to serve God according to the light of their own conscience. Goodwin said he revered and honoured their "persons and piety."² A person who was sincere and reverent in his beliefs, though he may be partially erroneous, was more to be commended than those who merely professed orthodoxy and did not live accordingly. One of his criticisms of forced conformity was that it was more likely to make hypocrites than true Christians. Above all, religion had to be a voluntary, personal matter.³

There was a strong ethical note in all of Goodwin's writings against intolerance. He frequently referred to the necessity for tolerating those of different opinions with care and tenderness.⁴ He was suspicious of those who

1. John Goodwin, Theomaxia, 1644, p. 27.

2. John Goodwin, The Scourge of the Saints Displayed, 1646, preface.

3. Another writer expressed Goodwin's views as well as his own when he wrote: ". . . for though it be the true Religion which we professe, yet if we were forced to it, it will doe us little good, nor be ever a whit available, for God accepts only of willing service, such as we performe of our owne free election, not by compulsion." [Henry Robinson], op.cit., 1643, p. 3.

4. Goodwin did not always practise this himself. But, considering the abusive and intolerant treatment he received he did remarkably well.

were too vehement in their beliefs. "When men are fierce and fiery in their disputes, it is much to be feared, that they want the truth, or at least the cleere and comprehensive knowledge of the truth, to coole and qualifie them."¹ He questioned whether it was in the Spirit of Christ, "who came into the world not to destroy men's lives but to save them" to use any of Christ's doctrines to destroy the lives of men.² He also raised the question as to whether it was Christian to punish others for their belief when Christianity should be defended, "not by slaying others, but by dying ourselves for it?"³

In addition to care and tenderness in opposing those of questionable beliefs, patience must also be exercised. He thought that as long as there was life there was hope of their arriving at the truth. God had provided the "golden altar" of repentance for those who had difficulty in "coming to the knowledge of the truth."⁴ God had nowhere set a time limit for a man's repentance; therefore, men should not. It was unchristian and presumptuous to do so. He warned that

. . . whosoever shall limit or straiten the providence of God, in this kind, by any hasty or violent taking away of soul from under the influence and working of any ordinance of Christ appointed for his salvation, before the blessed work of Repentance be accomplished in him, will be arraigned before the tribunall of the living God, as accessario to the blood of that soul, except he can shew a better warrant from God for such an action, then I know any.⁵

1. John Goodwin, A Treatise of Justification, 1648, preface.
 2. John Goodwin, Some Modest and Humble Queries, 1646, p. 7.
 3. Ibid., p. 8.
 4. John Goodwin, Redemption Redeemed, (edition of 1840), p. 576.
 5. John Goodwin, Theomaxia, 1644, pp. 35 f.

B. The Practical Arguments for Toleration

1. The danger of fighting against God.-- In the year 1644 when the debate over religious tolerance was at white heat in the Parliament, the Assembly, and the Press, Goodwin put forth a pamphlet taking his stand squarely for toleration. It was not an intellectual argument for religious freedom, but it set forth a basis for toleration. It soon became apparent that "the strategic exigency of the moment made Goodwin the prime exponent of a theological formula of liberty advantageous to all the radical sects and parties."¹ He based his position on the words of Gamaliel to the Jews in regard to the Christians, "For if this counsell or work be of men, it will come to nought; but if it be of God, yee cannot destroy it, lest yee be found oven fighters against God."² In using this Goodwin had "thrust forward a text which was to ring through most of the subsequent controversy over toleration."³

Most of the Puritans had a strong sense of God's providence in the events of history.⁴ Goodwin took the doctrine of Providence and applied it to ideas as well as events and

1. William Haller (ed.), Tracts on Liberty, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1934), Vol. I, p. 54.

2. Acts 5: 38.

3. William Haller (ed.), Tracts on Liberty, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1934), Vol. I, p. 54.

4. Goodwin shared this view. The occasion of this pamphlet was the recent defeat of the Parliamentary Army in Cornwall. He sought an inquiry as to "what that particular and speciall sin or provocation amongst us is . . . which hath brought the rod of this indignation upon our backs." John Goodwin, Theomaxia, 1644, p. 3. The purpose of the pamphlet was to suggest that they had been guilty of fighting against God in the manner in which he set forth.

persons. He said that God was in "every Way, Doctrine, and Ordinance of his. . . ."1 Through these "he communicates and imparts himself graciously into the world."2 Goodwin went on to draw this significant conclusion: "Therefore whosoever shall fight against any of these, by seeking to supplant, suppress, or keep them down, that they may not run and be glorified in the world, what do they else, let this work and course of theirs be truly interpreted, but fight against God himself?"3 To the Puritan reader and listener this was of tremendous importance. Most of them would have wholeheartedly agreed with Goodwin that "fighting against God, is a most dangerous posture or ingagement, for a creature to be taken or found in by God at any time."4 The passage which he quoted on the title page would have had great meaning for the average Puritan. "It is a feareful thing to fall into the hands of the living God." (Heb. 10:31).

Goodwin developed his argument with skill and boldness. Since opposing a doctrine which came from God was in essence fighting against God, it was a "point of much wisdom to forebeare the oppression, or suppression of such persons, Doctrines, and wayes, which men have any reasonable cause at all to judge or thinke, that they are, or may be, from God."5 The problem was that it was difficult to know, in a time of such varied opinions, what doctrine was indeed from God.

1. Ibid., p. 17.

2. Ibid.

3. Ibid.

4. Ibid., p. 12.

5. John Goodwin, Theomaxia, 1644, p. 11.

Goodwin said one thing was certain: "the determination of a Councell, or of the major part of a Councell against a way, Doctrine, or practice, is no demonstrative or sufficient prooffe for any wise man to rest or build upon, that such a way, Doctrine, or practice, are not from God."¹ The great difficulty of determining the truth of a doctrine placed men in the dangerous position of unknowingly fighting against God. ". . . many, who possibly for the present may conceive and thinke, and that with much confidence, that they fight for God, when the truth comes to an unpartiall and perfect scanning, will be found to have fought against him."² Goodwin then concludes that only when one has "prooffe upon prooffe, demonstration upon demonstration, evidence upon evidence" should a person run the hazard of fighting against God by opposing any doctrine which might possibly be from him.

This argument must have carried much weight with many of the Puritans.³ It did not deny the right to persecution, but it seriously questioned its wisdom. It was more an admonition to follow extreme caution rather than to abstain from opposing various opinions. Its effect, however, was to suggest that the issue of punishing error should be left in God's hands, not man's. God would vindicate the truth and destroy error by his own methods and according to his own desires. God's judgment and deliverance might come by the

1. Ibid.

2. Ibid., p. 12.

3. It quickly went through two printings. The numerous references to it by other writers (especially those attacking it) is another indication of its influence.

defeat of an army (as had just happened), or by writing his revelation upon the "fleshly tables of men's hearts," but, in any case, it was extremely dangerous for men to take matters in their own hands.

2. The Danger of Persecuting the Saints.-- The great difficulty in ascertaining truth infallibly made Goodwin's warning about the hazard of fighting against God a powerful argument. The same uncertainty and incompleteness of truth made his argument of the danger of persecuting the saints of great practical importance. Goodwin argued that truth was so elusive that it was possible to punish mistakenly those who were innocent. There was no test of Christian belief that was so accurate that it might not be used against the very people it was trying to protect. Persecution was a two-edged sword which could fall on the saint as well as the heretic.

Goodwin used the parable of the wheat and the tares to dramatize the danger of persecuting the saints while trying to punish the heretic.¹ ". . . if magistrates or others shall be busie about plucking up Sectaries, Heretiques, Teachers of Errors, &c., they will be in continuall danger of plucking up the wheat also, I mean godly men."² There were two reasons why this was true. "First, because many truly pious and conscientious men . . . may easily be drawn into some unwarrant-

1. This parable was used again and again in the sixteenth century as well as the seventeenth, in the argument over toleration. Cf. Bainton, *op.cit.*, p. 26. During Goodwin's time it was used very frequently by Presbyterian, Independent and Sectarian. It was quoted on both sides of the argument.

2. John Goodwin, The Scourge of the Saints Displayed, 1646, p. 92.

able Sect, or opinion."¹ The second reason echoed his argument used in Theomaxia. "Secondly, such opinions as express those who hold them forth, to the reproachful names of Sectaries, Schismatiques, Heretiques, &c. . . . may well be the sacred Truths of God. . . ."2

References to this parable run through his writings, but they all point to the same conclusion. "Whether our Saviours intent in the Parable of the tares . . . was not to prohibit such magistrates who are Christian and Orthodox, the exercising of any . . . severity against Blasphemes, Seducers, Heretiques. . . ."3 Just as there had been danger of fighting against God while fighting against Satan, there was danger of persecuting the saints while trying to persecute heretics. In both cases it was better to leave the issue in the hands of God. The parable of the wheat and the tares clearly meant that the heretics were to be left growing among the saints until the final judgment of God had separated them. To try to separate them was to assume a knowledge which only God had. It was better to leave unpunished the heretics than that one innocent saint should suffer. The nation had had enough experience with this danger during a time of persecution. "Examples hereof were frequent in this very Kingdome in the dayes of Papall power."⁴ There were also many Puritans who remembered vividly enough the persecutions under the Stuarts to recognize this danger and be influenced by this argument.

1. Ibid., p. 93.

2. Ibid.

3. John Goodwin, Thirty Queries, 1653, p. 5.

4. John Goodwin, The Scourge of the Saints Displayed, 1646, p. 93.

3. The danger of suppressing reformation.-- There was perhaps no note of the Puritan Revolution so dominant as its sense of expectancy of a coming reformation.¹ From the Presbyterian to the Fifth Monarchy millenarians there was an expectant spirit that God was bringing great things to pass in their own age. The ideal or vision of the utopia varied from group to group, but most of the Puritans were looking forward to the realization of that ideal. John Goodwin shared that sense of expectancy with his age.² The difference was that he looked not to the establishment of certain ecclesiastical or political forms as the basis for reformation, but the shining forth of new truth as its fountainhead. He thought a policy of intolerance was cutting off the possible sources of reformation.

Each Puritan group had its own particular approach as to the proper way to bring in the "new Jerusalem." Goodwin was one of those who thought it would be brought in by preaching and not by legislation. It would come by discovery of new truths or the rediscovery of old neglected truths, and not

1. William Haller, The Rise of Puritanism, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1934), p. 269, and A. S. P. Woodhouse, Puritanism and Liberty, (J. M. Dent, 1938), p. 47.

2. He was not, however, a Fifth Monarchy man or millenarian as he was sometimes accused of being. Cf., Bishop Burnet, History of His Own Time, (Revised edition, Oxford, 1833), Vol. I, p. 124. Actually he had some harsh things to say about the Fifth Monarchists. ". . . to set a few people a gogg with a conceit, that if they might chuse and set up such or such Persons in place of power and Authority over them, they should lay the foundations of the fifth Monarchie, and suddenly bring the Kingdome of Christ upon the world, is no testimony of Jesus proper to this generation. . . ." John Goodwin, Peace Protected and Discontent Disarmed, 1654, p. 47.

by the setting up of new creeds and confessions. It depended on freedom, not strict discipline and laws. Goodwin thought it was more important to defend civil and religious liberties, than to uphold a particular scheme of church discipline. It called for a separation from this sinful world and not a transformation of it. He was concerned lest over-zealous reformers undertake to "reconcile darknesse with light . . . to throw down partition wall, and make the Wildernesse of the world the Garden of God, the Church and the world enter-commoners?"¹ The Church's role was to be a city set upon a hill to save itself and the world by the preached word and the example of righteousness. Henry Burton well-expressed this point of view when he wrote:

For as tha[?] was the Gospell-Reformation, so is this; as that was a gathering of such churches out of that of the Jewes, as acknowledged Christ to be their onely King and Law-giver, to govern consciences and churches by his Word, when the rest of that church, even the main body of it, did reject Christ . . . So the preaching up of Christs Kingdome in these dayes, is that which calleth and gathereth those unto Christ, who acknowledge him alone for their King to govern them; and this out of those, that doe not, or will not submit unto his Kingly government, but depend upon the sole determination of men²

Truths discovered and preached, not political and ecclesiastical machinery, was Goodwin's idea of the basis for a reformation. "We are under a bondage of much misery, and it is onely the Truth, (as our Saviour saith) that can make us free. . . ."³ The problem was, however, that an intolerant

1. John Goodwin, Theomaxia, 1644, p. 24.

2. Henry Burton, op.cit., p. 27.

3. John Goodwin, Theomaxia, 1644, preface.

majority was trying to stifle the very truth which could reform their land. ". . . such is our condition and misery, that there is cause to feare, lest the Truth, which onely is able to make us free, should increase our bondage and misery, by being rejected and opposed by us, when it comes in love and mercy to visit us, and to blesse us out of our misery."¹ He thought that by opposing and crying down "for error everything that is not generally received and taught," the leaders were quenching "growth in the Lord Jesus" and suppressing reformation. Not only did their policies of persecution mean the silencing of many truths needed to set men free from bondage to error, but it also meant silencing many men who could make a contribution toward bringing in the reformation. Censorship and control over the press and the pulpit had caused the nation to "deeply suffer" by "being thereby deprived of the benefit of the gifts, and labours of many of her worthy members. . . ."² Persecution had been the instrument of both papists and prelates in opposing reformation, and the present leaders were making the same tragic mistake.³

1. Ibid.

2. John Goodwin, A Fresh Discovery Of The High-Prosbyterian Spirit, 1654, p. 8.

3. One of the most active sectarian pamphleteers of the period expressed the same idea in these words: "Let it be considered, whether it hath not been one of the Nationall sinnes, viz. Making Lawes against all other Forms but what it did establish it selfe Nationally; by which experience hath told us, how Gospell Truths have been kept out whole Generations; Popish States kept out Protestantism, and Prelacy kept out Presbytery, and whether Presbytery proceeding on the same ground, is not in the same danger of sin, and of keeping out other Truthes; and whether upon this ground, any Gospell Revelation or Light . . . ever shall come into this Nation. . . ." John Saltmarsh, Groanes for Liberty, 1646, pp. 19 f.

Goodwin's advice was that instead of asserting and enforcing one particular set of opinions to the exclusion of all others, men ought "candidly and unpartially to argue and debate, and so to finde out the Truth in things appertaining unto God. . . ."1 He thought that if men sought truth in "humilitie and meekenesse" to make "rough things plain, and things that were hard easie and dark things lightsome," then they might "expect a speciall presence of God with them, and the Churches of God about them, may comfortably waite for somewhat more of the minde of Christ from them, then they knew."² On the other hand, if the leaders insisted on an "authoritative commanding" of what men should believe then no true reformation could be expected.

4. The ineffectiveness of persecution.-- Indifference to religions and religious differences has been a factor making for religious toleration, especially in modern times.³ This was not true in Goodwin's own case. He warned his own Congregation against the new sects.

I fear that Satan hath drawn many into a like snare of misery, by investing them with new habits of Religion . . . as of Seeking, Quaking, Anabaptizing, Super-Ordinancing, with sundry other forms and fashions of professing Christ, which he hath devised to please the humours and fancies of unstable persons in these latter days.⁴

He also reminded his Presbyterian critics that he had been an active opponent of the leading heresies of his own day. "I

1. John Goodwin, Theomaxia, 1644, p. 45.

2. Ibid., p. 46.

3. Bainton, op.cit., p. 21.

4. John Goodwin, Cata-Baptism, 1655, Part I, para. 8.

have professedly engaged myself, in the course of my ministry, against four of these errors which are generally looked upon as most predominant amongst us, and to which all other may be reduced: Antinomianism, Anabaptism, Anti-Scripturism, Quorism."¹ To the charge of being a "friend to error and heresies" he replied: "I solemnly profess, that who ever they are, that bear the errors and wicked opinions of the times, as a burden of sorrow, I bear my share with them."² A distinction had to be made between those who "oppose, or contend against a doctrine" and those who "assume an Authoritative power, whether Ecclesiastique or Civill, to suppress or silence the publishing, practicing, arguing, or debating of such wayes or Doctrines, with the judgements and consciences of men."³

Experience had proven that persecution was always ineffective in dealing with error.⁴ In fact, persecution had the effect of spreading error and heresy rather than destroying it. Persecution only succeeded in causing error to either go underground where it spread unmolested, or to receive the crown of martyrdom from which it gained a wider hearing and a greater sympathy. Civil means, such as

1. John Goodwin, Sion-Colledg visited, 1648, p. 2.

2. Ibid.

3. John Goodwin, Theomaxia, 1644, pp. 12 f.

4. John Owen wrote in the same vein: "It would be seriously considered upon a view of the state and condition of Christians since their name was known in the world, whether this doctrine of punishing erring persons with death, imprisonment, banishment, and the like, under the name of hereticks, hath not been as usefull and advantagious for error, as truth. A Vision of Vnchangeable free mercy, 1646, p. 77.

imprisonment, banishment and finings have been to no avail in combatting spiritual evils and errors.

. . . both reason and experience concur . . . that such fetters as these put upon the feet of errors and heresies to secure and keep them under, still have prov'd (and are like to prove no other, but) wings whereby they raise themselves the higher in the thoughts and minds of men. . . .¹

Persecution, far from wiping out heresies, gave it "an opportunity of a further and ranker propagation of themselves in the world."² The Church Fathers had said "the blood of the Martyrs was the seed of the Church. . . ." Could it not also be said "the blood of Heretics is the seed of Heresy?"³

The ineffectiveness of persecution arose from the fact that it was the wrong method for opposing error. Men could not be forced into truth.⁴ The use of coercive methods made a man a hypocritical conformist. Error can only be removed by truth as darkness cannot be dispelled but by light.⁵ In opposing an effort by certain booksellers to set up a stricter control over the Press, Goodwin wrote: "The setting of Watchmen with authority at the door of the Press, to keep errors and heresies out of the world, is as weak a project, as

1. John Goodwin, Theomaxia, 1644, p. 37.

2. Ibid.

3. John Goodwin, Thirty Queries, 1653, p. 7.

4. An anonymous pamphleteer expressed the same idea which must have been shared by many Puritans. ". . . The conscience being subject only to reason (either that which is indeed, or seems to him which hears it to beso) can only be convinced or perswaded thereby, force makes it runne backe, and struggle; it is the nature of every man to be of any judgment rather then his that forces." The Compassionate Samaritane, 1644, p. 14.

5. John Goodwin, Theomaxia, 1644, p. 33.

it would be to set a company of armed men about an house to keep darknesse out of it in the night."¹

The proper way to oppose heresy and dangerous opinions was a matter for study and strategy, not blind zeal and oppression. "They that desire to serve as good soldiers of Jesus Christ against Errors and Heresies, must first conscienciously study the Christian art and method of this warfare; otherwise, they may easily build up what they go about to pull down."² Goodwin's position was that truth provided the antidote for error. "If men would call more for light, and less for fire from Heaven, their warfare against such events would be much sooner accomplished. . . ."³ Therefore setting forth the truth by writing, preaching and debating was the preferable method to finings, imprisonments, and excommunications. Men must be won to truth before they will be persuaded to let go of error. This implied a great faith in the ability of truth to triumph over its enemy error, when given a chance. Goodwin possessed such a faith.

5. The benefits of toleration.-- Goodwin consistently and courageously set forth the dangers and ineffectiveness of religious persecution in pamphlet after pamphlet, but he also called man's attention to the benefits to be derived from toleration. If the exigencies of the moment forced him to be largely negative and critical in his approach, he never

1. John Goodwin, A Fresh Discovery Of The High-Presbyterian Spirit, 1654, p. 9.

2. J. Acontius, Darkness Discovered, Edited by John Goodwin, 2d ed., 1651, epistle to the reader.

3. Ibid.

lost sight of the desirable aspects of the goal of religious freedom. Goodwin thought that toleration would bring with it two great blessings to the nation. First, it would bring peace to a divided and strife-torn England. Secondly, toleration would open the way for truth and its handmaiden reformation to triumph over their enemies.

He argued that toleration was the only balm that could heal the nation's strife. ". . . if a toleration were allowed, it would take away all occasions of tumults and garboils."¹ The case of the Netherlands was cited as proof of this. ". . . the tranquility and peace that hath been so long, and with so little interruption, enjoyed by the Netherlanders at home, above the proportion of any Kingdom or State round about them, doth abundantly demonstrate" that toleration was the answer to England's troubles as well.² For it was "famously known that Opinions, Religions, Church-Governments of all sorts . . . are there tolerated and yet never were there heard of any such contentions or mischiefs. . ."³, and yet they were not plagued by contentious and bitter strife. Experience had proven that a condition of freedom was more likely to obtain co-operation and harmony between various groups than would coercive measures. Men will not be so fierce and factious in their opinions, if they are not compelled "to keep them burning and glowing in their own

1. John Goodwin, Independencie God's Veritie, 1647, p. 8.

2. John Goodwin, The inexcusableness of that Grand Accusation of the Brethren, Called Antapologia, 1646, p. 115.

3. Ibid.

breasts. . . ."1 A measure of freedom makes the restraints which are imposed less burdensome.

For when every man is permitted to use his conscience according as he is persuaded in himself, they will esteem their burdens not half so heavy as before and be encouraged to yield obedience to those injunctions imposed on them by their rulers, which otherwise is not to be expected from them; so that it is not only convenient, but also very necessary, that there be a toleration.²

Toleration would bring forth truth as well as peace in its wake.³ Truth was not static; it had to be continually striven for. Men had to be frequently stirred out of their bondage to error, and their indifference to truth. The Church had to be always reforming itself. ". . . not only mens manners, but their Judgements and Doctrines also are apt in time, to warp, and to degenerate, unlesse God should ever and anon be stirring up some, who by dealing faithfully with them, should necessitate them to recollection and survey of themselves in both.⁴ This required a free atmosphere in which the wind of Spirit could blow where it listeth and the crucible of open discussion could purify the varied opinions of the nation leaving only "naked and innocent truth." It was

1. John Goodwin, A Reply of Two of the Brethren, (revised edition, 1644), p. 35.

2. John Goodwin, Independencie God's Veritie, 1647, p. 8.

3. Peace and truth were linked together in this manner by several proponents of toleration. Roger Williams used a dialogue between Peace and Truth as the vehicle for his argument for religious liberty in, The Bloudy Tenent of Persecution for Cause of Conscience Discussed, Edited by B. Underhill, (The Hanserd Knollys Society), 1848. Also the title to the anonymous pamphlet generally attributed to Henry Robinson brought out this theme. Liberty of Conscience: Or, The Sole means to obtaine Peace and Truth, 1643.

4. The Divine Authority of the Scriptures Asserted, 1648, epistle dedicatory.

only in the free interplay and disputation of ideas that truth could be disentangled from error. Toleration provided the kind of climate in which truth flourished.¹ And truth was the necessary prelude to reformation of Church and nation. Goodwin looked forward to the day,

. . . when men shall be freely permitted, without fear or danger of molestation, to consult with the apostles, prophets, etc. . . . without having their judgments emancipated . . . forestalled and overawed by the definitive, and compulsory determinations and allowances of other men.²

This would be a time when religious peace and true reform are "approaching the world."

6. The necessity of Toleration.-- Toleration was not just a matter of convenience or desire, but real necessity, Goodwin argued. The condition of the nation was such that various religious views had to be tolerated. Englishmen had now tasted the advantages of freedom and would not voluntarily permit it to be taken away.³ It was not to be expected that those who "have lately tasted the unexpressible

1. An anonymous pamphleteer expressed the same idea in this quaint fashion: "To take men off from the wrong way of opposing errours, which will be as fruitless as 'tis faithless, that they may apply themselves to the use of right mones . . . which requires this Libertie . . . for 'its better operation, as Physick doth require open weather, when the humors are stirring, not clung up nor restrained, for to purge them away." The ancient Bounds, Or Liberty of Conscience, 1645.

2. John Goodwin, A Reply of Two of the Brethren, (revised edition, 1644), p. 33.

3. Cf., [Henry Robinson], Liberty of Conscience, 1643, p. 5: ". . . it is necessary therefore to proceed upon a sure foundation, by passing an act against persecution for Religion, which besides the agreeableness with Scripture, all degrees of people have once tasted the sweetness of it, will never suffer themselves to be bereaved thereof againe, and by that means become a sure establisher of the generall peace of the Kingdome. . . ."

sweetness of ease, peace, and liberty of conscience; that they should, without extreme discontent, be brought back into another house of bondage, where the furnace of peremptory subjection is like to be heated every whit as hot as in the other!"¹ Any effort to enforce a rigid uniformity and pursue a policy of rigorous persecution would be met with "murmuring and clashings, if not open mutinyings."² Goodwin then went on to remind his countrymen of the lesson of recent experience, "that the original of our late war was the Bishops' assuming to themselves that power which Christ never gave them, to wit, of compelling men to yield obedience to whatever they imposed."³

Another fact which made toleration a practical necessity was the infinite variety of thought and practice which had sprung up during the early days of the Puritan revolution. Sects and doctrines had grown so numerous that the religious life of the nation could never be effectively fashioned into one mould again. All the efforts of assemblies, councils, synods and parliaments could never succeed in putting together the broken fragments of the vessel of religious uniformity. There was nothing to do but allow them to exist so long as they obeyed the civil laws of the nation.

And moreover, it is come to that pass -- but by what means I will not question -- that every man esteemeth it as properly his own, as any immunity contained in Magna Charta, to use his conscience without control; and when

1. John Goodwin, A Reply of Two of the Brethren, (revised edition, 1644), p. 88.

2. John Goodwin, Independencie God's Veritie, 1647, p. 8.

3. Ibid.

they shall be debarred of what they have so long enjoyed, and so much covet to keep, what they may attempt let the wise judge.¹

Goodwin's conclusion and warning was, "Therefore there is not only a reason, but also a necessity of toleration."²

1. Ibid.
2. Ibid.

Chapter VI

SUMMARY and CONCLUSIONS

"Mr Goodwin is a person whom his worth, pains, diligence, and opinions, and the contests wherein on their account he hath publicly engaged, have delivered from being the object of any ordinary thoughts or expressions. Nothing not great, not considerable, not some way eminent, is by any spoken of him, either consenting with him or dissenting from him." John Owen.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY and CONCLUSIONS

A. Goodwin's Theological Position

1. Puritanism modified by Christian Humanism.---

There have been many attempts at defining Puritanism but none of them have been adequate. This is to be expected for Puritanism was a many-sided, complex phenomenon. What began as a simple protest grew into a massive movement which ruled Britain for two decades and left a permanent imprint upon the life and thought of the nation. Its influence was not restricted to this island for it was equally important in helping to mold the habits and outlook of the new nation across the Atlantic. Perhaps the best way to understand Puritanism is by looking at some of its basic principles. Amid all the variety of Puritan thought and practice there are certain central characteristics that remain consistently dominant. There are three such characteristics which were important in the thought of all Puritans, including John Goodwin.

One of the most consistent emphases of Puritanism was the pre-eminence of the Bible. "While the word 'Puritan' came to mean many things, it properly denotes firm adherence to the Bible as the sole and sufficient authority in all matters of ecclesiastical government and ceremony as well as of belief and conduct."¹ It was this more than anything else that dis-

1. Douglas Bush, English Literature in the Earlier Seventeenth Century 1600-1660, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1945), p. 7.

tinguished and separated them from the Anglicans. Up until almost the eve of the Puritan Revolution, Anglican and Puritan alike shared the same Calvinist theology. The difference arose from the Puritan's desire to set up the Bible as the infallible guide to all aspects of life. They set out to "purify" first the church and then the nation to meet Biblical "standards". The Puritans tried to remove "superstitious, heathenish and papist" ideas and practices from the place they had in the nation, and bring reform according to the Word of God. This reverence for the Word of God united the Puritans when they were in the minority as the opposition group. When they gained control of the ecclesiastical and political power, the Puritans found that it divided them, for men interpreted the Scriptures in different ways.

The fact was, as experience was to demonstrate, that scripture, which had more poetry in its pages than law, worked upon men of uncritical minds, lively imaginations, differing temperaments and conflicting interests not as a unifying but as a divisive force.¹

Among the Puritans there were Presbyterians and Congregationalists, royalist and republicans, but they were nearly all scripturalists. They might challenge each other's interpretation of the Bible but few dared question its authority.

Goodwin's Puritanism is clearly seen in the Biblical character of his thought. It is not a matter of just paying lip-service to its authority. His theology, his terminology, and his writings are steeped in the Biblical language and out-

1. William Haller, The Rise of Puritanism, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1938), p. 14.

look. Even when he differed with his Puritan brethren, Goodwin felt that he was restoring the true scriptural doctrine. Most of the Puritans looked at the Scriptures through the eyes of Calvin and other Reformed writers. Goodwin used a broader perspective. The answers they received for their questions were often in conflict. Nevertheless the Bible remained the main reference book for all debates.

Here, as at every point, Goodwin modified Puritanism. He had a more liberal attitude toward the Bible than had most Puritans. Above all he replaced a literalistic view with a rational approach. Yet, it never led him to treat the Scriptures less seriously. For Goodwin there was no conflict between reason and revelation. He considered the revelation of the Scriptures as reasonable and the truths of reason as coming from God. Goodwin used reason to oppose authority, but not to challenge revelation. He was concerned to oppose authoritative interpretations of the Bible by a rational interpretation, not to use reason to deny revelation. He never denied the truth nor the authority of the Bible. He was as ready with texts and scriptural arguments as any other Puritan. His sole object was to secure a role for reason in understanding and interpreting the Scriptures, as opposed to the literalism and authoritarian methods of most of the Puritans.

A second dominant characteristic of Puritanism was its interest in reform. "The zeal for positive reform is one of the most constant and indisputable notes of Puritanism."¹

1. A. S. P. Woodhouse, Puritanism and Liberty, (J. M. Dent, 1938), p. 43.

Differences arose as to the pace, method, and nature of the reformation desired, but all Puritans were united on the need for and desirability of a reform of Church and nation. The Root and Branch Petition and the Solemn League and Covenant which sounded the keynote of the Puritan demand for reform displayed this unanimity. The subsequent discussion in pulpit, press, and parliament brought out the diversity of opinion concerning the kind of reformation wanted. What began as a simple effort to "purify" the worship and practices of the Established Church was to become, under the impetus of this zeal, a veritable revolution in Church and State.

John Goodwin shared this intense interest in reform. He identified himself actively with most of the reform measures during the two decades of the Puritan Revolution. He openly supported the parliamentary forces against the royalists, the Independents against the Presbyterians, the Army against Parliament, Cromwell against his detractors. He also participated in the discussions of all the major theological issues of the day. He was continually writing books and pamphlets on the issues being currently debated. From 1640 to 1658 he issued at least one book or pamphlet every year except one (1656). The usual rate was two or three a year. He took a leading part in most of the important controversies of this period.

This zeal for reform and this activity on Goodwin's part can be seen not only by the large number of his books, but also by the nature of his writings. They were, above all, practical in nature. Goodwin was not a system builder. All

of his works were argumentative. He was no idle philosopher speculating peacefully on the eternal verities. He was more of a propagandist writing to sway his own time. He wrote with the needs, issues, and problems of his own generation in mind, and not for posterity. All of his writings bear the imprint of practical necessity. There is a constant interplay between his theological position and the exigencies of the moment. This is not to say that he had no abiding, guiding principles, for he had many. It meant that being primarily a controversialist writer, his emphases and arguments are constantly shifting to meet those of his critics and opponents. It does not mean that his writings have no relevance for us today. On the contrary, they speak to many of the issues and problems of our own day. ". . . scarcely a page of Goodwin's pamphlets lacks a sentence of twentieth century pertinence."¹

Goodwin, however, was a different kind of reformer from most of the Puritans. The sternness of the Puritan reformers was mellowed in Goodwin's thought by the softer views of Christian humanism. Goodwin was more devoted to truth and freedom than most of the men of his day. The pursuit of these called for a rational, discursive approach. The reforming could not be done by outward discipline. Reason, not force, must be its instrument. Truth had to triumph by love, and not by being forced upon unwilling subjects. Freedom, not conformity, was the midwife of truth. Yet, even with this note or modifying influence, it was no renaissance that

1. D. M. Wolfe, Milton in the Puritan Revolution, (New York: Nelson, 1941), p. 9.

Goodwin looked forward to, but a reformation. However, his idea of reformation would have included some of the best elements of the Renaissance.

Closely allied to its Biblical emphasis and behind its zeal for reform, Puritanism had a strong evangelical strain. It caused the Puritan movement to appear at times more like a revival than a reformation or a revolution. It was the true forerunner of the evangelical revival of the eighteenth century. It distinguished the Puritans from the Anglicans. They were "bent upon saving the world through religious revival and ultimate ecclesiastical reform." They endeavoured to do this by moving men to "repent, believe and begin the new life."¹

Much of Puritan debate and concern centered around the questions concerning man's salvation. The poignant cry, "What can I do to be saved?" echoes through Puritan writing and preaching. Can only those predestined be saved, or will anyone who has faith receive salvation? Did Christ die to redeem everyone or only the elect? Can salvation be lost when once gained? What are the signs of being saved? What are its fruits? Is a second baptism necessary for salvation? What takes place when we are saved? Are we justified by Christ's righteousness imputed to us or by Christ's atonement? These and countless other questions were asked and answered in pulpit and pamphlet.

1. Haller, op.cit., p. 19.

John Goodwin's thought was deeply evangelical. Most of his theological writings dealt with the great evangelical themes of grace, justification, the atonement, and redemption. He had an evangelical's conception of the sinfulness of man and his need for forgiveness. Significantly, he makes the minimum for salvation of pagans, not mere belief, but repentance and belief. When he compares the message of philosophers to that of the Gospel this evangelical emphasis comes out clearly.

Plato cannot say, nor can Aristotle or Seneca, or any other of the great Philosophers of the world, say (nor doe any of them say) that they so loved the world . . . 'that they gave their only begotten sonnes for it.' They have no such golden chords as this, wherewith to draw the hearts of men against their native dispositions and desires, to comport with their instructions or exhortations unto vertue.¹

The contrast is even greater in the matter of threats of punishment as an incentive toward virtue.

The Hell of Philosophers, is but like the Hell of the Poets, which is an Hell to play and make sport withall: it is the Scripture Hell, that makes the hearts, and souls, and consciences, and all that is in men, to quake and tremble.²

Yet, Goodwin was a different kind of evangelical from most of the Puritans. In his view, man was not wholly corrupt. Nature was not in opposition to grace. The grace of God and His willingness to forgive, could be seen in nature as well as felt in the heart. Goodwin reacted against the cold, stern logic of the Calvinist doctrine of predestination which was the

1. John Goodwin, The Divine Authority of the Scriptures Asserted, 1648, p. 83.

2. Ibid.

key to the average Puritan's conception of salvation. Christ's atonement and the workings of the Holy Spirit embraced all of mankind, so that every man had a chance to be saved.

Goodwin was influenced by humanistic writers, especially Acontius, in the development of a rational, tolerant and individualistic approach to theology. This approach was important in leading Goodwin to forsake Presbyterianism for Congregationalism, and renounce Calvinism in favor of Arminianism. His theological perspective was basically Puritan, but it was substantially modified at every point by humanistic influences. It was to make Goodwin a Puritan of a "peculiar mould."¹ There was one Puritan, however, who was of almost the same 'mould' as Goodwin -- that was John Milton. As many writers have pointed out, there was a significant similarity in the two, for both were humanistic Puritans.²

The thought of John Goodwin and John Milton were remarkably similar during the entire period of the Puritan Revolution.³ Both men had been educated at Cambridge and became

1. Daniel Neal, The History of the Puritans, (Thomas Tegg and Son, 1837), Vol. III, p. 437: "Mr. John Goodwin was a learned divine, and a smart disputant, but of a peculiar mould, being a republican, an Independent, and a thorough Arminian.

• • • " 2. Among those who have commented on the close similarity and parallel development of the thought of John Goodwin and John Milton are: Arthur Barker, Milton and the Puritan Dilemma, (Toronto: University of Toronto, 1942), David Masson, The Life of John Milton, (Macmillan, 1859-1880), 6 vols., D. M. Wolfe, Milton in the Puritan Revolution, (New York: Nelson, 1941).

3. It is interesting to speculate as to whether they knew each other personally. There is no definite evidence either way. Masson thinks that Milton had frequent meetings with Goodwin. Cf. Masson, op.cit., Vol. IV, p. 107.

staunch Puritans. In each case, there was also added the modifying influence of humanism. Their devotion to humanistic writings and ideas did not lead either, however, to forsake his Puritan outlook.¹ It did cause both to deviate considerably from the main body of Puritan thought. John Milton was never so controversial a figure in his own day as was John Goodwin for he did not become quite so intimately associated in all the disputes. The thought of both, nevertheless, moved considerably ahead of the Puritan majority.

John Milton and John Goodwin alike were influenced by the broad, tolerant spirit of humanism to become outspoken advocates of religious freedom.² Milton was not so active and influential a defender of toleration as was Goodwin, but the outlook and ideas of the two were similar.³ Both men were convinced of the great importance of freedom of thought. "Give me the liberty to know, to utter, and to argue freely according to conscience, above all liberties."⁴ Each saw truth as continually growing, and religious persecution as a way of stopping that growth. ". . . our faith and knowledge thrives by exercise, as well as our limbs and complexion, Truth is compared in scripture to a streaming fountain; if

1. Barker, *op.cit.*, p. 184, "It is significant that John Goodwin, to whose thought Milton's bears the closest parallel not merely at one point but throughout the revolution, was similarly . . . humanistic in his scholarship without ever departing from the Puritan fold."

2. Both issued pamphlets within a few months of each other in the controversial year of 1644. John Milton, *Areopagitica*, John Goodwin, *Theomaxia*.

3. Cf. William Haller, (ed.), *Tracts on Liberty*, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1934), Vol. I, p. 128 ff.

4. John Milton, *Prose Works*, (Henry G. Bohn, 1848), Vol. II, p. 95.

her waters flow not in a perpetual progression, they sicken into a muddy pool of conformity and tradition."¹ Differences of opinion and religious debates were hopeful signs of progress and not to be curbed by censorship and enforced conformity.

"Where there is much desire to learn, there of necessity will be much arguing, much writing, many opinions; for opinion in good men is but knowledge in the making."² They denied the infallibility of any judge or judges who might be set up to force men into one belief.³ Truth was able to win her own battles if given a fair chance.⁴ This was especially the case in regard to religious truth, or the Gospel, for it needed the aid of no civil magistrate for its propagation.⁵ Under the Gospel there came a new freedom as contrasted to the bondage of the Law.⁶

Their love of freedom and their desire for reformation led both Milton and Goodwin to oppose Anglican efforts to

1. *Ibid.*, p. 85

2. *Ibid.*, p. 92.

3. *CF.*, *Ibid.*, p. 522.

4. *Ibid.*, p. 71: "See the ingenuity of truth, who, when she gets a free and willing hand, opens herself faster than the pace of method and discourse can overtake her."

5. *Ibid.*, p. 547: ". . . religion is . . . in sum, both our belief and our practice depending upon God only. . . . there can be no place then left for the magistrate or his force in the settlement of religion, by appointing either what we shall believe in divine things, or practice in religion. . . ."

6. *Ibid.*, p. 537: ". . . the state of religion under the gospel is far differing from what it was under the Law. Then was the state of rigour, childhood, bondage, and works, to all which force was not unbecoming; now is the state of grace, manhood, freedom, and faith, to all which belongs willingness and reason, not force"

suppress differences within the Church. Goodwin's attack was more political than Milton's.¹ Both men were led by the same motives to oppose Presbyterian rule a few years later. Milton expressed the sentiments and experience of Goodwin when he declared: "New Presbyter is but old Priest writ large." Each was to become closely associated with the Independent cause, although Milton was never such an articulate or firm exponent of Congregational principles as was Goodwin.² Each applied his conception of Christian liberty not only to the ecclesiastical sphere, but to the political as well. Accordingly, each wrote in defense of the execution of the King.³ Finally they were linked together in condemnation proceedings at the Restoration and their books were called in and burned at the same time.⁴

The rational, individualistic approach with its emphasis on human freedom and dignity which was characteristic of humanism, marked the theological thought of both Milton and Goodwin. It led them to move from Calvinism to a position close to Arminianism.⁵ There were differences

1. This difference can be seen in comparing Milton's, The Reason of Church-government Urg'd Against Prelaty, (1642), and Goodwin's, Anti-Cavallierismo, (1642).

2. Milton was even more of an individualist than Goodwin making any classification of him very difficult.

3. John Milton, Eikonoklastes, (1649), and Pro Populo Anglicano defensio, (1651), John Goodwin, The Obstructours Of Justice, (1649).

4. The Journal of the House of Commons, June 16, 1660.

5. One writer comments that Milton's controversy over the problem of divorce "opened the door leading to Arminianism" for Milton as did that over conscience for John Goodwin. Barker, op.cit., p. 310.

between them for Milton came to an essentially Arian position in regard to Christology which Goodwin never reached. Their final theological positions were not identical then, but the general movement of their thought was the same, and for similar reasons.¹ Milton was just as strong in his opposition to predestination as was Goodwin. He has Raphael tell Adam in

Paradise Lost:

He left it in thy power, ordain'd thy will
By nature free, not overrul'd by Fate
Inextricable, or strict necessity;
Our voluntarie service he requires,
Not our necessitated, such with him
Finds no acceptance, nor can find, for how
Can hearts, not free be tri'd whether they serve
Willing or no, who will but what they must
By Destinie, and can no other choose? (V, 524)

The doctrine of election seemed to have personal appeal to Milton; but he, like Goodwin, was strongly opposed to the notion of eternal reprobation.² The two were of the same mind in upholding universal redemption or atonement.³ There was not

1. Part of the difference lay in the fact that Milton was a layman and a poet while Goodwin was a minister and a theologian. Milton shared the theological interest of his age and sought to frame "a body of Divinity", which was published posthumously under the title, De Doctrina Christiana. Yet his impatience with the theological controversies of the day are perhaps accurately expressed in his epic poem, Paradise Lost, where he describes a group of fallen angels engaged in an endless and profitless discussion:

Of Providence, Foreknowledge, Will, and Fate,
Fixt Fate, free will, foreknowledge absolute,
And found no end, in wandring mazes lost. (II, 559)

For Milton's theology cf. Maurice Kelley, This Great Argument, (Princeton: University Press, 1941).

2. John Milton, Prose Works, (Henry G. Bohn, 1848), Vol. IV, p. 64.

3. Ibid., p. 321.

one of the traditional five points of the Calvinist-Arminian controversy in which Milton, as well as Goodwin, would not have been on the Arminian side. It is safe to conclude: ". . . in their daring and unorthodox interpretations of the Scriptures, in their assumption of every man's capacity for redemption, above all in their humane tolerationist principles, Goodwin and Milton are philosophical brothers."¹

2. A rationalist.-- Goodwin has been described as a "Puritan sui generis, a rationalistic Puritan."² There is little question but that he was a rationalist. He made reason sovereign throughout the whole domain of thought. The Scriptures had to be interpreted by reason. The revelation of the Spirit had to be apprehended and tested by it. He interpreted John 1:9 as meaning that

Christ out of the treasury of his grace and merit, furnisheth every man whatsoever, who liveth in the world to years of discretion, with a flock of light, reason, judgement, conscience, memory, understanding, &c. whereby to make him capable of those terms, of that great and blessed treaty, about the things of his eternall peace and wellbeing, wherein God addresseth himself unto the world.³

In addition to this "candle of the Lord" which by the hand of Christ is lighted in every man's soul, there is also the light of the Gospel which augments and enriches it.

Every man is endowed with reason by which he can know God. It is the faculty by which man receives revelation.

1. Wolfe, op.cit., p. 91.

2. Masson, op.cit., Vol. II, p. 583.

3. John Goodwin, The Divine Authority of the Scriptures Asserted, 1648, preface to the reader.

Whatever is above reason or contrary to reason must be rejected. God is the source of reason and of revelation. The two cannot be in conflict. If there be many passages of Scripture which are obscure, then man must go on searching until the "rough places become plain." Reason has to continue to probe the hidden and inexhaustible treasures of the Scriptures and thereby is rewarded with the discovery of new truth.

Reason is not only the instrument used to explore the depths of the Scriptures, but it is also the method for settling theological disputes. All men must submit in humility to her dictates. Reason is the supreme judge and criterion of all conflicting opinions. It is, of course, always reason interpreting the Scriptures that is the ultimate test. Nevertheless, reason must decide in the final analysis what the Scriptures say. The only restriction on reason is that it accepts the Word of God as authoritative and indisputably true. As we have seen, Goodwin considered this no restriction, for the reasonableness and truth of the Scriptures was an a priori truth. It is also important to remember Goodwin's distinction between the Bible and the Word of God, which gave him considerable freedom in using and interpreting the Bible. He could, for example, discard Old Testament practices and laws as no longer applicable. It opened the way for balancing various Scripture passages with each other and not building theology on a few proof texts, as some of the Puritans had a tendency to do.

Goodwin's method, then, was thoroughly rationalistic. He thought reason was a safe and accurate guide. It was not

necessarily infallible and beyond corruption. If men "followed the irregular and crooked dictates and leadings of their lusts and sinfull propensions," then they might become devoid of light as the fig tree in Christ's parable had become barren.¹ God through Christ had enlightened every man so that he could search the Scriptures for himself and find the things of God without being wholly dependent upon councils, magistrates and ministers. In fact, each individual had to use his reason to make his religion his own. Or, as we would say today, religious truths to be valid had to be existential.

As a rationalist, Goodwin was closer to the Cambridge Platonists than to any other Puritan group. No other leading Puritan, with the exception of the members of the Cambridge school, was such a thoroughgoing rationalist as was Goodwin. With all their similarities, there was a difference between Goodwin and the Cambridge Platonists, for he was a stauncher Puritan than they. Goodwin was more Biblical and evangelical. They were more philosophical in their approach. The problem of working out a synthesis of philosophy and theology with which the Cambridge Platonists were so concerned and successful, did not interest Goodwin. He wanted to make theology more rational by purging it of its irrationalities and applying reason to the Scriptures. He sought to use a rational approach to the theological issues of the day. The Cambridge Platonists did not attempt to reform the dominant theology by rational, Biblical criticism as did Goodwin. Their effort was directed

1. Ibid.

towards reformulating the traditional theology in terms of neo-Platonic philosophy. They set out deliberately to forsake the familiar theological and Biblical terms and reclothe it in less controversial philosophical terminology.¹ Goodwin, however, would keep the traditional terminology and give it a new interpretation.

As a Puritan, Goodwin saw his task as one of reform, while the milder Puritans of the Cambridge school saw theirs as one of reconstruction and reconciliation. Goodwin was at the center of the struggle. They were at the periphery. In dedicating his book Redemption Redeemed to Whichcote and the University of Cambridge, Goodwin challenged them to take a more active part in the theological debates of the day.

When men of rich endowments, and worthy abilities of learning and knowledge, shall give their strength in this kind to other studies, contemplations, and inquiries, suffering, in the mean time, the minds and consciences of men to corrupt, putrify, and perish in their sad pollutions through that ignorance, or, which is worse, those disloyal and profane notions and conceptions of God and of Christ which reign, or rather indeed rage, in the midst of them, without taking any compassion on them, by searching out and discovering unto them those most excellent and worthy things of God and Christ, the knowledge whereof would be unto them a resurrection from death unto life; they do but write their names in the dust, and buy vanity with that worthy price which was put into their hand for a far more honourable purchase.²

No response to this challenge seems to have come from Cambridge. They apparently thought they could be of greater service by staying aloof from the controversies raging about

1. Cf., C. R. Cragg, From Puritanism to the Age of Reason, (Cambridge: University Press, 1950), p. 39.

2. John Goodwin, Redemption Redeemed, (edition of 1840), epistle dedicatory, p. xi.

them, and carrying on the constructive task of reformulating the essentials of the faith in non-controversial, philosophical terms. Both Goodwin and the Cambridge Platonists had a measure of success in what they set out to do. There was need for the role each played. Perhaps Goodwin had more influence in his own day, and the Cambridge Platonists on subsequent thought. Goodwin had no significant link with later rationalism, while a line of development ran from the Cambridge Platonists through the Latitudinarians to the Deists.¹

3. An evangelical Arminian.--- Goodwin's position was neither an abandonment nor a reconstruction of the traditional Christian faith. It was a re-interpretation of the Calvinist version of that faith through the humanistic influences emanating from the renaissance. A more rational and liberal theology was the result. The original impulse for this change in position must have come from Acontius and other writers of similar persuasion, but in the formulating of his position he must have depended some upon more strictly Arminian sources. Goodwin continuously affirms his independence of Arminian writers. For example, in the preface to the reader of An Exposition of the Ninth Chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, he tries to defend it against the disparagement of being called Arminian.

For though there be some strains and turnings here and there which sympathize with the principles of that

1. Cragg, op.cit., p. 46.

way, yet the main body and bulk of the Exposition is built upon ground of common reception amongst all understanding and learned Christians,¹

He goes on to point out that whereas Arminius, the Remonstrants at the Synod of Dort, Simon Episcopius, and Hugo Grotius had all written brief commentaries on the chapter, he borrowed little from them. He claimed that whatever he had borrowed was "so transformed, and the property of it so altered, by superadded explications, limitations, distinctions, questions, &c., that the natural face of it can hardly be seen or discerned in my glass."² There is no question, then, but what Goodwin was well acquainted with Arminian writings and that they helped him in defining his theological position. It is probably equally true to say that, in spite of a certain amount of indebtedness to them, he came to his own position more or less independently.

The elements of Goodwin's approach can be seen in his treatment of the doctrine of justification. He affirms the central importance of the Protestant conception of justification by faith. He wants to free it from the legalistic notion of the imputation of Christ's righteousness to the believer in the act of justification. Goodwin's position is first of all, a spiritualizing of the concept. "In a word, this is that which we deny, & this is that which we affirm concerning the righteousness of Christ in the Justification of a sinner, that God cloaths no man with the letter of it but

1. John Goodwin, An Exposition of the Ninth Chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, (edition of 1835), p. 13.

2. Ibid., p. 14.

every man that believes with the Spirit of it. . . ."¹

Secondly, he wanted to free it from Old Testament ideas of the Law. He accuses the Calvinists of confusing the covenants of "grace" and "works" and acting as if God had never made but one covenant with men.

. . . men may aswell say, there was no second Adam, really differing from the first, as no second Covenant differing really from the first, and that mount Sina in Arabia, is the same mountaine with mount Sion in Judea, and that the Spirit of bondage is the same with the Spirit of Adoption. . . ."²

There is the questioning of the Calvinist's exclusive emphasis on the absolute sovereignty and justice of God. In opposing the idea of the imputation of Adam's sin to all of posterity he comments: ". . . reason itself fully demonstrates any such imputation, to be no sufficient or tollerable ground or reason, why God in a way of justice and equity, might involve Adams posterity with his person, in the punishment due to sin."³

He goes on to define justice as giving every one in a "way of equity and right" what is due to them.⁴ In his treatment of the imputation of Adam's sin there is also the emphasis on the personal, individual character of the Christian faith. ". . . if any imputation be in this case, it is of every mans owne sinne in Adam, for it was not Adam alone that sinned, but all sinned in him, it is every mans owne sinne that is imputed

Part I, p. 155.
 1. John Goodwin, A Treatise of Justification, 1642,
 2. Ibid., p. 155.
 3. Ibid., p. 210.
 4. Ibid., Part II, p. 3.

to him, and for which he is punished."¹ Here can also be seen his insistence on man's role in belief. ". . . Justification before God may be expected and looked for, though that Faith whereby we beleeve, be both weako and unperfect, and yet both these (we know) are somewaies contributorie towards Justification."² God takes the initiative in man's justification, but man must respond to that challenge.

". . . suppose the worke or act of beleeving, which is so imputed for righteousness, be a mans own work or act . . . yet it is so by gift, and by the meere grace and donation of another, viz. God."³ God gives salvation but man must receive. Finally, Goodwin makes a consistent effort to base his views on the Bible. ". . . the Scripture no where affirms, either the imputation of Adams sin to his posterity, or of the righteousnesse of Christ to [t]hose that beleve. . . ."⁴

Goodwin uses these same principles to modify the Calvinist doctrines of the atonement, grace, and election in the direction of a more liberal interpretation. They all rest on the basic shift from a one-sided emphasis on God's sovereignty and justice and man's corruption and incapacity, to an assertion of a reciprocal relationship between God and man. God's sovereignty and justice is seen as curbed by his own love and mercy. Man's corruption is somewhat offset by

1. *Ibid.*, Part I, p. 208.
 2. *Ibid.*, Part II, pp. 184 f.
 3. *Ibid.*, p. 180.
 4. *Ibid.*, Part I, p. 193.

the general nature of Christ's atonement, the universal presence of the Spirit, and a higher conception of man's natural endowments, especially his reason. This does not mean, however, that natural man can save himself without a "second Relief" from the free grace of God.

The Scripture affirms a generall aversenesse and indisposition in men (yea in the best of naturall men) to such a thing: and we know that where there is no disposition, no will to doe that which is our duty to doe, any power or abilitie to doe it serves for little, but only to leave us without excuse. . . .¹

Goodwin was concerned to give man a role, and therefore, a responsibility in his own salvation, but not to make man independent of God. "For certain it is, that it is the creature man, not God, or the Spirit of God, that believeth: and therefore a necessity there must so much, or such a degree of efficiency about it be left unto man, which many with truth give it the denomination of being his."² The result is that Goodwin comes out with an essentially Arminian position. It is Arminianism with a strong evangelical cast, and very close to that of the Dutch Remonstrants.

There were three seventeenth century groups in England which were Arminian. The most influential were the Anglo-Catholic group represented by William Laud. Goodwin had no sympathy with this kind of Arminianism. He would have rejected its sacramentarian and Erastian tenets. There

1. John Goodwin, The Divine Authority of the Scriptures Asserted, 1648, p. 101, also John Goodwin, The Remedy of Unreasonableness, 1650, p. 6.

2. John Goodwin, Redemption Redeemed, (edition of 1840), p. 33.

were also Arminians among those of the Anabaptist tradition. This included the General Baptists and the Quakers.¹ Goodwin probably did not have much in common with this group. They were more mystical and less rationalistic than Goodwin. The Quakers, at least, stressed the universal presence of the Spirit rather than universal redemption. The third group was less well defined and less numerous. It was those who arrived at an essentially Arminian position independently. John Goodwin was the leading member of this group. The Cambridge Platonists would also have come in this category. Perhaps Goodwin's Arminian thought could be considered as lying half way between the Cambridge Platonists and the General Baptists. He shared the humanistic spirit of the former and the evangelical concern of the latter.

4. An Independent.-- It is uncertain as to when and how Goodwin first embraced the Congregationalist concept of the Church. Two things are certain, however. Congregationalism was more compatible with John Goodwin's theological principles. Anyone who had read Goodwin's Treatise of Justification, (1642), could have predicted where his sympathies would lie. Secondly, when the issue was first clearly drawn between the opposing Presbyterian and Congregationalist doctrines of the church, Goodwin unhesitatingly chose

1. It is not true to say, as Bishop Gilbert Burnet does, that Goodwin was the first to bring in Arminianism among the sectaries. Gilbert Burnet, History of His Own Time, (Oxford, 1833), Vol. I, p. 124. Thomas Helwys was probably the one who did this. Minutes of the General Assembly of the General Baptist Churches, edited by W. T. Whitley, (Baptist Historical Society, 1908), Vol. I, p. xiii. Also A. W. Harrison, Arminianism, (Duckworth, 1937), pp.150 f.

the latter. He was later on to criticise the Independents, as they came to be called, but he continued to hold and expound the basic Congregational principles. There were six of these which Goodwin emphasized.

The first was that the church was to be a gathered Congregation of visible saints. From this there followed three corollaries. It was to be a voluntary church of those who joined of their own volition and on the basis of their own Christian faith. In the second place, it meant rejecting the idea of a national, comprehensive Church. Finally it implied an emphasis on godliness as the criterion of Church membership rather than orthodoxy. Goodwin upheld, then, the idea of the Church as made up of true believers called together by their common loyalty to Christ and the Christian life, and united in a covenant relationship.

The second principle which Goodwin held, followed the first. The independence of the local congregation was the result of a gathered church. Each congregation had the right and the responsibility to elect its own officers and call its own pastor. It could set its own membership requirements and deal in its own way with problems of error and immorality. Goodwin did not believe that the local Congregation had no relationships or responsibility toward other churches. He was only insistent upon the principle of no ecclesiastical or civil body having jurisdictional authority over a church. There should be mutual fellowship and consultation, but no control exercised by one church or group over another.

In the third place, Goodwin believed in the freedom of

the individual conscience as well as of the local Congregation. Ultimately, the individual was responsible to God alone for his beliefs. Preaching, reasoning, and as a last resort, excommunication could be used to oppose those who disturbed the peace of a congregation, but no man's conscience was to be coerced or forced to conform. Goodwin had enough faith in the gracious working of the Holy Spirit, the power of reason, and the self-vindicating character of truth to take the risk involved in such a freedom.

Fourthly, Goodwin firmly adhered to the tenet of the equality of all believers under the free guidance of the Spirit. This was one of the principal bases of Goodwin's unquenchable faith in freedom. The universal presence of the Spirit meant all men were capable of receiving the gifts of the Spirit. The Holy Spirit was no more confined to an elect few than was the grace of God. Therefore, preaching could not be limited to those exercising the function of pastor. Although he was a convinced rationalist, Goodwin thought that those who had the call and the gifts of the Spirit to preach, should be allowed to preach. He believed in the priesthood of all believers.

A fifth characteristic of Goodwin's doctrine of the Church was an emphasis on its spiritual nature. The Church had a primarily spiritual goal and interest. It was to use only spiritual methods in attaining that goal. Its unity was to be found in the unity of the Spirit. Its source was spiritual and its authority the same. Christ was its sole head and King. Its spiritual nature made necessary a

certain measure of separation from the world, but above all, it called for a complete separation from the State.

The final element in Goodwin's conception of the Church was a complete separation of Church and State. Neither was to interfere in the affairs of the other. The church member as a citizen of the State could and must exercise his rights in the nation, but the Church as an institution was to make no demands upon the State except for its own freedom. The Church is not dependent upon the State for the collecting of tithes, the propagation of the Gospel or the punishment of religious offences. Similarly, the Civil Magistrate as an individual Christian, has the same right as any other believer. It is only as a Christian and not as a magistrate, however. The State had no authority or right of interference in the affairs of the Church.

Goodwin's views on Church Government separated him from his fellow Puritans almost as much as did his Arminian tenets. He must be classified, however, as an Independent, although he was a peculiar one. If the Puritans are classified on this particular issue as Presbyterians, Independents, and Sectarians, Goodwin should be placed in the left-wing of Independency. Goodwin was nearer many of the sectarians on some issues than the more conservative Independents. Even more important was the fact that Goodwin was much closer to the views of the "Father of Congregationalism," Robert Browne, than were his fellow Independents. The Independent whose ideas on the Church were closest to Goodwin's was Henry

Burton.¹

5. An exponent of religious liberty.-- Goodwin's views on religious freedom developed as his theological thought developed. Humanistic influences had given him an intellectual outlook conducive to a position of tolerance. Congregationalism furnished him with a doctrine of the Church which provided a basis for freedom within the Church and freedom from forces outside the Church. Arminianism offered a wider doctrinal base for an unrestricted religious liberty. Goodwin had a sound, mature theory of religious liberty in the fullest sense of the term. He went further in his defense of religious freedom than any other leading Puritan was prepared to go.

Four approaches to the problem of toleration were found in Goodwin's own day.² The first was intolerance. It required an absolute and complete conformity of the whole nation to the one established Church. The representatives of this school of thought were found among the Anglicans and Presbyterians. The outstanding Puritan exponents of this position were Adam Stewart, John Bastwick, Thomas Edwards, and Robert Baillie.

The second group were those who were in favor of a limited toleration within an Established Church. This was the approach of the Latitudinarians who conceived of a broad comprehensive Church with few requirements so as to include

1. Cf., Henry Burton, A Vindication of Churches, Commonly Called Independent, 1644.

2. A similar classification is used by Masson, op.cit., Vol. III, pp. 122 ff.

nearly all Christians. John Halcs and Jeremy Taylor were among the Anglicans who would represent this viewpoint, while Stephen Marshall and George Gillespie held this view among the Presbyterians. . A limited tolerance would be given, but the need for uniformity would deny the right of dissent or the existence of rival churches.

The third group were those who would allow a limited toleration around, but not within the Established Church. This was the view of most of the Independents, such as John Owen, the "Five Dissenting Brethren", and Oliver Cromwell. Here there would be the right to dissent and organize competing Churches within certain broad limits. There was a difference of opinion among this group as to which groups should be tolerated. The State would exercise the minimum of interference in religious affairs and only the grossest errors would be punished.

There was a fourth group who would deny any right of the State to interfere in matters of religion. They were for a complete liberty of conscience. Generally, they would give freedom to non-Protestant or even non-Christian groups. Mere tolerance of minority religious groups under certain circumstances was supplanted by a demand for religious freedom which would make all groups equal under the State. The main strength of this group was found among the sects, especially the Baptists. John Goodwin was its outstanding representative.

B. Goodwin's Influence and Importance.

1. As an Arminian.-- There are two facts that must be kept constantly in mind when considering Goodwin's influence

in regard to Arminianism in his own day. The first is that the Puritans were overwhelmingly Calvinist in their theology. Secondly, there was real and widespread fear of Arminianism as associated with Anglicanism and popery. John Owen was more representative of the Puritan attitude toward Arminianism than was John Goodwin. John Owen asks:

. . . who would have thought, that our Church, would ever have given entertainment, to these Belgicke Semi-pelagians, who have cast dirt upon the faces, and raked up the ashes, of all those great and pious soules, whom God magnified, in using as his instruments to reforme his church; to the least of which, the whole troope of Arminians, shall never make themselves equall, though they swell till they breake? . . .¹

He then calls on the newly formed Committee on Religion to proclaim "an holy warre, to such enemies, of Gods providence, Christs merit, and the powerfull operation of the holy Spirit. . . ."² In a sense, it is true to say that a man "like John Goodwin did but emphasize the general tenour of the prevailing Calvinism."³ There is good evidence, however, that Goodwin made a considerable impact on the prevailing Calvinism.

One of the best testimonies to Goodwin's impact was the great number of books and condemnations the Calvinists heaped upon him. There were no fewer than six books written against his Redemption Redeemed. He was attacked before parliamentary committees and the proceedings of synods. Even in Scotland, Robert Baillie felt it necessary to issue the

1. John Owen, A Display of Arminianisme, 1643, epistle dedicatory.

2. Ibid.

3. Harrison, op.cit., p. 158.

book, A Scotch Antidote Against the English Infection Of Arminianism . . . from the infection of Mr Goodwin's Great Book (1652). Surely there would not have been such a determined effort to combat Goodwin's arguments, if his views had not carried weight. They must have had considerable hearing in his own day.

During Goodwin's time there were two groups to whom Arminianism had an appeal. The first group were the more humanistic Puritans such as the Cambridge Platonists and John Milton. There is no basis for demonstrating Goodwin's influence on either of these, but he undoubtedly reached some who were discontented with certain aspects of Calvinism. Goodwin must have had sympathizers, if not followers, among the faculties of the universities, especially Cambridge.¹ In dedicating his principal work on Arminianism to Dr. Whichcote, and the heads of colleges and divinity students of Cambridge, Goodwin asked them to give an opinion as to the truth of his position. No reply ever came from Cambridge. This came as

1. Dr. Tuckney spoke of Goodwin as "the great daring Champion of the Arminian Errors; whom the abusive Wits of the University with an impudent boldness wou'd say, none there durst adventure upon." Benjamin Whichcote, Moral and Religious Aphorisms, Edited by Samuel Salter, (revised edition, 1753), p. xxx. A statement of Goodwin's also suggests that he had a following among many of the students. "I know it would be offensive to the gentleman, if I should relate how many letters and messages otherwise of thankful acknowledgments of the grace of God given unto me, for the clearing of those doctrines of election, reprobation, &c., and of Christian encouragements to proceed in my way, &c., I have received time after time from several persons of considerable worth for godliness and knowledge, inhabiting in several parts of the nation, some of them Ministers of the Gospel, and others of them students in the University of good standing, &c." Banner of Justification Displayed, (edition of 1835), p. 317.

a surprise to some of the Puritans who expected a refutation of Goodwin to be sent from the University.¹ There is no way of knowing how many of the faculty at Cambridge approved of or sympathized with Goodwin's theology. Certainly Dr. Whichcote held essentially the same position.² Perhaps this tendency in him, and others as well, led Dr. Tuckney, Master of St. John's College, to write to Whichcote concerning Arminianism: "And truly I wou'd not have my good friend come near those mens' tentes though J. Goodwin, like a colonel, can march up in the face of all such imputations."³

Goodwin's spirited and intellectual defense of the Arminian doctrines must have had an appeal to those who, like him, had been restless under the rigid orthodoxy of Calvinism. Probably he, at least, succeeded in disassociating Arminianism from Anglicanism and popery. Goodwin was hated and severely criticised in his own day; but he was also respected for his ability and learning, by many. A staunch Calvinist opponent

1. Henry Jeanes, A Vindication of D. Twisse from the exceptions of Mr John Goodwin In his Redemption Redeemed, (Oxford, 1653), p. 201: ". . . there was a generall, and (as I think) a just expectation, that some in the University of Cambridge, who dissented from you, would comply with your faire invitation to them, to declare themselves in some worthy and satisfactory answer to the particulars propounded in your Book: But upon their long silence (which I can neither excuse, nor will I accuse (as being altogether ignorant of the causes thereof) I renewed my thoughts of setting about this worke.

2. Frederick J. Powicke, The Cambridge Platonists, (J. M. Dent and Sons, 1926), p. 35: "There is not one of the 'five points' in which he does not agree with Arminius more nearly than Calvin. No doubt this was why John Goodwin dedicated, chiefly to him, his Redemption Redeemed. The arch-Arminian saw, if Whichcote himself did not see, the whereabouts of his theological position and tendencies."

3. Whichcote, op.cit., pp. 27 f.

of his, John Owen, wrote of him: "The attempt made by Mr Goodwin against the truth here asserted was by all men judged so considerable . . . as that a removal of his exceptions to our arguments, and an answer to his objections, were judged necessary by all."¹ John Goodwin might have had a number of secret sympathizers, even if he had no open champions, among the University faculty and students. "The massive argument of Goodwin must have carried some weight."² This does not mean that Goodwin helped transform the Universities into strongholds of Arminian opinion. Perhaps it does partially account for the comparative ease with which the Universities made the transition to restoration Arminianism.

There must have been others, both ministers and laymen, who were not so much interested in the intellectual difficulties of Calvinism, as in its moral and evangelical problems. Richard Baxter was such a man. On the questions of universal redemption, reprobation, and man's responsibility, he was close to Goodwin's position. He could be best termed as semi-Arminian.³ On at least two occasions he recommended Goodwin's Divine Authority of the Scriptures.⁴ Baxter seems to have reached his own position independently, but many of the same reasons which influenced Goodwin, must have prompted

1. John Owen, The Doctrine of the Saints Perseverance, (Oxford, 1654), p. 13.

2. Harrison, op.cit., p. 155.

3. Ibid., pp. 160 f.

4. Richard Baxter, Works, edited by William Orme, (James Duncan, 1830), Vol. XXI, (The Reasons of the Christian Religion), p. 386, and Vol. XXII, (The Saint's Everlasting Rest), p. 334.

his modifications of Calvinism. Baxter was, at least, more in sympathy with Goodwin's theology than any of the other leading Puritan theologians. While there does not appear to be any direct influence of Goodwin upon Baxter, there were other pious folk and ministers who responded to the arguments which Goodwin put forth in pamphlets and sermons, as well as in his books.

One indication of this appeal was the large and active congregation which Goodwin had. He seems to have had such a sizable following that after the loss of his parish church, he was able to form another independent congregation nearby without any difficulty. Those who wrote against Goodwin were continually referring to his "followers" and his "disciples." The issuance of the theological apology of Goodwin and his Church, The Agreement and Distance of Brethren (1652), is an indication that his Congregation was very aware of its Arminian position. Another indication of Goodwin's adherents was the existence of such a minister as Tobias Conyers.¹ He was prominent enough to preach before Parliament. He was also described as a follower of John Goodwin.

During the two decades of the Puritan reign, Goodwin was the leading opponent of Calvinist principles and intolerance; therefore, any who had doubts about either would have been attracted to his preaching and writings.² Many of the

1. Bishop Kennet, A Register and Chronicle Ecclesiastical and Civil, Vol. I, p. 58, refers to his preaching at St. Pauls before the Lord Mayor and the Lord General Monk on Feb. 12, 1659.

2. Samuel Lane, A Vindication of Free Grace, 1645,

more radical leaders of the Puritan Revolution came under Goodwin's influence. William Kiffin, later an influential Baptist leader, attended Goodwin's Church and found the preaching "very profitable" to him.¹ John Lilburne and William Walwyn who were to become the leaders of the Leveller movement were both active in Goodwin's Church for a period.² Isaac Pennington, who was an Alderman and Lord Mayor of the City of London during the first Civil War and later became an outstanding Quaker, was a leading member of Goodwin's Church.³ Thomas Firmin who was to become one of the first significant exponents of Socinianism in England, was a faithful attender of Goodwin's preaching during his youth.⁴ Each of these men

preface: "Now it is easy to conceive how great mischief the preaching and arguing of so eminent a person for that error may do, to the confirming of men therein; especially if we consider how highly he hath gratified the maintainers thereof in another way also, as namely, by his earnest pleading for a toleration of any sect whatsoever."

1. William Orme, Remarkable Passages in the Life of William Kiffin, 1823, p. 10: "This was of great use to me, so far as to satisfy me that God had not tied himself to any one way of converting a sinner; but according to his own pleasure took several ways to bring a soul to Jesus Christ." Kiffin became a Particular Baptist and was, therefore, a Calvinist. But, he is an indication of the attraction Goodwin had for those with doubts concerning the prevailing theology.

2. Cf., Godfrey Davies and William Haller (editors), The Leveller Tracts 1647-1653, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1944), p. 24: "Walwyn came into especially close association with the very important congregation whose spiritual guide was John Goodwin."

3. Cf., "Isaac Pennington", Dictionary of National Biography, Vol. XLIV.

4. H.J. McLachlan, Socinianism in Seventeenth Century England, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1951), p. 294: "The best-known and most influential Socinian in England in the latter part of the seventeenth century was a layman who all his adult life remained in communion with the Church of England. Thomas Firmin (1632-97) had as a youth attended the ministry of the Arminian preacher, John Goodwin, at St. Stephen's Coleman Street, and imbibed from him some sturdy liberal principles in religion which he never abandoned."

later became outstanding leaders in their respective movements -- Baptist, Leveller, Quaker, and Socinian -- and were directly influenced by John Goodwin. All of them, with the exception of William Kiffin, abandoned Calvinism. Goodwin's theological and political battles brought him into frequent contact with many of the sectarian groups.¹ There must have been many among these groups who probably never read through Goodwin's Redemption Redeemed, but who were influenced by his sermons, disputations, and pamphlets.²

The number who openly espoused Arminianism during Goodwin's time was probably never large. The majority of the Puritans -- Presbyterian, Independent, and Baptist -- probably remained loyal Calvinists. Goodwin's significance, however, may have been greater than the small number of Arminian converts may indicate. He helped break up the united front of Calvinist orthodoxy. The Puritans were separated on the issue of church government, but were united in their Calvinist theology. Goodwin helped to sow the seeds of dissension and break up that unity. "It may be that Goodwin helps us to understand the secret of the weakness of Calvinism in the critical years before and after the Restoration."³ One

1. Such an example was his three debates with some Baptists on universal redemption before "thousands" of listeners. Notes of the debates were later published under the title, Truths Conflit with Error, 1650.

2. One purpose of the printing of The Agreement and Distance of Brethren, (1652), was to provide a popular summary and defense of the Arminian principles held by Goodwin and his congregation.

3. Cragg, op.cit., p. 17. McLachlan comments that Goodwin's writings were "an indication that the mould of the old Calvinistic Puritanism was breaking up and that new ideas and tendencies entirely incompatible with Puritan orthodoxy

contemporary historian comments in the year 1662:

It was observable, that whereas before the Civil Wars, one Firebrand towards the kindling of it was to cast the odium of Arminian upon the Church Bishops and clergy, as opening a door to Popery: The name of Arminian was not now so odious, nor so commonly imputed as a crime and a scandal to those who were offended at the rigid opinions of Calvin, etc. For tho' the strict Presbyterians continued to take Election and Reprobation in the more absolute sense, yet many preachers during the dissolution of the Church had espous'd and defended contrary principles; such as Mr John Goodwin. . . .¹

In addition to this negative significance, Goodwin also made the positive contribution of planting within the non-conformist, Puritan stream of thought, the Arminian criticisms of Calvinism. Arminianism had acquired a respectable standing in the Anglican Church during the time of Laud. Goodwin was too staunch a Puritan and republican to have any influence in the Anglican Church, in any case.² Goodwin's ideas were to live on in the non-conformist tradition where they were to be revived again in the revival of non-conformity itself in the next century.

Although Restoration Puritanism was still largely Calvinist in its theology, Goodwin's thought and writings were not immediately forgotten. The best proof of this was the

were abroad, seeking expression in both thought and institution." *op.cit.*, p. 51. It may be that there was some truth in Bishop Burnet's explanation as to why Goodwin escaped severe punishment at the Restoration "to the surprise of all people." He surmised that it was because, "Goodwin had been so zealous an Arminian, and had sown such divisions among all the sectaries upon these heads, that it was said this procured him friends." Burnet, *op.cit.*, p. 292.

1. Bishop Kennet, *op.cit.*, July 6, 1662, p. 727.

2. There do not seem to be any references to Goodwin in Anglican Arminian writings.

editing and publishing of his sermons in 1670,¹ and the printing of a new edition of The Agreement and Distance of Brethren and Pagans Debt and Dowry, in 1671. This is all the more significant when it is remembered that The Agreement and Distance of Brethren was a popular manual of Arminian theology dealing with the five points of the controversy with Calvinism. This indicates that there were still those, several years after his death, who were interested in Goodwin's ideas and the Arminian position. However, Goodwin's influence was to be negligible in non-conformist thought until the Evangelical Revival of the later part of the eighteenth century brought him back into prominence.

The Evangelical Revival revived interest in the questions concerning salvation and, therefore, revived the old Calvinist-Arminian controversy. It was John Wesley who found help in Goodwin's writings for his kind of evangelical Arminianism.² He published an abridged edition of Goodwin's Treatise of Justification (1763), and reprinted excerpts from his other writings in the Arminian Magazine which he edited. Wesley quoted and reprinted so much of Goodwin that he had to defend himself against being too closely identified with all of Goodwin's ideas.³ Wesley's staunch Calvinist opponent

1. A Being Filled With the Spirit.

2. J. B. Marsden, The History of the Early Puritans, (2d ed., Hamilton, Adams and Co., 1835), pp. 358 f.: "Of English divines he is still the master mind amongst evangelical arminians. John Wesley in the last century espoused his opinions, and republished his works; which in force and perspicuity, and freedom from the cumbrous verbiage of the times are remarkable."

3. In a reply to a criticism by a Mr. Hill, he had to say several times, "but John Goodwin is not John Wesley." He

Toplady, referred to him on several occasions as "the John Goodwin of the present age."¹

Wesley's interest in Goodwin and his writings was to bring Goodwin a popularity he perhaps never enjoyed even in his own day. The first half of the nineteenth century was to see the height of Goodwin's influence as an Arminian. The leading systematic theologian of early Methodism, Richard Watson, quoted Goodwin frequently and at length in his Theological Institutes.² In 1822, Thomas Jackson, a leading Methodist Minister wrote the first biography of Goodwin. Within the next two decades he published new editions of most of Goodwin's works on Arminianism, including the 'massive', Redemption Redeemed which he called "one of the most original and argumentative treatises in the English language."³ Jackson's reprint helped to establish it as one of the standard works in defense of the Arminian position.

The latter half of the nineteenth century saw the dying out of the Calvinist-Arminian controversy in England. Arminianism had won its long battle to modify the predestinarian doctrines of Calvinism. In the twentieth century the controversy seems to be only of antiquarian interest. Our own time, however, has seen a revival of Calvinism. It is

confessed that while he did "generally approve" of what Goodwin wrote, "the language" he many times did not. John Wesley, Works, (3d ed., John Mason, 1830), Vol. X, pp. 384 ff.

1. Augustus Toplady, Historic Proof of Doctrinal Calvinism of the Church of England, 1837, pp. 57 f.

2. Richard Watson, Works, (2d ed., John Mason, 1836), Vol. XI.

3. John Goodwin, Redemption Redeemed, (edition of 1840), title page.

not the same as the seventeenth century form, but it raises many of the same issues. The question now raised is not so much that of individual salvation as social salvation. The question is no longer that of the Puritan, what can I do to be saved: but rather, what can we do to save western civilization or the world? The problems are much the same, however. Is it God's responsibility or man's? Is the fate of the world predestined or within the power of man and nations to control? Is there any assurance that God will not let Christendom fall? Is the world too corrupt and impotent to save itself? These questions are similar to those which stirred the fires of controversy in the seventeenth century. The important issue and problem is still the relationship of God and man.¹

2. As a Congregationalist.-- In spite of his staunch defense of the Congregationalist cause and principles, Goodwin has had no continuing place in Congregational thought or history. He was largely ignored and forgotten by succeeding generations of Congregationalists. A twentieth century Congregationalist historian confessed: "It cannot be denied that to Goodwin Congregationalism owes something in the nature of honourable amends for bygone neglect. For he was one of Congregationalism's greatest men."² The source of this

1. Perhaps the present theological position which would be nearest Goodwin's would be some form of personalism such as is found in H. H. Farmer, God and Man, (Nisbet & Co., 1948), or in Emil Brunner, The Christian Doctrine of God, Translated by Olive Wyon, (Lutterworth Press, 1949).

2. H. W. Clark, The Life of John Goodwin, (Congregational Union of England and Wales, no date), Congregational Worthies Series: No. 9, p. 7.

neglect goes back to the attitude of the leading Congregationalists of Goodwin's own day.

The major cause for the suspicion with which other Independents regarded Goodwin was his Arminianism. Independency was almost as solidly Calvinist as was Presbyterianism. This was demonstrated by the fact that the Savoy Conference of 1658, in which the Independents drew up their own Confession of faith, accepted almost the whole of the Westminster Confession with only minor alterations.¹ The Congregationalists gladly accepted Goodwin's help in their defense during the days of their minority and before he had openly embraced the Arminian theology. In the 1650's after they became the ruling party, the Independents were less cordial toward Goodwin and he towards them. Another fact which caused a tension between Goodwin and the other leading Independents was that he was a more radical Congregationalist than they. He belonged to the left-wing of Independency. In his emphasis on the sole headship of Christ, the spiritual nature of the church, and the denial of any need for aid or interference from the civil powers, Goodwin was nearer Robert Browne than the Independent majority.

Goodwin's position was also closer to present day Congregationalism than was that of the Savoy Conference. At the International Congregational Council in 1949, a statement

1. Williston Walker, The Creeds and Platforms of Congregationalism, (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1893), pp. 340 ff., The Savoy Declaration of Faith and Order, 1658, Edited by Albert Peel, (Independent Press, 1939), p. 20. Goodwin apparently was not even invited to this conference.

was approved which included the following:

It is our fundamental principle that in all the organization of the Church at every level, all authority is spiritual, or, as our fathers put it, ministerial, not legalistic, coercive and magisterial. We believe this to be the true principle of government and authority in the whole Church catholic; this we regard as our essential contribution to the universal Church.¹

Goodwin's contribution to Congregationalism was to keep alive this central principle at a time when it was being compromised by the Independents. In their efforts to avoid extremes of the "Brownists" and the sectaries,² Independents were led to accept both the idea of a national Church and interference by the Civil Magistrates, and even a Committee of Triers similar to the Presbyterian Committee for Plundered Ministers to purge and supervise the ministry of the nation.³ Goodwin consistently and ably defended this principle of the nature of the Church and its authority against Presbyterian and Independent

1. Proceedings of the Sixth International Congregational Council, Edited by F. L. Fagley, (The Independent Press, 1949), p. 38.

2. The five "dissenting Brethren" in their Apologeticall Narration, spoke of having "the fatal miscarriages and shipwracks of the Separation (whom ye call Brownists) as Landmarks to fore-warn us of those rocks and shelves they ran upon. . . ." Tho: Goodwin, Philip Nye, Sidrach Simpson, Jer: Burroughes, and William Bridge, 1643, pp. 4 f. John Cotton's Keys of the Kingdom was reprinted and had wide circulation in England. In it he referred to his own doctrine of the church as being mid-way between the Brownist and the Presbyterian doctrines. Cf., R. N. Flew, (ed.,) The Nature of the Church, (SOM Press, 1952), p. 173.

3. H. M. Dexter, The Congregationalism of the Last Three Hundred Years, As seen in its Literature, (Hodder and Stoughton, 1880?), p. 661: "The rights of patronage remained undisturbed; tithes and other parochial dues continued to be exacted; the Triers, as I have said, took the place of the bishops, and over all were Cromwell and his Council exercising a mild Erastian sway."

alike, during this crucial early period of the Congregational Church in England.

While it cannot be claimed that Goodwin made an original addition to the Congregational doctrine of the Church, he did make a significant contribution in preserving, defending, and strengthening its essential principles in a time when the Church was being molded and fashioned. Goodwin not only helped to keep the essentials emphasized, but he aided in the spread of the influence of Congregationalism by being one of the leading forces in creating the Independent coalition.¹ As the outstanding Independent spokesman for toleration he opened the way for a loose alliance with the Army and the sects which enabled the Independent coalition to defeat Presbyterians and King to become the rulers of England for a decade.² Goodwin's role was to furnish the "intellectual leadership of a great movement which brought the sects and powerful sections of lay thought under the banner of Independency."³ Through Independency, Congregationalism was to become a vital religious and political force in the nation

1. Jordan, *op.cit.*, Vol. III, p. 376: "Goodwin was chiefly responsible for the enlargement of Congregational thought into Independency, and his prolific and provocative pen, during a critical period, gave to the Independent position clarity, vigour, and persuasiveness."

2. This is not to overlook the importance of Oliver Cromwell in welding together this group, but in a very real sense it is true to say that, "Goodwin prepared English opinion for the masterful hand of the Lord Protector." *Ibid.*, p. 377.

3. *Ibid.*

and leave a permanent deposit in English life.¹ Congregationalism became in this way a continuing and living tradition in the life of the nation.

Through Goodwin, Congregationalism made an important contribution to the development of toleration and of democracy.² Goodwin's doctrine of the Church was to be of great importance in regard to his contribution to democratic theory. An American church historian, J. H. Nichols, in a recent book, Democracy and the Churches,³ lists three contributions which "Left-wing Puritanism" contributed to the theory and practice of democracy. In each one of these John Goodwin played a leading part.

1. In 1640 there were but two regularly established Congregationalist Churches in London. Cf., R. W. Dale, History of English Congregationalism, (Hodder and Stoughton, 1907), p. 360. Even in 1645 Robert Baillie could write, "Blessed be God, all the ministers of London are for us. Burton and Goodwin, the only two that were Independent, are by the Parliament removed from their places. Seven or eight preachers that are against our way are only lecturers in the city, but not ministers." Robert Baillie, Letters and Journals, (revised edition, Edinburgh, 1842), Vol. II, p. 299. By 1658 one hundred and twenty Congregationalist Churches accepted calls to the Savoy Conference. Walker, op.cit., p. 348.

2. To this might be added a third contribution. It was during this period that the non-Conformist or Free Church tradition became a permanent force in England. In a recent study, The Free Church Tradition in the Life of England, (3d ed., revised, SCM Press, 1951), pp. 174 ff., E. A. Payne lists four characteristics and contributions of this tradition. Horton Davies, The Worship of the English Puritans, (Glasgow: Dacre Press, 1948), pp. 198 ff., has a similar list. In each of these principles there is an important indebtedness to Congregationalism. Also in each case they were principles to which Goodwin gave eloquent and courageous defense. Payne points out that Goodwin was one of those who emphasized such Free Church principles as "belief in the guidance of the Spirit, faith in private judgment, a sense of expectancy, and a willingness to experiment." Payne, op.cit., p. 46.

3. (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1951).

The first principle which was important for the development of democracy was that churches were to be "gathered" by a "covenant." The level of "general interest and participation" was thus much higher in such a Puritan gathered Church than in an Anglican or Presbyterian parish. "Church life, was, in fact, democratic."¹ This was certainly true of Goodwin's own Church which was one of the most active, theologically and politically, of any Church in London at the time. There probably was no other leading church in London in which the laymen played so prominent a part. Many of the most active figures in the Puritan Revolution were participants in his Church. He had a "compact, earnest congregation of vigorous adherents."²

According to Nichols, the political equivalent of the gathered Church was the "social contract" or "government compact." In this idea of individual participation and responsibility, a "tremendous revolution had taken place."³ Woodhouse comments: "The consciences of common men were a new phenomenon in politics, and one that has never since disappeared."⁴ Goodwin was one of those who made this inference and applied it to political theory. In his pamphlet, Right and Might well met (1648), justifying the Army's purge of Parliament, Goodwin had written: "The exercise of such a judging or judicative power, as this, is imposed by God, by

1. Ibid., p. 32.

2. William Haller, (ed.), Tracts on Liberty, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1938), Vol. I, p. 30.

3. Nichols, op.cit., p. 33.

4. Woodhouse, op.cit., p. 53.

way of duty upon all men."¹ G. P. Gooch in, The History of English Democratic Ideas in the Seventeenth Century, calls this pamphlet, "the most striking Document in the development of the political theory of the Independents. Revolutionary conclusions are now stated as axioms."²

Similar "revolutionary" ideas were set forth in his defense of the execution of the King. He said that "all men" were:

. . . naturally free, 1. to chuse, by what kind or form of Government, they would be governed, as whether by Kings, or by Counsels of State or by popular suffrage. . . . 2. In case of either of the two former Governments, to chuse what persons they pleased, for the administration of that Government. . . . 3. To proportion, limit, and circumscribe that power, which they were to confer upon the Administration of that Government they should chuse."³

Goodwin helped formulate and popularize this important principle in Western democratic thought.

A second element in the contribution which "left-wing Puritanism" made to democratic thought was its "new emphasis on the continuing role of the Holy Spirit in illuminating the mind of the Church."⁴ The political analogy to this was the "democratic principle of government by discussion."⁵ As Principal Lindsay has pointed out in The Essentials of Democracy, full and open discussion is the basis of democracy.⁶

1. p. 16.

2. G. P. Gooch, The History of English Democratic Ideas in the Seventeenth Century, (Cambridge: University Press, 1898), p. 175.

3. John Goodwin, The Obstructours of Justice, 1649, p. 22.

4. Nichols, op.cit., p. 34.

5. Ibid.

6. A. D. Lindsay, The Essentials of Democracy, (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1929).

"The more legalistic variety of Calvinist Presbyterian could not enter into the democratic process . . . because he would not admit the possibility of continuing revelation and new truths through the group."¹ Here again, John Goodwin was one of the leaders of the opposition and an exponent of democracy.

In his much quoted analogy of the discovery of America and the discovery of new truth, he takes his stand firmly for the continuing revelation of truth. There was no method which Goodwin thought better for arriving at new truth than discussion. Goodwin was not only a leader in the discussion of the main issues of the day in the press and the pulpit, but he also took part in the remarkably democratic debates held by the Army to arrive at a constitutional settlement for a republican government. It was Goodwin's belief in the importance, and even necessity, for free and open discussion on all issues that made him such a staunch defender of the freedom of the press and the pulpit. This emphasis of Goodwin's on developing new truth is evident in his discussion of the King's execution where he calls for the setting of new precedents. "Every succeeding age hath an opportunity of being wiser than the former, by having the experience of the wisdom of the former given in unto it by way of advance, the best and richest capacity of making Presidents ought still to be adjudged to the present age. . . ."²

1. Nichols, op.cit., p. 34.

2. John Goodwin, The Obstructours of Justice, 1649, p. 78.

The third contribution of this left-wing group was its emphasis on the separation of Church and State. This effort to "free the civil authority from all theocratic and ecclesiastical intervention" was to make possible a State based on "ethical norms known to all rational men."¹ As we have seen, this was precisely Goodwin's position. When it is pointed out that Goodwin "was the first significant English thinker to divorce the State completely from any participation in the religious life and discipline of the Church",² his importance in this regard can be appreciated. Goodwin was more interested in protecting the Church from interference by the State than vice versa, but his doctrine of the rigid separation of the two had the effect of helping one as well as the other, as he was careful to point out. There is then, little question but what Goodwin made an important and distinctive contribution to the development of democratic thought in England and thus in America also.

Goodwin was also to use the Congregationalist conception of the Church to make an important contribution to the theory and defense of religious freedom. He seized upon the notion of a voluntary and spiritual Church to deny all use of coercion in religion. He used the Congregational principle of the authority of the local congregation to deny the right of interference by the clergy or those obsessed with the idea of uniformity. Through Congregationalist principles he was able to effectively provide the essential elements of the

1. Nichols, op.cit., pp. 35 f.

2. Jordan, op.cit., Vol. III, p. 381.

denial of the right of religious persecution.

Goodwin was not, by any means, the only Independent to write on behalf of religious toleration. Many of them staunchly defended it on the basis of Congregational principles. Goodwin did, however, provide the most consistent, best reasoned, broadest defence of religious liberty of any other Independent. He was also one of the first to do this. Goodwin alone among the leading Independents followed the Congregationalist conception of the Church through to its logical conclusion in regard to religious tolerance. It would not be far amiss to conclude with W. K. Jordan, "Congregationalism made its logical and ultimate contribution to the development of religious toleration in Goodwin's early thought."¹

3. In defense of toleration.-- For the two significant decades of the Puritan revolution (1640-1660), Goodwin kept up a constant vigil for all attempts to infringe the liberties of the nation. He opposed practically every such attempted infringement. In the face of strong criticism and abusive treatment he wrote and preached against all efforts to deny men the right to think, write, and worship according to the dictates of their own conscience. During the course of this defense he had occasion to censure Parliament, the Westminster Assembly, the London Synod, several parliamentary committees, a group of booksellers and many of the leading exponents of intolerance. Boldly and firmly he assailed all efforts to persecute dissent, or curb freedom of expression.

1. Jordan, op.cit., Vol. III, p. 399.

In seeking to maintain and even broaden the area of toleration, Goodwin used all of the methods of a resourceful writer. He mustered argument after argument against intolerance. He used logic, ridicule, queries, and Biblical texts in his plea for tolerance. No party and no individual guilty of intolerance was spared the barbs of his pen. He was writing for a greater measure of religious freedom in his own time, and much of the success of that struggle must be attributed to Goodwin.

Perhaps the best way to see Goodwin's influence in his own day is to look at the opposition he aroused. He was the main object of attack by many of the Puritan leaders who opposed toleration. Of this group, Thomas Edwards was the most vitriolic and outspoken. In the third part of his Gangraena, he comments on a recent pamphlet on toleration by Goodwin,¹ calling it the most "desperate ungodly, Atheisticall peece written by any man since the Reformation."² He goes on to add:

I have had occasion to read many Discourses and Tractats of Libertines, and Scepticks that have been writ within this last hundred years . . . but in none of them do I find . . . such a spirit of Libertinisme, Atheisme, prophanesse and laying waste of all Religion, breathing, as in these Querues. . . .³

Edwards recalled that he had written earlier of Goodwin:

1. John Goodwin, Some Modest and Humble Queries Concerning a late printed paper, intituled, An ordinance presented to the honourable House of Commons, &c. for the preventing of the Growing and Spreading of Heresies. 1646.

2. Thomas Edwards, The third part of Gangraena, 1646, p. 117.

3. Ibid.

. . . That I feared (unlesse God gave him repentance) if hee lived but one seven years, hee would prove as Arch an Heretick, and as dangerous a man as ever England bred . . . and behold within a few moneths, not giving God glory to repent of his evill deeds, but going on to write, he hath by these Queries made good what I prophesied of him, and hath filled up the measure of his iniquities.
 . . .¹

He issues this final warning: "I doe not think 'tis lawful for Christians to receive such a one into their house, or to bid him God speed, but rather if they come where he is to fly from him. . . ."² He did hope, however, that "some good hand will make Animadiversions upon them, and give an Answer to those Queries."³ Edwards' horror and consternation at Goodwin's arguments was probably not representative of all the Presbyterians, but many would have had sympathy with his sentiments.

Other leading Presbyterian writers such as Baillie, Rutherford, Prynne and Vicars also attacked Goodwin's views on toleration. Prynne paid tribute to the effectiveness of Goodwin's arguments, commenting that any "teares of Repentance" Goodwin might shed, "will not be sufficient to quench those unhappy flames of contention your late Sermons and Pamphlets have kindled in our Church and State."⁴ Prynne recognized the ferment caused by Goodwin's able, courageous defense of toleration. That keen Scots observer of the English scene during this period, Robert Baillie, who after noting Goodwin's

1. Ibid., p. 118.

2. Ibid.

3. Ibid.

4. William Prynne, Truth Triumphant Over Falshood, 1645, p. 109.

plea for an unlimited toleration, added that "this way is very pleasant to many here."¹

Another example was John Vicars who was also a staunch opponent of religious liberty. He considered that "accursed and intolerable Toleration" as the "main means of totall and terrible, not onely shaking, but shattering in pieces, and utter ruining of all fundamentals of the true religion."² It is not surprising therefore, that he attacks Goodwin's "notorious jugling and subtill insinuation for the secelerous [?] and Sepertine working and winding in of a Toleration of all opinions among us."³ He saw his argument of the danger of fighting against God as, "A brave piece of pernicious Doctrine, indeed, for Mr John Goodwin, and all other his brother-hereticks to run head-long to Hell without controul, if it were as easily granted, as tis here most boldly, but abominably claymed. . . ." ⁴

A fairer opponent was Samuel Rutherford. While criticising Goodwin's views on toleration, Rutherford called him "undeniably the learnedst and most godly man of that way."⁵ There were perhaps as many Presbyterians who shared this view as shared the hatred of Edwards. In either

1. Robert Baillie, Letters and Journals, (Revised edition, Edinburgh, 1842), Vol. II, p. 180.

2. John Vicars, Coleman-street Conclave Visited, 1648, preface.

3. Ibid., p. 17.

4. Ibid., p. 18.

5. Samuel Rutherford, A Free Disputation Against pretended Liberty of Conscience, 1649, p. 362. He calls Goodwin the most "learned and sharp-written Divine" of those writing in support of toleration. Ibid., p. 64.

case, however, Goodwin was looked on as the leading exponent of toleration.

Goodwin had practically no direct influence on later theories of toleration. After the Restoration, he would not have been quoted by Anglicans or probably not by non-Conformists. To the odium of being a radical and sectary was added his defense of the execution of the King. This, of course, made his name anathema to most Anglicans.¹ Anthony Wood, for example, referred to him as "that infamous and blackmouth'd Independent."² His Arminianism made him suspect among most of the Puritans. So few were interested in Goodwin's ideas. He seems to have been little quoted during the Restoration period. Indirectly though, his influence might have been of considerable importance. The two arguments which Goodwin used to prove the necessity of toleration were just as compelling in the Restoration period as the Commonwealth era. There were two unshakeable facts which made toleration a practical necessity and led practical men like Shaftesbury, Buckingham, and Halifax to support toleration.³ Many men had tasted a goodly measure of religious freedom during the Commonwealth and were not content to return to the status quo before the Puritan Revolution. The Restoration in many ways represented a reaction against the Puritan Commonwealth, but

1. Jordan, *op.cit.*, Vol. IV, p. 382. Russell H. F. Smith, The Theory of Religious Liberty in the Reigns of Charles II and James II, (Cambridge: University Press, 1911), p. 39.

2. Anthony Wood, Athenae Oxonienses, 1723, Vol. II, p. 504.

3. Smith, op.cit., pp. 56 ff.

it could not ignore the gains made in the field of Parliamentary and religious liberties. The "Glorious Revolution" of 1688 and the Toleration Act of 1689 were to prove that.

The other fact which made toleration a practical necessity during the Restoration was the large number and variety of dissenters. They were now too numerous to force them to emigrate as had been done in the case of the earlier Separatists. All efforts to comprehend them within the Church of England failed for no formula was ever reached whereby the leading groups of Puritans -- Presbyterian, Independent, Baptist, and Quaker -- could be brought into the national Church. There were so many of the Dissenters who refused to conform in spite of pressure that a policy of rigorous persecution would have taxed the capacity of the prisons. There seemed to be almost no alternative but to give a certain measure of toleration. This was eventually the course which was followed.

The heritage of the Puritan Revolution had left the issue of toleration upon the conscience of the nation and the problems of dissenters in their laps. The restoration period was marked by a constant agitation for religious tolerance. In 1660 Charles II had agreed to the Declaration of Breda to grant toleration.¹ This agreement came to mean nothing, but

1. Cf., R. S. Gardiner (ed.), The Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution, (3d ed. revised, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1906), p. 466: ". . . we do declare a liberty to tender consciences, and that no man shall be disturbed or called in question for difference of opinion in matters of religion, which do not disturb the peace of the kingdom."

in the Parliament there were endless debates on the subject. In 1664, 1667-8, 1673, and 1681, bills were debated or passed by one of the Houses containing essentially the provisions of the successful act of 1689.¹ In 1672 Charles II issued a Declaration of Indulgence, in 1685 and in 1688 James II issued two Declarations of Indulgence.² The experience of a measure of toleration and the Puritan remnant from the Commonwealth had made toleration one of the leading issues of the day and a more lenient solution almost inevitable. John Goodwin's role as the leading exponent and defender of toleration during the Puritan period made his influence live on to haunt the reactionary elements of the Restoration, even though his name and works had sunk almost into oblivion.

John Goodwin lived in an era of great upheaval and change -- a truly revolutionary age. It was a time when powerful ideas were competing for the minds and loyalties of men. There was probably no individual more active in that momentous struggle of ideas than John Goodwin. Perhaps there were few who had more influence on the development of thought in this period. For in the discussions of the crucial doctrine of salvation, the controversial doctrine of the church, and the decisive question of religious liberty, Goodwin played a leading and significant role. It would not be far amiss to

1. Smith, *op.cit.*, p. 3.

2. There is reason to believe that Charles II and James II were more concerned to provide toleration for Roman Catholics than Puritans. The existence of such a large body of Protestant Dissenters, however, made it easier and safer for them to grant these "Indulgences."

conclude with one of the outstanding historians of the religious thought of seventeenth century in England: "Seldom indeed in English thought has any man exercised so profound and decisive an influence upon historical and religious development as did this interesting and complex figure."¹

1. Jordan, op.cit., Vol. III, p. 376.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

NOTE: All Books, unless otherwise indicated, were published in London.

1. PRIMARY SOURCES

1. Books by John Goodwin (listed chronologically):

Goodwin, John, The Saints Interest in God: opened in several sermons, preached anniversaryly upon the fifth of November, 1640.

. God a Good Master & Protector to His People
1641.

. The Returne Of Mercies: Or, The Saints Advantage by Losses. Delivered in sundry Sermons upon Philemon, verse 15. 1641.

. Imputatio Fidei: Or, A Treatise of Justification wherein ye imputation of faith for righteousness (mentioned Rom. 1v. 3-5) is explained & alle ye great Question largely handled, whether ye active obedience of Christ preformed to ye morall law, be imputed in justification, or noe, or how it is imputed. . . . 1642.
(abridged ed. 1763.)

. The Divine Authority of the Scriptures Asserted: Or, The Great Charter of the worlds Blessednes vindicated. Being A Discourse of Sovereigne use and service in these times; not only against that King of Errours, and Heresies Antiscripturismo, who hath already destroyed the faith of many, and hath all the faith in the World yet remaining, in chase, but also against all such inward suggestions and secret underminings of Satan, by which he privily attempteth the ruine of the precious faith and hope, wherewith the Saints have built up themselves with much spirituall Industry and Care. . . .
1643.

. 'Απολύτρωσις Ἀπολυτρώσεως', Or, Redemption Redeemed. Wherein the Most Glorious Work of the Redemption Of The World by Jesus Christ, is by Expressness of Scripture, clearness of Argument, countenance of the best Authority, as well Ancient as Modern, Vindicated and Asserted in the Just Latitude and Extent of it,

according to the Counsel and most Gracious Intentions of God, against the incroachments of later times made upon it, whereby the unsearchable Riches and Glory of the Grace of God therein, have been, and yet are, much obscured, and hid from the eyes of many. Together with a sober, plain, and through Discussion of the great Questions relating hereunto, as viz. concerning Election And Reprobation, The sufficiency, and Efficacy of the Means vouchsafed unto Men by God, to Repent and Believe: concerning the Perseverance of the Saints, and those who do Believe; concerning the Nature of God, his manner of Acting, his Intentions, Purposes, Decrees, &c. the Dependancy of all Creatures or second Causes upon Him, as well in their Operations, as simple Existencies, or Beings, &c. . . . 1651. (abridged ed. 1806; new ed. 1840.)

Ἐιρηνομασία . The Agreement & Distance Of Brethren:
Or, a brief Survey of The Judgement of Mr. J. C. and the Church of God walking with him touching those important Heads of Doctrine, 1. Election and Reprobation. 2. The Death of Christ. 3. The Grace of God, in and about Conversion. 4. The liberty or power of the will, or of the Creature Man. 5. The Perseverance of the Saints. Truly and plainly declaring the particulars, as well agreed upon, as dissented in, between them, and their Christian Brethren of opposite judgement to them in some things about the said Doctrines. . . . 1652. (later ed. 1671; reprinted in 1835 edition of An Exposition of The Ninth Chapter of the Epistle to the Romans.)

An Exposition of The Ninth Chapter of the Epistle to the Romans: Wherein, by the tenor and carriage of the contents of the said chapter, from first to last, is plainly showed and proved, that the Apostle's scope therein is to assert and maintain his great doctrine of Justification by Faith, and that here he discourseth nothing at all concerning Any Personal Election or Reprobation of Men from Eternity. 1653. (later ed. 1835.)

Cata-Baptism: Or New Baptism, waxing old, and ready to vanish away. . . . 1655.

Triumviri: Or, The Genius, Spirit, and Deportment Of the Three Men, Mr. Richard Resbury, Mr. John Pawson, and Mr. George Kendall, in their late Writings against The Free Grace of God in the Redemption of the World, and vouchsafement of Means of Salvation unto Men; briefly described in their native and true colours, borrowed of themselves in their said Writings (respectively.) Together With some brief touches (in the Preface) upon Dr. John Owen, Mr. Thomas Lamb (of the Spittle), Mr. Henry Jeanes, Mr. Obadiah How, and Mr. Marchamond Needham, in relation to their late Writings against the Author. . . . 1658.

. Πλήρωμα τὸ Πνευματικόν, Or, A Being Filled With The Spirit. Wherein is proved, That it is a Duty incumbent on all men (especially Believers) that they be filled with the Spirit of God. . . . As Also, The Divinity, or Godhead of the Holy Ghost Asserted, and the Arguments brought against it throughly Examined and Answered; The Grace of God in the fulness and freeness thereof evinced; and many things relating to the Saints Communion with God, and God dwelling in them Explained. . . . All heretofore delivered in several Sermons from Ephes. 5. 18. By that Pious, Learned, and Laborious Servant of God, Mr. John Goodwin, Sometime Minister of the Gospel in Coleman-Street London; And published after his death for the common good of all. 1670. (later ed. 1867.)

2. Pamphlets by John Goodwin (listed chronologically):

Goodwin, John, A defence of the true sense and meaning of the Words of the Holy Apostle. Rom. chap. iv. ver. 3, 5, 9. 1641.

. Impedit ira animum: Or, Animadversions Upon Some Of The Looser And Fouler Passages In A Pamphlet Intituled, A Defence Of The True Sense And meaning of the words of the holy Apostle. Romans iv. 3, 5, &c. First dispersed in several copies without the Authors Name, but since acknowledged and Triumphed in, by Mr. George Walker. 1641.

. Irelands Advocate: Or, A Sermon Preached Upon Novemb. 14, 1641. to promote the contributions by way of lending, for the present reliefe of the protestants party in Ireland. . . . 1641.

. Christ lifted up: Or, the heads of the chief controverted points, preached by John Goodwin, 1641.

. Anti-Cavalierisme: Or Truth Pleading As well the Necessity, as the Lawfulness of this present War, for the suppressing of that Butcherly brood of Cavaliering Incendiaries, who are now hammering England, to make an Ireland Of It. . . . 1642. (other editions, 1642, 1643; reprinted in Haller, Tracts on Liberty.)

. The Butchers Blessing: Or, The Bloody Intentions of Romish Cavaliers against the City of London above other places, Demonstrated by 5 Arguments, . . . delivered by way of Prologue before a Sermon the last publique Fast-Day, 1642. (reprinted as appendix in 2d ed., Anti-Cavaliorisme, 1642.)

. Os Ossorianum: Or, A Bone For A Bishop To Pick: Being a Vindication of some passages in a Treatise

lately published, called Anti-Cavalierismo, from the impertinent and importune exceptions of Gr. Williams, the Author of the Grand Rebellion. . . . 1643.

. A Quære, concerning the Church-Covenant, practiced in the Separate Congregations. Sent with a Letter thereunto annexed from J. G. to T. G. Wherein is proved that there is much evill and manifold inconveniences in the exacting and urging such a Covenant. 1643.

. M. S. to A. S. With a Plea for Libertie of Conscience in a Church Way, Against the Cavalls of A. S. And Observations On His Considerations, And Annotations Upon the Apologeticall Narration, Humbly submitted to the judgements of all rationally, and moderate men in the world; 1644. (rev. ed. under title, A Reply of Two of the Brethren to A. S. . . . 1644.) This pamphlet was anonymous, but Goodwin is generally accepted as one of the two authors.

. Theomaxia: Or, The Grand Imprudence of men running the hazard of Fighting Against God in suppressing any Way, Doctrine, or Practice, concerning which they know not certainly whether it be from God or no. Being the substance of two Sermons preached . . . upon occasion of the late disaster sustain'd in the West. With some necessary Enlargements thereto. 1644. (reprinted in Haller, Tracts on Liberty.)

. Innocencies Triumph: Or, An Answer To The Backpart Of A Discourse lately published by William Prynne, Esquire, intituled, A full Reply, &c. . . . 1644.

. Certain briefe Observations . . . On Master Prin's Twelve questions About Church-Government. . . . 1644. (anonymous but commonly attributed to Goodwin.)

. Innocency and Truth triumphing together: Or, The latter part of an Answer to the back-part of a Discourse, lately published By William Prynne. . . . 1645.

. Calumny Arraign'd And Cast: Or, A Briefe Answer to some extravagant and rank passages, lately fallen from the pen of William Prynne. . . . 1645.

. Anapologesiates Antapologias: Or, The inexousableness of that Grand Accusation of the Brethren, called Antapologia. Complaining As well of the want of Truth, as of Christianity, in many of the Reports and Assertions made in the said Discourse. Pitying (Though with some indignation) the impertinency and weaknesse of many others: And further Proving The utter insufficiency of the Antapologist for his Great undertaking in the behalfe of the Presbyterian cause: with Answers to his Arguments or Reasons (so call'd) for the support

thereof in sundry particulars, and more especially in the point of Non-toleration. . . . 1646.

. Cretensis: Or, A Briofe Answer To an ulcerous Treatise, lately published by Mr. Thomas Edwards, intituled, Gangraena: Calculated for the Meridian of such passages in the said Treatise, which relate to Mr. John Goodwin; but may without any sensible error indifferently serve for the whole Tract. Wherein some of the best means for the cure of the said dangerous ulcer, called Gangraena, and to prevent the spreading of it to the danger of the precious soules of men, are clearly opened, and effectually applied; 1646.

. Hagiomastix: Or, The Scourge Of The Saints Displayed In his colours of Ignorance & blood: Or, A vindication of some printed Queries published some moneths since by Authority, in way of Answer to certaine Anti-papers of Sylllogismes, intituled a Vindication of a Printed paper, &c. . . . the said Queries containing nothing, insinuating nothing prejudiciall in the least either to the lawfull Authority of the Civill Magistrate; or to any orderly, due or effectuall course for the suppressing of errours and Heresies. . . . 1646.

. A Post-script, or Appendix To A Treatise Lately published by Authority, intituled, Hagio-Mastix, Or, The Scourge of the Saints displaid in his colours of Ignorance and Blood, Being an Explication of the third verse of the thirteenth Chapter of the Prophecie of Zacharie; . . . According to the analogie of the Scriptures, the scope and exigency of the context, and the sence of the best Expositors upon the place. . . . 1646.

. Twelve considerable serious Cautions. Very Necessary to be observed, in, and about a Reformation according to the word of God, Wherein diverse particular inconsistencies with the word of God, very incident to Reformations (so called) are briefly insisted upon, and argued from the Word of God. . . . 1646.

. Some Modest and Humble Queries Concerning a late printed paper, intituled, An ordinance presented to the honourable House of Commons, &c. for the preventing of the Growing and Spreading of Heresies. . . . 1646.

. Independencie Gods Veritie: Or, The Necessitie of Toleration. Unto which is added the chief Principles of the Government of Independent Churches. 1647.

. A Candle to see the Sunne: Or, A further clearing up of some passages mis-apprehended by some, in a Treatise lately published by Authority, intituled, Hagiomastix displayed, &c. 1647.

. Sion-Colledge visited: Or, Some brief Animadversions upon a Pamphlet lately published, under the title of, A Testimonie to the Truth of Jesus Christ and to our Solemne League and Covenant, &c. Subscribed (as is pretended) by the Ministers of Christ within the Province of London. Calculated more especially for the vindication of certaine passages cited out of the writings of J. G. in the said pamphlet, with the blacke brand of Infamous and pernicious Errors, and which the said Ministers pretend (amongst other errors so called) more particularly to abhorre. Wherein the indirect and most un-Christian dealings of the said Minister, in charging & calling manifest and cleere Truths, yea such as are consonant to their own principles, by the Name of infamous and pernicious Errors, are detected and laid open to the Kingdome, and the whole world. . . . 1648.

. Νεόφυτοπρεσβύτερος, Or, The Yongling Elder, or, Novice-Presbyter. Compiled more especially for the Christian Instruction and redueement of William Jenkin, a young Presbyter, lately gone astray like a lost sheep from the wayes of Modesty, Conscience and Truth. And may indifferently serve for the better Regulation of the ill Governed Society of Sion Colledge. Occasioned by a late importune Pamphlet, published in the name of the said William Jenkin . . . the said Pamphlet containing very little in it, but which is chiefly Reducible to one or both, of those two unhappy Predicaments of Youth (Ignorance & Arrogance.) Clearly demonstrated by J. G. a servant of God and Men in the glorious Gospel of Jesus Christ. Wherein also the two great Questions, the one, concerning the Foundation of Christian Religion: the other, concerning the power of the Naturall Man to good supernaturall, are succinctly, yet satisfactorily discussed. . . . 1648.

. Right And Might well met: Or, A brief and unpartiall enquiry into the late and present proceedings of the Army under the Command of His Excellency the Lord Fairfax. Wherein the equity and regularnesse of the said proceedings are demonstratively vindicated upon undeniable Principles, as well of Reason, as Religion. Together With satisfactory Answers to all materiall Objections against them. . . . 1648.

. The Unrighteous Judge: Or, An Answer to a Printed Paper, pretending a Letter to Mr. Jo. Goodwin, by Sir Francis Nethersole Knight. Wherein the rough things of the said pretended Letter, are made smooth, and the crooked things straight: and the predominant designs of it fully evinced to be, either an unscholarlike oscitancie and mistake, or else somewhat much worse. . . . 1649.

. Ὑβριστοδίκαι. The Obstructours Of Justice: Or, A Defence of the Honourable Sentence passed upon

the late King, by the High Court of Justice. Opposed chiefly to The Serious and Faithful Representation and Vindication of some of The Ministers of London. As also to, The Humble Adresse of Dr. Hamond, to His Excellencie and Councel of Warre. Wherein the Justice, and Equitie of the said Sentence is Demonstratively Asserted, as well upon clear texts of Scripture, as principles of Reason, grounds of Law, Authorities, Presidents, as well Forreign, as Domestique. Together with, a brief Reply to Mr. John Gerce's Book, intituled, Night overcoming Right: wherein the Acts of the Armie in garbling the Parliament, is further cleared. . . . 1649.

. The Remedie of Unreasonableness: Or, The Substance of a Speech Intended at a Conference or Dispute, In Alhallows the Great, London. Feb. 11, 1649. Exhibiting the brief Heads of Mr. John Goodwin's Judgement, Concerning the Freeness Fulness Effectualness of the Grace of God. As also concerning the Bondage or Servility of the Will of Man. Occasioned by an undue aspersion case upon him; as (viz.) That he held Free-will in opposition to Free-Grace. . . . 1650.

. Confidence Dismounted: Or, A Letter To Mr. Richard Resburie of Oundle in North-Hamptonshire, upon the occasion, partly of a Title Page prefixed before a small Treatise of his concerning Election & Reprobation, Consisting of six Sermons preached by him about three years since, and lately published; the said Title Page bearing in front these words, Some stop to the Gangrene of Arminianism, lately promoted by Mr. John Goodwin, in his book intituled Redemption Redeemed; Partly also, of a short Preface or Epistle prefixed by the said Mr. Resbury to that Treatise. . . . 1651.

. Moses made Angry: Or, A Letter Written and Sent to Dr. Hill, Master of Trinity Colledg in Cambridge, Upon occasion of some hard Passages that fell from him in a Sermon preached at Pauls, May 4, 1651. . . . 1651.

. The Pagans Debt, and Dowry: Or, A Briefe Discussion of these Question, Whether, How Far, and in what Sence, such Persons of Mankinde amongst whom the Letter of the Gospel never came, are notwithstanding bound to Believe on Jesus Christ (with some other particulars relating hereunto.) Returned by way of Answer to a Discourse in Writing, lately sent without Name (together with a Letter, subscribed only T.S.) unto Mr. John Goodwin; . . . 1651. (reprinted with later edition of Agreement and Distance of Brethren, 1671.)

. The Apologist Condemned: Or, A Vindication Of The

Thirty Queries (Together with their Author) Concerning the Power of the Civil Magistrate in matters of Religion. By way of Answer to a scurrilous Pamphlet, published (as it seems) by some Proposalist, under the Mock-title of an Apologic for M. John Goodwin. Together With a brief Touch upon another Pamphlet, Intituled, Mr. J. Goodwin's Queries Questioned. . . . 1653.

. Thirty Queries: Modestly propounded in order to a Discovery of Truth, and Mind of God, in that Question, or Case of Conscience; Whether the Civil Magistrate stands bound by way of Duty to interpose his Power or Authority in matters of Religion, or Worship of God.
 . . . 1653.

. Water-Dipping No Firm Footing for Church-Communion: Or, Considerations Proving it not simply lawful, but necessary also (in point of Duty) for persons baptized after the new mode of Dipping, to continue Communion with those Churches, or imbodied Societies of Saints; of which they were members before the said Dipping;
 . . . 1653.

. A Fresh Discovery Of The High-Presbyterian Spirit: Or, the Quenching of the second Beacon fired. Declaring I. The Un-Christian Dealings of the Author of a Pamphlet, Entituled, A Second Beacon Fired, &c. In Presenting unto the Lord Protector and Parliament, a falsified passage out of one of Mr. John Goodwins Books, as containing, either Blasphemie, or Error, or both. II. The Evil of their Petition for subjecting the Libertie of the Press to the Arbitrariness and will of a few men. III. The Christian Equity, that satisfaction be givento the Person so notoriously and publicly wronged. . . . 1654.

. Peace Protected, and Discontent Disarmed: Whoroin The seventeen Queries (with addition of three more, Postscript-wise) lately published, partly to allay the discontents of some about the late Revolution of Government, but more especially to guide every mans feet into the way of Peace, 1654.

. Συγκρητισμός : Or, Dis-satisfaction Satisfied.
 In seventeen sober and serious Queries, Tending to allay the Discontents, and satisfie the Scruples, of persons Dis-satisfied about the late Revolution of Government in the Common-Wealth, and to guide every Mans feet into the way of his Duty, and the Publique Peace. . . . 1654.

. Mercy In Her Exaltation: Or, A Sovereigne Antidote against Fear of the Second Death. In a Sermon preached at the Funeral of Daniel Taylor Esq; in Stephens Coleman-Street London, on the twentieth day of April, An. 1655. . . . 1655.

. Βαταβιστά Or, The Triers (or Tormentors) Tryed and Cast, by the Laws both of God and Men. Or, Arguments and Grounds, as well in Reason as Religion; clearly evincing the unlawfulness of those Ordinances or Commissions (at least as they have been from time to time declared and interpreted, aloud by the persons acting them, and tacitly by the Authority enacting them) with all others of like import, by which the respective Courts, or Consistories of Tryers and Electors (so called) amongst us, are established: Together with the unwarrantableness of the acceptations and exercise of the Powers delegated and granted in the said Commissions by any man, or company of men whatsoever, now being, 1657.

. The Banner of Justification Displayed: Or, A Discourse concerning The Deep and Important Mystery of The Justification of A Sinner: Wherein the severall causes therof, being both numerous and various, are, from the first to the last, diligently inquired after, and their severall contributions towards so great and happy a work clearly distinguished, and assigned to their proper causes, respectively. . . . 1659, (reprinted in 1835 edition of An Exposition of The Ninth Chapter of the Epistle to the Romans.)

NOTE: Thomas Jackson, The Life of John Goodwin, ascribes Prelatique Preachers None of Christ's Teachers. . . . 1663, to Goodwin. There seems, however, to be little basis for this.

3. Works Edited by John Goodwin:

Acontius, J. Satan's Stratagems . . . with an epistle . . . by . . . Mr. John Goodwin touching the same. 1648. (2d ed. with the title, Darkness Discovered: Or, the Devil's secret stratagems laid open. . . . 1651.)

Fenner, W. A divine message to the Elect Soule. 1647.

. Practicall Divinitie. . . . 1650.

Ramsden, H. A Gleaning in God's Harvest. . . . 1639.

Two Hymns, or Spirituall Songs; Sung in Mr. Goodwins Congregation 1651.

4. Works Attacking John Goodwin:

An Apologie For The Six Book-Sellers; Subscribers of the Second Beacon fired. Or, A Vindication of them from the foul and unjust aspersions cast upon them by M. John Goodwin in a late Pamphlet Intituled A Fresh Discovery of The High Presbyterian Spirit 1655.

An Apologie For Mr. John Goodwin: Who having Subscribed Proposals to be presented to the Magistrate concerning matters of Religion; after that, Makes 30 Queries, whether it be the Magistrates duty to interpose his Authoritie in matters of Religion 1653.

Baillic, Robert. A Scotch Antidote Against The English Infection Of Arminianism. Which little Book may be (through Gods blessing) very useful to perserve those that are yet sound in the faith, from the Infection Of Mr. John Goodwin's Great Book. 1652.

Barlow, Thomas. "To the Reverend Mr. John Goodwin Minister of Gods Word in Coleman-street", The Genuine Remains of That Learned Prelate Dr. Thomas Barlow, Late Bishop of Lincoln. 1693.

Burgess, C. Sion College What it Is, and Doeth, Together with a Vindication Of that Society From the slanderous Diffamations of two fell and fiery Satyres, The one called Sion College Visited: The other The Pulpit Incendiary. 1648.

Edwards, Thomas. The First and Second Part of Gangraena: Or, A Catalogue and Discovery of many of the Errors, Heresies, Blasphemies and pernicious Practices of the Sectaries of this time, vented and acted in England in these four last years. 3d ed. revised. 1646.

The third Part of Gangraena: Or, A new and higher Discovery of the Errors, Heresies, Blasphemies, and insolent Proceedings of the Sectaries of these times; As also a particular Relation of many remarkable Stories, speciall Passages, Copies of Letters written by Sectaries to Sectaries, Brief Animadversions on many of the Sectaries late Pamphlets 1646.

F., D. A Letter Occasioned by Mr Needham's reply to Mr. Goodwin's Book against the Triers. By a Person of quality. 1657.

Faces About: Or, A Recrimination charged upon Mr. John Goodwin, In the point of fighting against God, and opposing the way of Christ: And a Justification of the Presbyterian way in the Particulars by him unjustly charged upon it. With other short animadversions upon his late Book called, Theomaxia, (attributed to William Prynne in the McAlpin Catalogue) 1644.

Coree, J. ΚΑΤΑ ΔΥΝΑΜΙΝΣ : Or, Might Overcoming Right: Or, A Clear Answer to Mr John Goodwin's Might and Right well met. 1649.

Hammond, H. A Brief reply to Mr. J. Goodwins 'Υβριστοβίκα as far as concerns Dr. Hammond. 1649.

Howe, O. The Pagan Preacher silenced: Or, An answer to a treatise to Mr J. G., entituled, The Pagans Debt and Dowry. . . . 1655.

Jeanes, Henry. A Vindication of D. Twisse from the exceptions of Mr. John Goodwin in his Redemption Redeemed. Oxford, 1653. (printed in William Twisse, The Riches of Gods Love,)

Jenkyn, William. Ἀλλοτριοεπίσκοπος. The Busio Bishop. Or, The Visitor Visited. By way of Answer to a very feeble Pamphlet lately Published by Mr J. G. called Sion Colledge visited, In which Answer, his Cavils against the Ministers of London for Witnessing against his Errours touching the holy Scriptures, and the power of man to good supernaturall, are answered, and the impertinency of his quotations out of the Fathers, Martin Bucer, and Mr. Ball are manifested. 1648.

Ὁδηγός Τυφλός, The Blinde Guide Composed by way of Reply to a . . . Pamphlet, entituled, The Youngling older, etc., written by J. G. 1648.

Kendall, George. Sancti Sanciti: Or, The Common Doctrine of the Perseverance of the Saints: As who are kept by the Power of God, through Faith Unto Salvation: Vindicated From the attempts lately made against it, by Mr. John Goodwin, in the Digression of his Book, which he was pleased to entitle Redemption Redeemed. . . . 1654.

Θεοκρατία : Or, A Vindication of the Doctrine Commonly Received in the Reformed Churches Concerning Gods Intentions of special Grace and Favour to his Elect In the Death of Christ: As Also His Prerogative, Power, Prescience, Providence, the Immutability of his Nature and Counsels, &c. from the attempts lately made against it, by Master John Goodwin in his book Entituled Redemption Redeemed. . . . 1653.

Lamb, Thomas. Absolute freedom from sin by Christs Death for the World, as the object of Faith in opposition to conditional, set forth by Mr. John Goodwin in his Book (hereby appearing falsly) entituled Redemption Redeemed. And the final perseverance of the Saints proceeding from election by the grace of God alone maintained, and sweetly reconciled with the foresaid Doctrine; and the great Question of Gods eternal Decree of reprobating the unbelieving World, cleared from that odium cast upon it by Mr. Goodwin. . . . 1656.

Truth Prevailing against the fiercest opposition: Or, An answer to Mr. J. G's Water-dipping 1655.

Lane, Samuel. A Vindication of Free-Grace: In Opposition

to this Arminian Position, (Naturall Men may do such things as whereunto God hath by way of Promise annexed Grace and Acceptation.) First Preached, after Asserted At Stephens Coleman-streete London, by Mr. John Goodwin. . . . 1645.

Master John Goodwins Quere's Questioned, Concerning the Power of the Civil Magistrate in matters of Religion. . . . 1653.

Moro-Mastix: Mr. John Goodwin whipt with his own Rod: Or, the dissecting of the sixteenth section of his book truly nam'd by himself Hagiomastix.: So far as it falsly and frivolously mentions a late disputation in Christ-Church Parish, concerning the lawfulness of paying Tythes. 1646.

Nedham, M. The Great Accuser cast down: Or, A Publick Trial of Mr. J. Goodwin. . . . Being A full Answer to . . . Book of his, . . . Entitled, The Triers Tried and Cast, etc. . . . 1657.

Nethersole, Francis. Ο ΑΥΤΟ-ΚΑΤΑΚΡΙΤΟΣ . The Self-Condemned: Or, A Letter To Mr. Jo: Goodwin: Shewing, That in his Essay to justifie . . . the Army by Principles of Reason, and Religion, he hath condemned himselfe of iniquity 1648.

Owen, John. The Doctrine of the Saints Perseverance Explained and Confirmed: Or, The certain Permanency of their 1. Acceptation with God, & 2. Sanctification from God. Manifested & Proved . . . and Vindicated in a Full Answer to the Discourse of Mr. John Goodwin against it, in his Book Entitled Redemption Redeemed. . . . Oxford, 1654.

Pawson, John. A Brief Vindication of Free Grace. . . . 1652.

Prynne, William. A full reply to certain briefe observations . . . on Master Prynne's Twelve Questions about Church Government. 1644.

. Truth Triumphant Over Falshood, Antiquity Over Novelty: Or, The First Part of A just and reasonable Vindication of the undoubted Ecclesiasticall Jurisdiction, Right, Legislative, Coercive Power of Christian Emperors, Kings, Magistrates, Parliaments, in all matters of Religion, Church-Government, Discipline, Ceremonies, Manners: . . . In Refutation of Mr. John Goodwins Innocencies Triumph: My doare brother Burtons Vindication of Churches, commonly called Independent: And of all Anti-Monarchicall, Anti-Parliamentall, Anti-Synodicall, and Anarchicall Paradoxes of Papists, Prelates, Anabaptists, Arminians, Socinians, Brownists, or Independents: . . . 1645.

Resburie, Richard. The Lightless-Starre: Or, Mr. John Goodwin discovered a Pelagio-Socinian: And this by the Examination of his Preface to his Book entituled Redemption Redeemed. Together with An Answer to his Letter entituled Confidence Dismounted. . . . 1652.

. Some stop to the Gangrene of Arminianism, Lately promoted by M. John Goodwin in his Book entituled, Redemption Redeemed. Or, The Doctrine of Election & Reprobation In Six Sermons Opened and cleared from the old Pelagian and late Arminian Errors. 1651.

Ricraft, Josiah. A Nosegay Of Rank-smelling Flowers, Such as grow in Mr. John Goodwins Garden. Gathered Upon occasion of his late lying Libell against M. Thomas Edwards, which he himselve fitly stiled Cretensis, for the foule lies therein contained, with sundry others, exactly gathered, and published. . . . 1646.

Roborough, Henry. The Doctrine of Justification cleared and vindicated From Arminian, Socinian, and Popish Errors. Or an Answer to Mr. John Goodwins Animadversions upon Master George Walkers Defence of the true sense of the Apostle; Rom. 4. 3. 5. Together with an Examination of the said Mr. John Goodwins Treatise of Justification. . . . 1650.

Rutherford, Samuel. A Free Disputation Against pretended Liberty of Conscience Tending To Resolve Doubts moved by Mr. John Goodwin, John Baptist, Dr. Jer. Taylor, the Belgick Arminians, Socinians, and other Authors contending for lawlesse Liberty, or licentious Toleration of Sects and Heresies. 1649.

A Testimony To The Truth of Jesus Christ, And To Our Solemn League and Covenant; As Also Against the Errours, Heresies and Blasphemies of these times, and the Toleration of them. . . . Subscribed by the Ministers of Christ within the Province of London, Decemb. 14 &c. 1647 1647.

Vicars, John. Coleman-street Conclave Visited. And, That Grand Impostor, the Schismaticks Cheator in Chief (who hath, long, slyly lurked therein) truly and duly discovered. Containing a most palpable and plain Display of Mr. John Goodwin's Self-conviction (under his own Hand-writing) and of the notorious Heresies, Errours, Malice, Pride, and Hypocrisie of this most huge Garagantua, in falsly pretended Piety; to the lamentable misleading of his too-too credulous Soul-murdered Proselytes of Coleman-street & elsewhere. . . . 1648.

Walker, Geo. Socinianisme: In The Fundamental Point Of Justification, Discovered and Confuted. 1640.

Williams, Gryffith. Vindiciae Regum; or The Grand Rebellion;
that is, a Looking-Glasse for Rebels. Oxford. 1643.

5. Other Contemporary Works Concerning John Goodwin:

An Apologeticall Account, of some Brethren of the Church,
Whereof Mr. John Goodwin is Pastor. (On the behalfe
of the Church.) Why they cannot execute that Unchris-
tian and passionate Charge, viz. Of Delivering up their
said Pastor unto Sathan, &c. Which is imposed upon them,
in the sixth Page of a late Printed Booke, called a Vin-
dication of a Printed Paper, &c. . . . 1647.

Brown, David. Two Conferences Between Some of those that
are called Separatists & Independents, Concerning their
different Tenents: One Whereof, was appointed with Mr.
Burton, and a number of his Church, and the other, with
Mr. John Goodwin, and some of his Church; 1650.

Lilburn, John. Jonahs Cry Out of the Whales belly: Or,
certaine Epistles writ by Licu. Coll. John Lilburne,
unto Licu. Generall Cromwell, and Mr. John Goodwin:
Complaining of the tyranny of the Houses of Lords and
Commons at Westminster; and the unworthy dealing of
divers (of those with him that are called) his
Friends. . . . 1647.

Salter, Christopher. Sal Scylla: Or, a Letter Written From
Scilly to Mr. John Goodwin, Minister of the Gospel in
London. 1653.

Three Hymnes: or certain excellent new Psalmes composed by
those three Reverend and Learned Divines, Mr. John
Goodwin, Mr. Dasoser Powel, and Mr. Appletree, sung in
their congregations . . . on the 8 of October, 1650,
being a day set apart for the total routing of the
Scots army 1650.

Truths Conflict with Error. Or, Universall Redemption Con-
troverted, In three Publike Disputations. The first
between M. John Goodwin, and M. Vavasour Powell, in
Coleman-street London. The other two between M. John
Goodwin, and M. John Simpson, at Alhallowes the great
in Thames-street: In the presence of divers Ministers
of the City of London, and thousands of others, . . .
1650.

Woodward, Hezekiah. As You Were: Or a reducing (if poss-
ibly any) seduc't ones, to Facing about, turn-head,
Front against God, by the Recrimination. (so intended)
upon Mr. J. G. (Pastor of the Church in Colemanstreet)
in point of Fighting against God. . . . 1644.

6. Other Primary Sources:

- Alsop, U. A. Melius Inquirendum. Or A Sober Inquiry Into the Reasonings of the Serious Inquiry. . . . 1679.
- The ancient Bounds, Or Liberty of Conscience, Tenderly Stated, Modestly Asserted, and Mildly Vindicated. 1645.
- Aminius, James. Works. Translated by William Nichols, 3 vols. Thomas Baker, 1875.
- Arrowsmith, John. Armillæ Catechetica. A Chain of Principles; Or, An orderly concatenation of Theological Aphorismes and Exercitation; Wherein, The Chief Heads of Christian Religion are Asserted and improved. Cambridge, 1659.
- The Articles of the Synod of Dort. Edited by Thomas Scott. A. Macintosh, 1818.
- Baillie, Robert. The Letters and Journals. 3 vols. Revised edition. Edinburgh, 1842.
- Bartlet, W. Ἰχνογραφία . Or A Model of the Primitive Congregational way. . . . 1647.
- Baxter, Richard. Works. Edited by William Orme. 23 vols. James Duncan, 1830.
- Bridge, William., Burroughes, Jer., Goodwin, Tho., Nye, Philip., and Simpson, Sidrach. An Apologeticall Narration, Humbly Submitted to the Honourable Houses of Parliament. 1643.
- Browne, Robert. A Treatise of Reformation Without Tarrying for Anie. . . . Edited by T. G. Crippen. Congregational Historical Society, 1903.
- Burnet, Gilbert. History of His Own Time. 6 vols. 2d ed. Oxford: University Press, 1833.
- Burton, Henry. A Vindication Of Churches, Commonly Called Independent. . . . 1644.
- Calamy, Edmund. An Account of the Ministers, Lecturers, Masters and Fellows of Colleges and Schoolmasters, who were Ejected or Silenced after the Restoration in 1660. . . . 2 vols. 2d ed., 1713.
- Calvin, John. Institutes of the Christian Religion. Translated by Henry Beveridge. 2 vols. James Clarke & Co., 1949.
- Clarke, William. The Clarke Papers. Edited by C. H. Firth. 4 vols. Camden Society, 1891-1901.

The Collegiat Suffrage of the Divines of Great Britaine, Concerning the Five Articles Controverted in the Low Countries. Which Suffrage was by them delivered in the Synod of Dort, March 6. Anno 1619. Being their vote or voice foregoing the joint and publique judgment of that Synod. 1629.

The Compassionate Samaritane Unbinding The Conscience, and pouring Oyle into the wounds which have been made upon the Separation. . . . Second Edition, Corrected, and enlarged, 1644.

The Confession or Declaration of the Ministers or Pastors, Which in the United Provinces are called Remonstrants, Concerning the chief Points of Christian Religion, 1676.

Cotton, J. The Way of the Churches Of Christ In New England. . . . 1645.

Culverwel, Nathanael. Of The Light Of Nature A Discourse. . . . Edited by John Brown. Edinburgh: Thomas Constable and Co., 1857.

Defoe, Daniel. (ed.) A Journal of the Plague Year. 1888.

Edwards, Thomas. Antapologia: Or, A Full Answer to the Apologeticall Narration 1644.

. Reasons against the Independant Government of Particular Congregations: As also against the Toleration of such Churches to be erected in this Kingdome. . . . 1641.

Englands Settlement Upon The Two solid foundations Of The Peoples Civil and Religious Liberties. 1659.

Fuller, Thomas. The Church History of Britain. 3 vols. Revised edition. 1837.

Gillespie, George. An Usefull Case Of Conscience Discoursed And Resolved, Concerning Associations and Confederacies with Idolaters, Infidels, Hereticks or any other known Enemies of Truth and Godlinesse. Edinburgh, 1649.

Hales, John. Works. 3 vols. Glasgow, 1765.

Homes, Nathanael. The Mischiefs of Mixt Communions. . . . 1650.

Laud, William. The Works of William Laud. 7 vols. Edited in the Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology, 1847-1860.

Locke, John. Four Letters On Toleration. 7th ed. Alexander Murray, 1879.

Iyford, William. The Matching of the Magistrates Authority,
And The Christians True Liberty in Matters of Religion.
. . . 1654.

Milton, John. Prose Works. 5 vols. Henry G. Bohn, 1848.

Complete Poetry and Selected Prose. New York: Modern Libry.
1942.

A Modest and Clear Vindication of the Serious Representation,
and late Vindication of the Ministers of London, from
the Scandalous Aspersions of John Price, In a Pamphlet
of his, Entitled, Clerico-Classicum. . . . 1649.

A Necessary and Seasonable Testimony Against Toleration . . .
from the Commissioners of the Kirk of Scotland. . . . 1649.

One Blow More At Babylon: Or A Discourse . . . Opening and
Answering the Grounds of the Presbyterians opposing the
Parliaments and Independents present Proceedings. . . .
By a Friend to the Parliament, Army, and Congregational
Churches. 1650.

Owen, John. A Display of Arminianisme. . . . 1643.

. A Vision of Vnchangeable free mercy. . . . Whereunto
is annexed, a Short defensative about Church Government,
(with a Countrey Essay for the practice of Church-Govern-
ment there) Toleration and Petitions about these things.
1646.

Peters, Hugh. Gods Doings, and Mans Duty 1645.

Poole, Matthew. Quo Warranto; Or, A Moderate Enquiry into the
Warrantableness of the Preaching of Gifted and Unordain-
ed Persons 1658.

Prynne, William. Independency Examined, Vnmasked, Refuted.
. . . 1644.

. Twelve Considerable Serious Questions touching Church
Government 1644.

Robinson, Henry. An Answer to Mr. William Prynne's Twelve
Questions concerning Church Government 1644.

Robinson, Henry . Liberty of Conscience: Or the Sole means
to obtaine Peace and Truth 1643.

Rutherford, Samuel. The Divine Right Of Church-Government and
Excommunication 1646.

Saltmarsh, John. Groanes for Liberty. . . . 1646.

The Savoy Declaration of Faith and Order, 1658. Edited by
Albert Peel. Independent Press, 1939.

- Smith, John. Select Discourses 2d ed. Cambridge, 1673.
- Stewart, Adam. Some Observations and Annotations Upon the Apologeticall Narration 1644.
- Twisse, William. The Riches of Gods Love Oxford, 1653.
- Vindiciæ Veritatis, Or an Unanimous Attestation to Gods bless-Truth Revealed in his Word . . . By The Ministers of the Gospel within the West-Riding of the Countie of York. . . . 1648.
- Walker, Clement. Relations and Observations, Historicall and Politick, upon the Parliament, begun Anno Dom. 1640 1648.
- Whichcote, Benjamin. Moral and Religious Aphorisms . . . To which are added, Eight letters: which passed between Dr. Whichcote . . . and Dr. Tuckney Edited by a Samuel Salter. revised edition. 1753.
- Williams, Roger. The Bloudy Tenent of Persecution for Cause of Conscience Discussed . . . Edited by E. B. Underhill, The Hanserd Knollys Society, 1848.
- Zeal Examined: Or, A Discourse for Liberty of Conscience in matters of Religion 1652.

II. SELECT SECONDARY SOURCES

- Bainton, Roland H. The Travail of Religious Liberty. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1951.
- Barker, Arthur. Milton and the Puritan Dilemma, 1641-1660. Toronto: University of Toronto, 1942.
- Bates, Searle H. Religious Liberty. International Missionary Council, 1945.
- Brook, Benjamin. The Lives of the Puritans, 3 vols. James Black, 1813.
- Browne, John. History of Congregationalism. Jarrold and Sons, 1877.
- Brunner, Emil. The Christian Doctrine of God, Translated by Olive Wyon. Lutterworth Press, 1949.
- Burrage, Champlin. Early English Dissenters in the Light of Recent Research, 1550-1641. 2 vols. Cambridge: University Press, 1912.
- Bush, Douglas. English Literature in the Earlier Seventeenth Century 1600-1660. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1946.

- Calder, I. M. (ed.) Letters of John Davenport, Puritan Divine. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1937.
- Clark, G. Kitson. The English Inheritance. SCM Press, 1950.
- Clark, G. N. The Seventeenth Century. Revised edition. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1950.
- Clark, Henry W. History of English Nonconformity. 2 vols. Chapman and Hall, 1911-1913.
- _____. The Life of John Goodwin. Congregational Worthies Series: No. 9. Congregational Union of England and Wales, no date.
- Copinger, W. A. A Treatise on Predestination, Election, And Grace. James Nisbet & Co., 1889.
- Cragg, C. R. From Puritanism to the Age of Reason. Cambridge: University Press, 1950.
- Creameus, C. D. The Reception of Calvinistic Thought in England. Urbana: University of Illinois, 1947.
- Cunningham, William. Historical Theology. 2 vols., 3d ed., Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1870.
- Dale, R. W. History of English Congregationalism. Hodder and Stoughton, 1907.
- Dakin, A. Calvinism. Duckworth, 1940.
- Davies, Godfrey. The Early Stuarts 1603-1660. Revised edition. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1949.
- Davies, Godfrey, and Haller, Wm. (editors) The Loveller Tracts, 1647-1653. New York: Columbia University Press, 1944.
- Davies, Horton. The Worship of the English Puritans. Glasgow: Dacre Press, 1948.
- Davies, Rupert E. The Problem of Authority in the Continental Reformers. Epworth Press, 1946.
- Dexter, H. M. The Congregationalism of the Last Three Hundred Years, As Seen in Its Literature. Hodder and Stoughton, n.d. (1880 ?).
- Dowden, E. Puritan and Anglican. Paul, Trench, Trubner and Co., 1900.
- Dunn, Samuel. (ed.) Christian Theology: by John Goodwin. Thomas Tegg and Son, 1836.

- England, John. A View Of Arminianism Compared with Moderate Calvinism. 1707.
- Farmer, H. H. God and Men. Nisbet & Co., 1948.
- Farrar, F. W. History of Interpretation. Macmillan, 1886.
- Fletcher, Joseph. The History of the Revival and Progress of Independence in England. 4 vols. John Snow, 1847-1849.
- Flew, R. Newton. (ed.) The Nature of the Church. SCM Press, 1952.
- Flynn, J. S. The Influence of Puritanism. John Murray, 1920.
- Frere, W. H. A History of the English Church in the Reigns of Elizabeth and James I, 1558-1625. Macmillan, 1904.
- Freshfield, Edwin. A Discourse on Some Unpublished Records of the City of London. Rixon and Arnold, 1887.
- _____. Some Remarks upon the Book of Records and History of the Parish of St. Stephen, Coleman Street in the City of London. Rixon and Arnold, 1887.
- Fröund, Michael. Die Idee der Toleranz im England der grossen Revolution. Halle, 1927.
- Gardiner, S. R. (ed.) The Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution. 3d ed. revised. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1906.
- _____. History of the Commonwealth and Protectorate. New edition, 4 vols. Longman Green, 1903.
- _____. The History of England from the Accession of James I to the Outbreak of the Civil War 1603-1642. 10 vols. Longman Green, 1884.
- _____. History of the Great Civil War 1642-1649. New edition, 4 vols. Longman Green 1897-1898.
- Gooch, G. P. The History of English Democratic Ideas in the Seventeenth Century. Cambridge: University Press, 1898.
- Grierson, H. J. C. Cross Currents in English Literature of the Seventeenth Century. Chatto and Windus, 1929.
- Haller, William. The Rise of Puritanism. New York: Columbia University Press, 1938.
- _____. (ed.) Tracts on Liberty. 3 vols. New York: Columbia University Press, 1934.

Hanbury, Benjamin. Historical Memorials Relating to the Independents, or Congregationalists. 3 vols. Congregational Union, 1844.

Hanford, J. H. John Milton Englishman. New York: Crown Press, 1949.

Harrison, A. W. Arminianism. Duckworth, 1937.

_____. The Beginnings of Arminianism. University of London Press, 1926.

Henderson, G. D. Religious Life in the Seventeenth Century Scotland. Cambridge: University Press, 1937.

Henson, H. Hensley. Puritanism in England. Hodder and Stoughton, 1912.

_____. Studies in English Religion in the Seventeenth Century. John Murray, 1903.

Hetherington, W. M. History of the Westminster Assembly of Divines. 4th ed. Edinburgh: James Gemmely, 1878.

A History of the Westminster Assembly of Divines. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication, 1841.

Hunt, John. Religious Thought in England. 3 vols. Strahan and Co., 1870-1873.

Hunter, A. Mitchell. The Teaching of Calvin. 2d ed. revised. James Clarke and Co., 1950.

Hutton, W. H. The English Church from the Accession of Charles I to the Death of Queen Anne. Macmillan, 1903.

Jackson, Thomas. The Life of John Goodwin. Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme and Brown, 1822.

Jordan, W. K. The Development of Religious Toleration in England. 4 vols. Allon and Unwin, 1932-1940.

Kelley, Maurice. This Great Argument. Princeton: University Press, 1941.

Lightfoot, John. The Journal of the Proceedings of the Assembly of Divines. Edited by J. R. Pitman, Works, Vol. XIII. J. F. Dove, 1824.

Lindsay, A. D. The Essentials of Democracy. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1929.

Lindstrom, Harold. Wesley and Sanctification. Stockholm: Nya Bokforlags Aktisbolaget, 1946.

- Lyon, Thomas. The Theory of Religious Liberty in England 1603-1639. Cambridge: University Press, 1937.
- Marsden, J. B. The History of the Early Puritans. 2d ed. Hamilton, Adams & Co., 1835.
- Masson, David. The Life of John Milton. 6 vols. Macmillan, 1859-1880.
- McLachlan, H. J. Socinianism in Seventeenth Century England. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1951.
- Miller, Perry. The New England Mind: the Seventeenth Century. New York: Macmillan, 1939.
- Miller, Perry and Johnson, T. H. The Puritans. New York: G. Allen, 1938.
- Minutes of the General Assembly of the General Baptist Churches in England. Edited by W. T. Whitley. 2 vols., Baptist Historical Society, 1909.
- Mitchell, A. F., and Struthers, John. (editors). Minutes of the Session of the Westminster Assembly of Divines. William Blackwood and Sons, 1874.
- Mullinger, J. B. The University of Cambridge. Cambridge: University Press, 3 vols. 1873-1911.
- Morrison, S. E. The Puritan Pronaos. New York: New York University Press, 1936.
- Neal, Daniel. History of the Puritans. 3 vols. Thomas Tegg and Son, 1837.
- Nichols, James. Calvinism and Arminianism Compared in their Principles and Tendency. Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme and Brown. 1824.
- Nichols, James H. Democracy and the Churches. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1951.
- Nobbs, Douglas. Theocracy and Toleration. Cambridge: University Press, 1938.
- Northcott, Cecil. Religious Liberty. SCM Press, 1948.
- Nuttall, G. F. The Holy Spirit in Puritan Faith and Experience. 2d ed. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1947.
- Orme, William. Remarkable Passages in the Life of William Kiffin, 1823.
- Payne, Ernest A. The Free Church Tradition in the Life of England. 3d ed. revised. SCM Press, 1951.

- Pearson, A. F. S. Church and State: Political Aspects of Sixteenth Century Puritanism. Cambridge: University Press, 1928.
- Peel, Albert. (ed.) Essays Congregational and Catholic. Congregational Union of England and Wales, 1931.
- Plum, H. G. Restoration Puritanism. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1943.
- Powicke, Frederick J. The Cambridge Platonists. J. M. Dent and Sons, 1926.
- Proceedings of the Sixth International Congregational Council. Edited by F. L. Fagley, Independent Press, 1949.
- Richardson, Alan and Schweitzer, Wolfgang. Biblical Authority for Today. SCM Press, 1951.
- Richardson, Alan. (ed.) A Theological Word Book of The Bible. SCM Press, 1950.
- Rowley, H. H. The Biblical Doctrine of Election. Lutterworth Press, 1950.
- Ruffini, Francesco. Religious Liberty. Translated by J. Parker Keyes. Williams and Norgate, 1912.
- Sanday, William and Headlam, Arthur C. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on The Epistle to the Romans. 5th ed. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1902.
- Schaff, Philip. (ed.) History of the Creeds of Christendom. 3 vols. New York: Harpers, 1877.
- Schenk, W. The Concern for Social Justice in the Puritan Revolution. Longmans, Green and Co., 1948.
- Searle, W. G. The History of the Queens' College of St. Margaret and St. Bernard in the University of Cambridge. University Press, 1871.
- Seaton, A. A. The Theory of Toleration Under the Later Stuarts. Cambridge: University Press, 1911.
- Shaw, W. A. A History of the English Church . . . 1640-1660. 2 vols. Longmans, Green and Co., 1900.
- Smith, Russell H. F. The Theory of Religious Liberty in the Reigns of Charles II and James II. Cambridge: University Press, 1911.
- Snaith, Norman H. The Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament. Epworth Press, 1944.

- Stoughton, John. History of Religion in England. Revised edition. 8 vols. Hodder and Stoughton, 1881.
- Toplady, A. Works. New edition. J. Cludley, 1837.
- Torrance, T. F. Calvin's Doctrine of Man. Lutterworth Press, 1949.
- Troeltsch, Ernst. The Social Teaching of the Christian Churches. Translated by Olive Wyon. 2 vols. Allen and Unwin, 1931.
- Trevelyan, G. M. England Under the Stuarts. Methuen and Co., 1949.
- _____. Illustrated English Social History. 4 vols. Longmans, Green and Co., 1949-1950.
- Tulloch, John. English Puritanism and It's Leaders. Edinburgh: William Blackwood, 1861.
- _____. Rational Theology and Christian Philosophy in England in the Seventeenth Century. 2 vols. William Blackwood: Edinburgh, 1872.
- Underwood, A. C. A History of the English Baptists. The Baptist Union Publication Dept., 1947.
- Walker, Williston. The Creeds and Platforms of Congregationalism. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1893.
- Watkin-Jones, H. The Holy Spirit from Arminius to Wesley. Epworth Press, 1929.
- Watson, Richard. Works. 13 vols., 2d ed., John Mason, 1834-1837.
- Wesley, John. Works. 14 vols., 3d ed., John Mason, 1829-1831.
- Whitely, W. T. A History of British Baptists. Charles Griffin and Co., 1923.
- Whiting, C. E. Studies in English Puritanism . . . 1660-1688. S.P.C.K., 1931.
- Willey, Basil. The Seventeenth Century Background, Chatto and Windus, 1934.
- Williams, A. T. P. The Anglican Tradition In the Life of England. SCM Press, 1947.
- Wilson, Walter. The History and Antiquities of Dissenting Churches and Meeting Houses in London, Westminster, and Southwark. 1808.

Wolfe, D. M. Milton in the Puritan Revolution. New York: Nelson, 1941.

Woodhouse, A. S. P. Puritanism and Liberty. J. M. Dent, 1938.

III. MISCELLANEOUS

1. Reference works:

Alumni Cantabrigienses. John and J. A. Venn, editors, 4 vols., 1922-1927.

Athenae Oxonienses. Anthony Wood, 2 vols., 1723.

Dictionary of National Biography. Sir Leslie Stephen and Sir Sidney Lee, editors, 43 vols., 1885 -

Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics. Edited by James Hastings. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 13 vols., 1908-1926.

2. Public Documents:

Great Britain, Public Record Office. Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series.

House of Commons. Journal.

House of Lords. Journal.

3. Manuscripts:

Register of the Parish of St. Stephens, Guildhall Library, Ms. 4449.

Vestry Minute Book of St. Stephens, Guildhall Library, Ms. 4458.

4. Bibliographies:

British Museum General Catalogue of Printed Books, 1931 -

Catalogue of the McAlpin Collection of British History and Theology. Edited by C. R. Gillett, 5 vols., New York; 1927-1930.

Catalogue of the Pamphlets, Books, Newspapers, and Manuscripts . . . Collected by George Tomason, 1640-1661. Edited by G. K. Fortescue, 2 vols., 1908.