



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

This thesis has been submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for a postgraduate degree (e.g. PhD, MPhil, DClinPsychol) at the University of Edinburgh. Please note the following terms and conditions of use:

This work is protected by copyright and other intellectual property rights, which are retained by the thesis author, unless otherwise stated.

A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge.

This thesis cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the author.

The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the author.

When referring to this work, full bibliographic details including the author, title, awarding institution and date of the thesis must be given.

The *munus triplex* in the English separatist tradition, 1580 to 1620, with particular attention to Henry Barrow and Henry Ainsworth

By

Tim Gessner

Doctor of Philosophy

The University of Edinburgh

2015

Declaration

I, Tim Gessner, declare that I have composed this thesis myself. All of the work contained within is my own work. It has not been submitted for any other degree or professional qualification.

Edinburgh, 14 September 2015

Tim Gessner

Abstract

This study explores the use of the doctrine of the offices of Christ (prophet, priest, and king) in the literature of the English separatists Henry Barrow (c.1550-1593) and Henry Ainsworth (1569-1622). No study to date explores the English separatists' use of the doctrine in ecclesiological debates. During the period 1580 to 1620 the doctrine was more commonly referenced when discussing soteriology. Barrow and Ainsworth provide some of the clearest expressions of the doctrine of the offices of Christ in separatist works and their steadfastness in those beliefs in light of opposition make them good candidates for this research.

This study sets out to answer the question: what was the significance of participation by the elect in the offices of Christ as used in Barrow and Ainsworth's writings? This research focuses on the theology of Barrow and Ainsworth and does not consider the social or experiential aspects of their professed beliefs. This study provides a detailed analysis of the writings of Barrow and Ainsworth particularly noting their use of the offices of Christ in discussions of the visible church. It then examines the relationship of Barrow and Ainsworth's Christology and ecclesiology, expressed through the offices of Christ, in their understanding of the visible church. Finally, this research compares their usage with works published in England from 1580 to 1620, considering whether their usage was distinct.

Its findings challenge the traditional historiographical suggestions that purity, polity, discipline, and covenant were the central themes of Barrow and Ainsworth's ecclesiology. This research suggests that, for Barrow and Ainsworth, the visible church was the visible expression of Christ on earth and the continuation of his earthly ministry begun at the incarnation. They believed that the visible church was the result of union with Christ, not the means of it. Through union with Christ, all the elect participated in Christ's offices. Barrow and Ainsworth's understanding of the visible church incorporated their understanding of Christ's continuing work expressed in his offices of prophecy, priesthood, and kingship. Christ was immediately present in his visible church, working in the elect and through the elect as prophets, priests, and kings. The visible elect, when gathered, became the body of Christ on earth and as his body they continued the work of prophecy, priesthood, and kingship that he had begun.

Lay Summary

This study explores the use of the concept of the ‘offices of Christ’ in the writings of Henry Barrow (1550-1593) and Henry Ainsworth (1569-1622). The offices of Christ describe Christ’s work on earth expressed through the Old Testament roles of a prophet, a priest, and a king. The church throughout its history has used this schema of Christ’s offices to understand Christ’s work. During the Reformation in England, in the decades that followed Queen Elizabeth I establishment of the English church (1559), some individuals refused to participate with the church as it was instituted; hence they ‘separated’ themselves from it. Barrow and Ainsworth were separatists. This research seeks to understand the significance of participation by the members of the church in the offices of Christ as used in Barrow and Ainsworth’s writings.

Previous research concerning those who separated from the Church of England has suggested that they were obsessed with a moral lifestyle, particular religious practices or a difference over how the church was to be organised. This work considers Barrow and Ainsworth’s religious beliefs, particularly the concept of the offices of Christ, as the motivations for their social practices. It addresses itself to historical theology. This work seeks to explain how their religious beliefs were the cause of their focus on purity and church organization.

The findings of this research argue for a different understanding of Barrow and Ainsworth than has been previously offered. For Barrow and Ainsworth, each local church was a visible expression of Christ on earth continuing his work of prophecy, priesthood, and kingship. They believed that all the members of the church were to participate in Christ’s offices and not just its leaders. The members of the church, when gathered, became the body of Christ on earth and as his body they continued the work of prophecy, priesthood, and kingship that he had begun.

Acknowledgements

The completion of this project owes a debt to many individuals. I would like to thank my supervisor Professor Susan Hardman-Moore for her help and longsuffering patience with me. I would also like to thank the staff of the School of Divinity and of the Divinity library for all the help they offered through the years of research on this project.

Most importantly I would like to thank my wife, Doreen, and my children, Sara and Christopher. This thesis is dedicated to them. Thank you for all you have sacrificed for me.

soli Deo gloria

A Note on Transcribing Early Modern Texts

Quotations from early modern texts have preserved the original spelling, capitalization, and punctuation with two exceptions. In the case of the letters ‘u’ and ‘v’ a modern form has been used. For example where the text had ‘vs,’ the ‘v’ has been changed to a ‘u.’ Similarly where the text had ‘couenant,’ the ‘u’ has been changed to a ‘v’ in this work. The second exception concerns the letters ‘i’ and ‘j’ which differ in similar fashion to the letters ‘u’ and ‘v.’ Where the text had ‘Iesus’ the ‘I’ has been changed to a ‘J.’ It is believed these changes modify only the orthography of the original texts and not the variations common to the period.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction	1
1. Historical Context	10
2. Separatist Historiography	30
3. The Available Literature	36
4. Methodology	40
5. Argument and Findings.....	50
Chapter 2: Henry Barrow and the Offices of Christ	55
1. Separation from a false church.....	56
2. Christ's offices and the errors of the Church of England.....	66
3. Participation in the offices of Christ	76
1. True members of a true visible church.....	77
2. Every member's interest in the work of Christ	87
4. Conclusion.....	95
Chapter 3: Henry Ainsworth and the Barrowist tradition	99
1. Separation from a false church.....	102
2. Christ's offices and the errors of the Church of England.....	109
3. Participation in the offices of Christ	118
1. True members of a true visible church.....	120
2. Every member's interest in the work of Christ	128
4. Conclusion.....	142
Chapter 4: The Offices of Christ and the True Visible Church	149
1. The presence of Christ	151
2. An empowered people.....	161

3. The visible church, the body of Christ	175
4. Conclusion.....	188
Chapter 5: The Offices of Christ as a Distinct Emphasis.....	192
1. Importance of the doctrine	195
2. The offices as a mark of orthodoxy or heterodoxy	202
3. Christ as prophet, priest, and king of the church.....	216
4. Every believer a prophet, priest, and king.....	223
5. Robert Browne and the Barrowists	232
6. Conclusion.....	240
Chapter 6: Conclusion.....	243
Appendix	257
Bibliography.....	279

Chapter 1: Introduction

The doctrine of the offices of Christ stands out in the writings of Henry Barrow (c1550-1593) in his attacks on the Church of England. Henry Barrow was known as a separatist. Believing the Church of England to be a false church, Barrow refused to communicate with it. Barrow ‘separated’ himself from the Church of England and he was not alone in doing so. The doctrine of the offices of Christ is conspicuous in Barrow’s writings not because of his particular understanding of it, but because of his application of it to ecclesiological debates. The doctrine was not unique to the Protestant Reformation, either in the British Isles or on the Continent, having appeared early in the history of the church.¹ The doctrine of the offices of Christ described Christ’s work in fulfilling the Old Testament roles of prophet, priest, and king.² Christ’s fulfilment of these roles was a common topic in discussions of soteriology during the English Reformation, particularly regarding the meaning of the atonement.³ However, in Barrow’s writings, the doctrine appears in the context of ecclesiology rather than soteriology. Barrow used the doctrine in debates over the nature and structure of the visible church. It is with the use of the doctrine in an ecclesiological context within separatist literature that this research is concerned. In a broader sense, this work considers the relationship of Christology to

¹ Robert S. Franks, *A History of the Doctrine of the Work of Christ* (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 1962; reprint, 2001), passim; Gerald W. McCulloh, *Christ's person and life-work in the theology of Albrecht Ritschl: with special attention to munus triplex* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1990), ch. 3.

² At times referred to as the offices of Christ, the threefold office of Christ, or the *munus triplex* (*triplex munus Christi*), they all refer to the same doctrine.

³ I. M. Green, *The Christian's ABC: catechisms and catechizing in England c. 1530-1740* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), 311ff. This idea will be considered in greater detail in chapter 5 *infra*.

ecclesiology in English separatist literature in the late sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century.⁴ The essential point is not that English separatists held a different understanding of the doctrine of the offices of Christ, but rather the extent to which they appear to integrate the doctrine into their understanding of the visible church.

While the doctrine of the offices of Christ was not new in the sixteenth-century, it had received renewed interest during the Reformation. The use of the offices of priesthood and kingship to describe Christ's work occurred early in the history of the church. Robert Franks explains the doctrine's origin and later emphasis: 'The schema of the threefold office and the deduction of it from the title Christ seem to have originated from Eusebius; but Calvin was the first to employ it in dogmatics.'⁵ Prior to the Reformation, the doctrine of the offices of Christ was not emphasized. John Yoder writes, 'This "threefold office" emphasis was first developed with great care as the outline of Christology in the Protestant world. It was not a strong medieval emphasis. It is used in Protestant orthodoxy.'⁶ While the threefold structure is found early in the history of the church, medieval authors did not emphasize it in their writings. Franks observes, 'Thomas [Aquinas] never uses

⁴ Throughout the history of the church and during the period of the English Reformation it was common to understand a relationship between soteriology and ecclesiology. This thesis seeks to explore this relationship in English separatist literature focusing on the use of the doctrine of the offices of Christ. On the relationship between soteriology and ecclesiology in the English Reformation see Stephen Brachlow, *The Communion of Saints: Radical Puritan and Separatist Ecclesiology, 1570-1625*, Oxford theological monographs (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988), 27, 43; John Von Rohr, 'Extra Ecclesiam Nulla Salus: An Early Congregational Version,' *Church History* 36, no. 2 (1967).

⁵ Franks, *A History of the Doctrine*, 348. Gerald McCulloh finds earlier references including Justin Martyr who referred to Christ as king, priest, and messenger. McCulloh, *Christ's person*, 102.

⁶ John Howard Yoder, *Preface to theology: christology and theological method* (Grand Rapids, MI: Brazos Press, 2002), 237.

the scheme of the threefold office as a conceptual unity, as does Calvin, who follows Eusebius in perceiving the unity of three offices in the name of Christ.⁷

It has been suggested that Calvin renewed interest in the threefold schema to describe Christ's work. Gerald O'Collins and Michael Jones suggest, 'Calvin was the first Christian to treat in an extended way this tripartite manner of presenting the ministry of Jesus, and he applied it to all the baptized faithful.'⁸ Further, Susan Wood explains,

Peter J. Drilling's study of the triad concludes that "none of the texts cited from the first twelve hundred years of the Church's history applies the three, as three that are inseparable, as titles, or as characteristics of the ministry of the ordained." John Calvin's *Institutes* (1545) was the first work to show how the threefold offices of Christ continue to function in the Church.⁹

While Wood's assessment of Drilling's research is relevant, it seems to overstate the case somewhat. The threefold structure of prophet, priest, and king was at times presented as priest and king, reflecting a twofold structure, a *munus duplex* rather than a *munus triplex*. Christ's prophetic office was assumed under his priestly function. Calvin's earlier works followed Luther's thought regarding a twofold structure, treating of Christ's two offices, priestly and kingly. Calvin treated the function of prophecy or teaching as part of the priestly office. In his later works, he

⁷ Franks, *A History of the Doctrine*, 349.

⁸ Gerald O'Collins and Michael Keenan Jones, *Jesus our priest: a Christian approach to the priesthood of Christ* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 149. Cyril Eastwood adds, 'It was Calvin who properly revived the *triplex munus* which speaks of Christ as Prophet, Priest, and King.' C. Cyril Eastwood, *The priesthood of all believers; an examination of the doctrine from the Reformation to the present day* (Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Publishing House, 1962), 66.

⁹ Susan K. Wood, *Sacramental orders* (Collegetown, MN: Liturgical Press, 2000), 17.

discussed the threefold structure of Christ's offices, king, priest, and prophet, separating Christ's teaching and sacrificial role in the priestly and prophetic offices.¹⁰

Still, Calvin's use of the threefold structure is in regard to his Christology and is not found when discussing the church. Contrary to Wood's view, Calvin does not explain how Christ's offices continued in the church. As Paul Avis has pointed out,

While it is clear that in Calvin the triple office applies to the Church as well as to Christ himself, he expounds it under the heading of Christology and does not return to it in his fourth book, on the Church. Moreover, the treatment is not as systematic or comprehensive as one might expect. The kingly office is related to the divine preservation or indefectibility of the Church, rather than to its governing ministry. The priestly office is expounded in purely individual terms, and not in relation to the ministry of the sacraments. The prophetic office is related to the Church's mission and is not given an individual application: teaching and preaching were strictly controlled in Calvin's Geneva.¹¹

Calvin did not make a clear connection between the threefold office of Christ working in and through the church as brought out in Barrow and Ainsworth's writings. There is a danger in attributing to Calvin more than he intended to express. While Calvin used the threefold structure to discuss Christ's work, there was no evidence he used it in defence of the ministry or to explain the nature of the church.

For Henry Barrow, however, the doctrine of the offices of Christ was a point of difference between himself and those who remained in communion with the

¹⁰ J. F. Jansen has examined Calvin's use of a threefold structure. Jansen argues that this change in Calvin's thinking, adding the prophetic office, was for the purpose of defending the ministerial order. Jansen's argument is intriguing, yet the evidence to support his thesis is lacking. It is more probable that Calvin separated the two functions, sacrificial and teaching, in later works as he further developed his earlier writings. John Frederick Jansen, *Calvin's Doctrine of the Work of Christ* (London: J. Clarke, 1956), 51ff. For a discussion of Jansen's thesis see Robert A. Peterson, *Calvin and the atonement*, Revised ed. (Fearn, Ross-shire: Mentor, 1999), 45-6.

¹¹ Paul D. L. Avis, *Beyond the Reformation?: Authority, Primacy and Unity in the Conciliar Tradition*, Pbk. ed. (London: T&T Clark, 2008), 10.

Church of England. In *A Brief Discoverie of the False Church* (1590) Barrow made this difference clear:

These and many other comfortable and true doctrines they [the Church of England] can and doe deliver touching the offices of Christ; but all these you must understand, and I pray you observe wel (for so shal you cleerly espie their error and deceit) are still but what Christ hath done in his owne person for his elect: here is not one word spoken what he doth in his elect ... how he is a king, priest, a prophet heere on earth ... and maketh all his children kings, priests, and prophets.¹²

Barrow distinguished between Christ's work *for* the elect and Christ's work *in* the elect. According to Barrow, Christ was still working as the prophet, priest, and king. Further, Christ made 'all his children' prophets, priests, and kings as well. Christ's work in the church as prophet, priest, and king was carried out through the members of his body as they participated in those offices. As Barrow observed, the Church of England taught true things concerning Christ and his offices. Nevertheless, the Church of England had failed to consider what Christ did in and through the elect as each participated in Christ's offices. This idea of participation in the offices of Christ is of particular interest for this research. The historiography of the English separatists has not adequately explored the doctrine of the offices of Christ.¹³

Other notable individuals, like Henry Barrow, separated from the Church of England in the period 1580 to 1620. The first and perhaps most commonly mentioned is Robert Browne (c.1550-1633). Browne's most famous work (and that for which he is remembered as a separatist) was *A Treatise of reformation without tarying for anie* (1582). Nevertheless, Browne's advocacy of the separatist

¹² Henry Barrow, 'A Brief Discoverie of the False Church,' in *The writings of Henry Barrow, 1587-1590*, ed. Leland H. Carlson, Elizabethan Nonconformist Texts, vol. 3 (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1962), 509.

¹³ Secondary references to the doctrine of the offices of Christ will be discussed in the following paragraphs when reviewing the available literature for this research.

movement was overshadowed by the work of Barrow. Barrow along with John Greenwood (c.1560-1593) became, quite possibly, the movement's most able spokesmen.¹⁴ Timothy George suggests, 'From the writings of Barrow and Greenwood emerged the most comprehensive statement of Separatist principles set forth in the sixteenth century.'¹⁵ Imprisoned along with Barrow and Greenwood was their recent convert John Penry (1562/3-1593). Penry was a puritan before he joined Barrow and Greenwood's London church in 1592. He was arrested in early 1593 and executed shortly after Barrow and Greenwood in that same year. Not all separatists had the consistency of Henry Barrow, John Greenwood, or John Penry, who held their views even to their execution.¹⁶ Browne himself returned to relations with the Church of England though his relationship with the established Church was always in question. Others, like Richard Bernard (1568?-1642) and Henoah Clapham (fl. 1585-1614), tried separatism for a time only to return to the Church of England without reservation.¹⁷ Moreover, after Barrow and Greenwood had been executed, others took their place in the separatist movement, even if only briefly. Francis Johnson (c.1562-1617) and Henry Ainsworth (1569-1622) both followed Barrow's views concerning the visible church. As a result, both Johnson and Ainsworth were

¹⁴ Timothy George, *John Robinson and the English separatist tradition* (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1982; reprint, 2005), 55.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 48, 55. Joe Coker notes, 'In the writings of Henry Barrow, one finds some of the earliest expressions of themes that would become common among all English Separatist writers.' Joe L. Coker, "'Cast out from among the Saints": Church Discipline among Anabaptists and English Separatists in Holland, 1590-1620,' *Reformation* 11, (2006), 11.

¹⁶ Champlin Burrage raises the question whether Barrow, Greenwood, and Penry recanted at their execution. He suggests that Penry might have, yet provides no solid evidence that Barrow or Greenwood did. On Penry's recantation, Burrage cites John Cotton. While the evidence appears weak, it is possible that Cotton's story is true. Champlin Burrage, *The Early English Dissenters in the Light of Recent Research (1550-1641)*, 2 vols. (Cambridge: The University Press, 1912), vol. 1, 149ff.

¹⁷ Richard L. Greaves, 'Bernard, Richard (bap. 1568, d. 1642),' in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed., ed. Lawrence Goldman, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/2249> (accessed 1 Oct 2013); Alexandra Walsham, 'Clapham, Henoah (fl. 1585-1614),' in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed., ed. Lawrence Goldman, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/5431> (accessed 29 Sept 2011).

forced into exile in the Netherlands. However, that is where their paths diverged.

Johnson, though never officially returning to the Church of England, repudiated the separatist ideals he once held.¹⁸ Ainsworth however, continued to hold separatist views until the end of his life.

This brief review of English separatists is by no means exhaustive. Selecting individuals for this research is not without options. Nevertheless, the focus must be narrowed. This study, then, will pay particular attention to the writings of Henry Barrow and Henry Ainsworth.

Henry Barrow was, as noted already, one of English separatism's most able spokesmen and remained consistent in those views even in the face of death. For these reasons alone Barrow would be a good candidate for this research. Barrow's works *Four Causes of Separation* (1587), *A Breefe Sum of Our Profession* (1587), and *A True Description of the Visible Church out of the Worde of God* (1589) have been considered separatist manifestos.¹⁹ 'Barrowism,' the name sometimes used in English Reformation historiography for Barrow and his followers, provides yet further interest in Henry Barrow for the purposes of this study.²⁰ What so distinguished Barrow and his followers that they should be considered separately from 'Brownism' (named after Robert Browne) or that they should be considered a subgroup within English separatism? Still, there remains yet another reason for the selection of Barrow for this study. While Barrow has been the focus of several

¹⁸ Michael E. Moody, 'Johnson, Francis (bap. 1562, d. 1617),' in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed., ed. Lawrence Goldman, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/14877> (accessed 9 Sept 2013).

¹⁹ Peter Milward, *Religious controversies of the Jacobean age: a survey of printed sources* (London: Scholar Press, 1978), 96; Henry Barrow, *The Writings of Henry Barrow, 1587-1590*, 6 vols., Elizabethan Nonconformist Texts, ed. Leland H. Carlson, vol. 3 (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1962), 5.

²⁰ The terms 'Barrowism' and 'Barrowist' will be considered *infra* p. 37.

works, his use of the doctrine of the offices of Christ has received little attention. Moreover, Barrow's works provide one of the clearest examples of the use of the doctrine of the offices of Christ in an ecclesiological context within separatist writings. Barrow's clear use of the doctrine makes him of great interest for this research.

Equally of interest for their use of the doctrine of the offices of Christ are the writings of Henry Ainsworth. Despite a propensity to avoid conflict, Ainsworth remained consistent in his beliefs. He became a separatist sometime prior to the mid-1590s and retained his beliefs up to his death in 1622. Ainsworth believed he was following in the faith that Barrow had died for.²¹ Ainsworth would likely have rejected the title 'Barrowist,' even though he agreed with Barrow in his understanding of the visible church. Ainsworth, then, provides a perspective on the use of the offices of Christ in the understanding of the visible church after Barrow's time. More importantly, Barrow's short time of writing and absence after 1593 left separatism leaderless.²² Ainsworth, it could be argued, filled this role alongside Francis Johnson. Given Johnson's repudiation of his separatist beliefs and Ainsworth's consistency in those same beliefs Francis Johnson is a less desirable candidate for this research. While Ainsworth's contemporary John Robinson did appear to use the offices of Christ in an ecclesiological context, he did not completely follow Barrow's distinctive views. Ainsworth, then, is an interesting candidate to explore the development of Barrow's ecclesiology. Additionally, Ainsworth was a minister to a congregation. His writings provide insight from one

²¹ Chapter 3 *infra* discusses Ainsworth's view of Barrow in more detail.

²² Timothy George comments, 'The execution of Barrow and Greenwood on April 6, 1593, followed six weeks later by that of their recent convert John Penry, deprived the Separatists of their most able spokesmen.' George, *John Robinson*, 55.

who practised his and Barrow's distinct views of the visible church. As this work seeks to follow the use of the doctrine across a longer period, 1580 to 1620, Henry Ainsworth has also been chosen for this research.

By examining Ainsworth's use of the doctrine of the offices of Christ, a continuous thread can be seen from Barrow through Ainsworth concerning the use of the doctrine in an ecclesiological context. Henry Ainsworth discussed the participation of the elect in the offices of Christ. In *Counterpoyson* (1608) Ainsworth wrote,

The estate whereunto God calleth his church in this life, is generally to the Communion (or fellowship) of his Son Jesus Christ, as being their onely mediator and Saviour, the Prophet Priest & King of the Church; which they beleeving and professing, are also made partakers (in a proportion and in their mesure) of these three offices with him.²³

Ainsworth used the language of *communion* in describing the participation of each member in the offices of Christ. Consistent with Barrow's distinction, Ainsworth described Christ working *in* and *through* the elect in addition to what Christ had done *for* the elect. It will be argued in chapters three and four that Barrow and Ainsworth's use gave them a distinct identity and theological position that has been rightly titled 'Barrowist.'²⁴ Henry Barrow and Henry Ainsworth have been regarded as schismatics, Brownists, and Barrowists both in their own time and in the modern historiography. Both rejected the titles of schismatic and 'Brownist,' and would likely have rejected 'Barrowist' as well. They saw themselves not as schismatics, but as true Christians who came out of a false church to join with the true visible church of Christ.

²³ Henry Ainsworth, *Counterpoyson* (Amsterdam, 1608), 117.

²⁴ The use of this term will be considered in more detail *infra* p. 37.

1. Historical Context

Henry Barrow was born circa 1550 in Norfolk, England, the third of eight children. Not much is known about his early life until he matriculated at Clare Hall, Cambridge in 1566. He seems to have come from a moderately wealthy family entering Cambridge as a fellow commoner. He graduated BA from Cambridge 1569/70. He disappears from the records again until 1576 when he entered Gray's Inn to study law. He remained at Gray's Inn until 1580/81 though he does not appear to have stayed long enough to complete his education there. Although Barrow was well educated, he was a layman in the church.²⁵ Additionally, no profession was ever recorded for him. Even so, he never seemed to be in need of money. At his death, he even left funds for the poor in the church. During one of his examinations, he referred to himself as a gentleman.²⁶ Barrow was arrested and imprisoned in 1587 while visiting his friend, John Greenwood, who was in prison at the time. Greenwood had been arrested about one month earlier during a separatist meeting. Before Barrow's conversion (probably occurring in 1580 or 1581) he had obtained a reputation for a licentious lifestyle. Barrow's lifestyle was probably not distinctive

²⁵ Barrow did not oppose education itself. Rather he opposed the education that was prevalent in Oxford and Cambridge. He disliked their subjects but had no such dislike of learning. See David William Gurney, 'Education and the early modern English Separatists' (PhD Thesis, University of London, 1998), 202-18.

²⁶ Henry Barrow, 'Barrow's First Examination, November 19, 1587,' in *The Writings of Henry Barrow, 1587-1590*, ed. Leland H. Carlson, Elizabethan Nonconformist Texts, vol. 3 (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1962), 98. For more on the class of the 'gentleman' see Ruth Kelso, 'The doctrine of the English gentleman in the sixteenth century: with a bibliographical list of treatises on the gentleman and related subjects published in Europe to 1625' (PhD Thesis, University of Illinois, 1929); Mark H. Curtis, *Oxford and Cambridge in transition, 1558-1642: an essay on changing relations between the English universities and English society* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1959).

either at Cambridge or Gray's Inn during the period.²⁷ It appears that Barrow spent some time at Queen Elizabeth's court before conversion and in doing so came to know the Queen personally. During an examination, Barrow was asked if he could provide someone to vouch for his behaviour. In response, he suggested that the Queen might vouch for him.²⁸ From all appearances then, Barrow was an unlikely candidate to become a Christian much less a separatist. Barrow's journey of faith, however, was short-lived, and he was executed in 1593 for 'the offence of writing and publishing seditious literature with malicious intent.'²⁹

Influences on Barrow are difficult if not impossible to identify. In 1587, Barrow began to write and publish works attacking the Church of England.³⁰ He is adamant that his views derived from God's word and were not dependent upon any other person. At times, he was associated with Robert Browne and Browne's ideas. However, Barrow denied any connection. Patrick Collinson in the Oxford Dictionary of National Biography article on Barrow comments,

It must have been in Norfolk, only eighteen months after becoming 'a zealous professor', that he [Barrow] read Browne's writings with the intention of confuting them. But finding some passages 'too hard for him', he sought out a certain Thomas Wolsey, an ordained minister who evidently formed with Browne and Robert Harrison a kind of troika of early separatist leadership in East Anglia, and who was to

²⁷ Kenneth Charlton, 'Liberal Education and the Inns of Court in the Sixteenth Century,' *British Journal of Educational Studies* 9, no. 1 (1960), passim.

²⁸ Barrow stated, 'For my good behaviour, I suppose I could get her word.' When asked if the Queen knew him he responded, 'I know her.' Barrow's response was, perhaps, just modesty, not wanting to claim the Queen's friendship, yet noting, for his part, they knew each other. Barrow, 'Barrow's First Examination,' 98.

²⁹ Patrick Collinson, 'Barrow, Henry (c.1550–1593),' in Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, online ed., ed. Lawrence Goldman, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/1540> (accessed 6 March 2013).

³⁰ Barrow was arrested in November of 1587. Leland Carlson suggests a date prior to this for Barrow's first work, *Four Causes of Separation*. Since it is probable that Barrow's arrest is based on knowledge of this work, Carlson's dating should be accepted. While Barrow's writing career was not instigated by his arrest, it is possible that his arrest and imprisonment contributed to his animosity toward the Church of England. For a survey of Barrow's works see Barrow, *The Writings of Henry Barrow, 1587-1590*, Introduction.

spend the last thirty years of his life in a Norwich prison. The authority for this is a later pamphleteer, Stephen Offwood, who tells that Wolsey 'perverted' many zealous professors, twenty to be precise, of whom Barrow was one.³¹

Once again, Barrow himself denied receiving his view of the church from another person. It is possible that Barrow met with Thomas Wolsey though the evidence is limited. Such a meeting, however, does not provide details on what Barrow and Wolsey discussed or what views Barrow took from Wolsey's teaching. It is impossible to ascribe a dependency on Wolsey with any certainty. Leland Carlson has published two references of alleged claims by Barrow that he received his particular views of the church from the puritan, Thomas Cartwright (1534/5-1603). The two references that Carlson provides (the first published in 1612 and the second in 1670) were published some time after Barrow had been executed. While the references cannot be rejected out of hand, they appear questionable.³² Given that Barrow considered Scripture the only authoritative source for the church and Christian life it would be unusual if he had noted a dependence upon any other human being for his views.³³

Barrow never veered from his convictions, holding them in the face of trial by the authorities and ultimately his execution. As Patrick Collinson has remarked, Barrow was consistent.³⁴ However, Stephen Brachlow suggests,

³¹ Collinson, 'Barrow, Henry (c.1550–1593).'

³² John Greenwood and Henry Barrow, *The Writings of John Greenwood and Henry Barrow, 1591-1593*, 6 vols., Elizabethan Nonconformist Texts, ed. Leland H. Carlson, vol. 6 (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1970), 236-7.

³³ B. R. White, *The English Separatist Tradition: From the Marian Martyrs to the Pilgrim Fathers*, Oxford theological monographs (London: Oxford University Press, 1971), 44, 69-72; George, *John Robinson*, 5.

³⁴ Patrick Collinson, 'Separation in and out of the Church: The Consistency of Barrow and Greenwood,' *Journal of the United Reformed Church History Society* 5, (1994), passim.

English separatists were never consistently hard-line ideologues either. There were inevitably points at which even the separatists drew back from the radical force of their principles and, in the process, rediscovered dimensions of moderation and accommodation that generated the anomalies of what Dr. Lake calls 'moderate extremism' ... Their principles could take them only so far from the protestant mainstream before the claims of the human community - the need for friendship and acceptance, as well as their very real fears of social anarchy in the uncertain times of pre-revolutionary England - worked to turn them back from the brink of that complete isolation which the individualism of a radical mentality so often breeds.³⁵

Brachlow's assessment comes up short when considering Barrow, for Barrow never turned back even in the face of death. It might be said of him that he was stubborn, unwilling to budge an inch, but that misses the depth of his character and zeal.

Barrow regarded himself as a servant of God, a messenger, who was tasked with bringing a prophetic correction to God's people still in bondage to Antichrist. Though Barrow had studied law for some years before being arrested, and demonstrated some prowess at argument during his trials, he did not consider himself knowledgeable in law nor did he see himself as a member of the civil magistracy.³⁶

He wrote,

Yea, what heart could endure to behold so manie of his naturall councitriemen, deare frendes, and neere kinsfolke in the flesh, to perish before his eies, for want of warning or help, wherfore behold, even the zeale of the glorie of my God inforced me, as also the tender love and care of the safetie, of this my countrie constrained me, to breake silence, and to set the trumpet to my mouth, not any longer enduring the excellencie of the one, or the life of the other, thus to be troden under foote, and neglected. My self I willinglie acknowledg of all other the most unmeet, and everie way unfit unto this worke; but let

³⁵ Brachlow, *Communion of Saints*, 12-3.

³⁶ Despite Barrow's lifestyle and the likelihood that the quality of legal education during the period was lacking, Barrow appeared to reap some profit from his time at Gray's Inn. See Charlton, 'Liberal Education and the Inns of Court,' *passim*. When questioned whether he knew the law Barrow replied, 'Very little, yet I was of Graye's Inne some years. ... Let this passé: I look for little help by law against yow.' Later in the same examination when told he will be sent to prison Barrow said, 'Yow shal not touch one haire of my head without the wil of my heavenly Father.' Barrow, 'Barrow's First Examination,' 93, 99.

my zeale of the truth, my love unto you, and the present necessitie of the time, excuse me of the presumption of vaine glorie, though no way cover or excuse anie errors or faults escaped me in this present writing.³⁷

While Barrow was not seeking martyrdom, he noted how the Church of England ‘most bitterly persecute all Christ's servantes that are sent to them, to shew them, and call them back to the right way, rejecting Christ's ordinances.’³⁸ Barrow was not surprised by his treatment at the hands of the Church of England. Christ had been treated in the same way, and Barrow looked ‘for no better usage at your hands; the servant is neither greater nor better than his maister.’³⁹ He was following in his master’s footsteps, and this was, to him, assurance of his election.

Indeed, Barrow saw himself as the suffering servant rather than the conquering king. He considered himself frail and more than capable of error. The confidence he showed during his trials was not confidence in himself, but in his calling and most importantly in his lord. When he spoke it was not in his own strength: ‘The Lord gave me boldnes, so that I answered.’⁴⁰ He was frail and insignificant, but his message was mighty and terrible.⁴¹ Barrow was God’s prophet. He had been sent by God to warn the nation ‘as they are not marked on the foreheads by the angel clothed in linnen with the writer's inckhorne: so shall they not be spared by the avenging angels that carrie the instrumentes of dissipation in their handes.’⁴² His mission was to call the elect to come out and separate themselves from the world and the false church.

³⁷ Barrow, 'Brief Discoverie,' 265.

³⁸ Ibid., 263.

³⁹ Barrow, 'A Brief Summe of the Causes,' 141.

⁴⁰ Barrow, 'Barrow's Fourth Examination,' 188.

⁴¹ Barrow, 'Brief Discoverie,' 267.

⁴² Ibid., 264.

Despite his ill-treatment, Barrow considered himself a loyal subject of the state. He did not believe that his attacks on the national church opposed the Queen or the monarchy. He explained, 'Our purpose is not to medle with the reformation of the state ... Neither indeavour we to reforme your Babilonish deformities, or to repaire the ruines of Hierico, or dawbe the wall of antichrist with you. This trash we know to be devote to execration by the Lord's owne irrevocable sentence.'⁴³

According to Barrow, the Church of England was destined for God's judgment rather than for reformation. Barrow saw himself as an innocent being prosecuted for a crime of which he was not guilty.⁴⁴ While it was true that Barrow did not attend a 'Church Chappell or usuall Place of Common Prayer' established by the state, he argued that the law under which he was being charged was intended for Catholic recusants. He complained, 'that statute was not made for us.'⁴⁵ After Barrow's death, others took up his mission, yet not all those who followed him were as resolute.

Henry Ainsworth (1569-1622) came from Swanton Morley, Norfolk, the son of Thomas Ainsworth, a yeoman. He entered St. John's College Cambridge as a pensioner in December 1586. After a year there he moved to Gonville and Caius College as a scholar. He remained at Gonville and Caius College until 1591, departing without a degree. Despite not receiving a degree, he was possibly 'one of the finest Hebrew scholars of his day.'⁴⁶ Ainsworth had adopted separatist views at some point before the mid-1590s. It seems that he quit attending Church of England

⁴³ Barrow, 'A Brief Summe of the Causes,' 124.

⁴⁴ Barrow's view was that the law under which he was being examined was meant for 'Catholic recusants' and not for Protestants. It is possible that the statute was enacted because of plots to replace Elizabeth though no plot immediately precedes the statute. *The Statutes of the Realm*, vol. 4 (Ontario: TannerRitchie Publishing & The University of St Andrews, 2007), 657-8.

⁴⁵ Barrow, 'Barrow's Fourth Examination,' 183.

⁴⁶ Michael E. Moody, 'Ainsworth, Henry (1569–1622),' in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed., ed. Lawrence Goldman, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/240> (accessed 6 March 2013).

services and as a result he had some trouble with the authorities. He subsequently relocated to Amsterdam, arriving in the mid-1590s. There is a suggestion that he travelled to Ireland first and from there, to Amsterdam, but this cannot be determined with any certainty.⁴⁷ He was likely already in Amsterdam when Francis Johnson arrived to become the pastor of the 'Ancient Separatist Church' in 1597. Ainsworth became the church's teacher at that time. Ainsworth later married a widow, Margery Halie, from Ipswich, in 1607.

Around 1610, a disagreement arose between Ainsworth and Johnson over the role of the leaders and the congregation in discipline. Francis Johnson and his brother, George, had been embroiled in a controversy while in London concerning the behaviour of Francis' wife. They appeared to have settled their dispute before leaving London, however, after arriving in Amsterdam the altercation erupted again. Francis sought to excommunicate George from the Ancient Separatist Church that Francis was pastoring. At the time, the practice of the Ancient Separatist Church was for the entire congregation to handle church discipline. It would seem that as a result of the problems Francis had in bringing about the excommunication of George, Francis began to rethink his views on discipline and polity. By 1610, Johnson had changed his views on church polity moving towards a presbyterian model. In the following debates between Francis and Ainsworth, Francis wanted the authority of

⁴⁷ Michael E. Moody, 'The Apostasy of Henry Ainsworth: A Case Study in Early Separatist Historiography,' *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 131, no. 1 (1987), 17; Richard A. Muller, *After Calvin: studies in the development of a theological tradition*, Oxford studies in historical theology (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 158; Henry Martyn Dexter, *The Congregationalism of the last three hundred years, as seen in its literature: with special reference to certain recondite, neglected, or disputed passages. In twelve lectures, delivered on the Southworth foundation in the Theological seminary at Andover, Mass., 1876-1879. With a bibliographical appendix* (New York: Harper & brothers, 1880), 270; William E. A. Axon and Ernest Axon, *Henry Ainsworth, the Puritan Commentator ... Reprinted from the 'Transactions of the Lancashire and Cheshire Antiquarian Society,' etc* (Manchester: 1889), 45.

excommunication to reside with the pastor and elders while Ainsworth still held that it belonged to the entire congregation.⁴⁸ Eventually, Ainsworth and Johnson split: Ainsworth became the pastor of a new church and Francis continued as the pastor of the Ancient Separatist Church. Ainsworth remained in Amsterdam until his death in 1622.⁴⁹

Ainsworth was a man seeking peace, not contention. Having been forced from his native country, Ainsworth seemed to hold some bitterness towards the English bishops and the Church that had driven him away. He wrote in a petition to King James, ‘May it, therefore please your Majestie to take knowledge of this cause of Christ, witnessed by us his unworthie servants, in long and manifold affliction susteined at the hands & by meanes of the Prelats.’⁵⁰ For Ainsworth, the prelates were acting on behalf of Satan: ‘Yet heere the malice of Satan stayed not it self but raysed up against us a more greevous persecution even unto the violent death of some and lamentable exile of us all; causing heavie decrees to come forth against us that wee should for sweare our own Countrey & depart or else bee slayne therin.’⁵¹ Like Barrow, Ainsworth was not concerned with reforming the Church of England though he was concerned with rescuing the elect held in bondage within it. Nevertheless, what Ainsworth wanted most was to be allowed to practise the true faith, as he understood it, in England. He petitioned King James that he ‘may be

⁴⁸ Doney argues that Ainsworth changed his position during the debate to excommunicate George Johnson. Ainsworth seemed to side with Francis regarding George’s excommunication but when the time came Ainsworth refused to support it. It is possible to view his actions in another light. Ainsworth sought to avoid conflict and restore unity between the brothers. Rather than siding with Francis Johnson, Ainsworth avoided a clear position hoping to resolve the issue without division. In the end, Ainsworth had to take a position and in this he argued that the authority to excommunicate resided with the congregation and not with the leaders alone. Simon Doney, ‘The Lordship of Christ in the Theology of the Elizabethan Separatists with Particular Reference to Henry Barrow’ (PhD Thesis, University of Lampeter, 2005), 239.

⁴⁹ Moody, ‘Ainsworth, Henry (1569–1622).’

⁵⁰ Henry Ainsworth, *An apologie* (Amsterdam, 1604), 34.

⁵¹ Henry Ainsworth, *A true confession of the faith* (Amsterdam, 1596), Preface.

suffred in peace under your Majesties government within your dominions,' and 'not be urged to the use or approbation of any remnants of poperie & humane traditions.'⁵²

In contrast to Barrow's steadfastness, Ainsworth was not always unwavering. The Ancient Separatist Church in Amsterdam had adopted the position that apostates, those who had sided with separatism and then returned to the Church of England for a time, could not hold office ever again in a separatist church despite repenting of their actions.⁵³ During the strife in Amsterdam between George Johnson and his brother Francis, George accused Ainsworth of having apostatised before arriving in Amsterdam. It is difficult to know for certain if the accusations were true, yet Ainsworth never denied them.⁵⁴ Francis Johnson wrote that he had changed his views concerning apostates and holding office before hearing of Ainsworth's apostasy. Francis argued that apostates could hold office if the church determined that the apostate's life evidenced true repentance and a proven commitment to Christ.⁵⁵ Neither Barrow nor Ainsworth seems to have prohibited apostates from leadership, or at least they never declared that position in their writings.

Ainsworth was not willing to suffer for his views as Barrow had, having fled England to avoid prison and possible execution. He also vacillated in the excommunication of George Johnson. Apparently Ainsworth had decided that

⁵² Ainsworth, *An apologie*, 34.

⁵³ The view that the separatists rejected 'traditores,' those who had apostatised, from serving in office led many to see the heresy of Donatism returned. This was a frequent accusation by George Gifford. Note the titles of Gifford's works, *A short treatise against the Donatists of England, whome we call Brownists* and *plaine declaration that our Brownists be full Donatists*. See also Jesse Hoover, "'They bee Full Donatists'," *Reformation & Renaissance Review: Journal of the Society for Reformation Studies* 15, no. 2 (2013), passim.

⁵⁴ Moody, 'The Apostasy of Henry Ainsworth,' passim.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 18-9; Michael E. Moody, "'A Man of a Thousand": The Reputation and Character of Henry Ainsworth, 1569/70-1622,' *Huntington Library Quarterly* 45, no. 3 (1982).

George's offenses did not merit excommunication but when the final debate took place, Ainsworth remained silent. Ainsworth's personality was such that he avoided conflict. Despite his unwillingness to remain in England and face persecution, he did endure frequent conflict in the churches in Amsterdam. Despite his quiet and peace-loving character, he was unable to avoid problems. W.E.A. and Ernest Axon have written that Ainsworth was 'unwilling to enter upon controversy and yet not shrinking from it when duty called.'⁵⁶ Nevertheless, despite any issues with his character Ainsworth was generally well respected.⁵⁷

While there was more doctrinal agreement than disagreement during the English Reformation, it was the differences that tended to distinguish people. Defining distinct groups during the English Reformation is difficult at best. The suggestions already offered in scholarly literature are numerous and without consensus. It was a problem during Barrow and Ainsworth's time as well. John Paget remarked,

Of the Brownists also there are sundry sects: Some separate from the Church of England for corruptions; and yet confesse both it & Roome also to be a true Church, as the followers of Mr. Johnson: Some renounce the Church of England as a false Church; and yet allow private communion with the godly therein, as Mr. Robinson and his followers: Some renounce all Religious communion both publique and private with any member of that Church whosoever, as Mr. Ainsworth and such as hearken unto him, being deepest and stiffest in their Schisme.⁵⁸

⁵⁶ Axon and Axon, *Henry Ainsworth, the Puritan Commentator*, 52.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 45.

⁵⁸ John Paget, *An arrow against the separation of the Brownists* (Amsterdam, 1618), To the Christian Reader; Christopher Durston and Jacqueline Eales, *The culture of English puritanism, 1560-1700*, Themes in focus (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1996), 1.

Attempting to put forward definitions is venturing into dangerous waters.

Nevertheless, for the purposes of this research, the groups and traditions of that period will be defined by their relationship to the established church in England following the Elizabethan settlement. If Protestantism is in some sense a response to the Church of Rome, puritanism can be defined as a response to the established church in England following the 1559 settlement.⁵⁹ This approach to defining groups does not preclude the themes of further reform within the established church or inward purity and a disciplined lifestyle, both notable traits in puritanism. Obedience and ‘godly conversation’ were, in fact, part of the response to a church that held onto the practices and behaviours that some felt needed further reforming.⁶⁰ For many in England in the late sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century, the structure, ceremonies, and practices of the church were tightly coupled to the participants’ lifestyle. One could not separate church ritual and a godly life.

A defining question in early modern England was whether the Church of England was a true church or not. Some argued that though the Church of England was corrupt, it was not so impure that it was a false church. Even so, separation was the only proper response for those who believed that the Church of England was a false church. Victoria Gregory points out, ‘It was “separation” from Rome that

⁵⁹ It is important to note that many factors were involved in the Protestant Reformation including political, economic, and social issues. Also, the Reformation was not an event set in a moment of history; it was an period whose boundaries are not always easy to establish. Durston and Eales, *culture of English puritanism*, 4. See also Peter Lake, *Moderate Puritans and the Elizabethan church*, 1st pbk. ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 1; Willem J. van Asselt, ‘Scholasticism Revisited: Methodological Reflections on the Study of Seventeenth-Century Reformed Thought,’ in *Seeing things their way: intellectual history and the return of religion* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2009), 160.

⁶⁰ Patrick Collinson, *The Reformation* (London: Phoenix, 2005), 116. Cf. David R. Como, *Blown by the Spirit: Puritanism and the Emergence of an Antinomian Underground in Pre-Civil-War England* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2004), 21, 34; Durston and Eales, *culture of English puritanism*, 4ff; Peter Lake, ‘William Bradshaw, antichrist and the community of the godly,’ *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 36, no. 4 (1985), 585.

defined the nature of the “protest” upon which Protestantism had been founded. Conceptually, therefore, “separation” was integral to the self-image of Protestantism itself.’⁶¹ While the continental Reformers began with the intention of reforming the Church of Rome, in the course of time they took up some form of separation. In English separatist thinking, no true believer should have communion with a false church. As B.R. White put it,

The nonconforming Edwardian Anglicans under Mary became Separatists because they regarded the Roman Church and its ways as false and its worship idolatrous. Later Separatism in England was to involve the same repudiation of an established church as anti-Christian because its ways were contrary to Scripture and also to involve the gathering of congregations whose practices were more closely aligned with Scripture teachings.⁶²

As a result, ‘separatists’ refused to participate with the established church in any way.⁶³

There were, of course, those who fully endorsed the established church in its ceremonies, rites, and polity. While they might find fault with some aspects of it, they did not subscribe to the idea that it needed significant reform. Advocates of the established church argued that the ceremonies, rites, and form of church government were ‘adiaphora’ or things indifferent. They believed that the Scriptures did not prescribe a specific polity, ceremonies, or rites that were to be practiced within the visible church. Given their view of things indifferent, it was the responsibility of the church leadership and civil magistrate to establish those practices that best-suited

⁶¹ Victoria Joy Gregory, 'Congregational puritanism and the radical puritan community in England c. 1585-1625' (PhD Thesis, University of Cambridge, 2003), 214.

⁶² White, *English Separatist Tradition*, 6.

⁶³ While John Robinson was regarded as a separatist he appears to have allowed for ‘private’ communication with the Church of England. In this thesis Robinson is considered to have been a separatist his allowance for communication with the Church of England notwithstanding.

edification and proper order both within the church and the commonwealth.⁶⁴

Theodore Bozeman explains, ‘*Adiaphoria* - the notion of “things indifferent” - became, in time, “the corner-stone of Anglicanism.” Of continental origin, adiaphorism apparently was first popularized in England in the 1530's.’⁶⁵ Those points that were considered ‘indifferent’ (or open to the church and state to prescribe) were not considered to be fundamental to one’s salvation. In the debates between Archbishop John Whitgift and puritan Thomas Cartwright, the importance of things indifferent was challenged. Stephen Brachlow points out, ‘Whereas Whitgift had argued that ecclesiology was an indifferent matter and, hence of no soteriological value, Cartwright now claimed, without reservation, “matters of ceremonies, orders, discipline and government ... are ... of faith and salvation.”’⁶⁶ For Cartwright, though, individuals were not free to reform the church without the magistrate.⁶⁷

English separatists took Cartwright’s view one-step further. They agreed that the form of government, ceremonies, and rites were specifically instituted by Christ and clearly presented in the word of God. These points were, therefore, anything but indifferent.⁶⁸ Separatists believed that the word prescribed not only what was acceptable but also, more importantly, what was mandatory for the church. Only those forms instituted by Christ were allowed in his church. The Church of England,

⁶⁴ Coolidge notes, ‘Elizabeth committed her Church to the principle that order is to be established by the regulation of indifferent things.’ John S. Coolidge, *The Pauline Renaissance in England: Puritanism and the Bible* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970), 49.

⁶⁵ Theodore Dwight Bozeman, *To Live Ancient Lives: The Primitivist Dimension in Puritanism* (Chapel Hill, NC: Published for the Institute of Early American History and Culture, Williamsburg, Virginia, by the University of North Carolina Press, 1988), 57.

⁶⁶ Brachlow, *Communion of Saints*, 27. Cf. Thomas Cartwright, *A repleye to an answeere* (n.p., 1573), 14.

⁶⁷ Coolidge, *Pauline Renaissance*, 56-8.

⁶⁸ Brachlow, *Communion of Saints*, 27, 43; Lake, *Moderate Puritans*, 19-22, 281; Von Rohr, ‘Extra Ecclesiam Nulla Salus,’ 117; Paul Christianson, ‘Reformers and the Church of England under Elizabeth I and the Early Stuarts,’ *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 31, no. 4 (1980); Patrick Collinson, ‘A comment: concerning the name Puritan,’ *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 31, no. 4 (1980).

because it continued in sinful practices, was a false church. Therefore, separatists refused to associate with the established Church at all. Separatists worried more about avoiding sin in an Antichristian church than defying the magistrate. One significant problem with defining separatism is the breadth of those who might fairly be termed 'separatist.' Those who refused to associate with the established church included the papists as well as numerous sects.⁶⁹ It is necessary then to delimit the use of the term 'separatist' to those commonly termed 'Brownists' or 'Barrowists.'⁷⁰

The idea of separation encompassed two facets. First was separation in order to practise the faith as one saw fit. The second facet was separation in order to avoid any infectious evil inherent in the group from which one had separated. There was both a separation for freedom and a separation from evil. For the English separatists, namely, those known as 'Brownists' or 'Barrowists,' sin was infectious.⁷¹ To communicate with a false church was not an option even if there were some within that church who were true believers. As noted, the separatists believed that the polity, ceremonies, and liturgy of the visible church were ordinances of God clearly prescribed in the New Testament.⁷² To participate with the established church in its 'sinful' practices was to risk both divine response and impede one's progress toward holiness and sanctification. Separation, then, was a necessary act in the pursuit of purity before God. The separatists did not consider themselves to be the only true believers. They simply had 'discovered' the Church of England to be false just as

⁶⁹ Geoffrey F. Nuttall, *The Holy Spirit in Puritan Faith and Experience* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992), 12.

⁷⁰ Edward Henry Bloomfield, 'The Opposition to the English Separatists: 1570-1625. A Survey of the Polemical Literature Written by the Opponents to Separatism' (PhD Thesis, The Claremont Graduate University, 1974), 4-5.

⁷¹ Barrow, 'Brief Discoverie,' 313; Henry Ainsworth, *The communion of saints* (Amsterdam, 1607), To the Reader. The infectiousness of sin will be considered in more detail in chapter 5 *infra*.

⁷² Brachlow, *Communion of Saints*, 27, 43; Von Rohr, 'Extra Ecclesiam Nulla Salus,' 117.

previous reformers had discovered the Church of Rome to be false and accordingly separated from it.⁷³

In between these two positions (advocates and separatists) were those who sought significant reform in the established church, yet refused to separate from it. They believed the established church to be a true church even though it was, at points, markedly corrupt. These will here be referred to as ‘puritans’; dissenters who continued to communicate with the established church yet were not unequivocal champions of it. Puritans argued that though the Church of England had significant wounds, it was, nevertheless, still a true church of Christ. Some puritans conformed to Church of England practices while others refused to adopt practices that violated their consciences. Even so, both remained within the established church.⁷⁴ Despite puritans and separatists holding much in common, from the separatist point of view, failure to separate from what was clearly a false church could not be reconciled with the puritans’ emphasis on purity and obedience. For the separatists, the distinction between an advocate of the Church of England and a puritan made little difference. Both considered the established church to be a true church, and neither would separate themselves from it. Both advocates and puritans were ‘supporters’ of the Church of England and will be described as such throughout this work.

The problem with theological labels is that the edges or boundaries are seldom as precise as one might wish. Trying to draw boundaries will always include some while excluding others that are only a shade away from the definition being used. Further complicating the issue, the use of labels during the period of this research involved rhetoric more than definition; labels were frequently used as terms

⁷³ Note the title of Henry Barrow’s work *A Brief Discoverie of the false church*, 1591.

⁷⁴ The difficulty of defining the term ‘puritan’ has not been lost with this simple explanation.

of derision.⁷⁵ Further, as already noted, individuals could move between the groups as their views changed, or the expediencies of the circumstances might press on them. Such general definitions always fail to capture the dynamic nature of life, reflecting, rather, snapshots captured in print. Nevertheless, these labels are helpful and will be used throughout this work with this caveat.

The years from 1580 to 1620 may lack the appeal of the uncertainty during the transition from Mary to Elizabeth or the disruption during the period of the civil war. Nevertheless, they hold significant interest for the beginnings of English separatism. During Mary's reign, there were communities of those who refused to participate in their local parish church.⁷⁶ To these groups, some have attributed the origins of what is known as English separatism. Even so, the first written apology for separatism appears to be *A Treatise of Reformation without Tarying for Anie* by Robert Browne published in 1582. Malcolm Yarnell points out, 'There were Elizabethan semi-separatist and separatist congregations before Browne, but he was the first to formulate their theological principles.'⁷⁷ Browne's schism was viewed as having come from the puritan's rejection of the Elizabethan settlement: separatism was the logical conclusion of the puritan view.⁷⁸ John Coolidge remarks, 'Separatism

⁷⁵ Coker states, 'Most Protestants applied the term anabaptistical to any belief that seemed too radical.' Coker, 'Cast out from among the Saints,' 4.

⁷⁶ B.R. White noted, 'The nonconforming Edwardian anglicans under Mary became Separatists because they regarded the Roman Church and its ways as false and its worship idolatrous. Later Separatism in England was to involve the same repudiation of an established church as anti-Christian because its ways were contrary to Scripture and also to involve the gathering of congregations whose practices were more closely aligned with Scripture teachings.' White, *English Separatist Tradition*, 6. See also Burrage, *Early English Dissenters*, vol. 1, 68ff.

⁷⁷ Malcolm B. Yarnell, *Royal Priesthood in the English Reformation* (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2013), 268.

⁷⁸ Collinson, quoting Hooker, notes that the separatist came out from among the puritans, separation being the logical conclusion of puritanism. Collinson, 'Separation in and out of the Church,' 239-40.

springs from the original Puritan conviction that “carnal things cannot make the perfect building of things spiritual.”⁷⁹

The complexity of identifying the origins of English separatism cannot be overlooked. Charles Barrett contributes,

Tracing the origins of English separatism to Browne's controversial pamphlet printed in 1582 is too simplistic. Although it is true that Browne's tract *Reformation without tarrying for any* drew attention to the presence of separatism and nonconformity during Queen Elizabeth's reign, the roots of separatism predate Browne's momentous publication.⁸⁰

Simon Doney, working from Collinson's research, notes the beginning of separatist congregations in the 1560s as 'conventicles' moved from sermon repetition to original material. Doney explains, 'Indeed, defining where one private meeting might end and an established Separatist one begins would be a difficult task in the radical environment where both thrived.'⁸¹ As Collinson explains, those within such groups did not intend to separate themselves completely from the Church of England nor did they consider it a false church. As long as the meeting only repeated the sermon they remained faithful members of the Church of England. When new doctrine or teaching was introduced, they were on very precarious ground. Nevertheless, it is safe to say that separatism was established by the time Barrow separated.

⁷⁹ Coolidge, *Pauline Renaissance*, 56. Coolidge 'argues that Puritanism originates as a response to elements of Pauline theology which are especially pertinent to a time of cultural dislocation, that English Separatism and Congregationalism are further developments of Paul's complex ecclesiology - or, as it may be useful to call it, his sociology of life in Christ - and that a Pauline understanding of scripture is in face the matrix of Puritan thought generally.' *ibid.*, xiii. Coolidge's citation is from Anthony Gilby, *A pleasant dialogue* (Middelburg, 1581), H6 Recto.

⁸⁰ Charles M. Barrett, 'A Systematization of the Separatist Principles of Henry Barrow and John Greenwood taken from their Ecclesiastical Writings, 1587-1593' (PhD Thesis, Bob Jones University, 2006), 21.

⁸¹ Doney, 'Lordship of Christ', 28. See also Patrick Collinson, 'The English conventicle,' in *Voluntary religion* (London: Basil Blackwell, 1986), *passim*.

The period in which Barrow and Ainsworth lived was one of political and religious diversity. During Elizabeth's reign, some of her nobles and people kept their allegiance to the Church of Rome.⁸² The Catholic threat to Queen Elizabeth's throne, most notably from within, connected with Mary Stuart, and from without, by Spain, was ever present. There is still much debate over Queen Elizabeth's attitude toward religion and her attempts at establishing a more 'reformed' church in England.⁸³ Even so, it is clear that Elizabeth was an astute politician and whatever her true views on religion she was able to hold together a religiously diverse nation in relative peace and prosperity. While Elizabeth's famous rejection of 'windows into men's souls' allowed many people to hold beliefs contrary to the Church of England, it did not allow them to act contrary to its practices.⁸⁴

Within Elizabeth's realm, there were the advocates of the established church, puritans, Catholics, and sectarians. Polly Ha observes, 'There were clear divisions between English protestants, even when it came to shared antitypes such as the Church of Rome ... Rather than identifying an organized puritan assault on the Church of England, postrevisionism has tended to stress diversity and division among the godly.'⁸⁵ David Como agrees, 'There are considerable difficulties in attempting to define puritanism as a single, monolithic entity, with a unified theology.'⁸⁶ Nevertheless, as Elizabeth's reign neared its end, there was an

⁸² Patrick Collinson, 'The politics of religion and the religion of politics in Elizabethan England,' *Historical Research* 82, no. 215 (2009), 83-4, 86ff.

⁸³ Patrick Collinson, 'Windows in a Woman's Soul: Questions about the Religion of Queen Elizabeth I,' in *Elizabethan essays* (London: Hambledon, 1994), passim.

⁸⁴ Collinson, 'politics of religion and the religion of politics,' 88.

⁸⁵ Polly Ha, *English Presbyterianism, 1590-1640* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2011), 2.

⁸⁶ Como, *Blown by the Spirit*, 21.

established church and a likely heir to her throne despite the fact that she refused to name her successor.⁸⁷

James the VIth of Scotland would succeed Elizabeth and with him came great hopes among those who sought further reform in the established church in England. However, James seems to have preferred England's Church to the presbyterian model of his home country.⁸⁸ After the Hampton Court Conference in 1604 the hopes of England's reformers were checked once again. The success or failure of the Hampton Court Conference is open to debate though few if any of the petition's demands were met.⁸⁹ As Ainsworth's life was nearing its end in the early 1620s, new tensions were rising to challenge the peace and unity of the nation. The rise of the future Archbishop Laud and the advocacy of Arminianism brought two such challenges to the succeeding decades.⁹⁰

Certainly the circumstances of the period played their part in shaping Barrow and Ainsworth's worldview. The Church of England's suppression of nonconformity in the late 1580s and early 1590s had forced many puritans and semi-separatists into

⁸⁷ For a brief look into the politics of James' claim to the throne and his ultimate succession see R. Kanemura, 'Kingship by Descent or Kingship by Election? The Contested Title of James VI and I,' *Journal Of British Studies* 52, no. 2 (2013).

⁸⁸ Patrick Collinson noted, 'On the second day of the Hampton Court Conference of January 1604, King James I rebuked Dr John Reynolds of Oxford in words which are almost painfully familiar. A Scottish presbytery, pronounced the royal theologian, "as well agreeth with a monarchy as God and the Devil," and there followed what a Scot later remembered as "that unkoth motto," "no bishop, no king." The King's *bon mot* so perfectly epitomises an important principle of Stuart Policy that it may seem an act of pedantry to ask whether in fact the proposals which provoked it included the extirpation of bishops.' Patrick Collinson, 'Episcopacy and Reform in England in the Later Sixteenth Century,' in *Godly people: essays on English Protestantism and Puritanism* (London: Hambledon Press, 1983), 155; William Barlow, *The summe and substance of the conference* (London, 1604), 79-80.

⁸⁹ Mark Curtis notes, 'Over the years two interpretations of the Hampton Court Conference have come down to us. They are similar in holding that except for the authorization of a new translation of the Bible little of consequence was accomplished there.' Curtis continues to argue that the conference was a success for puritans and a failure for the Bishops in the established church. Given the diversity of the period leading up to and following after the conference it is possible to find support for both views. Mark H. Curtis, 'Hampton Court Conference and Its Aftermath,' *History* 46.156, (1961).

⁹⁰ Nicholas Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists: the rise of English Arminianism c.1590-1640*, Oxford historical monographs (Oxford: Clarendon, 1987), 6-7; Collinson, 'Towards a Broader Understanding,' 535.

hiding for a time.⁹¹ It was during this suppression that Greenwood and Barrow were arrested and subsequently executed. Barrow had argued that the law under which he was imprisoned was made to counter the Catholic threat and not to suppress 'loyal subjects' like himself. Ainsworth, perhaps tired of religious wars, sought to be allowed to practise his faith as he believed Christ's Testament prescribed in peace and quietness. Ainsworth appealed to be allowed to return to England and live peaceably but was never given the opportunity. Continued pressure from the Bishops forced many more to go into exile. Ainsworth considered his followers and himself, 'Your Majesties faithfull Subjects, who have now a long tyme ben constreyned eyther to live as exiles abroad, or to endure other grievous persecutions at home, for bearing witness to the truth of Christ against the corruptions of Antichrist yet remaying.'⁹²

Neither Barrow nor Ainsworth believed their views were attacking the political or social structures in England. They were addressing themselves to all of Christ's elect and to his visible church. Barrow and Ainsworth still expected the Crown to rule, the nobility to defend, and the commoners to work.⁹³ Nevertheless, for some, Barrow and Ainsworth's views could be seen as a threat to peace and order in the commonwealth.⁹⁴ For Barrow and Ainsworth, the elect were literally kings, priests, and prophets in the visible church. To assert such a thing was a challenge to the equilibrium of the time. It is an interesting point that neither Barrow nor Ainsworth seems to have understood the threat that their views posed to the state; a

⁹¹ Polly Ha argues that though those who supported a presbyterian form of church government did go underground for a time, they did not completely disappear. Ha, *English Presbyterianism*, Introduction; Brachlow, *Communion of Saints*, 40; John Morgan, *Godly Learning: Puritan Attitudes Towards Reason, Learning and Education 1560-1640* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), 19.

⁹² Ainsworth, *An apologie*, 35.

⁹³ Barrow, 'Brief Discoverie,' 405.

⁹⁴ Collinson, 'politics of religion and the religion of politics,' 77-8, 80, 83.

threat that their opponents saw all too clearly.⁹⁵ The relationship between church and state was to be mutually beneficial. The visible church was to support the unity and peace of the commonwealth, and the rulers were to support the work of Christ's church on earth.⁹⁶

2. *Separatist Historiography*

Modern historiography considering the period, and particularly the theology of the various groups and traditions, is almost as varied as the suggested definitions. Attempting a thorough examination of the historiography of the separatist tradition would strain the largest tome. Only a brief survey will be possible here. In particular, attention will be paid to key theological themes that seek to illuminate separatism's ecclesiology. Each of these themes can be understood as a key idea or central motif within separatist ecclesiology. Each theme provides insight into separatist thinking and helps explain separatist practice. Throughout this thesis, comparison will be made to the suggested themes noted in the following paragraphs and the doctrine of the offices of Christ in Barrow and Ainsworth's writings. This comparison will be done in an attempt to understand better separatist ecclesiology and the significance of the doctrine in their thinking about the visible church.

⁹⁵ Barrow, 'Barrow's First Examination,' 97; Collinson, 'politics of religion and the religion of politics,' 78.

⁹⁶ Ainsworth wrote, 'The kingdom or Civil state, is an ordinance immediately under God, *Rom. 13*. the church or ecclesiastical state is an ordinance immediately under Christ the mediator, and he is the head of the bodie the church, *Colos. 1.18*. The civil state is above the ecclesiastical, as God is the head of Christ: therfore the Church is to be subject to the Magistrate.' Henry Ainsworth, *A reply to a pretended Christian plea* (Amsterdam, 1620), 81-2.

Not all modern separatist historiography has accepted a distinct separatist ecclesiology in the late sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century.⁹⁷ There were, of course, many points held in common by advocates, puritans, and separatists. Additionally, equivocation in the writings of the late sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century authors makes it more difficult to distinguish their views.⁹⁸ Nevertheless, many themes have been posited as contributions towards understanding separatist ecclesiology. It has been pointed out, concerning polity, that a presbyterian form was more prevalent among the puritans while a congregational form more prevalent among separatists.⁹⁹ Congregational forms were more diverse and less unitary than the presbyterian forms though neither was as well defined in late sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century England as the polity being practiced in Geneva. Those who held to a congregational polity and yet rejected separation from the established church could blur the lines even further. These have sometimes been referred to as 'independents' or as Victoria Gregory has argued, 'congregational puritans.'¹⁰⁰

Beyond the question of a difference in church government, separatist ecclesiology has also been noted for an emphasis on discipline and the desire for

⁹⁷ Stephen Brachlow argues that the difference between the separatists and the more radical puritans 'is not to be explained as a difference of ecclesiology but as a difference of strategy, timing, and the extent to which each was willing (or unwilling) to disavow their allegiance to the church as constituted by English law.' Nevertheless, Brachlow adds, 'Among themselves puritans and separatists sometimes perceived an ideological rift between their respective positions.' For Brachlow then, these perceived differences were the result of misunderstanding and ambiguity in the development of their ecclesiology. Brachlow, *Communion of Saints*, 6, 14.

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, passim.

⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, 7.

¹⁰⁰ Gregory writes, 'At the beginning of the last century, Champlin Burrage described puritans who demonstrated a pronounced belief in congregational autonomy (rather convolutedly) as the "Jacobite, Bradshawian, Congregational, or Independent non-separatist type." It was Perry Miller who coined the more slimline phrase, "non-separating congregationalist" in the 1930s. This term was rejected by Geoffrey Nuttall in 1957, who instead preferred "semi-separatist." Gregory, 'Congregational puritanism', passim; White, *English Separatist Tradition*, 165.

purity in the visible church. Discipline itself was only a means to ‘purify’ the community of those already within its boundaries. Separatists accused the established church of accepting everyone: ‘these heapes of the wicked & open unworthy, even all the profane multitude, & al sortes of people that are found within their territories and jurisdiction, without respect of person.’¹⁰¹ Separatists, on the other hand, accepted only known believers of good morals. By admitting everyone into the church, separatists argued, wilful sinners and possibly even non-believers might enter the visible church thus making it impure.¹⁰² On this point, the separatists were clear: while they could not prevent all impurity within the church, to allow it to continue wilfully was a sin and dishonoured Christ. Purity, therefore, was both an aspect of membership and corporate discipline. Those who were already within the church and discovered to have sin in their lives needed to repent. Those who refused to repent were to be removed from the body. Every member was expected to fight against sin and increase in purity and knowledge. Sin destroyed the body rather than building it up. It has been suggested that building the body of Christ (or edification) and Christian liberty marked the core of puritan and separatist thought.¹⁰³ As John Coolidge has argued, separatism came out of puritanism’s desire to build Christ’s body. In separatist thought, a perfect building cannot use imperfect materials.¹⁰⁴ Further, this emphasis on a pure church has, at times, led to separatists being accused

¹⁰¹ Barrow, 'Brief Discoverie,' 301.

¹⁰² Interestingly, Richard Alison, a contemporary and opponent of Henry Barrow, considers purity to be a distinguishing factor and levels that accusation against Barrow. Richard Alison, *A plaine confutation of a treatise of Brownisme* (London, 1590), 11-3; Brachlow, *Communion of Saints*, 8-9; Coker, 'Cast out from among the Saints,' 4; George, *John Robinson*, 28, 99-100; Como, *Blown by the Spirit*, 29.

¹⁰³ Coolidge, *Pauline Renaissance*, passim.

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, 56.

of confusing the invisible church with the visible church.¹⁰⁵ The invisible church was pure while the visible church would contain impurity, a *corpus permixtum*.¹⁰⁶

The prominence of the ‘visible church’ in separatist thinking, and arguments for the autonomy of each local congregation, has led to the view that early separatist understanding of the visible church (and all who held to a congregational polity) was plural rather than singular.¹⁰⁷ Polly Ha argues that this distinction can be found earlier than has been previously suggested, at least by the beginning of the seventeenth-century. According to Ha, those who held to a presbyterian form of government saw a single visible national church while those who held to a congregational form saw many separate visible churches with no authoritative national structure at all.¹⁰⁸ Each congregation was responsible for admitting new members without any interference from other churches or the civil magistrate. Separatist churches consisted of individuals who voluntarily gathered together. Those who became part of a separatist church committed themselves to God and one another. Commonly these ‘commitments’ took the form of a written ‘covenant.’ B. R. White has interpreted the ecclesiology of the separatists according to the idea of church covenants.¹⁰⁹ Not only was a separatist church a voluntary community, but it was also a community whose members had documented their commitment. This commitment ‘involved a strenuous and unremitting struggle to do God's will’ that

¹⁰⁵ Timothy George observes, ‘Modern historians of Congregationalism, for the most part, have accepted the judgment of the Separatists' opponents in relating their motive for separation to a desire to correlate the visible Church with the invisible.’ George, *John Robinson*, 102.

¹⁰⁶ Von Rohr, ‘Extra Ecclesiam Nulla Salus,’ 116. Cf. Brachlow, *Communion of Saints*, 131; George, *John Robinson*, 102.

¹⁰⁷ The idea that the visible church was a prominent feature in separatist thinking will be taken up in more detail in the following chapters, most particularly in chapter 5 *infra*.

¹⁰⁸ Ha, *English Presbyterianism*, ch. 3.

¹⁰⁹ White, *English Separatist Tradition*, 53ff.

was only possible by means of the grace of God, present in church members' lives through the indwelling Holy Spirit.¹¹⁰

The Holy Spirit's role in the church and the life of the believer has also been considered in separatist historiography.¹¹¹ It was the realization of the active presence of the Holy Spirit in the lives of the members that formed an important theme in the ecclesiologies of the period according to Geoffrey Nuttall. Church communities in the period can be viewed as a spectrum, beginning with those that advocated for the established church and moving on to the more sectarian groups.¹¹² Nuttall argues on this basis for a distinction between presbyterian and congregational groups, noting that the latter had a greater interest in the Holy Spirit.¹¹³ In separatist thinking, both ordained and non-ordained members experienced the same indwelling Holy Spirit though perhaps in different measure.¹¹⁴ This idea that all members shared in the experience of the Holy Spirit provided a new freedom for many within the church. For some, this 'freedom' offered the 'non-ordained' members a greater role in the church's activities.

The degree to which the ecclesiological issues of the period were the result of pressures arising from a new found 'lay freedom' rather than clerical intention has also been explored. As David Zaret argues,

Many of the celebrated controversies over clerical nonconformity, regarding wearing the surplice and use of the cross in baptism, turn out to have been animated not merely by clerical conscience but by

¹¹⁰ Como, *Blown by the Spirit*, 34ff.

¹¹¹ Nuttall, *The Holy Spirit*, passim.

¹¹² *Ibid.*, 4, 12.

¹¹³ *Ibid.*, 113.

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 19.

the demands of indignant laypersons, who literally extorted nonconformity from the clerics as the price of their loyalty.¹¹⁵

The interest of the non-ordained members in the religious disputes and issues of the day along with more accessible education (especially enabled by printing) are key ideas in Zaret's understanding of the laity's contribution.¹¹⁶ Once again, according to Zaret, the role of the laity was more pronounced within separatism.¹¹⁷ The changing status of the non-ordained has offered evidence of 'individualism' in the Reformation according to some researchers. Given the emphasis on the role of the non-ordained members of the church by English separatists, it has been suggested that there was a more individualistic spirit in separatist theology.¹¹⁸

These themes within the separatist historiography suggest characteristics of the movement's distinctiveness and justification for separation. However, Barrow argued that the reason for ecclesiological separation was a difference regarding the offices of Christ. It was the Church of England's teaching concerning the offices of Christ and their practice of those offices within the visible church with which Barrow was concerned. As will be discussed in chapter five, the common references to the offices of Christ in non-separatist literature occur in the context of soteriology, not ecclesiology; that is, the offices of Christ were not commonly mentioned when discussing the visible church. There is then a need to understand Barrow and

¹¹⁵ David Zaret, *The Heavenly Contract: Ideology and Organization in Pre-Revolutionary Puritanism* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985), 14.

¹¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 30-1, 54ff.

¹¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 5, 95.

¹¹⁸ Geoffrey Nuttall observes, 'In the party at the opposite pole within puritanism, the fully radical party, we find no longer two wings, as in the conservative and middle parties. We find, rather, a series of positions which shade off, through increasingly complete separatism, into pure and acknowledged individualism.' Nuttall, *The Holy Spirit*, 12.

Ainsworth's use of the doctrine of the offices of Christ in relation to the visible church.

3. The Available Literature

The available literature considering the question of separatist understanding of the offices of Christ is limited. The most recent work that discusses the offices in separatist writings is a thesis from 2005 by Simon Doney entitled 'The Lordship of Christ in the Theology of the Elizabethan Separatists with Particular Reference to Henry Barrow.' Doney explores 'the imagery, language, and theology of kingship and obedience that are present in Elizabethan separatist writings.'¹¹⁹ Doney draws on the kingly office of Christ as his work is focused on the reign of Christ over the church. He briefly discusses participation in the offices by the elect but spends only a very limited space considering how this participation might impact Barrow's ecclesiology. Further on this point, Doney only considers the non-ordained elect's participation in discipline, which he sees as an aspect of Christ's reign over the church. Interestingly, Doney comments, 'The interdependency between Christ's offices and the church was wholeheartedly embraced by both Puritans and Separatists.'¹²⁰ However, Doney only considers the offices with respect to Christ's kingly office and then does not explore any non-separatist writings in his analysis. The focus of Doney's research leaves open the question of how the participation of every member of the congregation in the offices of Christ might help explain separatist ecclesiology. Given his concern for Christ's reign over the church and the

¹¹⁹ Doney, 'Lordship of Christ', 5.

¹²⁰ *Ibid.*, 220.

issue of church polity, there remains much to be said about the participation of every member in all three roles of Christ's offices within the visible church.

Timothy George picks up the question of Christ's offices in early separatist writings in his book *John Robinson and the English Separatist Tradition*, published in 1982. George writes on the importance of the communal role of the offices within Robinson's thought:

Robinson described the divine commissioning of Christ by the Father as an anointing with the oil of gladness, an anointing which Christ in turn 'communicates' with his body, thus transforming every member severally into 'Kings and Priests and all jointly a Kingly Priesthood, or communion of Kinges, Priests, and Prophets.' So 'plenteous' is this anointing that it more than suffices for each individual member, so that 'every one is made a King, Preist, and Prophet, not onely to himself, but to every other, yea to the whole.' Thus each member is a prophet to teach and exhort, a priest to offer up spiritual sacrifices of prayer and praise, a king to guide and govern.¹²¹

Despite these comments, George leaves this idea with little further exploration.

Nevertheless he does draw out an interesting aspect of the offices in relation to the visible church: 'Seen from another perspective the offices of Christ corresponded to three vital acts of corporate worship, each of them essential to the furtherance of life within the Church. The Priestly and Prophetical offices are administered in prayer and preaching, and the Kingly office in government.'¹²² George then entrusts this teasing statement to the reader to consider without further discussion.

B.R. White, in his classic work *The English Separatist Tradition* (1971), also mentions the offices of Christ in separatist writings. Focusing his research on Robert Browne, Francis Johnson, and John Smyth, White directed his attention to the kingly office of Christ and the structure of the church. As in the previous works, there is

¹²¹ George, *John Robinson*, 146.

¹²² *Ibid.*, 146-7.

little analysis of the implications of the participation of every member for their ecclesiology beyond discipline and government. White suggests the idea of the empowerment of every member as a result of sharing in the offices, yet he does not address how that empowerment was reflected in separatist ecclesiology. White points out a connection between separatist thought and Calvin concerning the offices:

‘Calvin and his disciples taught Browne another central conviction of his ecclesiology: that Jesus Christ is prophet, priest, and king of his Church. As prophet Christ teaches her through the scriptures, as priest he redeems her and intercedes for her, as king he desires to rule her.’¹²³

The relationship between the doctrine of the priesthood of all believers and the doctrine of the offices in the development of ecclesiological thinking comes out in Malcolm Yarnell’s PhD thesis *Royal Priesthood in the English Reformation* (2000).¹²⁴ Yarnell considers the meaning of the priesthood of all believers in England ‘spanning the transition from the Middle Ages to the early modern period.’¹²⁵ He primarily examines John Wyclif and Thomas Cranmer for his research. Yarnell refutes three understandings of royal priesthood, notably, individualism, anticlericalism, and sacred kingship. He explains, ‘The equation of baptismal anointing with making all Christians into prophets, priests, and kings stretches back at least to Hippolytus’ *Apostolic Tradition*. This tradition was affirmed in both Eastern and Western baptismal rites, giving all Christians a share in Christ’s

¹²³ White, *English Separatist Tradition*, 54.

¹²⁴ Yarnell’s research exists in his DPhil thesis and in a published book. Both works have been cited herein. Malcolm B. Yarnell, ‘Royal Priesthood in the English Reformation’ (DPhil Thesis, University of Oxford, 2000); Malcolm B. Yarnell, *Royal Priesthood in the English Reformation* (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2013).

¹²⁵ Yarnell, *Royal Priesthood*, 4.

threefold office.’¹²⁶ Yarnell continues regarding Robert Browne, ‘Browne constructed his theology out of the Calvinism of his day. The church and the kingdom of Christ are coterminus; therefore, King Jesus is the only monarch in the church. Christ exercises his offices of kingship, priesthood and prophecy - triplex munus Christi - within the congregation.’¹²⁷ While Yarnell’s work is interesting, it provides little analysis of English separatism between 1580 and 1620.¹²⁸

Stephen Brachlow points out in *The Communion of Saints* (1988), ‘Like Browne, Barrow said every member was a prophet, priest, and king, with the power to cast out church officers for either apostasy or disability.’¹²⁹ Brachlow’s thesis is that there was no theological difference between radical puritans and separatists. The separatists, Brachlow argues, were impatient and unwilling to wait for reform in the established church. Equivication in the writings of the period convinces Brachlow that neither side had well-defined beliefs concerning ecclesiology. While Brachlow mentions the offices of Christ and the participation of the elect in them, he provides little analysis of the doctrine’s role in the ecclesiology of the period. More importantly, given Brachlow’s thesis, he does not look for any distinguishing theological positions of the separatists compared with radical puritans. Still, Brachlow concedes, ‘There was, of course, a proclivity toward egalitarian participation in their [separatists] congregational polity that favoured an increasingly assertive and independent puritan laity.’¹³⁰

¹²⁶ Ibid., 68.

¹²⁷ Malcolm B. Yarnell, 'Royal Priesthood in the English Reformation' (DPhil Thesis, University of Oxford, 2000), 314.

¹²⁸ Yarnell covers Browne and Barrow in two paragraphs of his book. He sees the covenant as the key theme in English separatism calling it ‘covenantal ecclesiology.’ Yarnell, *Royal Priesthood*, 268-70.

¹²⁹ Brachlow, *Communion of Saints*, 177.

¹³⁰ Ibid.

4. Methodology

The question that this research hopes to answer is thus: what is the significance of participation by the elect in the offices of Christ for separatist ecclesiology? An immediate clarification must be pointed out regarding the phrase ‘separatist ecclesiology,’ which will become more narrowly defined as this work progresses. Barrowism will be distinguished from Brownism, and no comparison will be made with groups further along the spectrum of separation. In this thesis, the focus will be upon a small group who appeared in the mid-1580s represented by Henry Barrow and Henry Ainsworth. By considering a founder and a later adherent, an attempt will be made to demonstrate the duration of their theological distinctions. Henry Barrow’s understanding of the work of Christ as prophet, priest, and king and the elect as prophets, priests, and kings was not his alone. There were others who embraced the doctrine of Christ’s work both *for* and *in* the visible church. These were the ‘Barrowists.’

Within this study, the terms ‘Barrowist’ and ‘Barrowism’ will be used to refer to Henry Barrow and his followers (including Ainsworth) to distinguish them from the larger category of ‘separatists’ in early modern England. The terms Barrowist and Barrowism have been used of Barrow and his followers since the late sixteenth-century.¹³¹ These terms have also been used in the historiography of English separatism.¹³² While the use of these terms is not uncommon, the validity of their use

¹³¹ William Warner used the term as early as 1597 and Richard Hooker used it in 1604. Champlin Burrage devoted a chapter to ‘The Rise of the Barrowists.’ William Warner, *Albions England* (London, 1597); Richard Hooker, *Of the lawes of ecclesiasticall politie* (London, 1604); Burrage, *Early English Dissenters*.

¹³² Examples of those who distinguish Barrowism from Brownism see *infra* chapters 3 and 4 on the difference between Brown and Barrow and Ainsworth. For use of the term ‘Barrowist’ or ‘Barrowism’ in the historiography see Dexter, *Congregationalism*, 276; Burrage, *Early English*

will be considered throughout the following chapters based upon Barrow and Ainsworth's usage of the participation by all the elect in the offices of Christ as a possible distinct theological emphasis.

Whether Barrow or Ainsworth's views on the implications of participation in the offices of Christ were in any sense an emphasis distinct to 'Barrowism' or the separatist movement as a whole has not been answered by current research. While there have been references to the offices of Christ in separatist literature within the historiography, the doctrine has not been adequately explored. If Barrow and Ainsworth's usage or understanding of the doctrine was common among advocates of the Church of England and puritans, then it is unlikely to be important to understanding the distinctives of Barrow and Ainsworth's ecclesiology. On the other hand, if it can be shown to be a distinct emphasis within Barrow and Ainsworth's works, and that it formed a key theme in their thinking about the visible church, it merits consideration within the broader separatist historiography.

This study reassesses the beliefs and motivations of Barrow and Ainsworth in light of their use of the doctrine of the offices of Christ. The work is carried out within the context of the modern historiographical approaches to English separatism, notably considering the role of discipline, purity, polity and covenant as key themes in separatist ecclesiology. It will be argued that the doctrine of the offices of Christ and participation by all the elect in those offices persuaded Barrow and Ainsworth's understanding of the visible church. Their Christology persuaded their ecclesiology.

Dissenters, vol. 1, 118ff; Horton Davies, *Worship and Theology in England*, 5 vols. (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1961), vol. 1, 335; White, *English Separatist Tradition*, 78; Alan Tovey, 'Forms of Authority in the Theology of the Elizabethan Separatists' (BD Thesis, University of Oxford, 1991), 226.

For Barrow and Ainsworth, the visible church was a visible expression of Christ on earth and the continuation of his earthly ministry begun at the incarnation.

The definition of ‘ecclesiology’ among modern writers seems to be in question. For example, Walter Goehring notes that what distinguished the semi-separatists and the separatists was not ‘matters of doctrine’ but whether one could continue to ‘consider themselves part of the Church of England’ or not.¹³³ However, to the separatists being a part of a false church was a matter of doctrine. To associate with the established church was sin. No point could be a greater matter of doctrine. Additionally, the concept of doctrine has been separated from ecclesiology in some cases. There is a difference between doctrine and theology, but that difference is cause and effect rather than a complete separation. Doctrine is the effect or the result of theology, certainly not the sole result, but one of several products that come out of the study of God and his works. The resulting doctrine is then to be lived out. One argument of this thesis is that Barrow and Ainsworth had distinct beliefs about the visible church that led to a difference of practice.

Currently, the term *ecclesiology* is taken in two ways. According to the Oxford English Dictionary, the term now commonly refers to ‘the science of church building and decoration.’¹³⁴ However, the more common use of the term among theologians refers to the theology or doctrine of the church. It is in the latter sense that this work is concerned. Even so, as Hunter Powell remarks, not all understand the latter sense of the term as theological:

While the discovery over the past thirty years of protestant scholasticism has helped to rescue post-Reformation English

¹³³ Walter R. Goehring, 'Henry Jacob (1563-1624) and The Separatists' (PhD Thesis, New York University, 1975), 97.

¹³⁴ “ecclesiology, n.,” in the Oxford English Dictionary.

Puritanism from the realms of pietistic platitudes, it has not been equally applied to the field of ecclesiology. Indeed, church government is regarded as *non*-theological. Political and intellectual historians approach church government with little interest in, as John Coffey and Alistair Chapman have noted, understanding that 'religious ideas (like political, philosophical, or scientific ideas) need to be understood first and foremost on their own terms.'¹³⁵

For the English separatists, understanding the church was a very *theological* endeavour. In the study of God and his works, the church had a very prominent position. Ecclesiology, as considered in this work, addresses several areas of enquiry, namely the church's origin and nature, purpose, membership, organisation, and praxis.

These issues concerning the church were prevalent within the debates of the English Reformation. In late sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century the modern systematic categories of Christology and ecclesiology were not in common use.¹³⁶ Examining these issues in the early modern English literature, however, is no anachronism. Both Barrow and Ainsworth invested their lives in addressing a false understanding of the visible church. Though they did not categorize their questions with the term 'ecclesiology,' they did discuss these same issues. To place their use of the doctrine of the offices within an ecclesiological context means to consider if they

¹³⁵ Hunter Powell, 'The Dissenting Brethren and the Power of the Keys, 1640-1644' (PhD Thesis, University of Cambridge, 2011), 9; Alistair Chapman, John Coffey, and Brad S. Gregory, *Seeing Things Their Way: Intellectual History and the Return of Religion* (Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 2009), 15.

¹³⁶ The term 'Christology' appears in English towards the middle of seventeenth-century and 'ecclesiology' appears in the nineteenth-century. Regarding ecclesiology, Wolfhart Pannenberg explains, 'The church did not form a separate theme in the systematic presentation of Christian doctrine until the 15th century. . . . The Reformers were certainly the first to introduce the doctrine of the church into dogmatics.' Ecclesiology as a separate topic probably originated within theological works during the sixteenth- and seventeenth-centuries. Still, the idea of ecclesiology as the study of the Church according to the Scriptures existed well before the Reformation. See "Christology, n.," in the Oxford English Dictionary; "ecclesiology, n.," in the Oxford English Dictionary. See also Wolfhart Pannenberg, *Systematic Theology*, 3 vols. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1991), 3:21-2, 7; Veli-Matti Kärkkäinen, *Introduction to Ecclesiology: Ecumenical, Historical & Global Perspectives* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2002), 9, 11.

used the doctrine to address or support their understanding of the church, most importantly the visible church. The authors of the period were concerned with many of the same questions, namely the origin and nature, purpose, membership, organisation, and praxis of the church that the modern category of ecclesiology attempts to address. A further concern is the application of one doctrine to another. Did the authors demonstrate or explain how the doctrine of Christ's offices impacted their understanding of the visible church? It will be argued it is in this latter aspect that Barrow and Ainsworth's distinct usage may be found. Claiming belief in a doctrine yet finding no appreciable effect on other beliefs or practices raised a question of true belief. In this sense, 'denial' (of the truth of the doctrine) is a frequent term used by Barrow and Ainsworth when referring to the Church of England. This denial is not only an intellectual rejection of the idea but also a failure to put into practice the implications of that belief.

The issue of whether the doctrine was a key theme in Barrow and Ainsworth's theology will be addressed in the consideration of the significance of the doctrine.¹³⁷ The idea of a central motif in theological methodology is highly disputed. Problems identifying a single central motif in Calvin's writings provide a

¹³⁷ Stanley Grenz defines a central motif as 'that concept which serves as the central organizational feature of the system, that theme around which the systematic theology is structured ... We may term this integrative motif the "orienting concept," for it provides the thematic perspective in light of which all other theological concepts are understood and given their relative meaning or value.' Millard Erickson calls it a 'central motif,' and Stephen Holmes describes it as, 'a "central dogma" account of the work ... whereby one doctrine ... was seen to be elevated to a decisive place and used as the key to unlock all other doctrines.' Erickson writes, 'One might think of the central motif as a perspective from which the data of theology are viewed. The perspective does not affect what the data are, but it does give a particular angle or cast to the way in which they are viewed.' Stanley J. Grenz, *Theology for the Community of God* (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 2000), 137; Stephen R. Holmes, *Listening to the Past: the Place of Tradition in Theology* (Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 2002), 75; Millard J. Erickson, *Christian Theology*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1998), 80ff.

case in point.¹³⁸ Warnings against an overly aggressive reliance on central motifs in historical theological analysis are replete. Stephen Holmes offers just such a caution:

The question here is whether such a 'central dogma' picture is an accurate portrayal of seventeenth- or eighteenth-century theology, which seemed to understand itself as offering a series of interconnected loci, or common-places, which did affect one another but were not hierarchically ordered, and were generally presented following the credal order.¹³⁹

Holmes' caution seems appropriate for the works considered in this thesis.

Nevertheless, Barrow and Ainsworth's writings belie certain themes as more important to their immediate circumstances than others. To suggest that discipline is the essential mark of the church for separatists is to make just such a case.¹⁴⁰ The issue then is not whether there were themes that held greater importance than others in the circumstances of writing, but rather which themes they were. While the visible church could be characterized by the idea of one, holy, catholic, and apostolic, as the right practice of word and sacrament, or perhaps by the exercise of Christ's offices by all the elect, each view notes some aspects as more crucial than others in understanding the visible church.

Charles Partee offers an alternative view to the concept of a central motif. He writes,

¹³⁸ For some examples of the debate see Thomas L. Wenger, 'The new perspective on Calvin: responding to recent Calvin interpretations,' *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 50, no. 2 (2007); Marcus P. Johnson, 'New or nuanced perspective on Calvin? A reply to Thomas Wenger,' *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 51, no. 3 (2008); Charles Partee, 'Calvin's Central Dogma Again,' *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 18, no. 2 (1987).

¹³⁹ Holmes, *Listening to the Past*, 75-6.

¹⁴⁰ For example Timothy George's comment, 'An essential feature of Separatist ecclesiology was the ritual of covenant-taking ...' Paul Avis noted, 'In the teaching of Henry Barrow and his fellow separatists ecclesiology is totally dominated by an obsession with discipline ...' Simon Doney noted that 'Lordship ... was the very essence of the movement.' Finally, David Gurney considers freedom to obey Christ separatism's 'essential characteristic.' Timothy George, 'Predestination In A Separatist Context: The Case Of John Robinson,' *Sixteenth Century Journal* 15, no. 1 (1984), 75-6; Paul D. L. Avis, *The Church in the Theology of the Reformers* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock Publishers, 2002), 7; Doney, 'Lordship of Christ', 5-6; Gurney, 'Education', 38.

A root metaphor or central theological theme may be discovered, in the sense that the reader can find a clarifying organization without being required to prove that the author deliberately and consciously put it there as an organizing principle. As a matter of fact, the older quest for Calvin's central dogma did not, in the main, contend that Calvin himself expounded the doctrine of God's sovereignty (and predestination) for this purpose, but only that it was correct for interpreters to do so.¹⁴¹

For Partee, the danger is to try to enter into the author's mind and recreate what their intent was when writing. Partee argues that a central motif may play a greater role for the interpreter than for the writer.¹⁴² Further, Partee notes that rather than a single central dogma it might be better to consider many 'centrally important themes.'¹⁴³ It must be agreed that there are often many centrally important themes in occasional writings; that is, writings fit to a specific circumstance. Nevertheless, contrary to Partee, it is argued that the author, not the interpreter, creates the theological methodology of a central motif. The view that the author creates a central motif does not mean the author deliberately chose a motif and then intentionally wrote with that in mind. The use of a central motif is more complicated than that.

Thinking (and writing) may be influenced by values and ideas whether one is aware of those values or not. One's worldview is not always consciously thought out

¹⁴¹ Partee, 'Calvin's Central Dogma Again,' 193.

¹⁴² Partee's suggestion follows the debates over meaning. For many, meaning is to be found in the reader, hence 'reader response.' The other side of the debate argues for meaning in the text as put there by the author, hence authorial intent. While the debate will not be resolved here, the approach taken in this work to the texts considered will be one of authorial intent. John Morgan remarks, 'The historian of ideas must recognize the distinction between the intention to do something (which may be called a "cause"), and the specific intention *in* doing something, which is not a "cause" but rather a perception of one's own purpose at the time the action is being committed. Skinner concluded that the essential question to ask of any text is what the author "could in practice have been intending to communicate by the utterance of this given utterance", and that the specific aim of the historian of ideas is the recovery "of this complex intention on the part of the author". This function is obviously related to, but distinguishable from the assessment of the effect of a single tract or of an author's career upon the society around him and upon the longer-term interests of his civilization.' Morgan, *Godly Learning*, 5.

¹⁴³ Partee, 'Calvin's Central Dogma Again,' 192.

and constructed but also grows and develops from the values and accepted beliefs that underlie that worldview. The occasional nature of much of written material works to influence how the author presents their argument as well. Most of Barrow and Ainsworth's works were occasional literature. While it has been suggested for theological methodology that the data are organized by a single idea, a single idea may not account for all of the author's presentation.¹⁴⁴ Presenting a whole summary of religion is a large undertaking and cannot be expected to fit neatly into a single idea. Here Partee's suggestion, that many centrally important ideas may be present in a text, is relevant. As an organizing structure the methodology of key themes or central motifs appears valid. The warning is not to try to fit everything neatly into one single idea. It is in this modest sense that the idea of a central motif will be employed here. For the separatists, it will be argued the doctrine of the offices of Christ played a 'centrally important' role within their ecclesiology, not that the doctrine was the sole or only theme. Whether Barrow began with the doctrine and applied it to the visible church or began with his particular view of the visible church and sought for support in the doctrine cannot be resolved. Barrow never explained how he came to his particular understanding of the visible church. Still, future research may be able to determine whether Barrow was the first to publish it. Given Barrow and Ainsworth's denial of borrowing ideas from others, it is speculative to argue for any dependency.

This research is concerned with Barrow and Ainsworth's ideas. It is not meant to be a historical examination of Barrow and Ainsworth or of separatism from 1580 to 1620. The intended questions are theological, considering separatist beliefs

¹⁴⁴ Erickson, *Christian Theology*, 80ff.

and the significance of one doctrine within their ecclesiology. Neither Barrow nor Ainsworth's ecclesiology (or their theology as a whole) appears as developed as something like Calvin's *Institutes*. As Ha notes, theology was developing during the period through debates with opponents.¹⁴⁵ Even so, Barrow and Ainsworth's writings do denote a theology and, in particular, an ecclesiology more developed than Stephen Brachlow has allowed for.¹⁴⁶ Barrow's works especially show an unwavering conviction of thought.¹⁴⁷ It is important to note a distinction between history and historical theology at least for the purposes of this work.¹⁴⁸ Historical research is broad, and while it is true that historical research can and often does consider religion and theology, historical theology takes a much narrower look, limiting the breadth of the resulting focus. It might better be termed historical dogmatics. It examines, in particular, the beliefs of those considered, either synchronically or diachronically. It explores the interrelations between different doctrines in their systems of belief. Finally, historical theology analyzes the differences and similarities with those before, during, and after in the long chain of dogmatic development. It is with this

¹⁴⁵ Ha, *English Presbyterianism*, 3, 49, 179-80.

¹⁴⁶ Brachlow, *Communion of Saints*, passim.

¹⁴⁷ There is always the danger of finding a system of ideas in historical writings where none exists or to look at historical works as if they intended to present modern systems of thought. However the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century writers did attempt to present their thoughts in a logical and orderly fashion and in this sense, they were systematic if perhaps incomplete compared to modern day ecclesiologies. Cf. John Coffey and Alister Chapman, 'Introduction,' in *Seeing Things Their Way: Intellectual History and the Return of Religion*, ed. Alister Chapman, John Coffey, and Brad S. Gregory (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2009), 2, 14; Quentin Skinner, 'Meaning and Understanding in the History of Ideas,' *History and Theory*, no. 1 (1969), 4ff; Gale Heide, *Timeless Truth in the Hands of History: a Short History of System in Theology* (Cambridge: James Clarke, 2012).

¹⁴⁸ Morgan comments, 'In such a vein the ideas of the puritans are frequently taken by historians merely as a backdrop to the influence of puritans on their society. Patrick Collinson has recently noted that sociological influences have caused the modern historian of religion to ponder not only "what people were supposed to believe, but what they in fact believed and still more what they did with their belief, its meaning and function.'" Morgan, *Godly Learning*, 1.

understanding in mind that this work is undertaken. Whether in practice the separatist movement ever achieved the ideals it argued for must be left for others to consider.¹⁴⁹

Researching Henry Barrow's writings has been significantly aided by the work of Leland Carlson. Carlson has collected Barrow's writings in the series *Elizabethan Nonconformist Texts*.¹⁵⁰ This valuable series has made Barrow's works accessible to modern researchers. For this thesis, all of Barrow's works, as provided by Carlson in the *Elizabethan Nonconformist Texts* series, will be considered. Of particular note however, are Barrow's earliest work, *Four Causes of Separation* (1587), and his largest and perhaps most important works, *A Brief Discoverie of the False Church* (1590), and *A Plaine Refutation of Mr. George Giffarde's Reprochful Booke* (1591). Questions concerning Barrow's authorship of particular works will follow Carlson's decisions. It is worth noting that Barrow was able to produce most of his works from the confines of prison with limited access to ink and paper and requiring his writings to be smuggled out.

Ainsworth was significantly more prolific in writing than Barrow, perhaps as a result of having more freedom and time. Several works of Ainsworth's are of particular importance to this research: *A True Confession of the Faith* (1596); *An apologie or defence of such true Christians as are commonly (but unjustly) called Brownists* (1604); *Communion of the Saints* (1607); *The confession of faith of certayn English people living in exile* (1607); *Counterpoyson* (1608); *An arrow against idolatrie* (1610); *An animadversion to Mr Richard Clyftons advertisement*

¹⁴⁹ Timothy George remarks, 'Separatism, in its most organized and articulate form, hardly, if ever, achieved the status of a "movement," and that what success it did obtain was usually dissipated by a recurring fratricidal impulse.' George, *John Robinson*, 7.

¹⁵⁰ At least Carlson has collected all known works by Barrow. It is always possible new manuscripts will be discovered.

(1613); and *A reply to a pretended Christian plea for the anti-Chistian [sic] Church of Rome* (1620). While not all of Ainsworth's writings will be used in this research, many beyond those noted above will be considered. As with many writings of the period, Ainsworth's authorship of some works has been questioned, most notably *A True Confession of the Faith* variously attributed to Francis Johnson alone, to Ainsworth alone, and as a cooperative work by Francis Johnson and Ainsworth. The latter view is taken here.

5. *Argument and Findings*

This study identifies five characteristics of Barrow and Ainsworth's use of the doctrine of the offices of Christ that will be considered as this work progresses. First, Barrow and Ainsworth's understanding of the visible church differed from those who supported the Church of England. While there was much held in common, Henry Barrow and Henry Ainsworth's use of the doctrine of the offices of Christ in their understanding of the visible church gave to them a distinct theological identity. This identity began in the mid-1580s and continued at least into the early 1620s. As detailed in chapter five, Barrow and Ainsworth's application of the *munus triplex* to the visible church was not found in the non-separatist writings considered in this research. Further, the separatists were not one homogeneous group either in their practices or beliefs. There were differences among those who had separated from the Church of England, most notably differences with Robert Browne. A second point worth noting from this research is that Barrow and Ainsworth placed their emphasis on the visible church over the invisible church. Neither Henry Barrow nor Henry

Ainsworth denied the invisible church, but it appears infrequently in their writings. Barrow and Ainsworth argued that the visible church was the result of union with Christ, not the means of it. The true visible church was not to be a place where non-believers went to hear the gospel. Rather it was a true visible church only when it was a gathering of those already in union with Christ. Barrow and Ainsworth distinguished between a true visible church and a false visible church. The Church of England was a visible church, however according to Barrow and Ainsworth, it was a false church. As a false church, it belonged to Antichrist. Third, Henry Barrow and Henry Ainsworth rejected the traditional Reformation marks of the church, notably word and sacrament (and discipline). For Barrow and Ainsworth, the whole of scripture must be considered in identifying a true visible church. Nevertheless, for Barrow and Ainsworth's rejection of the Church of England, the people and active work of Christ in and through the elect characterized the true visible church. Christ was present in the visible church when he was working in his offices. According to Barrow and Ainsworth, Christ did not share space with Antichrist in the visible church. Fourth, all the elect's participation in the offices of Christ obligated them to fulfil the work of Christ on earth and gave them an interest in the public affairs of the visible church. Because of union with Christ, all the elect shared in Christ's offices of prophecy, priesthood, and kingship. Further, all the elect were empowered as his body to serve as prophets, priests, and kings in the visible church's public affairs. Finally then, Christ was still presently working on earth after his ascension both immediately in and mediately through the elect as prophets, priests, and kings. While all the elect were prophets, priests, and kings always, only as they gathered were they the body of Christ. The visible church was the body of Christ, his continued presence

on earth. Christ was still present on earth working as the elect exercised his offices of prophecy, priesthood, and kingship.

The argument that follows begins with an exploration of the doctrine of the offices of Christ in the writings of Henry Barrow and Henry Ainsworth. Chapters two and three present Barrow and Ainsworth's use of the doctrine of the offices of Christ both in their attacks on the Church of England and in their description of the true visible church. Of particular interest in this work is their discussion of the participation of all the elect in those offices. These chapters form the foundation of the work of this thesis, arguing that for Barrow and Ainsworth, participation by all the elect in the offices of Christ was a central theme of their ecclesiology. These chapters do not attempt to make the case that the doctrine of the offices of Christ explains all of Barrow and Ainsworth's theology. Since neither wrote a complete summary, it is not even possible to investigate a larger central motif for them. However, it will be argued that the doctrine played a central role in their understanding of the visible church. Barrow and Ainsworth distinguished between what Christ had done for the elect and what he was doing in and through the elect. This distinction is important in order to understand Barrow and Ainsworth's ecclesiology. Chapters two and three present evidence to support this distinction. While Barrow and Ainsworth also distinguished between the church invisible and the church visible, the discussion in chapters two and three will show that the visible church was most prominent in their writings.

Chapter four makes the case that Barrow and Ainsworth were not obsessed with purity and discipline, as so much of the historiography has claimed. They were arguing for a correction in the visible church based upon their understanding of

Christ's work on earth. Their Christology and ecclesiology were inseparable. More importantly, Barrow and Ainsworth's understanding of Christ's work on earth was not just a doctrine to which they assented, rather their belief was visible in their practices. The visible church was the body of Christ continuing to work and thereby a visible expression of Christ on earth. All of the elect were empowered to serve in the visible church as prophets, priests, and kings. Barrow and Ainsworth's ecclesiology was shaped by their view of Christ and his work as prophet, priest, and king in and through the visible church.

Chapter five then looks at how the doctrine was commonly used during the period 1580 to 1620. The chapter considers over 175 works related to the offices of Christ.¹⁵¹ The works were by non-separatist authors and included treatises, catechisms, and sermons. The authors were Catholic, advocates of the Church of England, puritan, and continental Reformers. The chapter compares the use of the doctrine within these works with that of Barrow and Ainsworth established in the previous three chapters. The point of chapter five is to present the case that Barrow and Ainsworth's use of the doctrine differed from the common use of their time. It will be argued that Barrow and Ainsworth used the doctrine mainly for ecclesiology and seldom for soteriology. Further, Barrow and Ainsworth's use marked them as distinct within English separatism, most notably distinct from Robert Browne. Within the 'separatist' category, there was diversity. Chapter five argues that Barrow and Ainsworth should not be considered 'Brownists' or be indistinctly grouped among the 'separatists' but rather as 'Barrowists.' In this discussion, Barrow and Ainsworth's emphasis on all of the elect's participation will be further drawn out.

¹⁵¹ For a more detailed description of the selection criteria see *infra* chapter 5 and the Appendix.

Chapter six forms the conclusion providing some final thoughts on this research. It addresses the value of the research for the field of English Reformation studies and identifies unanswered questions brought up through this work. Finally, it offers some ways Barrow and Ainsworth's ideas might challenge the visible church today.

Chapter 2: Henry Barrow and the Offices of Christ

The rationale for Henry Barrow's attacks on the Church of England is found in his understanding of the relationship between Christ's work and the visible church, his Christology and ecclesiology. His argument was strengthened by the connection between Christ's person and his work; to deny either one was to deny Christ. No greater allegation could be made against one's opponents than that they denied their Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. No church that denied Christ could be a true Christian church. Barrow accused the Church of England of that very thing, of having denied Christ. Based on their denial of Christ, Barrow condemned the Church of England as a false church. Even more than that, it was an antichristian church. From his perspective, the Church of England was no better than the Church of Rome, and neither could be considered Christ's visible church. While much has been written on the debates between the English separatists and their opponents, as already noted, Barrow's understanding of Christ's work within the church, expressed in the offices of prophecy, priesthood, and kingship, has not been adequately explored.

This chapter will seek to address foundational questions related to Barrow's use of the doctrine of the offices of Christ.¹ Namely, it will consider how the doctrine of the offices of Christ functioned in Barrow's theology and particularly whether Barrow used the doctrine in an ecclesiological context; that is, whether Barrow used the doctrine in his description of the true visible church. Two points are of particular

¹ While Barrow was frequently called a 'Brownist' and associated with the teaching of Robert Browne, Barrow rejected any connection to Browne or his teachings. Throughout this chapter quotations by Barrow's opponents will reference 'the Brownists' including Barrow with this epithet. Their use is more rhetoric than accurate description. Chapters 3 and 4 *infra* will consider Barrow's connection to Browne and whether there was a distinct 'Barrowist' theological tradition.

importance in this chapter. First is Barrow's idea of participation by the elect in Christ's offices. Second is the distinction between what Christ had done for the church and what he was doing in the church, Christ's work in the past and his continuing work in the present. This chapter will consider whether these two ideas were present in his ecclesiology. Finally then, the chapter will reflect on whether the doctrine was a prominent feature of Barrow's thinking; that is, whether it was a key theme for his understanding of the church. The answers to these questions provide a foundation for the work of subsequent chapters.

What follows in this chapter will be largely exegetical, providing a critical explanation of Barrow's usage of the doctrine as found in his published writings. An attempt will be made to allow Barrow to speak for himself within the context of his time. Barrow never wrote a systematic treatise of the church in the modern sense of the idea. His writings were largely polemical, attacking the Church of England and its proponents. There is no attempt here to provide a comprehensive 'ecclesiology' for Barrow. Rather, this chapter is only an exploration of his ecclesiology as it relates to his use of the doctrine of the offices of Christ. Necessarily then, questions on some points of Barrow's ecclesiology will not be addressed or will be considered only briefly in footnotes.

1. Separation from a false church

Barrow's understanding of the true visible church centred on Christ's presence in the church through his offices of prophecy, priesthood, and kingship. He introduced this idea in his earliest known work *Four Causes of Separation*, probably

written in the fall of 1587. Barrow referenced the doctrine of Christ's offices in his reasons for separating from the Church of England. According to Barrow, the Church of England was a false church because they denied Christ's offices. In Barrow's worldview, there were only two churches, the true church belonging to Christ and the false church belonging to Antichrist. It was obvious to Barrow that since Christ could not be associated with a false church; a false church by definition must belong to Antichrist. 'It is impossible that the Church of *Christ* can carie the yoake of Antichrist,' Barrow maintained.² As a false church, then, true Christians could have no communication with it. Barrow concluded, 'Two so contrarie maisters they cannot serve, as Christ & Antichrist, neither have communion with both.'³ True Christians had to make a choice, either for Christ or Antichrist. They could not remain in a false church and serve Christ.

Barrow pointed out four particular errors within the Church of England that proved it to be a false church. Those errors he described as, 'The profane and ungodly people received into and retained in the bozom and bodie of ther churches,' 'The false and Antichristian ministrie imposed upone ther churches,' 'The fals maner of worshipping the true God,' and 'The false and Antichristian government wherewith ther churches are ruled.'⁴ While his opponents chafed at his assertion that the Church of England was a false church, Barrow was not arguing that there was nothing good within it. His opponents responded that although there was sin within their church, there was also much that was good and godly.⁵ The puritan George Gifford (perhaps

² Barrow, 'A Brief Summe of the Causes,' 145.

³ Barrow, 'Brief Discoverie,' 56.

⁴ Barrow, 'Four Causes of Separation,' 54.

⁵ George Gifford, *A short treatise* (London, 1590), 2-3.

Barrow's most notable opponent) argued that what was at issue was the degree of sin that might 'divorce' a church from Christ.⁶ Gifford wrote,

The matter in question betweene the Brownists and me, is not about the controversie in our Church, as whether there be imperfections, corruptions and faults, in our Worship, Ministerie and Church government, nor how many great or smal: but whether there be such heinous enormities as destroy the verie life, and being of a true Church, and make an utter divorce from Christ.⁷

While for Gifford the debate concerned corruption in the Church of England, for Barrow the debate concerned their continuation in known sin.⁸

Calling these four errors the cause of separation is somewhat misleading. Separation was not justified by the mere presence of sin within the church. Separation was necessary, rather, due to the 'wilful and obstinate refusal' of the Church of England to repent and change after their sin had been made known to them. This distinction was important for Barrow as he responded to his opponents. Contrary to Gifford's argument, the issue for Barrow was not whether the severity of sin in the Church of England was sufficient to cause a divorce from Christ. Rather, for Barrow, the debate was over what to do once sin had been discovered within the church. It was their unwillingness to repent that made the Church of England a false church. Barrow believed 'no true Church or Christian will maintaine anie sinne or error, when it is evidentialie shewed & convinced unto them by the worde of God ...

⁶ Brett Usher, 'Gifford, George (1547/8–1600),' in Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, online ed., ed. Lawrence Goldman, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/10658> (accessed 29 Oct 2013).

⁷ George Gifford, *A plaine declaration* (London, 1590), To the Reader.

⁸ Stephen Brachlow notes, 'Robinson and other separatists made much of the open wickedness, profanity, and corruption they believed permeated the parish churches. Yet those evils in themselves did not make the national church a false one. Rather, its corrupt constitution was the culprit because, in the first place, it granted membership to visibly profane people and, in the second place, it failed to provide valid Biblical measures for the "evacuation and expulsion of excrements, or other noisome things.'" The argument of this chapter is that for Barrow, it was not the corrupt constitution as Brachlow's notes, but rather the rejection of Christ. Brachlow, *Communion of Saints*, 68.

Or if they doe, whilst they remaine in that estate, they are not of us to be held the true Churches of Christ.’⁹ From Barrow’s point of view, the Church of England had been shown their errors and yet chose to remain in them.¹⁰ Therefore, Barrow concluded, the Church of England could not be considered a true church.

Although, from Barrow’s point of view, all sin was capable of separating one from Christ if not repented of, these four errors in particular were noteworthy.¹¹ The discussion here so far would seem to support the suggestion that discipline, or excommunication, was a key theme in Barrow’s ecclesiology. This suggestion was, in fact, what the Church of England clergyman Richard Alison had argued in response to Barrow’s work *A True Description*.¹² In Alison’s response, he understood Barrow to be arguing for absolute purity in the visible church. However, Barrow was not arguing the visible church would ever be pure; he agreed it would not. Rather, for Barrow, there was a connection between these particular errors (and the failure of the Church of England to repent of them) and a denial of Christ’s incarnation. Barrow wrote, ‘The haynous and fearfull enormities that insue of these [errors] are infinitt and cannot be sufyciently expressed ether by word or writing: but summarylye, you shall find herbye Christ Jesus denied in all his offices, and so

⁹ Henry Barrow, 'A Plaine Refutation of Mr. George Giffarde's Reprochful Booke, Intituled, A Short Treatise against the Donatists of England,' in *The writings of Henry Barrow, 1590-1591*, ed. Leland H. Carlson, Elizabethan Nonconformist Texts, vol. 5 (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1966), 57.

¹⁰ Barrow, 'A Pastoral Letter from Prison,' 111-2.

¹¹ Barrow, 'Brief Discoverie,' 305-6.

¹² Little is known of Alison though Leland Carlson provides a very brief biography, ‘Richard Alison, rector of St. Thomas the Apostle, 1591/2-1612; rector of St. Leonard, Shoreditch, 1596-1612. He was the author of a book entitled *A Plaine Confutation of a Treatise of Brownisme*, which was a refutation of Barrow’s *A True Description out of the Worde of God, of the Visible Church*.’ He is referred to as ‘Doctor Alison’ indicating an advanced level of education. Alison is listed as one of the ‘visitors’ of Barrow and Greenwood during their prison stay. From the scant evidence Alison appeared to have been in good standing with the hierarchy of the Church of England, perhaps being employed by the archbishop to write his response to Barrow. John Greenwood and Henry Barrow, *The Writings of John Greenwood, 1587-1590: Together with the Joint Writings of Henry Barrow and John Greenwood, 1587-1590*, 6 vols., Elizabethan Nonconformist Texts, ed. Leland H. Carlson, vol. 4 (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1962), 119, note 39; Barrow, *The Writings of Henry Barrow, 1587-1590*, 67.

consequently not to be com in the flesh.’¹³ For Barrow, the failure to repent of these errors was a denial of Christ.

Barrow did not accuse the Church of England of openly and explicitly denying Christ’s offices. On the contrary, their denial was subtler. Barrow’s statement that through these four errors the incarnation was denied was to say that the Church of England neither allowed Christ to establish nor work in their church. Christ, then, had no part in the Church of England from Barrow’s point of view. This connection between the incarnation and Christ’s work was not an uncommon view in the period 1580 to 1620. The bishop of Winchester Thomas Cooper maintained a similar attitude concerning the Church of Rome:

What it is to denye Christe to have come in Fleshe, and who they are that denye it, you shall understande that there bee two wayes to denye Christe to have come in fleshe. The one flatlye and groselye, and in playne wordes, as Ebion, Erinthus, Marcion, Valentinian, Arrius, and a number suche other, in the Primative Churche, whiche denyed eyther the Deitie, or Humanitie of Christe. But in them Sathan shewed himselfe in his owne Coloures, like a blacke Devill, and therefore the Heresydes beeing so grosse, were soone confuted, and confounded in the Churche of God. There is another waye more subtle, and perilous, undirectly to denye Christ to have come in fleshe, in whiche Sathan tourneth himselfe into an Aungell of lighte, and as Cyprian sayeth, Under the name of Christe, confounding the Religion of christe. That is, While in wordes they confesse the Incarnation of Christ, by perverse Doctrynes in effecte they deny it, by denying those causes, for which the Sonne of God was Incarnate, attributing the effect of oure Salvation, to other thinges.¹⁴

¹³ Barrow, 'Four Causes of Separation,' 54.

¹⁴ Thomas Cooper, *Certaine sermons wherin is contained the defense of the gospell* (London, 1580), 235. Concerning Thomas Cooper see Margaret Bowker, 'Cooper, Thomas (c.1517–1594),' in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed., ed. Lawrence Goldman, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/6229> (accessed 28 Feb 2014).

Cooper's statement was published in 1580 probably before Barrow had become a Christian. Cooper was arguing against the addition of works to salvation, yet his understanding was not very different from Barrow's.

Barrow's charges against the Church of England demonstrate a connection between the doctrine of Christ's offices and the status of a church as true or false.¹⁵ The Church of England had replaced Christ, constructing a different priesthood, accepting a different prophecy, and living under a different kingship. Through their 'perverse' teaching and practice, in effect, the Church of England had denied the reason that Christ had become incarnate. The true church, as Barrow described it, was 'a company and fellowship of faithful and holie people gathered in the name of Christ Jesus their only king, priest, and prophet, worshiping him aright, being peaceable and quietlie governed by his officers and lawes, keeping the unitie of faith in the bonde of peace & love unfained.'¹⁶ For those properly gathered, there was only one king, one priest, and one prophet, namely Christ Jesus.¹⁷

It should not be surprising that Barrow's opponents rejected his accusation that they denied Christ's offices. Richard Alison maintained that the Church of England firmly believed in the doctrine of Christ's offices. Responding to a description by Barrow of the true visible church Alison wrote, 'That Christ Jesus is our onely king, priest, and prophet, and that the servants of God in all their assemblies, both publike and private, do meete in his name, is confessed.'¹⁸ George

¹⁵ As Christ was prior to the church, his offices, though not yet fulfilled, were his prior to the church. Barrow agreed with the Covenant Theology of the period holding the church to have existed prior to the cross (Israel was a manifestation of the church).

¹⁶ Barrow, 'A True Description out of the Worde of God,' 214.

¹⁷ Again Charke made similar claims concerning the Catholic church, 'Whoesoever therefore confesseth not Christ to be a Saviour, Prophet, King, and Priest, is not of God, but of Antichrist.' William Charke, *A treatise against the Defense of the censure* (Cambridge, 1586), 64.

¹⁸ Alison, *A plaine confutation of a treatise of Brownisme*, 19.

Gifford gave a similar response, 'We preach him in his three offices to be our King, Priest, and Prophet: Wee preach al the fundamental articles of our christian faith; and as wee preach, so you believe al these.'¹⁹

Barrow acknowledged that the Church of England had some understanding of the doctrine of Christ's offices. His criticism was that they did not teach the whole doctrine and had failed to practice the implications of it in their church. Therefore, their confession of belief in Christ's offices did not satisfy Barrow. He remarked,

These and many other comfortable and true doctrines they can and doe deliver touching the offices of Christ; but all these you must understand, and I pray you observe wel (for so shal you cleerly espie their error and deceit) are still but what Christ hath done in his owne person for his elect: here is not one worde spoken what he doth in his elect: how he teacheth, sanctifieth and ruleth them by the scepter of his word, how he is a king, priest, a prophet heere on earth, and exerciseth the offices here in his church amongst his servantes the saints.²⁰

According to Barrow, it was the present work of Christ in the elect that the Church of England had neglected. He drew a distinction between what Christ had done and what he was doing, between his past work for the church and his present work in and through the church. This distinction of a twofold work of Christ expressed in his offices was important in Barrow's understanding of the true visible church. While the Church of England professed belief in the doctrine, they failed to teach and practice the full truth of Christ's offices.

After Christ ascended, his work of prophecy, priesthood, and kingship continued. Barrow observed a distinction between that which Christ had done and that which Christ was doing. He argued that Christ's work was both in the past as

¹⁹ Barrow, 'Plaine Refutation,' 277.

²⁰ Barrow, 'Brief Discoverie,' 509.

well as in the present. Christ was still present in his visible churches, continuing to work immediately *in* all of the elect as well as working mediately *through* all of the elect. For Barrow, hindering Christ's work in the visible church made the incarnation of no value. After Barrow attacked the 'bishops and learned priests of England' for ignoring the liberty of the members of Christ's body, he explained, 'Then was not Christe's death a sufficient ransome for, neither extended to al our sinnes, neither hath he subdued or set us free from al our enimies, neither have we as yet anie perfect peace or reconciliation with God. And then was his coming vayne, then can no flesh be saved therbie.'²¹ Barrow's reference here to Christ's incarnation demonstrated the connection between the doctrine of Christ's offices and the purpose for which he became incarnate, his work of prophecy, priesthood, and kingship.²²

However, during Barrow's time, this connection between the doctrine of the offices of Christ and the incarnation was frequently noted only in terms of what Christ had done for the church. As Robert Franks put it in his work *A History of the Doctrine of the Work of Christ*, 'The Incarnation then took place that Christ might offer a sacrifice in human nature for us.' Franks continues,

Such is the first summary account of the work of Christ given by Hooker, representing Him as Priest and King. It is not, however, Hooker's whole theory: but requires to be supplemented by passages scattered through the following chapters on the Incarnation and the Sacraments, in which the central thought is the ancient patristic idea of the communication of salvation to humanity, involved in the very Incarnation itself. In the Incarnation the Person of the Lord was united, not to a single man, but to humanity in general.²³

²¹ Barrow, 'Plaine Refutation,' 301.

²² This issue will be taken up again in chapter 4 *infra*.

²³ Franks, *A History of the Doctrine*, 450-1.

Franks goes on to note that ‘Scripture, moreover, always connects the Incarnation with the necessity of redemption.’²⁴

According to Barrow, Christ had worked, yet more importantly to Barrow’s present circumstances, Christ was still working. Furthermore, Christ worked *through* the elect mediately in addition to working *in* the elect immediately. After explaining what Christ was doing in the elect, Barrow remarked that Christ ‘maketh all his children kings, priests, and prophets.’²⁵ The work of prophecy, priesthood, and kingship that Barrow explained Christ continued to do was the very same work that Christ’s children were to do. However, as will be discussed in what follows, the elect were never to act independently of Christ. The elect participated in Christ’s offices, they did not occupy them separately. They shared with Christ, and it was as Christ worked through them that they carried on his work. For Barrow, then, to hinder Christ’s servants was to hinder Christ. Significantly for Barrow, the Church of England prevented the public exercise of Christ’s offices by some members: ‘They thus blasphemously denie in deed and practise the whole annointing of Christ, namely his three offices, his kingdome, priesthood, and prophecie.’²⁶

The Church of England’s failure to practice the truth of Christ’s offices in their church meant they had a different priesthood, prophecy, and kingship from what Christ had commanded. From Barrow’s perspective, they ‘blasphemously usurpe the very peculiar names, offices and honours proper to Christ alone.’²⁷ They not only denied Christ his offices but also replaced him in those offices. Their sin was not to offer another means of justification, or an alternative atonement, but rather

²⁴ Ibid., 339.

²⁵ Barrow, 'Brief Discoverie,' 509.

²⁶ Ibid., 514.

²⁷ Barrow, 'The First Part of the Platforme,' 242.

to offer a different saviour and a different church. Barrow's frustration at what he believed the Church of England had done to Christ is clear:

For doe they not put the reede of the popes Canons in his [Christ's] hand, in steade of the Scepter of his owne holy word? Do they not make him a minister of an other Testament, by bynding him to this theire popishe apochripha liturgye, and all theire other devises made, or to be made? Do they not make him a priest, a sacrifice, to all the prophane & ungodly? To conclude, do they not hereby denye and abrogate all his offices in his Church, of kingdome, priesthoode & prophecy, and his whole anointing in the flesh?²⁸

For Barrow, their worship, ministry, people, and government were not those that Christ had explicitly commanded in his word. They were not those that should have been the expression of Christ's offices in and through the true visible church.

Barrow argued that Christ's work, expressed in his offices, had not ceased with his ascension. The Church of England had failed to recognize this distinction between what Christ had done for his elect and what he was doing in the elect according to Barrow. Neither Alison nor Gifford discussed this distinction in Barrow's argument. It was this distinction that Barrow had maintained as 'their error.'²⁹ He had conceded that the Church of England taught some truths concerning Christ. His point was that they failed to teach what Christ was doing in the elect and hindered Christ's servants from practicing those same truths. While it could be argued that Alison and Gifford had misunderstood Barrow's writings, they clearly understood that he accused them of denying Christ's offices since they had asserted their belief in that doctrine in response. As Gifford had explained, he saw the debate

²⁸ John Greenwood and Henry Barrow, 'A Collection of Certaine Sclaunderous Articles Gyven out by the Bisshops,' in *The Writings of John Greenwood, 1587-1590: Together with the Joint Writings of Henry Barrow and John Greenwood, 1587-1590*, ed. Leland H. Carlson, Elizabethan Nonconformist Texts, vol. 4 (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1962), 127.

²⁹ Barrow, 'Brief Discoverie,' 509.

between them as whether the severity of the sins within the Church of England made it a false church. On this point Barrow responded that their acceptance of known sin in the Church of England led to a denial of the offices of Christ and as such was ‘sufficient’ to bring about a divorce from Christ, using Gifford’s terms.³⁰

2. Christ’s offices and the errors of the Church of England

Barrow defended his charge of denial by comparing the functions of Christ’s offices of prophecy, priesthood, and kingship, and the errors over which the Church of England had refused to repent. Regarding Christ’s prophetic office Barrow wrote, ‘When anything is aded to or taken from his written word, or wher Christ's voyce [sic] onlye is not heard and obeyed in the church’ this office was denied.³¹ The Church of England’s liturgy demonstrated a denial of Christ’s prophetic office in their use of the Book of Common Prayer. Barrow accused the Church of England of replacing God’s word with ‘an invention of man.’ Nothing was allowed in the church but scripture according to Barrow, all else was ‘apocrypha’ and a device of man. He wrote, ‘In the church of God may nothing come, or be heard, but the canonical Scriptures and lively graces of Gode's Spirit, according to the same.’³² Barrow charged the ministers of the Church of England of following the Book of Common Prayer in place of Christ’s commands. Barrow explained, ‘We may ... conclude from the second Commandment, that whatsoever worship is devised by man, and whatsoever devise of man is put into the worship of God, is idolatrie.’³³ Though the

³⁰ Gifford, *A short treatise*, 90.

³¹ Barrow, 'Four Causes of Separation,' 55.

³² Barrow, 'Brief Discoverie,' 368.

³³ Barrow, 'Plaine Refutation,' 28.

Prayer Book did contain within it some scripture, that was not sufficient in Barrow's eyes to make up for all the 'apocrypha' that it also contained.

George Gifford agreed with Barrow that no human devices should be brought into the visible church: 'For whatsoever man inventeth in Gods worship, is erroneous: and whatsoever in the same is erroneous, hath beene invented by man.'³⁴ However, as Barrow pointed out, Christ had not given the Book of Common Prayer to his church; therefore, it was a human creation. Gifford's defence was that some ministers in the Church of England used only those portions of the Book that they felt did not violate their conscience. Given that not all used the Book wholly, Gifford considered Barrow's charge that the whole church was corrupt to be unfounded. As Gifford saw it, those ministers who were scrupulous to avoid any parts that were contrary to Christ's word, gave validity to the Church of England.

Since all ministers were required to subscribe to the entirety of the Book, non-conformity to some parts was not sufficient for Barrow. The second of Archbishop John Whitgift's three articles, which were compulsory for ministerial license, made use of the Book mandatory.³⁵ The applicant was required to affirm,

that the Book of Common Prayer, and of ordering bishops, priests, and deacons, containeth nothing in it contrary to the word of God, and that the same may lawfully be used, and that he himself will use the form of the said book prescribed in public prayer and administration of the sacraments, and none other.³⁶

³⁴ Gifford, *A short treatise*, 9. The use of human inventions was a concern for many puritans as well. Theodore Bozeman observes, 'Belligerent, untiring opposition to 'human invention' was a cardinal feature of the Puritan movement in all its phases.' Bozeman continued, 'No other technical term, not "covenant," not "sanctification," not "discipline" or "purity," is more revealing of the distinctively Puritan phenomenon within the English church.' Bozeman, *To Live Ancient Lives*, 51.

³⁵ Archbishop John Whitgift required subscription to three articles in order to be licensed to preach. These articles were put forward in 1583 though As Gerald Bray notes, 'These articles were only haphazardly enforced during Elizabeth's reign, but they were incorporated as Canon 36 of the Canons of 1604, after which subscription to them was regularly insisted upon.' Gerald Lewis Bray, *Documents of the English Reformation* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1994), 397.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 398.

Even if it was granted that some ministers avoided portions of the Prayer Book that they felt violated their conscience, they were required to subscribe to its entirety before the Bishop. As Barrow considered the book itself an abomination, in part or whole, whether they used all of it or not they were equally guilty. Barrow wrote, ‘All the whole masse-booke, the English service-booke and everie part therof are detestable idolls. All which idoll and every part therof we can condemne.’³⁷ Gifford’s argument had failed to convince Barrow. Given that the ministers of the Church of England brought a human device into the public worship of God they had denied Christ’s prophetic office.

The form of government found in the Church of England was also the invention of man and therefore was not according to Christ’s commands in Barrow’s eyes. As he observed, that form of government could not be found in Scripture: ‘Ther straung offices, officers, and laws, . . . never re[a]d of, never h[e]ard of, in the Scriptures.’³⁸ There was nothing in the church that was ‘indifferent’ to Barrow:

Christ hath left but one forme of government in his last Will and Testament unto his Church, which he hath sealed with his blood; and therefore not left it arbitrable at the pleasures of Princes, or pollicies of tymes to be done or undon, but made it by a double right inviolable, both by his word and his Testament; so that the Church of God can neither be governed by anie other lawes or government, neither ought it to be without this; for God holdeth them all in the estate of enimies, which have not his Sonne to reigne over them.³⁹

Not only was the Church of England disobeying what Christ had commanded, they had replaced his commands with their own invention:

³⁷ Barrow, 'Plaine Refutation,' 67.

³⁸ Barrow, 'Four Causes of Separation,' 33.

³⁹ Barrow, 'A Brief Summe of the Causes,' 127.

They thrust these devises of men into the place of God's worde, causing the people therbie to reverence and esteeme them as the holie oracles of God, of like authoritie, dignitie, and truth, and to resorte unto them to builde their faith therupon, and therby they bring in an other foundation into the church: besides the high injurie donne unto God therbie.⁴⁰

As with the Church of England's liturgy, their form of government proved they had denied Christ's prophetic office by substituting human devices in place of Christ's commands.

Christ's priestly office was denied, Barrow explained, 'When any unlawfull worship is offered to Christ, or in his name.'⁴¹ His justification for this claim was that 'Christ is not a priest for such sacrifices as his Father is not pleased with.'⁴²

Much of the debate over false worship, as with the liturgy in general, centred on the use of the Book of Common Prayer. Barrow wrote that the Prayer Book,

standeth a publike prescript contained leiturgy (not as yet to come to the particulars or meddle with the blasphemous contentes therof but to speak generally of it) ... it becometh a detestable idol, standing for that it is not in the church of God and consciences of men: namely, for holy, spirituall, and faithfull prayer, it being nothing lesse, but rather abhominable and loathsome sacrifice in the sight of God, even as a dead dogg.⁴³

Liturgy taken from the Book of Common Prayer was not an acceptable sacrifice to God as Barrow understood things. All prescribed liturgies were rotten carcasses, slain long before they were brought to the altar.

Prescribed prayers and selected portions of Scripture were an abomination because they were not according to Christ's word. Spiritual prayer, or prayer that was

⁴⁰ Barrow, 'Plaine Refutation,' 101.

⁴¹ Barrow, 'Four Causes of Separation,' 55.

⁴² Barrow, 'Plaine Refutation,' 74.

⁴³ Barrow, 'Brief Discoverie,' 364.

acceptable to God, was to be extemporaneous. Read prayers were not to be offered to God in worship; they were sacrifices not slain at the altar, but dead animals brought to the altar contrary to the law of God. Again Barrow clarified,

Everie sacrifice must be brought quick & new unto the Altar, & there be slayne everie morning and evening: how much more in this spiritual Temple of God, where the offrings are spiritual, and God hath made al his servantes Kings, & priestes, to offer up acceptable sacrifices unto him, through Jesus Christ.⁴⁴

Barrow's imagery, drawing on Old Testament animal sacrifices, could not paint a clearer picture; public worship required new and living sacrifices, not previously slain works of rotten flesh with their stench.

According to Barrow, even the lord's prayer was a 'previously slain work' and was not to be used in public or private as a prayer. Read prayers could be used for the purpose of meditation but could not be offered to God. Reading was communication from God to man while prayer was communication from man to God. Prayer was to address the immediate needs of the one praying and to bring before God the ready expressions of the community. Barrow's opinion of those who read prayers in the worship of God is clear when he described read prayer as 'the froth of their lips, and follie of their heartes.' He asked if this folly should 'be thrust upon men's consciences, yea, even upon the Spirit of God himself in this maner'? He concluded, 'In the church of God may nothing come, or be heard, but the canonical Scriptures and lively graces of Gode's Spirit, according to the same.'⁴⁵ It was the latter phrase, 'the lively graces of Gode's Spirit' which allowed for prayers and sermons to be heard in worship. Both were to be extemporaneous; prayer, a fresh

⁴⁴ Ibid.

⁴⁵ Ibid., 368.

expression by the help of the Spirit from the community to God, and the sermon, a fresh expression by the help of the Spirit from God to the community.

Barrow complained that prescribed portions of Scripture to be read in worship denied the ‘free use both of the Scriptures and spirit of God.’⁴⁶ The presence of some scripture could not justify the use of the Prayer Book as far as Barrow was concerned. Joining the holy word of God with human inventions could not ‘prove it lawful for them to bring in their owne apocrypha divises, and set them up in the church.’⁴⁷ Using any part of the Prayer Book in the church was false worship and, therefore, denied Christ’s priestly office. It was a false liturgy, a human invention, containing false ceremonies and dead sacrifices. Christ did not institute it and it denied the Spirit of God in worship. The Church of England, Barrow argued, denied Christ’s prophetic and priestly office by not obeying what Christ had commanded for his visible church and substituting human invention in the place of Christ’s ordinances.

Finally, Barrow explained that Christ’s kingly office was denied, ‘wher his lawes and ordernances ar rejected and not obeyed, or anie other thurste upon the church, etc.’⁴⁸ The Church of England’s willful and obstinate refusal to repent of those sins that existed in their church was conclusive proof, from Barrow’s perspective, that Christ was not their king. Christ was not sitting on the throne of any church that continued in sin. Barrow argued, ‘God can never be severed from his worde; they that despise and reject God's worde, despise and reject God himself. Christ ruleth and reigneth by the scepter of his owne worde, they that are not subject

⁴⁶ Barrow, 'Plaine Refutation,' 101.

⁴⁷ Barrow, 'Brief Discoverie,' 368.

⁴⁸ Barrow, 'Four Causes of Separation,' 55.

unto, but wilfully disobey, that word, are not subject unto Christ, have not him a kinge, but a judge over them.⁴⁹ The problem was not that there was sin in the Church of England; rather that the Church refused to repent of the sin that Barrow and others had exposed. There may very well have been much that was good and godly in the Church of England. However, refusing to repent of those sins that were now known meant they had wilfully rejected God's word. Barrow pointed out, 'The worde of God calethe him an heretick that obstinatelie holdeth anie one error after due conviction, though he hold much truth besides.'⁵⁰ Barrow's argument was that while sin may exist in the church known sin must be removed.

Barrow did not claim that all sin could be removed from the visible church, contrary to his opponent's charges.⁵¹ The visible church would continue to consist of both the wicked and the righteous.⁵² While the precise meaning and application of the parable of the wheat and tares in Matthew 13 was debated, Barrow never denied that there could be some sin in the visible church.⁵³ There could be both sinners and righteous until Christ returned in judgment.⁵⁴ Barrow's concern was that no sin was to be knowingly allowed to enter into the visible church and all sin already within the visible church, once discovered, was to be removed. Sin that was hidden could not be

⁴⁹ Barrow, 'Plaine Refutation,' 161.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 67.

⁵¹ Alison, *A plaine confutation of a treatise of Brownisme*, 12-9.

⁵² Barrow did not confuse the invisible church with the visible. He clearly distinguished between the two in his writings. Barrow wrote, 'We acknowledg his universall church and kingdome to extend to all such as by a true faith apprehend and confesse Christ, howsoever they be scattered, or wheresoever dispersed upon the face of the earth.' He also explained, 'This church as it is universallie understood, conteyneth in it all the elect of God that have bin, are, or shalbe.' Barrow, 'A Brief Summe of the Causes,' 122-3; Barrow, 'A True Description out of the Worde of God,' 214.

⁵³ The point being debated was the referent of the 'field' in the parable. For some the field represented the church where both wheat and tares (elect and non-elect) would grow together. The separation of the elect from the non-elect would happen at the end of the age. For Barrow, the field referred to the world and not the church. Separation of the wheat and tares happened when the church accepted individuals into or rejected them from church membership. Barrow, 'Brief Discoverie,' 295.

⁵⁴ Alison, *A plaine confutation of a treatise of Brownisme*, 12-3.

prevented from entering or removed as long as undiscovered and, therefore, would continue in the visible church. In his argument that the Church of England remained in known sin Barrow was not arguing for a visible church free from all sin, but a church that fought against sin as part of the kingly office. By continuing in known sin, the Church of England was denying Christ's kingly office.

The Church of England did claim Christ as king, yet Barrow maintained that they refused to have Christ to reign over them:

These husbandmen are they that caste the Sonne and heyre out of the vineyarde, that wil not have him reigne over them, but take the regiment into their owne hands, devising and erecting a newe forme of governement unto the Church, as these their popish Courtes, Cannons, Customes, Officers declare, and persecuting with al hostility and tyranny all such as pleade for *Christes* governement, and wil not subject their bodies and soules unto their Antichristian yoke.⁵⁵

As already discussed, the government established within the Church of England was not the government that Christ commanded in his word. Barrow questioned, 'How can Christ be said to stand a king and Lord unto them that breake and reject his lawes, and set up in stead thereof their owne devises and inventions'?'⁵⁶ For Barrow, their claims were incongruous.

George Gifford contended that Christ's kingdom was chiefly inward and spiritual and because of this he argued that open sin in the visible church did not nullify Christ's reign.⁵⁷ Gifford agreed with Barrow that the visible church should obey Christ's laws and fight against sin outwardly. Even so, Gifford believed that the visible church was still in some bondage to sin: 'It standeth cleere by the scriptures, that the Church in her perfectest repentance, even with all her children, is held in

⁵⁵ Barrow, 'Plaine Refutation,' 114.

⁵⁶ Barrow, 'Brief Discoverie,' 305.

⁵⁷ Gifford, *A short treatise*, 90-1. *ibid.*, 87.

some spirituall bondage unto sin, but yet she is not obstinat I grant, for she hateth the evil she doth & laboureth against it.' This outward bondage of sin meant that Antichrist was sitting in the true visible church according to Gifford.⁵⁸ Again, as the true church was chiefly inward and spiritual, in Gifford's view, Antichrist sitting in the church did not make it a false church; Christ was not cast out, divided, or subject to Antichrist.⁵⁹

Barrow agreed that the true church was spiritual but in his view it was also outward and physical as well. He charged his opponents with hypocrisy: 'You make it only inward, and use Christ as one of the phisitions' planitarie signes, assigning to him in hipocrisie your heart and soule to rule, whilst in the meane time you yield your bodies and whole assemblies to the obedience and rule of antichrist.' and, 'thinking ... Christ's kingdome so inward and spirituall as that he requireth no bodily or outward obedience.'⁶⁰ Barrow rejected the distinction between Christ's inward spiritual reign and his outward physical reign:

Now as for this inward government & sanctification they speake of, where Christ reigneth in their hearts by the power of his Spirit &c. I say that the Spirit of God may not & cannot be severed from the word of God. They that openly & willingly breake the least of Gods lawes, boast of a false gift when they speake of their inward sanctification. Christ doth not reigne in the heart of anie that wil not submit all their outward actions to be ruled by him also. Christ will have the whole man both bodie & soule to serve him: he parteth not with Antichrist or Beliall.⁶¹

According to Barrow, the visible church was both the spiritual and physical manifestation of Christ's offices.

⁵⁸ George Gifford, *A short reply* (London, 1591), 55ff.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 56.

⁶⁰ Barrow, 'A Brief Summe of the Causes,' 121.

⁶¹ Barrow, 'Brief Discoverie,' 570.

Christ as king of the visible church meant that the true visible church was free from the bondage of sin according to Barrow. As Barrow put it, 'if wee be in bondage to sinne, then are we not Kinges and Priestes unto God.'⁶² According to Barrow, the true visible church of Christ could not be under bondage to sin without denying Christ's offices. Barrow took offence at Gifford's understanding: 'Yet procedeth this graceles man furder, and is not afraide to affirme, that the church and everie member therof is in some spiritual bondage to sinne, and draweth an argument from this position, that therefore much more may it be in some outward bondage to Antichrist.'⁶³ For Barrow, if Antichrist sat in the true church then Christ was not its prophet, priest, and king:

If Antichrist may be said to sitt, reigne, and remaine in the church of God, the Christ is not made heire and Lorde of all, and set as Kinge upon Mount Sion. Then Christ is either cast out of his house, or made subject unto Antichrist, or divideth with him. ... Then Christ is not the onlie head of the church. ... If Antichriste's doctrines and lawes may be brought, set up, and remaine in the church, then Christ is not the onlie prophet and lawe-giver.⁶⁴

Barrow agreed that Antichrist reigned in the Church of England but not in a true visible church. Christ was prophet, priest, and king in a true visible church. For Barrow the government that Christ commanded in his word was a visible manifestation of Christ's kingdom on earth. In rejecting Christ's outward government, the Church of England had denied Christ his kingly office.

⁶² Barrow, 'Plaine Refutation,' 301.

⁶³ Alison agreed with Gifford, 'In the visible church of God there will be tares, yea untill the harvest: chaffe among the wheat, goates among the sheepe, hypocrites among the true professors: nay to go further, Antichrist for a time sitting in the temple of God, and other monstrous men abiding in the church, turning the grace of God into wantonnesse.' *ibid.*, 300-1; Alison, *A plaine confutation of a treatise of Brownisme*, 12-3.

⁶⁴ Barrow, 'Plaine Refutation,' 127.

3. Participation in the offices of Christ

Barrow accused the Church of England of denying Christ's prophetic, priestly, and kingly offices. More significantly (for this research), he accused the Church of England of preventing the whole membership of the church from fulfilling their obligations as prophets, priests, and kings. Barrow's most distinct usage of the doctrine of the offices of Christ is found in his discussions of what Christ was doing through the elect; that is, the participation in Christ's offices by the members of the true visible church. As already noted, Barrow distinguished between what Christ had done for the elect and what he 'doth in his elect.' In fact, it was the Church of England's neglect of what Christ was doing in the elect that Barrow maintained as their 'error and deceit.' He alleged, '[there is] not one worde spoken what he doth in his elect.'⁶⁵

The participation of the elect with Christ in his offices informed Barrow's understanding of the true visible church. If Barrow had more confidence in Christians to participate in the public affairs of the visible church than did the proponents of the Church of England, the reason is likely to be found in his understanding of the people of God. Christ made the elect to be kings, priests, and prophets with him. If the offices of Christ were the basis of Christ's activity within the church, then according to Barrow's thinking, the believer's participation in those offices was the basis for each member's interest and involvement in the church's affairs both public and private. As Barrow explained of the Church of England, 'their

⁶⁵ Barrow, 'Brief Discoverie,' 509.

people are blind, ignorant, seditious, headstrong,' but the same was not true of the members of Christ's visible church.⁶⁶

1. True members of a true visible church

The false membership of the Church of England meant that its members did not participate in Christ's offices. Christ did not make the members of the Church of England to be prophets, priests, and kings and he did not exercise his offices through them.⁶⁷ Barrow had argued that wicked and profane individuals were being accepted into and retained in the Church of England. Barrow's opponents did not dispute this charge.⁶⁸ To the contrary, their interpretation of the wheat and tares parable in Matthew 13 meant that they were to tolerate sinners within the church until the end of the age and the final judgment of God. However for Barrow, this criticism was not just an assessment of the sinfulness of the people within the Church of England. He was also concerned that the members of the false church did not 'have fellowship with Christ and his members.'⁶⁹ Barrow described the situation: 'All without exception or respect of person are received into, and nourished in the bosome of this church, with the word and sacraments. None are here refused, none kept out. ... This is their communion of saintes, their holy fellowship.'⁷⁰ All the people of the nation were considered to be members of the established church.

Given Barrow's understanding of the visible church as those who were in communion with Christ (or at least appeared to be in communion) there was a

⁶⁶ Ibid., 522.

⁶⁷ For those Christ does make prophets, priests, and kings, he 'exerciseth the offices here in his church amongst his servantes the saints.' *ibid.*, 509.

⁶⁸ Gifford, *A short treatise*, 47.

⁶⁹ Barrow, 'Plaine Refutation,' 179.

⁷⁰ Barrow, 'Brief Discoverie,' 281-2.

fundamental difference in the nature of the visible church itself between the true church and the false church. Barrow criticized the view that ‘where a christian prince is, which maintaineth the gospel, and the whole land or estate not resisting this commandment, reverencth the word and sacramentes, there the whole multitude of such a land or state, are without doubt to be esteemed and judged a true church.’⁷¹ He complained that, ‘All this people, with all these manners, were in one daye, with the blast of Q. Elizabeths trumpet, of ignorant papistes and grosse idolaters, made faithfull Christianes, & true professors.’⁷² According to Barrow, ‘no prince or mortal man can make any a member of the true church.’⁷³ While Barrow accepted that the prince could compel the gospel to be heard by all in the land, the prince could not make anyone a Christian.⁷⁴ Only Christ could make one a member of the true visible church.

For Barrow, the true visible church was solely the work of Christ. Not even the elect had the power to make someone a member. They only had the power to recognize whether Christ had already made the individual a member of the true church or not. Nor was it the exclusive practice of the leadership to accept into membership.⁷⁵ Every member was responsible to participate in recognising those whom Christ had chosen and those whom he had not. Barrow explained,

To chuse or to refuse, to cal or harden; that the eternal and almightie ruler of heaven and earth keepeth in his owne hands, and giveth not this power unto any other. This also we know, that whome the Lord hath before al wordes chosen, them he wil in his due time and meanes cal by his word, and whome he calleth, them he seaeth with this seale, to depart from iniquitie, to beleve and lay hold of Christ Jesus as

⁷¹ Ibid., 286.

⁷² Ibid., 283.

⁷³ Ibid., 288.

⁷⁴ Barrow, 'Plaine Refutation,' 40.

⁷⁵ Barrow, 'Brief Discoverie,' 520-1.

their alone saviour, to honour and obey him as their annointed King, Priest, & Prophet, to submit themselves unto him in all thinges, to be reformed, corrected, governed, & directed by his most holy word, vowing their faithful obedience unto the same, as it shalbe revealed unto them.⁷⁶

Those in a true visible church had communion with Christ and with the members of his body. They participated in Christ's offices in that he made them prophets, priests, and kings. Those outside a true church did not have communion with Christ nor did they participate in his offices.

As the civil magistrate could not create a true visible church neither could such a church so constituted seal the true covenant. Barrow and his opponents believed that the sacrament of baptism was the seal of the covenant that signified a person's entry into relationship with Christ and his body. Further, as every member became united to Christ, so were they united to each other. The lord's supper was a seal of the covenant that signified this communion with Christ and with his body.⁷⁷ For Barrow, the sacraments were relational; signs of the relationship that already existed between the believer and Christ.⁷⁸ Barrow had argued that the sacraments performed by the Church of England (as well as the Roman Church) were false sacraments.⁷⁹ Similarly, ordination performed by a false church was a false ordination and produced a false ministry. How then, could a false church and false

⁷⁶ Ibid., 288.

⁷⁷ Barrow, 'Plaine Refutation,' 152.

⁷⁸ Barrow, 'Brief Discoverie,' 281.

⁷⁹ Barrow's charge that the sacraments of the Church of England were false led to the separatists being accused of Donatism. Both George Gifford and Robert Some charged the separatists with this heresy. As Leland Carlson points out, 'Dr. Some's attitude is that of the medieval church. The office and its incumbent are independent of each other. An ignorant or wicked priest may administer the sacrament, and those who receive the sacrament are not perverted or polluted. Augustine and the Donatists fought over similar issues.' Barrow, *The Writings of Henry Barrow, 1587-1590*, 155. Even so, for Barrow, the issue was not one of the wickedness of the minister. The sacraments were not an act that communicated grace, but were seals of the covenant between God and his elect. They were signs of the communion the believer had with Christ and their fellow members of Christ's body. The sacraments could not be a true seal of a false covenant. See chapter 4 *infra*.

ministers bring one into communion with the true Christ and with his true members?⁸⁰ How could such sacraments seal the true covenant? If the Church of England could not bring one into communion with Christ and his body, its members could not participate in Christ's offices nor serve him as prophets, priests, and kings.

Defending the Church of England, George Gifford argued that Christ was active within it. He pointed out that the Church of England fought sin, worshiped God, and advanced Christ's kingdom. Therefore, God must have blessed it with the ability to do these things. Unsurprisingly, Barrow rejected Gifford's claims:

They build not upon but destroye the house of God, the bodie of Christ. This their worcke, the present estate of their Church witnesseth to their face, and sheweth what maner of worckmen they are: where we finde not one pinne, nayle, or hooke in due order and proportion according to the true paterne. They feed not the Lordes sheepe but the Lordes goates, and that not with wholesome foode, with sincere milke, that they might growe and be encreased therby, as the generall sinne, prophannes, and ignorance of al estates both Priestes and people declare. Neither guide they in the way of godlines, but in the wayes of destruction and calamitie. They have al declined & bene made together unprofitable.⁸¹

If, as Barrow argued, the Church of England was not properly constructed, did not edify its members, did not produce a godly life, and did not advance Christ's kingdom, then God had not blessed the Church of England nor empowered them to serve him. Only the church that belonged to Christ could claim God's favour. The false church belonged to Antichrist. 'The holie Ghost hath taught us to call you his servants to whome you obey: So we finding you under the obedience of Antichrist, cannot compt you the servants of Christ; unlesse you can prove that you can serve

⁸⁰ Barrow did not deny that God might save individuals within the Church of England or within the Roman church. True Christians within did not make them a true church nor could a false church expect God to use them to build his kingdom. See chapter 4 *infra*.

⁸¹ Barrow, 'Plaine Refutation,' 272.

two contrarie Maisters faithfullie at once.’⁸² Those serving Antichrist in the Church of England could not be prophets, priests, and kings serving Christ in Barrow’s view.

Barrow did not deny that there might be true Christians within the Church of England.⁸³ God was able to save even in a false church. Even so, as far as Barrow was concerned, any true Christians who remained within a false church were held in bondage and called by God to come out from such a wicked and corrupt body.⁸⁴ Barrow pointed out that there was no sure promise for those who remained in a sinful church after discovering its corruption. While God only held the elect accountable for what they understood, in Barrow’s words, ‘so far as shalbe revealed unto them,’ he would not overlook obstinate sin.⁸⁵ As already observed, Barrow believed that no true Christian would remain in sin once they became aware of it. Those who chose to remain in the corrupt Church of England were on very precarious ground. They could not have communion with Christ and his body while in such a state. So while there could be elect in the Church of England, they were not prophets, priests, and kings unto God.

In contrast to the Church of England, membership in the true visible church was not open to all in the land. Barrow explained, ‘We hold, that only such as voluntarily make a true profession of faith, and vowe of their obedience, and as in the same faith and obedience seek the communion and fellowship of the faithful, are to be receaved as members into the church.’⁸⁶ By excluding some from the true visible church, Barrow was not trying to make the visible church identical with the invisible

⁸² Barrow, 'A Brief Summe of the Causes,' 145.

⁸³ Barrow, 'Plaine Refutation,' 274-5.

⁸⁴ Barrow, 'Brief Discoverie,' 306.

⁸⁵ Ibid.

⁸⁶ Barrow, 'Plaine Refutation,' 110.

church, or even to make it as close as possible. The issue once again was known sin. While Barrow and his opponents both claimed that the visible church was the body of Christ, for Barrow no known sin or unbelieving person could be united to Christ's body. The true visible church was a gathering of those who had already been united with Christ. The visible church in Barrow's thinking, then, was the result of grace, not an institution that distributed grace. It came about after justification for the purpose of sanctification.

An exclusive membership was not solely the result of restricting entry into the church. Those within the church were kept pure through discipline. Discipline has been an oft-cited theme to define separatist ecclesiology.⁸⁷ As has already been discussed, Barrow's view left no room for a continuation of known sin within the church. This concern over sin in the visible church led Richard Alison to argue that the purity of the visible church was the *essence* of Barrow's understanding of the true visible church. In response to Barrow's description of the true visible church Alison wrote,

The matter whereof this church is framed, is a companie of people which is faithfull, etc. The Authors meaning is expressed more plainely in the arguments used against the church of England, Argument.6. The church of Christ is sanctified and made glorious, without spot or wrinkle, or grosse pollution, Againe, Argument.8. The people shalbe all righteous. Againe, One wicked man disanulleth the covenant unto all. And in the latter end of this booke it is concluded, that in this visible church is no uncleane person.⁸⁸

Contrary to Alison's charge, Barrow believed that there could be hidden sin in the church, and, therefore, the visible church would never be truly pure. While Alison

⁸⁷ Brachlow, *Communion of Saints*, 8-9; Coker, 'Cast out from among the Saints,' 4; George, *John Robinson*, 28, 99-100; Gurney, 'Education', 61.

⁸⁸ Alison, *A plaine confutation of a treatise of Brownisme*, 12.

acknowledged Barrow's 'exception' of hidden sin he concluded that 'they do confesse that there may be pollutions in the manners of men being secret, which they leave to God: but if they be such spots and wrinkles, as declare the church not to be glorious, then no apparant church.'⁸⁹ Barrow understood that true members could sin which should then lead to repentance. Participation in Christ's offices enabled the elect to be faithful though not perfect.

Discipline, or rather excommunication, served the purpose of purifying the church of sin once it had been discovered. Even so, excommunication was the final resort for those who refused to repent of their sin. The goal of discipline was not to remove the member from the body, but instead to encourage repentance.⁹⁰ Only for those who refused to repent was excommunication the appropriate action to be taken by the church. While the subject of discipline received much attention in Barrow's debates, it was a means rather than an end within his ecclesiology. Discipline was one aspect of the exercise of Christ's kingly office and was one part of the fight against sin. To ignore sin once discovered was to deny Christ's kingly office whether in one's life or the church. Discipline itself was not the *sine qua non* in Barrow's ecclesiology. Rather, Barrow believed it was the only proper response to sin in the visible church.

The connection of faith and obedience was not unique to Barrow.⁹¹ For Barrow, though, obedience was related to Christ's offices: 'How can Christ be said to

⁸⁹ Ibid., 14.

⁹⁰ Barrow wrote, 'The church is not to holde him as an enimie, but to admonish him and praye for him as a brother, proving if at anie time the Lorde will give him repentaunce.' Barrow, 'A True Description out of the Worde of God,' 221; Barrow, 'Plaine Refutation,' 205-6.

⁹¹ J. William Black, 'From Martin Bucer to Richard Baxter: "Discipline" and Reformation in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century England,' *Church History* 70, no. 4 (2001), 647; William Bradshaw, *A treatise of Justification* (London, 1615), 88-9; Jerald C. Brauer, 'Types of Puritan Piety,' *Church History* 56, no. 1 (1987), 47; John Von Rohr, *The covenant of grace in Puritan thought*, AAR

stand a king and Lord unto them that breake and reject his lawes'?⁹² He had pointed out numerous times that to claim Christ as king one had to be willing to obey his laws. He had stated this in his description of the true members of Christ's church: 'We hold, that only such as voluntarily make a true profession of faith, and vowe of their obedience, and as in the same faith and obedience seek the communion and fellowship of the faithful, are to be received as members into the church,' and when describing himself and those with him, 'we are as we professe to be, simple hearted Christians, which seek to worship and obey Christ as our only king, priest, and prophet.'⁹³ As Barrow had pointed out, each of Christ's offices required obedience. While all sin was capable of separating someone from Christ, only the wilful and obstinate refusal to repent would bring about such a separation.

For those who chose to remain in their sin Barrow offered little hope: 'How can Christ be said a saviour unto them that despise his grace and mercie offered, refuse to repent and turne from their evil waies? They then not being under Christe's protection, nor in state of grace, while they continue obstinate in their sinne.'⁹⁴ Barrow limited his assessment to what could be seen and not according to God's understanding of the person's heart: 'It becometh not us to give anie such finall judgment of matters not knowen unto us. Yet this wee may by warrant of the whole Scripture saie, that the wais of the false churche and ministrie are the wais of death, and have no promise of salvation.'⁹⁵ The person who chose to remain in known sin was no longer in a state of grace. Barrow believed 'the godly may sinne of ignorance,

studies in religion (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986), 5-6; Theodore Dwight Bozeman, 'Federal Theology and the "national covenant": an Elizabethan Presbyterian case study,' *Church History* 61, no. 4 (1992), 396-7.

⁹² Barrow, 'Brief Discoverie,' 305.

⁹³ Barrow, 'Plaine Refutation,' 110; Barrow, 'A Brief Summe of the Causes,' 125.

⁹⁴ Barrow, 'Brief Discoverie,' 305.

⁹⁵ Barrow, 'Plaine Refutation,' 274.

of negligence, of fraylety, yet not therupon untill obstinacie be added unto sinne, cease to be Christians.’⁹⁶ He never explained if or how the elect could lose their justification before God, and it is unlikely that he believed they could. Interestingly, his opponents never challenged him on this point. To all appearances, a truly elect and justified person could fall out of grace and yet still be justified before God and among the elect. Barrow’s understanding was from a human perspective, someone could ‘appear’ not to be a Christian and yet in God’s perfect knowledge truly be one of the elect. Of course, such a person did stand in a very precarious position. Barrow made it clear that such a person stood under the threat of God’s discipline and certainly may not be among the elect at all. Still, he never described them as finally condemned.⁹⁷

Assurance of one’s salvation was not a topic Barrow discussed except to say that those who remained within the Church of England could have no assurance for their soul. For Barrow, personal obedience was not evidence of salvation alone. Assurance of salvation came with separation from the false church and joining with the true visible church. Persecution by the civil authorities and the antichristian Church of England was not proof of error but rather proof of salvation. Barrow drew upon the mistreatment of Christ at the hands of the authorities and then stated, ‘We looke for no better usage at your hands; the servant is neither greater nor better than his maister.’⁹⁸ Obedience was neither a necessary test for membership nor a means of personal assurance. It was, rather, the appropriate response for one who claimed Christ as prophet, priest, and king.

⁹⁶ Ibid., 323.

⁹⁷ Barrow did not provide much detail on his views of soteriology and security. However, for the argument here, it is not necessary to explore Barrow’s views any further.

⁹⁸ Barrow, 'A Brief Summe of the Causes,' 141.

Still, Barrow's emphasis on obedience by the members of the true visible church led Gifford to accuse him of making the covenant of grace a covenant of works. Barrow had argued that 'obstinate & presumptuous transgression breaketh the covenant.'⁹⁹ This, from Gifford's perspective, made the covenant of grace dependent upon works: 'Whosoever maketh the stableness of Gods covenant towards his people, and with his Church, to depend upon the works of men, he maintaineth flat heresie.'¹⁰⁰ Barrow denied the accusation and stated his belief that the covenant is solely based upon God's mercy and grace.¹⁰¹ Once again Barrow maintained the distinction between what Christ had done for the elect and what he (through the Holy Spirit) was doing in the elect: 'Is Mr. Giffard a teacher of the Church of England, and cannot yet put difference betwixt the worcke of our salvation by Christ for us, and the worke of God's Holy Spirit, the fruicts of God's grace in us?'¹⁰² Based on this distinction Barrow questioned what response the elect owe to God: 'As though the Lord plighteth his love to us, and requireth not agayne our faith and obedience unto him in the same covenant?'¹⁰³ He continued, 'Every on[e] takethe howld of the covenants of God unto them, but no man remembreth his covenant to the Lord.'¹⁰⁴ For Barrow obedience was the proper response for the elect; the elect owed obedience back to God.¹⁰⁵

⁹⁹ Barrow, 'Brief Discoverie,' 310.

¹⁰⁰ Gifford, *A short treatise*, 65.

¹⁰¹ Barrow, 'Plaine Refutation,' 162-3.

¹⁰² *Ibid.*, 165.

¹⁰³ *Ibid.*, 117.

¹⁰⁴ Barrow, 'A Pastoral Letter from Prison,' 110.

¹⁰⁵ Barrow seems to be distinguishing between justification that was understood to be monergistic and sanctification that was seen as synergistic.

2. Every member's interest in the work of Christ

Barrow pointed out that each and every member of a true visible church had 'power ... in the church, and in the publike actions of the church.'¹⁰⁶ The true visible church was a community of those chosen by Christ and engrafted into him by the Spirit of God. As a result of this work of the Spirit, every true Christian in a true visible church was in communion with Christ and with every other member of Christ's body. Through union with Christ, every member participated in Christ's offices, and Christ exercised his offices through every member. Union with Christ meant that every member had an obligation to serve him in the church: 'Nowe this power which Christ hath given unto his Church, and to everie member of his Church, to keepe it in order, hee hath not left it to their discretions and lustes to be used or neglected as they will.'¹⁰⁷ Participating in Christ's offices meant that every member of the true visible church had been made prophets, priests, and kings. Barrow explained, 'The people of Christ ... to them and everie one of them he hath given his holy sanctifyng Spirit, to open unto them and to lead them into al truth: to them he hath given his Sonne to be ther King, Priest and Prophet, who hath made them unto him Kings & Priests.'¹⁰⁸ This meant, according to Barrow, 'Christ hath given ful power and libertie to all and everie one of his servantes, to put in practise whatsoever he commandeth.'¹⁰⁹ Not only had the Church of England denied Christ his offices,

¹⁰⁶ Barrow, 'Brief Discoverie,' 319.

¹⁰⁷ Barrow, 'A True Description out of the Worde of God,' 220-1.

¹⁰⁸ Barrow, 'Brief Discoverie,' 522.

¹⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, 511.

but they had failed to teach how Christ worked through the elect. They denied every member the liberty to be prophets, priests, and kings in the visible church.¹¹⁰

Barrow charged the bishops of the Church of England with hindering Christ's servants. He argued, 'Christe's servantes are kept in servitude from the free practise of his word.'¹¹¹ He continued, 'Bondage is the badge of Antichrist ... wherby his souldiours are discerned from the souldiors of Christ; and the children of mount Sina from the children of Hierusalem which is above & free, ... for whome our Capitaine Christ hath purchased a full & a perfect libertie at a deare & precious price.'¹¹²

Liberty and bondage were frequent terms Barrow used to discuss the freedom of believers to serve Christ through the exercise of Christ's offices, and the oppression of the bishops who denied true believers that freedom. Christ empowered the elect for service through participation in his offices. According to Barrow, the leaders of the church 'were appointed for the preservation of the order of the church, and not for the subvertion therof: for the defence of the libertie of the least, and not to plucke

¹¹⁰ John Coolidge has argued for a different understanding of liberty among puritans. He notes, 'As the Conformist understands it, Christian liberty derives from the autonomy of doctrine. It can be summed up by the adage "Thought is free."' In contrast, 'The Puritan thinks of Christian liberty less as a permission than as a command. To do "any of those things which God hath not commanded" would be, not an assertion, but a violation of Christian liberty.' Coolidge argues the puritan view of liberty as freedom from practices that violate the conscience. He comments, 'Thus Christian liberty is not simply a release; rather, it is an active engagement in a struggle like that of organic life to resist dissolution. The exercise of Christian liberty is subject to constraints analogous to those by which life is conditioned on pain of ceasing to be.' For Barrow and as will be seen in the next chapter concerning Ainsworth, liberty is viewed more as a freedom to serve Christ. While the distinction is subtle, it is important in understanding the separatist argument. The difference can be seen in 'freedom from' compared to 'freedom to.' It was not enough to be free from popish ceremonies if Christ's members were not free to serve him as he commanded. On the different views of liberty note also Margaret Sommerville, 'The insistence by the Independents that an "indifferent" area was one where God had left man a positive freedom that could not legitimately be infringed, was a response to and repudiation of the bishops' use of "indifferent" to signify an area in which it was possible for men to make laws because God had not specifically commanded actions that must be performed or eschewed.' See Coolidge, *Pauline Renaissance*, 25-6, 39-40; Margaret Ruth Sommerville, 'Independent thought, 1603-1649' (PhD Thesis, University of Cambridge, 1982), 10 note 22.

¹¹¹ Barrow, 'Brief Discoverie,' 276.

¹¹² Barrow, 'Plaine Refutation,' 17.

away the libertie of all.’¹¹³ Barrow wrote, ‘You shall find this gospell they prech no gospell of lybertie and power, but a gospell framed to the pollysies of the times, and wrested to uphould and serve this haynous idolatrie they use and stand under, and this Antichristian government of their bishops and their officers.’¹¹⁴ Not only did the Church of England deny Christ his offices, they also hindered his servants from exercising those offices.

The members of Christ’s visible church were servants of Christ. Barrow put forward three duties of Christ’s servants.¹¹⁵ First, as kings, they were to fight all sin and error both within themselves and in the world around them. As Barrow explained, ‘These perticular dueties and chardges dulle considered, there can be no doubt but everie Christian is a king and priest unto God to spie out, censure, and cut downe sinne as it ariseth, with that two-edged sworde that proceedeth out of Christ’s mouth.’¹¹⁶ Second, as priests they were to worship God according to the commands of Christ: ‘Priestes he maketh them, in that he annointeth them with his owne holy spirit, wherby they both offer up their praiers & praises through him unto God, & their owne bodies & soules as living sacrifices unto him daily; which is their reasonable serving of God.’¹¹⁷ Finally, as prophets, they were to witness to Christ and to the gospel message thus advancing his kingdom: ‘Prophets he maketh them, in that he revealeth his truth unto them, & commandeth them to witsesse it & spread it forth in all places to his glorie.’¹¹⁸ Christ was presently active in every true visible church both in and through his members. Barrow explained, Christ ‘exerciseth the

¹¹³ Ibid., 143.

¹¹⁴ Barrow, ‘Four Causes of Separation,’ 60.

¹¹⁵ Barrow, ‘Brief Discoverie,’ 509.

¹¹⁶ Barrow, ‘Plaine Refutation,’ 139-40.

¹¹⁷ Barrow, ‘Brief Discoverie,’ 510.

¹¹⁸ Ibid.

offices here in his church amongst his servantes the saints ... and maketh all his children kings, priests, and prophets.’¹¹⁹

A congregational form of polity was what Christ commanded, in Barrow’s understanding. It was also the most logical form of government given Barrow’s understanding of the true visible church in which every member had an equal interest and obligation in the church’s affairs both public and private. Stephen Brachlow has suggested that assurance may be part of the reason for lay involvement in congregational polity. According to Brachlow, congregational polity provided additional opportunities for good works by the laity. With the stress on obedience as a sign of election and thus assurance, Brachlow writes, ‘congregational activism ... would have ensured that opportunities were available for each ... soul within the church to make his or her calling and election more sure.’¹²⁰ If, as has been argued, Barrow’s focus on obedience was not for soteriological assurance, then Brachlow’s suggestion may not capture the essential reason for congregational polity in separatist thought. Rather, given Barrow’s view of participation by every member in the offices of Christ, every member had a like interest and duty in the affairs of the church. Christ exercised his offices through his members as prophets, priests, and kings. Barrow argued for the liberty of each member of Christ’s visible church to practice what Christ had commanded. Congregational polity allowed every member just such freedom.

The congregational polity that Barrow argued for was not without an ordered ministry, however. Barrow explained the purpose of each of the offices that Christ had provided for his church in *A True Description out of the Worde of God, of the*

¹¹⁹ Ibid., 509.

¹²⁰ Brachlow, *Communion of Saints*, 122.

Visible Church. According to Barrow, Christ gave four offices to the church, pastor, doctor, elders, and deacons.¹²¹ Those who were to hold these offices were to be elected by the congregation as ‘everie one of the people [hath] interest in the election and ordination of their officers.’¹²² The participation of every member was in accordance with his view of the relationship between the officers and the non-ordained members. He maintained, ‘Elders were appointed for the preservation of the order of the church,’ ‘not to plucke away the power and liberty of the whole church, or to translate and assume the publicke actions of the whole church into their owne handes alone.’¹²³ Barrow rejected the distinction between clergy and laity. He argued that those who held office were members of the same body with those who did not and, therefore, the officers were no different from other members.¹²⁴

The function of the officers of the church may have distinguished their role from the non-ordained members, but it did not divide them. There was both equality and diversity as Barrow explained,

There is no division in the bodie, neither anie thing donne according to the will of man, but according to the will of God only, all have received of and being guided by one and the same spirit, even as God is one, and Christ not yea and naye. Now though all the members have received of this spirit of God, yet have not all received in like measure. Though all the bodie be light, yet is not all the bodie an eye. But God that hath made the bodie to consist of divers members, hath distributed divers giftes in divers measure unto them.¹²⁵

While every member had an interest and obligation in the public affairs of the visible church, in Barrow’s view, there were differences.

¹²¹ Barrow, ‘A True Description out of the Worde of God,’ 216ff.

¹²² *Ibid.*, 216.

¹²³ Barrow, ‘Plaine Refutation,’ 143, 146.

¹²⁴ Barrow, ‘Brief Discoverie,’ 658-9. See also White, *English Separatist Tradition*, 79. Barrow was not unique in this view. See Leonard J. Trinterud, ‘The origins of Puritanism,’ *Church History* 20, no. 1 (1951), 39; Avis, *The Church*, 89.

¹²⁵ Barrow, ‘Plaine Refutation,’ 146.

Whatever distinguished the officers of the church from the non-ordained members the distinction did not make them any less prone to error or sin. Therefore, the officers were equally subject to judgment:

They [the officers] are men and may erre. They themselves even for al their doctrines and actions are subject to the censure of the church, or of the least members of the church, if in any thing they be founde to erre or transgresse. Yea, if they remaine obstinate, that congregation wherof they remaine ministers and members is to procede against them and to excommunicate them as any other member. For (as it hath bene said) the judgements of the church are not the judgements of men but of God, to which al the members of the church must alike be subject.¹²⁶

The people were commanded to obey their leaders in so much as they remained true to Christ according to Barrow. Officers could make mistakes and sin. The people of the congregation were responsible to fight sin in the leaders as much as in themselves and in each other.

This judgment of the officers was the responsibility of the whole congregation, each and every member as all the members of the body were made prophets, priests, and kings, not just the officers. When their leaders abandoned Christ, it was the charge of the congregation to discipline them. Every member had been given the same right and responsibility to judge sin. It was given ‘to the whole church ... and to everie member therof, and hath like power to binde or to loose in the mouth of the least, as in the mouth of the greatest.’¹²⁷ The congregation was not just free to discipline the offending officer if they desired. In Barrow’s view, they were obligated to do so. Liberty of the congregation to practice Christ’s commands, then, was not a privilege but a duty. To fail to excommunicate someone was to fail to

¹²⁶ Ibid.

¹²⁷ Ibid., 141.

fulfil Christ's kingly office in which every member participated. Participating in Christ's offices meant that every member was responsible for the church's public affairs. Barrow wrote, 'Everie member hath like interest in Christ, in his word, the publike doctrine, and ministration of the church, and shall all be held guiltie and punished for the publike transgressions and abuses of the church.'¹²⁸

For Barrow, the authority to bind and loose sin did not belong to the leaders alone, but to every member.¹²⁹ Barrow challenged the limitation of discipline to the officers. Limiting the role of forgiving sin and discipline to the ministerial order was more common to the period. The puritan and academic William Perkins explained that those not in the ministerial order 'ordinarily ... have not the power to pronounce the sentence of binding or loosing upon any man.' In exceptional circumstances, a layperson may perform these duties but on those occasions God makes that one a minister temporarily according to Perkins. Only a properly called minister, or exceptionally, a temporary minister could loose or bind sin.¹³⁰ The bishop of Derry George Downname added, 'Our Saviour Christ ... to his stewards hath committed keies,' and 'the Ministers, having the keyes of the kingdome of heaven, have power to bind and loose the soules of men, and to deliver the obstinate to Satan.'¹³¹

¹²⁸ Barrow, 'Brief Discoverie,' 520-1.

¹²⁹ Barrow, 'A True Description out of the Worde of God,' 220-1.

¹³⁰ Perkins wrote, 'I confess, in times or places, where no minister can bee had, God blesseth the labors of private men, that have knowledge, sometimes even for comforting him at the houre of death, and gives a virtue and power to that sentence which they shall pronounce one upon anothers repentance: but as this is extraordinarie, and in the want of ordinary ministers, so in that case a private man of knowledge & godlines, is made a Minister for that time to himself, or to another.' William Perkins and William Crashaw, *Of the calling of the ministerie* (London, 1605), 12. Regarding Williams Perkins see Michael Jinkins, 'Perkins, William (1558–1602),' in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed., ed. Lawrence Goldman, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/21973> (accessed 28 Oct 2013).

¹³¹ George Downname, *Two sermons* (London, 1608), 38, 39. On George Downname see Kenneth Gibson, 'Downham, George (d. 1634),' in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed., ed. Lawrence Goldman, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/7977> (accessed 3 Sept 2012).

According to Barrow, however, the word of God was given to every member and, therefore, every member was responsible to loose and bind: ‘Is not al this binding and loosing donne by the worde of God, and not by anie power or excellencye of man? Hath not the worde of God the like power and effect against sinne in the mouth of the least of God's servants, as in the mouth of the greatest’?¹³² No minister of the church held more power in this matter than any other member according to Barrow. He asked, ‘Hath the greatest minister of the church any more power to retaine or loose the sinne of the least member, than the said member hath to bind or loose his [the minister's] sinne’?¹³³ The equality of every member of the church meant that all had the power and obligation to judge.

In a similar vein, the whole congregation was responsible to consider the doctrine being taught, whether delivered by the officers or lay prophets.¹³⁴ For Barrow, every member was to try the teaching and to reject that which was unsound. It was the responsibility of every member to ensure sound doctrine. Barrow argued,

Everie christian congregation hath power in themselves, and of duty ought presently and publikly to censure any false or unsound doctrine that is publikly delivered or maintained amongst them, if it be knowen and discerned unto them; yea, anie one member in the church hath this power, whatsoever he be, pastor or prophet, that uttereth it.¹³⁵

Barrow believed that because the people had stopped examining the doctrine being taught the church had strayed: ‘The people upon a superstitious reverence and preposterous estimation unto their teachers and elders, resigned up al into their handes: suffering them to alter and dispose of all thinges after their owne lustes,

¹³² Barrow, 'Plaine Refutation,' 80-1.

¹³³ Ibid., 80.

¹³⁴ Barrow argued that gifted men who did not hold a teaching office could still explain the word of God in the public service. Barrow, 'Brief Discoverie,' 531ff.

¹³⁵ Ibid., 519.

without inquirie or controlement.¹³⁶ Barrow lamented that because the people of God did not fulfil their responsibility the church had defected from the truth:

The whole land ... hath lien so long, and is so deeplie set in defection, sinne and securitie, where they are so universally departed from the strait waies of life and peace, and are so far wandred and straid in their owne bywaies which they have sought out unto themselves, as they have now utterly lost all knowledg of the true way, and have no will to returne: but though they be shewed the way, and willed to walke in it, yet even the best of them stop their eares, wink with their eies, and turne away the shoulder, least they should be converted and be healed.¹³⁷

Each congregation, independent of all others, and every member of the congregation was responsible to recognise false teaching.

4. Conclusion

Barrow believed he was a messenger from God calling the people back to their obligations as prophets, priests, and kings. His claim that Christ had not come in the flesh when Christ's offices were denied demonstrated the significance he attributed to this doctrine. Denying Christ's offices affected more than a debate over the strategy and timing of church reform. In fact, Barrow was not arguing for a reform of the national church at all.¹³⁸ The Church of England belonged to Antichrist and, therefore, was not a true church (albeit corrupt) needing further reform. The Church of England's 'obstinacy' regarding the four errors that Barrow had charged it with demonstrated (to Barrow at least) that it had denied Christ's offices. The Church

¹³⁶ Ibid., 273.

¹³⁷ Ibid., 263.

¹³⁸ Barrow held the Church of England to be a false church established by the state. As such there was nothing to be reformed. It was not a corrupt church that could be repaired. He wrote, 'We say not now that private men may reforme the false church, abolish publicke idolatrie, or depose a false ministrie that the kinge setteth upp.' Barrow, 'A Refutation of Mr. Giffard's Reasons,' 350-1.

of England then was a false church and therefore, the elect were to have no part in it. Barrow was urging the elect to come out of those churches that belonged to Antichrist and to join with Christ's visible church.

The doctrine of the offices of Christ was more than a polemical device for Barrow. His understanding of a true visible church was informed by his application of the offices of Christ. As Barrow explained, Christ's offices were both what Christ had done *for* the church as well as what he was still doing *in* the church. Christ was the only prophet, priest, and king of his visible church and he made all his members to be prophets, priests, and kings with him. Christ's visible church was one in which he exercised his offices *in* all of the elect and *through* all of the elect. Barrow had rejected the traditional Reformation marks of the church, namely, word and sacrament. Neither, however, were the offices of Christ marks of a true church or *notae ecclesiae*, for Barrow.¹³⁹ Barrow argued that such 'infallible signs' could not be found in scripture.¹⁴⁰ Still, the offices of Christ were essential to a true visible church. As Barrow observed, denying Christ his offices or hindering his servants from exercising their roles as prophets, priests, and kings was a denial of the incarnation. As the Church of England lacked Christ's offices, they lacked Christ. Christ was not present in the Church of England because he had not constituted it nor was he allowed to work within it. Christ was only present where he exercised his offices both *in* and *through* all of the elect.

¹³⁹ Barrow believed that the visible church must be considered against the whole word of God and not just certain characteristics. This point will be discussed in more detail in chapter 4 *infra*. See Barrow, 'A True Description out of the Worde of God,' 214; Barrow, 'Plaine Refutation,' 110; Barrow, 'A Brief Summe of the Causes,' 125.

¹⁴⁰ Barrow, 'Brief Discoverie,' 279.

Barrow's distinction between what Christ had done for the elect and what he was doing in and through the elect provides a crucial idea in his thinking. Christ's work had secured salvation for the elect. Christ's work was now sanctifying the members of his true visible church and calling his elect from the world to himself through his visible church, his body on earth. This work was Christ's offices of prophecy, priesthood, and kingship. Moreover, this work was the obligation of every member, to do what Christ commanded. All of the elect were to exercise their obligations as prophets, priests, and kings as a result of their union with Christ and with the other members of his body. The theology of union with Christ was not distinct to Barrow, yet for Barrow, union with Christ was the means of the visible church and not the result of it. Christ's church was both invisible and visible, both spiritual and physical in Barrow's view. For Barrow, Christ's offices were not just true of the invisible church and not just spiritual and inward. Christ was spiritually present to all the elect everywhere yet he was also visibly present in a true visible church.

For Barrow, a true visible church as the body of Christ could not contain those known to be non-elect or any known sin. Nor could Antichrist sit in Christ's visible churches. The visible church as the body of Christ was not a place where Christ and Antichrist could both dwell. Barrow was not trying to make the visible church identical to the invisible church. He never confused the invisible church and the visible church. Barrow believed the invisible church was pure, no sin or non-elect could enter there. However, for Barrow the visible church could contain some impurity. Unknown sin and non-elect who professed Christ could be in a true visible church. Discipline then was not the essence of a true visible church for Barrow.

Rather, it was the appropriate response to sin once discovered within Christ's visible body.

Barrow's writings demonstrated his use of the doctrine in an ecclesiological context. Barrow discussed the offices of Christ when addressing the origin and nature of the church, its purpose, organization, membership, and praxis. Barrow's argument against the Church of England bound together Christ's offices with his understanding of the true and false church. The offices of Christ were fundamental to Barrow's understanding of the true visible church. No single idea is likely to explain all of Barrow's ecclesiology. Nevertheless, no complete explanation of Barrow's ecclesiology can be made without reference to his use of the doctrine of the offices of Christ. The doctrine of the offices of Christ, then, was a central theme in Barrow's ecclesiology. This chapter has argued that while present in Barrow's writings, the themes of purity, discipline, polity, and covenant were not ends in themselves but rather means to an end. These themes were the appropriate practices for the elect who understood their roles as prophets, priests, and kings.

Barrow's understanding of the true visible church and his application of the offices of Christ did not cease with his death. There were others who accepted his views and continued in his ideas. In order to consider Barrow's views as part of a wider separatist tradition, it is necessary to examine some of those who believed they were following after Barrow.

Chapter 3: Henry Ainsworth and the Barrowist tradition

Henry Ainsworth's first published work, *A true confession of the faith ... which wee hir Majesties subjects, falsely called Brownists, doo hould towards God* ... (1596), made clear his rejection of the epithet 'Brownist.'¹ Rejecting the title 'Brownist' was a repeated issue for Ainsworth, as in the title of his 1604 work *An Apologie or defence of such true Christians as are commonly (but unjustly) called brownists*.² Stephen Bredwell, a moderate puritan layman,³ called all those who were unwilling to communicate with the Church of England (such as Ainsworth) 'Brownists,' regardless of any differences in their theology:

But some will object, that these that I name, agree not among themselves: and therefore cannot be accounted of one familie. I am not ignorant, that they are at oddes betweene themselves, but yet so, as that neither partie will joyne member-like with our Churches in the woorde and Sacraments. In doctrine I knowe they differ, but diversitie of practise was cause thereof.⁴

George Gifford also referred to Barrow and his associates as 'Brownists.'⁵ The term 'Brownist' was most frequently used as rhetoric, a derogatory name meant to identify the recipient as a heretic and an enemy of true religion. Even so, the designation did

¹ The full title is *A true confession of the faith, and humble acknowledgement of the alegeance, which wee hir Majesties subjects, falsely called Brownists, doo hould towards God, and yeild to hir Majestie and all other that are over us in the Lord Set down in articles or positions, for the better & more easie understanding of those that shall read it: and published for the cleering of our selves from those unchristian slanders of heresie, schisme, pryde, obstinacie, disloyaltie, sedicion, &c. which by our adversaries are in all places given out against us.*

² The full title is *An apologie or defence of such true Christians as are commonly (but uniustly) called Brownists against such imputations as are layd upon them by the heads and doctors of the University of Oxford, in their Ansver to the humble petition of the ministers of the Church of England, desiring reformation of certayne ceremonies and abuses of the Church.*

³ Timothy Scott McGinnis, 'George Gifford and the reformation of the common sort: Puritan priorities in Elizabethan religious life' (PhD Thesis, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 2002), 114; George, *John Robinson*, 44.

⁴ Stephen Bredwell, *The rasing of the foundations of Brownisme* (London, 1588), To the Christian Reader.

⁵ Gifford, *A short treatise*, 90; Gifford, *A plaine declaration*, 16, 50.

not always miss its mark. There were those who had adopted Browne's distinctive views on the visible church and the role of non-ordained members. Robert Browne's name was given to what was seen as a distinct theological position.

This chapter will explore the doctrine of the offices of Christ in the works of Henry Ainsworth. As in the previous chapter, foundational questions related to the use of the doctrine of the offices of Christ in Ainsworth's published works will be addressed. An examination of Ainsworth's usage of the doctrine of the offices of Christ will be presented in an effort to show how the doctrine functioned in his theology. Following the chapter on Barrow's use of the doctrine, this chapter will consider whether Ainsworth employed the doctrine in an ecclesiological context and, as in the previous chapter, this chapter will consider whether the doctrine was a prominent feature of Ainsworth's thinking. The question will be asked whether the doctrine was a key theme for his understanding of the visible church. What follows, then, will be necessarily exegetical, providing a critical explanation of Ainsworth's usage of the doctrine. Most of the themes and issues brought to bear on Ainsworth's texts will be familiar territory as they follow the pattern of enquiry established in the previous chapter in relation to Barrow. A significant difference of course between this chapter and the previous is that it considers a slightly later period and a different author.

As Ainsworth believed his views to be consistent with those of Barrow, this chapter will consider to what extent his use of the doctrine of the offices of Christ was similar to Barrow's. The chapter will also consider whether Barrow and Ainsworth were ever spokespersons for what would become a 'distinct theological position.' Specifically, can it be argued that there was a 'Barrowist' tradition that was

marked by a distinctive use of the doctrine of the offices of Christ within its ecclesiology? Describing Barrow's use of the doctrine of Christ's offices within an ecclesiological context as a 'theological position' would be unwarranted if Barrow were the sole proponent of that view. As the definition of 'tradition' notes, the idea must be shown to have been passed down from generation to generation or to have become a long established belief.⁶ This chapter will attempt to determine if Ainsworth was a proponent of Barrow's views on Christ's offices and the visible church. A subsequent chapter will then take a broader look at the use of the doctrine of the offices of Christ in the literature of the period from 1580 to 1620 particularly noting 'non-Barrowist' usage.⁷

The discussion in the previous chapter demonstrated that Barrow had used the doctrine in two notable ways. His first use was when claiming that the Church of England was a false church. Barrow had reasoned it was false because it denied Christ (the consequent of having denied Christ's offices). The second notable way was his arguments on the nature of a true visible church and the role of every member in its affairs public and private. This was the idea of 'participation' in Christ's offices by all the elect. As discussed, Barrow made a distinction between what Christ had done *for* the elect and what he was doing *in* the elect. Barrow drew attention to Christ's continued work of prophecy, priesthood, and kingship in building the visible church. This distinction was crucial to how Barrow understood the true visible church. These points from Barrow's usage are important when considering how Ainsworth employed the doctrine. From Ainsworth's writings, it appears that he followed in Barrow's understanding of Christ's offices and the

⁶ "tradition, n.," in the Oxford English Dictionary.

⁷ See chapter 5 *infra*.

visible church. Throughout the discussion that follows comparison will be made between Ainsworth and Barrow regarding Christ's offices and the visible church. Greater attention will be given to the points at which Ainsworth developed Barrow's handling of the doctrine.

1. Separation from a false church

Ainsworth agreed with Barrow that the Church of England was a false church from which separation was necessary. He wrote, 'This their renowned Church of England wee have both by word and writing proved it unto them to be false and counterfeit.'⁸ Ainsworth did not possess the 'prophetic temperament' that Barrow had, and he generally sought to steer clear of conflict. Nevertheless, when called to it, Ainsworth did not shy away from criticising his opponents. In demonstrating why the Church of England was false, Ainsworth repeated Barrow's 'four causes of separation,' though he seemed to give greatest weight to its false membership: 'We forsake your Church for this mayn corruption, that all, sorts of profane and wicked men have been and are, both they and their seed, received into and nourished within the bosome of your Church.'⁹

Regarding the Church of England's failure to repent of their sins, Ainsworth repeated Barrow's argument. He agreed that the refusal of the Church of England to repent led to a denial of Christ's offices. Such a rejection of Christ meant the Church of England was a false church:

⁸ Ainsworth, *A true confession of the faith*, Preface.

⁹ Ainsworth, *Counterpoyson*, 3-5.

That these Ecclesiastiall Assemblies, remayning in confusion and bondage under this Antichristian Ministerie, Courts, Canons, worship, Ordinances, &c. without freedom or powre to redresse anie enormitie, have not in this confusion and subjection, Christ their Prophet, Priest, and King, neither can bee in this estate, (whilest wee judge them by the rules of Gods word) esteemed the true, orderly gathered, or constituted churches of Christ, wherof the faithfull ought to beecome or stand Members, or to have anie Spirituall communion with them in their publick worship and Administration.¹⁰

In Ainsworth's understanding, it was necessary for the faithful to separate themselves from the Church of England and avoid all communication with it.

Ainsworth drew on the offices of Christ in his argument for separation from the Church of England as Barrow had done earlier.

Ainsworth also rejected the Church of England's claims concerning Christ as prophet, priest, and king. As already discussed,¹¹ the proponents of the Church of England asserted their belief that Christ was a prophet, priest, and king in their church. Even so, Ainsworth considered their pleas to be hollow just as Barrow had.

From Ainsworth's perspective, they held Christ's offices in pretence only:

The Foundation is Jesus Christ to build upon. ... But this Foundation is not yet rightlie laid in your assemblies you have it onelie in name and shew: Christ is neer in your mouthes, but farr from your actions. If you had shewed by the scriptures how Christ is laid for the foundation of the church: it would soon have bene seen that your house is set upon the sands. For you have not him for the mediator, prophet, priest, or king of your church, as it is now established. Many truthes I acknowledge are taught among you but many untruthes are also mixed with them, and the power of godlines is denied; for the truthes that are taught cannot be practised.¹²

Ainsworth's writing followed Barrow's in presenting two issues. First, while the Church of England taught some truth concerning Christ, they did not teach the whole

¹⁰ Ainsworth, *A true confession of the faith*, #31.

¹¹ See *supra* p. 58.

¹² Ainsworth, *Counterpoyson*, 57.

truth and they mixed in many untruths as well. Secondly, Ainsworth agreed with Barrow noting, ‘the truthes that are taught cannot be practiced.’

Any church that failed to teach the whole truth concerning Christ and prevented the practise of what the word of God taught, was not built upon Christ according to Ainsworth: ‘Every true Church of God, hath Christ for the Prophet of the same ... but the Church of England hath not Christ for the Prophet of the same,’ ‘Every true Church of God hath Christ for the Preist and Sacrificer of the same ... but the Church of England hath not Christ for the Preist or sacrificer of the same,’ and ‘Every true Church of God hath Christ for the king thereof ... but the Church of England hath not Christ for king thereof.’ He continued,

The summe of all that which hath bene sayd, is this, That the Church which hath not Christ for the head, Mediator, Prophet, Preist and king of the same; hath not God his father for God of the same ... But the Church of England hath not Christ for the head, Mediator, Prophet, Preist, or king of the same. ... Therefore it hath not God the father for God of the same, and consequently is not his Church.¹³

Ainsworth was following Barrow’s argument against the Church of England. Only a church that had a true confession of Christ and practiced his commands was a true visible church. Ainsworth argued, ‘The parishes of England professe him also’ yet they are ‘false, seing there is not a right & true profession of Christ, made by their parishes.’¹⁴

Still, teaching the whole truth of Christ and obeying all of his commands were not *notae ecclesiae* for Ainsworth. He rejected the notion that the word and sacraments were ‘infallible marks’ of a true church, just as Barrow had.¹⁵ Like

¹³ Ibid., 136, 141, 146, 150.

¹⁴ Ibid., 114-5, 181-2, 207.

¹⁵ Ibid., To the Reader.

Barrow, Ainsworth also rejected adding discipline as a third mark. The true visible church was a gathering of true Christians who exercised their roles as prophets, priests, and kings according to Ainsworth. The true visible church could not be reduced to certain practices alone even if performed correctly. Ainsworth accepted that the visible church could not know with certainty if its members were united to Christ. Only God could truly see the heart of a person.¹⁶ As Barrow had argued, it was enough if there was a correct profession of Christ and nothing known which made that profession appear false. Only gatherings of those who were united to Christ, who then professed him ‘rightly and truly’ and obeyed his commands could be considered a true visible church.

It is important to point out that, for Ainsworth, those who professed Christ were a church though not necessarily Christ’s church. He distinguished between ‘no church’ and a false church. The Pagans, Turks, and Jews were ‘no church.’ The polarized view of the church that Barrow held can also be found in Ainsworth’s thinking; namely, the false church belonged to Antichrist and the true church belonged to Christ. While the pagans, Turks, and Jews rejected Christ completely, a false church professed Christ but not completely or accurately. Ainsworth wrote, ‘Was there ever such grossnes in the deepest gulf of Poperie as to deny Christ utterly, and not to professe him in some mesure? Nay it could not be the throne of Antichrist, unlesse he did professe Christ.’ A false church may have professed Christ however it did not have a ‘right and true profession’ of him.

The explicit language of ‘denying’ Christ’s offices that Barrow had used was not as prevalent in Ainsworth’s writing. When discussing Christ’s offices and the

¹⁶ Ibid., 67; Ainsworth, *A reply to a pretended Christian plea*, 155-6.

Church of England, Ainsworth more frequently used the language of deprivation. He claimed that the Church of England ‘lacked’ Christ as prophet, priest, and king or ‘did not have’ Christ as such. Even so, he did write of a denial of Christ: ‘The Papists & Anabaptists at this day, hold & professe Jesus Christ: yet such errors are among them, as Christ in deed is denyed,’ and ‘The Papists and you both confesse Christ, in words; both deny him in practice.’¹⁷ Ainsworth argued that both errors, the incorrect doctrine of Christ and the failure to practice his commands, were a denial of Christ. He wrote, ‘The churches or assemblies of false Christians, which professe God and his sonne Christ, into whose name they are baptized ... by their works doe deny him, and by their errorrs & heresies, doe overthrow the truth of religion.’¹⁸ While Ainsworth’s language differed at points from Barrow’s, his meaning was clearly the same. Ainsworth argued that the Church of England did not properly recognize Christ’s offices in their church.

Why Ainsworth chose to use the language of deprivation more frequently than denial is not clear. For Ainsworth, to lack Christ’s offices was to lack his person. He believed that Christ’s person and work (expressed through the offices of prophet, priest, and king) could not be separated; to deny one was to deny the other. Ainsworth wrote, ‘Of his office ... the proper accidents and effects of Christs person be contained.’¹⁹ He remarked, ‘the Arians ... overthrow the person of Christ, ... the Papists ... overthrow the office of Christ,’ and both denied Christ.²⁰ Given Ainsworth’s aversion to conflict, the idea of ‘lacking’ might have sounded less offensive to his ear. Another consideration is that since the Church of England did

¹⁷ Henry Ainsworth, *An animadversion* (Amsterdam, 1613), 181, 245.

¹⁸ Ainsworth, *Counterpoyson*, 115.

¹⁹ Henry Ainsworth, *The orthodox foundation of religion* (London, 1641), 42.

²⁰ Ainsworth, *An animadversion*, 105.

not explicitly deny Christ's offices, accusing them of denial may not have been an effective strategy. By accusing the Church of England of lacking the offices of Christ, Ainsworth might have believed he was shifting the debate onto clearer ground. It would not be necessary to prove their denial, as had been Barrow's task, but rather to prove how they lacked Christ's offices despite their claim to the contrary.

Moreover, the distinction that was so prominent in Barrow's writings – between what Christ had done for his elect and what he does in his elect – can also be seen in Ainsworth's writings: 'Touching his Priesthood, and our communion therewith, two things ar to be considered; First What of his grace in his own person he hath wrought and worketh for us; ... Secondly, what by his mighty power he graciously worketh in us, and applieth unto us.'²¹ Here is Barrow's distinction, what Christ 'worketh *for* us' and what he 'worketh *in* us.' Ainsworth specifically described this distinction as Christ's work in justification and sanctification. He wrote, 'Both forgivenes of synns, to justification, and writing of the Law on our harts to sanctification and obedience, are shewed to be the covenant of Gods grace with men.'²² He added, 'Justification is an act undivided, and all at once, and so it differeth from Sanctification which is done by degrees and parts.'²³ Christ's work, expressed in his offices of prophecy, priesthood, and kingship, provided redemption for the elect as well as continuing to sustain and purify them. These were the benefits of Christ. As Timothy George notes with reference to Calvin's understanding of justification and sanctification, 'The two are connected as distinct but interrelated

²¹ Ainsworth, *The communion of saints*, 228.

²² Ainsworth, *A reply to a pretended Christian plea*, 77.

²³ Ainsworth, *The orthodox foundation of religion*, 59-60; Ainsworth, *Counterpoison*, 120.

“moments” in the appropriation of the work of Christ. Together they comprise a twofold grace.’²⁴ Ainsworth described it as Christ’s,

powre hee now exerciseth ... communicating and applying the benefits, virtue and frutes of his prophecy and Priesthood unto his elect, namely to the remission, subduing and takeing away of their sinnes, to their justification, adoption-of-sonnes, regeneration, sanctification, preservation & strengthning in all their spirituall conflicts against Sathan, the world & the flesh &c.²⁵

Without Christ’s work *for* and *in* the church, there was no justification or sanctification. Ainsworth argued that the Church of England lacked Christ as prophet, priest, and king and therefore, they lacked his benefits; that is, within the Church of England there was no justification or sanctification to be found.

For Ainsworth (as for Barrow) there was only one prophet, priest, and king of the true visible church. Regardless of the difference in Ainsworth’s language the conclusion was the same; Christ was not prophet, priest, or king in the Church of England. Ainsworth explained, ‘The estate whereunto God called his church in this life, is generally to the communion (or fellowship) of his sonne Jesus Christ, as being their onely mediator and Saviour, the Prophet Priest and King of the Church.’²⁶ For Ainsworth, just as for Barrow, lacking Christ’s offices was no minor issue: ‘Christ is not the Head, Mediator, Prophet, Preist and King of your church: which if it be so, no Christian can doubt, but your wounds in themselves are deadly.’²⁷ In contrast to Gifford’s argument that the corruption in the Church of England was not so severe that it had divorced their church from Christ, Ainsworth saw their church’s denial of Christ as the worst possible corruption.

²⁴ George, *John Robinson*, 98-9.

²⁵ Ainsworth, *A true confession of the faith*, #15.

²⁶ Ainsworth, *Counterpoyson*, 117.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 241.

Ainsworth made the same case against the Church of England that Barrow had made. First, regarding their teaching of Christ, Ainsworth explained, ‘Many truthes I acknowledge are taught among you but many untruthes are also mixed with them.’ Secondly, concerning the Church of England’s practices, he observed that, within the Church of England, even those ‘truthes that are taught cannot be practiced.’²⁸ Ainsworth charged the Church of England with hindering obedience to Christ: ‘As for power and liberty to observe Christs commandements, that is farr from your people, which all are in bondage to the Bishops and their courts; having not Christian freedom to censure syn or synners, or practise the ordinances, of the Gospel, as the Apostles did.’²⁹ The false teaching concerning Christ, and the hindering of obedience to him, led Ainsworth to the same conclusion Barrow had drawn; the Church of England had denied Christ his offices.

2. Christ’s offices and the errors of the Church of England

As Barrow had done previously, Ainsworth established his charge against the Church of England by comparing their errors with each part of Christ’s offices. He wrote, ‘The parts or branches of Christs office are three, 1 Prophetie, 2 Priesthood, 3 Kingdome.’³⁰ Regarding the prophetic office of Christ, Ainsworth argued that the Church of England lacks ‘part & communion with Christ in that propheticall office, which he hath imparted to his people, namely power & freedom to witnes, professe, practise, and hold forth the word of life, & all that Christ hath commanded.’³¹ The

²⁸ Ibid., 57.

²⁹ Ibid., 13-4.

³⁰ Ainsworth, *The orthodox foundation of religion*, 43.

³¹ Ainsworth, *Counterpoyson*, 139.

Church of England denied the people the use of Christ's commands both corporately and towards one another individually. Ainsworth wrote that the people were in,

servile subjection to the hierarchie, lawes and canons which are amongst them, wherby they are restrayned from professing & practising any further truth then is by law established among them, but must obey & follow all that their spirituall Lords the Bishops do injoyn them, and may not speak against or reprove any of the abominations that are in their church, worship, Ministrie, ceremonies etc.³²

In the Church of England, the people were not free to obey 'all that Christ commanded' according to Ainsworth. They had to obey the bishop no matter how the bishop conducted himself. Ainsworth explained that the people within the established church were under the civil ruler's yoke rather than Christ's.³³

'The Church is not to be governed by Popish Canons, Courts, Classes, Customes, or any humane inventions, but by the Lawes & rules which Christ hath appointed in his Testament' wrote Ainsworth.³⁴ The state of affairs in the Church of England, as Ainsworth saw it, was not according to Christ's Testament. Christ was 'a Prophet rayseed up of the Lord, to speak unto us al that he commanded him, and him are we willed for to hear.'³⁵ Christ's true servants were to listen only to Christ and, most notably, they were not to listen to the bishops of the Church of England and their 'human inventions.' Ainsworth explained that the foundation of the true visible church was Christ and 'the instrument of building is the word of God ... delivered by the Prophets and Apostles and Christ himself.' Ainsworth indicted the Church of England because their 'builders use not this instrument aright, in doctrine or

³² Ibid., 139-40.

³³ Ibid., 146-8.

³⁴ Henry Ainsworth, *The confession of faith* (Amsterdam, 1607), 70.

³⁵ Ainsworth, *The communion of saints*, 218.

practice.³⁶ In other words, according to Ainsworth, the Church of England built with different materials; they did not use the word of God.

The Church of England had many other sources for building their church than the word of God. Ainsworth explained, ‘You have besides the Bible, Apocripha bookes, commanded by law to be read in your church: also that other instrument called the service book: and with this tool your best ministers build up your church, and the reading hereof doth now much edifie, in al your parishes.’³⁷ Ainsworth agreed with Barrow that the Book of Common Prayer was an abomination: ‘You serve God not as himselfe commandeth, but after your own devising, or by imitation rather of the Romane Antichrist ... for of your service-book you say, it was culled and picked out of the Popish dunghil the portuis and masse-book full of all abominations.’³⁸ Bringing the Book of Common Prayer into the church and requiring its usage made clear the Church of England ‘lacked’ Christ’s prophetic office according to Ainsworth. He held that ‘only the Canonical scriptures are to be used in the Church.’³⁹ For Ainsworth, Christ had provided all that was needed in the word of God: ‘That thouching his Prophecie, Christ hath perfectly revealed out of the bozome of his father, the wholl word & will of God, that is needfull for his servants, either joyntly or severally to know, beleeve & obey.’⁴⁰ Human inventions, as he called them, were not necessary. More to the point, though, for Ainsworth, they were a rejection of what Christ commanded. The Church of England did not keep themselves to Christ’s teaching in his word; they allowed for ‘other things’ to be

³⁶ Ainsworth, *Counterpoyson*, 58.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, 59.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 4.

³⁹ Ainsworth, *The confession of faith*, 70-1.

⁴⁰ Ainsworth, *A true confession of the faith*, #13.

brought into their church. By doing so, they clearly demonstrated that they had rejected Christ's prophetic office.

Concerning the priestly office, Ainsworth insisted, 'The Church of England hath not Christ for the Priest or sacrificer ... Because the gifts and sacrifices which it offreth unto God, are not presented and offred unto him by Christ; neyther is this church reconciled unto God by him.'⁴¹ Ainsworth continued, Christ 'maketh his people a spirituall howse, and holy Priesthood, to offer up spirituall sacrifices, acceptable to God through him. Neither doth the Father accept, or Christ offer anie other sacrifice, worship or worshippers.'⁴² As in his discussion of the prophetic office, Ainsworth again highlighted the Book of Common Prayer. Their liturgy was idolatrous, the invention of man, and not according to Christ's commands that 'forbiddeth Al inventions of our own to worship God by, voluntary religion, opinions and doctrins of men.'⁴³ The Church of England brought in 'a written leitourgie translated out of the Masse book' and continued in the 'errors and untruthes in that book ... All which being commanded and used daily by law of their church, without ground from Gods word, which approveth none of these idolatries but condemneth them.'⁴⁴

Requiring the Book of Common Prayer in the church brought with it a false worship, as it was the invention of human beings. 'The Lord is to be worshipped and called upon in spirit & truth, according to that forme of praier given by the Lord Jesus, Mat. 6. & after the Leitourgie of his own Testament, not by any other framed or imposed by men, much lesse by one translated from the Popish leitourgie, as the

⁴¹ Ainsworth, *Counterpoyson*, 141.

⁴² Ainsworth, *A true confession of the faith*, #14.

⁴³ Henry Ainsworth, *An arrow against idolatrie* (Amsterdam, 1611), 4.

⁴⁴ Ainsworth, *Counterpoyson*, 141-2.

Book of common praier &c,’ Ainsworth argued.⁴⁵ Bringing in human inventions to worship was idolatry. There were two aspects to idolatry, as Ainsworth explained, ‘Idolatry is performed, either by mixing mens own inventions with the ordinances of God in the service of him or by using and applying the rites and services of the Lord, or other humane devices; unto the honour and service of some creature, in heaven, earth, or under the earth.’⁴⁶ The Church of England was guilty of the first aspect of idolatry. Christ was not priest in a church whose worship was idolatrous.

The Church of England’s false membership also proved that it lacked Christ’s priestly function for Ainsworth: ‘The bodyes and sowles of men are also spiritual and living sacrifices ... the people offered in this church are a confuse unsanctified multitude, not separated from the world.’⁴⁷ Ainsworth believed all the elect ‘giv up our own bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is our reasonable serving of God ... By Christ, we offer the sacrifice of Praise always to God.’⁴⁸ God would not accept impure sacrifices. More to the point, without Christ, God would not accept anyone’s sacrifice. The membership of the Church of England contained within it some who were without Christ. For Ainsworth, the church was not a collection of individuals offering their sacrifice, each standing before God independently of those next to them. Every true member of the church was in communion with Christ, and this communion with Christ is a communion with his members as well, each one in communion with the others: ‘This gathering together of the Saincts, is not a bare assembly or concourse onely, of people; but a neer uniting

⁴⁵ Ainsworth, *The confession of faith*, 71.

⁴⁶ Ainsworth, *An arrow against idolatrie*, 3.

⁴⁷ Ainsworth, *Counterpoyson*, 142.

⁴⁸ Ainsworth, *The communion of saincts*, 237.

and knitting of themselves, in one holy communion and fellowship.’⁴⁹ The congregation as a whole was the sacrifice; any and all ‘blemishes’ made the sacrifice unacceptable to God. The Church of England’s false membership was a blemished sacrifice that God would not accept.

This ‘unsanctified multitude’ that was in the Church of England was also offered the sacraments of baptism and the lord’s supper. In Ainsworth’s eyes, this practice profaned Christ because the unworthy were allowed to participate in these ordinances. Ainsworth maintained, ‘By baptisme which is one, we al are made one in Christ Jesus ... we al are baptized into one body.’⁵⁰ How can the righteous be one with the wicked? How can the unbeliever become one with Christ? Christ’s baptism did not belong to a false church. To Ainsworth, the argument that Christ’s baptism could be offered to the ‘unsanctified multitude’ found in the Church of England was absurd. Ainsworth accused the Church of England of ‘prostituting’ the sacraments: ‘The precious sacrifice of the body & blood of Christ (remembred and represented by bread and wine at his supper,) is prostituted (as if it were an unholy thing) to the prophane & wicked in this church.’⁵¹ The signs and seals of Christ’s covenant belonged to the elect. To offer his seals to the wicked was a ‘sacrilegious prophanation of the holy mysteries’ and ‘sheweth a manifest contempt of Christ represented in them.’⁵² The seriousness of this sin, according to Ainsworth, should not be discounted:

To give the seales of the righteousnes of faith, (baptisme, and the Lords supper) to the wicked, blasphemers, irreligious, and to their seed; it is a syn of synns, for which your ministers shall give an heavy

⁴⁹ Ibid., 318.

⁵⁰ Ibid., 374.

⁵¹ Ainsworth, *Counterpoyson*, 142.

⁵² Ibid., 142-3.

account to Christ at his appearing; as having counted the precious blood of his testament an unholy thing, & washed & fed therewith even doggs and swine; as the scripture calleth such ungodly persons.⁵³

Ainsworth concluded, 'For asmuch then as the publick service and sacrifice of this church is idolatrous, the holy mysteries of Christ profaned, the people unsanctified, and their synns unrepented of; there is no word or promise in scripture that Christ is the preist or sacrificer of such worship or worshippers.'⁵⁴

A church that did not have Christ for its priest was no true visible church and had no guarantee of eternal life. Christ was only present in a true visible church; he was not present in a false church. Ainsworth agreed with Barrow that God was able to save apart from the true visible church. Nevertheless, a true visible church could beget true faith, a false church could not.⁵⁵ He wrote, 'The blessing of spiritual propagation, is peculiar to the true church; yet God, which brought light out of darknes, causeth some children to be born & brought up unto him in false churches.'⁵⁶ Ainsworth held that Christ was the sacrifice for all the elect and that God could and sometimes did save some outside the true visible church. Nevertheless, as a false church lacked Christ as priest and sacrifice, he was not theirs to give. Only the true visible church could claim to have Christ as priest and, therefore, could boast of Christ's presence to the elect. From Ainsworth's perspective, then, the Church of England denied Christ his priestly office.

⁵³ Ibid., 78.

⁵⁴ Ibid., 145.

⁵⁵ Ainsworth, *A reply to a pretended Christian plea*, 7, 49.

⁵⁶ Ibid., 12; Ainsworth, *Counterpoyson*, 11.

Finally, concerning Christ's kingly office, Ainsworth claimed that the Church of England did not follow the government Christ required nor practiced what he had commanded:

The Church of England hath not Christ for the king thereof; first, because it hath not those officers which he hath appointed to governe his church under him ... Secondly, because this church hath not the Lawes and statutes of Christ for to governe the same; for although they have the holy Bible among them, yet are not the ordinances therein written, practised or suffred to be practised in these assemblies.⁵⁷

While the debate over the correct form of polity had occupied many writers of the period, it was the second issue in the citation above that was more noteworthy.

Ainsworth accused the Church of England of ignoring the Bible, and further, of hindering the practice of what it prescribed. The improper officers found within the Church of England were evidence that they ignored what Christ had commanded for his church.

Without Christ as king, even those elect who remained in the Church of England could not be assured of salvation. Ainsworth explained,

Our redemption from evil, and restauration unto happines, he conserveth & maynteyneth by his mighty power, from al enemies whom hee hath subdued under his owne feet, & wil also subdue under ours: and is therefore named our King whom al kings shal worship, al nations shal serv, who wil redeem our sowles from deceit & violence, wil give us also the redemption of our bodie, and cause our last enemy Death to be swallowed up in victorie, & so wil be our ful Redemption for ever & ever, at his appearing with glorie, in the day of Redemption.⁵⁸

Christ in his kingly office ensured the elect would not fall away and that no enemy would be able to separate them from him. As the Church of England did not have

⁵⁷ Ainsworth, *Counterpoison*, 146.

⁵⁸ Ainsworth, *The communion of saints*, 220-1.

Christ as king over them, those elect who remained within it could have no assurance. For those in the true visible church, Christ's kingly office would bring victory for himself and his elect.⁵⁹ Ainsworth explained, 'This power & regiment, he [Christ] ... applying unto them for their benefit and salvation, al that himself hath done and doeth.'⁶⁰

Both the doctrine and practice of the Church of England demonstrated that it did not have Christ as its prophet, priest, and king according to Ainsworth. He used the doctrine of the offices of Christ in the same ways as Barrow when proving the Church of England to be a false church. Both Barrow and Ainsworth asserted that the Church of England denied Christ his offices in their church. Both had concluded that such a denial was a rejection of Christ. While the Church of England professed Christ, and claimed to have him as prophet, priest, and king within their church, the 'truth' pointed out by Barrow and reiterated by Ainsworth demonstrated the hollowness of their assertions. Further, not only did the Church of England lack Christ as prophet, priest, and king over their church, their members were not prophets, priests, and kings within it. The 'unsanctified multitude' within their church did not participate with Christ in his offices. In all these points, Ainsworth followed Barrow's views, and his use of Christ's offices was consistent with Barrow's. The argument can proceed now to examine Ainsworth's use in the second of Barrow's use of the doctrine, the idea of participation in Christ's offices.

⁵⁹ Ainsworth, *The orthodox foundation of religion*, 51-2.

⁶⁰ Ainsworth, *The communion of saints*, 245.

3. *Participation in the offices of Christ*

The characteristics of a true visible church were a point of difference between Ainsworth and his opponents. For his opponents, a true church was marked by its practices. Most importantly, where the word is rightly preached and the sacraments rightly administered, there is a true church. These were the common *notae ecclesiae* of the period.⁶¹ As has already been pointed out, for Ainsworth (as well as for Barrow) the true visible church was ‘marked’ not by its practices alone, but also by its membership and their roles as prophets, priests, and kings. The true visible church was the body of Christ.⁶² It was a communion of the elect with Christ and with each other. It was ‘a kingdom of priests and a holy nation.’⁶³ Christ was its ‘only mediator and Saviour, the Prophet Priest and King ... which they beleaving and professing, are also made partakers of these three offices with him.’⁶⁴ Ainsworth was not arguing that the practices were insignificant. Rather, the practices of a true church were the result of what Christ was doing in the elect. These practices were only appropriate for those whom the Son had redeemed, sanctified, and united together, those whom he had made to be prophets, priests, and kings, and through whom Christ was continuing to work. The practices of the church alone were not sufficient marks to distinguish a true church from a false church.

⁶¹ Article 19 of the Church of England’s 39 Articles stated, ‘The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men in which the pure Word of God is preached and the sacraments be duly administered.’ Robert Some, a member of the Church of England clergy, wrote, ‘The preaching of Gods word, & the sincere administration of the Sacraments, are the essential markes of Christes Churche: and where these markes are, there undoubtedly the true church is, though there bee otherwise in that Church some blemishes.’ Bray, *Documents of the English Reformation*, 296; Robert Some, *A godlie treatise of the Church* (London, 1582), B6 Recto.

⁶² Ainsworth’s opponents would have agreed that the church was the body of Christ. The distinction for Ainsworth concerned the visible church and the idea of the body of Christ being united with a known ‘unsanctified multitude.’ This point will be considered in greater detail in the discussion that follows as well as in chapter 4 *infra*.

⁶³ Ainsworth, *The communion of saints*, 158.

⁶⁴ Ainsworth, *Counterpoyson*, 117.

To all appearances, the practices could be the same between the true church and the false church.⁶⁵ However, the practices were only effective when carried out within a true visible church. The practices of the visible church were only appropriate for Christ's members, as Ainsworth called them, 'faithful men.' The *notae ecclesiae* were insufficient identifiers of a true church because they were only effective in those who had the Holy Spirit at work in them. If the Spirit was not present, the word preached and the sacraments administered could not build the body of Christ. A gathering of non-believers who heard the word preached and received the sacraments was still a false church. Ainsworth explained this difference, 'The word *Church*, is used sometimes more largely, for such an Assembly as professe Christ the King, Priest, and Prophet, which comprehendeth in it hypocrites, and reprobates, as well as Gods elect ... Hypocrites, or reprobates are not properly of the Church.' He continued, 'Strictly, and properly, the Church is the company of them whom the Father hath chosen to life, given to the Sonne to redeeme, sanctifying them by the Spirit, and uniting them together among themselves, by the bond of faith and love.'⁶⁶ Neither the practices of the word preached and the sacraments administered nor professing belief in Christ's offices were sufficient in themselves to constitute a true visible church.

For Ainsworth, as well as for Barrow, the true visible church was a gathering of 'faithful men.' Those within the true visible church were different from those outside it. This difference was important in how each side in the debate understood the visible church. Ainsworth's understanding of the true visible church as a

⁶⁵ Cf. Stephen Brachlow's thesis on this point. Brachlow argues the practices of the radical puritans and the separatists were the same. Brachlow, *Communion of Saints*, Introduction.

⁶⁶ Ainsworth, *The orthodox foundation of religion*, 58.

‘company of faithful men’ was in contrast to the Church of England’s inclusion of both saved and unsaved. The proponents of the Church of England argued that the phrase ‘company of faithful men’ applied only to the universal church while Ainsworth argued that it applied to the visible church.⁶⁷ Ainsworth pointed out that the Church of England’s own Thirty-Nine Articles described the church as ‘*Ecclesia Christi visibilis est coetus fidelium*,’ that is, ‘The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men.’⁶⁸

1. True members of a true visible church

Those who were members of the true visible church were so because of their relationship with Christ and with the members of his body. They were not the true church because of their good behavior as if purity of life was the issue, nor because of civil law as if the prince could make any members. Having been united with Christ, members of a true visible church received the benefits of Christ’s graces as Christ exercised his power ‘communicating and applying the benefits, virtue and frutes ... unto his elect.’⁶⁹ The members of a true visible church were ‘faithful men’ because Christ had made them so, not because of any special worth they possessed. The faithful ones were the elect, justified and brought into communion with Christ by the Holy Spirit. This communion of the elect with Christ and with each other was a significant theme in Ainsworth’s thinking.⁷⁰

⁶⁷ Richard Bernard, *Christian advertisements and counsels of peace* (London, 1608), 167.

⁶⁸ Ainsworth, *Counterpoyson*, A fore-speech to the Christian Reader, 208; Bray, *Documents of the English Reformation*, 296.

⁶⁹ Ainsworth, *A true confession of the faith*, #15.

⁷⁰ Ainsworth’s *The Communion of Saints* was an extensive work (493 pages) discussing the nature of the union between Christ and the elect and the union between the members of his body.

As Christ chose the elect solely by his grace, Christ's members were not made prophets, priests, and kings because of any individual's personal worth or behaviour. Ainsworth made this point clear: 'This honour of Priesthood, (which no man can take to himself, nor any other thing except it be given him from heaven,) Christ giveth unto us, of his rich grace by his word & spirit.'⁷¹ He added, 'From all that which is before spoken, of the Communion that God hath called us unto with his Son, it followeth, that whatsoever ... was in Christ ... the same is made ours by grace and imputation.'⁷² Each member of Christ's body participated in the offices of Christ by his grace. Further, the members of Christ's body did not occupy Christ's offices independently of him. Christ's members shared in his work, never acting apart from him. Ainsworth explained, 'That this Office to bee Mediator, that is, Prophet, Priest and King of the Church of God, is so proper to him, as nether in the whol, nor in anie part therof it can be transferred from him to anie other.'⁷³ Ainsworth understood the true members of a true visible church as Christ's servants dependent upon him who was the head of the church: 'Now all this life and grace doth Christ communicate with the Saincts, being their Head, & they his members.'⁷⁴ As Christ's offices were signified by his anointing, so those who participated in his offices were anointed: 'Our God it is which stablisheth us in Christ, & hath anynted us, and also sealed us, and given us the earnest of his spirit in our hartes.'⁷⁵ Ainsworth argued that the Church of England hierarchy usurped Christ's offices,

⁷¹ Ainsworth, *The communion of saints*, 238.

⁷² *Ibid.*, 255.

⁷³ Ainsworth, *A true confession of the faith*, #12.

⁷⁴ Ainsworth, *The communion of saints*, 226.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 194.

taking them to themselves.⁷⁶ The members of Christ's body were not usurpers of offices that were not rightly theirs. Rather they took part in offices that belonged solely to Christ. They participated because Christ granted it to them.

Ainsworth was concerned that true Christians understood what communion with Christ meant: 'It is good and needful that we know, both who ar the persons, and what be the causes & conditions of this communion; how farr the bounds and limits of it doe extend.'⁷⁷ He remarked how 'the scripture speaketh so much of the fellowship and communion of the Saincts, with God and among themselves.'⁷⁸ The members of true visible churches were the beneficiaries of communion with Christ:

The summe of the grace given us through communion with our Lord Jesus, is comprised in those words of the Apostle saying, that Christ is of God made unto us Wisdom, and Justice, and Sanctification, and Redemption. These things he is unto us by vertue of his mediatorship, which consisteth in the three functions or offices of Prophecie, Priesthood, & Kingdome, committed unto him by the Father.⁷⁹

Only the church which had Christ as its prophet, priest, and king, and whose members, through communion with Christ, participated in his offices, would experience the wisdom, justice, sanctification and redemption of God.

The true visible church was Christ's body because of union with him: 'Everie Church, as they have communion with Christ and are one body with him, so have they communion also one with another & are all one body.'⁸⁰ Ainsworth's understanding of the elect as the body of Christ focused his view of the true visible

⁷⁶ Ainsworth, *An apologie*, 50-1.

⁷⁷ Ainsworth, *The communion of saincts*, 1-2.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 63.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, 218.

⁸⁰ Ainsworth, *An apologie*, 45.

church.⁸¹ It was the understanding of the nature of the church that Ainsworth saw as the point of controversy with his opponents:

For the true constituting of a Church by the word preached, calling men to a willing holy covenant with God, separating them from the wayes of Satan and Antichrist, his false and idolatrous worship, priesthood, and government, uniting them together in the communion of the true faith, and bond of love and peace, (which are the controversies between you and us).⁸²

The true visible church, for Ainsworth, was not a collection of practices alone, but a gathering of people who had been called out of the world to union with Christ.

A difference between Ainsworth and his opponents was which passages of scripture described Christ's spiritual kingdom and which scriptures described the shape of his visible kingdom on earth; that is, which scriptures applied to the invisible church and which applied to the visible church? This distinction between the invisible church and the visible church was a continuous point of debate. Barrow had already confronted this issue, asserting that the kingdom of Christ was both spiritual and invisible as well as physical and thus visible. Ainsworth explained it this way:

They that are called of God, & members of the church universal, are united and gathered into many churches or congregations, in severall cities and countries: every of which churches being joyned together in the profession and practise of the Gospel of Christ have his power and presence with them, & is to convene or come together in one, for the worship of God, and performance of publick duties.⁸³

⁸¹ Ibid., 44.

⁸² Ainsworth, *Counterpoison*, 80.

⁸³ Ibid., 121.

For Ainsworth, the earthly church *was* a visible gathering of the invisible church while, for his opponents, the earthly church *included* some from the invisible church along with some who were not part of the invisible church and never would be.⁸⁴

As Ainsworth explained, members of the true visible church participated in Christ's offices through communion with Christ. Citing 1 Peter 2:9 (in addition to other passages) Ainsworth argued that each and every member of the true visible church was made a prophet, a priest, and a king, applying that passage to the visible church. The Church of England clergyman, Richard Bernard,⁸⁵ took exception to Ainsworth's application of that verse. The Geneva bible translated 1 Peter 2:9 as, 'But yee are a chosen generation, a royall Priesthoode, an holy nation, a people set at libertie, that yee shoulde shewe foorth the vertues of him that hath called you out of darkenesse into his marveilous light.'⁸⁶ Bernard argued that the phrase 'a royall Priesthoode' applied to the church invisible and not to particular visible churches.⁸⁷ For Bernard, participation of the elect in Christ's offices was only true of the invisible church. The elect exercised their roles as prophets, priests, and kings personally and in private settings. In the public affairs of the visible church, the non-ordained members of the visible church were not to exercise their roles as prophets, priests and kings.

Ainsworth's understanding of the true visible church was a physical gathering of those who were in the invisible church. He, like Barrow, was also accused of confusing the invisible and visible churches. Once again Ainsworth's opponents held

⁸⁴ There were the elect who had yet to be converted as well as the non-elect who would never be converted.

⁸⁵ Greaves, 'Bernard, Richard (bap. 1568, d. 1642).'

⁸⁶ 1 Peter 2:29, Geneva, 1599.

⁸⁷ Bernard, *Christian advertisements and counsels of peace*, 18.

the visible church would be a mixture of the elect and the wicked. Both Ainsworth and Barrow were charged with trying to make the visible church consist only of those who were also part of the invisible church. This idea was commonly expressed as trying to make the visible church pure, a state that only the invisible church could achieve. Ainsworth accepted that the visible church might contain the non-elect, and he never argued that the visible church would be free from all sin.⁸⁸ Ainsworth held, as did Barrow, that the church was to prevent known sin from entering, and to remove sin (not repented of) once discovered.⁸⁹ It was possible that some within the true visible church were not united with Christ. Such hypocrites might remain within a true visible church as long as their deception stayed hidden. They would appear to be part of God's visible covenant and would have the liberty to act as prophets, priests, and kings though Christ had not made them such. Even so, God would accept the sacrifice of such a church as long as the blemishes were 'hidden' from its members, namely, as long as no known sin was allowed in and all sin once discovered was removed.

According to Ainsworth, because Christ had not founded the Church of England its people were not in visible covenant with Christ.⁹⁰ Each member of Christ's body was part of his eternal covenant according to Ainsworth: 'This grace God signified to our fathers ... ye shalbe unto me also a kingdom of priests, and a holy nation. ... The manifestation and assurance of this grace, is to be seen in that

⁸⁸ Ainsworth, *Counterpoyson*, 155-6; Ainsworth, *A reply to a pretended Christian plea*, 7, 49.

⁸⁹ As with Barrow, excommunication was the last resort. Sin within the church demanded repentance and restoration to fellowship. Only when the sinner was unrepentant was excommunication the appropriate action for the church. Ainsworth, *An animadversion*, 9. See *supra* p. 81.

⁹⁰ Ainsworth's point was that Christ had not founded the Church of England and then rejected it. Rather Christ had never founded it to begin with. This agrees with Barrow's statement that it was the queen's (Elizabeth) proclamation that had founded it. See *supra* p. 75.

eternal Covenant and O[a]th which he maketh with us.’⁹¹ He continued, ‘The covenant was many yeares afore confirmed of God, & could not by the Law that came after, be disanulled.’⁹² Ainsworth challenged the Church of England: ‘Your church can shew no covenant that was made between Christ and her, at any time: the gathering and planting of your church having been by the Magistrates authority: not by the word of Christ, winning mens soules unto his faith, separating them from the unbeleevvers, and taking them to communion with himselfe.’⁹³ Those who were not in covenant with Christ did not receive his benefits; they were not made prophets, priests, and kings to serve him in his church. Ainsworth wrote that the members of the Church of England ‘hath not Christ for the Mediator and Advocate of the same; because, Christ is not Mediator of any other covenant or testament.’⁹⁴ God’s promises were only made to those within the covenant.

Those who remained in the Church of England, whether elect or not, could not exercise their duties as prophets, priests, and kings. It has already been pointed out that Ainsworth recognized that there could be elect outside the true visible church: ‘His elect ... are under his covenant in regard of his election, which was before the world began: but until they be called & come out [of the antichristian church] ... they appear not unto men to be under the visible covenant of Gods church.’⁹⁵ Ainsworth was in agreement with Barrow regarding any elect in the Church of England. Those elect who were outside the true visible church were held

⁹¹ Ainsworth, *The communion of saints*, 158.

⁹² *Ibid.*, 92.

⁹³ Ainsworth, *Counterpoyson*, 64.

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, 131.

⁹⁵ Ainsworth, *A reply to a pretended Christian plea*, 70. Ainsworth’s discussion on page 70 was with reference to the elect in the Church of Rome.

‘in bondage to the Bishops and their courts.’⁹⁶ Those elect who remained in the Church of England were called to come out and join in the communion of the true visible church. Ainsworth wrote, ‘The calling of the Saints into communion, we have seen to consist of two branches, 1. A separation from the wicked of the world; 2. and a collection or gathering together of themselves in the faith & love of Christ.’⁹⁷ Only those who had come out of the false church and joined themselves to the true visible church could exercise their roles as prophets, priests, and kings.

Thus, for Ainsworth, participation in the offices of Christ was the natural result of the elect’s communion with Christ. Christ was the prophet, priest, and king for the church and he worked in the church through his members with whom he shared his offices. Ainsworth recognized that there could be elect in a false church.⁹⁸ He also allowed for individuals to be in a true visible church who were not in communion with Christ, though if they were found out they were to be removed. Even so, only those who were in communion with Christ and a member of a true visible church were made prophets, priests, and kings and could serve Christ as he commanded. Only those with whom Christ shared his offices could witness to God and bring him glory. The offices of Christ were an essential part of every true visible church. Every member, as a prophet, a priest, and a king had an essential function in the true visible church: ‘The members have their portion in the general, so have they also in the particulars: each one according to his place, calling and measure of grace, given him from Christ the head.’⁹⁹

⁹⁶ Ainsworth, *Counterpoyson*, 13-4.

⁹⁷ Ainsworth, *The communion of saints*, 340.

⁹⁸ Ainsworth, *A reply to a pretended Christian plea*, 77.

⁹⁹ Ainsworth, *The communion of saints*, 376.

2. Every member's interest in the work of Christ

Participation in the offices of Christ gave every member an interest in the public affairs of the church according to Ainsworth: 'As the Saints have al a right & interest in the covenant of God, & seales of the same, wherein they have and hold communion together: so have and doe they also, in al other Christian spiritual duties, publick or private.'¹⁰⁰ He explained these duties:

The churches in the Apostles dayes had also the like right & libertie, for the multitudes of beleevers, wer both beholders & actors in the commune affayres; as at the choise & ordination of church-officers; at the deciding of questions & controversies; at the excommunication or casting out of impenitent synners; at the choise & appointment of men, to cary the grace or benevolence of the Saints to their needy brethren; at the receiving and reading of the Apostles Letters; and generally, in the publick communion and fellowship of the Apostles, & one of another. They were also willed to exhort and admonish ech other; even the Officers of the churches; to mark diligently, and to avoyd, the causes of division and offences; & to looke that no root of bitternes spring up and troubled them, least therby many should be defiled.¹⁰¹

Thus, Ainsworth listed seven areas where the people had interest and involvement in the affairs of the church. To this list could be added lay prophecy which Ainsworth discussed elsewhere.¹⁰² Each of the duties mentioned above was part of Christ's offices, and Christ was the one doing the work. Concerning discipline Ainsworth maintained, 'The church judgments are the Lords works, not ours ... they belong to Christs kingly office, and therefore are holy, as the works of his propheticall and preistly office.'¹⁰³ The judgments of the church were an expression of Christ working

¹⁰⁰ Ibid., 375.

¹⁰¹ Ibid., 377-8.

¹⁰² Ainsworth, *Counterpoyson*, 136, 176.

¹⁰³ Ainsworth, *An animadversion*, 44.

through his members. Ainsworth agreed with Barrow that Christ worked in the elect immediately as well as through the elect mediately.

Moreover, participation in Christ's offices was not limited to those ordained: 'We find not that Christian people are more excluded from being publik members of the body, and actors with their ministers in the Kingdom of Christ, then they are in the Priesthood and prophesie,' Ainsworth explained.¹⁰⁴ Every one of the elect was to exercise Christ's offices of prophecy, priesthood, and kingship in the visible church as Christ worked through them. Put another way, Christ exercised his offices within the true visible church through each and every member of his body. According to Ainsworth, 'Every Christian is a King ... unto God to spie out, censure, and cut down syn as it ariseth, with that two edged sword that proceedeth out of Christs mouth.'¹⁰⁵ As Ainsworth argued, every member had the right in the choice and ordination of church officers; the deciding of questions and controversies; the excommunication or casting out of impenitent sinners; the choice and appointment of men, to carry the grace or benevolence of the saints to their brethren in need; the receiving and reading of the scriptures; and they were also instructed to exhort and admonish each other; even the officers of the churches.¹⁰⁶

Ainsworth discussed the elect's participation in each function of Christ's offices, kingly, priestly, and prophetic. He wrote, 'This his kingly office he so communicateth with his church; as they are by him preserved and defended from all adversarie power; freed from the dominion of sin, and tyranny of Satan; from subjection to the world, and servitude unto men: and restored to the joyfull libertie of

¹⁰⁴ Ibid., To the Reader.

¹⁰⁵ Ibid., 110.

¹⁰⁶ Ainsworth, *The communion of saints*, 377-8.

the children of God.’¹⁰⁷ He clearly described what Christ had done *for* the elect, yet within that was a hint of what Christ did *in* the elect. As Ainsworth noted, his servants were no longer in subjection to men and had been restored to ‘joyfull libertie.’ As pointed out by Barrow, the freedom of the elect to serve Christ was the exercise of Christ’s offices in the Church. Ainsworth added that, as kings, Christ’s servants reigned with him on earth and would reign with him in the end time:

He communcateth with his Saints this grace, to be *kings* also with him, and to reign on earth: that as himself sitteth & ruleth upon his throne ... so they who he hath made *kings* ... unto God his Father, ... having part in the first resurrection, the second death may have no power over them; but ... reigning with him the terme of yeres limited, at last, when they have overcome, may sit with Christ in his throne; even as he overcame & sitteth with his Father in his throne.¹⁰⁸

Again Ainsworth described this shared reign, for Christ ‘hath made them *Kings* ... unto God even his father, and they shall reign on the earth, till having served here their time, they come to reign with him in glory, in the heavens for ever.’¹⁰⁹

Ainsworth’s understanding of the expression of Christ’s kingly office carried the idea of preservation and strengthening in all spiritual conflicts, notably against Satan, the world, and the flesh, which resulted in sanctification and the restoration of the image of God.¹¹⁰

Christ’s priestly office, Ainsworth explained, ‘is so imparted to his church, as they have not onely interest in his death and suffrings whereby they are reconciled to God, but also are themselves made a holy priesthood.’¹¹¹ Again he observed, ‘The communion of this Blessing, is more particularly to be discerned in that honour of

¹⁰⁷ Ainsworth, *Counterpoyson*, 119.

¹⁰⁸ Ainsworth, *The communion of saints*, 247.

¹⁰⁹ Ainsworth, *Counterpoyson*, 119.

¹¹⁰ Ainsworth, *The orthodox foundation of religion*, 42-3.

¹¹¹ Ainsworth, *Counterpoyson*, 118-9.

Priesthood, which is given to al Christians ... For he hath made us Priests unto God even his Father.¹¹² Only those who participated in Christ's priestly office could offer acceptable sacrifices. Ainsworth, agreeing with Barrow, pointed out that Christ 'maketh his people a spirituall howse, and holy Priesthood, to offer up spirituall sacrifices, acceptable to God through him. Neither doth the Father accept, or Christ offer anie other sacrifice, worship or worshippers.'¹¹³ Participation in Christ's priesthood was essential to the true visible church. Being made priests, the elect were able,

to offer up spirituall sacrifices acceptable to God by him: giving up their own bodies a living sacrifice; mortifying their members which are on earth and crucifying the flesh with the affections and lusts; offering up contrite and broken harts, with sacrifices of praise confessing to his name; and praying not onely every man for himself, but one for another, doing good and distributing to the necessities of the Saincts, suffring affliction for the Gospell and finally if they be called thereunto, powring out their soules unto death for the truthes sake.¹¹⁴

Through Christ's priesthood, the elect had 'authority in every place to offer incense unto his name, and a pure offering.'¹¹⁵ All those whom Christ had not made to be priests were false priests placing strange fire upon the altar.¹¹⁶ The Church of England's worship was false worship since its people did not participate in Christ's priestly office. The Father would not accept their sacrifices of worship.

Finally, regarding Christ's prophetic office, 'He [Christ] hath communicated with the church, by giving to the same his word for their instruction and comfort, and graffing the same within them, his spirit also as an Anoynting to teach them all

¹¹² Ainsworth, *The communion of saints*, 235.

¹¹³ Ainsworth, *A true confession of the faith*, #14.

¹¹⁴ Ainsworth, *Counterpoyson*, 118-9.

¹¹⁵ Ainsworth, *The communion of saints*, 240.

¹¹⁶ Leviticus 10:1

things.¹¹⁷ Ainsworth explained that Christ made the elect prophets by giving them his word, his Spirit, his ministers, and the power and freedom for ‘witnes profession and practice’ in order to,

hold forth that word of life as lights in the world: thereby to preach unto others the faith of Christ, to edify and build up one another dayly therein, to provoke unto love and to good works; to admonish and reprehend for evill and iniquity; to forgive and comfort one another in the bowels of Christ, whose word therefore all ought to labour that it may dwel plenteously in them, that if any man speak, it may be as the words of God.¹¹⁸

Ainsworth argued that the prophetic office was essential to the building up of the church. It was not just a liberty but also an obligation: ‘All men hav not onely libertie, but are exhorted to desire that they may prophesie; that is, speak unto the church, to edifying, to exhortation, and to comfort.’¹¹⁹

For Ainsworth, as for Barrow, Christ had always been the only prophet, priest, and king over the church as well as in the church. Each member having been made a prophet, priest, and king, participated in and exercised Christ’s offices in the church. This was true of the church always, whether under the administration of Old Testament during national Israel or under the administration of the New Testament. Ainsworth wrote, ‘The Israelites were Kings and Preists as well as we ... They were Kings and Preists as they were Christians, and partakers of the Anoynting, and that is, as they were under the new Testament.’¹²⁰ The Old Testament was part of the covenant of grace and Israel was part of the church, though under an administration of law. As such, those within the nation who were part of the church were priests and

¹¹⁷ Ainsworth, *Counterpoyson*, 117.

¹¹⁸ Ibid.

¹¹⁹ Ainsworth, *The communion of saints*, 370.

¹²⁰ Ainsworth, *An animadversion*, 24.

kings. The idea of participation in Christ's offices was not peculiar to the New Testament as far as Ainsworth was concerned. Looked at from another perspective, the visible church never lacked prophets, priests, and kings as the people of the church were always such. As the visible church was spiritual Israel during the administration of law, those who were in communion with Christ were saved by his priestly work even though his 'last will and testament' (New Testament) had not yet been written. As Ainsworth explained, it was 'not the law, but Christ hath made us Kings and Preists.'¹²¹

The Israelites' sharing in Christ's offices during the Old Testament differed from Christians' sharing in Christ's offices during the administration of the New Testament. Still, participation in Christ's offices was 'foundational' to the visible church throughout its existence. When Ainsworth wrote that those under the Old Testament administration were partakers of the anointing just as those under the New Testament, he made a distinction, 'They were not so under it as we are: neyther are we so under the Old Testament as were they.'¹²² While the Israelites were prophets, priests, and kings, they were so differently than those under the administration of the New Testament. This distinction was important to Ainsworth in the debates with his opponents. Ainsworth's critics questioned whether those under the new administration had any more right or authority in the church than those under the old administration. They challenged Ainsworth's model of participation by the laity in the public affairs of the church.¹²³ Ainsworth responded, 'The external Preisthood of Israel, is accomplished in Christ and now abolished, Heb. 7. yet in Davids Kingdom,

¹²¹ Ibid., 25.

¹²² Ibid., 24.

¹²³ Ainsworth notes, 'Secondly they ask, whither the people have any more right and authoritie in the churches government now, then the people of Israel had in those dayes.' *ibid.*

and Levies preisthood, ther was a figure also of the kingdom and preisthood that Christ bestoweth on the saincts. Who have as much more power and libertie in the Gospel now, than the Jewes had.’¹²⁴

Just how much ‘more power and liberty’ the non-ordained members of the visible church had in the church’s public affairs was a point of disagreement.

Ainsworth discussed power in the church and the errors that both the Church of England and the Church of Rome practiced:

So wheras our opposites tel us the Elders power that in deed it is the Churches; the papists also tel us the same: but the more is their syn that deprive the Church of it, by ingrossing it into their own hands alone; thus did the Pope clime by steps unto his primacie. And it is (say they) to be ministred by the Officers: but not (say I) by them onely; therin is the deceyt. The whole Church is a kingdome of Preists, that is of ministers.¹²⁵

While the locus of power within the true visible church was an issue for Ainsworth and Barrow, it was only a symptom of the problem. Christ’s work, expressed in all three roles as prophet, priest, and king, had been denied. Neither Christ nor his servants could fulfill their roles within the body. The body of Christ had suffered a mortal wound according to Ainsworth and Barrow. Ainsworth wrote that denying Christ’s offices meant ‘no Christian can doubt, but your wounds in themselves are deadly.’¹²⁶ A denial of Christ’s offices was a denial of Christ. More than a power struggle, it was a question of a living body and a corpse. Those who remained in the Church of England were dead members of a dead body (though Ainsworth and Barrow’s opponents viewed the matter quite differently of course).

¹²⁴ Ibid.

¹²⁵ Ibid., 26-7.

¹²⁶ Ainsworth, *Counterpoyson*, 241.

Ainsworth's critics claimed that he gave the government of the church to the 'people.' Ainsworth, however, denied any such thing. He explained, 'We give the people ... a right and power to observe and do all the commandments of Christ.'¹²⁷ Both Ainsworth and Barrow made a distinction between the officers of the church and those in the church who did not hold a local office. The true visible church was not a popular democracy. Ainsworth responded, 'So then for popular government, (which Mr Bern. [Richard Bernard] would traduce us by;) we hold it not, we approve it not; for if the multitude govern, then who shall be governed? Christian liberty (which all have) is one thing, the reins of government (which some have) is another thing.'¹²⁸ At issue was the meaning and role of 'government' within the visible church. Ainsworth's understanding and that of his opponents differed.

Ainsworth argued that the members of the church should have liberty to keep all of Christ's commandments. As he saw it, the Church of England had deprived their members of that liberty, having kept them in bondage, familiar language in Barrow's writings. It was the difference between partaking in Christ's offices under the two administrations – that of law in the Old Testament and national Israel, and that of grace in the New Testament – that provided Ainsworth with an explanation. While the members of Christ's church had always been made prophets, priests, and kings, they did not exercise those offices in the same way. In national Israel, Christ's members did not take part in government, as they were to do during the administration of grace. When he was asked, 'Whither in Israel the Lord abridged the people of their right and liberty,' Ainsworth acknowledged that the Israelites did not

¹²⁷ Ainsworth, *An animadversion*, 24.

¹²⁸ Ainsworth, *Counterpoyson*, 177.

participate in the affairs of the nation, as priests and kings, as Christians should in the church under the new administration.¹²⁹ He explained a part of this distinction:

They were a national Church, & the Magistrats in the gates of Jerusalem, the Preists in the Temple, being for the whole Realm; it could not be that al the people should be present at the dayly judgements of the Magistrates, or sacrifices of the Preists. And therefore it was not required so of them; as now it is of us, who are but particular Churches, to be present at al publik administration of Christs kingdom and preisthood.¹³⁰

Ainsworth's understanding of the visible church as particular and plural rather than national and singular helps to understand his argument for the elect's participation in Christ's offices.¹³¹ The true visible church, existing as it did in many disparate locations, each autonomous from one another, meant that every member had a role to play in the public affairs of the visible church. The visible church under the administration of law was national, but under the administration of grace it was not so. While all the elect at all times have been priests and kings, those under the administration of law were priests and kings in a different respect to those who were priests and kings under the new administration.

Liberty to keep Christ's commands by all the elect and particularly exercising their roles as participants in Christ's offices made possible Christ's expectations for the true visible church under the New Testament. Ainsworth wrote,

Their spiritual communion may be considered in three things: First in al duties from themselves towards God; as be prayses, thanksgivings, prayers supplications &c. which they powr out one with & for an other. Secondly in all graces given them of God, as are the words of

¹²⁹ Ainsworth, *An animadversion*, 34. See also Francis Johnson, *An advertisement* (Amsterdam, 1612), 34.

¹³⁰ Ainsworth, *An animadversion*, 30-1.

¹³¹ Polly Ha has argued that the distinction between a singular national visible church as held by Presbyterians and plural visible local churches as held by Congregationalists forms a key theme in understanding their debates in the period. See Ha, *English Presbyterianism*, ch. 3. See also *supra* p. 30.

his covenant, the comforts and seales of the same, opened and applied for the helping forward and assurance of their salvation. Thirdly in al duties among themselves, one towards an other, as counsels, deliberation, exhortations, consolations, admonitions, rebukes, censures, and such like: al which for the honour of God and their mutual food, they carefully together doe keep & execute.¹³²

Communion with Christ prescribed the duties of the elect toward God and the responsibilities of the elect toward one another. These duties were the expression of Christ's offices in the true visible church; they were neither aesthetic practices nor things indifferent. The church as the body of Christ required each and every member to perform their role or the body suffered. If the officers of the visible church took power to themselves, the people came under bondage to Antichrist. Ainsworth argued, 'Those Officers are to be judged Antichristian, which usurp and exercise the office peculiar to Christ himself alone.'¹³³ While Christ's offices were his uniquely, he shared his offices with the members of his body so that every one was a prophet, a priest, and a king with him. The Church of England and the Church of Rome, Ainsworth argued, had usurped Christ's offices by their antichristian leadership. Proof of this was that Christ's servants were prevented from exercising their offices as prophets, priests, and kings.

Government in the church was neither to be in the hands of a select few nor the hands of the people alone according to Ainsworth. He argued for the rightful place of an ordained ministry in the true visible church: 'We acknowledge Christ to have ordeyned a *Presbyterie* or *Eldership*, and that in every church; for to teach and rule them by his own word and lawes; unto whom all the multitude, the members, the

¹³² Ainsworth, *The communion of saints*, 363-4.

¹³³ Ainsworth, *An apologie*, 51.

Saints, ought to obey and submit themselves, as the scriptures teach.¹³⁴ He further explained, ‘Every particular Church established in the order of Christ, consisteth of these parts: namely, that all the members therof, are either private brethren, whom the Scripture calleth the Saints, the flock, the multitude, &c. or else are publick Officers and servants of the Church.’¹³⁵ Nevertheless, Ainsworth’s understanding of the officers of the church was not the same as that found in the Church of England. Ainsworth warned against the leaders taking power and liberty from the congregation. The leaders in the church were not to lead with power, but to serve: ‘These Overseers, that thus go before, help, direct, and govern their brethren, are not to impeach their freedom or power in anything: for be they never so great they are not their owne, but the Churches to whom they administer, the churches being Christ; and Christ Gods.’¹³⁶ The congregation had a part to play in the church’s public affairs; however, they were also to obey the leaders they had chosen. Ainsworth informed his readers, ‘These guides ar to be heard, reverenced, and submitted unto in the Lord; they attend to the publick service of the church, and are as the hand, mouth, & eyes of the same; by such God of old signified his wil to the people.’¹³⁷

Even so, Ainsworth believed that the congregation’s involvement in the church’s public affairs was more than consent to the decisions of their officers. The relationship between church leaders and the people varied widely in the period, yet puritans generally supported the idea of acting only with the consent of the

¹³⁴ Ainsworth, *Counterpoyson*, 176.

¹³⁵ Ainsworth, *An apologie*, 49.

¹³⁶ Ainsworth, *The communion of saints*, 380.

¹³⁷ *Ibid.*, 379.

congregation. David Hall speaks of the ‘laymen’s privilege of consent.’¹³⁸ Margaret Sommerville argues this ‘privilege of consent’ applied to separatists as well: ‘The English Separatist tradition had always maintained that the church's officers must not attempt to reach important decisions in ecclesiastical matters without the consent of the whole church.’¹³⁹ Ainsworth held that the ruling power in the church was not in each member, nor in the hands of one or a few, but was in Christ.¹⁴⁰ Christ’s ruling power was expressed in the church through his offices of prophecy, priesthood, and kingship. As every member shared in these offices, they had an active role to play in the decisions of the church, whether to choose a minister, to accept someone into membership, or to excommunicate someone from the congregation. Only as the congregation was gathered did it express the offices of Christ. Ainsworth made the point that no individual member, independent of the others, had authority in the congregation.¹⁴¹

Ainsworth did, however, limit some practices to those who had been ordained to office. Regarding the authority to teach the scripture in the congregation he wrote,

The word of God, is given to all & every member of the church, to read & exercise privately: but publickly in the church there is a double use, in prophesy; and in office; as the Apostle distinguisheth. The office of teaching, is layd upon some few chosen and ordeyned therunto. ... Teaching in way of prophesie ... so many as have the gift & ability from God, may all prophesy one by one.¹⁴²

¹³⁸ David D. Hall, *The faithful shepherd: a history of the New England ministry in the seventeenth century*, Harvard theological studies (Cambridge, MA: Distributed by Harvard University Press for Harvard Theological Studies, Harvard Divinity School, 2006), 33.

¹³⁹ Sommerville, 'Independent thought', 103.

¹⁴⁰ Ainsworth, *Counterpoison*, 175.

¹⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 174-8.

¹⁴² *Ibid.*, 176.

So while Ainsworth limited teaching to those who had been called to that office, the practice of sharing the word in the congregation was open to all.¹⁴³ This distinction, if there was any practical difference, is found in Barrow's writings as well. For Ainsworth, the officers were to 'studie and labour in the word and doctrine, to feed the flocks that depend upon them ... to build up the bodie of Christ.'¹⁴⁴ He continued, 'Al men may prophesie in his church, which is to speak to edifying, to exhortation & to comfort, and all men are exhorted to covet this more than other spiritual gifts.'¹⁴⁵ Ainsworth noted that the Church of England allowed only those ordained to office to teach or to share the word of God in their assemblies.

Regarding the sacraments, Ainsworth believed that no sacraments were to be administered until the officers had been chosen and ordained to their office.¹⁴⁶ The role of the non-ordained members in administering the sacraments is never clearly addressed in Ainsworth's writings. Of course, Ainsworth did limit those who were to receive the sacraments to the faithful.¹⁴⁷ It is interesting to note that while Ainsworth allowed a congregation to excommunicate members without officers, they could not participate in the sacraments until officers had been ordained.¹⁴⁸ For Ainsworth, as with Barrow, the sacraments were seals of the covenant with God, a sign of the communion that the true Christian had with Christ and with the members of his body. Once again, as with Barrow, the sacraments were not essential to one's salvation.

¹⁴³ Ainsworth limits 'prophesying' to men. More will be said about gender distinctions in participation of Christ's offices in chapter 4 *infra*.

¹⁴⁴ Ainsworth, *The communion of saints*, 372.

¹⁴⁵ Ainsworth, *Counterpoyson*, 136.

¹⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 177.

¹⁴⁷ Ainsworth, *The confession of faith*, 71.

¹⁴⁸ Teaching by means of lay prophesying was allowed before leaders were selected. See Ainsworth, *Counterpoyson*, 176-7.

Limiting some practices to those ordained was a delicate balance. Ainsworth was concerned over the abridgement of the liberties of the saints through the accumulation of power in the hands of a few. He noted, ‘They [Francis Johnson, et. al.] conclude with an aequivocation in this word power, which is not in the same sense to be applied to the Elders, as it is to the body of the Church.’¹⁴⁹ As Ainsworth understood the true visible church, every member of the congregation was equal in power, but diverse in role:

The Ministers of the word, how great gifts or authority soever thy have, they al are ours, and we Christs, and Christ Gods; we are to trye their doctrine by the scriptures, for they have not dominion over our faith, but are helpers of our joy; and in declaration of the truth are to approve themselves to every mans conscience in the sight of God.¹⁵⁰

The congregation was not subservient to their officers nor were the officers beneath the congregation. The congregation was to submit and obey their officers as long as they remained true to the Scriptures and their officers were to serve the church. Ainsworth explained, ‘We neyther taught nor doo teach otherwise then as we always professed; namely that they are a royal Preisthood, made by Christ unto God ... not one over another, as they speak, but one with another, in the fellowship of the faith of Christ.’¹⁵¹

Richard Bernard complained that with the ‘Brownists’ ‘the power of Christ, that is, authoritie to preach, to administer the Sacraments, and to exercise the Censures of the Church, belongeth to the whole Church, yea to every one of them, and not the principall members thereof.’¹⁵² Ainsworth rejected Bernard’s

¹⁴⁹ Ainsworth, *An animadversion*, 26.

¹⁵⁰ Ainsworth, *The communion of saints*, 226.

¹⁵¹ Ainsworth, *An animadversion*, 110.

¹⁵² Bernard, *Christian advertisements and counsels of peace*, 88.

explanation, responding ‘Christ’s ruling power ... we say not ... that it is in the body of the Congregation, the multitude; but in Christ himself.’¹⁵³ Christ is the head of the church. No other authority existed in the church according to Ainsworth. Further, the officers did not exercise Christ’s authority alone: ‘And it is (say they) to be ministred by the Officers: but not (say I) by them onely; therin is the deceyt. The whole Church is a kingdome of Preists, that is of ministers.’¹⁵⁴ Ainsworth accused the Church of England of usurping Christ’s offices and not allowing Christ’s members to serve him as prophets, priests, and kings.

Ainsworth argued that the Church of England, as well as that of Rome, had misrepresented Christ’s gospel at best, and in the worst case had deprived the people of the true gospel and the graces of God, deliberately holding them in bondage. The bishops took Christ’s offices to themselves. In a true visible church, Christ alone is the head over the members his body. As Christ is the prophet, priest, and king of his church, every member of his body shares in his offices. Christ exercises his offices through his members in the church. Only the true visible church can offer justification and sanctification without which no one will see God. Only when every member participates in Christ’s offices can the church fulfil its purpose. Only as prophets, priests, and kings, can the elect serve God and bring glory to his name.

4. Conclusion

Ainsworth held a true visible church to be a company of ‘faithful people’ in communion with Christ and with each other as members of his body. A true visible

¹⁵³ Ainsworth, *Counterpoyson*, 175.

¹⁵⁴ Ainsworth, *An animadversion*, 26-7.

church was not distinguished by its 'right practices' alone but also by its 'right people.'¹⁵⁵ A true visible church was a gathering of the members of Christ's invisible church in a particular location. Ainsworth viewed the nature of the church differently than his opponents. David Gurney maintains, 'The root difference between the Separatist and non-Separatist doctrines of the church was the former's insistence that the church is called out of the world. The concept was quite simply one of exclusivity; the Separatists implemented literally Paul's injunction to "Come away and leave them, separate yourselves."'"¹⁵⁶ Once again, though, for Ainsworth, separation was the means, not the end. The 'root difference' was how each side in the debate understood the nature of the visible church. Was it were all people gathered to hear the gospel and be 'saved' or was it a gathering of the saved who were being built as the body of Christ? For Barrow and Ainsworth, it could not be both.

Essential to Ainsworth's understanding of the visible church were Christ's offices and the participation of the elect in them. He joined his Christology with his ecclesiology. As he said, 'Christ was the foundation of the true church.' Christ was not only the foundation of his visible church, but he was also its continuing builder. Underlying this view was the work of Christ, namely in his threefold office of prophet, priest, and king. Christ's work for the elect and his work in and through the elect formed a significant aspect of Ainsworth's ecclesiology. His reason for separating from the Church of England was because they had denied Christ by denying his offices. As Ainsworth explained, to deny either Christ's person or his

¹⁵⁵ Ainsworth wrote, 'This our English word Church, through custome of speech is commonly used for the Temple or place where people come together for the worship of God: but they that are any thing exercised in religion, know, that it also signifieth the People, which gather together for divine service; and this is the first & proper meaning of the word Church.' Ainsworth, *Counterpoysion*, 112.

¹⁵⁶ Gurney, 'Education', 60.

work was to deny him. The charge that the Church of England denied Christ placed them outside the bounds of orthodox belief and demanded separation, from Ainsworth's perspective.

As has been argued throughout this chapter, Ainsworth's use of the doctrine of Christ's offices and the participation of the elect in those offices was consistent with Barrow's use. Ainsworth's consistency should not be surprising, as he believed he continued in the same theological understanding as Barrow. Both Barrow and Ainsworth understood the Church of England to be a false church because of its denial of Christ's offices. Both Barrow and Ainsworth argued that the true visible church was where Christ was prophet, priest, and king and where every member participated in Christ's offices. Both believed that Christ exercised his offices through the members of his body. At no point did their usage of the doctrine disagree. Ainsworth did, however, expand upon points that Barrow had raised.

Notably, Ainsworth gave more attention to the idea of communion with Christ and the members of his body. Barrow maintained that union with Christ was the basis of participation in Christ's offices, yet Ainsworth spent more time discussing this idea. Ainsworth also made clear the distinction between what Christ had done for the elect and what he was doing in the elect with the ideas of justification and sanctification. While Barrow does refer to this distinction as justification and sanctification, it was not as clear as in Ainsworth's writings. Ainsworth also discussed participation in Christ's offices during the Old Testament economy. Ainsworth clarified the discussion of 'no church' and a 'false church,' ideas that were not as clear in Barrow's writings. Finally, Ainsworth spent more time discussing the issues of power and authority in the church. Once again these were

present in Barrow's writings yet took on greater import for Ainsworth. It is important to note that neither Ainsworth nor Barrow's opponents engaged their usage of the doctrine of the offices of Christ.

Was the concept of participation in the offices of Christ by the elect a key theme in Ainsworth's ecclesiology? As was observed in the previous chapter concerning Barrow's use of the doctrine, it is not wise to try to take the idea of a 'central theme' too far. No single doctrine can serve as a focal lens for all of Ainsworth's theology nor provide an explanation to all of his thinking. Nevertheless, the doctrine of the offices of Christ played a significant role in Ainsworth's ecclesiology. While it might be difficult to establish a pattern of cause and effect, the ideas were clearly integrated, and Ainsworth's ecclesiology cannot be fully understood apart from this doctrine. The body of this chapter has shown that Ainsworth used the doctrine of Christ's offices and participation by the elect to defend and explain his views of the true visible church. It might be said that the four causes of separation to which Ainsworth subscribed were the formal cause, however as this chapter has demonstrated, underlying those errors was the Church of England's denial of Christ's offices and their hindering of Christ's true servants from fulfilling their duties as participants in those offices. The Church of England's denial of Christ's offices in their doctrine and practice was the material cause of separation for Ainsworth. It was argued in the previous chapter that this idea, the participation by the elect in Christ's offices, was a key theme in Barrow's ecclesiology. It is reasonable to conclude from all that has been presented in this chapter that it was a central theme in Ainsworth's ecclesiology as well. Whether it was a theological position distinct to them cannot yet be answered, however.

Though both Barrow and Ainsworth were frequently referred to as ‘Brownists,’ they never accepted that name. Ainsworth pointed out that Browne loved the world more than God because he had reconciled with the Church of England; Browne had not held fast to the truth. Interestingly though, Ainsworth believed that Brown still held a poor opinion of the Church of England: ‘How wel Mr. Brown approveth of your church, though he live in it; if you ask him I suppose, will tel you.’¹⁵⁷ While Barrow rejected the title ‘Brownist,’ it is unlikely that he would have accepted the title ‘Barrowist’ either. Barrow did not see himself as the spokesperson for a tradition, but rather as a prophet of his God. Further, given his adherence to Scripture alone it is more probable that he would have seen himself, and those who agreed with him simply as true Christians: ‘We are as we professe to be, simple hearted Christians, which seek to worship and obey Christ as our only king, priest, and prophet.’¹⁵⁸ Ainsworth would probably have rejected the title of ‘Barrowist’ as well although he agreed with Barrow’s views and held Barrow in high esteem. He remarked that Barrow and Greenwood ‘dyed in *that faith which we professe*.’¹⁵⁹ He also commented, ‘The exceptions which these godly ministers take against Mr Barrowes writings, and yet professe not to answer them need not now to be stood upon, til the particulars whereby he hath discovered their errors & evil dealings, be by them taken away.’¹⁶⁰ While Ainsworth did not consider Barrow’s writings to be without error, he did nevertheless, recognize that they contained truth to which Ainsworth agreed.

¹⁵⁷ Ainsworth, *Counterpoyson*, 39.

¹⁵⁸ Barrow, ‘A Brief Summe of the Causes,’ 125.

¹⁵⁹ Ainsworth, *An apologie*, 86. (Italics added).

¹⁶⁰ Ainsworth, *Counterpoyson*, 215.

Both Barrow and Ainsworth insisted they had not received their theology from Robert Browne.¹⁶¹ There were, however, points of agreement between them and Browne. As Edward Bloomfield notes, the Brownists' 'ecclesiology and worship were very similar to that of the Barrowists.'¹⁶² B.R. White made the same point, 'There was a wide area of agreement between the teaching of Browne and Barrow.'¹⁶³ Even so, points of agreement do not necessarily unite Browne, Barrow, and Ainsworth into a common tradition. White pointed out, 'It seems probable that Henry Barrow and his disciples, although widely counted as "Brownists" by their contemporaries as well as by later writers, owed little if any of their distinctive ecclesiology to the man they quickly came to regard as an apostate from their cause.'¹⁶⁴ Champlin Burrage wrote, 'He [Barrow] detested the name Brownist, partly no doubt because he was not a Brownist. Browne considered the Church of England to be imperfect and therefore needing reform; Barrowe termed the Church of England a false Church, which it was one's duty to desert.'¹⁶⁵

The question, however, is not whether they drew their theology from Browne but whether they held to the same distinctive theological ideas; that is, did Robert Browne hold to the same ideas concerning the offices of Christ in the visible church that Barrow and Ainsworth held? Barrow and Ainsworth's relationship to Browne is part of a larger question concerning the 'distinctiveness' of their ideas regarding Christ's offices in the visible church. Browne's views on the doctrine of the offices of Christ will be considered in a subsequent chapter along with the usage common to

¹⁶¹ Barrow accuses his opponents of 'baptising us into the name of Browne, as though we had either derived or hold our faith of him, or any mortal man.' For Ainsworth's opinion see *supra* p. 99. Barrow, 'Brief Discoverie,' 440.

¹⁶² Bloomfield, 'Opposition to the English Separatists', 21.

¹⁶³ White, *English Separatist Tradition*, 70.

¹⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 44.

¹⁶⁵ Burrage, *Early English Dissenters*, vol. 1, 130.

the period, 1580 to 1620. The question then, whether Barrow and Ainsworth's usage of the doctrine of the offices of Christ was a distinctive theological position common only to those associated with Barrow will have to wait to be fully answered. It is important to note, though, that both Barrow and Ainsworth considered their understanding to differ from their opponents, and from the Church of England in general. For Barrow and Ainsworth, separation was not a matter of 'strategy or timing' but a fundamental difference in the nature of the church. The next chapter considers the 'Barrowist' view of the offices of Christ, both for the elect and in the elect, as essential attributes of the true visible church.

Chapter 4: The Offices of Christ and the True Visible Church

For Barrow and Ainsworth, Christ was immediately present in his visible church, working *in* the elect and *through* the elect. Their understanding of the visible church was based upon their conviction of Christ's purpose in the incarnation, his work of prophecy, priesthood, and kingship. Barrow's reference to the Church of England's denial of the incarnation was a hint of this fundamental understanding.¹ It has already been suggested that Barrow and Ainsworth focused on the *raison d'être* of the visible church and were not obsessed with its details. They believed that Christ's work as prophet, priest, and king (the continuation of his earthly ministry begun in the incarnation) was the reason and foundation of the visible church. George Yule comments that according to Calvin, 'The whole life of the Church and not just its doctrine ought to be interpreted by the incarnation, death and resurrection of Jesus Christ.'² In fact, this was what Barrow and Ainsworth believed they were doing.³

It was pointed out in chapter two that Barrow's first work, *Four Causes of Separation*, described four errors that led to a denial of Christ's offices. For Barrow, that denial was a denial of Christ's incarnation.⁴ He believed that a true visible church was a gathering of the elect where Christ was the prophet, priest, and king

¹ See *supra* p. 56.

² George Yule, 'Theological developments in Elizabethan Puritanism,' *Journal of Religious History* 1, no. 1 (1960), 19.

³ George Yule argues that for Calvin, to interpret the church by the incarnation meant the church was *not* to follow a pattern found in the New Testament. Yule explains, 'This did not mean, as many later Calvinists stated it, that the order of the Church could be read off from the New Testament pattern, but that the order of the Church had to conform to Christ its Head as the Suffering Servant. The emphasis had to be on ministries (i.e. services) not on rights, while the corporate emphasis of the Body of Christ had to be preserved also in the order of the Church.' *ibid.*

⁴ See *supra* p. 56.

and where all the elect participated in those offices with Christ. Barrow had explained the error of the Church of England as a rejection of what Christ was doing *in* and *through* the visible church; that is, the Church of England rejected Christ's 'present' work of prophecy, priesthood, and kingship in the visible church. Barrow saw in the argument for adiaphora a rejection of Christ in the 'present.' By introducing human devices into worship the Church of England had replaced Christ as their prophet, priest, and king in favour of the bishops.⁵ Chapter three argued that Ainsworth followed in Barrow's view of the offices of Christ and the visible church. Further, chapters two and three demonstrated that both Barrow and Ainsworth had used the doctrine offices of Christ in an ecclesiological context; that is, they focused on the offices of Christ in their debates over the visible church.

This chapter will examine the significance of the offices of Christ to a true visible church in Barrow and Ainsworth's understanding; that is, it will explore the integration of their Christology and ecclesiology. It was Barrow and Ainsworth's understanding of Christ, that is, their Christology, which persuaded their understanding of the visible church, that is, their ecclesiology. For Barrow and Ainsworth, the visible church was the visible expression of Christ on earth and the continuation of his earthly ministry begun at the incarnation. In the discussion that follows, three ideas will underscore this argument. First, Christ's 'present' working in the visible church as prophet, priest, and king, both *in* and *through* the elect, was an essential sign of a true visible church. It was Christ's offices as prophet, priest, and king that signified Christ's presence in the visible church. More importantly, at least for the purposes of this thesis, Christ not only continued to work immediately in

⁵ See *supra* pp. 63, 136.

all of the elect, but also worked mediately through all of the elect as the members of his body. Secondly, all those in union with Christ were empowered to serve him as prophets, priests, and kings. Christ made them prophets, priests, and kings to serve him, and he worked in and through them. It was the participation of all of the elect, notably in the public affairs of the visible church that was Christ's body at work on the earth. Finally, when Christ was working in and through the gathered elect in prophecy, priesthood, and kingship, they were his body presently working on earth. Each visible church was Christ's body, not a gathering of individuals; each was a visible expression of Christ still present and working on the earth.

1. The presence of Christ

Barrow and Ainsworth believed that Christ's continued work was an essential characteristic of a true visible church. Christ working in and through all of the elect were two signs of Christ's presence in the visible church. Even so, these two signs were not *notae ecclesiae* for Barrow and Ainsworth. They argued that the visible church must be measured by the whole word of God rather than just two or three 'infallible marks.' Barrow argued,

Neither need we unto this busines to goe fetch our light out of men's writings (as sundrie of the chief builders of this corrupt age do) or curiously to enquire or dispute about I wote [know] not what markes of the true church, which whiles some indevored to set downe, endles controversies and vaine striefe about words hath arisen amongst them, without end or edifying. Therefore let us, for the apeasing and assurance of our consciences give heed to the word of God, and by that golden reed measure our temple, our altar, and out worshippers.⁶

⁶ Barrow, 'Brief Discoverie,' 278-9.

The offices of Christ were not the only signs of Christ's presence in a true visible church for Barrow and Ainsworth. However, these two signs were the problem in the Church of England at that time. For Barrow and Ainsworth, the offices of Christ were the current circumstance they were addressing. Barrow, however, went even further arguing that the Church of England had no true sign of Christ's presence among them at all.⁷

Supporters of the Church of England argued that the preaching of the word and administration of the sacraments proved the Church of England to be a true church and as such Christ was present there.⁸ Further, the existence of elect in the Church of England (the existence of which both Barrow and Ainsworth accepted) also demonstrated that Christ was present in their church.⁹ For Church of England supporters, the presence of the word preached and the sacraments administered alone were sufficient to prove Christ's presence in their church. The existence of elect in their church just furthered the argument. As noted in chapters two and three, according to Barrow and Ainsworth's opponents, anything that may be lacking or any sin present in the church would not make it false.¹⁰ An incorrect polity, the lack of discipline, or even the presence of wicked and non-believing people in the church would not, thereby, cause Christ to abandon that church.

According to Barrow and Ainsworth, the idea of *notae ecclesiae*, or as they understood them, 'infallible marks' of the visible church, was not found in scripture. There were no 'infallible marks.' Barrow explained, 'But here they deceive themselves and others, with certayne infallible markes of the church, which they

⁷ Barrow, 'Four Causes of Separation,' 63.

⁸ See *supra* p. 117.

⁹ See *supra* pp. 78, 79, 122.

¹⁰ See *supra* pp. 55, 63, 64, 72, 73.

have fantasied unto themselves; namely, that where the word of God is sincerely taught, and the sacramentes rightly administered, there undoubtedly is still the true church of Christ.’¹¹ Ainsworth likewise rejected such ‘infallible marks.’ Mocking Richard Bernard, Ainsworth wrote, ‘Mr Bernarde in the name of all the divines in their church, yea (if we may beleeeve him) of all the reformed Churches in Christendome, telleth us with a marginall note also to have it wel observed, that the true word of God preached, and true sacraments of Christ administred, are infallible tokens of a true church.’¹²

For Barrow and Ainsworth, the sacraments were signs that grace had already been imputed to the true believer who received them. Christ’s sacraments, then, were only for the elect.¹³ Barrow explained, ‘The sacramentes confer not so much, as seale God’s grace unto us, they give not faith so much, as confirme the faith of all the worthy receavers.’¹⁴ The sentiment that the sacraments were seals of the covenant was almost universally accepted in English Protestantism. Robert Some wrote, ‘We are taught in Gods booke, that the Sacraments instituted of Christ, are the seales of Gods word.’¹⁵ Thomas Cartwright explained, ‘The Lorde is in covenaut with that people to whome he giveth the seales of his covenant.’¹⁶ Barrow’s comment that the sacraments ‘do not confer but seal grace’ was not so unusual. Even so, George

¹¹ Barrow, 'Brief Discoverie,' 306.

¹² Ainsworth, *Counterpoysion*, To the Reader.

¹³ Few of Barrow and Ainsworth’s opponents would have disagreed with them on this point. However Gifford acknowledged that some priests allowed all to approach the table of the Lord, but explained that the practice was not what the Church of England taught. Gifford wrote, ‘I did confesse, and doo still with gréeffe, that in very manye assemblies in England, all are admitted to the Table of the Lord, which offer themselves, even the most prophane and grosse sinners.’ He continued, ‘the Church of England dooth neither approve such admission of prophane men to the Sacrament, nor yet suffer it in practise wholly.’ Gifford, *A short treatise*, 47.

¹⁴ Barrow, 'Brief Discoverie.'

¹⁵ Some, *A godlie treatise of the Church*, B6 verso.

¹⁶ Thomas Cartwright, 'An Answer unto a letter of Master Harrison,' in *Cartwrightiana*, ed. Albert Peel and Leland H. Carlson, Elizabethan Nonconformist Texts, vol. 1 (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1951), 52.

Gifford, a puritan, seems to understand Barrow's view as different from his own.

Gifford challenged, 'And tell me, Master Barrow, is there not some part of this power of loosing or remitting sinnes by the sacraments'? Barrow responded that the sacraments did not provide forgiveness of sin. Rather, only those who had had their sins forgiven already should receive the sacraments.¹⁷

For Barrow, the sacraments were signs of what had already taken place while Gifford seemed to see some present efficacy of the sacraments for the forgiveness of sin. Barrow chided, 'I hope you thincke their sinnes are forgiven before and not by the receiving of the sacraments.'¹⁸ Ainsworth's view was similar to Barrow's: 'As touching the relation, (which is the mayn thing in a sacrament,) that it should seal up unto them the forgivnes of synns, and (as they blasphemously say) quite take away synns, and conferr grace; so it is a vayn idol and nothing: for neyther doo the true Sacraments of Christ's church work any such effect to Gods own people.'¹⁹ For Gifford, the sacraments were more than an empty sign. The distinction between Barrow and Gifford was between the sacrament as a sign of what had already happened and the sacrament as a sign of the grace being received at the moment of reception. For both, the sacrament was a sign and the sacrament signified receiving God's grace. The difference was when that grace was received. For Barrow, the grace had been received in the past, previous to the recipient receiving the sacrament. For Gifford, at least some grace was being received as the sign was being received. According to Gifford's understanding, Christ was present administering the grace as

¹⁷ Henry Barrow, 'Barrow's Final Answer to Gifford - Marginalia,' in *The writings of John Greenwood and Henry Barrow, 1591-1593*, ed. Leland H. Carlson, Elizabethan Nonconformist Texts, vol. 6 (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1970), 154.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 153.

¹⁹ Ainsworth, *An animadversion*, 72-3.

the recipient received the elements.²⁰ However for Barrow, the grace had already been received and therefore it was not necessary that Christ be present at the reception of the sacrament. For Barrow and Ainsworth, the sacraments did not signify Christ's immediate presence but rather his past work. That the sacraments did not signify Christ's presence was especially true where they were delivered to the non-believing, a practice that Barrow and Ainsworth had accused the Church of England of.²¹

The word preached was also an infallible sign of Christ's presence for Barrow and Ainsworth's opponents.²² Yarnell points out that for English Protestants, 'If Christ is the Word of God, the preaching of the Word makes Christ present.'²³ Jerald Brauer agrees, noting that for some puritans, the word preached was more important than the word itself since, in preaching, the word was energised

²⁰ For many English Reformers, there were changes in language from the use of 'bodily presence' to 'real presence' or 'spiritual presence.' Arthur Hildersham noted, 'Q. Is Christ then indeed present in this Sacrament? A. Yes verily: ... yet not corporally, but spiritually and sacramentally present.' William Perkins explained, 'We holde and beleewe a presence of Christs bodie and bloode in the Sacrament of the Lords supper: and that no fained, but a true and reall presence.' Many who rejected transubstantiation and consubstantiation still argued for a 'real presence' of Christ in the Eucharist. The debates are complex and beyond the scope of this thesis. Arthur Hildersham, 'The Doctrine of communicating worthily in the Lords Supper,' in *A direction for the weaker sort of Christians*, ed. William Bradshaw (London: 1609), 35; William Perkins, *A reformed Catholike* (Cambridge, 1598), 185; E. Brooks Holifield, *The covenant sealed: the development of Puritan sacramental theology in old and New England, 1570-1720* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974), 57.

²¹ Gifford, *A short treatise*, 47.

²² For many of the 'hotter Protestants' in England, the preaching of the word was the primary means of experiencing Christ's presence and was seen as more important than the sacraments. The Church of England clergyman, Adrian Savaria, lamented, 'For who seeeth not, and greeveth not to see, how men are set together upon mischief? even to reduce the whole Ministerie of the church, to the bare Ministerie of the word.' Edward Philips maintained that the word was 'more necessarie' than the sacraments, because it 'begets and begins faith,' whereas 'the Sacraments do but confirme it.' Even so, Hunt argues that the dichotomy between preaching and sacraments among the English reformers is not supportable. He notes that puritans emphasized and participated in the sacraments equally with preaching. There was no diminishing of the sacraments among the puritans according to Hunt. Hunt does note though, 'This did not, of course, alter the fact that the word was primary, the sacraments secondary.' While there are indications that preaching was emphasized over the sacraments as channels of grace, there were few who neglected the sacraments altogether. Adrien Saravia, *1. Of the diverse degrees of the ministers of the gospel. 2. Of the honor which is due unto the priestes and prelates of the church. 3. Of sacrilege, and the punishment thereof.* (London, 1591), 6; Arnold Hunt, 'The Lord's Supper in Early Modern England,' *Past & Present*, no. 161 (1998), 54, 75, 78-9, 55.

²³ Yarnell, 'Royal Priesthood', 318.

immediately by the Holy Spirit.²⁴ The arguments for the effectiveness of the word preached and the ineffectiveness of the word read in begetting salvation were consistent with this view.²⁵ Further, Ian Green points out an interesting similarity between the Reformed pastors and the Catholic priests noting, ‘In the eyes of many reformers, the act of preaching, of being the channel through which the Holy Ghost called the faithful to salvation, took on an almost mystical significance comparable to that felt by Catholic priests for the miracle of the mass.’²⁶ Alexandra Walsham agrees with this point, ‘For fervent Protestants, moreover, hearing or reading the Word of God itself could be a near sacramental and mystical experience. The word was not “just a communicative sign. It could mediate the divine.”’²⁷

However for Barrow and Ainsworth, the word could only be an aid for those who were already united to Christ. The word preached, while a great benefit to the elect, did not infallibly signify Christ’s presence. Barrow explained, ‘The preaching of the word maketh not a church, except there be by the same a faithfull people gathered unto Christ Jesus.’²⁸ For the non-elect, the word preached was a sure sign of their judgment.²⁹ Barrow and Ainsworth were not rejecting the idea that faith came

²⁴ Brauer, 'Types of Puritan Piety,' 48.

²⁵ There was debate whether the word read, either privately or heard read publicly, could beget faith. Cf. Thomas White, *A sermon preached at Paules Crosse* (London, 1589), 22; Samuel Hieron, *The preachers plea* (London, 1604), 172; John Downe and George Hakewill, 'A treatise concerning the force and efficacy of reading,' in *Certaine treatises of the late reverend and learned divine, Mr John Downe* (Oxford: 1633), passim.

²⁶ I. M. Green, "'Reformed Pastors" and *Bons Curés*: The Changing Role of the Parish Clergy in Early Modern Europe,' in *The ministry: clerical and lay; papers read at the 1988 Summer Meeting and the 1989 Winter Meeting of the Ecclesiastical History Society*, ed. W. J. Sheils and Diana Wood, Studies in church history (Oxford: Published for the Ecclesiastical History Society by Basil Blackwell, 1989), 252.

²⁷ Alexandra Walsham, 'The Reformation and the Disenchantment of the World Reassessed,' *The Historical Journal* 51, no. 02 (2008).

²⁸ Barrow, 'Brief Discoverie,' 306. Ainsworth wrote, ‘Yet is not the outward ministry of the word sufficient, unlesse we be also taught of God himself; who therefore voucheth safe to giv us a third help, even his own good spirit to instruct us, without which no man can say that Jesus is the Lord.’ Ainsworth, *The communion of saints*, 83.

²⁹ Barrow, 'Brief Discoverie,' 286-7, 290.

by hearing the word preached rather they were rejecting preaching as the means by which Christ was made present to the elect in the visible church.³⁰ For the elect, the word of God was an aid to growth as the Holy Spirit brought about change within the believer. Ainsworth explained, ‘Christ worketh in all men by his Spirit, pricking their hearts, illuminating their understanding, changing their affections, working repentance, faith and comfort, these effects he worketh by his Spirit, which hee sendeth into the hearts of his people.’³¹ The idea that the Holy Spirit made the word effective was not unique to Barrow and Ainsworth. The distinction between Barrow and Ainsworth and their opponents was whether preaching in the visible church was an ‘infallible sign’ of Christ’s presence there. For Barrow and Ainsworth, it was not the act of preaching itself but rather the presence of the elect hearing the word preached that gave to preaching its significance.

The existence of some elect in the Church of England was not an ‘infallible sign’ of Christ’s presence either. Of course, Christ was spiritually present in every true believer so that wherever believers were he was present. Ainsworth wrote that Christ’s presence ‘be with every of his Saints, in al places wher they become; yet is it most lively seen in their Assemblie, and there he is very terrible. For this cause did his people love the habitation of his house, & desired to dwel there al their dayes, that they might be hold his bewtie.’³² William Perkins wrote,

Now gods presence hath divers degrees. First, god is present to our conscience, when we thinke of him. 2. He is present when we name him, or heare him named or mentioned by others and these are the furthest off. Thirdly, god is neerer unto us in the presence of his Ordinances, as his Word and Sacraments, and publike service in the Congregation. Fourthly, there is a most apparant and sensible presence

³⁰ See *supra* p. 76.

³¹ Ainsworth, *The orthodox foundation of religion*, 46.

³² Ainsworth, *The communion of saints*, 215, 468.

of god, which shall be at the last judgement, when all men shall stand before him in his immediat presence, to receive their judgement.³³

While Christ was present with every believer always, there was a sense in which Christ was more present when the elect gathered together.

Nevertheless, the existence of some elect in a visible church did not prove Christ's visible presence there according to Barrow and Ainsworth.³⁴ As there could be elect in a false church, and Christ dwelled in all the elect through his Holy Spirit, it was still true that Christ was spiritually present in all the elect wherever they were. Barrow and Ainsworth distinguished between Christ's spiritual presence in all the elect and his visible presence in his true visible church.³⁵ As noted previously, Barrow and Ainsworth argued that Christ was not visibly present in a visible church in which he was not its prophet, priest, and king, and that did not teach or allow the practice of his offices *in* and *through* the elect.³⁶ Even though there might be elect in the Church of England, Christ was not present there. This point is perhaps most indicative of their ecclesiology. It was not simply the elect gathered that made Christ visibly present, for Barrow and Ainsworth. Rather, it was a gathering of the elect wherein Christ was visibly working as a prophet, priest, and king that was a sign of Christ's visible presence.

Barrow and Ainsworth had a different grasp of Christ's presence based upon a different understanding of the visible church. The true visible church was a gathering of the elect yet it was more than that. Christ was visibly present only where

³³ Perkins and Crashaw, *Of the calling of the ministerie*, 25.

³⁴ See *supra* pp. 79, 122.

³⁵ See *supra* pp. 71, 120.

³⁶ On elect in the Church of England see *supra* pp. 79, 122. Regarding the distinction between a true and false church based upon the participation of the elect in Christ's offices, both Barrow and Ainsworth make the case that the bishops hindered God's people and held them in bondage. See the section 'Every member's interest in the work of Christ' in chapters 2 and 3.

he was the only prophet, priest, and king and where all the elect participated as prophets, priests, and kings.³⁷ For Barrow and Ainsworth, in the visible church Christ was more than just spiritually present in the hearts of the elect. Barrow and Ainsworth distinguished between Christ's spiritual presence and his visible presence just as they distinguished between the invisible church and the visible church.³⁸ The historiography has not always recognized the distinction in Barrow and Ainsworth's writings between the invisible and visible churches. Fred Powicke and Leland Carlson both argue that Barrow rejected the concept of an invisible church. Powicke suggested that Barrow 'rightly held that the distinction between visible and invisible has no New Testament support, and did not emerge until the Church, having corrupted itself, sought an excuse for its degraded state and for the continuance of it.'³⁹ Carlson pointed out,

For Barrow the Church Invisible did not exist either in the New Testament or in real life. There was no Platonic spiritual archetype which had actual existence, but there was an Aristotelian nominalistic concept which did exist as an ideal. This ideal was the Church Visible, which was realisable, cognizable, and meaningful in daily affairs and localised in true visible churches, which collectively comprised the Church Visible, spiritually unified but geographically diverse.⁴⁰

Stephen Brachlow takes a slightly different approach:

The distinction between visible, and invisible churches was, in practical terms, of little purpose, except in so far as it provided a theological apologetic against what they perceived to be the unorthodox perfectionist theories of the radical sectaries, the sixteenth-century 'Donatists' and 'Cathari' among the Continental

³⁷ See *supra* p. 74ff.

³⁸ See *supra* pp. 70, 123.

³⁹ Fred J. Powicke, *Henry Barrow Separatist (1550?-1593) and the Exiled Church of Amsterdam (1593-1622)* (London: J. Clarke, 1900), xxiii.

⁴⁰ Henry Barrow, *The Writings of Henry Barrow, 1587-1590*, 6 vols., Elizabethan Nonconformist Texts, ed. Leland H. Carlson (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1962), 21.

anabaptists and, by some accounts, among the radical puritans and separatists of England.⁴¹

For Barrow and Ainsworth, however, the visible church was distinct from the invisible church; the visible church was a visible manifestation of the invisible church.⁴² As Barrow and Ainsworth understood the distinction, the visible church was limited to human frailty and to a time and geography on earth. The invisible church was perfect and not limited to time or geography.

Barrow and Ainsworth made it clear that only when Christ was working immediately *in* the elect as the prophet, priest, and king and mediately *through* the elect as prophets, priests, and kings, was he visibly present in a visible church.

Barrow argued,

Is not Christ now dead, rised, and ascended, and hath freed his church from such tutelship, he himself now becoming their law giver and minister *in person*, and hath now given them his holy word and Spirit, to administer wisdom unto theme in al freedome to use the same, his word, according to his wil and their owne occasions, unto his glorie and their comfortes?⁴³

As Barrow noted, Christ was a minister in person. The presence of Christ in the visible church was a significant point of debate during the Reformation.⁴⁴ The issue

⁴¹ Brachlow, *Communion of Saints*, 115.

⁴² See *supra* pp. 70, 123.

⁴³ Barrow, 'Brief Discoverie,' 369, (Italics added).

⁴⁴ Stephen Brachlow writes, 'The concept of Christ's presence was not unique to the separatists but part of the common currency of reformed rhetoric.' Malcolm Yarnell notes, 'The issue of the presence of Christ was a lively one in the subject period. Traditionalists granted the priesthood incredible power by virtue of the latter's ability to confect the body of God in the host. In turn, the body of God was used for physical and spiritual welfare ... In reaction, the reformers questioned the confecting Authority of the priest. Lutherans kept the Real Presence of Christ in the eucharist elements but affirmed the indefinite Presence of Christ in the faithful community gathered around the Lord's table. The "ecclesial presence" of the Reformed replaced the need for a Real Presence in the elements.' How exactly Christ was made present engaged both Protestants and Papists. There was (and still is) a tension between the transcendence and immanence of Christ. Brachlow, *Communion of Saints*, 101 note 90; Yarnell, 'Royal Priesthood', 318.

between Barrow and Ainsworth and their opponents was not whether Christ was present in the visible church, but rather the signs of his presence.

Barrow's point when he made a distinction between what Christ had done *for* the elect and what he did *in* and *through* the elect was that the Church of England denied Christ's 'present' work in the visible church. Barrow and Ainsworth argued that the bishops in the Church of England had taken Christ's offices away from him and hindered some of Christ's servants from exercising their roles as prophets, priests, and kings.⁴⁵ Christ was not working in the Church of England either immediately or mediately. According to Barrow and Ainsworth, these essential signs of a true visible church were lacking in the Church of England. These signs were essential because Christ's presence was essential. Even so, in response to Barrow and Ainsworth's accusations, supporters of the Church of England claimed that Christ was still presently working in their church through those ordained, 'his chosen instruments.'

2. *An empowered people*

All the elect, as members of Christ's body, were provided with everything necessary to continue his work on earth according to Barrow and Ainsworth. This idea was discussed in chapters two and three regarding the participation of all the elect in Christ's offices. Through union with Christ, both the responsibility of his offices and the empowerment to fulfil them were communicated to each member.⁴⁶ Union with Christ meant that all the elect were obligated to continue Christ's work of

⁴⁵ See *supra* pp. 87, 108.

⁴⁶ See *supra* pp. 87, 121.

prophecy, priesthood, and kingship.⁴⁷ The church was Christ's body, and the elect were the members of his body. Christ, who was anointed as the prophet, priest, and king, anointed the elect, prophets, priests, and kings. The elect were never independent of Christ. They were prophets as Christ was a prophet in them. They were priests as Christ was a priest in them. They were kings only as Christ was a king in and through them. They shared in Christ's offices. Each member of Christ's body acted in accordance with Christ's purpose for taking on humanity and entering the world. It was immediate union with Christ as Christ worked in the church and in the world that empowered the elect.

It was also noted, in chapters two and three, that the difference between Barrow and Ainsworth and their opponents concerning the role of the non-ordained in the public affairs of the visible church involved how each saw the people who were part of the visible church.⁴⁸ Barrow and Ainsworth argued that all of the elect had a right and interest in the visible church's public affairs. Barrow, offering up a possible objection by his opponents to the non-ordained participating in the public activities of the visible church wrote,

Heere will be grossly objected, that the common people are ignorant, not able to judg betwixt truth and error, disordered, variable, easie to be devided and led into sects; and therefore they are not to intermedle with the judgement and reproof of faults and errors escaped in the ministerie, or with the censuring their persons.⁴⁹

However, Barrow and Ainsworth saw the members of a true visible church differently.

⁴⁷ See *supra* pp. 85, 132.

⁴⁸ See *supra* pp. 74, 119.

⁴⁹ Barrow, 'Brief Discoverie,' 522.

Two distinctions are important to note here. First, there was a distinction between the public works of the visible church and private settings. Fathers were to pray with and instruct their households, and masters to do the same for their servants. Still, these were considered private settings.⁵⁰ Individuals could also gather to repeat the sermon for mutual benefit, but this too was regarded to be a private setting.⁵¹ As long as there was no new doctrine introduced the setting remained 'private.' The second distinction was that while Christ worked *in* all the elect in both public and private settings, according to the Church of England, Christ only worked *through* the ministers in public settings.⁵² While it might appear from the previous statement that the non-ordained in the Church of England were purely passive observers during the service that was not the case. The non-ordained did not stand before the congregation during the public service nor were they God's mouthpiece to the congregation or congregation's mouth to God. However, they were expected to listen actively and

⁵⁰ Henry Smith, *The sermons of Maister Henrie Smith* (London, 1593), 56; Richard Rogers, *Seaven treatises* (London, 1604), 212; Thomas Gibson, *The blessing of a good king* (London, 1614), 321.

⁵¹ Patrick Collinson explained that as long as those who met repeated the minister's sermon, the meeting was not a conventicle; that is, no new or original doctrine was being taught. Though in this way the meeting had the potential to become a conventicle and thereby to separate from the church. Collinson wrote, 'The importance of repetition lies chiefly in the link, the umbilical cord as it were, which it served to symbolise between the public assemblies and doctrine of the Church and the exploration of religious knowledge and experience at a private and domestic level; and also between the trained and qualified professional, the minister, and his people.' Collinson, 'The English conventicle,' 243.

⁵² Perkins argued, 'No man is to undertake this function [preaching], unlesse God *call and send him*: therefore heere are condemned, the profane fances of the *Anabaptists*, and all like them, who thinke that any many uppon a private motion, may steppe foorth and undertake the duties of a *Prophet*, to Preach and expound, &c.' Ainsworth remarked, 'The Church of England hath not Christs ordinance of *prophesie* without office; for it is unknowen, un practised, and unsufferable among them, for private men to preach in their assemblies; they must be Ministers allowed by the *Ordinary*, els it is punishable by the law of their church.' Malcolm Yarnell draws out this idea, 'Reformed ministers also had a different monopoly over the presence of God. If Christ is the Word of God, the preaching of the Word makes Christ present.' Following this logic, those who did not or could not preach could not make Christ present to the congregation gathered. Perkins and Crashaw, *Of the calling of the ministerie*, 39; Ainsworth, *Counterpoyson*, 136; Yarnell, 'Royal Priesthood', 318.

provide their ‘amen’ to what the minister was doing.⁵³ Listening was seen as a very participatory activity for the non-ordained.

Barrow and Ainsworth’s ecclesiology did not limit Christ’s work in the public affairs of the visible church to those ordained but argued it was the responsibility of all the elect. Barrow wrote, ‘Everie member hath like interest in Christ, in his word, the publike doctrine, and ministration of the church, and shall all be held guiltie and punished for the publike transgressions and abuses of the church.’⁵⁴ For Barrow and Ainsworth, the ordained and non-ordained were equally responsible for the public works and sins of the visible church. Ainsworth wrote, ‘The Saincts have al a right & interest in the covenant of God, & seales of the same, wherein they have and hold communion together: so have and doe they also, in al other Christian spiritual duties, publick or private.’⁵⁵

Every true believer was a prophet, priest, and king in the personal ‘strenuous and unremitting struggle to do God’s will in the world.’⁵⁶ With fellow Protestants, Barrow and Ainsworth shared the view that every true believer was empowered to live the Christian life. No person was capable of living a godly life without Christ. Human inability, while not universally accepted, was a common Protestant

⁵³ Arnold Hunt, *The art of hearing: English preachers and their audiences, 1590-1640*, Cambridge studies in early modern British history (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), ch. 2. Holifield explains that the laity participated in the public affairs of the church through their consent. He quotes Dudley Fenner, ‘Not the Ministers alone must worke here, but the Church with him, in witnessing his work, in approving the same by one consent of the spirit of grace, by consenting in prayer and thanks-giving, for which they are saide to doe the works of the Sacraments.’ Polly Ha notes, ‘If the principle of common consent provided an ideological foundation for lay involvement in the Church, it also provided other crucial points of contact between clerical and lay developments.’ She adds however, ‘The principle of consent, however, was deeply divisive in both theory and practice.’ Holifield, *covenant sealed*, 37; Ha, *English Presbyterianism*, 96, 74.

⁵⁴ Barrow, ‘Brief Discoverie,’ 520-1.

⁵⁵ Ainsworth, *The communion of saints*, 375.

⁵⁶ Como, *Blown by the Spirit*, 34. Chapter 5 *infra* discusses the use of the doctrine in this sense. Chapters 2 and 3 *supra* discuss the personal role of prophecy, priesthood, and kingship.

doctrine.⁵⁷ Good works that a person performed were the work of God in them, whether in conversion or subsequently in sanctification.⁵⁸ Barrow and Ainsworth's understanding of participation in Christ's offices did not make the elect more capable of fighting sin or more obedient to the obligations of the covenant of grace. In one aspect, participation in Christ's offices as empowerment for the individual believer's life of faith was common to Barrow and Ainsworth as well as their opponents. Every true believer had been called *generally* to communion with Christ and furnished with all that was necessary for the journey. Still, in the Church of England there was a distinction between the work of the ordained and the non-ordained during the public service.

The concept of the continuation of Christ's work on earth was not distinct to Barrow and Ainsworth's ecclesiology either. According to the Church of England, Christ continued his work in the visible church through his chosen instruments. Perkins argued that the minister was only an instrument and did not possess any

⁵⁷ Of course human inability or ability has oft been seen as the debate between Arminianism and Calvinism. Historic Arminianism did not reject human inability though, and this was not the crux of the debate. Rather, since all needed grace, the question was whether that grace was made available only to a select group or to all. English Protestants did not reject original sin. David Como comments, 'According to standard protestant readings, not only were people incapable of obeying the Law perfectly (thereby meriting salvation), but their very inability to keep the Law was central to the true path to salvation.' *ibid.*, 116; Charles Lloyd Cohen, *God's caress: the psychology of Puritan religious experience* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986), ch. 1; Keith D. Stanglin and Thomas H. McCall, 'Jacob Arminius: theologian of grace,' (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013).

⁵⁸ The debate between Protestantism and the Church of Rome regarding merit for good works concerned the 'earning' of grace. The Church of Rome taught that good works were the result of grace given by God and so were not equal in merit to the reward received for them. Nevertheless, good works performed, according to the Church of Rome, received in return, greater grace, thus enabling more and greater good works. For the English Protestants though, any grace received in return for good works performed was to add to Christ's work and thereby deny Christ's office of priesthood. Richard Rogers explained, 'Thus while he speaketh such contraries, sometime, that good workes must be built on the foundation of faith; and with an other breath, that good life is the right way to bring faith, (and yet all may see he speaketh of one and the selfe same faith in both places).' Thomas Beard, *A retractive from the Romish religion* (London, 1616), 113, 120-1; Matthew Kellison, *A survey of the new religion* (Doway, Rheims, 1603), 299ff; Edward Bulkley, *An apologie for religion* (London, 1602), 171; Rogers, *Seaven treatises*, Preface. Many more places could be cited here but for the sake of some brevity these should suffice.

ontological power.⁵⁹ As Perkins explained, ‘God confirmeth the word of his servants, and performeth the counsell of his messengers.’⁶⁰ God worked through the means of the ministry that he had ordained.⁶¹ Those who defended the established church in England distinguished between the ministers, those called to public service and who were Christ’s chosen instruments, and those who made up the non-ordained within the congregation. Supporters of the Church of England argued that Christ was present as the gospel was preached and the sacraments administered by *Christ’s chosen instruments*. Perkins noted that the minister ‘is Gods instrument, and Christs instrument,’ and ‘they are Gods instruments, ordained by him to convey his grace unto us.’⁶² One whom Christ worked through as his instrument must be called by Christ and most often recognised by the church as having been called.⁶³

For the supporters of the Church of England, the difference between the clergy and laity might be argued on the basis of the function or ontology of the minister, or on the difference between the ‘possession’ and ‘use’ of power.⁶⁴ While

⁵⁹ Perkins and Crashaw, *Of the calling of the ministerie*, 11.

⁶⁰ Ibid.

⁶¹ Ibid., 36.

⁶² William Perkins, *A treatise of the vocations, or, Callings of men* (London, 1603), 13, 36. Yule explains that for Calvin, ‘The means by which the Church nourishes us are the Word and Sacraments through the agency of the ministry.’ George Yule, ‘Calvin’s View of the Ministry of the Church,’ in *The ministry: clerical and lay; papers read at the 1988 Summer Meeting and the 1989 Winter Meeting of the Ecclesiastical History Society*, ed. Ecclesiastical History Society. Summer Meeting Magdalene College Cambridge (1988) et al., *Studies in church history* (Oxford: Published for the Ecclesiastical History Society by Basil Blackwell, 1989), 171.

⁶³ Hieron, *The preachers plea*, 133; Perkins and Crashaw, *Of the calling of the ministerie*, 39; Richard Bernard, *The faithfull shepheard the shepherds faithfulness* (London, 1607), 6; Downname, *Two sermons*, 3.

⁶⁴ In their efforts to defend the dignity and authority of the minister, English Protestant writers in the late sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century used language that could be understood to argue for an ontological change in the minister. George Downname argued, ‘For their [men’s] calling is but declarative, as the Schoolemen speak, whereas God’s calling is effective. And therefore men ought by their calling to declare none fit for the Ministerie, but such as God by his calling hath made fit.’ William Perkins explained, ‘To call a man to the Ministerie, is the greatest worke that God worketh in his church, but the converting of a sinner, and calling him to the state of grace: nay it is a work even like unto it: for as a sinner in his conversion, so be at his Vocation to that place, is often to cry out in the amazement of his soule, Woe is me, I am undone.’ The change wrought within the sinner in conversion was ontological. The comparison seems to make the same assertion of the minister. Even

all the elect had gifts through which Christ's work continued, not all had the same gifting or measure. William Perkins explained,

Besides other Christians being private men, though they be sanctified, and have a good measure of knowledge, yet have they not the same Spirit of discerning that godly Ministers have: nor can so fully & truly judge when a man hath repented, when not; and there cannot so truly pronounce the sentence of the law or gospel, nor have the abilitie ordinarily by their good conference, and Christian counsel, to convert a soule, but to confirme one converted; but that power ordinarily belongs to the publike ministry of the word, therefore it followeth, that ordinarily they have not the power to pronounce the sentence of binding or loosing upon any man: I confess, in times or places, where no minister can bee had, God blesseth the labors of private men, that have knowledge, sometimes even for comforting him at the houre of death, and gives a virtue and power to that sentence which they shall pronounce one upon anothers repentance: but as this is extraordinarie, and in the want of ordinary ministers, so in that case a private man of knowledge & godlines, is made a Minister for that time to himself, or to another, even as a private man in cases of extreame danger, when no magistrate is present, is made a magistrate himselfe to defend his own life.⁶⁵

Even in those times when a non-ordained person may act as God's instrument, it was only a temporary circumstance brought on by the absence of an ordinary minister.

The puritan John Brinsley commented, 'The Ministers of the Word, being agents betwixt God and his people, their office consisteth in two things: 1. In dealing with God for the people. 2. In dealing with the people for and from God.'⁶⁶ The minister was to be an intermediary in the public service.

While not all supporters of the Church of England would have argued that the minister was more important, the language used to describe the minister could easily

though they clearly rejected a true ontological claim their language was at times confusing. Downname, *Two sermons*, 3; Perkins and Crashaw, *Of the calling of the ministerie*, 16-8. On the distinction between possession and use see Hall, *faithful shepherd*, 112.

⁶⁵ Perkins and Crashaw, *Of the calling of the ministerie*, 12.

⁶⁶ John Brinsley, *The preachers charge, and peoples duty* (London, 1631), 4. Concerning John Brinsley see Richard Cust, 'Brinsley, John (1600–1665),' in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed., ed. Lawrence Goldman, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/3441> (accessed 30 July 2014).

be understood to give the minister greater value than the laity in God's economy. George Downname commented, 'For Ministers though they bee men: yet are they not as others, men of the world, but, as the Scripture usually calleth them, men of God. ... It cannot bee denied but those whom the Lord calleth to the Ministry, he advanceth above the condition of other men.'⁶⁷ The Minister had the privilege of representing Christ, a privilege not shared by the non-ordained. Richard Bernard noted, 'True Ministers of Christ Jesus ... represent Christs person unto the congregation ... Now the bodie of the people, do not by office represent Christ, neither are equall with the Ministers as they bee such, much lesse have authoritie over them.'⁶⁸ Further, some comments seem to give to the minister an ontological power to perform their work. Perkins argued, 'Angels themselves doe wonder at the excelencie of thy calling [the Minister], in that thou hast power to declare unto man his righteousness.'⁶⁹

The minister also bore a special responsibility for the lay members because of his distinct calling according to Church of England supporters. Perkins argued that the minister was responsible for the sins of the people:

It cannot be but the sinnes of his people, are in some sort his [the minister]: for this is the peculiar danger of the Magistrates and Ministers calling, that generally the sinnes of their people are theirs: I meane that they are accessarie to the sinnes of their people, either by provoking them by their evil example, or by not reprovng, to not hindring or suffering, or winking or covering & concealing or not punishing them, or not carefully enough using meanes to prevent them: by all which meanes and many more, it comes to passe, that the peoples sinnes are the Ministers by communication: so that as well for his owne sake, as theirs, hee is to confesse to GOD their sinnes, as well as his owne.⁷⁰

⁶⁷ Downname, *Two sermons*, 55.

⁶⁸ Bernard, *Christian advertisements and counsels of peace*, 102.

⁶⁹ Perkins and Crashaw, *Of the calling of the ministerie*, 10.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 21.

For Perkins, while the minister was held responsible for the sins of the people the people were not held responsible for each other's sins or the sins of the minister.

The issue between Barrow and Ainsworth and their opponents was whether there was a group, specially set apart, through whom Christ *solely* worked in the public affairs of the visible church. In private settings, Christ may work through any one of the elect, such as a father within his family or a master among his servants. All the elect were called to be prophets, priests, and kings as Barrow and Ainsworth as well as their opponents agreed. There was no dispute that all the elect were empowered in their personal struggle of faith. However, when it came to the public affairs of the visible church, there was a difference. The supporters of the Church of England argued that some of Christ's work as prophet, priest, and king, most notably that in the public service, was limited to those called and ordained to ministry.⁷¹

In limiting some of the public practices of the visible church to those ordained, the Church of England hindered some of the elect (those not ordained) from their roles as prophets, priests, and kings according to Barrow and Ainsworth. They believed that a church that prevented any of the elect from exercising the functions of prophecy, priesthood, and kingship was a false church. Here is the crux of the issue. The Church of England (as well as the Church of Rome) did not allow all the elect to participate in Christ's offices, notably in the public affairs of the visible church. The non-ordained elect were not free to select the leadership of the church, to accept into fellowship, to take part in church discipline, to share the word of God publically, or resolve doctrinal issues in that church. Christ was not the

⁷¹ See *supra* pp. 91, 92, 128ff.

prophet, priest, and king of any church where the members of his body were not at liberty to exercise their responsibilities as prophets, priests, and kings. To hinder the members of Christ's body, binding his limbs, his hands, his feet, was to hinder Christ. Barrow complained that the ministers were not to 'assume the publicke actions of the whole church into their owne handes alone.'⁷² Ainsworth agreed, 'And it [power] is (say they) to be ministred by the Officers: but not (say I) by them onely; therin is the deceyt. The whole Church is a kingdome of Preists, that is of ministers.'⁷³

Though Barrow and Ainsworth still held to an ordained ministry, they allowed for more participation by the non-ordained members in the public affairs of the church. The underlying theology upon which this practice was based was the participation of the elect in the offices of Christ. Walsham notes, 'There was a moment when the reformers favoured the establishment of broadly participatory parish regimes and believed that the humble laity could be trusted to play an active part in local ecclesiastical government.'⁷⁴ Nevertheless, none of Barrow and Ainsworth's opponents argued for lay involvement in the public affairs of the visible church.

Despite Barrow and Ainsworth's understanding of participation by all the elect in the offices of Christ, they still held to some limitations within the public service. As already noted, while the congregation could still open the scriptures and interpret them, having no persons in office, they could not participate in the

⁷² Barrow, 'Plaine Refutation,' 146.

⁷³ Ainsworth, *An animadversion*, 27.

⁷⁴ Alexandra Walsham, 'The godly and popular culture,' in *The Cambridge companion to Puritanism*, ed. John Coffey and Paul Chang-Ha Lim, Cambridge companions to religion (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 285.

sacraments. Further, a distinction was made between the public teaching offices and lay prophesying within the public service by those outside that office. Teaching was limited to an ordained office holder. However, as previously discussed, while not all could hold the teaching office, all male members could publically share the word and explain its meaning to the congregation.⁷⁵ How exactly these two acts differed is not apparent. While the teaching office was restricted, apparently teaching itself was not.⁷⁶ The question has already been considered whether, for Ainsworth, only the officers could administer the sacraments.⁷⁷ However, it should be remembered that for Barrow and Ainsworth, the role of officers was not to ‘assume the publicke actions of the whole church into their owne handes alone.’⁷⁸

Beyond the limitations on the office of teaching and the administration of the sacraments, in Barrow and Ainsworth’s ecclesiology perhaps the most notable limitation concerned the role of women. Both Barrow and Ainsworth denied women the right to prophesy in the visible church based on 1 Corinthians 14.⁷⁹ The fellow separatist, John Robinson (a contemporary of Ainsworth) noted that St. Paul’s denial, in 1 Corinthians 14, of women in prophesying was under ordinary conditions.⁸⁰ He

⁷⁵ See *supra* pp. 92, 139.

⁷⁶ Greenwood responding to Stephen Egerton claimed, ‘Giftes of interpretation are sufficient calling to speake of the word in the congregation, in due order and place.’ Greenwood and Barrow, ‘A Collection of Certain Letters and Conferences,’ 213.

⁷⁷ Barrow noted that only pastors were allowed to deliver the sacraments but in this he may have been referring to what the Church of England held. His comment was in response to Sperin concerning whether ministers in the Church of England were true ministers of Christ, even if they read the sermon. Barrow’s position was that if they could not teach they were not true pastors and yet those same individuals deliver the sacraments ‘which none but pastors can do.’ His point was that their ministry was not from God therefore their sacraments were not from God. It seems best not to make too much of Barrow’s statement here regarding the role of the non-ordained in the sacraments. *Ibid.*, 188.

⁷⁸ Barrow, ‘Plaine Refutation,’ 146.

⁷⁹ Barrow, ‘Brief Discoverie,’ 531-2, 562; Ainsworth, *Counterpoyson*, 176.

⁸⁰ There is a question whether John Robinson was a follower of Barrow. Barrington White considers Robinson a disciple of Francis Johnson. The difficulty here is that Johnson’s views changed. Johnson appears to have followed Barrow after the early 1590s up to the early years of the 1600s. Ainsworth quotes from Robinson in Ainsworth’s work *An Animadversion* where Robinson uses the offices of

wrote, ‘For women immediately, and extraordinarily, and miraculously inspired, might speak without restreynnt.’⁸¹ Robinson provided several Old Testament and New Testament examples supporting his view. Neither Barrow nor Ainsworth addressed whether Paul’s prohibition concerning women prophesying was limited to ordinary conditions or what if any limitations might be appropriate under extraordinary circumstances.

Concerning the sacraments, Barrow frequently charged the Church of England with allowing women to baptise, an indictment that George Gifford rejected.⁸² According to the Book of Common Prayer, women could baptise in extraordinary circumstances (when urgency was needed, and a minister would not be available in time).⁸³ Barrow considered allowing women to baptise under extraordinary circumstances as evidence the Church of England had rejected Christ. Given the polemical nature of many of the writings of the period, it can be difficult to distinguish what an author might believe from the expediency of the argument. Nevertheless, Barrow was experienced in debate, and it would seem unlikely that he would allow himself to be caught in expediency. It seems reasonable then, to suggest that Barrow limited a woman’s participation in the administration of the sacraments,

Christ in the same way as Barrow and Ainsworth had. Timothy George points out, ‘More pervasive than any of these, however, is the theological rubric of the *triplex minus Christi*, the communal embodiment of which Robinson locates in the true visible Church.’ Fred Powicke explains Robinson in this way, ‘Robinson, then, no less than Ainsworth was, if not a disciple, yet an admirer and adherent of Barrow.’ The issue is of course how one defines a ‘Barrowist.’ Robinson did not seem to agree on all the common points of Barrowism, most notably associating with those who remained in the Church of England. White, *English Separatist Tradition*, 161; Ainsworth, *An animadversion*, 111 ff; George, *John Robinson*, 146; Fred J. Powicke, *Henry Barrow Separatist (1550?-1593) and the exiled church of Amsterdam (1593-1622)* (London: J. Clarke, 1900), 274. See also Keith L. Sprunger, ‘Robinson, John (1575/6?-1625),’ in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed., ed. Lawrence Goldman, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/23847> (accessed 29 August 2012).

⁸¹ John Robinson, *A Justification of Separation* (Amsterdam, 1610), 237.

⁸² Barrow, ‘A Brief Summe of the Causes,’ 131; Gifford, *A short treatise*, 15.

⁸³ Brian Cummings, ed. *The book of common prayer: the texts of 1549, 1559, and 1662* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 774; Barlow, *The summe and substance of the conference*, 8.

at least in baptism. Women were not to be hindered from baptism or from receiving the Eucharist in both kinds just as the men were free to do. However administering the sacraments was limited to men even in extraordinary circumstances. It must be remembered, though, for Barrow and Ainsworth there was no danger to one's salvation to be without the sacraments. A true visible church could exist without officers and without the sacraments being administered.

Nevertheless, limiting women's role in the public affairs did not mean that they did not participate as prophets, priests, and kings the same as men. Both Barrow and Ainsworth noted that not all received the same gifts or measure of gifts. One man was not inferior to another who had different gifts or to one who had a greater measure. In the same way, a woman was not inferior if she was not gifted in a certain way or called to a particular office. For Barrow and Ainsworth, the limitations on women were commanded by God and not the result of any inadequacy. Ainsworth commented, 'Although a woman, in regard of her sex, may not speak or teach in the church: yet with other wemen, and in her private familie, she openeth her mouth in wisdom, & the doctrine of grace is in her tongue.'⁸⁴ Women played a very prominent role in the life of the true visible church. As Barrow and Ainsworth had rejected a clergy-laity distinction, they also rejected gender inequality, although there were limitations on roles.

An oft-used comment by Barrow regarding women must be brought to bear on this discussion, however. In Barrow's support for the congregation selecting its minister and his rejection of selection by the bishop or patron, he used the fact that

⁸⁴ Ainsworth, *The communion of saints*, 371.

patrons were sometimes women as support for rejecting the practice. Barrow noted this problem with patronage:

When one man (were he never so wise) taketh away the power and dutie of the whole church to make the choice, how much lesse when the patron that oweth [owneth] the advouson, is many tymes a stranger both to the priest and people, ignorant, and unable to discern or judge of the gifts, fitnes, life of the person chosen and presented, the patron many times being a child, a woman, yea, peradventure a profane or wicked person, a papist, an atheist, an heretick, etc.⁸⁵

Barrow could be understood as arguing that a woman was unfit to select a valid minister for a congregation. Still, Barrow insisted that women participate, as members of the congregation in the congregation's selection of its minister. It is difficult to reconcile Barrow's reference to a female patron as a reason to reject the practice with his position on the participation of both men and women in the true visible church. It is possible that he is using the position of his opponents against them rather than arguing for the position himself. Barrow's opponents saw women as inferior; how could they then support the practice of patronage when in some cases the patron was a woman? Barrow, then, may have been pointing out the inconsistency of his opponents' argument rather than stating his position. This understanding seems to be consistent with Barrow's use of the argument against his opponents. Even so, this issue does not undermine the principal theme of this chapter: the relationship of Christology and ecclesiology in Barrow and Ainsworth's thought.

All of the elect, then, were empowered to fulfil their roles as prophets, priests, and kings through union with Christ. All of the elect, and not just the leadership, participated in the public affairs of the visible church. Barrow and Ainsworth argued

⁸⁵ Barrow, 'The First Part of the Platforme,' 236-7.

that only as all of the elect were free to exercise their roles as prophets, priests, and kings in the public affairs of the visible church was the visible church Christ's body. After Christ had ascended, he sat at the right hand of the Father. However, Christ's earthly ministry had not ended with his ascension. Christ's body (through the elect) was still on earth and was still performing the work for which he became incarnate. It was Christ's continuing work in and through the elect that was an essential characteristic of a true visible church. Central to Barrow and Ainsworth's ecclesiology was the belief that the visible church was an expression of Christ's body on earth. Christ continued his earthly ministry of prophecy, priesthood, and kingship through his body, the elect, in visible churches.

3. The visible church, the body of Christ

When the elect gathered together they were not members of a church; they were members of Christ's body in Barrow and Ainsworth's view. Participation in Christ's offices by all the elect meant more than that every believer was an instrument of Christ. Every one of the elect who had faith in Christ was joined with Christ and every other member of Christ's body. Barrow explained, 'Paull to the Romans speaketh thus: "we have many members of on[e] bodye ... so we being many ar on[e] bodye in Christ, and every on[e] of us on[e] another's members."'»⁸⁶ Ainsworth agreed,

To illustrate this Communion between our Saviour and us, we have the similitude of an humane bodie, the members wherof by their due joynts and synewes are joyned to the head, receiv from it life and motion, and government in al the actions and affayrs: so Christ is the

⁸⁶ Barrow, 'Profes of Apparant Churche,' 76.

head of the body of his church, & communcateth with al the Saints his members, life and grace, and al good things for their conservation. ... Agayn as the husband and wife, ar not two, but one flesh; & the first woman builded of the rib of man, was flesh of his flesh and bone of his bone, and so did love & live together partaking ech with the others welfare: in like manner are we joyned to the Lord, & made one spirit; ... for we are members of his body, of his flesh and of his bones.⁸⁷

Not only were the elect united to Christ but each was also united to all other elect in Christ's body.

Barrow and Ainsworth viewed the visible church as the body of Christ in a literal sense. For Barrow and Ainsworth, the elect, as prophets, priests, and kings, were Christ's arms and legs, his hands and feet. Christ, the head, commanded them, and they continued on earth what he had begun. Ainsworth explained, 'This gathering together of the Saints, is not a bare assembly or concourse onely, of people; but a neer uniting and knitting of themselves, in one holy communion and fellowship.' He continued, 'The Saints of God, ar ... one body in Christ, & every one, one anothers members; being by one spirit al baptised into one body; which is caled Christs Church or Congregation, because we are gathered and joyned together unto him our head.'⁸⁸ Barrow and Ainsworth's emphasis on the visible church made the implications of union with Christ and the members of his body more prominent.

As a gathering of the elect, the visible church existed as the consequence of union with Christ, not prior to or independent of union with Christ according to Barrow and Ainsworth. Only when those who had been united to Christ gathered together as participants in his offices of prophecy, priesthood, and kingship was there

⁸⁷ Ainsworth, *The communion of saints*, 253-4.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, 318, 320.

a true visible church. The visible church, therefore, was the result of grace and not the means of it. Edmund Morgan commented,

As Anglicans and nonseparating Puritans continued to press the claim that the Anglican church was a true church because it brought saving faith to some, at least, of its members, Ainsworth launched a rebuttal ... Separatist members, he said already had faith, while the Anglicans' claim that they produced faith was in itself proof that the Anglican church was improperly constituted, because the members should have had faith before they were admitted.⁸⁹

For Barrow and Ainsworth, a true visible church was not where people received saving faith but was, rather, a gathering of those who had already received it. Barrow and Ainsworth agreed that true faith came by hearing the word preached. Still, the members of a true visible church already possessed saving faith.⁹⁰ While the ability of a church to 'beget a true saving faith' belonged only to Christ's visible church, this ability was not an essential mark of the visible church according to Ainsworth. Gifford had argued that since people were 'saved' in the Church of England and this ability to beget true saving faith was a mark of a true church, therefore, the Church of England was a true church. In reply to Gifford Ainsworth wrote: 'These notes which you propound, are not the essential notes of a true church: neyther (if they were,) ar they ordinarily found in your church.'⁹¹

The gathering of the true visible church, then, was for sanctification, not justification. Barrow explained that there was a 'difference betwixt the worcke of our salvation by Christ for us, and the worcke of God's Holy Spirit, the fruiets of God's

⁸⁹ Edmund Sears Morgan, *Visible saints: the history of a Puritan idea* (Ithaca, NY: New York University Press, 1963), 54.

⁹⁰ See *supra* pp. 75, 120ff.

⁹¹ Ainsworth, *Counterpoyson*, 10.

grace in us.’⁹² Again Barrow’s distinction of Christ’s work *for* the elect and his work *in* the elect appears. Ainsworth wrote, ‘Now followeth our Sanctification or, reformation into the image of God, which is Christs worke in us.’⁹³ For Barrow and Ainsworth, justification happened before joining with the visible church while sanctification happened after joining. Since no unbeliever was to be allowed to join with the true visible church, the gathered congregation was not for the purpose of conversion and justification. Timothy George adds concerning John Robinson, ‘In the *ordo salutis*, then, church order belonged not to the “invisible justification” of the individual believer, but to the outward, empirical process of sanctification defined in communal terms as the dynamic interaction and mutual edification of the Lord’s free people.’⁹⁴

The exclusion practiced by Barrow and Ainsworth was the *result* of their understanding of the visible church as Christ’s body. Barrow and Ainsworth excluded some because of what they understood the visible church to be, not in order to make it a true visible church. This distinction is crucial to understanding Barrow and Ainsworth’s ecclesiology. According to Ainsworth, ‘No knowne Atheist, unbelever, Heretique, or wicked liver, be received or reteined a member in the Church of Christ, which is his body.’⁹⁵ He continued noting that those who had received saving faith were ‘commanded to separate’ from the wicked and ‘to entertayn and continue a holy communion among themselves.’⁹⁶ As already pointed out Barrow and Ainsworth distinguished between visible churches and the invisible

⁹² Barrow, 'Plaine Refutation,' 165.

⁹³ Ainsworth, *The orthodox foundation of religion*, 63.

⁹⁴ George, *John Robinson*, 105.

⁹⁵ Ainsworth, *An apologie*, 36.

⁹⁶ Ainsworth, *The communion of saints*, 1-2.

church.⁹⁷ Barrow and Ainsworth, then, were not trying to make the visible church absolutely pure and thereby confuse it with the invisible church.

Further, this separation was not just a separation from the corruptions, but from the people themselves.⁹⁸ Barrow argued, ‘Mr. Calvin’s distinction, that he separated from the corruptions of the Church of Rome and not from the church of Rome, wil not here stand.’⁹⁹ Barrow was making the point that to consider the Church of Rome a true visible church and yet to separate from its corruptions could not be justified. For Barrow and Ainsworth, the visible church was the body of Christ; it could not be both his true body and at the same time belong to Antichrist. Ainsworth wrote, ‘the scripture speaketh . . . of the fellowship and communion of the Saints, with God and among themselves; and of their separation from the Divil, and from his children the wicked men even in this life, whiles yet they live together with them in civil societie.’¹⁰⁰

If the visible church was truly the body of Christ, then it could not consist of a mixed assembly unless the existence of any non-elect within it was unknown to its members. Barrow and Ainsworth argued that there was no communion between Christ and Antichrist. How could Christ’s body knowingly contain both the servants of Christ and Antichrist? Barrington White pointed out, ‘Every member of such a community “is made a king, a priest, and a prophet under Christ, to uphold and

⁹⁷ See *supra* pp. 70, 123.

⁹⁸ Collinson remarked, ‘Separatism . . . is normally understood as a rejection of the Church of England as a national and comprehensive establishment of religion, whereas the Puritans who did not separate are said to have been moved by veneration for the principle of the indivisible Church, conterminous with the Commonwealth, part of the Church Universal. This is not false, but it misses the point that the Separatists cut themselves off, not from some legal abstraction, but from fellowship with like-minded brethren within and yet not wholly of the Church of England.’ Collinson, ‘Towards a Broader Understanding,’ 543. See also Brachlow, *Communion of Saints*, 13.

⁹⁹ Barrow, ‘Plaine Refutation,’ 235.

¹⁰⁰ Ainsworth, *The communion of saints*, 63.

further the kingdom of God, and to break and destroy the kingdom of Antichrist, and Satan.”¹⁰¹ Is Christ divided? Barrow and Ainsworth would have responded with a resounding ‘no.’ They objected to this ‘communion’ of Christ and Antichrist in the visible church. Barrow argued, ‘For two contrarie Maisters they cannot obey, they cannot be subject both to Christ and Antichrist: two diverse and contrarie ministeries they cannot execute, the ministerie of Christ and the ministerie of Antichrist at the same time, neither can they prophecie in both their names &c.’¹⁰² Ainsworth believed, ‘The true constituting of a Church’ meant ‘separating them from the wayes of Satan and Antichrist.’¹⁰³

For Barrow and Ainsworth, being the visible body of Christ was such that sin in one member could infect the rest of the body. Ainsworth argued that participating in spiritual actions or congregating with the known wicked did infect the body. He wrote of those who denied this, ‘Such men seem not to discern the nature of communion, how far it reacheth; or the contagion of sin, how far it infecteth.’¹⁰⁴ Barrow too noted that in participating with the wicked ‘all become alike guilty.’¹⁰⁵ The nature of the visible church as the body of Christ has been misunderstood in separatist historiography. John Coolidge argues, ‘The separation of the unworthy is valued as manifesting that power [power of Christ expressed in discipline], and not, as is sometimes imagined, because Separatists thought that the presence of anyone in their midst of whose election in the secret counsel of God there was any reason to

¹⁰¹ White, *English Separatist Tradition*, 60.

¹⁰² Barrow, ‘Brief Discoverie,’ 514.

¹⁰³ Ainsworth, *Counterpoyson*, 80.

¹⁰⁴ Ainsworth, *The communion of saints*, To the Reader.

¹⁰⁵ Barrow, ‘Brief Discoverie,’ 313.

doubt 'would infect and corrupt all the rest.'¹⁰⁶ Coolidge's statement here does not seem to reflect Barrow and Ainsworth's understanding. For Barrow and Ainsworth, sin in the congregation was infectious.

Even so, it was not just the nature of sin itself but more so the nature of union with Christ. Attending Church of England services was more than just dangerous. Barrow argued, 'Neither may anie faithfull Christian be brought in subjection to this their antichristian power and yoke, without bowing downe and worshipping the beast.'¹⁰⁷ He further noted, 'All the actions of the church, as praiers, censures, sacramentes, faith, etc., be the actions of them all jointly, and of everie one of them severally.'¹⁰⁸ Separation from a false church was not just a good idea; it was necessary. Ainsworth pointed out that some people 'take boldnes to communicate in spiritual actions with any, supposing that the sins of some, or of the publick congregation cannot hurt them, especially if in hart they disallow the evil and condemn the same.'¹⁰⁹ Participating in a false church was perilous even if one condemned that church's practices. Barrow and Ainsworth were God's messengers calling the elect to come out from Antichrist's church. The elect could not be prophets, priests, and kings with Christ and under bondage to Antichrist at the same time.¹¹⁰

The proscription against sharing in the lord's supper with the non-elect also demonstrated the nature of union within the body of Christ in Barrow and Ainsworth's thought. Barrow wrote, 'We see here this sacrament of the Supper to

¹⁰⁶ Coolidge, *Pauline Renaissance*, 61.

¹⁰⁷ Barrow, 'Plaine Refutation,' 320.

¹⁰⁸ Barrow, 'Brief Discoverie,' 319.

¹⁰⁹ Ainsworth, *The communion of saints*, To The Reader.

¹¹⁰ See *supra* pp. 73, 104.

denote that communion which all that partake thereof have with Christ as his members.¹¹¹ Do the non-elect share in union with Christ and the elect? Again, Barrow and Ainsworth would respond emphatically ‘no.’ More than just being illogical there was a real danger in sharing with the wicked. Barrow wrote, ‘We had thought that all the communicantes at the Lorde's table had bene joyned and commingled together into one spiritual body, even into Christ, as manie grapes are there bruized into one cup, manie graynes into one loafe.’¹¹² The wicked could not be united with Christ or the members of his body. To share with those whom one knew to be non-believers or to be in a sinful state was a danger to one’s sanctification. As Christ could not have communion with Antichrist, participation with the servants of Antichrist would almost separate even the elect from Christ were that possible.¹¹³ The underlying argument for these views was the nature of the visible church as the body of Christ and the union of Christ’s members.

Barrow and Ainsworth’s emphasis on the visible church as the body of Christ along with lay participation and the empowerment of every believer creates an apparent tension between the unity of the body and the individual.¹¹⁴ This tension invites the question whether Barrow and Ainsworth’s views were in any sense individualistic. Arguably, the Reformation gave attention to the individual’s

¹¹¹ Barrow, 'Plaine Refutation,' 152.

¹¹² Ibid., 177.

¹¹³ Barrow wrote, ‘The godly may sinne of ignorance, of negligence, of fraylety, yet not therupon untill obstinacie be added unto sinne, cease to be Christians.’ Even so, Barrow probably did not believe that the elect could truly lose their salvation. Ibid., 323. See also *supra* p. 82.

¹¹⁴ Malcolm Yarnell remarks, ‘Harnack stresses the individualism during the Reformation,’ and ‘A similar understanding is adopted by Troeltsch, who traces the historical interplay of individualism and universalism in his influential analysis of Christian social theories.’ Geoffrey Nuttall argues that in a congregational form of government as a movement from presbyterian polity ‘may be seen the expression in religion of the general tendency of the period towards individualism and democracy.’ Yarnell, 'Royal Priesthood', 2; Nuttall, *The Holy Spirit*, 119.

relationship with God that was not accentuated previously.¹¹⁵ This emphasis created an inherent tension between the individual in their personal struggle and their relationship to community and church.¹¹⁶ Fred Powicke, in his extensive treatment of Henry Barrow, describes Barrow's view of the ideal church as securing the 'indefeasible spiritual rights to the individual.' He continues, 'In the sixteenth century individualism was the spirit of the age. Beneath its influence, the fettering frost of tradition was melting from the mind of Europe.'¹¹⁷ Powicke's assessment, however, reflects an anachronistic view of Barrow's thought.

¹¹⁵ The emphasis on the individual struggle for salvation arising during the Reformation is easily found in the historiography. John von Rohr explains, 'Each Christian was called upon to participate in a personal "pilgrim's progress" toward appropriation of that triumph. The saga must be made one's own - and to that end the battle must be joined and the forces of evil overcome through faith and obedience.' Charles Cohen describes the puritan conversion experience as an individual relationship: 'Corrupted humanity cannot begin to repair its breach with God, until He [God] takes the initiative, and His manner of approach, Puritans thought, has not varied since the days of the Hebrews. The communication of grace takes place in a formalized relationship, the individual "making covenant with God, and God with him, either at his first conversion, or at other times."' John van Til comments on the priesthood of all believers noting, 'The individual was finally responsible for the condition of his soul as it progressed in the sanctified life. No priest or church or government could act or believe, or refrain from acting or believing, for him.' The description of conversion can sound very individualistic, a relationship between the individual and God and a covenant between the individual and God. Again John Morgan describes the puritan view of this experience: 'For puritans, the central fact of human existence was thus the relationship, in all its intricacies, of the individual and God, not the free being in control of his own destiny.' Von Rohr, *covenant of grace*, 6, 5; Cohen, *God's caress*, 47; L. John Van Til, *Liberty of conscience; the history of a Puritan idea* (Nutley, NJ: Craig Press, 1972), 11-2; Morgan, *Godly Learning*, 77, 26; Andrew Cambers, *Godly reading: print, manuscript and Puritanism in England, 1580-1720*, Cambridge studies in early modern British history (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 9, 253; Thomas J. Davis, *This is my body: the presence of Christ in Reformation thought* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2008), 20; Wilhelm Pauck, 'Luther and the Reformation,' *Theology Today* 3, no. 3 (1946), 315, 317; H. Chris Ross, 'Puritanism's Ascetic Pedigree: Catholic Treatises and Protestant "Counterpoisons" in Early Modern England' (PhD Thesis, University of Edinburgh, 2009), 67; Lake, 'William Bradshaw,' 585; Nuttall, *The Holy Spirit*, 4; Zaret, *The Heavenly Contract*, 185.

¹¹⁶ Susan Wabuda comments, 'The new availability of scripture stimulated the unprecedented phenomenon of lay men and women reading aloud from the Bible. Scripture was released from behind the screen, where until now it had been reserved in the sacred enclosure with the clergy in the choir of the church.' Patrick Collinson adds, 'Everywhere both the political authorities and responsible churchmen were nervous about letting the unlearned and semi-learned loose on a potentially dangerous book, especially when published with prefaces and notes that made the Bible a vehicle for one Protestant tendency or another.' Susan Wabuda, *Preaching during the English Reformation*, Pbk ed., Cambridge studies in early modern British history (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002; reprint, 2008), 99; Collinson, *The Reformation*, 39.

¹¹⁷ Powicke, *Henry Barrow*, xxiv, xiv. Barbara Griswold maintains, 'The guiding principle of Barrow's thought was the spiritual rights of the individual for whom Christ died.' Barbara Stone Griswold, 'Congregational dynamics in the early tradition of independency' (PhD Thesis, Baylor University, 2006), 79.

This tension between the individual and the community must not be viewed through modern lenses. Peter Lake offers a helpful insight:

The individualism inscribed at the heart of puritanism has been remarked upon many times. While the isolation of the individual before God and a personal sense of sin were central to puritan religion, they provided only one moment, albeit the most intense, in a longer process whereby the individual was integrated into the community of the godly.¹¹⁸

Lake's warning fits well Barrow and Ainsworth's focus on the visible church as the body of Christ and not as a gathering of individuals. The elect's participation was the expression of Christ's body. The individual was a prophet, priest, and king in their personal journey of faith as well as a prophet, priest, and king as a member of Christ's body. For Barrow and Ainsworth, both were true.

Barrow and Ainsworth's focus on the elect as prophets, priests, and kings in the visible church did not mean giving each member an individual voice. Barrow rejected the idea that each individual had a vote in the running of the church. He wrote, 'This balloting by suffrage or plurality of voyces might well be a custome amongst the heathen in their popular governmentes, but it is unheard of and unsufferable in the church of Christ, whatsoever some dreame unto themselves therof.'¹¹⁹ Geoffrey Nuttall explains that Barrow rejected the democratic principle of voting in favor of 'the charismatic principle of seeking the unity of the Spirit.'¹²⁰ For Barrow and Ainsworth, every one of the elect was in Christ, and when gathered together, became the body of Christ on earth. They were not 'visible saints' but the

¹¹⁸ Lake, 'William Bradshaw,' 587-8.

¹¹⁹ Barrow, 'Plaine Refutation,' 146.

¹²⁰ Nuttall, *The Holy Spirit*, 6.

visible church.¹²¹ Ainsworth explained, ‘Everie Church, as they have communion with Christ and are one body with him, so have they communion also one with another & are all one body.’¹²²

Though Barrow and Ainsworth believed that the word of God was given to each of the elect, the visible church was not to be a cacophony of different voices. Interpretation of doctrine was neither the domain of the individual nor the leaders solely.¹²³ The point was not to seek each member’s understanding but to seek the will of Christ. Seeking Christ’s will was to be done through the unity of the Spirit within the community. Each and every member of the body of Christ had the same indwelling Spirit. Barrow explained,

There all from the highest to the lowest in all actions enquire the will of God: which being knowen, they all walke by the same rule, and with one consent doe the will of God accordingly. There is no division in the bodie, neither anie thing donne according to the will of man, but according to the will of God only, all have received of and being guided by one and the same spirit, even as God is one, and Christ not yea and naye.¹²⁴

The issue was not the ‘spiritual rights’ of the individual; it was obedience to Christ’s commands as Christ’s body. Barrow noted, ‘I say that the Spirit of God may not & cannot be severed from the word of God. They that openly & willingly breake the least of Gods lawes, boast of a false gift when they speake of their inward

¹²¹ Geoffrey Nuttall observes, ‘This phrase [visible saints], which occurs repeatedly in their [separatists] writings, was undoubtedly their controlling idea and provides the key to an understanding of what they were after.’ Geoffrey F. Nuttall, *Visible Saints: the Congregational Way, 1640-1660*, 2nd ed. (Oswestry: Quinta, 2002), x.

¹²² Ainsworth, *An apologie*, 45.

¹²³ Ainsworth, *The communion of saints*, 451.

¹²⁴ Barrow, ‘Plaine Refutation,’ 146.

sanctification. Christ doth not reigne in the heart of anie that wil not submit all their outward actions to be ruled by him also.’¹²⁵

Participation in the offices of Christ was not individualistic for Barrow and Ainsworth. While Barrow and Ainsworth did not ignore the individual struggle of faith, it was the communal responsibilities that were most prominent in their ecclesiology.¹²⁶ As already noted above, Ainsworth distinguished between the individual as prophet, priest, and king and the congregation acting together as the body of Christ.¹²⁷ In his response to Bernard concerning discipline, he wrote: ‘Now that every one hath not this power [to discipline], nor yet any member or members apart; we have plainly signified.’¹²⁸ While every member was to challenge sin in fellow believers as partakers in Christ’s kingship, it was only when gathered together that the body had the power to discipline.¹²⁹ The ruling power was not in the congregation but in Christ. Only when the congregation was acting in communion as prophets, priests, and kings was it acting on behalf of Christ. No individual, then, represented Christ; to think that way was to miss the point that it was only the visible church gathered that was Christ’s body.

Every member of the body of Christ had a duty to Christ and to the other members of the body. Barrow wrote, ‘This the Lorde in wisdom hath thought moste meete for his church and ministerie unto the worlde’s end, as wherby to knit

¹²⁵ Barrow, ‘Brief Discoverie,’ 570.

¹²⁶ Ainsworth was a pastor and many of his writings demonstrate a true pastoral concern for those in his flock. However, the individual struggle of faith cannot be separated from the community in which that individual dwells. George notes concerning Robinson, ‘So “plenteous” is this anointing [of Christ] that it more than suffices for each individual member, so that “every one is made a King, Preist, and Prophet, not onely to himself, but to every other, yea to the whole.” Thus each member is a prophet to teach and exhort, a priest to offer up spiritual sacrifices of prayer and praise, a king to guide and govern.’ George, *John Robinson*, 146.

¹²⁷ See *supra* pp. 113ff.

¹²⁸ Ainsworth, *Counterpoyson*, 177.

¹²⁹ *Ibid.*, 174-5.

the heartes of them together in the band of love, in al mutual dueties, to have each other in minde, to care, provide, and labour each for other as they ought.’¹³⁰

Ainsworth also commented on ‘the mutual ayd strengthening, and consolation one of another in al other Christian duties both publick & private.’¹³¹ Each one of the elect needed the other members of Christ’s body. Timothy George writes of John Robinson, ‘Within the “Lord's walled orchard” the demands of corporate sanctification require a vigorous fellowship of mutual edification and participation which distinguishes the true visible Church from all other “bodies” as a unique kind of communal order sustained by the Spirit of life.’¹³² This communal order was true of Barrow and Ainsworth’s thinking as well.

Barrow and Ainsworth’s understanding of the true visible church was based upon the elect as Christ’s body. Ainsworth wrote, ‘The true church is a People called of God by the Gospel, from the world, unto the Communion or Fellowship of his son Jesus Christ, in whom they are coupled and built together, to be the habitation of God by the Spirit.’¹³³ Each true visible church was the presence, the very real presence, of Christ on earth. Every member of Christ’s body, when gathered together, became the expression of Christ in his earthly ministry. Christ had ascended to the right hand of the Father, but he had not left his work incomplete. His death, burial, and resurrection were just the beginning. As Barrow observed, ‘he [Christ] is a king, priest, a prophet heere on earth, and exerciseth the offices here in his church amongst his servantes the saints ... he is their pastour, their teacher, their king ... he feedeth

¹³⁰ Barrow, 'Plaine Refutation,' 261.

¹³¹ Ainsworth, *The communion of saints*, 333ff.

¹³² George, *John Robinson*, 100.

¹³³ Ainsworth, *Counterpoyson*, 115.

and reigneth in Sion, yea, and maketh all his children kings, priests, and prophets.¹³⁴

Here again is Barrow's distinction between what Christ had done *for* the church in contrast to what he was doing *in* and *through* the visible church.

4. Conclusion

This chapter has argued that, for Barrow and Ainsworth, the visible church was the visible expression of Christ on earth and the continuation of his earthly ministry begun at the incarnation. The doctrine of the offices of Christ and participation by all the elect in them persuaded Barrow and Ainsworth's understanding of the visible church. As the visible church was visibly present on earth, so was Christ visibly present on earth. However, this was true only when he occupied his offices of priesthood, prophecy, and kingship and when all of the elect fulfilled their roles as members of his body, being prophets, priests, and kings. While Christ was present in all his elect, he was visibly present in the visible church when he worked through all of his elect. Every member of his body was empowered and had a right and duty to serve in the public affairs of the visible church. When the elect came together, they were not a collection of individuals. As the elect gathered they became the body of Christ and as the body of Christ, they continued the work Christ had begun at the incarnation.

Separation from the established church was not an obsession with external practices but with the underlying theology, or ecclesiology, of the visible church itself. Forms of polity, ceremonies, discipline, purity, or the obligations of covenant

¹³⁴ Barrow, 'Brief Discoverie,' 509.

were only the implications, the symptoms of an inner conviction. Barrow and Ainsworth argued their opponents had denied Christ, not just neglected ‘minor’ details in the visible church. Their opponents may not have always recognized or accepted these accusations, yet it is a misunderstanding to attribute the disagreements between Barrow and Ainsworth and their opponents to minor details of church practice. It has been argued here that differences in practice were the symptoms and not the cause. As is often the case, symptoms appear prominently while causes may remain hidden. Of course issues such as visible purity, discipline, and congregational polity were prominent factors in Barrow and Ainsworth’s writings. However, to understand Barrow and Ainsworth it is necessary to look past the symptoms to identify the cause.

Barrow and Ainsworth believed they were making a Christological correction that resulted in an ecclesiological distinction. Put another way, their understanding of the visible church incorporated their understanding of Christ’s continuing work expressed in his offices of prophecy, priesthood, and kingship. Barrow and Ainsworth’s ecclesiology was an earthly manifestation of their Christology. Christ was in heaven sitting at the right hand of the Father, yet his body was really and truly on earth, continuing his work in and through the elect. Barrow and Ainsworth were not neglecting the Reformation issues of *sola Christus* or *sola gratia*. While their understanding and emphasis was different from their opponents, they were focused on Christ, his person and work.

Participation by the elect in the offices of Christ was a central theme in Barrow and Ainsworth’s ecclesiology, yet it must not be seen as the sole or only factor in their theology. Neither Barrow nor Ainsworth wrote a systematic theology

in the modern sense of the idea.¹³⁵ The *munus triplex* of Christ, then, was not a central motif around which they organized their whole theological system. Nevertheless, the doctrine of Christ's offices was a fundamental idea in their understanding of the true visible church. According to Barrow and Ainsworth, to deny Christ's offices in the church was to deny the very reason Christ had come. The debate for Barrow and Ainsworth concerned Christ's body present on earth, continuing to work.

It is important to remember, though, that from the perspective of Barrow and Ainsworth's opponents there had been no denial of Christ. Those who supported the Church of England argued that Christ was in their church. Barrow and Ainsworth's opponents denied accusations that they had rejected Christ or had denied his 'coming in the flesh.' While they sometimes agreed that there were problems within the Church of England, they argued that their church was true in all the fundamentals of the faith. According to Barrow and Ainsworth's opponents, the fundamentals of the faith were those issues that involved salvation, those points that would bring one into union with Christ.¹³⁶ For the supporters of the Church of England, their focus on the fundamentals of the faith proved their church had Christ at its centre. While Barrow and Ainsworth rejected their opponents' claims, it would be inaccurate to say Barrow and Ainsworth claimed Christ at the centre of their ecclesiology and their opponents did not make the same claim.

¹³⁵ Gale Heide argues that in a modern philosophical sense the phrase 'systematic theology' has no place earlier than the eighteenth century yet if the phrase is taken to mean an orderly, logical summary of the whole of the Church's teaching bounded by Scripture then a case can be made it is valid to use as early as the second century. Heide, *Timeless Truth*, passim.

¹³⁶ Ainsworth, *Counterpoison*, 210; Barrow, 'Plaine Refutation,' 249; Bernard, *Christian advertisements and counsels of peace*, 173. See *infra* pp. 204ff.

At the centre of Barrow and Ainsworth's understanding of the visible church was Christ, his person and work. The visible church was a visible expression of Christ on earth continuing his earthly ministry begun in the incarnation.

Chapter 5: The Offices of Christ as a Distinct Emphasis

The question has been raised whether Barrow and Ainsworth's use of the doctrine of the offices of Christ in their understanding of the visible church was common in England during the period under study. Barrow and Ainsworth's opponents often argued as if Barrow and Ainsworth held to Robert Browne's ecclesiology; in this, their opponents missed what Barrow and Ainsworth were saying. For Browne, Christ's rule over the church was an essential characteristic expressed through discipline. Browne was concerned first and foremost with purity in the visible church. While Barrow and Ainsworth were concerned with purity, that was not the essential mark of the true visible church in their ecclesiology. Trying to understand Barrow and Ainsworth through Browne's ecclesiology has been a common approach in the historiography of the separatists. Simon Doney in his doctoral thesis argues that Barrow followed Browne's ecclesiology 'although [it] was not always visible in his writings.'¹ Paul Avis notes, 'In the teaching of Henry Barrow and his fellow separatists ecclesiology is totally dominated by an obsession with discipline and the gospel practically obscured by the regime under which it is preached.'² This chapter will evaluate these approaches by comparing Barrow and Ainsworth's employment of the doctrine of the offices of Christ with the common usage of that doctrine from the period. It will be argued here that Barrow and Ainsworth's usage of the doctrine of the offices of Christ was an ecclesiological emphasis distinct to them.

¹ Doney, 'Lordship of Christ', 157.

² Avis, *The Church*, 7.

This chapter explores the importance and usage of the doctrine within the published works of the period by non-Barrowist authors. The works selected for this chapter were obtained from the Early English Books Online database by searching for keywords related to the doctrine. For more details on how the works were selected see the Appendix. At many points in this chapter, numerous citations could be presented to support the argument. Rather than list all the quotations that could be offered a select few will be used to illustrate the point being made. All of the works considered were published in England during the period being researched (1580 to 1620). Included in the works considered were sermons, treatises, and catechisms. Some were originally written in English while others were English translations of continental works originally published in Latin, French, or German. The authors were advocates of the Church of England, Papists, puritans, and continental Reformers. Some of the works saw significant reprints while others were limited to single printings. It is difficult to assess the full influence any particular work may have had, yet the works represent the historical context of the ideas being discussed in this thesis. This methodology cannot make a definitive case that Barrow and Ainsworth's use was unique. However, it can provide evidence that their usage was not common. It has already been argued that Barrow and Ainsworth's ideas of the visible church were different from those with whom they debated.

While some similarities to the ideas presented in the previous chapters were found, nothing approaching the distinct arguments that Barrow and Ainsworth employed the doctrine for was encountered. This chapter will first address the importance of the doctrine during the period. As indicative of the doctrine's importance, the use of the doctrine as a mark of orthodoxy or heterodoxy will be

examined. It will be argued that the threefold office of Christ was a fundamental doctrine in the beliefs of the period. Further, it was considered a mark either of orthodoxy or heterodoxy according to how it was explained and practiced. Next, the use of the doctrine will be compared with Barrow and Ainsworth's use notably under two headings, Christ as prophet, priest, and king of the church and every believer as a prophet, priest, and king within the church. This structure follows the distinction made by Barrow of Christ's work for the elect and his work in the elect.

Two ideas should be kept in mind concerning Barrow and Ainsworth's understanding and use of the doctrine. First, they used the doctrine predominantly to explain what the true nature of the church was to be. They employed the doctrine in their ecclesiology much more often than when discussing soteriology. It is important to note, though, that their view of church and salvation were tightly coupled. Without the true church of Christ, salvation was unlikely though not impossible for God. The second difference in their understanding of the doctrine was their emphasis on the participation of all the elect in Christ's offices. Henry Barrow had distinguished two aspects of the doctrine of the offices of Christ: what Christ had done *for* the elect, and what he did *in* the elect. This distinction was not common in the works examined for this chapter. The point is not that the works of the period, and thereby the writers of their time, did not use the doctrine when discussing the church or the participation of the elect. Quite to the contrary, examples of such usage will be noted in what follows. The point is that there were differences, which will be noted as this chapter progresses, between how Barrow and Ainsworth used the doctrine and how their non-Barrowist peers used it.

1. Importance of the doctrine

Christ's person and offices were presented as the foundation of the Christian faith and were central to both Protestant and Catholic theology. For that matter, Christ's person and offices were a central issue of the church throughout its history.³ The Cambridge academic and puritan William Fulke wrote, it was 'the office of Christe upon which is grounded all Christianitie.'⁴ The Church of England clergyman Thomas Wilson wrote 'Wheresoever wee finde Faith, and Christ his blood and death coupled together, wee are given to wit, that the Doctrine teaching Christ his person and offices, is the proper object of our justifying Faith, which is therefore by Divines defined to bee an affiance in the promise of Grace.'⁵ While debates over the church were frequent, it was discussions concerning the person and offices of Christ that truly brought out the strongest responses. Hunter Powell explains that during the Westminster Assembly, 'While the debates over ecclesiology could get intense, only when disputing Christology did Assembly members call each other heretics.'⁶ Disagreements over the correct understanding of the doctrine of the offices of Christ were used to justify Protestant separation from the Church of Rome.

³ George Yule argues that the Reformation was a Christological correction: 'What the Reformers tried to do, therefore, was to reform the doctrines and practices by the fact of the incarnation, death and resurrection of Jesus Christ; it was a Christological correction of the doctrine of the Church, its ministry, its sacraments and especially its eschatology.' Yule, 'Theological developments in Elizabethan Puritanism,' 16.

⁴ William Fulke, *A retentive, to stay good Christians, in true faith and religion* (London, 1580), 7. On William Fulke see Richard Bauckham, 'Fulke, William (1536/7–1589),' in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed., ed. Lawrence Goldman, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/10224> (accessed 28 Feb 2014).

⁵ Thomas Wilson, *A commentarie upon the most divine Epistle of S. Paul to the Romanes* (London, 1614), 794. Regarding Thomas Wilson see Stephen Wright, 'Wilson, Thomas (1562/3–1622),' in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed., ed. Lawrence Goldman, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/29689> (accessed 5 June 2014).

⁶ Powell, 'Dissenting Brethren', 259.

It further provided just cause for ascribing the name of ‘antichrist’ and ‘heretic’ to opponents.⁷

Barrow and Ainsworth, then, did not invent a new doctrine or take an obscure point of theology and make it a central issue. The doctrine of the offices of Christ already existed and was a central theme in religious debates before Barrow voiced his opinions. The doctrine was the foundation of the faith because Christ (both his person and work) was essential to Christianity; Christ was (and is) the *sine qua non* of the Christian faith. Thomas Tuke, a Church of England clergyman, remarked, ‘It is then a certaine token of a mans regeneration to beleieve distinctly that Jesus the sonne of Marie is that anointed king, priest and prophet, which God hath raised up for the salvation of his soule, and of the rest of Gods Elect.’⁸ Without Christ, and more to the point, a correct understanding of and trust in Christ, there was no redemption available for humanity. In England during the period 1580 to 1620, the doctrine appeared both in the works of Protestants and Catholics, though it must be conceded that where it was found in works by Catholic authors it was frequently in response to Protestant charges of denying the offices. Nevertheless, this is not to say that the Church of Rome was unconcerned with Christ’s work or unconcerned with salvation. The point is that Catholic authors did not commonly use the concept of Christ’s offices as prophet, priest, and king to describe his work.

Among English Protestant authors, the doctrine was frequently put forward as a necessary belief; that is, something that must be confessed in order to be saved.

⁷ The use of the offices in attacks on Rome and as a factor in determining heresy will be the point of the discussion that follows.

⁸ Thomas Tuke, *The high-way to heaven* (London, 1609), 178. On Thomas Tuke see J. F. Merritt, ‘Tuke, Thomas (1580/81–1657),’ in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed., ed. Lawrence Goldman, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/27809> (accessed 2 May 2014).

Simple knowledge of the doctrine was not sufficient. The true Christian must understand and trust in Christ's work. William Charke, a puritan, argued that 'the confession of his name in bare wordes, and with the mouth only, [was insufficient] but of his power, of his offices, that is to say, of his prophetship, of his kingdome, and of his priesthood acknowledged also from the hearte.'⁹ Belief in Christ's offices was more than agreement with the doctrine; the doctrine had to be personalized. One needed to believe that Christ's work applied to them personally. The Italian Reformer Bernardino Ochino explained,

We must then beléeve in Christ, that is in Jesus Christ, that he is the high Priest, undefyled and holye, and that he hath done the office of the chiefe and most perfect Priest. ... Thou must also beléeve, that in as much as he is Christ the chiefe Prophete. ... Thou must also beléeve that he is a King, bicause that with his spirite he moveth, raigneth over and governeth the electe, whiche be given him of God, there-fore he is a King, in the spirituall kingdome of GOD, whiche is righteousnesse, peace and joye in the holy Ghost. ... It is not sufficyent that thou beléeve that Jesus is Christe, the chiefe Prophet, Priest and king of the elect, but also thou must lively beléeve that he is thy Christ, that is, the chiefest Prophet Priest and king over thée.¹⁰

The doctrine of the offices of Christ was an essential object of faith and thereby part of one's salvation.

The offices of Christ were at the very core of what it meant to be a Christian as one redeemed from sin through the work of Christ. The doctrine was part of the gospel message. 'The subject and matter of the Gospel, is Jesus Christ the Sonne of

⁹ William Charke, *An answeare for the time* (London, 1583), 15. On William Charke see Richard L. Greaves, 'Charke, William (d. 1617),' in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed., ed. Lawrence Goldman, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/5142> (accessed 29 Oct 2013).

¹⁰ Bernardino Ochino, *Certaine godly and very profitable sermons of faith, hope and charitie* (London, 1580), 10. For more on Bernardino Ochino see Mark Taplin, 'Ochino, Bernardino (c.1487–1564/5),' in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed., ed. Lawrence Goldman, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/20489> (accessed 1 May 2014).

God: who is described in his person, the Sonne of God, in his offices, he is Jesus, the Saviour, and Christ, the annointed of God,' wrote Andrew Willet, a Church of England clergyman.¹¹ Calvin also pointed out the connection between the gospel and the offices of Christ: 'And the Gospell testifieth of Christ, that is, of his person and offices, and of all his benefites towards us: that is to say, that Christ is the only begotten sonne of God, which for our sake and for our salvation came downe from heaven, and was made man of the virgine Marie.'¹² The gospel concerned the person and offices of Christ because Christ's person and work were necessary for the redemption of the elect.

Given the importance of the doctrine, it was necessary to teach the people the meaning of the offices of Christ. Authors in the period produced treatises, sermons, and catechisms explaining the doctrine including several examples considering Christ's offices in expositions of earlier creeds.¹³ Ian Green, in his epic work *The Christian's ABC*, notes references to the offices of Christ in the catechisms he examined: 'The term "Christ" should be understood as referring to his office or offices as saviour, or his being anointed to be a prophet, priest, and king: a majority of the forms in our sample adopted and developed such a threefold account.'¹⁴ Three examples will illustrate this point. A catechism by John Craig explained,

Q. What thing is his Priesthood?

A. An office appointed for the satisfaction of Gods wrath.

¹¹ Andrew Willet, *Hexapla, that is, A six-fold commentarie upon the most divine Epistle of the holy apostle S. Paul to the Romanes* (Cambridge, 1611), 38. For details on Willet see Anthony Milton, 'Willet, Andrew (1561/2–1621),' in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed., ed. Lawrence Goldman, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/29445> (accessed 29 Oct 2013).

¹² Jean Calvin, *Aphorismes of Christian religion* (London, 1596), 196.

¹³ William Perkins, *An exposition of the Symbole or Creed of the Apostles* (Cambridge, 1595), passim; Henry Jacob, *A treatise of the sufferings and victory of Christ* (Middelburg, 1598), 166; John Baker, *Lectures* (London, 1581), C VI-VII.

¹⁴ Green, *Christian's ABC*, 311. See pages 311-2 on each office, also 511.

Q. How is he called our onely Prophet?

A. He ever was, is, and shalbe the onely teacher of the Church.

Q. Wherefore were all these honorable offices given to him?

A. That therby he might deliver us from sin.

Q. declare that particularly in these three offices

A. By his kingly power we are free from sinne, death, and hell.¹⁵

The minister John Baker put it, ‘First to bee our Prophet to teach us, secondly, our priest to offer him selfe a sacrifice for us, and thirdly, our king to rule & to defend us from our enemies.’¹⁶ The puritan theologian William Perkins remarked that Christ’s kingly office was to proclaim the remission of sin and to make laws, his priestly office was to provide a propitiation for sin and to intercede for the elect, and finally his prophetic office was to teach the elect.¹⁷ As the examples cited here demonstrate, there was little variation or dispute on these points of Christ’s offices.¹⁸ Determining heresy from orthodoxy was not always an easy task. As Lee Palmer Wandel explains, ‘The concern throughout was to formulate “orthodoxy” in such a way that it was at once clearly demarcated from “heresy,” but also, in its silences and ambiguities, accommodated 1500 years of “tradition” which was not univocal.’¹⁹ Despite the

¹⁵ John Craig, *A short summe of the whole catechisme* (London, 1583), 8-9. Concerning John Craig nothing is known.

¹⁶ Baker, *Lectures*, C VI verso. Baker calls himself a minister though nothing else is known about him.

¹⁷ William Perkins, *A godlie and learned exposition upon the whole epistle of Jude* (London, 1606), 24.

¹⁸ There was consistency between English and continental Reformers on the use of this doctrine. See Zacharias Ursinus, *The summe of Christian religion* (Oxford, 1587), 209-10. Théodore de Bèze, *Propositions and principles of divinitie* (Edinburgh, 1591), 46-7.

¹⁹ Lee Palmer Wandel, *The Eucharist in the Reformation: Incarnation and Liturgy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 218.

diversity suggested by Wandel, there was little disagreement over the doctrine of the offices of Christ.

More significant in the literature reviewed, however, were references to the ‘person and offices of Christ’ without any explanation. A sermon by the Church of England clergyman Thomas Cooper stated, ‘Godly myracles bee alwayes shewed by God, to confirme the Divine nature and office of Christ, in the worke of our redemption, and that he is the true and onely Messias and Saviour, or to justifie and prove the doctrine of the Gospel to bee good.’²⁰ Cooper’s statement was not intended to explain Christ’s offices to his hearers. It appears that he believed they would understand his reference. The Church of England clergyman Thomas Pie provided another example.²¹ When discussing the chronology of Daniel’s 70th week prophecy he explained, ‘Againe it is evident, that the Angell respecteth for the marke and scope of all those workes, the person and office of Christ onely; and not of his Apostles.’²² Pie did not explain what Christ’s offices were or how they applied to the church. He made reference to ‘Christ’s person and offices’ as if the phrase was a formulaic expression. It seems probable that the authors assumed their hearers/readers would be familiar with the concept of Christ’s offices. Taking into account the importance of this doctrine to the Christian faith, it seems reasonable to conclude that the people were generally familiar with it.²³

²⁰ Cooper, *Certaine sermons wherin is contained the defense of the gospell*, 80-1. For more on Thomas Cooper see Bowker, ‘Cooper, Thomas (c.1517–1594).’

²¹ Stephen Wright, ‘Pye, Thomas (d. 1609/10),’ in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed., ed. Lawrence Goldman, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/22922> (accessed 5 June 2014).

²² Thomas Pie, *An houre glasse* (London, 1597), 55.

²³ David Weir references the doctrine in a New England church covenant from 1636 once again without further explanation. Christ was the ‘onely high priest & Prophet and King.’ See David A. Weir, *Early New England: a covenanted society*, Emory University studies in law and religion (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 2005), 153, 158.

Objections to the importance of the doctrine were rare, yet they did exist.

William Rainolds, a Roman Catholic priest, noted that some,

thinke al these questions, of Christ & his office, of his consubstantialitie with the father, of the Trinitie, of predestination, of freewill, of God, of Angels, of the Supper, of baptisme, of the being of mens sowles after this lyfe, who thinke I say al these thinges to be but trifles & thinges indifferent and not necessarie to justification which is obteyned by fayth.²⁴

Rainolds' comment is interesting in that he connects it with believer's justification.

The puritan layman Stephen Bredwell arguing against Robert Browne, the well known separatist, wrote that discipline was not essential to the church as part of Christ's kingly office.²⁵ Bredwell wrote,

And concerning these offices in question, touching which Browne so arrogantly challengeth M.C. [Thomas Cartwright] to answer whether they be of the essence of the Church: I would the reader should aske of him, or his friends (if he thinke it good) whether the kingdome & Priesthood of the sonne of God and man, the word incarnate, be partes of his essence, or accidentes unto him rather: and so whether hee that shall say, they are not of his essence, doeth thereby dispoyle him of his offices? I feare not (unlesse you take him in some desperate fit) hee will answer, no. Why then, if a thing may truely be removed from the essence, and neverthelesse necessarily admitted in the Subject, howe followeth it, that they that deny the kingly power or authoritie of Christ, to bee of the essence of a Church, doe there-fore make or feyne a Church that is without it.²⁶

Bredwell's argument that Christ's offices were attributes and not of his essence were not intended to make them unimportant. Nevertheless, in his efforts to reject

²⁴ William Rainolds, *A refutation of sundry reprehensions* (Paris, 1583), 280. Regarding William Rainolds see J. Blom and F. Blom, 'Rainolds, William (1544?–1594),' in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed., ed. Lawrence Goldman, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/23030> (accessed 27 March 2014).

²⁵ "Bredwell, Stephen (Sen)," Margaret Pelling and Frances White, in *Physicians and Irregular Medical Practitioners in London 1550-1640 Database* (London: Centre for Metropolitan History, 2004), <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/no-series/london-physicians/1550-1640/bredwell-stephen-sen> (accessed May 7, 2015). Michael E. Moody, 'Browne, Robert (1550?–1633),' in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed., ed. Lawrence Goldman, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/3695> (accessed 11 Nov 2013).

²⁶ Bredwell, *The rasing of the foundations of Brownisme*, 79.

Browne's argument Bredwell's comment appears out of place. It might be a point of debate whether discipline was essential to the church based on the belief that it was part of Christ's kingly office. Still, to make the case that Christ's offices were not essential to him could easily have been misunderstood.

2. *The offices as a mark of orthodoxy or heterodoxy*

The importance of the doctrine can also be seen in its use as a characteristic trait of orthodoxy and heresy during the period. It was a familiar idea to reject anyone who held to an incorrect view of Christ's person or work. Matthew Sutcliffe, a dean in the Church of England, argued there was nothing worse than to denigrate Christ's person or work: 'What more hereticall then to destroy *Christes* humane nature, and office.'²⁷ Sutcliffe's critique of the Church of Rome led him to view it as wholly outside the bounds of orthodoxy: 'Their faith concerning the foundations of Christian religion, concerning Christs office, and humane nature, concerning the Church and Sacraments, concerning the ministry and policy of the Church, nay concerning the Law and the Gospell, is altogether different from that faith which the first Christians of this Iland professed.'²⁸

All heresy was seen as a disfigurement of Christ's person or work. The German Reformer Zacharias Ursinus explained, 'All heretiques mainetaine errors

²⁷ Matthew Sutcliffe, *The subversion of Robert Parsons* (London, 1606), A7 verso. For more on Matthew Sutcliffe see Nicholas W. S. Cranfield, 'Sutcliffe, Matthew (1549/50–1629),' in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed., ed. Lawrence Goldman, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/26792> (accessed 2 May 2014).

²⁸ Sutcliffe, *The subversion of Robert Parsons*, A4 recto.

either touching the [per]son of Christ, or concerning his office.²⁹ Another continental Reformed theologian, Amandus Polanus von Polansdorf explained, ‘An Heretike is he who doth erre in the foundation of eternall salvation, that is to say, who doth fight against eyther the person or office of Christ, and doth stubbornly persevere in errour.’³⁰ Beliefs about Christ’s person and offices were a prominent issue determining orthodoxy. As previously pointed out, using the threefold structure to describe Christ’s work was not emphasized in the medieval church.³¹ Yoder explains one reason for its prominence during the Reformation polemics: ‘To say that Christ is king in the Protestant-Catholic debate of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries was first to say the pope is not.’³² The works considered for this chapter support Yoder’s comment though Protestants did not employ the structure in polemics against the Papists exclusively.

The vigorous responses to charges of denigrating Christ’s offices also point to the significance of the doctrine during the period. Those denounced with an erroneous understanding of Christ’s person or office did not willingly accept the indictment. For example, the Roman Catholic priest Matthew Kellison responding to Protestant charges argued that it was his accusers who ‘sheweth howe they make Christ ignoraunte, not knowing what belonged to his office, & how therby they

²⁹ Zacharias Ursinus, *A collection of certaine learned discourses* (Oxford, 1600), 205. Concerning Zacharias Ursinus see J. Ney, 'Ursinus, Zacharias,' in *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, online ed., <http://www.deutsche-biographie.de/ppn118803573.html> (accessed 7 May 2015 2015).

³⁰ Amandus Polanus von Polansdorf, *The substance of Christian religion* (London, 1595), 174-5. Concerning Amandus Polanus von Polansdorf see Bernhard Riggenbach, 'Polanus von Polansdorf, Amandus,' in *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, online ed., [://www.deutsche-biographie.de/ppn117688584.html](http://www.deutsche-biographie.de/ppn117688584.html) (accessed 7 May 2015 2015). Robert Letham, 'Amandus Polanus: A Neglected Theologian?,' *Sixteenth Century Journal* 21, no. 3 (1990).

³¹ See *supra* p. 6.

³² Yoder, *Preface to theology*, 237.

bring the new testament, and Christian religion in question.’³³ From Kellison’s perspective, the Protestants rejected Christ as a judge of good works and remuneration. According to him, part of Christ’s kingly office was to judge the works of humanity. As he saw the debate, it was the Protestants who denied Christ’s offices and were the heretics and not the Church of Rome. Rather than make the case that one’s view of Christ’s offices was not significant, Kellison had turned the accusation around. Of course, Kellison’s accusers in turn rejected his charges against them.

English reformers justified separation from the Church of Rome over Rome’s denial of Christ’s offices. Perkins wrote, ‘Now they [Rome] denie the Sonne both in his natures abolishing his Manhood in their doctrine of the Sacrament, as also his offices of King, Priest and Prophet, for which we must utterly separate from them.’³⁴

After accusing the Pope of robbing Christ of his offices, the Church of England Archbishop Edwin Sandys added, ‘This is our Apostasie. We have forsaken him that hath forsaken God and whom God hath forsaken.’³⁵ Though Sandys was referring to separating from the Church of Rome, as has been observed from Barrow’s writings, Barrow would gladly have agreed with Sandys’ language concerning separation from the Church of England. There could be no act more heinous than to deny Christ.

William Fulke, in an attack on Richard Bristow, a Roman Catholic priest, claimed, ‘Indeed you be catholike (that is to say universal revoltors from the holy scriptures) if

³³ Kellison, *A survey of the new religion*, 307. For more on Matthew Kellison see Peter Milward, ‘Kellison, Matthew (1561–1642),’ in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed., ed. Lawrence Goldman, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/15290> (accessed 2 May 2014).

³⁴ Perkins, *A godlie and learned exposition upon the whole epistle of Jude*, 19-20.

³⁵ Edwin Sandys, *Sermons* (London, 1585), 347. Regarding Edwin Sandys see Patrick Collinson, ‘Sandys, Edwin (1519?-1588),’ in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed., ed. Lawrence Goldman, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/24649> (accessed 5 June 2014).

that title please you, rejoyce of it & spare not. You be Catholike heretiks, that is, heretikes not in one or two articles of religion, but in all in as much as you denie the office of Christe upon which is grounded all Christianitie.³⁶ The use of terms such as ‘heretic’ and ‘Antichrist’ were common Protestant rhetoric employed against the Church of Rome.³⁷

According to Protestants, the Church of Rome was guilty of teaching heresy concerning Christ’s offices. Perkins took issue with the conclusions of the Council of Trent (1545-1563): ‘Therefore this Romish doctrine established by the Councell of Trent, is an hereticall and Antichristian doctrine, making God an Idoll God, which is concluded out of the place alleaged, thus: He that denieth Jesus to be Christ, is Antichrist.’³⁸ Similarly Thomas Gibson, a layman in the Church of England, wrote, ‘The Papists they teach & hold many things corruptly of Christ Jesus the sonne of God, overthrowing the power, and ende of his comming, and derogating from him the glory of our owne, and full redemption.’³⁹ In Gibson’s critique is seen a similar relationship between denying Christ’s offices and the incarnation. Barrow had made this same connection. Denial of the purpose for which Christ took on human flesh is to deny his offices, that is, to deny his work. Rome denied Christ’s offices by taking

³⁶ Fulke, *A retentive, to stay good Christians, in true faith and religion*, 7. Concerning Richard Bristow see Peter E. B. Harris, ‘Bristow, Richard (1538–1581),’ in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed., ed. Lawrence Goldman, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/3452> (accessed 28 Feb 2014).

³⁷ Perkins commented, ‘Little Children, it is the last time: and as yee have hearde, that Antichrist shall come, (a speciall Antichrist, the chiefe of all other; who is nowe manifest to be the Pope of Rome) even now, ar there many Antichristes, (Heretickes, denying, either the natures of Christ, or his offices: or the union and distinction of his Natures:) whereby wee knowe, that it is the last time.’ William Perkins, *A case of conscience* (Edinburgh, 1592), 10-1.

³⁸ Perkins, *A godlie and learned exposition upon the whole epistle of Jude*, 24.

³⁹ Gibson, *The blessing of a good king*, 102-3. On Thomas Gibson see I. Gadd, ‘Gibson, Thomas (d. 1562),’ in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed., ed. Lawrence Goldman, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/10634> (accessed 16 March 2014).

to themselves Christ's work in their teaching and practice. In Protestant eyes, by usurping Christ's offices, Rome had denied Christ's incarnation.

The Church of Rome taught that the keys of heaven gave to the Pope and the priesthood the ability to pronounce forgiveness for sin. For English Protestants, this teaching was a denial of Christ's office. Perkins explained,

So bad is this age, that such as will be taken to be the speciall members of Christ, doe not onely with the souldiers strippe Christ of his garments, but more then this, they bereave him of his natures and offices. The Church of Rome by their transsubstantiation strippe him of his manhoode: and by making other priests after the same order with him, which doe properly forgive sinnes, strippe him of his priesthoode: and of his kingly office, by joyning with him a Vicar on earth, and head of the Catholicke Church, and that in his presence, whereas all debittshipes and commissions cease in the presence of the principall.⁴⁰

The Church of England layman John Merbeck noted, 'For no man can be partner with God in forgiving sins. This is Christs onely office, that hath taken away the sinnes of the world.'⁴¹ To assume any part of Christ's office was a rejection of Christ as the foundation of true religion.

Accusations against the Church of Rome focused on both their teaching and their practice. Anthony Nixon, a Church of England layman, commented, 'I might yet adde further touching the Offices of Christ, for that the Church of Rome will yeeld that the Office of Christ consisteth in these three pointes, namely that he is both a Prophet, a Priest and a King: which in wordes onely, not in deedes and veritie

⁴⁰ Perkins, *An exposition of the Symbole or Creed of the Apostles*, 241.

⁴¹ John Merbecke, *A booke of notes and common places* (London, 1581), 843. Concerning John Marbeck see David Mateer, 'Marbeck, John (c.1505–1585?),' in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed., ed. Lawrence Goldman, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/18026> (accessed 28 Feb 2014).

they will acknowledge.⁴² William Perkins explained, ‘So the Papists hold the Scriptures in word, but in deed denie them, seeing they take away Christ, in spoiling him of his merit and intercession: for take away his offices, and then you shall have an halfe Christ.’⁴³ There was no separation between doctrine and practice. Failure in either was equally heinous. Wandel explains, ‘In 1500, Christianity was not so much articulated doctrines as an aggregate of practices.’⁴⁴ It was not sufficient to claim to believe correct doctrine without evidence. True belief in Christ should influence practice.

Barrow and Ainsworth argued for separation from the Church of England along the same lines as Protestants argued for separation from the Church of Rome. Separation from the Church of Rome was not only justified but was necessary according to English Protestants. Those who refused to separate from the Church of Rome were viewed as being held in bondage or were in agreement with Rome’s heresy. Obviously the Church of Rome did not concede to being a false church. Rather, those who supported the Church of Rome held the Protestants to be heretics and therefore separated from God. According to Barrow and Ainsworth, both the Church of England and the Church of Rome were false churches. Supporters of the Church of England did not concede their church to be false any more than the Papists had conceded such accusations. Gifford explained,

All the true Churches have convinced the Church of Rome, and condemned her as obstinate, not in some light offences, in which true Christians may erre, but as most blasphemous and Idolatrous against

⁴² Anthony Nixon, *The blacke yeare Seria iocis* (London, 1606), E3 recto. For more on Anthony Nixon see Anthony Parr, ‘Nixon, Anthony (fl. 1592–1616),’ in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed., ed. Lawrence Goldman, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/20206> (accessed 2 May 2014).

⁴³ William Perkins and Robert Hill, *Lectures upon the three first chapters of the Revelation* (London, 1604), 169.

⁴⁴ Wandel, *Eucharist*, 47.

the principles of fayth and grounds of Religion, teaching that no Christian man ought to joyne with her. But what Churches are they which have convinced the Church of England of such errors, and found her so obstinate, that they have condemned her and willed all men to forsake her?⁴⁵

From Gifford's perspective, the issue between Barrow and himself was whether the errors Barrow had accused the Church of England of were sufficient to remove the foundation of the church, namely Christ. Barrow argued that obstinately holding those errors was a denial of Christ's offices and in denying Christ's offices the Church of England had denied Christ. Barrow's argument was the same as that made against the Church of Rome.

The rhetoric flung back and forth between Barrow and Ainsworth and their opponents within the Church of England was not so distinct from that used by the Protestants against the Church of Rome. As already considered, Kellison had accused the Protestants of denying Christ's office because Protestants refused to accept Christ as judge of men's works. Kellison wrote, 'This is the honourable title and office of Christ, which the ghospellers also confesse in words and professe in their Creed, but in their doctrine they deny.'⁴⁶ Gifford charged Barrow with usurping Christ's office by judging all who were in the Church of England as separate from Christ. He wrote, 'Then how much more intollerable is their wicked presumption and intrusion into Gods office, which take upon them utterly to condemne as quite separate from Christ all the assemblies in a kingdome.'⁴⁷ Nearly all agreed that Christ's offices were the foundation of the Christian faith. Each accused the other of denying those offices, the Protestants and Romans, advocates of the Church of England, puritans, and the

⁴⁵ Gifford, *A short reply*, 7-8.

⁴⁶ Kellison, *A survey of the new religion*, 299.

⁴⁷ Gifford, *A short reply*, 2.

‘Barrowists.’ A proper understanding of the offices meant one was a true Christian while an incorrect understanding of the doctrine or a practice that seemed to deny that doctrine meant one was a heretic.

English Protestants not only accused the Church of Rome of denial but also accused them of usurping each of Christ’s offices. Regarding his priestly office, the Church of England clergyman Thomas Rogers wrote, ‘The time is now that you tel how the Pope is placed in the Priestlie office of our Saviour Christ, & in that respect made another Saviour.’⁴⁸ Percival Wilburn, another Church of England clergyman, explained, ‘The more wrong a great deale doth your pope to Christ, and to his church also; to take upon him the title & office of high Priest in Christ his Church, without warrant from God: seeing it was allotted by a singular prerogative to our Saviour Christ alone of his Father.’⁴⁹ The sufficiency of Christ’s sacrificial priesthood was a principal idea in the Protestant Papist debates. Henry Balnaves, a layperson in the Church of England, pointed out the incompatibility of human works and salvation by grace: ‘Why will wee usurpe his office to our selves, and spoile Christ of his glorie, or be come thrall againe to that thing from the which Christ hath freed us. The which we do, if we wilbe participant with Christ in the making of our selves just, or mixt any workes with the article of justification.’⁵⁰

⁴⁸ Thomas Rogers, *An historical dialogue* (London, 1589), 96. For more on Thomas Rogers see John Craig, ‘Rogers, Thomas (c.1553–1616),’ in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed., ed. Lawrence Goldman, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/23998> (accessed 17 June 2014).

⁴⁹ Perceval Wiburn, *A checke or reproofe of M. Howlets untimely shreeching in her Maiesties eares* (London, 1581), 162. Regarding Percival Wiburn see C. S. Knighton, ‘Wiburn, Percival (1533/4–1606),’ in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed., ed. Lawrence Goldman, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/29346> (accessed 25 March 2014).

⁵⁰ Henry Balnaves, *The confession of faith contending how the troubled man should seeke refuge at his God* (Edinburgh, 1584), 130. Regarding Henry Balnaves see Martin Holt Dotterweich, ‘Balnaves, Henry (d. 1570),’ in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed., ed. Lawrence Goldman,

Accusations that the Pope usurped Christ's priesthood could be found among the continental reformers as well. Théodore de Bèze maintained: 'As litle have they left the Priesthoode of Jesus Christ whole and untouched, having added & annexed unto his expiation and satisfaction for our sinnes whatsoever came into their own brainsicke fancy, as holy water chrisme, oyle, waxe, spettle, beades, pilgrimages, & other such bables they could thinke upon or devise.'⁵¹ Calvin complained of the Church of Rome's addition of prayer to saints departed: 'Furthermore let us marke that the Papistes have in all respects defaced the office of our Lord Jesus Christ. For by their making of the saintes to be their patrons & advocates, they have also made them as good as mediators, so as we should obtaine favour at Gods hand by their meanes.'⁵² If human works did not contribute to salvation, what purpose could they serve? If the works of the elect did not add to or in any way fulfill Christ's work how can it be said that they are priests and kings?

Of course, adding anything to Christ's work was an abomination to Protestant ears. Most important to the debate was whether believers' works could in any way contribute to their salvation. The rector of Odell Edward Bulkeley explained, 'Hee hath loved us, and washed us from our sinnes in his blood, and made us Kings and Priests unto God his father. As these places attribute our justification and salvation onely to Jesus Christ and his merits: so others doe detract and take the same from our workes and deservings.'⁵³ The work of saving human beings from sin and

Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/1248> (accessed 10 March 2014).

⁵¹ Théodore de Bèze, *Master Bezaes sermons upon the three chapters of the canticle of canticles* (Oxford, 1587), 136.

⁵² Jean Calvin, *The sermons of M. John Calvin upon the fifth booke of Moses* (London, 1583), 418.

⁵³ Bulkeley, *An apologie for religion*, 171. Edward Bulkeley, rector of Odell, was the Father of Peter Bulkeley. See Michael McGiffert, 'Bulkeley, Peter (1583–1659),' in *Oxford Dictionary of National*

reconciling them to God was solely the work of Christ. There could be no contribution made by another human being without a loss to Christ's office. Henry Dod, a layperson in the Church of England, summed up this point, 'Then is it great blasphemy to maintaine such an heresie, which doth cut away the cause of our salvation, by the only death and passion of Christ our Saviour, and attributeth the same to me[ns] rites, and works by grace, whereby they have made the works of the lawe to put Christ cleane out of office, in the merite of our salvation.'⁵⁴

Christ's kingly function as head of his church was also a significant point of debate between Protestants and Papists. Both sides agreed that Christ was and would always be the only head of his church. Anyone who took to themselves that office was a thief. Patrick Forbes, a Church of England clergyman, pointed out:

God is described from his office and from his nature. His office, in that, as onely King, Lord, and Head of his Church, he ruleth therein, and steadfastly fixeth his habitation in the midst thereof, as which he hath chosen to be the place of his feet, even the mountaine wherein hee delighteth to dwell, yea wherein hee will dwell for ever.⁵⁵

The Church of Rome was accused of rejecting Christ's Rule. Andrew Willet explained, 'Neither doe they [the Church of Rome] acknowledge Christ to be the onely king of his Church, making the Pope his Vicar, and head of the Church: and they say that unto the Pope is given all authoritie in heaven and earth.'⁵⁶ The

Biography, online ed., ed. Lawrence Goldman, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/3901> (accessed 13 July 2015).

⁵⁴ Henry Dod, *A godlie and fruitfull treatise* (London, 1583), 41. For more on Henry Dod see Jennett Humphreys, 'Dod, Henry (fl. 1583?–1620),' in Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, online ed., ed. Lawrence Goldman, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/7728> (accessed 17 March 2014).

⁵⁵ Patrick Forbes, *An exquisite commentarie upon the Revelation of Saint John* (London, 1613), 12. Concerning Patrick Forbes see David George Mullan, 'Forbes, Patrick, of Corse (1564–1635),' in Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, online ed., ed. Lawrence Goldman, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/9843> (accessed 16 March 2014).

⁵⁶ Andrew Willet, *Hexapla in Danielem* (Cambridge, 1610), 455.

Protestant accusation was that the Church of Rome claimed Christ as head but in their teaching and practice they made another head of their church.

Finally, from the Protestant perspective, the Church of Rome denied Christ's prophetic office in that they detracted 'from the authoritie of the Scriptures, making them imperfect, and adding thereunto traditions, which they are not afraid to call (the word of God unwritten,) and the Pope reserveth unto himselfe power to interpret Scripture, as he list.'⁵⁷ The Protestant view was that the Pope had set himself over the Scriptures, giving to himself more authority than God's written word. Perkins pointed out, 'Neither doe we beleeve a thing, because the Church saith it is to be beleaved: but therefore we doe beleeve a thing, because that which the Church speaketh, the Scripture did first speak.' He continued, 'The soveraigne or supream judgement concerning matters of faith belongeth to the holy Ghost speaking in the Scriptures. The ministerie of judgement (or a ministeriall judgement) is only given unto the Church: because she must judge according to the Scriptures: and because she doth not this alwaies, but sometimes faileth.'⁵⁸ While the church and its ministers did have the duty of interpreting the Scriptures, they could err in their understanding. Scripture was to be the final judge of doctrine. Thomas Gibson charged the Church of Rome of rejecting Christ's prophetic office noting, 'By their owne Inventions, and vaine Traditions: they take away his Propheticall office: their Gospell is full of superstition and Idolatrie, adding and diminishing at their pleasure: making newe Articles, and new Sacraments: their spirit is a spirit of Error, of Ignorance, of doubting, and torment.'⁵⁹

⁵⁷ Ibid., 504.

⁵⁸ William Perkins and Thomas Tuke, *The arte of prophecying* (London, 1607), 19-20.

⁵⁹ Gibson, *The blessing of a good king*, 102-3.

The Church of Rome responded to these charges just as the Church of England had. Rome argued that the accusations of the Protestants did not make them false. The Church of Rome believed they held to the faith agreeing with the early church fathers.⁶⁰ Both their doctrine and practice were consistent with church tradition and, therefore, the Church of Rome was a true church. From Rome's perspective, it was the Protestants who had disgraced Christ's offices. In like manner, the Church of England claimed to be a true church as well. While some supporters of the Church of England denied that Rome was a true church, Church of England supporters argued that the true church throughout the world acknowledged the Church of England as a true church. Supporters of the Church of England believed their church held to the fundamental doctrines and that Christ was the only prophet, priest, and king of their church. The Church of England believed that to separate from them was to separate from the true church and, therefore, to separate from God. Rome had made the same point. Barrow and Ainsworth had turned the existing argument for separation from Rome towards the Church of England. They charged the Church of England with denying Christ's offices in doctrine (neglecting some truths and mixing in false ideas) and in practice. The point here though is not to argue for literary dependency. The similarities considered here were merely common ideas of the period.

The semblance between Barrowist and non-Barrowist literature went further. In both, the doctrine of the offices of Christ was associated with Christ's incarnation. Barrow maintained that to deny Christ's offices was to deny his incarnation. Likewise, William Charke wrote, 'Whosoever therefore confesseth not Christ to be

⁶⁰ William Fulke, *A rejoinder to Bristows replie* (London, 1581), 10.

a Saviour, Prophet, King, and Priest, is not of God, but of Antichrist: he whosoever confesseth not that he is a wholl and onelie Saviour: Prophet, King, and Priest, is of the same spirite of Antichrist, that denieth Jesus Christ being come in the flesh.⁶¹

Thomas Cooper explained, ‘While in wordes they confesse the Incarnation of Christ, by perverse Doctrynes in effecte they deny it, by denying those causes, for which the Sonne of GOD was Incarnate, attributing the effect of oure Salvation, to other thinges.’⁶² Barrow’s reference to the incarnation in his assessment of the errors of the Church of England followed the Christian worldview of the time. Christ had come to earth to redeem humanity. Denying the reason for his coming was synonymous with denying him. Any church that denied Christ to have come in the flesh must be a false church. This assessment of a false church was true of the Church of Rome according to the English Protestants, and it was true of the Church of England according to Barrow and Ainsworth. Clearly Barrow and Ainsworth were familiar with the arguments against Rome from the period. Their arguments against the Church of England differed little from their peers’ arguments against the Church of Rome. Similarly, supporters of the Church of England had responded in the same way as had supporters of the Church of Rome. The doctrine of the offices of Christ was a significant motif in the polemics of the period and a central idea in orthodox Protestant belief.

The debate between Barrow and Ainsworth and their opponents was not over the importance of Christ’s offices to faith and salvation. Their opponents agreed the offices were a fundamental point of the faith. Further, their opponents claimed that they held to all the fundamental points of the faith. Barrow and Ainsworth’s

⁶¹ Charke, *A treatise against the Defense of the censure*, 64.

⁶² Cooper, *Certaine sermons wherin is contained the defense of the gossell*, 235.

opponents made a distinction between some points of the faith as fundamental and some not. Gifford explained, ‘Christ being the foundation, upon which all the faithfull as living stones are built, and grow together into a holy Temple,’ he continued, ‘Are there not errors, which if a man hold never so ignorantlie he is not in Christ, hee holdeth not the foundation so long as hee erreth in them, he is not coupled with the living stones to make one building? And on the contrary, be there not errors which the faithfull doo erre in, and be in Christ?’⁶³ This distinction was important in Gifford’s defense of the Church of England. He had argued that while the Church of England had erred, they had not erred in fundamental issues; that is, they had not destroyed the foundation.⁶⁴ Richard Bernard made the same point. He explained that while all Scripture has value, some was of the foundation of the faith while other parts not so: ‘Dare wee not call every truth fundamentall; that is, such as if it be not knowne and obeyed, the whole religion and faith of the Church must needes fall to the ground.’ He added, ‘The only fundamentall truth in religion is this: That Jesus Christ the sonne of God, who took our nature of the Virgine Mary, is our onely and all sufficient Saviour.’⁶⁵ As already observed, Barrow and Ainsworth’s opponents argued they correctly held and preached his offices.⁶⁶

The controversy between Barrow and Ainsworth and their opponents was how each side saw the offices in relation to the visible church. The response of both supporters of the Church of England and Church of Rome was that any problems in their church were insufficient to make them false churches. Ainsworth argued that ‘if the corruption be such as destroyeth the foundations, as in the Arians which

⁶³ Gifford, *A short reply*, 16.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 91.

⁶⁵ Bernard, *Christian advertisements and counsels of peace*, 174-5.

⁶⁶ See *supra* p. 58

overthrow the person of Christ, as in the Papists which overthrow the office of Christ, they being no Church, ought to have no privilege of the church.’⁶⁷ A proper understanding of the doctrine of the offices of Christ included understanding how those offices were essential to a visible church. Denying Christ’s offices was a rejection of the very foundation of the church. No group that rejected Christ could be a true church. In Barrow and Ainsworth’s thought, it was not possible to separate the doctrine of the offices from a discussion of the visible church. As William Perkins stated, ‘Now Christ being a King, he must needs have a kingdome.’⁶⁸

3. *Christ as prophet, priest, and king of the church*

Ainsworth argued that only a true visible church could offer faith: ‘The blessing of spiritual propagation, is peculiar to the true church.’⁶⁹ The connection between salvation and the church was not isolated to the Barrowists.⁷⁰ Thomas Cartwright argued that matters of discipline and kind of government were things necessary to salvation and of faith.⁷¹ While both Barrow and Ainsworth held that God could save outside the true visible church, they explained that the true visible church was the ordinary means through which faith was received. Nevertheless, what drove Barrow and Ainsworth was not the relationship between the church and justification. Timothy George notes concerning John Robinson, ‘It is important to realize that his expressed motive for separating from the Church of England related

⁶⁷ Ainsworth, *An animadversion*, 105.

⁶⁸ Perkins and Hill, *Lectures upon the three first chapters of the Revelation*, 37.

⁶⁹ Ainsworth, *A reply to a pretended Christian plea*, 12; Ainsworth, *Counterpoyson*, 11.

⁷⁰ John von Rohr notes, ‘Ecclesiastical exclusiveness has been among the persistent historical characteristics of the Christian church as, in its various forms and by varying degrees, it has insisted on monopoly in the mediation of salvation.’ Von Rohr, ‘Extra Ecclesiam Nulla Salus,’ 107.

⁷¹ Hall, *faithful shepherd*, 24; Brachlow, *Communion of Saints*, 27; George, *John Robinson*, 137.

not to a quest for soteriological exclusivism, but rather to a concern for a corporate sanctification through obedience to Christ.⁷² Barrow had pointed out the difference between ‘the worcke of our salvation by Christ for us, and the worke of God's Holy Spirit, the fruicts of God's grace in us.’⁷³ For Barrow and Ainsworth, it was not only necessary to separate themselves from false churches, but once separated, the elect needed to join with a true visible church; a visible church where Christ was present as their only prophet, priest, and king.

References to Christ’s office in the sampled literature frequently included the phrase, ‘*of the church*’; that is, Christ was the prophet, priest, and king *of the church*. A few examples will suffice for this point. Thomas Gibson confessed, ‘We preach the true Jesus according to the scriptures, that there is no Name under heaven that wee can be saved by but by him: that hee is both true God and man; that he is the King, the Priest, and Prophet of his Church: we preach the true Gospell, containing the doctrine of Faith and Repentance.’⁷⁴ The Church of England clergyman John Sprint offered a catechism:

Q. What are we to consider in the person of the Sonne?

A. His Natures, Offices, and State.

Q. What is he in his Offices?

A. Both Jesus, a Saviour, and Christ, the only anointed King Priest, & Prophet of his Church.⁷⁵

⁷² George, *John Robinson*, 105.

⁷³ Barrow, 'Plaine Refutation,' 165.

⁷⁴ Gibson, *The blessing of a good king*, 102.

⁷⁵ John Sprint, *The summe of the Christian religion* (London, 1613), 5-6. Regarding John Sprint see Tom Webster, 'Sprint, John (d. 1623),' in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed., ed. Lawrence Goldman, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/26181> (accessed 5 June 2014).

The French Reformed theologian Franciscus Junius wrote, 'Touching his Office, Jesus Christ only is made the Mediator of the new Testament, even of the everlasting Covenant of grace between God & man to be perfectly and fully the Prophet, Priest and King of the Church of God for evermore.'⁷⁶ William Perkins commented, 'He is Mediatour, that is, a Priest, a Prophet, and King of the Church.'⁷⁷

More importantly, though, not only was Christ *a* prophet, priest, and king of the church, he was the *only* prophet, priest, and king. This point was significant in the Protestant polemics against the Church of Rome. While the elect were made priests and kings according to St Peter and St John, no one could take Christ's offices to themselves.⁷⁸ John Boys, a dean in the Church of England, explained, 'Christ in the worke of our salvation is only sufficient and efficient. Our only Prophet, in whose word we must rest: our onely Priest, in whose sacrifice we must rest: our only King under whose protection wee must rest: who with his blessed Spirit leadeth us in waies of eternall life, working in us all in all.'⁷⁹ Protestants accused the Church of Rome, the Pope, and their priesthood with usurping Christ's offices. Barrow and Ainsworth similarly charged the Church of England of taking Christ's offices to themselves. All sides acknowledged Christ to be the only prophet, priest, and king of the church. The issue was whether certain beliefs and practices could take Christ's offices from him; that is, how could the church participate in Christ's offices without denying him of his rightful place?

⁷⁶ Franciscus Junius, *Certayne letters* (Amsterdam, 1602), 17. On Franciscus Junius see Todd M. Rester, 'Translator's Introduction,' *Journal of Markets & Morality* 14, no. 1 (2011).

⁷⁷ William Perkins, *A golden chaine* (London, 1591), ch. 18 B6 recto.

⁷⁸ See 1 Peter 2:9 and Revelation 1:6.

⁷⁹ John Boys, *An exposition of the festivall epistles and gospels* (London, 1615), 186-7. Concerning John Boys see David Mateer, 'Boys, John (bap. 1571, d. 1625),' in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed., ed. Lawrence Goldman, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/3144> (accessed 16 March 2014).

The problem of participating in the offices of Christ was the same for all Christians. The Church of Rome defended themselves claiming that both the Papacy and the priesthood were derived from Christ's offices and properly shared. There was no usurpation according to Rome. William Rainolds, a Catholic, pointed out the problem in the Protestant argument: 'If Christ be our priest, and of this priesthode there are two partes, one, that for us he offer him self an only and perpetual sacrifice, the other, that he pray for us, why then do the papistes offer Christ daylie?' He continued,

Then, whereas there be two partes of Christes priesthode, to sacrifice, & pray, they that pray, be injurious to his priesthode, and robbe Christ of that which by your divinitie is proper to his person and office of mediation. and so if we be Antichristes for doing the first, needes must you and your comministers be Antichristes for doing the second.⁸⁰

According to Rainolds, if the papists in the sacrifice of the mass were guilty of usurping Christ's offices, the Protestants must be equally guilty by interceding in prayer. Anyone stepping into Christ's place, taking to themselves Christ's work could be seen as unlawfully taking his honour and denying Christ his rightful role.

One solution was to argue that Christ's kingdom was spiritual, not physical.

Perkins explained,

Now Christ being a King, he must needes have a kingdome, which cannot stand in the might and pollicie of man, as earthly kingdomes do: but it is spirituall, it stands in the heart and consciences of men: his lawes they bind the soule and conscience to obedience. And this is his priviledge, which can be given to no creature, man or Angell, to rule and raigne spirituallly in the heart and conscience.

This spirituall kingdome of Christ is exercised in the consciences and soules of men by the word of Christ, not by dint of sword, or force of armes: but he is a King which carieth his sword in his mouth, even his word, by which he rules and raignes in our hearts: he rules with the rod

⁸⁰ Rainolds, *A refutation of sundry reprehensions*, 128.

of his mouth. Esa. 11. that is, by his word, by which he speaketh to mens consciences.⁸¹

Following this line of thought, Christ's work was immediate, in the heart of the elect. Christ was immediately present to the individual in their conscience and soul; he was prophet, priest, and king to each of his elect notwithstanding the particular church they might be in. If the elect were in a false church, they could be held in bondage. Nevertheless, Christ's offices could not be usurped because Christ worked spiritually and inwardly wherever the elect might be. The physical church was not Christ's pure kingdom, though, Christ's pure kingdom existed within the visible church. The belief that Christ's kingdom was spiritual was a recurrent view in the literature.

Despite the argument that Christ's kingdom was spiritual, and Christ's offices were present within each of the elect, Protestants still claimed that the Church of Rome had usurped Christ's offices. Within the Protestant attack on Rome, there was some sense in which Christ's kingdom was more than spiritual and his offices present in the visible church as well as in each of the elect. Protestants contended that prayer to the saints, the priests' offering in the sacrifice of the mass, the Church's adding to and taking away from Christ's word, making human works an addition to Christ's merit, the Pope and priesthood offering forgiveness of sin that was Christ's sole right and the Pope's rule over the earthly church were all ways in which the Church of Rome usurped Christ's offices. Despite arguing Christ's kingdom to be chiefly spiritual, Protestants made the case that Christ's offices were present in the visible church. Ian Green notes this difference in understanding Christ's kingdom within the catechisms he examined:

⁸¹ Perkins and Hill, *Lectures upon the three first chapters of the Revelation*, 37.

For authors like Calvin, Virel, and Hammond, Christ's kingdom is a spiritual one set up in our hearts, which gives us strength and grace to overcome the devil, sin, flesh, and the world. For others, like Palmer, Gouge, Marshall, Williams, Isham, and Lewis, the kingdom Christ was governing was his church, though whether this was the invisible church (of saints, on earth, and in heaven) or the visible church here on earth is not always clear from the context.⁸²

For Barrow and Ainsworth, Christ's kingdom was more than just spiritual and Christ's offices were present in the visible church. Barrow and Ainsworth avoided the tension between Christ's spiritual kingdom and the physical, visible church that was common in many Protestant attacks on Rome.

According to the non-separatist literature of the period, Christ was present in the elect spiritually, however, in a true visible church Christ's offices were present through individuals who were his instruments. To Protestants and Catholics, these were the bishops, priests, and ministers. Kellison made reference to these instruments in the Church of Rome: 'In the new lawe one christ Jesus is sufficient, who thoughe hee hathe many vicegerentes, which are bishops and preestes of the new lawe, yet hathe he noe successours.'⁸³ Perkins noted that ministers were 'instruments to declare the will of God, and can go no further then to teach the eare: for it is Christ himselfe that enlighteneth the mind.'⁸⁴ In both cases, they were mediatory figures, standing in between God and his people. Perkins, when discussing why so few sought to become Ministers or among those who did so few truly deserved the title, described the role of the Minister:

The next reason is the difficulty, of discharging the duties of his calling: to stand in Gods presence, to enter into the holy of holiest, to goe betwixt God and his people, to be Gods mouth to the people, and

⁸² Green, *Christian's ABC*, 312.

⁸³ Kellison, *A survey of the new religion*, 285-6.

⁸⁴ Perkins, *A godlie and learned exposition upon the whole epistle of Jude*, 24.

the peoples to God: to be the Interpreter, of the eternall lawe of the old testament, and the everlasting Gospell of the new, to stand in the ro[o]me, and to beare the office of Christ himselfe, to take the care and charge of soules, these considerations are so many amazements to the consciences of such men, who doe with reverence approch, and not with rashnes, rush unto his sacred seate.⁸⁵

Similarly, Ursinus taught, ‘For the ministers as well in administration of sacraments as preaching the word, represent the person and office of God towards his church.’⁸⁶

Neither Perkins nor Ursinus believed that the minister, as they had described him, took away Christ’s office.

The use of mediatorial language regarding the minister was common to the period. George Downname, for example, stated, ‘For as in the preaching of the word, the Minister is the Lord's Embassadour to his people: so in publicke prayer he is an orator; and as it were an intercessor for the people unto God.’ Again Perkins described the minister’s role as ‘to stand in Gods presence, to enter into the holy of holiest, to goe betwixt God and his people, to bee Gods mouth to the people, and the peoples to God.’⁸⁷ The bishop and priests in the Church of Rome and the ministers among the Protestants were instruments and, according to their proponents, did not usurp Christ’s offices. Christ alone was the mediator between God and man, and Christ continued to work in the church after his ascension, though not immediately. Now there were those in the church whom Christ had sent to represent him to the people and the people to him.

According to Barrow and Ainsworth, Christ was prophet, priest, and king *of the church directly*, that is, without any mediation. The church was both spiritual and

⁸⁵ Perkins and Crashaw, *Of the calling of the ministerie*, B2 recto.

⁸⁶ Ursinus, *A collection of certaine learned discourses*, 273.

⁸⁷ Perkins and Crashaw, *Of the calling of the ministerie*, 5.

physical, invisible and visible. Christ's offices were present outwardly in addition to inwardly. Nevertheless, it was the visible manifestation of Christ's offices that were more important to Barrow and Ainsworth. This visible manifestation was more than the correct form of government or the ability of the local church to excommunicate. Christ was visibly present immediately in his members in all of the church's affairs both public and private. Barrow had noted that his opponents did teach Christ's offices although this was 'still but what Christ hath done in his owne person for his elect.' He argued they did not teach that Christ was present in the elect in the true visible church. Barrow and Ainsworth's assessment of their opponents' church was that Christ was not present because his offices had been usurped.

As has been observed in chapters two and three, participation by the elect in Christ's offices was a significant theme in Barrow and Ainsworth's theology. To what extent this aspect of the doctrine was present in other works of the period must now be considered.

4. Every believer a prophet, priest, and king

As has already been discussed, it was frequently argued, especially in antipapal works, that Christ's offices could not be shared or occupied by another. The offices belonged to Christ alone, and he had not given them away. The Church of England clergyman Richard Fowns explained, 'As all these offices are given to Christ, so are they uncommunicably given unto him: neither may they bee imparted

to any other, as they are in him.’⁸⁸ Cooper also noted, ‘In these offices, none can without blasphemy be joined with him.’⁸⁹ Christ was the only prophet, priest, and king of the church during his earthly ministry and remained the only prophet, priest, and king after his ascension. The fact that Christ’s offices could not be shared created a tension, as Scripture was clear; all believers were made priests and kings. The literature of the period acknowledged the kingly priesthood of all the elect. The Calvinistic French reformer Augustin Marlorat pointed out this tension, ‘Wee are anoynted that wee may bee Partakers of the kingdome, of the Priesthoode, and of the Propheticall office of Christ: notwithstanding Christe onely was anoynted to bee a Kinge, a Priest, and a Prophet.’⁹⁰

All the elect were kings, heirs of Christ’s kingdom and sons of God.⁹¹ They were kings to fight against sin within themselves and to rule over their lives and consciences.⁹² Finally, they were kings to rule with Christ in his future eternal kingdom.⁹³ All believers were priests to offer up their lives as living sacrifices (a sacrifice of thanksgiving and obedience, not propitiation) and to offer prayer for themselves and fellow members of Christ.⁹⁴ All believers were prophets to examine

⁸⁸ Richard Fowns, *Trisagion* (London, 1618), 4-5. Concerning Richard Fowns see Rev. Scott Mandelbrote, 'Fowns, Richard (1561/2–1625),' in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed., ed. Lawrence Goldman, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/10018> (accessed 26 Feb 2014).

⁸⁹ Cooper, *Certaine sermons wherin is contained the defense of the gospell*, 86.

⁹⁰ Augustin Marlorat, *A catholike and ecclesiasticall exposition of the holy gospell* (London, 1583), 138. For more on Augustin Marlorat see Philip Schaff, ed. *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*, ed. Samuel Macauley Jackson, XII vols., vol. VI (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1953), 186.

⁹¹ Wilson, *A commentarie upon the most divine Epistle of S. Paul to the Romanes*, 571-2; Thomas Tuke, *The treasure of true love* (London, 1608), 198, 214-5.

⁹² Andrew Willet, *Synopsis papismi* (London, 1592), 335; Perkins and Hill, *Lectures upon the three first chapters of the Revelation*, 43-4.

⁹³ Pierre Du Moulin, *The accomplishment of the prophecies* (Oxford, 1613), 383; Thomas Ingmethorpe, *A sermon upon part of the second chapter of the first epistle of S. John* (Oxford, 1598), 44-5.

⁹⁴ Elnathan Parr, *The grounds of divinitie* (London, 1614), 203; William Loe, *The joy of Jerusalem* (London, 1609), B7 recto.

the doctrine they heard and to teach themselves and one another.⁹⁵ Because of this great privilege given to them by Christ, every believer was able to overcome the snares of the world, the flesh, and the devil.⁹⁶ The Church of England clergyman William Loe explained, ‘In everie true christian there shineth a certaine princely majestie, seasoned and sorted with a Priestlie modestie, and humilitie.’⁹⁷

There was tension with anyone sharing in Christ’s offices in view of the fact that the offices were his alone. Christ’s offices were part of his mediatorship. Perkins explained, ‘As he is Mediatour, and so consequently a priest and a King, hee hath neither deputie nor vicegerent; neither king to rule in his stead over his Church, nor priests to offer sacrifice for him: nay hee hath no prophet to be his deputie, as he is the doctour of the Church.’⁹⁸ Christ alone was the mediator between God and man. Therefore, no one could add to or take away from Christ’s work, the very thing that Protestants had charged the Catholics of doing. Thomas Bilson challenged the Church of Rome’s assertion ‘that Christs Priestly prerogative is communicated in most ample & exact termes to the chiefe Priest and Pastor of the Church.’ Bilson responded, ‘For al the prerogative of Christs Priesthood is not communicated to any other.’⁹⁹ If Christ’s offices were not communicated to any other, then how could all believers exercise the role of prophets, priests, and kings? Would not their work add to Christ’s works? Rainolds had made this case against the Protestants when he

⁹⁵ Richard Greenham, *The workes of the reverend and faithfull servant of Jesus Christ* (London, 1599), 665; Gibson, *The blessing of a good king*, 321.

⁹⁶ Wilson, *A commentarie upon the most divine Epistle of S. Paul to the Romanes*, 1017; Bèze, *Master Bezaes sermons upon the three chapters of the canticle of canticles*, 120-1.

⁹⁷ Loe, *The joy of Jerusalem*, B7 recto. On William Loe see Stephen Wright, ‘Loe, William (d. 1645),’ in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed., ed. Lawrence Goldman, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/16927> (accessed 6 June 2014).

⁹⁸ Perkins, *An exposition of the Symbole or Creed of the Apostles*, 263-4.

⁹⁹ Thomas Bilson, *The true difference betweene Christian subjection and unchristian rebellion* (Oxford, 1585), 343.

argued that if the Roman priesthood usurped Christ's office by offering a sacrifice, so did all believers by offering intercession.¹⁰⁰

While all believers were prophets, priests, and kings participating in Christ's offices, they were not so in the same sense as Christ. Thomas Tuke explained,

And thus we see the glorious estate of all the faythfull, that even as Christ their Head is a king and Priest, so are all they kings and priests also, yea a kingdome of priests, a regall and holy priesthood; although it be with great difference. For they receive this honour by him, and not he through them. He is a king by nature, but they by grace. Hee is an absolute Prince over all creatures whatsoever, and over the very conscience: but so are not they. He is now in the full possession of his kingdome: so are not we: but we wayt in our mortall bodies of this earthly thraldome, for the hope of that mortall and regall liberty of the sonnes of God in the heavens.¹⁰¹

Christ retained his offices though the members of his body shared in them. Christ lost none of his authority, power, or dignity in sharing his offices with his elect. As with the imputation of Christ's righteousness, Christ's offices were imputed to all believers. Richard Fowns explained:

As all these offices are given to Christ, so are they uncommunicably given unto him: neither may they bee imparted to any other, as they are in him ...

Some perhaps will object, that not onely Peter (speaking of the whole Church) saith, It is a royall Priesthood: but in the Revelation also, Saint John witnesseth, Hee hath made us Kings and Priests unto God, even his Father.

... it is evident that meere men are called Kings and Priests in another sense, and after another meaning then Jesus is. For these offices are inherent in our Saviour, truely, subsantively, and indeede. He is such as he is called: but they are in us, the members of his Church, by imputation and figuratively, for that in some sort and after a manner we are so called.¹⁰²

¹⁰⁰ Rainolds, *A refutation of sundry reprehensions*, 128.

¹⁰¹ Tuke, *The treasure of true love*, 228.

¹⁰² Fowns, *Trisagion*, 4-5.

Perkins also commented, 'Christ giveth his members right to his owne kingdome, to be Kings and Priests; yet not so, that they can execute the regiment sustained by Christ, and do the office of a King and Priest as it is done by Christ, but because they belong to them in part, and they have the benefite of them both redounding to them wholly.' He continued, 'Every thing which belongs to Christ as he is head of the Church, belongs to his servants as members, and he imparts it to them in some sort.'¹⁰³ All believers were prophets, priests, and kings through their relationship with Christ but participated in those offices differently than did Christ.

Further, though all believers participated in Christ's offices, they did not share equally in them. It was argued that those ordained were not prophets, priests, and kings in the same way as the non-ordained were. Richard Greenham, a Church of England clergyman, argued that the kingship and priesthood of all believers could not be understood literally.¹⁰⁴ He explained that no one believed 'that every man was a King sitting in a throne, thereby overthrowing the politicall estate,' or 'that every man was a Priest, taking that office of the Priest upon him.' He continued, 'Why then should wee thinke grossely and literally, that indeede wee are become Prophets having that speciall calling, and so take away that order of Teachers and learners, which God hath ordained.'¹⁰⁵ On this basis, it was argued that while all believers were prophets, priests, and kings, they did not all have a like interest in the church. Some were called to preach, some to administer, some to serve, yet all to offer themselves as sacrifices, to pray, and to fight sin. Henry Balnaves wrote, 'We are all

¹⁰³ Perkins and Hill, *Lectures upon the three first chapters of the Revelation*, 45-6.

¹⁰⁴ Eric Josef Carlson, 'Greenham, Richard (early 1540s–1594),' in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed., ed. Lawrence Goldman, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/11424> (accessed 17 March 2014).

¹⁰⁵ Richard Greenham, *The workes* (London, 1612), 228.

made priests, and kings: but let no man herefore, usurpe the authoritie of a king in dignitie: nor the office of a priest in administration of gods word, & sacraments: for that pertaineth to a speciall vocation.’¹⁰⁶

As Greenham had pointed out, the prophecy of all believers was different from the office of prophecy in the church. This office of prophecy, Greenham explained, had a special calling that was different from the general calling of all Christians.¹⁰⁷ Willet believed, ‘Now, though there be a difference of callings amongst men, yet before God we are all Priests alike, and there is but one Priest for us all to Godward, even Christ Jesus our Lord.’¹⁰⁸ If all believers participated in Christ’s offices what was the role of the ordered ministry? The French-Swiss reformer Jean-François Salnar defended the distinction between the offices of all believers and the offices of the ordered ministry:

The Apostles of Christ doe terme al those which beleeve in Christ, *Priests*, but not in regarde of their ministerie, but because that all the faithfull being made Kings and Priests by Christ, maie offer up spirituall sacrifices unto God. The ministerie then and priesthood are things farre different one from the other. For priesthood, as we saide even now, is common to all christians, so is not the ministerie.¹⁰⁹

There appeared, then, three office holders; Christ, who held his offices alone, all believers who participated in Christ’s offices though were different in them from Christ, and the offices of the ordered ministry that differed from both. The Church of

¹⁰⁶ Balnaves, *The confession of faith contending how the troubled man should seeke refuge at his God*, Summary of Chapter 24.

¹⁰⁷ Eastwood, *priesthood of all believers*, 71.

¹⁰⁸ Willet, *Synopsis papismi*, 191.

¹⁰⁹ Jean-François Salnar, *An harmony of the confessions of the faith* (Cambridge, 1586), 341.

Regarding Salnar see Tony Cetta, 'Salvard, Jean-François,' in *Historical Dictionary of Switzerland*, online ed., Bern, 2009, <http://www.hls-dhs-dss.ch/textes/f/F11318.php> (accessed 13 July 2015).

England Bishop John Howson wrote, ‘all may be Priests, & yet have a distinct order of Priesthood.’¹¹⁰

Participation in the offices of Christ by the ministry was a carefully navigated issue. It was used to accuse both Protestants and the Church of Rome of having usurped Christ’s offices. Kellison responded,

In the new lawe one christ Jesus is sufficient, who thought hee hathe many vicegerentes, which are bishops and preestes of the new lawe, yet hathe he noe successours. For noe man succeedeth to another, unless the other ether dye, or give over his office; wherfor seing that our Saviour Christe though he dyed, yet rose again, never to dy agayne, and never surrendred or gave over his office, but still offereth sacrifice, still baptiseth, still ministreth Sacramentes, and ruleth & governeth his Church *by his vicars and ministres*, he hathe noe highe preest that succeedeth him, but is the sole and only high preest of the new lawe, farie exceeding all the Popes, bishops, and preests that ever were.¹¹¹

For Kellison, Christ continued to work through his vicars and ministers. His vice-regents acting in his stead did not usurp his offices. The Church of England clergyman Anthony Wotton argued that ministers were Christ’s instruments: ‘The Ministers that dispence the word are not his deputies, but reasonable and voluntarie instruments, which he useth.’¹¹² Wotton was defending Perkins on this point who had argued that Ministers were instruments God used to fulfill his commands.¹¹³ Ministers then did not take Christ’s offices rather Christ used them as instruments to accomplish his work.

¹¹⁰ John Howson, *A sermon preached at Paules Crosse* (London, 1597), 39. On John Howson see Nicholas W. S. Cranfield, ‘Howson, John (1556/7–1632),’ in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed., ed. Lawrence Goldman, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/14006> (accessed 6 June 2014).

¹¹¹ Kellison, *A survey of the new religion*, 285–6. (Italics added)

¹¹² Anthony Wotton, *A defence of M. Perkins booke* (London, 1606), 320. Regarding Anthony Wotton see Richard L. Greaves, ‘Wotton, Anthony (bap. 1561?, d. 1626),’ in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed., ed. Lawrence Goldman, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/29997> (accessed 13 May 2014).

¹¹³ Perkins, *A godlie and learned exposition upon the whole epistle of Jude*, 24.

After Christ's ascension he no longer operated immediately in the visible church, but rather mediately through his instruments. Concerning Christ's office as prophet, the Church of England clergyman Elnathan Parr explained, 'His Prophetship is in the teaching of his people, in his owne Person, while hee lived on the earth, and in the continuance of the heavenly doctrine to his Church by the Ministry ordaind, to the end of the world.'¹¹⁴ The view that the ministers of the church represented Christ's offices to the people was not uncommon. Ursinus remarked, 'For the ministers as well in administration of sacraments as preaching the word, represent the person and office of God towards his church.'¹¹⁵ As pointed out previously, Perkins, in describing the difficulty of being a minister remarked how they 'beare the office of Christ himself.'¹¹⁶ The understanding that all believers were prophets, priests, and kings was not used to argue for liberty in the public activities of the church. Perkins argued that only lawfully called ministers were to preach in the church. As Malcolm Yarnell writes of the early English Reformation, 'The third great estate, that of the people, could also claim to be kings and priests. The Church never denied this, though it does not seem to have made much of it. More often, orthodox theologians have defined the people's royal priesthood in such a way as to rob it of temporal relevance.'¹¹⁷

The expression of the offices of Christ by all believers was seen as inward sanctification resulting outwardly as a godly conversation. The offices of all believers were not so much for the church but for each individual to live as reflecting

¹¹⁴ Parr, *The grounds of divinitie*, 200. For more on Stephen Parr see Stephen Wright, 'Parr, Elnathan (1577–1622),' in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed., ed. Lawrence Goldman, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/21394> (accessed 6 June 2014).

¹¹⁵ Ursinus, *A collection of certaine learned discourses*, 273.

¹¹⁶ Perkins and Crashaw, *Of the calling of the ministerie*, B2 recto.

¹¹⁷ Yarnell, 'Royal Priesthood', iv.

the prophet, priest, and king who had called them. As the kingdom was chiefly spiritual and inward, so were all believers spiritual prophets, spiritual priests, and spiritual kings. Andrew Willet wrote, ‘Thou hast made us Kinges and priests, and we shall raigne upon the earth: that is, their kingdome is spirituall, in fighting against, and overcoming the concupiscence of the flesh and all carnall desires.’¹¹⁸

Similarly, Thomas Tuke wrote, ‘For if we be Christs, we are All of us spirituall Kings and Priests, one as truely as another: wee are all the Lords annointed.’¹¹⁹

According to Barrow and Ainsworth, however, as prophets, priests, and kings all believers were in a present earthly visible kingdom and were to fulfil their participation in Christ’s offices, both publically and privately.

It was argued in chapters two and three considering Henry Barrow and Henry Ainsworth, respectively, that all believers, as prophets, priests, and kings, had an equal interest in the public affairs of the visible church. Neither Barrow nor Ainsworth denied an ordered ministry in the church, yet they did deny them exclusive roles or special access. Ministers did not stand between God and the people, nor were they the peoples’ mouth to God. They were equals, fellow members of Christ’s body and participants in Christ’s offices. Nothing like the mediatorial language observed in this chapter was found in Barrow or Ainsworth’s writings. Neither was there the distinction made between the ministers and the people regarding participation in Christ’s offices. For Barrow and Ainsworth, Christ was truly present when every member of Christ’s true visible church had the liberty to exercise their roles as prophets, priests, and kings. Barrow and Ainsworth’s use was

¹¹⁸ Willet, *Synopsis papismi*, 335.

¹¹⁹ Tuke, *The treasure of true love*, 207.

distinct from the non-separatist literature examined here. It was also distinct from other separatists, namely Robert Browne.

5. Robert Browne and the Barrowists

Barrow and Ainsworth were frequently referred to as Brownists and charged with the same errors that Robert Browne held. Browne's emphasis on purity and discipline expressed in a covenant relationship was the brush that many in the period used to paint Barrow and Ainsworth. Robert Browne argued that Christ's rule over the visible church was an essential mark that was expressed through discipline. For Browne, reformation of life and purity in the church were the church's defining characteristics. According to Browne, it was necessary for the members of the church to lead godly lives. When they failed to do so, the church was to discipline them. Browne explained this when responding to a letter from Thomas Cartwright to Robert Harrison: 'For in whome we see the spirit, that is, the graces of the spilit [sic] by their outward good works, and the trueth, that is the lawes and word of Christ which is true, to be kept & observed, them only we must call the Church of God.'¹²⁰ Without discipline, the church could not be kept pure. Discipline was the visible expression of Christ's kingly office. For Browne, discipline meant that the church must have the power to excommunicate its members. Further, Browne argued that a true church must have the correct form of government. There was an integral connection between the form of church government and Christ's offices in Browne's

¹²⁰ Robert Browne, 'An Answer to Master Cartwright His Letter,' in *The writings of Robert Harrison and Robert Browne*, ed. Albert Peel and Leland H. Carlson, Elizabethan nonconformist texts, vol. 2 (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1953), 448.

understanding. He commented, ‘The Church government, is the Lordshipp of Christ in the communion of his offices: wherby his people obey to his will, and have mutual use of their graces and callings, to further their godlines and welfare.’¹²¹

In Browne’s view, the church was a mutual covenant made between God and his people.¹²² God promised to save, and the people promised obedience. If the people failed to obey and continued in their disobedience without repentance, the covenant was broken. Those people who had broken their covenant with God were no longer a church. A true visible church must exercise discipline in order to avoid breaking the covenant. Browne explained that the essence of the church was the covenant: ‘We make not the minister, whether dumbe, or not dumbe to be the essence, substance, or life of the outward Church, but the keeping of the covenant by the outwarde discipline and government thereof.’¹²³ Timothy George adds, ‘Browne's chief contribution to Separatist ecclesiology was to place his church-ideal in the context of a covenant relationship.’¹²⁴

Neither Henry Barrow nor Henry Ainsworth followed Browne on the distinctive aspects of his theology. While there were some points of similarity, the differences were significant. Barrow and Ainsworth were concerned with the purity of the body of Christ, but for different reasons and based upon different theological

¹²¹ Robert Browne, 'A Booke which sheweth the life and manners of all true Christians,' in *The writings of Robert Harrison and Robert Browne*, ed. Albert Peel and Leland H. Carlson, Elizabethan nonconformist texts, vol. 2 (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1953), 253.

¹²² The notion that the covenant between God and the elect required obedience on the part of the redeemed has already been discussed in chapter 2 *supra*. Joel Beeke and Mark Jones explain, ‘The covenant of grace may be understood as both monopleuric or unilateral (*foedus monopleuron*) and dipleuric or bilateral (*foedus dipleuron*).’ In English Protestant theology, it was common to see in the covenant an expectation of obedience without thereby, violating the concept of salvation by grace alone. See Joel R. Beeke and Mark Jones, *A Puritan Theology: Doctrine for Life* (Grand Rapids, MI: Reformation Heritage Books, 2012), 279; Richard L. Greaves, 'The Origins and Early Development of English Covenant Thought,' *Historian* 31, (1968), *passim*.

¹²³ Browne, 'An Answer to Master Cartwright,' 447.

¹²⁴ George, *John Robinson*, 41.

emphases. B.R. White, who considered Barrow and Greenwood successors of Browne, commented, 'It is certainly noteworthy that the covenant theology which was so dominant in Browne's thinking did not play so significant a part in the teaching of his successors.'¹²⁵ Browne described the church as 'a companie or number of Christians or beleevers, which by a willing covenant made with their God, are under the government of god and Christ, and kepe his lawes in one holie communion.'¹²⁶ Browne made the covenant and government essential to the nature of the church. For Barrow, it was the offices of Christ within the church, both for and in the elect, that was the essence of the church. Both Barrow and Browne understood Christ to be present in the body in his work, yet for Browne this was Christ in his kingly role as judge removing sin and unrepentant sinners.

Both Browne and Barrow shared the view that Christ was present in the gathered congregation. Malcolm Yarnell notes, 'Beginning from a Reformed position, Browne moved towards a different means of localizing Christ's presence, not by affirming Real Presence in the eucharist, but by affirming Christ's powerful presence in the gathered congregation.'¹²⁷ Browne maintained, 'The kingdome of Christ is his office of government, whereby he useth the obedience of his people to keepe his lawes & commaundements, to their salvation and welfare.' Again Browne explained, 'The Prophecie of Christ is his office of teaching and giving lawes to his people, wherby he useth their obedience to learne and know the same.'¹²⁸ Browne's

¹²⁵ White, *English Separatist Tradition*, 90.

¹²⁶ The view of the church as 'gathered' was not uncommon in the period. William Bradshaw wrote, 'Every Companie, Congregation or Assemblie of men, ordinarilie joineing together in the true worship of God, is a true visible church of Christ.' While Bradshaw argued for a congregational polity, he was no separatist. Robert Browne, *A booke which sheweth the life and manners of all true Christians* (Middelburgh, 1582), 253; William Bradshaw, *English puritanisme* (London, 1605), 5.

¹²⁷ Yarnell, 'Royal Priesthood', 318.

¹²⁸ Browne, *A booke which sheweth the life and manners of all true Christians*, 265-7.

emphasis on outward obedience was a familiar refrain in his writings. Still, for Barrow, Christ was present in the gathered congregation through his offices and that not just his kingly role of discipline.

Barrow and Ainsworth had a broader understanding of Christ's offices in the church. Christ as the prophet, priest, and king *of the church* was more than discipline and government. Browne did not deny Christ's prophetic or priestly roles in the church. However, his emphasis on outward obedience and discipline in the church obscured all else. Paul Avis's observation cited at the beginning of this chapter regarding Barrow's emphasis on discipline fits Browne's writings well, but it does not appear true of Barrow. Again Avis remarks that separatist 'ecclesiology is totally dominated by an obsession with discipline and the gospel practically obscured by the regime under which it is preached.'¹²⁹ Limiting Barrow and Ainsworth to discipline and government simply misses too much of their ecclesiology. Despite the evidence, interpreting the Barrowists through Browne's ecclesiology is still a prevalent approach.

Simon Doney has considered Browne's emphasis on the lordship of Christ in his doctoral thesis. He argues that it was the lordship of Christ expressed in his kingly office that was the characteristic mark of English separatists. Doney's work pays particular attention to Henry Barrow though he frequently cites Browne in his argument. Doney explains, 'Because of the nature of the controversy in which the Separatists were engaged, their prime concern was the establishment of the rule and government of Christ.'¹³⁰ He further argues, 'The idea that Christ the Lord should be allowed to reign in the midst of his flock was of the essence of Separatist

¹²⁹ Avis, *The Church*, 7.

¹³⁰ Doney, 'Lordship of Christ', 49.

polemic.¹³¹ Doney includes Barrow and Ainsworth in the broader category of separatists, making no distinction between Brownists and Barrowists.¹³² He maintains, ‘For the Separatists, the true church was a covenanted community of believers who voluntarily gathered together and vowed to remain loyal to Christ and his commands.’¹³³

As noted at the beginning of the chapter, Doney, based on White’s work, asserts ‘that, although the covenant idea was dominant in Browne’s work, it was only in the background of Barrow’s thought. However, the role of the covenant in Barrow’s theology needs to be interpreted in the light of the wider Separatist tradition.’ Doney continues explaining that for Barrow ‘although [the covenant was] not always visible in his writings, it was certainly important in his thinking.’¹³⁴ Doney does not explain where the evidence for the importance of the covenant in Barrow’s understanding came from if it was not found in Barrow’s writings. If Barrow was not following a common separatist theological position then reading his works with that in mind fails to do justice to his ideas. Barrow clearly accepted the covenant theology of the time, yet there is no mention of written church covenants in his writings. For Barrow, the covenant of grace, as well as church covenants, were not formative for his understanding of the church. Barrow’s church experience was limited to a brief period prior to his imprisonment. Even if Barrow participated in a

¹³¹ Ibid., 26.

¹³² Edward Bloomfield also uses a single category of separatism with no distinction. Bloomfield maintains concerning the marks of the church, ‘For the Separatists the marks of a true church were covenant, confession and discipline.’ and ‘The true marks of the church were faith and order, followed by a reformation in one’s personal life guided and sanctified by the Holy Spirit.’ David Hall also explains, ‘The marks of the gathered church, declared Barrow, were the faith of its members and their covenant with one another; the preaching of the word was incidental. In place of Calvin’s doctrine that the ministry gave being to the church, Barrow argued that the purity of the gathered church was the precondition for a valid ministry.’ Bloomfield, ‘Opposition to the English Separatists’, 134; Hall, *faithful shepherd*, 30.

¹³³ Doney, ‘Lordship of Christ’, 154.

¹³⁴ Ibid., 157.

church covenant, it does not follow that church covenants played a significant part in his thinking if his writings do not evidence that.

Doney further argues that the prominence of debates over the form of church government demonstrated the importance of Christ's Lordship among separatists:

From its beginnings in Reformation theology to its role among Nonconformists in the days following the Restoration, the lordship of Christ as expressed in the desire for godly government over the Christian community was thus a central if not a controversial theme. The Elizabethan Separatists were an important part of that historical and theological process. Barrington White, the doyen of Separatist historians, once wrote that "the characteristic consciousness of Christ's reigning, and ruling presence among his people in the present [is] the significant kernel of Separatist thought and experience." Although White was writing of early Stuart Separatism, his words hold true also for the Elizabethan Separatists.¹³⁵

Barrow and Ainsworth did discuss church government and did hold to a congregational form. However, as was demonstrated in the previous chapters, neither Barrow nor Ainsworth made the form of government the single essential or most important characteristic of the visible church. Polity was, for Barrow and Ainsworth, the consequence of their view of the nature of the church; that is, the form of government was a means and not the end in itself.

Doney claims that Christ's kingly office was more important to Barrow than the priestly or prophetic:

The authority of Christ and the obedience of his people were sentiments found throughout Separatist and Puritan polemics at this time. It was no accident, as Craig has noted, that the office of king was placed before the other two ... For the Separatists, Christ's government and rule over the church were paramount. Barrow does the same on a number of occasions throughout his works.¹³⁶

¹³⁵ Ibid., 5.

¹³⁶ Ibid., 33 note 131.

Neither Barrow nor Ainsworth made any distinction between the Christ's offices, that is, making one more important than the others. Additionally, the order of the offices in Barrow and Ainsworth do not appear to have any significance. As Doney notes, Christ's kingly office is not always placed first in order. The order of the offices was never consistent in Barrow and Ainsworth's works. Neither was there any tension or hierarchy among the functions of Christ's office in the non-Barrowist works surveyed. The Church of England clergyman Thomas Bilson and the Jesuit (member of the Society of Jesus) Robert Parsons both raised the question whether Christ's kingly office or priestly office was the greater.¹³⁷ Bilson, citing an anonymous Papist wrote, 'It derogateth from Christes Priesthood which both in his owne person, and in the Church is above his kingly dignitie.'¹³⁸ Parsons responded, 'First I say that it conteyneth a manifest, fond and impious paradox, that Christes Kingdome (as he was both King and Priest) had the preheminance of his Priesthood; and I call it a paradox, for that I thinke no Christian man of learning ever held it before, and much lesse any sound devine.'¹³⁹ This debate, though, and debates over the offices and Christ's two natures did not occupy a significant portion of the polemic or teaching of the period regarding Christ's offices.¹⁴⁰

As has been observed, Barrow and Ainsworth's theology was broader than just Christ's rule over the church. While Doney's emphasis on Christ's kingly office

¹³⁷ On Thomas Bilson see William Richardson, 'Bilson, Thomas (1546/7–1616),' in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed., ed. Lawrence Goldman, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/2401> (accessed 10 March 2014). Concerning Robert Parsons see Victor Houlston, 'Persons [Parsons], Robert (1546–1610),' in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed., ed. Lawrence Goldman, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/21474> (accessed 5 June 2014).

¹³⁸ Bilson, *The true difference betweene Christian subjection and unchristian rebellion*, 222.

¹³⁹ Robert Parsons, *A treatise tending to mitigation* (Saint-Omer, 1607), 147-8.

¹⁴⁰ There was some discussion over the relationship of each function to each of Christ's natures. See *ibid.*, 146ff; Ursinus, *The summe of Christian religion*, 443; Niels Hemmingsen, *The faith of the church militant* (London, 1581), 299-300.

in English separatism is valuable, it is incomplete. The role of the kingly office within the church was not limited to English separatism. It was a significant part of the polemic against the Church of Rome as well. It was also present in non-separatist teaching and catechisms of the period. Doney does briefly pick up on separatist use of the prophetic and priestly offices of Christ in the church, yet he quickly shifts focus to the kingly office: ‘Once the members of the congregation entered into the covenant, they were bound to recognise Christ as king, priest, and prophet. Having Christ the king reigning as the church's monarch was of paramount importance in Separatist theology.’¹⁴¹ He also notes the participation of all believers in the offices, yet then only in connection with discipline.¹⁴²

While there were points of agreement between Browne and Barrow, Barrow’s understanding of the nature of the body of Christ differed from Browne’s. Doney’s focus on Christ’s kingship and the struggle over Christ’s control of the church misses the significance of Christ’s priestly and prophetic office and their role in the polemics of the period. As has been observed, in Barrow and Ainsworth’s works, Christ’s priestly and prophetic offices are equally important. Most problematic for Doney’s thesis is that he attributes to Barrow and Ainsworth Browne’s views on the church. Doney, like many before him, reads Barrow and Ainsworth’s works through Browne’s ecclesiology.¹⁴³ For Barrow and Ainsworth, it was Christ’s presence in the church expressed through his ongoing work that was central to their thinking. B.R. White’s comment, ‘The characteristic consciousness of Christ's reigning, and ruling

¹⁴¹ Doney, 'Lordship of Christ', 164, 49.

¹⁴² *Ibid.*, 220ff, 252.

¹⁴³ Doney comments, ‘It is possible to agree with Fraser's observation that Barrow's writings “contain the clearest exposition of Separatist ecclesiology”, while remaining more cautious concerning Fraser's assertion that Barrow was “consciously indebted to the concisely presented views of Robert Browne.”’ Though in a footnote Doney comments that Fraser’s assertion may be correct. *Ibid.*, 48.

presence among his people in the present [is] the significant kernel of Separatist thought and experience,' noted this idea of Christ's presence. Even so, in White's thinking, this refers only to Christ's presence to rule and discipline.¹⁴⁴ Barrow's reference to the denial of Christ's work as a denial of his coming in the flesh was more than just rule and discipline. For Barrow and Ainsworth, Christ's presence after his ascension was to be found in all of his offices. Christ was a prophet, priest, and king, over the church and within the church.

There is valid justification for making a distinction between Barrowists and Brownists within the broader category of English separatism. Contrary to Doney, Henry Barrow and Henry Ainsworth should not be interpreted in light of the 'broader separatist tradition.' The Barrowists formed a distinct theological tradition apart from Robert Browne. Failing to distinguish between Barrowists and Brownists has been a weakness in the historiography of Barrow and his successors.

6. Conclusion

At the beginning of this chapter, two ideas were discussed concerning Barrow and Ainsworth's understanding and use of the doctrine of the offices of Christ. It is worth repeating those ideas here. First, Barrow and Ainsworth used the doctrine predominantly to explain what the true nature of the church was to be. They employed the doctrine in their ecclesiology much more often than when discussing soteriology. In the non-separatist literature of the period, the offices were discussed

¹⁴⁴ B. R. White, 'The development of the doctrine of the Church among the English separatists with especial reference to Robert Browne and John Smyth' (DPhil Thesis, University of Oxford, 1961), 337. Cited in Doney, 'Lordship of Christ', 5.

more frequently in the context of soteriology. The second difference in their understanding of the doctrine was their emphasis on the participation of the elect in those offices to describe Christ's presence in the visible church. It is important to note that Barrow and Ainsworth's understanding of the offices of Christ, and their use of that doctrine, differed in these respects from that of their contemporaries, both from the Church of England as well as the Church of Rome. The doctrine of the offices of Christ was not an unfamiliar topic between 1580 and 1620. The use of the doctrine to assess orthodoxy and heresy was widespread especially in Protestant attacks on the Church of Rome. There was a universal refrain among Protestant reformers both in England and on the continent that Rome had usurped Christ's offices. Barrow and Ainsworth's use justifying separation was not a unique application of the doctrine: Barrow and Ainsworth had followed a well-worn path.

Nevertheless, there was a distinction in Barrow and Ainsworth's use when compared with the use of the non-separatists considered here. Barrow and Ainsworth understood Christ's offices to be present in the visible church in all of the church's interests, not just in discipline or polity. Further, while they acknowledged Christ's kingdom to be spiritual, it was also physical. The visible church was an outward manifestation of Christ working in and through all the elect. Christ's offices as prophet, priest, and king *of the church* were not just works in the past, but also a continuing operation by Christ immediately in all the elect and mediately through all of the elect. If these differences are accepted, then Barrow and his successors held to a distinct theological emphasis. Further, they should not be read with the same lenses as used for Robert Browne and his followers. Within the broad separatist category, there is justification to distinguish its various sub-groups.

This chapter has argued that, when put into the context of the period 1580 to 1620, considering works which address Christ's offices, Barrow and Ainsworth's use of the doctrine was distinct. This distinction, it is argued, demonstrated a 'Barrowist' theological tradition. Barrow and Ainsworth had a different understanding of the visible church because of their understanding of Christ, most notably his work. Their view of Christ's work on earth influenced their understanding of Christ's church, visible on earth.

Chapter 6: Conclusion

Henry Barrow and Henry Ainsworth provide an interesting case study in the ideological issues concerning the visible church that arose during the Protestant Reformation. This research began as a larger question regarding the relationship between the clergy and laity following the Protestant Reformation. The Protestant Reformation presented challenges for the visible church, its relationships, and its practices. What then became of those challenges? How did the relationship between the ordained and non-ordained members of the visible church change from the medieval to the early modern period as a result of the theological changes in the Protestant Reformation? This study provides a very small glimpse of how one group responded to those challenges. While the results of this study offer only a partial answer to the larger question of clergy lay relations in the Protestant Reformation, it is, nevertheless, a necessary part of the whole. The long duration of the English Reformation presents an opportunity to see the development of these questions over a longer period. The years 1580 to the early 1620s were formative for the beginnings of English separatism and hold a distinct picture of the beginnings of some of the more radical approaches to the questions of the visible church in England.

The literature of the English Reformation has not left the questions of clergy lay relations unanswered. Puritan devotional works of the sixteenth- and seventeenth-centuries provide significant insight to the responsibilities of the individual in their

personal journey of faith.¹ Further, ministerial manuals from the same period offer an extensive look into the responsibilities of the ordained in the lives of those they were accountable for.² English Reformation literature also provides some evidence for the attitudes of the people towards their clergy and of the clergy towards the people. The frequency of works defending the dignity of the ministers seems to imply that an attitude existed among the people that the ministers felt needed reform.³ Scholars have debated whether the populace was opposed to the clergy, hence ‘anticlerical’ or not. Anticlericalism has been both defended and rejected in the historiography of the English Reformation. Patrick Collinson observed, ‘Something called “anticlericalism” was once proposed as the reason for the Reformation, but evidence that the clergy were detested as a caste is unreliable and the very word “anticlericalism” is an anachronistic import from much more modern European politics.’⁴ Additionally, some have questioned whether the populace became anticlerical as a result of the Reformation. Malcolm Yarnell observes, ‘Whiggish historiography sees anticlericalism as ballooning at the beginning of the Reformation; Revisionist historiography sees anticlericalism as a result of Reformation.’⁵

The question of ‘things indifferent’ in the practice of the visible church was paramount in separatist debates with supporters of the established church in

¹ Examples of puritan devotional works: Rogers, *Seaven treatises*; Arthur Dent, *The plaine mans pathway to heaven* (London, 1625). See also Elizabeth K. Hudson, ‘The Catholic challenge to puritan piety, 1580-1620,’ *Catholic Historical Review* 77, no. 1 (1991).

² Examples of puritan ministerial manuals: Perkins and Crashaw, *Of the calling of the ministerie*; Perkins and Tuke, *The arte of prophesying*; Bernard, *The faithfull shepheard the shepheards faithfulnessse*.

³ Perkins and Crashaw, *Of the calling of the ministerie*, 1-3; Bernard, *The faithfull shepheard the shepheards faithfulnessse*, chs. 1-2; Richard Bernard, *Two twinnes: or Two parts of one portion of scripture* (London, 1613), 33, 36; Downe and Hakewill, ‘An Amulet or preservative against the contempt of the Ministry,’ 1-12.

⁴ Collinson, *The Reformation*, 108.

⁵ Yarnell, ‘Royal Priesthood’, 80.

England.⁶ Theodore Bozeman's understanding of *adiaphora* in the English Reformation has already been cited but is worth considering again: '*adiaphoria* - the notion of "things indifferent" - became, in time, "the corner-stone of Anglicanism."'”⁷ According to the doctrine of *adiaphora*, the magistrate and church leadership were responsible to organize the visible church for the purpose of order and building the body of Christ. However, Barrow and Ainsworth rejected the idea that there were aspects of the visible church that the magistrate and church leadership were free to determine.⁸ John von Rohr concludes, 'There is no question but that for these separatists [Barrow, Johnson, Ainsworth, et. al.] the forms of ecclesiastical organisation and government were no mere *adiaphora* but were *fundamenta* in relation to God's plans for men's temporal and eternal destiny.'⁹ For Barrow and Ainsworth, the order and practice of the visible church was a fundamental issue of the faith.

The importance of the form of church government, the practice of discipline, and the participation of all the elect in the public affairs of the church was a matter of obedience for Barrow and Ainsworth. They were not arguing that congregationalism was a more effective form of government for spiritual development than presbyterianism or episcopalianism. They were not seeking the best polity,

⁶ Barrow and Greenwood explained, 'The cawes of controversie thow maist herby perceave to be no light or small matters concerning things indifferent or some fewe trifling ceremonies (as they have long labored to make the world beleeve, although even those least litle trifles being brought into and thrust by way of law upon the church having no warrant in the Testament of Christ ought not to be suffred for the space of an howre), but most high and waightie are these matters, concerning the whole building of the church.' Greenwood and Barrow, 'A Collection of Certaine Sclaunderous Articles,' 127. See also Barrow, 'A Brief Summe of the Causes,' 35; Robert Some, *A godly treatise* (London, 1588), 35.

⁷ Bozeman, *To Live Ancient Lives*, 57.

⁸ Stephen Brachlow explains, 'Whereas Whitgift had argued that ecclesiology was an indifferent matter and, hence of no soteriological value, Cartwright now claimed, without reservation, that "matters of ceremonies, orders, discipline and government ... are ... of faith and salvation."' Brachlow, *Communion of Saints*, 27.

⁹ Von Rohr, 'Extra Ecclesiam Nulla Salus,' 117.

discipline, covenant, and purity for building the body of Christ. They were seeking the only true polity, discipline, covenant, and purity. From their perspective, these issues were true and false, black and white, not matters of effectiveness. For Barrow and Ainsworth, it was not the case that those who remained in a false church would grow more slowly. Rather they would not grow at all; they had no assurance of salvation nor could they experience the nourishing presence of Christ in their midst.

To understand ‘Barrowism’ one must recognize the connection between their Christology and the visible church. As Barrow and Ainsworth explained, not only what Christ did *for* the elect but what he continued to do *in* and *through* the elect. For Barrow and Ainsworth, Christ had not ceased working, and neither was Christ’s work limited to the hearts of his elect. Further, the ordained leaders were not the only members of the congregation through whom Christ worked in the public affairs of the visible church. Christ continued to work on earth after his ascension. His work was visible in his body, the visible church. While much has been written on the debates between the separatists and their opponents, separatist use of the doctrine of the offices of Christ in the understanding of the visible church has not been previously explored. Moreover, it is this doctrine that helps modern scholarship understand Barrowism. While this study cannot speak for all the English separatists, it is the first detailed work to explore participation by the elect in the offices of Christ within ‘Barrowist’ literature.

Separatist historiography has often focused on discipline, purity, polity, or covenant as explanations of separatist ecclesiology. These themes have been put forward to explain the differences between the separatists and those who remained within the established church in early modern England. It has also been argued that

there was no theological distinction between the separatists and radical puritans, just a difference in strategy and timing. English separatism has been accused of losing sight of Christ in their efforts to establish a true church. Further, those who see in the early modern period a democratic or individualistic rise have suggested that the English separatists were preoccupied with the rise of the 'laity' in the government of the church mirroring the rise of the common people in the government of the state.

The evidence presented here challenges all of these approaches to Barrow and Ainsworth. It has been argued in this work that Barrow and Ainsworth have been largely misunderstood in modern historiography. Too often there has been a wholesale suggestion that English separatists were obsessed with obedience, discipline, and the details of the visible church. Certainly, to some extent, all of these ideas can be found in the separatist literature of 1580 to 1620. The debate is not over the existence of these motifs but rather the causes of them. For Barrow and Ainsworth, concern with the theology of the visible church underpinned their concern with the details of ecclesiology. The value of this research to the field of English Reformation studies begins with a re-evaluation of separatist historiography. It reassesses 'Barrowism' and their focus on purity, discipline, polity, and covenant. This study has contended that the suggestions offered in the historiography for the *sine qua non* of Barrowist ecclesiology have failed to consider the underlying doctrinal beliefs. Barrow and Ainsworth's concern over polity, purity, discipline, and covenant were the result of their beliefs rather than the source. These themes were the symptoms and not the cause. As is often the case, symptoms appear prominently while causes may remain hidden. The themes of purity, discipline, polity, and covenant were not the essential ideas of Barrow and Ainsworth's understanding of

the visible church. Underlying these themes was their understanding of the presence of Christ in his visible church continuing his work of prophecy, priesthood, and kingship.

This study also offers a reminder of the complexity and diversity of the period. Henry Barrow and Henry Ainsworth were neither puritans nor Brownists. There were theological differences among those who rejected the Elizabethan settlement. It is important to recognize that there was both unity and diversity in early modern England, or perhaps better envisioned, there was a great deal of agreement in theological understanding and a small amount of difference. Barrow and Ainsworth agreed with much that was taught in the Church of England. Barrow conceded, 'These and many other comfortable and true doctrines they can and doe deliver touching the offices of Christ.'¹⁰ Still, it was the differences that led to separation, exile, and even martyrdom. There is nothing unique in separation from what one considers to be a false church. Differences have brought about separation throughout the history of the church. Barrowism, then, was just one more group among many who have refused fellowship with those they did not consider to be part of the true church.

Barrow and Ainsworth were willing to cut themselves off from the godly in the Church of England as well as other separatists because they considered the points of difference significant enough to demand such an action. English Protestants, and English separatists in particular, must not be seen as a homogeneous group with a shared set of beliefs. For many, including Barrow and Ainsworth, it was the differences that were most important. The use of such terms as 'Barrowist' and

¹⁰ Barrow, 'Brief Discoverie,' 509.

‘Barrowism’ is not new. The historiography of English separatism used these terms as distinct from ‘Brownism’ early in the twentieth century.¹¹ This distinction has not, however, been consistently recognized in the historiography of English separatism. As with puritanism, there were too many differences for such terms as puritan or separatist to capture accurately the diversity of the period. Nevertheless, the terms ‘puritan’ and ‘separatist’ as categories do have value. The caution here is that general assertions concerning the entire category may be inaccurate. It has been suggested here that Barrow and Ainsworth’s focus on the ecclesiological details of the visible church was the result of an underlying theological construct, namely participation of the elect in the offices of Christ. That underlying construct differentiated the Barrowists from other English Protestants.

Additionally, there was ecclesiological diversity earlier in the English Reformation (mid-1580s) than has sometimes been allowed for. The ambiguity of the developing thought prior to and into the early seventeenth-century cannot adequately explain away this diversity. Differences appear both between separatism and the more radical puritans as well as within separatism itself. Once again there was more agreement than disagreement: however, the points of disagreement were sufficient to make clear ecclesiological diversity. More to the point, the differences were not just in practice or preference but were theological or rather dogmatic in nature. The issues were not just whether some practices such as the clothing worn by the minister or the position taken while receiving the Eucharist were dangerous because they might lead some parishioners back to the papacy. As Barrow and Ainsworth argued, the differences involved a denial of Christ and his incarnation. While there is value in

¹¹ See *supra* p. 37.

focusing on the points of unity during the English Reformation, the differences of belief must not be neglected in the process.

This study also provides a context, a lens, through which to understand better the debates between Barrow and Ainsworth and their opponents. It updates the work done by Fred Powicke regarding the issues that led to Barrow's martyrdom and provides a theological insight to Barrow's examinations.¹² What is fascinating in Barrow's interactions is that his opponents did not fully address Barrow's position. In the debates between Barrow and George Gifford, they seem to be having two separate, though related, conversations. Gifford did not directly challenge Barrow's argument. Rather, he took a different approach to proving the Church of England to be true and Barrow to be a schismatic. For Gifford, the debate was about whether there were sufficient corruptions in the Church of England to separate it from Christ. For Barrow, the debate was about whether holding obstinately to those corruptions proved that the Church of England had denied Christ. Gifford spent little space in his works asserting the Church of England's belief in Christ and his offices. While the distinction may appear slight, it was, however, significant as both claimed the other had not addressed their argument.

While work has been done on Francis Johnson, little exists concerning Henry Ainsworth.¹³ The debates between Francis Johnson and Henry Ainsworth and their ultimate break in 1610 provide an interesting look at the problems of pastoring according to Barrow's views. This study offers background to Johnson and

¹² Powicke, *Henry Barrow*.

¹³ Simon Doney has suggested, 'No single study on the theology of Henry Ainsworth has been carried out. Considering that just as his predecessor Barrow, he was a prolific writer with over thirty volumes including his commentaries, it appears that Ainsworth has been rather neglected in studies on Elizabethan and Jacobean Separatism.' Doney, 'Lordship of Christ', 7. On Francis Johnson see Scott Culpepper, *Francis Johnson and the English Separatist influence: the Bishop of Brownism's life, writings, and controversies*, 1st ed. (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 2011).

Ainsworth's ecclesiology and provides a context for the differences that arose as Johnson's views of the visible church changed. Ainsworth carried on the debate against two fronts, first against the traditional opponents who defended the Church of England and secondly against Johnson, who had at one time held to Ainsworth's views. Ainsworth, unlike Barrow, was also the pastor of a congregation. For Ainsworth, the issues were not just theoretical. The debates between he and Johnson demonstrate the real difficulties in trying to practice the distinctive views Barrow had argued for. Ainsworth provides the modern researcher with a second-generation attempt to live out the previous generation's beliefs. Ainsworth was not ignorant of the problems with a visible church in which all the members had a right and interest in its public affairs. Given that Johnson abandoned those views, it is even more interesting that Ainsworth continued to defend and practise them until his death.

Finally, this study offers a reminder to the field of Reformation studies that ideology plays an important role in historical research. A focus on sociology and politics in historical research has dominated recent work especially concerning the English Reformation. David Bagchi and David Steinmetz comment,

Towards the end of the twentieth century, theology came to be seen by many as marginal to Reformation studies. This was in part a reaction to the 'great man' approach to the past. In the same way that history in general was no longer primarily about what kings and queens did or what parliaments enacted, so the motivating force of religious history was not to be found in the writings of the ecclesiastical elite. Attention turned instead to the 'simple folk' ... It was the social historian, not the historical theologian, who seemed better equipped to answer the real question about the Reformation, 'What impact did it have on ordinary people?'¹⁴

¹⁴ David V. N. Bagchi and David Curtis Steinmetz, *The Cambridge Companion to Reformation Theology*, Cambridge companions to religion (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 1.

The shift from theology towards sociology is certainly not wrong. The danger is shifting to one extreme and neglecting the other. Deliberately, this study has not considered the social implications of separatism and of Barrow and Ainsworth in particular. The reason is not that the impact of separatism on the people is deemed unimportant. Rather, it has attempted to provide a context or framework within which to understand better the social issues facing the Barrowists. In this, it provides a foundational building block and not the capstone.

Historical theology is neither the best nor only approach to Reformation studies; it is just one of several perspectives, each contributing its own unique approach. Geoffrey Bromiley explains that historical theology,

fills the gap between the time of God's Word and the present time of the church's word by studying the church's word in the intervening periods. In so doing ... it shows how the church and its word, moving across the centuries and continents, have come from there to here with an ongoing continuity in spite of every discontinuity.¹⁵

The value of historical theology lies in the fact that while people did not always practice what they claimed to believe, the church often built its beliefs (doctrines) from the claims of previous generations rather than their practices.

Despite this study's value to the field, it leaves many unanswered questions. It has been argued that it would be a difficult task to determine where Barrow and Ainsworth's use of the doctrine came from. Further, it seems impossible to demonstrate true ideological dependence without new evidence given Barrow and Ainsworth's claims that they did not draw their views from any other human being. Nevertheless, it would be possible and valuable to trace similarities of thought. It

¹⁵ Geoffrey William Bromiley, *Historical theology: an introduction* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1978), xxvi.

might be possible to demonstrate similar usage of the doctrine of the offices of Christ both earlier and later than Barrow and Ainsworth. For example, John Wyclif, William Tyndale, and the Lollards offer a history of dissent within English Christianity. Further, Wyclif does make reference to the elect as prophets, priests, and kings.¹⁶ Was Barrow following in a long line of religious English rebels, especially in their understanding of all of the elect as prophets, priests, and kings? Considering the continental reformers, there is similarity in some of Barrow and Ainsworth's views and the early views of Martin Luther and the priesthood of all believers. Were Barrow and Ainsworth simply explaining how they understood Luther's early writings on the priesthood of all believers? It would be interesting and helpful to note the points of similarity and difference between Barrow and Ainsworth's view of the participation of the elect in the offices of Christ and Luther's priesthood of all believers.

Closer to Barrow and Ainsworth's time is the view of John Robinson on the participation of the elect in the offices of Christ. Ainsworth included a response by John Robinson in his work *An Animadversion to Mr Richard Clyftons Advertisement* (1613). Robinson was quoted there: 'I say in one place, that the saynts are not Kings for themselves alone, but for their brethern also, as they are no Preists onely for themselves, but for their brethren. And in another place, that every one of the faithful is a king, not onely to him self, but to every other member, as he is a Preist, and a Prophet &c.'¹⁷ Robinson's language and use of the doctrine here shows some similarity to Ainsworth's use. Timothy George has offered a significant work on

¹⁶ John Wyclif, Alfred W. Pollard, and Charles Sayle, *Iohannis Wyclif Tractatus de officio regis* (New York: Minerva, 1966), 133.

¹⁷ Ainsworth, *An animadversion*, 114.

John Robinson yet he has not discussed Robinson's understanding of the offices of Christ and the visible church.¹⁸ Robinson influenced some of the individuals who migrated to the New World. It would be valuable to understand the extent to which Barrow's view of the offices of Christ were prevalent in the Netherlands and in the early thinking of the members of Plymouth colony. Did 'Barrowism' die after Ainsworth's death in 1622 or did it evolve and continue? If the use of the participation of the elect in the offices of Christ was distinct for Barrow and Ainsworth (and their followers) at what point can that usage be demonstrated to have ended? These questions address issues of ideology, but what of the sociology of Barrow and Ainsworth's views? Was there a distinctive social culture among Ainsworth's congregation that emerged from his understanding of the participation of the elect? Can a picture of the religious experience of those who followed Barrow and Ainsworth be painted? These and many other questions manifest how little this study has provided (however significant) to the understanding of the people and their time.

Barrow and Ainsworth's views raise some interesting questions for the present time as well. The roles of the non-ordained and ordained are still in tension in some visible churches today. Barrow and Ainsworth offer a more empowered picture of the laity than is sometimes practised. The idea that all of the elect are obligated to exercise their roles as prophets, priests, and kings is an affront to many who see themselves as passive receivers of the clergy's produce. Barrow and Ainsworth's emphasis on the visible church as the body of Christ on earth gives input to the questions of the nature and purpose of the visible church today. They offer a

¹⁸ See *supra* p. 34.

challenging picture of what it means to be the visible church and how that affects all those who are part of it. For some today, they inject uncomfortable ideas into the status quo. The point is not so much to accept Barrow and Ainsworth's model of the visible church and attempt to recreate it today. Rather the visible church today should consider how Barrow and Ainsworth responded to the questions and challenges that the Protestant Reformation brought with it. Barrow and Ainsworth's opinions should not simply be rejected as obsolete ideas of a bygone age. The opportunity is to find within Barrow and Ainsworth's views fodder in the continuing work of the visible church on earth. For Protestants, the visible church is reformed and always reforming.

This study began with the research question, what is the significance of participation by the elect in the offices of Christ in separatist literature. To this question, the argument has been made that participation by the elect in the offices of Christ represented a visible expression of Christ's continuing work on earth, both in and through the visible church. It has been argued that Barrow and Ainsworth were focused on the implications of Christ's work on earth expressed through his offices of prophecy, priesthood, and kingship. Christ's work did not end with his ascension nor was it handed over to the bishops of the Church of England. His work was continued both immediately and mediately, that is, in and through all of the elect. As a result, the public affairs of the visible church were the responsibility of all the members of Christ's body including the non-ordained members. While this study cannot answer for all English separatists, for Barrow and Ainsworth there was a Christological centre to their ecclesiology. Their focus on the details of ecclesiology was not an obsession with the details for their own sake. Neither did they lose sight

of Christ and his work of redeeming humanity. Barrow and Ainsworth strove to teach and live out a true picture of Christ on earth. As Barrow wrote, ‘Thus you see what kind of Christ they teach you ...’¹⁹

¹⁹ Barrow, 'Brief Discoverie,' 514.

Appendix

In comparing Barrow and Ainsworth's use of the doctrine of the offices of Christ for Chapter four *supra*, it would not be practical to consider every published work from the period 1580 to 1620. The method employed was to search the Early English Books Online (EEBO) database for works published between 1580-1620 and that contained occurrences of certain keywords related to the doctrine. Not all works in EEBO have the full text available and, therefore, are not searchable. Only those that have the full text provided by the Text Creation Partnership (TCP) could be searched.¹ Those works that lacked a 'searchable text' were not included in the set. This search in EEBO provided 174 works that contained one or more of the search keywords. Those keywords were 'offices of Christ,' 'priest and king,' 'priesthood,' and 'priests and kings' including variations on word order and spelling. Each search hit was then examined to determine how the doctrine was used. EEBO-TCP is an ongoing effort providing searchable text for additional works in EEBO. The search producing this population was performed in August 2013. The works that were analysed are listed below. Works from the list below that were cited in this thesis have been listed in the bibliography as well.

Anon. *Ane Shorte and Generall Confession of the Trewe Christiane Fayth and Religion, According to Godis Word and Actis of Our Parliamentis Subscribed Be the Kingis Majestie and His Housholde, with Sindrie Utheries, to the Glorye of God and Good Exemple of All Men, at Edinburgh the Twentie Eyght Day of Januarie, the Yere of God, Ane Thousand, Fyve Hundreth, Fourescore Yeirs, and the Fourtene Yeir of His Majesteis Regne.* Edinburgh, 1581.

¹ From the EEBO-TCP website, 'EEBO-TCP is a partnership with ProQuest and with more than 150 libraries to generate highly accurate, fully-searchable, SGML/XML-encoded texts corresponding to books from the Early English Books Online Database.' 'EEBO-TCP: Early English Books online,' accessed May 19, 2015, <http://www.textcreationpartnership.org/tcp-eebo/>.

- Arthington, Henry. *The Seduction of Arthington by Hacket Especiallie with Some Tokens of His Unfained Repentance and Submission. Written by the Said Henrie Arthington, the Third Person, in That Wofull Tragedie.* London, 1592.
- Attersoll, William. *The Badges of Christianity. Or, a Treatise of the Sacraments Fully Declared out of the Word of God Wherein the Truth It Selfe Is Proved, the Doctrine of the Reformed Churches Maintained, and the Errors of the Churches of Rome Are Evidently Convinced: By Perusing Wherof the Discreet Reader May Easily Perceive, the Weak and Unstable Grounds of the Roman Religion, and the Just Causes of Our Lawfull Separation. Divided into Three Bookes: 1. Of the Sacraments in Generall. 2. Of Baptisme. 3. Of the Lords Supper. Hereunto Is Annexed a Corollarie or Necessary Advertisement, Shewing the Intention of This Present Worke, Opening the Differences among Us About the Question of the Supper, Discovering the Idolatry and Divisions of the Popish Clergy.* London, 1606.
- Baker, John minister. *Lectures of J.B. Upon the Xii. Articles of Our Christian Faith Briefely Set Forth for the Comfort of the Godly, and the Better Instruction of the Simple and Ignorant. Also Hereunto Is Annexed a Briefe and Cleare Confession of the Christian Faith, Containing an Hundreth Articles, According to the Order of the Creede of the Apostles.* London, 1581.
- Balnaves, Henry. *The Confession of Faith Contending How the Troubled Man Should Seeke Refuge at His God, Thereto Led by Faith: With the Declaratio[N] of the Article of Justification at Length. ... Compiled by M. Henry Balnaves of Halhill, & One of the Lords of Session, and Counsell of Scotland, Being as Prisoner within the Old Pallaice of Roane: In the Yeare of Our Lord. 1548. Direct to His Faithfull Brethren, Being in Like Trouble or More.* Edinburgh, 1584.
- Bancroft, Richard. *A Sermon Preached at Paules Crosse the 9. Of Februarie Being the First Sunday in the Parleament, Anno. 1588. By Richard Bancroft D. Of Divinitie, and Chaplaine to the Right Honorable Sir Christopher Hatson Knight L. Chancelor of England. Wherein Some Things Are Now Added, Which Then Were Omitted, Either through Want of Time, or Default in Memorie.* London, 1588.
- Batt, John. *The Royall Priesthood of Christians an Excellent Treatise, Wherein the Nature of the Priesthood, the Function of the Priests, and Qualitie of the Sacrifice Is Lively Portrayed, for the Sure Building up of the Faithfull Professors of the Gospell, in Holinesse and Sanctitie of Life.* London, 1605.
- Beard, Thomas. *A Retractive from the Romish Religion Contayning Thirteene Forcible Motives, Disswading from the Communion with the Church of Rome: Wherein Is Demonstratively Proved, That the Now Romish Religion (So Farre Forth as It Is Romish) Is Not the True Catholike Religion of Christ, but the Seduction of Antichrist.* London, 1616.
- Bell, Thomas. *The Survey of Popery Wherein the Reader May Cleerely Behold, Not Onely*

the Originall and Daily Incrementes of Papistrie, with an Evident Confutation of the Same; but Also a Succinct and Profitable Enarration of the State of Gods Church from Adam Untill Christs Ascension, Contained in the First and Second Part Thereof: And Throughout the Third Part Poperie Is Turned up-Side Downe. London, 1596.

Bèze, Théodore de. *Master Bezaes Sermons Upon the Three Chapters of the Canticle of Canticles Wherein Are Handled the Chiefest Points of Religion Controversed and Debated Betweene Us and the Adversarie at This Day, Especially Touching the True Jesus Christ and the True Church, and the Certaine & Infallible Marks Both of the One and of the Other.* Oxford, 1587.

. *Propositions and Principles of Divinitie Propounded and Disputed in the Universitie of Geneva, by Certaine Students of Divinitie There, under M. Theod. Beza, and M. Anthonie Faius ... Wherein Is Contained a Methodicall Summarie, or Epitome of the Common Places of Divinitie. Translated out of Latine into English, to the End That the Causes, Both of the Present Dangers of That Church, and Also of the Troubles of Those That Are Hardlie Dealt with Els-Where, May Appeare in the English Tongue.* Edinburgh, 1591.

Bilson, Thomas. *The True Difference Betweene Christian Subjection and Unchristian Rebellion Wherein the Princes Lawfull Power to Commaund for Trueth, and Indeprivable Right to Beare the Sword Are Defended against the Popes Censures and the Jesuits Sophismes Uttered in Their Apologie and Defence of English Catholikes: With a Demonstration That the Thinges Refourmed in the Church of England by the Lawes of This Realme Are Truely Catholike, Notwithstanding the Vaine Shew Made to the Contrary in Their Late Rhemish Testament.* Oxford, 1585.

. *The Perpetual Governement of Christes Church Wherein Are Handled; the Fatherly Superioritie Which God First Established in the Patriarkes for the Guiding of His Church, and after Continued in the Tribe of Levi and the Prophetes; and Lastlie Confirmed in the New Testament to the Apostles and Their Successours: As Also the Points in Question at This Day; Touching the Jewish Synedrion: The True Kingdome of Christ: The Apostles Commission: The Laie Presbyterie: The Distinction of Bishops from Presbyters, and Their Succssion [Sic] from the Apostles Times and Hands: The Calling and Moderating of Provinciaall Synodes by Primates and Metropolitanes: The Alloting of Dioeceses, and the Popular Electing of Such as Must Feed and Watch the Flocke: And Divers Other Points Concerning the Pastorall Regiment of the House of God.* London, 1593.

. *The Survey of Christs Sufferings for Mans Redemption and of His Descent to Hades or Hel for Our Deliverance.* London, 1604.

Boys, John. *The Autumne Part from the Twelfth Sundry [Sic] after Trinitie, to the Last in the Whole Yeere Dedicated Unto the Much Honoured and Most Worthy Doctor John Overal.* London, 1613.

- _____. *An Exposition of the Festivall Epistles and Gospels Used in Our English Liturgie Together with a Reason Why the Church Did Chuse the Same; the First Part from the Feast of S. Andrew the Apostle, to the Purification of Blessed Mary the Virgin.* London, 1615.
- Bredwell, Stephen. *The Rasing of the Foundations of Brownisme Wherein, against All the Writings of the Principall Masters of That Sect, Those Chiefe Conclusions in the Next Page, Are, (Amongst Sundry Other Matters, Worthie the Readers Knowledge) Purposely Handled, and Soundely Prooved. Also Their Contrarie Arguments and Objections Deliberately Examined, and Clearly Refelled by the Word of God.* London, 1588.
- Broughton, Hugh. *Daniel His Chaldie Visions and His Ebrew: Both Translated after the Original: And Expounded Both, by Reduction of Heathen Most Famous Stories Unto the Exact Propriete of His Wordes (Which Is the Surest Certaintie What He Must Meane:) and by Joyning All the Bible, and Learned Tongues to the Frame of His Worke.* London, 1596.
- _____. *A Revelation of the Holy Apocalyps.* Middelburg, 1610.
- Bruce, Robert. *Sermons Upon the Sacrament of the Lords Supper.* Edinburgh, 1591.
- _____. *The Way to True Peace and Rest Delivered at Edinborough in Xvi. Sermons: On the Lords Supper: Hezechiahs Sicknesse: And Other Select Scriptures.* London, 1617.
- Bulkley, Edward. *An Apologie for Religion, or an Answere to an Unlearned and Slanderous Pamphlet Intituled: Certaine Articles, or Forcible Reasons Discovering the Palpable Absurdities, and Most Notorious Errors of the Protestants Religion, Pretended to Be Printed at Antwerpe 1600.* London, 1602.
- Bunny, Francis. *A Survey of the Popes Supremacie Wherein Is a Triall of His Title, and a Prooffe of His Practices: And in It Are Examined the Chiefe Argumentes That M. Bellarmine Hath, for Defence of the Said Supremacie, in His Bookes of the Bishop of Rome.* London, 1595.
- _____. *A Comparison Betweene the Auncient Fayth of the Romans, and the New Romish Religion.* London, 1595.
- Burton, William. *Conclusions of Peace, Betweene God and Man Containing Comfortable Meditations for the Children of God.* London, 1594.
- Byfield, Nicholas. *The Paterne of Wholsome Words. Or a Collection of Such Truths as Are of Necessity to Be Believed Unto Salvation Separated out of the Body of All Theologie Made Evident by Infallible Plaine Proofes of Scripture. And Withall, the Severall Uses Such Principles Should Be Put to, Are Abundantly Shewed. A Project Much Desired, and of Singular Use for All Sorts of Christians.* London, 1618.

Calderwood, David. *The Speach of the Kirk of Scotland to Her Beloved Children*. Amsterdam, 1620.

Calvin, Jean. *The Sermons of M. John Calvin Upon the Fifth Booke of Moses Called Deuteronomie Faithfully Gathered Word for Word as He Preached Them in Open Pulpit; Together with a Preface of the Ministers of the Church of Geneva, and an Admonishment Made by the Deacons There. Also There Are Annexed Two Profitable Tables, the One Containing the Chiefe Matters; the Other the Places of Scripture Herein Alledged*. London, 1583.

_____. *A Commentarie Upon the Epistle of Saint Paul to the Romanes, Written in Latine by M. John Calvin, and Newly Translated into Englishe by Christopher Rosdell Preacher. Whereunto Is Added a Necessarie Table for the Better and More Readie Finding out of Certayne Principall Matters Conteyned in This Worke*. London, 1583.

_____. *A Harmonie Upon the the Three Evangelists, Matthew, Mark and Luke with the Commentarie of M. John Calvine: Faithfully Translated out of Latine into English, by E.P. Whereunto Is Also Added a Commentarie Upon the Evangelist S. John, by the Same Authour*. London, 1584.

_____. *Aphorismes of Christian Religion: Or, a Verie Compendious Abridgement of M. J. Calvins Institutions Set Forth in Short Sentences Methodically by M. J. Piscator: And Now Englished According to the Authors Third and Last Edition*. London, 1596.

Carpenter, John. *Contemplations for the Institution of Children in the Christian Religion*. London, 1601.

Collins, Samuel. *Epphata to F.T., or, the Defence of the Right Reverend Father in God, the Lord Bishop of Elie, Lord High-Almoner and Privie Counsellour to the Kings Most Excellent Majestie Concerning His Answer to Cardinall Bellarmines Apologie, against the Slaunderous Cavills of a Namelesse Adjoyner, Entitling His Booke in Every Page of It, a Discoverie of Many Fowle Absurdities, Falsities, Lyes, &c.: Wherein These Things Cheifely Are Discussed, (Besides Many Other Incident), 1. The Popes False Primacie, Clayming by Peter, 2. Invocation of Saints, with Worship of Creatures, and Faith in Them, 3. The Supremacie of Kings Both in Temporall and Ecclesiasticall Matters and Causes, over All States and Persons, &c. Within Their Realms and Dominions*. Cambridge, 1617.

Cooper, Thomas. *Certaine Sermons Wherin Is Contained the Defense of the Gospell Nowe Preached against Such Cavils and False Accusations, as Are Objected Both against the Doctrine It Selfe, and the Preachers and Professors Thereof, by the Friendes and Favourers of the Church of Rome*. London, 1580.

_____. *An Admonition to the People of England Wherein Are Answered, Not Onely the Slaunderous Untruethes, Reprochfully Uttered by Martin the Libeller, but Also Many Other Crimes by Some of His Broode, Objected Generally against All Bishops, and*

the Chiefe of the Cleargie, Purposely to Deface and Discredite the Present State of the Church. Seene and Allowed by Authoritie. London, 1589.

. The Converts First Love Discerned Justified, Left and Recovered. Resolving the Truth of an Effectuall Conversion. And Informing the Right Way to Perseverance and Perfection. London, 1610.

. A Familiar Treatise Laying Downe Cases of Conscience, Furthering to Perseverance in Sanctification. London, 1615.

Cosin, Richard. *Conspiracie, for Pretended Reformation Viz. Presbyteriall Discipline. A Treatise Discouering the Late Designments and Courses Held for Advancement Thereof, by William Hacket Yeoman, Edmund Coppinger, and Henry Arthington Gent. Out of Others Depositions and Their Owne Letters, Writings & Confessions Upon Examination: Together with Some Part of the Life and Conditions, and Two Inditements, Arraignment, and Execution of the Sayd Hacket: Also an Answere to the Calumniation of Such as Affirme They Were Mad Men: And a Resemblance of This Action Unto the Like, Happened Heretofore in Germanie. Ultimo Septembris. 1591. Published Now by Authoritie.* London, 1592.

Cowper, William. *Pathmos: Or, a Commentary on the Revelation of Saint John Divided into Three Seuerall Prophecies. The First Prophecie Contained in the Fourth, Fift, Sixt and Seventh Chapters.* London, 1619.

Craig, John. *A Short Summe of the Whole Catechisme Wherin the Question Is Propounded and Answered in Fewe Wordes, for the Greater Ease of the Common People & Children. Gathered by M. John Craig, Minister of Gods Word, to the Kinges Majestie.* London, 1583.

Cranmer, Thomas. *An Aunswere by the Reverend Father in God Thomas Archbyshop of Canterbury, Primate of All England and Metropolitane, Unto a Craftie and Sophisticall Cavillation, Devised by Stephen Gardiner Doctour of Law, Late Byshop of Winchester Agaynst the True and Godly Doctrine of the Most Holy Sacrament, of the Body and Bloud of Our Sauuour Jesu Christ Wherein Is Also, as Occasion Serveth, Aunswered Such Places of the Booke of Doct. Richard Smith, as May Seeme Any Thyng Worthy the Aunsweryng. Here Is Also the True Copy of the Booke Written, and in Open Court Delivered.* London, 1580.

Crowley, Robert. *Fryer John Frauncis of Nigeon in Fraunce a Replication to That Lewde Aunswere, Which Fryer John Frauncis (of the Minimes Order in Nigeon Nigh Unto Paris in Fraunce) Hath Made to a Letter, That His Mother Caused to Be Written, and Sent to Him out of England, in August. 1585. Whereunto Is Annexed an Aunswere, to That Which the Same Fryer Hath Written to His Father and Mother: In Defence, and to the Prayse of That Religion, Which He Dooth Nowe Professe: And to the Disprayse and Defacing of That Religion, Which Is Nowe Professed in Englande. Whereof the Fryer Himselfe Was a Scholler and Professor, Untill the Yeere 1583. Which Was the 18. Yeere of Hys Age.* London, 1586.

- Dod, Henry. *A Godlie and Fruitfull Treatise of Faith and Workes. Wherein Is Confuted a Certaine Opinion of Merit by Workes, Which an Adversary to the Gospell of Christ Jesu, Held in the Conference, Had in the Tower of London.* London, 1583.
- Downame, George. *A Treatise Concerning Antichrist Divided into Two Bookes, the Former, Proving That the Pope Is Antichrist, the Latter, Maintaining the Same Assertion, against All the Objections of Robert Bellarmine, Jesuit and Cardinall of the Church of Rome.* London, 1603.
- Downame, John. *The Christian Warfare Wherein Is First Generally Shewed the Malice, Power and Politike Stratagems of the Spirituall Ennemies of Our Salvation, Sathan and His Assistants the World and the Flesh, with the Meanes Also Whereby the Christian May Withstand and Defeate Them: And Afterwards More Speciallie Their Particular Temptatiions, against the Severall Causes and Meanes of Our Salvation, Whereby on the One Side They Allure Us to Security and Presumption, and on the Other Side, Draw Us to Doubting and Desperation, Are Expressed and Answered: Written Especially for Their Sakes Who Are Exercised in the Spirituall Conflict of Temptations, and Are Afflicted in Conscience in the Sight and Sense of Their Sinnes.* London, 1604.
- Draxe, Thomas. *The Worldes Resurrection, or the Generall Calling of the Jewes a Familiar Commentary Upon the Eleventh Chapter of Saint Paul to the Romaines, According to the Sence of Scripture, and the Consent of the Most Judicious Interpreters, Wherein above Fiftie Notable Questions Are Soundly Answered, and the Particular Doctrines, Reasons and Uses of Every Verse, Are Profitable and Plainly Delivered.* London, 1608.
- Du Moulin, Pierre. *The Accomplishment of the Prophecies; or the Third Booke in Defence of the Catholike Faith Contained in the Booke of the High & Mighty King James. I. By the Grace of God King of Great Brittain and Ireland. Against the Allegations of R. Bellarmine; and F.N. Coïffeteau & Other Doctors of the Romish Church.* Oxford, 1613.
- Fitzsimon, Henry. *A Catholike Confutation of M. John Riders Clayme of Antiquitie and a Cavlling Comfort against His Caveat. In Which Is Demonstrated, by Assurances, Even of Protestants, That Al Antiquitie, for Al Pointes of Religion in Controversie, Is Repugnant to Protestancie. Secondly, That Protestancie Is Repugnant Particularlie to Al Articles of Beleeffe. Thirdly, That Puritan Plots Are Pernitious to Religion, and State. And Lastly, a Replye to M. Riders Rescript; with a Discoverie of Puritan Partialitie in His Behalfe.* Roan, 1608.
- Fletcher, Giles. *Of the Russe Common Wealth. Or, Maner of Governement of the Russe Emperour, (Commonly Called the Emperour of Moskovia) with the Manners, and Fashions of the People of That Countrey.* London, 1591.
- Forbes, Patrick. *An Exquisite Commentarie Upon the Revelation of Saint John Wherein,*

Both the Course of the Whole Booke, as Also the More Abstruse and Hard Places Thereof Not Heretofore Opened; Are Now at Last Most Cleerely and Evidently Explained. London, 1613.

Foxe, John. *Actes and Monuments of Matters Most Speciall and Memorable, Happenyng in the Church with an Universall History of the Same, Wherein Is Set Forth at Large the Whole Race and Course of the Church, from the Primitive Age to These Latter Tymes of Ours, with the Bloudy Times, Horrible Troubles, and Great Persecutions Agaynst the True Martyrs of Christ, Sought and Wrought as Well by Heathen Emperours, as Nowe Lately Practised by Romish Prelates, Especially in This Realme of England and Scotland. Newly Revised and Recognised, Partly Also Augmented, and Now the Fourth Time Agayne Published and Recommended to the Studious Reader, by the Author (through the Helpe of Christ Our Lord) John Foxe, Which Desireth Thee Good Reader to Helpe Him with Thy Prayer. Volume 1 Only.* London, 1583.

Fulke, William. *A Retentive, to Stay Good Christians, in True Faith and Religion, against the Motives of Richard Bristow Also a Discoverie of the Daungerous Rocke of the Popish Church.* London, 1580.

_____. *A Rejoynder to Bristows Replie in Defence of Allens Scroll of Articles and Booke of Purgatorie Also the Cavils of Nicholas Sander D. In Divinitie About the Supper of Our Lord, and the Apologie of the Church of England, Touching the Doctrine Thereof, Confuted. Seene and Allowed.* London, 1581.

_____. *A Defense of the Sincere and True Translations of the Holie Scriptures into the English Tong against the Manifold Cavils, Frivolous Quarels, and Impudent Slaunders of Gregorie Martin, One of the Readers of Popish Divinitie in the Trayterous Seminarie of Rhemes. By William Fvlke D. In Divinitie, and M. Of Pembroke Haule in Cambridge. Whereunto Is Added a Briefe Confutation of All Such Quarrels & Cavils, as Have Bene of Late Uttered by Diverse Papistes in Their English Pamphlets, against the Writings of the Saide William Fulke.* London, 1583.

Gibson, Thomas. *The Blessing of a Good King Delivered in Eight Sermons Upon the Storie of the Queene of the South, Her Words to Salomon, Magnifying the Government of His Familie and Kingdome.* London, 1614.

Godskall, James. *The Arke of Noah for the Londoners That Remaine in the Cittie to Enter in, with Their Families, to Be Preserved from the Deluge of the Plague. Item, an Exercise for the Londoners That Are Departed out of the Cittie into the Coutnrey, to Spend Their Time Till They Returne. Whereunto Is Annexed an Epistle Sent out of the COUNTRY, to the Afflicted Cittie of London.* London, 1604.

Gordon, John. *A Panegyrique of Congratulation for the Concord of the Realmes of Great Britaine in Unitie of Religion, and under One King to the Most High, Most Puissant and Magnanimous, James King of England, Scotland, France and Ireland. Written in French by John Gordon Scottish-Man, Lord of Long-Orme, and One of the*

Gentlemen of the French Kings Chamber. Translated into English by E.G. London, 1603.

Granger, Thomas. *The Light of the World a Sermon Preached at Botterwike in Holland, Neere Boston, in Lincolnshire.* London, 1616.

_____. *The Bread of Life, or Foode of the Regenerate a Sermon Preached at Botterwike in Holland, Neere Boston, in Lincolnshire.* London, 1616.

Greenham, Richard. *The Workes of the Reverend and Faithfull Servant of Jesus Christ M. Richard Greenham, Minister and Preacher of the Word of God the Second Edition, Revised, Corrected, and Published, for the Further Building of All Such as Love the Trueth, and Desire to Know the Power of Godlines.* London, 1599.

Guild, William. *Moses Unvaild: Or Those Figures Which Served Unto the Patterne and Shaddow of Heavenly Things, Pointing out the Messiah Christ Jesus, Briefly Explained Whereunto Is Added the Harmony of All the Prophets, Breathing with One Mouth the Myserie of His Comming, and of That Redemption Which by His Death He Was to Accomplish.* London, 1620.

Haren, Jean. *The Repentance of John Haren Priest and His Returne to the Church of God; Publickly by Him Recited in the French Church at Wezell, in the Presence of the Senate, Composed of the Ministers and the People Assembled Togeather Upon the 7. Day of March, Anno. 1610. Likewise, the Recantation of Martine Bartox, at Rochell, Sometimes Doctor of Divinitie in Spaine, Vicar Provinciall and Visitor of the Order of the Holy Trinitie for the Redemption of Prisoners in the Kingdomes and Crowne of Arragon. Translated out of the Latine and French, into English.* London, 1610.

Harrison, William. *Deaths Advantage Little Regarded, and the Soules Solace against Sorrow Preached in Two Funerall Sermons at Childwal in Lancashire at the Buriall of Mistris Katherin Brettergh the Third of June. 1601. The One by William Harrison, One of the Preachers Appointed by Her. Majestie for the Countie Palatine of Lancaster, the Other by William Leygh, Bachelor of Divinitie, and Pastor of Standish. Whereunto Is Annexed, the Christian Life and Godly Death of the Said Gentlewoman.* London, 1602.

Harvey, Gabriel. *Pierces Supererogation or a New Prayse of the Old Asse a Preparative to Certaine Larger Discourses, Intituled Nashes S. Fame.* London, 1593.

Hemmingsen, Niels. *The Faith of the Church Militant Moste Effectualie Described in This Exposition of the 84. Psalme, by That Reverend Pastor, and Publike Professor of Gods Word, in the Famous Uniuersitie of Hassine in Denmarke, Nicholas Hemmingius. A Treatise Written as to the Instruction of the Ignorant in the Groundes of Religion, So to the Confutation of the Jewes, the Turkes, Atheists, Papists, Heretiks, and Al Other Adversaries of the Trueth Whatsoever.* London, 1581.

Hieron, Samuel. *The Baptizing of the Eunuch in Three Sermons Upon Act. 8. 36. 37. 38.*

- London, 1613.
- Horne, Robert. *Of the Rich Man and Lazarus Certaine Sermons*. London, 1619.
- Howson, John. *A Sermon Preached at Paules Crosse the 4 of December, 1597 Wherein Is Discoursed That All Buying and Selling of Spirituall Promotion Is Unlawfull*. London, 1597.
- Hume, Alexander schoolmaster. *A Rejoynder to Doctor Hil Concerning the Descense of Christ into Hell Wherein the Answere to His Sermon Is Justlie Defended, and the Roust of His Reply Scraped from Those Arguments as Cleanlie, as If They Had Never Bene Touched with That Canker. Heere, Besides the Reioynder, Thou Hast His Paralogismes: That Is, His Fallacies and Deceits in Reason Pointed out, and Numbered in the Margin: Amounting to the Number of 600. And Above: And yet Not Half Reckoned*. Edinburgh, 1594.
- Hutton, Thomas, and William Cotton. *The Second and Last Part of Reasons for Refusall of Subscription to the Booke of Common Prayer under the Hands of Certaine Ministers of Devon. And Cornwall, as They Were Exhibited by Them to the Right Reverend Father in God William Cotton Doctor of Divinitie, and Lord Bishop of Exceter. As Also an Appendix, or Compendious Briefe of All Other Exceptions Taken by Others against the Bookes of Communion, Homilies, and Ordination, Word for Word, as It Came to the Hands of an Honorable Personage. With an Answere to Both at Severall Times Returned Them in Publike Conference, and in Diverse Sermons Upon Occasion Preached in the Cathedrall Church of Exceter*. London, 1606.
- Ingmethorpe, Thomas. *A Sermon Upon Part of the Second Chapter of the First Epistle of S. John: Preached by Thomas Ingmethorp. The Summe Whereof Is Briefly Comprised in This Hexameter*. Oxford, 1598.
- Ireland, Thomas. *The Oath of Allegeance Defended by a Sermon Preached at a Synode in the Metropolitanall Church of Yorke*. London, 1610.
- Jackson, William. *The Celestiall Husbandrie: Or, the Tillage of the Soule First, Handled in a Sermon at Pauls Crosse the 25. Of February, 1616*. London, 1616.
- Jacob, Henry. *A Treatise of the Sufferings and Victory of Christ, in the Work of Our Redemption Declaring by the Scripturs These Two Questions: That Christ Suffered for Us the Wrath of God, Which We May Well Terme the Paynes of Hell, or Hellish Sorrowes. That Christ after His Death on the Crosse, Went Not into Hell in His Soule. Contrarie to Certaine Errours in These Points Publiklie Preached in London: Anno 1597*. Middelburg, 1598.
- James I, King of England. *The Workes of the Most High and Mightie Prince, James by the Grace of God, King of Great Britaine, France and Ireland, Defender of the Faith, &C. . London, 1616*.

- Johnson, Francis. *An Answer to Maister H. Jacob His Defence of the Churches and Ministry of England*. Amsterdam, 1600.
- Junius, Franciscus. *Certayne Letters, Translated into English, Being First Written in Latine. Two, by the Reverend and Learned Mr. Francis Junius, Divinitie Reader at Leyden in Holland. The Other, by the Exiled English Church, Abiding for the Present at Amsterdam in Holland. Together with the Confession of Faith Prefixed: Where Upon the Said Letters Were First Written*. Amsterdam, 1602.
- Kellison, Matthew. *A Survey of the New Religion Detecting Manie Grosse Absurdities Which It Imphieth*. Doway, Rheims, 1603.
- Keltridge, John. *Two Godlie and Learned Sermons Appointed, and Preached, before the Jesuites, Seminaries, and Other Adversaries to the Gospell of Christ in the Tower of London. In Which, Were Confuted to Their Faces, the Moste Principall and Cheefe Pointcs of Their Romish and Whoarish Religion: And All Such Articles as They Defend, Contrarie to the Woord of Cod [Sic], Were Layed Open and Ripped Up Unto Them. In Maye. 7 and 21. Anno. 1581*. London, 1581.
- Kimedoncius, Jacobus. *Of the Redemption of Mankind Three Bookes Wherein the Controversie of the Universalitie of Redemption and Grace by Christ, and of His Death for All Men, Is Largely Handled. Hereunto Is Annexed a Treatise of Gods Predestination in One Booke*. London, 1598.
- La Primaudaye, Pierre de. *The French Academie Fully Discoursed and Finished in Foure Bookes. 1. Institution of Manners and Callings of All Estates. 2. Concerning the Soule and Body of Man. 3. A Notable Description of the Whole World, &C. 4. Christian Philosophie, Instructing the True and Onely Meanes to Eternall Life. This Fourth Part Never before Published in English*. London, 1618.
- Langley, Henry. *The Chariot and Horsemen of Israel a Discourse of Prayer: Shewing What It Is, as Also the Meanes to Attaine to the Practise of It. An Exercise So Rare in the World, and yet So Requisite, as Few Use It Aright, and None May Omit It*. London, 1616.
- Leech, Humphrey, and Robert Parsons. *Dutifull and Respective Considerations Upon Foure Severall Heads of Prooffe and Triall in Matters of Religion Proposed by the High and Mighty Prince, James King of Great Britayne, France, and Ireland &C. In His Late Booke of Premonition to All Christian Princes, for Clearing His Royall Person from the Imputation of Heresy*. 1609.
- Loe, William. *The Joy of Jerusalem and Woe of the Worldlings. A Sermon Preached at Pauls Crosse the 18. Of June. 1609*. London, 1609.
- _____. *The Mysterie of Mankind, Made into a Manual, or the Protestants Portuize Reduced into Explication Application, Invocation, Tending to Illumination, Sanctification, Devotion, Being the Summe of Seven Sermons, Preached at S.*

Michaels in Cornehill, London. London, 1619.

Luther, Martin. *A Commentarie or Exposition Uppon the Twoo Epistles Generall of Sainct Peter, and That of Sainct Jude. First Faithfullie Gathered out of the Lectures and Preachings of That Worthie Instrumente in Goddes Churche, Doctour Martine Luther. And Now out of Latine, for the Singuler Benefite and Comfort of the Godlie, Familiarlie Translated into Englishe. London, 1581.*

Lyster, John. *A Rule How to Bring up Children a Treatise Wherein Is Declared, How the Father Apposeth His Sonne in the Holy Scripture, Whereby All Parents May Be Taught a Rule How to Bring up Their Children, Briefelie Collected into a Short Volume. London, 1588.*

Maihew, Edward. *A Treatise of the Groundes of the Old and Newe Religion Devided into Two Parts, Whereunto Is Added an Appendix, Containing a Briefe Confutation of William Crashaw His First Tome of Romish Forgeries and Falsifications. England, 1608.*

Marlorat, Augustin. *A Catholike and Ecclesiasticall Exposition of the Holy Gospell after S. Marke and Luke. Gathered out of All the Singular and Approued Devines, Which the Lorde Hath Geven to Hys Church. London, 1583.*

Marten, Anthony. *A Second Sound, or Warning of the Trumpet Unto Judgement Wherein Is Proved, That All the Tokens of the Latter Day, Are Not Onelie Come, but Welneere Finished. With an Earnest Exhortation, to Be in Continuall Readinesse. London, 1589.*

Martin, Gregory. *A Discoverie of the Manifolde Corruptions of the Holy Scriptures by the Heretikes of Our Daies Specially the English Sectaries, and of Their Foule Dealing Herein, by Partial & False Translations to the Advantage of Their Heresies, in Their English Bibles Used and Authorised since the Time of Schisme. Rhemes, 1582.*

Mason, Francis. *Of the Consecration of the Bishops in the Church of England with Their Succession, Jurisdiction, and Other Things Incident to Their Calling: As Also of the Ordination of Priests and Deacons. Five Bookes: Wherein They Are Cleared from the Slanders and Odious Imputations of Bellarmine, Sanders, Bristow, Harding, Allen, Stapleton, Parsons, Kellison, Eudemon, Becanus, and Other Romanists: And Justified to Containe Nothing Contrary to the Scriptures, Councils, Fathers, or Approved Examples of Primitive Antiquitie. London, 1613.*

Mavericke, Radford. *Saint Peters Chaine Consisting of Eight Golden Linckes, Most Fit to Adorne the Neckes of the Greatest States, Nobles, and Ladies in This Land, as the Chiefest Jewell of True Nobilitie: And Not Unfit for the Meaner Sort. Digested into Eight Chapters, and Published by R.M. Minister. With a Praier Annexed to the End of Everie Chapter. London, 1596.*

Maxwell, James. *The Golden Art, or the Right Way of Enriching Comprised in Ten Rules,*

Proved and Confirmed by Many Places of Holy Scripture, and Illustrated by Divers Notable Examples of the Same. Very Profitable for All Such Persons in Citie or Countrie, as Doe Desire to Get, Increase, Conserve, and Use Goods with a Good Conscience. London, 1611.

_____. *A New Eight-Fold Probation of the Church of Englands Divine Constitution Prooved by Many Pregnant Arguments, to Be Much More Complete Then Any Genevian in the World against the Contrary Assertion of the Fifty Three Petitioner-Preachers of Scotland in Their Petition Presented in the Later Parliament to the Kings Most Excellent Majesty. With a Ten-Folde Probation of the Same Churches Doctrine Touching One of the Most Important Points of Our Creede, Which Is of Our Saviours Descending into Hell.* London, 1617.

Merbecke, John. *A Booke of Notes and Common Places, with Their Expositions, Collected and Gathered out of the Workes of Divers Singular Writers, and Brought Alphabetically into Order. A Worke Both Profitable and Also Necessarie, to Those That Desire the True Understanding & Meaning of Holy Scripture.* London, 1581.

Meriton, George. *A Sermon of Nobilitie Preached at White-Hall, before the King in February 1606.* London, 1607.

Middleton, Richard. *The Carde and Compasse of Life Containing Many Passages, Fit for These Times. And Directing All Men in a True, Christian, Godly and Civill Course, to Arrive at the Blessed and Glorious Harbour of Heaven.* London, 1613.

Mornay, Philippe de seigneur du Plessis-Marly. *A Woorke Concerning the Trewnesse of the Christian Religion, Written in French: Against Atheists, Epicures, Paynims, Jewes, Mahumetists, and Other Infidels.* London, 1587.

_____. *Fowre Bookes, of the Institution, Use and Doctrine of the Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist in the Old Church as Likewise, How, When, and by What Degrees the Masse Is Brought in, in Place Thereof.* London, 1600.

_____. *The Mysterie of Iniquitie: That Is to Say, the Historie of the Papacie Declaring by What Degrees It Is Now Mounted to This Height, and What Oppositions the Better Sort from Time to Time Have Made against It. Where Is Also Defended the Right of Emperours, Kings, and Christian Princes, against the Assertions of the Cardinals, Bellarmine and Baronius.* London, 1612.

Naerne, William. *The Pearle of Prayer Most Pretious and Powerfull, or, a Christian Treatise Most Necessarie for All These That Desire to Shew That Wrath to Come.* Edinburgh, 1620.

Nichols, Josias. *An Order of Houshold Instruction by Which Every Master of a Familie, May Easily and in Short Space, Make His Whole Houshold to Understand the Principall and Chiefe Points of Christian Religion, without the Knowledge Whereof, No Man Can Be Saved.* London, 1595.

- _____. *Abrahams Faith: That Is, the Olde Religion Wherein Is Taught, That the Religion Now Publikely Taught and Defended by Order in the Church of England, Is the Onely True Catholicke, Auncient, and Unchangeable Faith of Gods Elect. And the Pretensed Religion of the Sea of Rome Is a False, Bastard, New, Upstart, Hereticall and Variable Superstitious Devise of Man.* London, 1602.
- Nid, Gervase. *Certaine Sermons Upon Divers Texts of Scripture.* London, 1616.
- Nixon, Anthony. *The Blacke Yeare Seria Iocis.* London, 1606.
- Ochino, Bernardino. *Certaine Godly and Very Profitable Sermons of Faith, Hope and Charitie. First Set Foorth by Master Barnardine Occhine, of Siena in Italy, and Now Lately Collected, and Translated out of the Italian Tongue, into the English by William Phiston of London Student. Published for the Profit of Such as Desire to Understand the Truth of the Gospell.* London, 1580.
- Olevian, Caspar. *An Exposition of the Symbole of the Apostles, or Rather of the Articles of Faith in Which the Chiefe Points of the Everlasting and Free Covenant Betweene God and the Faithfull Is Briefly and Plainly Handled. Gathered out of the Catechising Sermons of Gasper Oleuvian Treuir, and Now Translated out of the Latine Tongue into the English for the Benefite of Christ His Church. By John Fielde.* London, 1581.
- Paget, John. *An Arrow against the Separation of the Brownists Also an Admonition Touching Talmudique & Rabbinical Allegations.* Amsterdam, 1618.
- Parr, Elnathan. *The Grounds of Divinitie Plainely Discovering the Mysteries of Christian Religion, Propounded Familiarly in Divers Questions and Answeres: Substantially Proved by Scriptures; Expounded Faithfully, According to the Writings of the Best Divines, and Evidently Applied by Profitable Uses, for the Helpe and Benefite of the Unlearned Which Desire Knowledge. To the Which Is Prefixed a Very Profitable Treatise, Containing an Exhortation to the Study of the Word, with Singular Directions for the Hearing and Reading of the Same.* London, 1614.
- Parsons, Robert. *A Treatise Tending to Mitigation Towardes Catholike-Subjectes in England Wherin Is Declared, That It Is Not Impossible for Subjects of Different Religion, (Especially Catholikes and Protestant) to Live Togeather in Dutifull Obedience and Subjection, under the Government of His Maiesty of Great Britany. Against the Seditions Wrytings of Thomas Morton Minister, & Some Others to the Contrary. Whose Two False and Slaunderous Groundes, Pretended to Be Drawne from Catholike Doctrine & Practice, Concerning Rebellion and Equivocation, Are Overthrowne, and Cast Upon Himselfe. Dedicated to the Learned Schoole-Devines, Cyvill and Canon Lawyers of the Two Uniuersities of England.* 1607.
- Paterson, F. William. *The Protestants Theologie Containing the True Solutions, and Groundes of Religion, This Daye Mainteyned, and Intreated, Betwixt the Protestants,*

and Catholicks. Mechlin, 1620.

Penry, John. *A Briefe Discovery of the Untruthes and Slanders (against the True Governement of the Church of Christ) Contained in a Sermon, Preached the 8. [Sic] of Februarie 1588. By D. Bancroft and since That Time, Set Forth in Print, with Additions by the Said Authour. This Short Answer May Serve for the Clearing of the Truth, Untill a Larger Confutation of the Sermon Be Published.* Edinburgh, 1590.

Perkins, William. *A Golden Chaine, or the Description of Theologie Containing the Order of the Causes of Salvation and Damnation, According to Gods Woord. A View of the Order Wherof, Is to Be Seene in the Table Annexed. Written in Latine by William Perkins, and Translated by an Other. Hereunto Is Adjoynd the Order Which M. Theodore Beza Used in Comforting Troubled Consciences.* London, 1591.

_____. *A Case of Conscience the Greatest Taht [Sic] Ever Was, How a Man May Know, Whether He Be the Son of God or No. Resolved by the Word of God. Whereunto Is Added a Briefe Discourse, Taken out of Hier. Zanchius.* Edinburgh, 1592.

_____. *An Exposition of the Symbole or Creed of the Apostles, According to the Tenour of the Scriptures, and the Consent of Orthodoxe Fathers of the Church.* Cambridge, 1595.

_____. *A Godlie and Learned Exposition Upon the Whole Epistle of Jude, Containing Threescore and Six Sermons Preached in Cambridge by That Reverend and Faithfull Man of God, Master William Perkins, and Now at the Request of His Executors, Published by Thomas Taylor, Preacher of Gods Word; Whereunto Is Prefixed a Large Analysis, Containing the Summe and Order of the Whole Booke, According to the Authors Owne Method, to Which Are Further Added, Foure Briefe Tables to Direct the Reader.* London, 1606.

Perkins, William, and William Crashaw. *Of the Calling of the Ministerie Two Treatises, Discribing the Duties and Dignities of That Calling. Delivered Publickly in the Universitie of Cambridge, by Maister Perkins. Taken Then from His Mouth, and Now Dilligently Perused and Published, by a Preacher of the Word with a Preface Prefixed Touching the Publishing of Maister Perkins His Workes, & a Catalogue of All Such Particulars Thereof, as Are to Bee Expected.* London, 1605.

_____. *M. Perkins, His Exhortation to Repentance, out of Zephaniah Preached in 2. Sermons in Sturbridge Faire. Together with Two Treatises of the Duties and Dignitie of the Ministrie: Delivered Publicquely in the Universitie of Cambridge. With a Preface Praefixed Touching the Publishing of All Such Workes of His as Are to Be Expected: With a Catalogue of All the Perticulers [Sic] of Them, Diligently Perused and Published, by a Preacher of the Word.* London, 1605.

Perkins, William, and Ralph Cudworth. *A Commentarie or Exposition, Upon the Five First Chapters of the Epistle to the Galatians: Penned by the Godly, Learned, and Judiciall Divine, Mr. W. Perkins. Now Published for the Benefit of the Church, and*

Continued with a Supplement Upon the Sixt Chapter. Cambridge, 1604.

- Perkins, William, and Robert Hill. *Lectures Upon the Three First Chapters of the Revelation: Preached in Cambridge Anno Dom. 1595. By Master William Perkins, and Now Published for the Benefite of This Church, by Robert Hill Bachelor in Divinitie. To Which Is Added an Excellent Sermon, Penned at the Request of That Noble and Wise Councillor, Ambrose, Earle of Warwicke: In Which Is Proved That Rome Is Babylon, and That Babylon Is Fallen.* London, 1604.
- Perkins, William, and Thomas Tuke. *The Arte of Prophecying, or, a Treatise Concerning the Sacred and Onely True Manner and Methode of Preaching.* London, 1607.
- Pestell, Thomas. *The Good Conscience. Or, the Soules Banquet Royall.* London, 1615.
- Philips, Edward, and Henry Sir Yelverton. *Certain Godly and Learned Sermons, Preached by That Worthy Servant of Christ M. Ed. Philips in S. Saviors in Southwarke: Upon the Whole Foure First Chapters of Matthew, Luc. 11. Vers. 24. 25. 26. Rom. 8. The Whole, 1. Thess. 5. 19. Tit. 2. 11. 12. James 2. From the 20. To the 26. And 1. Joh. 3. 9. 10.* London, 1607.
- Pie, Thomas. *An Houreglasse Contayning I a Computation from the Beginning of Time to Christ by X. Articles. Ii a Confirmation of the Same for the Times Controversed before Christ: As Also That There Wanteth a Yeare after Christ, in the Usuall Computation. With Other Matters, Offered to the Judgement of the Learned, and Use of the Studious in Chronologie and Historie.* London, 1597.
- Polanus von Polansdorf, Amandus. *The Substance of Christian Religion Soundly Set Forth in Two Bookes, by Definitions and Partitions, Framed According to the Rules of a Naturall Method, by Amandus Polanus Professor of Divinitie. The First Booke Concerneth Faith. The Second Concerneth Good Workes. The Principall Pointes Whereof Are Contained in a Short Table Hereunto Annexed.* London, 1595.
- Price, Daniel. *Recusants Conversion a Sermon Preached at St. James, before the Prince on the 25. Of Februarie. 1608.* Oxford, 1608.
- _____. *Sauls Prohibition Staide. Or the Apprehension, and Examination of Saule and the Inditement of All That Persecute Christ, with a Reproofe of Those That Traduce the Honourable Plantation of Virginia. Preached in a Sermon Commaunded at Pauls Crosse, Upon Rogation Sunday, Being the 28. Of May. 1609.* London, 1609.
- Prime, John. *A Fruitefull and Briefe Discourse in Two Bookes: The One of Nature, the Other of Grace with Convenient Aunswer to the Enemies of Grace, Upon Incident Occasions Offered by the Late Rhemish Notes in Their New Translation of the New Testament, & Others.* London, 1583.
- _____. *An Exposition, and Observations Upon Saint Paul to the Galathians Together with Incident Quaestions Debated, and Motives Removed.* Oxford, 1587.

- Rainolds, John. *The Summe of the Conference Betwene John Rainoldes and John Hart Touching the Head and the Faith of the Church. Wherein by the Way Are Handled Sundrie Points, of the Sufficiencie and Right Expounding of the Scriptures, the Ministerie of the Church, the Function of Priesthood, the Sacrifice of the Masse, with Other Controversies of Religion: But Chiefly and Purposely the Point of Church-Government ... Penned by John Rainoldes, According to the Notes Set Downe in Writing by Them Both: Perused by John Hart, and (after Things Supplied, & Altered, as He Thought Good) Allowed for the Faithfull Report of That Which Past in Conference Betwene Them. Whereunto Is Annexed a Treatise Intituled, Six Conclusions Touching the Holie Scripture and the Church, Written by John Rainoldes. With a Defence of Such Things as Thomas Stapleton and Gregorie Martin Have Carped at Therein.* London, 1584.
- Rainolds, William. *A Refutation of Sundry Reprehensions, Cavils, and False Sleights, by Which M. Whitaker Laboureth to Deface the Late English Translation, and Catholike Annotations of the New Testament, and the Booke of Discovery of Heretical Corruptions.* Paris, 1583.
- Rawlinson, John. *Fishermen Fishers of Men a Sermon Preached at Mercers Chapell on Mid-Lent Sunday the 26. Of March 1609.* London, 1609.
- Rennecher, Hermann. *The Golden Chayne of Salvation.* London, 1604.
- Rhegius, Urbanus. *The Solace of Sion, and Joy of Jerusalem. Or Consolation of Gods Church in the Latter Age Redeemed by the Preaching of the Gospell Universallye. Beeing a Godly and Learned Exposition of the Lxxxvij. Psalme of the Princelye Prophet David.* London, 1587.
- Rider, John. *A Friendly Caveat to Irelands Catholickes, Concerning the Daungerous Dreame of Christs Corporall (yet Invisible) Presence in the Sacrament of the Lords Supper Grounded Upon a Letter Pretended to Be Sent by Some Well Minded Catholickes: Who Doubted, and Therefore Desired Satisfaction in Certaine Points of Religion, with the Aunswere and Proofes of the Romane Catholicke Priests, to Satisfie and Confirme Them in the Same. Perused and Allowed for Apostolicall and Catholicke, by the Subscription of Maister Henry Fitzsimon Jesuit, Now Prisoner in the Castle of Dublin. With a True, Diligent, and Charitable Examination of the Same Prooffes: Wherein the Catholickes May See This New Romane Doctrine to Bee Neither Apostolicall nor Catholicke, but Cleane Contarie to the Old Romane Religion, and Therefore to Bee Shunned of All True Auncient Romane Catholickes, Unlesse They Will Be New Romish Heretickes.* Dublin, 1602.
- Roberts, Alexander. *A Sacred Septenarie, or the Seven Last Wordes of Our Saviour Christ Uttered Upon the Crosse, (with the Necessary Circumstances of the Same:) Expounded by a Commentary, Gathered out of the Holy Scriptures, the Writings of the Ancient Fathers, and Later Divines.* London, 1614.

- Robertson, Bartholomew. *A Blow for the Pope, or, a Discourse Had in S. Giles Church, in Elgen of Murray at a Conference with Certaine Papists, Plainely Proving That Peter Was Never Head of the Church : With a Short Register of All the Attempts and Murthers Upon Kings and Princes in Our Time by the Persuasion of the Jesuits.* London, 1615.
- Rogers, Thomas. *An Historical Dialogue Touching Antichrist and Poperie, Drawen and Published for the Common Benefit and Comfort of Our Church in These Dangerous Daies, & against the Desperate Attemptes of the Vowed Adversaries of Jesus Christ, His Gospell, and This Flourishing State.* London, 1589.
- Rollock, Robert. *Lectures, Upon the History of the Passion, Resurrection, and Ascension of Our Lord Jesus Christ Beginning at the Eighteenth Chapter of the Gospell, According to S. John, and from the 16. Verse of the 19. Chapter Thereof, Containing a Perfect Harmonie of All the Foure Evangelists, for the Better Understanding of All the Circumstances of the Lords Death, and Resurrection.* Edinburgh, 1616.
- Rudd, Anthony. *A Sermon Preached before the Kings Majestie at White-Hall Upon the Ninth of Februarie. 1605.* London, 1606.
- S, I. *Bromelion a Discourse of the Most Substantial Points of Divinitie, Handled by Divers Common Places: With Great Studie, Sinceritie, and Perspicuitie.* London, 1595.
- Salnar. *An Harmony of the Confessions of the Faith of the Christian and Reformed Churches Which Purlelie Professe the Holy Doctrine of the Gospell in All the Chiefe Kingdomes, Nations, and Provinces of Europe: The Catalogue and Order Whereof the Pages Following Will Declare. There Are Added in the Ende Verie Shorte Notes: In Which Both the Obscure Things Are Made Plaine, & Those Things Which Maie in Shew Seeme to Be Contrarie Each to Other, Are Plainelie and Verie Modestlie Reconciled, and If Anie Points Doe as yet Hang in Doubt, They Are Sincerelie Pointed At. All Which Things, in the Name of the Churches of Fraunce and Belgia, Are Submitted to the Free and Discrete Iudgement of All Other Churches. Newlie Translated out of Latine into English. Also in the End Is Added the Confession of the Church of Scotland. Alowed by Publique Authoritie.* Cambridge, 1586.
- Sandys, Edwin. *Sermons Made by the Most Reverende Father in God, Edwin, Archbishop of Yorke, Primate of England and Metropolitane.* London, 1585.
- Shelford, Robert. *Lectures or Readings Upon the 6. Verse of the 22. Chapter of the Proverbs Concerning the Vertuous Education of Youth: A Treatise Very Necessary for All Parents in This Corrupt and Declining Age of the World.* London, 1602.
- Simson, Patrick. *A Short Compend of the Historie of the First Ten Persecutions Moved against Christians Divided into Iii. Centuries. Whereunto Are Added in the End of Every Centurie Treatises Arising Upon Occasion Offered in the Historie, Clearly Declaring the Noveltie of Popish Religion, and That It Neither Flowed from the Mouthes of Christs Holy Apostles, Neither Was It Confirmed by the Blood of the*

- Holy Martyrs Who Died in These Ten Persecutions*. Edinburgh, 1613.
- Smith, Henry. *Gods Arrowe against Atheists*. London, 1593.
- _____. *Foure Sermons Preached by Master Henry Smith. And Published by a More Perfect Copie Then Heretofore*. London, 1599.
- Sohn, Georg. *A Briefe and Learned Treatise, Containing a True Description of the Antichrist, Who Was Foretold by the Prophets and Apostles and an Evident Proofoe That the Same Agreeeth Unto the Pope*. Cambridge, 1592.
- Spenser, John. *A Learned and Gracious Sermon Preached at Paules Crosse*. London, 1615.
- Sprint, John. *The Summe of the Christian Religion Contayning the Chiefe Points of the Perswasion and Practise of a Christian, Which Are Needfull to His Salvation. Drawne Orderly in a Cleare Methode, and Proposed in Forme of Question and Answer*. London, 1613.
- Sutcliffe, Matthew. *The Subversion of Robert Parsons His Confused and Worthlesse Worke, Entituled, a Treatise of Three Conversions of England from Paganisme to Christian Religion*. London, 1606.
- Taylor, Thomas. *The Kings Bath Affording Many Sweet and Comfortable Observations from the Baptisme of Christ. Gathered by Thomas Taylor, Preacher of the Word of God at Redding in Barkshire*. London, 1620.
- Thompson, Thomas. *Antichrist Arraigned in a Sermon at Pauls Crosse, the Third Sunday after Epiphanie. With the Tryall of Guides, on the Fourth Sunday after Trinitie*. London, 1618.
- Throckmorton, Job. M. *Some Laid Open in His Coulers Wherein the Indifferent Reader May Easily See, Howe Wretchedly and Loosely He Hath Handeled the Cause against M. Penri*. La Rochelle, 1589.
- Topsell, Edward. *Times Lamentation: Or an Exposition on the Prophet Joel, in Sundry Sermons or Meditations*. London, 1599.
- Tuke, Thomas. *The Treasure of True Love or a Lively Description of the Love of Christ Unto His Spouse, Whom in Love He Hath Clensed in His Blood from Sinne, and Made a Royall Priesthood Unto His Father*. London, 1608.
- _____. *The High-Way to Heaven: Or, the Doctrine of Election, Effectuall Vocation, Justification, Santification and Eternall Life Grounded Upon the Holy Scriptures, Confirmed by the Testimonies of Sundry Judicious and Great Divines, Ancient and Moderne*. London, 1609.
- _____. *A Theological Discourse of the Gracious and Blessed Conjunction of Christ and*

a Sincere Christian. By Tho: Tuke Preacher of Gods Word. The Blessed Virgin Mary Brought Foorth Christ, and the Catholique Church Brings Foorth All True Christians. London, 1617.

Udall, John. *Amendment of Life Three Sermons, Upon Actes 2. Verses 37. 38. Containing the True Effect of the Worde of God, in the Conversion of the Godly: And the Maner How It Changeth Their Harts, and Reformeth Their Lives, Which Is the True Worke of Regeneration.* London, 1584.

Ursinus, Zacharias. *The Summe of Christian Religion: Delivered by Zacharias Ursinus in His Lectures Upon the Catechism Autorised by the Noble Prince Frederick, Throughout His Dominions: Wherein Are Debated and Resolved the Questions of Whatsoever Points of Moment, Which Have Beene or Are Controversed in Divinitie. Translated into English by Henrie Parrie, out of the Last & Best Latin Editions, Together with Some Supplie of Wa[N]Ts out of His Discourses of Divinitie, and with Correction of Sundrie Faults & Imperfections, Which Ar [Sic] as yet Remaining in the Best Corrected Latine.* Oxford, 1587.

. A Collection of Certaine Learned Discourses, Written by That Famous Man of Memory Zachary Ursine; Doctor and Professor of Divinitie in the Noble and Flourishing Schools of Neustad. For Explication of Divers Difficult Points, Laide Downe by That Author in His Catechisme. Lately Put in Print in Latin by the Last Labour of D. David Parry: And Now Newlie Translated into English, by I.H. For the Benefit and Behoofe of Our Christian Country-Man. Oxford, 1600.

Valera, Cipriano de. *Two Treatises the First, of the Lives of the Popes, and Their Doctrine. The Second, of the Masse: The One and the Other Collected of That, Which the Doctors, and Ancient Councels, and the Sacred Scripture Do Teach. Also, a Swarme of False Miracles, Wherewith Marie De La Visitacion, Prioress De La Annuntiada of Lisbon, Deceived Very Many: And How She Was Discovered, and Condemned.* London, 1600.

Walkington, Thomas. *Salomons Sweete Harpe Consisting of Five Words, Like So Many Golden Strings, Toucht with the Cunning Hand of His True Skill, Commanding All Other Humane Speech: Wherein Both Cleargie and Laitie May Learne How to Speake.* Cambridge, 1608.

Wiburn, Perceval. *A Checke or Reproofe of M. Howlets Untimely Shreeching in Her Maiesties Eares with an Answere to the Reasons Alleadged in a Discourse Therunto Annexed, Why Catholikes (as They Are Called) Refuse to Goe to Church: Wherein (among Other Things) the Papists Traiterous and Treacherous Doctrine and Demeanour Towardses Our Sovereigne and the State, Is Somewhat at Large Upon Occasion Unfolded: Their Divilish Pretended Conscience Also Examined, and the Foundation Thereof Undermined. And Lastly Shewed Thatit [Sic] Is the Duety of All True Christians and Subjectes to Haunt Publike Church Assemblies.* London, 1581.

Willet, Andrew. *Synopsis Papismi, That Is, a Generall Viewe of Papistry Wherein the Whole*

Mysterie of Iniquitie, and Summe of Antichristian Doctrine Is Set Downe, Which Is Maintained This Day by the Synagogue of Rome, against the Church of Christ, Together with an Antithesis of the True Christian Faith, and an Antidotum or Counterpoyson out of the Scriptures, against the Whore of Babylons Filthy Cuppe of Abominations: Deuided into Three Bookes or Centuries, That Is, So Many Hundreds of Popish Heresies and Errors. Collected by Andrew Willet Bachelor of Divinity. London, 1592.

. An Antilogie or Counterplea to an Apologicall (He Should Have Said) Apologeticall Epistle Published by a Favorite of the Romane Separation, and (as Is Supposed) One of the Ignatian Faction Wherein Two Hundred Untruths and Slaunders Are Discovered, and Many Politicke Objections of the Romaines Answered. London, 1603.

. Hexapla in Danielelem: That Is, a Six-Fold Commentarie Upon the Most Divine Prophetie of Daniel Wherein According to the Method Propounded in Hexapla Upon Genesis and Exodus, Sixe Things Are Observed in Every Chapter. 1. The Argument and Method. 2. The Divers Readings. 3. The Questions Discussed. 4. Doctrines Noted. 5. Controversies Handled. 6. Morall Observations Applied. Wherein Many Obscure Visions, and Divine Propheties Are Opened, and Difficult Questions Handled with Great Brevitie, Perspicuities, and Varietie ... And the Best Interpreters Both Old and New Are Therein Abridged. Divided into Two Bookes. Cambridge, 1610.

. Hexapla, That Is, a Six-Fold Commentarie Upon the Most Divine Epistle of the Holy Apostle S. Paul to the Romanes Wherein According to the Authors Former Method, Sixe Things Are Observed in Every Chapter ... : Wherein Are Handled the Greatest Points of Christian Religion ... : Divided into Two Bookes. Cambridge, 1611.

Wilson, Thomas. *A Commentarie Upon the Most Divine Epistle of S. Paul to the Romanes Containing for Matter, the Degeneration of Our Nature by Adams Fall; and the Restauration Thereof, by the Grace of Christ. Together with the Perfection of Faith, and the Imbecillity of Workes, in the Cause of Justification of Elect Sinners before God. For Forme and Maner of Handling, It Hath the Coherence and Method, the Summe and Scope, the Interpretations & Doctrines the Reasons and Uses, of Most Texts. All Which, Are Set Downe Very Familiarly and Compendiously, in Forme of a Dialogue, Betweene Tlmotheus [Sic] and Silas, by Thomas Wilson, One of the Six Preachers in the Cathedrall Church of Canterbury. London, 1614.*

Wotton, Anthony. *A Defence of M. Perkins Booke, Called a Reformed Catholike against the Cavils of a Popish Writer, One D.B.P. Or W.B. In His Deformed Reformation. London, 1606.*

Wycliffe, John. *Two Short Treatises, against the Orders of the Begging Friars, Compiled by That Famous Doctour of the Church, and Preacher of Gods Word John Wickliffe, Sometime Fellow of Merton, and Master of Ballioll Coll. In Oxford, and Afterwards*

Parson of Lutterworth in Lecestershire. Faithfully Printed According to Two Ancient Manuscript Copies, Extant, the One in Benet Colledge in Cambridge, the Other Remaining in the Publike Librarie at Oxford. Oxford, 1608.

Yarrow, Robert. *Soveraigne Comforts for a Troubled Conscience Wherein the Subtilties of Satan Are Discovered, His Reasons and Objections Fully Answered. And Further, the Truth Laid Open and Manifested, to the Great Consolation and Strengthening of Such as Are Distressed and Afflicted in Minde. London, 1619.*

Zanchi, Girolamo. *Speculum Christianum or, a Christian Survey for the Conscience Containing, Three Tractates of That Eminent, Grave, and Learned Divine, Maister Hierome Zanchius. 1. Of the End of the World. 2. Of the Perseverance of the Saints. 3. A Summarie Abridgement of His Protections. Englished for the Good of Gods Church, and for a Warning to Wicked and Impenitent Men. London, 1614.*

Bibliography

Primary Sources (All sources taken from EEBO unless otherwise noted)

Ainsworth, Henry. *A true confession of the faith, and humble acknowledgement of the alegeance, which wee hir Majesties subjects, falsely called Brownists, doo hould towards God, and yeild to hir Majestie and all other that are over us in the Lord Set down in articles or positions, for the better & more easie understanding of those that shall read it: and published for the cleering of our selves from those unchristian slanders of heresie, schisme, pryde, obstinacie, disloyaltie, sedicion, &c. which by our adversaries are in all places given out against us.* Amsterdam, 1596.

_____. *An apologie or defence of such true Christians as are commonly (but unjustly) called Brownists against such imputations as are layd upon them by the heads and doctors of the University of Oxford, in their Answer to the humble petition of the ministers of the Church of England, desiring reformation of certayne ceremonies and abuses of the Church.* Amsterdam, 1604.

_____. *The communion of saints A treatise of the fellowship that the faithful have with God, and his angels, and one with an other; in this present life. Gathered out of the holy Scriptures.* Amsterdam, 1607.

_____. *The confession of faith of certayn English people living in exile, in the Low countreyes. Together with a brief note of the speciall heads of those things wherin we differ fro[m] the Church of Engla[n]d.* Amsterdam, 1607.

_____. *Counterpoyson Considerations touching the points in difference between the godly ministers & people of the Church of England, and the seduced brethren of the separation. Arguments that the best assemblies of the present Church of England are true visible Churches. That the preachers in the best assemblies of Engl. are true ministers of Christ. Mr Bernards book intituled The Separatists schisme. Mr Crashawes questions propounded in his Sermon preached at the crosse. Examined and answered.* Amsterdam, 1608.

_____. *An epistle sent unto two daughters of Warwick from H.N., the oldest father of the Familie of Love; with a refutation of the errors that are therein.* Amsterdam, 1608.

_____. *A defence of the Holy Scriptures, worship, and ministerie, used in the Christian Churches separated from Antichrist Against the challenges, cavils and contradiction of M. Smyth: in his book intituled The differences of the Churches of the Separation. Hereunto are annexed a few observations upon some of M. Smythes censures; in his answer made to M. Bernard.* Amsterdam, 1609.

_____. *An arrow against idolatrie Taken out of the quiver of the Lord of hosts.* Amsterdam, 1611.

_____. *An animadversion to Mr Richard Clyftons advertisement Who under pretense of answering Chr. Lawnes book, hath published an other mans private letter, with Mr Francis Johnsons answer therto. Which letter is here justified; the answer therto refuted: and the true causes of the lamentable breach that hath lately fallen out in the English exiled Church at Amsterdam, manifested.* Amsterdam, 1613.

_____. *A reply to a pretended Christian plea for the anti-Chistian [sic] Church of Rome: Wherin the weakness of the sayd plea is manifested, and arguments alleaged for the Church of Rome, and baptisme therein, are refuted.* Amsterdam, 1620.

_____. *A censure upon the dialogue of the Anabaptists intituled, A description of what God hath predestinated concerning man.* Amsterdam, 1623.

_____. *Certain notes of M. Henry Aynsworth his last sermon. Taken by pen in the publike delivery by one of his flock, a little before his death. Anno 1622. Published now at last by the said writer, as a love token of remembrance to his brethren to inkindle their affections to prayer, that scandalls (of manie years continuance) may be removed, that are barrs to keep back manie godly wise and judicious from us, wherby we might grow to farther perfection again.* Amsterdam, 1630.

_____. *The orthodox foundation of religion long since collected by that iudicious and elegant man, Mr. Henry Ainsworth, for the benefit of his private company, and now divulged for the publike good of all that desire to know that Cornerstone, Christ Jesus crucified.* London, 1641.

Ainsworth, John. *The trying out of the truth begunn and prosecuted in certayn letters and passages between Iohn Aynsworth and Henry Aynsworth; the one pleading for, the other against the present religion of the Church of Rome. The chief things to be handled, are. 1. Of Gods word and Scriptures, whither they be a sufficient rule of our faith. 2. Of the Scriptures expounded by the Church; and of unwritten traditions. 3. Of the Church of Rome, whither it be the true Catholike Church, and her sentence to be received, as the certayn truth.* Amsterdam, 1615.

Alison, Richard. *A plaine confutation of a treatise of Brownisme, published by some of that faction, entituled: A description of the visible Church In the confutation wherof, is shewed, that the author hath neither described a true goverment of the Church, nor yet proved, that outward discipline is the life of the Church. Whereunto is annexed an answeare unto two other pamphlets, by the said factioners latelie dispersed, of certaine conferences had with some of*

them in prison. Wherein is made knowen the inconstancie of this sect, what the articles are which they still maintaine: as also a short confutation of them. There is also added a short answeare unto such argumentes as they have used to prove the Church of England not to be the Church of God. London, 1590.

Anon. *Ane shorte and generall confession of the trewe Christiane fayth and religion, according to Godis Word and actis of our Parliamentis subscribed be the Kingis Majestie and his housholde, with sindrie utheries, to the glorye of God and good exemple of all men, at Edinburgh the twentie eyght day of Januarie, the yere of God, ane thousand, fyve hundreth, fourescore yeirs, and the fourtene yeir of His Majesteis regne.* Edinburgh, 1581.

Baker, John. *Lectures of J.B. upon the xii. Articles of our Christian faith briefly set forth for the comfort of the godly, and the better instruction of the simple and ignorant. Also hereunto is annexed a briefe and cleare confession of the Christian faith, conteining an hundreth articles, according to the order of the Creede of the Apostles.* London, 1581.

Balnaves, Henry. *The confession of faith contending how the troubled man should seeke refuge at his God, thereto led by faith: with the declaratio[n] of the article of Justification at length. ... Compiled by M. Henry Balnaves of Halhill, & one of the Lords of session, and Counsell of Scotland, being as prisoner within the old pallaice of Roane: in the yere of our Lord. 1548. Direct to his faithfull brethren, being in like trouble or more.* Edinburgh, 1584.

Barlow, William. *The summe and substance of the conference which, it pleased his excellent Majestie to have with the lords, bishops, and other of his clergie, (at which the most of the lordes of the councill were present) in his Majesties privy-chamber, at Hampton Court. January 14. 1603. Whereunto are added, some copies, (scattered abroad,) unsauory, and untrue.* London, 1604.

Barrow, Henry. 'Barrow's Fifth Examination, March 24, 1588/9 (Barrow's Version).' In *The writings of Henry Barrow, 1587-1590*, edited by Leland H. Carlson, vol 3, 193-202. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1962.

_____. 'Barrow's First Examination, November 19, 1587.' In *The Writings of Henry Barrow, 1587-1590*, edited by Leland H. Carlson, vol 3, 89-100. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1962.

_____. 'Barrow's Fourth Examination, March 18, 1588/9.' In *The Writings of Henry Barrow, 1587-1590*, edited by Leland H. Carlson, vol 3, 178-189. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1962.

- _____. 'Barrow's Second Examination, November 27, 1587.' In *The Writings of Henry Barrow, 1587-1590*, edited by Leland H. Carlson, vol 3, 102-105. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1962.
- _____. 'Barrow's Third Examination, January 1, 1588/9.' In *The Writings of Henry Barrow, 1587-1590*, edited by Leland H. Carlson, vol 3, 171-172. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1962.
- _____. 'A Breefe Sum of Our Profession.' In *The Writings of Henry Barrow, 1587-1590*, edited by Leland H. Carlson, vol 3, 84-85. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1962.
- _____. 'A Brief Discoverie of the False Church.' In *The writings of Henry Barrow, 1587-1590*, edited by Leland H. Carlson, vol 3, 263-673. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1962.
- _____. 'A Brief Summe of the Causes of Our Separation, and of Our Purposes in Practise.' In *The Writings of Henry Barrow, 1587-1590*, edited by Leland H. Carlson, vol 3, 119-150. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1962.
- _____. 'The First Part of the Platforme.' In *The writings of Henry Barrow, 1587-1590*, edited by Leland H. Carlson, vol 3, 227-249. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1962.
- _____. 'Four Causes of Separation.' In *The Writings of Henry Barrow, 1587-1590*, edited by Leland H. Carlson, vol 3, 54-66. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1962.
- _____. 'Letter to Mr. Fisher.' In *The writings of Henry Barrow, 1587-1590*, edited by Leland H. Carlson, vol 3, 252-257. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1962.
- _____. 'A Pastoral Letter from Prison.' In *The Writings of Henry Barrow, 1587-1590*, edited by Leland H. Carlson, vol 3, 108-117. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1962.
- _____. 'Profes of Apparant Churche.' In *The Writings of Henry Barrow, 1587-1590*, edited by Leland H. Carlson, vol 3, 71-80. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1962.
- _____. 'Reply to Dr. Some's A Godly Treatise.' In *The Writings of Henry Barrow, 1587-1590*, edited by Leland H. Carlson, vol 3, 154-169. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1962.
- _____. 'A True Description out of the Worde of God, of the Visible Church.' In *The writings of Henry Barrow, 1587-1590*, edited by Leland H. Carlson, vol 3, 214-223. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1962.

- _____. 'A Plaine Refutation of Mr. George Giffarde's Reprochful Booke, Intituled, A Short Treatise against the Donatists of England.' In *The writings of Henry Barrow, 1590-1591*, edited by Leland H. Carlson, vol 5, 28-331. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1966.
- _____. 'A Refutation of Mr. Giffard's Reasons concerning Our Purposes in the Practise of the Truth of the Gospel of Christ.' In *The writings of Henry Barrow, 1590-1591*, edited by Leland H. Carlson, vol 5, 332-364. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1966.
- _____. 'Barrow's Final Answer to Gifford - Marginalia.' In *The writings of John Greenwood and Henry Barrow, 1591-1593*, edited by Leland H. Carlson, vol 6, 127-218. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1970.
- _____. 'Barrow's Letter to [Attorney-General Thomas Egerton, March 26, 1593].' In *The writings of John Greenwood and Henry Barrow, 1591-1593*, edited by Leland H. Carlson, vol 6, 230-1. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1970.
- _____. 'Barrow's Letter to [Attorney-General Thomas Egerton, March 27, 1593].' In *The writings of John Greenwood and Henry Barrow, 1591-1593*, edited by Leland H. Carlson, vol 6, 232-3. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1970.
- _____. 'Barrow's Seventh Examination, March 20, 1592/1593.' In *The writings of John Greenwood and Henry Barrow, 1591-1593*, edited by Leland H. Carlson, vol 6, 227-9. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1970.
- _____. 'Barrow's Sixth Examination, March 11, 1592/1593.' In *The writings of John Greenwood and Henry Barrow, 1591-1593*, edited by Leland H. Carlson, vol 6, 223-5. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1970.
- _____. 'Excerpt from Barrow's Conference with Several Clergymen, March 29/30, 1593.' In *The writings of John Greenwood and Henry Barrow, 1591-1593*, edited by Leland H. Carlson, vol 6, 236-7. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1970.
- _____. 'Excerpt on Cartwright from Barrow's Prison Conference with Dr. Ravis [ca. April, 1592].' In *The writings of John Greenwood and Henry Barrow, 1591-1593*, edited by Leland H. Carlson, vol 6, 220. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1970.
- _____. 'A Fragment Directed to the Parliament [1592/1593].' In *The writings of John Greenwood and Henry Barrow, 1591-1593*, edited by Leland H. Carlson, vol 6, 221-2. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1970.
- _____. 'Letter to an Honorable Lady and Countesse of His Kin[d]red Yet Living, April 4/5, 1593.' In *The writings of John Greenwood and Henry Barrow*,

1591-1593, edited by Leland H. Carlson, vol 6, 242-52. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1970.

Batt, John. *The royall priesthood of Christians An excellent treatise, wherein the nature of the priesthood, the function of the priests, and qualitie of the sacrifice is lively portrayed, for the sure building up of the faithfull professors of the gossell, in holinesse and sanctitie of life.* London, 1605.

Beard, Thomas. *A retractive from the Romish religion contayning thirteene forcible motives, disswading from the communion with the Church of Rome: wherein is demonstratively proved, that the now Romish religion (so farre forth as it is Romish) is not the true Catholike religion of Christ, but the seduction of Antichrist.* London, 1616.

Bernard, Richard. *The faithfull shepheard the shepheards faithfulness: wherein is for the matter largely, but for the maner, in few words, set forth the excellencie and necessitie of the ministerie; a ministers properties and dutie; his entrance into this function and charge; how to begin fitly to instruct his people; catechising and preaching; and a good plaine order and method therein: not so as yet published.* London, 1607.

_____. *Christian advertisements and counsels of peace Also disswasions from the separatists schisme, commonly called Brownisme, which is set apart from such truths as they take from us and other reformed churches, and is nakedly discovered, that so the falsitie thereof may better be discerned, and so justly condemned and wisely avoided. Published, for the benefit of the humble and godlie lover of the trueth.* London, 1608.

_____. *Two twinnes: or Two parts of one portion of scripture. I. Is of catechising. II. Of the ministers maintenance.* London, 1613.

Bèze, Théodore de. *Master Bezaes sermons upon the three chapters of the cantic of canticles wherein are handled the chieffest points of religion controversed and debated betweene us and the adversarie at this day, especially touching the true Jesus Christ and the true Church, and the certaine & infallible marks both of the one and of the other.* Oxford, 1587.

_____. *Propositions and principles of divinitie propounded and disputed in the universitie of Geneva, by certaine students of divinitie there, under M. Theod. Beza, and M. Anthonie Faius ... Wherein is contained a methodicall summarie, or epitome of the common places of divinitie. Translated out of Latine into English, to the end that the causes, both of the present dangers of that Church, and also of the troubles of those that are hardlie dealt with elsewhere, may appeare in the English tongue.* Edinburgh, 1591.

Bèze, Théodore de. *A little catechisme, that is to say, a short instruction touching christian religion.* London, 1578.

- Bilson, Thomas. *The true difference betweene Christian subjection and unchristian rebellion wherein the princes lawfull power to commaund for trueth, and indeprivable right to beare the sword are defended against the Popes censures and the Jesuits sophismes uttered in their apologie and defence of English Catholikes: with a demonstration that the thinges reformed in the Church of England by the lawes of this realme are truely Catholike, notwithstanding the vaine shew made to the contrary in their late Rhemish Testament.* Oxford, 1585.
- Boys, John. *An exposition of the festivall epistles and gospels used in our English liturgie together with a reason why the church did chuse the same; the first part from the feast of S. Andrew the Apostle, to the purification of Blessed Mary the Virgin.* London, 1615.
- Bradshaw, William. *A triall of subscription by way of a preface unto certaine subscribers; and, reasons for lesse rigour against non-subscribers. Both modestly written; that neither should offend.* Middelburg, 1599.
- _____. *English puritanisme containening [sic]. The maine opinions of the rigidest sort of those that are called Puritanes in the realme of England.* London, 1605.
- _____. *A treatise of Justification Tending to prove that a sinner is Justified before God, onely by Christs righteousnes imputed.* London, 1615.
- Bray, Gerald Lewis. *Documents of the English Reformation.* Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1994.
- Bredwell, Stephen. *The rasing of the foundations of Brownisme Wherein, against all the writings of the principall masters of that sect, those chiefe conclusions in the next page, are, (amongst sundry other matters, worthie the readers knowledge) purposely handled, and soundely proved. Also their contrarie arguments and obiections deliberately examined, and clearly refelled by the word of God.* London, 1588.
- Brinsley, John. *The preachers charge, and peoples duty about preaching and hearing of the Word: opened in a sermon, being the first fruits of a publike exercise, begun in the parish church of Lownd, for the benefit of the island of Lovingland in Suffolke.* London, 1631.
- Browne, Robert. *A booke which sheweth the life and manners of all true Christians and howe unlike they are unto Turkes and Papistes, and heathen folke. Also the pointes and partes of all divinitie, that is of the revealed will and worde of God are declared by their severall definitions and divisions in order as followeth. Also there goeth a treatise before of reformation without tarying for anie, and of the wickednesse of those preachers, which will not reforme*

them selves and their charge, because they will tarie till the magistrate commanude and compell them. Middelburgh, 1582.

_____. 'An Answer to Master Cartwright His Letter.' In *The writings of Robert Harrison and Robert Browne*, edited by Albert Peel and Leland H. Carlson, vol 2, 431-506. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1953.

_____. 'A Booke which sheweth the life and manners of all true Christians.' In *The writings of Robert Harrison and Robert Browne*, edited by Albert Peel and Leland H. Carlson, vol 2, 221-395. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1953.

Bulkley, Edward. *An apologie for religion, or an answere to an unlearned and slanderous pamphlet intituled: Certaine articles, or forcible reasons discovering the palpable absurdities, and most notorious errors of the Protestants religion, pretended to be printed at Antwerpe 1600.* London, 1602.

Calvin, Jean. *The sermons of M. John Calvin upon the fifth booke of Moses called Deuteronomie faithfully gathered word for word as he preached them in open pulpet; together with a preface of the ministers of the Church of Geneva, and an admonishment made by the deacons there. Also there are annexed two profitable tables, the one containing the chiefe matters; the other the places of Scripture herein alledged.* London, 1583.

_____. *Aphorismes of Christian religion: or, a verie compendious abridgement of M. I. Calvins Institutions set forth in short sentences methodically by M. I. Piscator: and now Englished according to the authors third and last edition.* London, 1596.

Cartwright, Thomas. *A replye to an answere made of M. Doctor Whitgifte Agaynste the admonition to the Parliament.* n.p., 1573.

_____. *A treatise of Christian religion. Or, the whole bodie and substance of divnintie.* London, 1616.

_____. 'An Answer unto a letter of Master Harrisons.' In *Cartwrightiana*, edited by Albert Peel and Leland H. Carlson, vol 1, 49-58. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1951.

Charke, William. *An answeare for the time, unto that foule, and wicked Defence of the censure, that was given upon M. Charkes booke, and Meredith Hammers Contayning a maintenance of the credite and persons of all those woorthie men: namely, of M. Luther, Calvin, Bucer, Beza, and the rest of those godlie ministers of Gods worde, whom he, with a shamelesse penne most slanderously hath sought to deface: finished sometime sithence: and now*

published for the stay of the Christian reader till Maister Charkes booke come foorth. London, 1583.

_____. *A treatise against the Defense of the censure, given upon the bookes of W. Charke and Meredith Hanmer, by an unknowne popish traytor in maintenance of the seditious challenge of Edmond Campion ... Hereunto are adjoynd two treatises.* Cambridge, 1586.

Cooper, Thomas. *Certaine sermons wherin is contained the defense of the gossell nowe preached against such cavils and false accusations, as are objected both against the doctrine it selfe, and the preachers and professors thereof, by the friendes and favourers of the Church of Rome.* London, 1580.

Craig, John. *A short summe of the whole catechisme wherin the question is propounded and answered in fewe wordes, for the greater ease of the common people & children.* London, 1583.

Dent, Arthur. *The plaine mans pathway to heaven wherein every man may clearely see whether hee shall be saved or damned / set foorth dialogue-wise, for the better understanding of the simple.* London, 1625.

Dod, Henry. *A godlie and fruitfull treatise of faith and workes. Wherein is confuted a certaine opinion of merit by workes, which an adversary to the gossell of Christ Jesu, held in the conference, had in the Tower of London.* London, 1583.

Dod, John. *Ten sermons tending chiefly to the sitting of men for the worthy receiving of the Lords Supper Wherein amongst many other holy instructions: the doctrines of sound repentance and humiliation, and of Gods speciall favours unto penitent sinners, and worthy communicants are largely and effectually handled. The six first, by J. Dod. The foure last, by R. Cleaver. Whereunto is annexed, a plaine and learned metaphrase on the epistle to the Collossians, written by a godly and judicious preacher. There is also set before the sermons, a short dialogue of preparation: containing the chiefe points that concerne the worthy receiving of the Lords Supper, taken for the most part, out of the sermons following: and collected into a method for the benefit and ease of those that desire direction in this matter.* London, 1609.

Downame, George. *A treatise concerning Antichrist divided into two bookes, the former, proving that the Pope is Antichrist, the latter, maintaining the same assertion, against all the objections of Robert Bellarmine, Jesuit and cardinall of the church of Rome.* London, 1603.

_____. *Two sermons the one commending the ministerie in generall: the other defending the office of bishops in particular: both preached, and since enlarged.* London, 1608.

Downe, John, and George Hakewill. 'An Amulet or preservative against the contempt of the Ministry.' In *Certaine treatises of the late reverend and learned divine, Mr John Downe*. Oxford, 1633.

_____. *Certaine treatises of the late reverend and learned divine, Mr John Downe*. Oxford, 1633.

_____. 'A treatise concerning the force and efficacy of reading.' In *Certaine treatises of the late reverend and learned divine, Mr John Downe*. Oxford, 1633.

Du Moulin, Pierre. *The accomplishment of the prophecies; or The third booke in defence of the Catholicke faith contained in the booke of the high & mighty King James. I. by the grace of God King of Great Brittain and Ireland. Against the allegations of R. Bellarmine; and F.N. Colffeteau & other doctors of the Romish church*. Oxford, 1613.

Fenner, Dudley. *A briefe and plaine declaration, concerning the desires of all those faithfull ministers, that have and do seeke for the discipline and reformation of the Church of Englande which may serve for a just apologie, against the false accusations and slaunders of their adversaries*. London, 1584.

_____. *A defence of the reasons of the counter-poyson, for maintenance of the eldership against an aunswere made to them by Doctor Copequot, in a publike sermon at Pawles Crosse, upon Psal. 84. 1584. Wherein also according to his demaunde is proved syllogisticallie for the learned, and plainlie for all men, the perpetuitie of the elders office in the church*. Middelburg, 1586.

Forbes, Patrick. *An exquisite commentarie upon the Revelation of Saint John Wherein, both the course of the whole booke, as also the more abstruse and hard places thereof not heretofore opened; are now at last most cleerely and evidently explained*. London, 1613.

Fowns, Richard. *Trisagion or, The three holy offices of Jesus Christ, the sonne of God, priestly, propheticall, and regall how they ought of all his Church to be received. With a declaration of the violence and iniuries offered unto the same, by the spirituall and Romish Babylon ... Revealing many blasphemous mysteries unknowne to the vulgar*. London, 1618.

Fulke, William. *A retentive, to stay good Christians, in true faith and religion, against the motives of Richard Bristow Also a discoverie of the daungerous rocke of the popish Church*. London, 1580.

_____. *A rejoynder to Bristows replie in defence of Allens scroll of articles and booke of purgatorie Also the cavils of Nicholas Sander D. in Divinitie about the supper of our Lord, and the apologie of the Church of England, touching*

the doctrine thereof, confuted by William Fulke, Doctor in Divinitie, and master of Pembroke Hall in Cambridge. Seene and allowed. London, 1581.

Gibson, Thomas. *The blessing of a good king Delivered in eight sermons upon the storie of the Queene of the south, her words to Salomon, magnifying the government of his familie and kingdome.* London, 1614.

Gifford, George. *A briefe discourse of certaine points of the religion which is among the common sort of Christians, which may bee termed the countrie divinitie With a manifest confutation of the same, after the order of a dialogue.* London, 1581.

_____. *A plaine declaration that our Brownists be full Donatists by comparing them together from point to point out of the writings of Augustine. Also a replie to Master Greenwood touching read prayer, wherein his grosse ignorance is detected, which labouring to purge himselfe from former absurdities, doth plunge himselfe deeper into the mire.* London, 1590.

_____. *A short treatise against the Donatists of England, whome we call Brownists Wherein, by the answers unto certayne writings of theirs, divers of their heresies are noted, with sundry fantasticall opinions.* London, 1590.

_____. *A short reply unto the last printed books of Henry Barrow and John Greenwood, the chiefe ringleaders of our Donatists in England Wherein is layd open their grosse ignorance, and foule errors: upon which their whole building is founded.* London, 1591.

Gilby, Anthony. *A pleasant dialogue, betweene a souldior of Barwicke, and an English chaplaine Wherein are largely handled & laide open, such reasons as are brought in for maintenaunce of popishe traditions in our Eng. church. Also is collected, as in a short table, 120. particular corruptions yet remaining in our saide church, with sundrie other matters, necessary to be knowne of all persons. Together with a letter of the same author, placed before this booke, in vway of a preface.* Middelburg, 1581.

Greenham, Richard. *The workes of the reverend and faithfull servant of Jesus Christ M. Richard Greenham, minister and preacher of the word of God the second edition, revised, corrected, and published, for the further building of all such as love the trueth, and desire to know the power of godlines.* London, 1599.

_____. *The workes of the reverend and faithfull servant of Jesus Christ M. Richard Greenham, minister and preacher of the Word of God collected into one volume: revised, corrected, and published, for the further building of all such as loue the truth, and desire to know the power of godlinesse.* London, 1612.

Greenwood, John, and Henry Barrow. 'A Collection of Certain Letters and Conferences Lately Passed betwixt Certaine Preachers and Two Prinsoners in the Fleet.' In *The Writings of John Greenwood, 1587-1590: Together with the Joint Writings of Henry Barrow and John Greenwood, 1587-1590*, edited by Leland H. Carlson, vol 4, 177-262. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1962.

_____. 'A Collection of Certaine Sclaunderous Articles Gyven out by the Bisshops.' In *The Writings of John Greenwood, 1587-1590: Together with the Joint Writings of Henry Barrow and John Greenwood, 1587-1590*, edited by Leland H. Carlson, vol 4, 108-174. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1962.

_____. *The Writings of John Greenwood, 1587-1590: Together with the Joint Writings of Henry Barrow and John Greenwood, 1587-1590*. vol. 4. 6 vols. Elizabethan Nonconformist Texts, Edited by Leland H. Carlson. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1962.

_____. *The Writings of John Greenwood and Henry Barrow, 1591-1593*. vol. 6. 6 vols. Elizabethan Nonconformist Texts, Edited by Leland H. Carlson. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1970.

Hemmingsen, Niels. *The faith of the church militant moste effectualie described in this exposition of the 84. Psalme, by that reverend pastor, and publike professor of Gods word, in the famous uniuersitie of Hassine in Denmarke, Nicholas Hemmingius. A treatise written as to the instruction of the ignorant in the groundes of religion, so to the confutation of the Jewes, the Turkes, atheists, Papists, heretiks, and al other adversaries of the trueth whatsoever.* London, 1581.

Hieron, Samuel. *The preachers plea: or, A treatise in forme of a plain dialogue making known the worth and necessary use of preaching: shewing also how a man may profit by it, both for the informing of his judgement, and the reforming of his life.* London, 1604.

Hildersam, Arthur. 'The Doctrine of communicating worthily in the Lords Supper.' In *A direction for the weaker sort of Christians*, edited by William Bradshaw. London, 1609.

Hooker, Richard. *Of the lawes of ecclesiasticall politie eight bookes.* London, 1604.

Hooper, John. *A declaration of Christe and of his offyce complyd.* Zurych, 1547.

Howson, John. *A sermon preached at Paules Crosse the 4 of December, 1597 wherein is discoursed that all buying and selling of spirituall promotion is unlawfull.* London, 1597.

Ingmethorpe, Thomas. *A sermon upon part of the second chapter of the first epistle of S. John: Preached by Thomas Ingmethorp. The summe whereof is briefly comprised in this hexameter.* Oxford, 1598.

Jacob, Henry. *A treatise of the sufferings and victory of Christ, in the work of our redemption declaring by the Scripturs these two questions: that Christ suffered for us the wrath of God, which we may well terme the paynes of hell, or hellish sorrowes. That Christ after his death on the crosse, went not into hell in his soule. Contrarie to certaine errours in these points publiklie preached in London: anno 1597.* Middelburg, 1598.

_____. *Reasons taken out of Gods Word and the best humane testimonies proving a necessitie of reforming our churches in England Framed and applied to 4. assertions wherein the foresaid purpose is contained.* Middelburg, 1604.

_____. *The divine beginning and institution of Christs church.* Leiden, 1610.

Johnson, Francis. *An advertisement concerning a book lately published by Christopher Lawne and others, against the English exiled Church at Amsterdam. By Richard Clyfton teacher of the same church.* Amsterdam, 1612.

Junius, Franciscus. *Certayne letters, translated into English, being first written in Latine. Two, by the reverend and learned Mr. Francis Junius, divinitie reader at Leyden in Holland. The other, by the exiled English Church, abiding for the present at Amsterdam in Holland. Together with the confession of faith prefixed: where upon the said letters were first written.* Amsterdam, 1602.

Kellison, Matthew. *A survey of the new religion detecting manie grosse absurdities which it implieth.* Doway, Rheims, 1603.

Lawne, Christopher. *The prophane schisme of the Brownists or separatists With the impietie, dissensions, lewd, and abhominable vices of that impure sect. Discovered by Christopher Lawne, John Fowler, Clement Sanders, Robert Bulward. Lately returned from the companie of M. Johnson, that wicked brother, into the bosome of the Church of England, their true mother.* London, 1612.

_____. *Brownisme turned the in-side out-ward Being a paralell betweene the profession and practise of the Brownists religion. By Christopher Lavvne, lately returned from that wicked separation.* London, 1613.

Learned and Judicious Divine. *A guide unto Sion. Or certaine positions, concerning a true visible church Wherein the nature of a true church is so plainly described, as all men may easily decerne the same from false assemblies. Written by a learned and judicious divine.* Amsterdam, 1638.

Loe, William. *The joy of Jerusalem and woe of the worldlings. A sermon preached at Pauls Crosse the 18. of June. 1609.* London, 1609.

Luther, Martin. *Three treatises.* 2nd rev. ed. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1970.

Marlorat, Augustin. *A catholike and ecclesiasticall exposition of the holy gossell after S. Marke and Luke. Gathered out of all the singular and approved devines, which the Lorde hath geven to hys church.* London, 1583.

Merbecke, John. *A booke of notes and common places, with their expositions, collected and gathered out of the workes of divers singular writers, and brought alphabetically into order. A worke both profitable and also necessarie, to those that desire the true understanding & meaning of holy Scripture.* London, 1581.

Nixon, Anthony. *The blacke yeare Seria iocis.* London, 1606.

Ochino, Bernardino. *Certaine godly and very profitable sermons of faith, hope and charitie. First set forth by Master Barnardine Occhine, of Siena in Italy, and now lately collected, and translated out of the Italian tongue, into the English by William Phiston of London student. Published for the profit of such as desire to understand the truth of the gossell.* London, 1580.

Paget, John. *An arrow against the separation of the Brownists Also an admonition touching Talmudique & rabbinical allegations.* Amsterdam, 1618.

Parr, Elnathan. *The grounds of divinitie plainely discovering the mysteries of Christian religion, propounded familiarly in divers questions and answers: substantially proved by scriptures; expounded faithfully, according to the writings of the best divines, and evidently applied by profitable uses, for the helpe and benefite of the unlearned which desire knowledge. To the which is prefixed a very profitable treatise, containing an exhortation to the study of the word, with singular directions for the hearing and reading of the same.* London, 1614.

Parsons, Robert. *A treatise tending to mitigation towardes Catholike-subjectes in England Wherin is declared, that it is not impossible for subjects of different religion, (especially Catholikes and Protestantes) to live together in dutifull obedience and subjection, under the government of his Maiesty of Great Britany. Against the seditious wrytings of Thomas Morton minister, & some others to the contrary. Whose two false and slaunderous groundes, pretended to be drawne from Catholike doctrine & practice, concerning rebellion and equivocation, are overthrowne, and cast upon himselfe. Dedicated to the learned schoole-devines, cyvill and canon lawyers of the two uniuersities of England.* Saint-Omer, 1607.

Perkins, William. *The foundation of Christian religion gathered into sixe principles. And it is to bee learned of ignorant people, that they may be fit to hear sermons with profit, and to receive the Lords Supper with comfort.* London, 1591.

_____. *A golden chaine, or the description of theologie containing the order of the causes of salvation and damnation, according to Gods woord. A view of the order wherof, is to be seene in the table annexed. Written in Latine by William Perkins, and translated by an other. Hereunto is adjoynded the order which M. Theodore Beza used in comforting troubled consciences.* London, 1591.

_____. *A case of conscience the greatest taht [sic] ever was, how a man may know, whether he be the son of God or no. Resolved by the word of God. Whereunto is added a briefe discourse, taken out of Hier. Zanchius.* Edinburgh, 1592.

_____. *An exposition of the Symbole or Creed of the Apostles, according to the tenour of the Scriptures, and the consent of orthodoxe Fathers of the Church.* Cambridge, 1595.

_____. *A reformed Catholike: or, A declaration shewing how neere we may come to the present Church of Rome in sundrie points of religion: and wherein we must for ever depart from them with an advertisement to all favourers of the Romane religion, shewing that the said religion is against the Catholike principles and grounds of the catechisme.* Cambridge, 1598.

_____. *A treatise of the vocations, or, Callings of men, with the sorts and kinds of them, and the right use thereof.* London, 1603.

_____. *A godlie and learned exposition upon the whole epistle of Jude, containing threescore and sixe sermons preached in Cambridge by that reverend and faithfull man of God, Master William Perkins, and now at the request of his executors, published by Thomas Taylor, preacher of Gods word; whereunto is prefixed a large analysis, containing the summe and order of the whole booke, according to the authors owne method, to which are further added, foure briefe tables to direct the reader.* London, 1606.

Perkins, William, and William Crashaw. *Of the calling of the ministerie two treatises, discribing the duties and dignities of that calling. Delivered publickly in the Universitie of Cambridge, by Maister Perkins. Taken then from his mouth, and now dilligently perused and published, by a preacher of the word with a preface prefixed touching the publishing of Maister Perkins his workes, & a catalogue of all such particulars thereof, as are to bee expected.* London, 1605.

- Perkins, William, and Robert Hill. *Lectures upon the three first chapters of the Revelation: preached in Cambridge anno Dom. 1595. by Master William Perkins, and now published for the benefite of this Church, by Robert Hill Bachelor in Divinitie. To which is added an excellent sermon, penned at the request of that noble and wise counsellor, Ambrose, Earle of Warwicke: in which is proved that Rome is Babylon, and that Babylon is fallen.* London, 1604.
- Perkins, William, and Thomas Tuke. *The arte of prophecying, or, A treatise concerning the sacred and onely true manner and methode of preaching.* London, 1607.
- Pie, Thomas. *An houre glasse contayning I a computation from the beginning of time to Christ by X. articles. II A confirmation of the same for the times controverted before Christ: as also that there wanteth a yeare after Christ, in the usuall computation. With other matters, offered to the judgement of the learned, and use of the studious in chronologie and historie.* London, 1597.
- Polanus von Polansdorf, Amandus. *The substance of Christian religion soundly set forth in two bookes, by definitions and partitions, framed according to the rules of a naturall method, by Amandus Polanus professor of diuinitie. The first booke concerneth faith. The second concerneth good workes. The principall pointes whereof are contained in a short table hereunto annexed.* London, 1595.
- Rainolds, William. *A refutation of sundry reprehensions, cavils, and false sleightes, by which M. Whitaker laboureth to deface the late English translation, and Catholike annotations of the new Testament, and the booke of Discovery of heretical corruptions.* Paris, 1583.
- Robinson, John. *A justification of separation from the Church of England Against Mr Richard Bernard his invective, intituled; The separatists schisme.* Amsterdam, 1610.
- Rogers, Richard. *Seaven treatises containing such direction as is gathered out of the Holie Scriptures, leading and guiding to true happines, both in this life, and in the life to come, and may be called the practise of Christianitie: profitable for all such as heartily desire the same, in the which, more particularly true Christians may learne how to leade a godly and comfortable life euery day, notwithstanding their tribulations.* London, 1604.
- Rogers, Thomas. *An historical dialogue touching antichrist and poperie, drawn and published for the common benefit and comfort of our church in these dangerous daies, & against the desperate attemptes of the vowed adversaries of Jesus Christ, his gospell, and this flourishing state.* London, 1589.

Salnar, Jean-François. *An harmony of the confessions of the faith of the Christian and Reformed Churches which purelie professe the holy doctrine of the Gospell in all the chiefe kingdomes, nations, and provinces of Europe: the catalogue and order whereof the pages following will declare. There are added in the ende verie shorte notes: in which both the obscure thinges are made plaine, & those thinges which maie in shew seeme to be contrarie each to other, are plainelie and verie modestlie reconciled, and if anie points doe as yet hang in doubt, they are sincerelie pointed at. All which things, in the name of the Churches of Fraunce and Belgia, are submitted to the free and discrete iudgement of all other Churches. Newlie translated out of Latine into English. Also in the end is added the confession of the Church of Scotland. Alowed by publique authoritie.* Cambridge, 1586.

Sandys, Edwin. *Sermons made by the most reverende Father in God, Edwin, Archbishop of Yorke, primate of England and metropolitane.* London, 1585.

Saravia, Adrien. *1. Of the diverse degrees of the ministers of the gospell. 2. Of the honor which is due unto the priestes and prelates of the church. 3. Of sacrilege, and the punishment thereof.* London, 1591.

Smith, Henry. *The sermons of Maister Henrie Smith gathered into one volume. Printed according to his corrected copies in his life time.* London, 1593.

Some, Robert. *A godlie treatise of the Church.* London, 1582.

_____. *A godly treatise containing and deciding certaine questions, mooved of late in London and other places, touching the ministerie, sacraments, and Church Whereunto one proposition more is added. After the ende of this booke you shall finde a defence of such points as M. Penry hath dealt against: and a confutation of many grosse errorrs broched in M. Penries last treatise.* London, 1588.

_____. *A godly treatise, wherein are examined and confuted many execrable fancies, given out and holden, partly by Henry Barrow and John Greenwood: partly, by other of the Anabaptistical order.* London, 1589.

Sprint, John. *The summe of the Christian religion contayning the chiefe points of the perswasion and practise of a Christian, which are needfull to his salvation. Drawne orderly in a cleare methode, and proposed in forme of question and answer.* London, 1613.

The Statutes of the Realm. vol. 4. Ontario: TannerRitchie Publishing & The University of St Andrews, 2007.

Sutcliffe, Matthew. *The subversion of Robert Parsons his confused and worthlesse worke, entituled, A treatise of three conversions of England from paganisme to Christian religion.* London, 1606.

Tuke, Thomas. *The treasure of true love or A lively description of the love of Christ unto his spouse, whom in love he hath clensed in his blood from sinne, and made a royall priesthood unto his Father.* London, 1608.

_____. *The high-way to heaven: or, the doctrine of election, effectuall vocation, justification, santification and eternall life Grounded upon the holy Scriptures, confirmed by the testimonies of sundry judicious and great divines, ancient and moderne.* London, 1609.

University of Oxford. *The answere of the vicechancelour, the doctors, both the proctors, and other the heads of houses in the University of Oxford (agreeable, undoubtedly, to the joint and uniforme opinion, of all the deanes and chapters, and all other the learned and obedient cleargy, in the Church of England.) To the humble petition of the ministers of the Church of England, desiring reformation of certaine ceremonies and abuses of the church.* Oxford, 1603.

Ursinus, Zacharias. *The summe of Christian religion: delivered by Zacharias Ursinus in his lectures upon the Catechism autorised by the noble Prince Frederick, throughout his dominions: wherein are debated and resolved the questions of whatsoever points of moment, which have beene or are controverted in divinitie. Translated into English by Henrie Parrie, out of the last & best Latin editions, together with some supplie of wa[n]ts out of his discourses of divinitie, and with correction of sundrie faults & imperfections, which ar [sic] as yet remaining in the best corrected Latine.* Oxford, 1587.

_____. *A collection of certaine learned discourses, written by that famous man of memory Zachary Ursine; doctor and professor of divinitie in the noble and flourishing schools of Neustad. For explication of divers difficult points, laide downe by that author in his catechisme. Lately put in print in Latin by the last labour of D. David Parry: and now newlie translated into English, by I.H. for the benefit and behoefe of our Christian country-man.* Oxford, 1600.

Warner, William. *Albions England a continued historie of the same kingdome, from the originals of the first inhabitants thereof: and most the chiefe alterations and accidents there hapning: vnto, and in, the happie raigne of our now most gracious soueraigne Queene Elizabeth. With varietie of inuentiue and historicall intermixtures. First penned and published by William Warner: and now revised, and newly enlarged by the same author.* London, 1597.

White, Thomas. *A sermon preached at Paules Crosse the 17. of November An. 1589 Injoyfull remembrance and thanksgiving unto God, for the peaceable yeres of her majesties most gracious raigne over us, now 32.* London, 1589.

_____. *A discoverie of Brownisme: or, a brief declaration of some of the errors and abominations daily practiced and increased among the English*

company of the seperation remayning for the present at Amsterdam in Holland. London, 1605.

Whittingham, William. *A brieff discours off the troubles begonne at Franckford in Germany Anno Domini 1554 Abowte the booke off off [sic] common prayer and ceremonies, and continued by the Englishe men theyre/ to thende off Q. Maries raigne, in the which discours, the gentle reader shall see the very originall and beginninge off all the contention that hathe byn, and what was the cause off the same.* Heidelberg, 1574.

Wiburn, Perceval. *A checke or reproofe of M. Howlets untimely shreeching in her Maiesties eares with an answeare to the reasons alleadged in a discourse therunto annexed, why Catholikes (as they are called) refuse to goe to church: wherein (among other things) the papists traiterous and treacherous doctrine and demeanour towards our Sovereaigne and the state, is somewhat at large upon occasion unfolded: their divelish pretended conscience also examined, and the foundation thereof undermined. And lastly shewed thatit [sic] is the duety of all true Christians and subjectes to haunt publike church assemblies.* London, 1581.

Willet, Andrew. *Synopsis papismi, that is, A generall viewe of papistry wherein the whole mysterie of iniquitie, and summe of antichristian doctrine is set downe, which is maintained this day by the Synagogue of Rome, against the Church of Christ, together with an antithesis of the true Christian faith, and an antidotum or counterpoyson out of the Scriptures, against the whore of Babylons filthy cuppe of abominations: devided into three bookes or centuries, that is, so many hundreds of popish heresies and errors.* London, 1592.

. *Hexapla in Danielem: that is, A six-fold commentarie upon the most divine prophesie of Daniel wherein according to the method propounded in Hexapla upon Genesis and Exodus, sixe things are observed in every chapter. 1. The argument and method. 2. The divers readings. 3. The questions discussed. 4. Doctrines noted. 5. Controversies handled. 6. Morall observations applyed. Wherein many obscure visions, and divine prophesies are opened, and difficult questions handled with great brevitie, perspicuitie, and varietie ... and the best interpreters both old and new are therein abridged. Divided into two bookes.* Cambridge, 1610.

. *Hexapla, that is, A six-fold commentarie upon the most divine Epistle of the holy apostle S. Paul to the Romanes wherein according to the authors former method, sixe things are observed in every chapter ... : wherein are handled the greatest points of Christian religion ... : divided into two bookes.* Cambridge, 1611.

Wilson, Thomas. *A commentarie upon the most divine Epistle of S. Paul to the Romanes Containing for matter, the degeneration of our nature by Adams*

Fall; and the restauration thereof, by the grace of Christ. Together with the perfection of faith, and the imbecillity of workes, in the cause of justification of elect sinners before God. For forme and maner of handling, it hath the coherence and method, the summe and scope, the interpretations & doctrines the reasons and uses, of most texts. All which, are set downe very familiarly and compendiously, in forme of a dialogue, betweene Tlmotheus [sic] and Silas, by Thomas Wilson, one of the six preachers in the cathedrall church of Canterbury. London, 1614.

Wotton, Anthony. *A defence of M. Perkins booke, called A reformed Catholike against the cavils of a popish writer, one D.B.P. or W.B. in his deformed Reformation.* London, 1606.

Secondary Sources

Acheson, R. J. *Radical Puritans in England, 1550-1660.* Seminar studies in history. London: Longman, 1990.

Atkinson, David W. 'A Brief Discoverie of the False Church: Henry Barrow's Last Spiritual Statement.' *Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church* 48, no. 3 (1979): 265-278.

Avis, Paul D. L. 'True Church in Reformation Theology.' *Scottish Journal of Theology* 30, no. 4 (1977): 319-345.

_____. 'The church's one foundation.' *Theology* 89, no. 730 (1986): 257-263.

_____. *The Church in the Theology of the Reformers.* Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock Publishers, 2002.

_____. *Beyond the Reformation?: Authority, Primacy and Unity in the Conciliar Tradition.* Pbk. ed. London: T&T Clark, 2008.

Axon, William E. A., and Ernest Axon. *Henry Ainsworth, the Puritan Commentator ... Reprinted from the 'Transactions of the Lancashire and Cheshire Antiquarian Society,' etc.* Manchester, 1889.

Bagchi, David V. N., and David Curtis Steinmetz. *The Cambridge Companion to Reformation Theology.* Cambridge companions to religion. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Barrett, Charles M. 'A Systematization of the Separatist Principles of Henry Barrow and John Greenwood taken from their Ecclesiastical Writings, 1587-1593.' PhD Thesis, Bob Jones University, 2006.

- Barrow, Henry. *The Writings of Henry Barrow, 1587-1590*. vol. 3. 6 vols. Elizabethan Nonconformist Texts, Edited by Leland H. Carlson. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1962.
- Bauckham, Richard. 'Fulke, William (1536/7–1589).' In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed. Edited by Lawrence Goldman. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/10224> [accessed 28 Feb 2014].
- Beeke, Joel R., and Mark Jones. *A Puritan Theology: Doctrine for Life*. Grand Rapids, MI: Reformation Heritage Books, 2012.
- Black, J. William. 'From Martin Bucer to Richard Baxter: "Discipline" and Reformation in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century England.' *Church History* 70, no. 4 (2001): 644-673.
- Blom, J., and F. Blom. 'Rainolds , William (1544?–1594).' In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed. Edited by Lawrence Goldman. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/23030> [accessed 27 March 2014].
- Bloomfield, Edward Henry. 'The Opposition to the English Separatists: 1570-1625. A Survey of the Polemical Literature Written by the Opponents to Separatism.' PhD Thesis, The Claremont Graduate University, 1974.
- Bosc, Jean. *The Kingly Office of the Lord Jesus Christ*. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1959.
- Bowker, Margaret. 'Cooper, Thomas (c.1517–1594).' In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed. Edited by Lawrence Goldman. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/6229> [accessed 28 Feb 2014].
- Bozeman, Theodore Dwight. *To Live Ancient Lives: The Primitivist Dimension in Puritanism*. Chapel Hill, NC: Published for the Institute of Early American History and Culture, Williamsburg, Virginia, by the University of North Carolina Press, 1988.
- _____. 'Federal Theology and the "national covenant": an Elizabethan Presbyterian case study.' *Church History* 61, no. 4 (1992): 394-407.
- Brachlow, Stephen. 'More Light on John Robinson and the Separatist Tradition.' *Fides et historia* 13, no. 1 (1980): 6-22.
- _____. 'John Robinson and the Lure of Separatism in Pre-Revolutionary England.' *Church History* 50, no. 3 (1981): 288-301.

- _____. 'The Elizabethan Roots of Henry Jacob's Churchmanship: Refocusing the Historiographical Lens.' *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 36, no. 1 (1985): 228-254.
- _____. *The Communion of Saints: Radical Puritan and Separatist Ecclesiology, 1570-1625*. Oxford theological monographs. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988.
- Brauer, Jerald C. 'Types of Puritan Piety.' *Church History* 56, no. 1 (1987): 39-58.
- Breshears, Gerry. 'The Body of Christ: Prophet, Priest, or King?' *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 37, no. 1 (1994): 3-26.
- Breward, Ian. 'William Perkins and the Ideal of the Ministry in the Elizabethan Church.' *Reformed Theological Review* 24, no. 3 (1965): 73-84.
- _____. 'William Perkins and the Origins of Reformed Casuistry.' *Evangelical Quarterly* 40, no. 1 (1968): 3-20.
- Bromiley, Geoffrey William. *Historical theology: an introduction*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1978.
- Bruhn, Karen. "'Sinne Unfoulded": Time, Election, and Disbelief among the Godly in Late Sixteenth- and Early Seventeenth-Century England.' *Church History* 77, no. 3 (2008): 574-595.
- Burrage, Champlin. *The Early English Dissenters in the Light of Recent Research (1550-1641)*. 2 vols. Cambridge: The University Press, 1912.
- Butin, Philip Walker. 'Two Early Reformed Catechisms, the Threefold Office, and the Shape of Karl Barth's Christology.' *Scottish Journal of Theology* 44, no. 2 (1991): 195-214.
- Cambers, Andrew. *Godly reading: print, manuscript and Puritanism in England, 1580-1720*. Cambridge studies in early modern British history. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- Carlson, Eric Josef. 'Greenham, Richard (early 1540s–1594).' In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed. Edited by Lawrence Goldman. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/11424> [accessed 17 March 2014].
- Cetta, Tony. 'Salvard, Jean-François.' In *Historical Dictionary of Switzerland*, online ed. Bern, 2009, <http://www.hls-dhs-dss.ch/textes/f/F11318.php> [accessed 13 July 2015].

- Chapman, Alister, John Coffey, and Brad S. Gregory. *Seeing Things Their Way: Intellectual History and the Return of Religion*. Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 2009.
- Charlton, Kenneth. 'Liberal Education and the Inns of Court in the Sixteenth Century.' *British Journal of Educational Studies* 9, no. 1 (1960): 25-38.
- Christianson, Paul. *Reformers and Babylon: English Apocalyptic Visions from the Reformation to the Eve of the Civil War*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1978.
- _____. 'Reformers and the Church of England under Elizabeth I and the Early Stuarts.' *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 31, no. 4 (1980): 463-484.
- 'Christology, n.' In *Oxford English Dictionary*, online ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013, <http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/32491> [accessed 14 June 2013].
- Coffey, John, and Alister Chapman. 'Introduction.' In *Seeing Things Their Way: Intellectual History and the Return of Religion*, edited by Alister Chapman, John Coffey and Brad S. Gregory, 1-20. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2009.
- Cohen, Charles Lloyd. *God's caress: the psychology of Puritan religious experience*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1986.
- Coker, Joe L. "'Cast out from among the Saints": Church Discipline among Anabaptists and English Separatists in Holland, 1590-1620.' *Reformation* 11, (2006): 1-27.
- Collinson, Patrick. 'A comment: concerning the name Puritan.' *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 31, no. 4 (1980): 483-488.
- _____. *The religion of Protestants: the church in English society, 1559-1625*. The Ford lectures. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982.
- _____. 'Episcopacy and Reform in England in the Later Sixteenth Century.' In *Godly people: essays on English Protestantism and Puritanism*, 155-89. London: Hambledon Press, 1983.
- _____. 'Towards a Broader Understanding of the Early Dissenting Tradition.' In *Godly people: essays on English Protestantism and Puritanism*, 527-562. London: Hambledon Press, 1983.
- _____. 'The English conventicle.' In *Voluntary religion*, 223-259. London: Basil Blackwell, 1986.

_____. 'Shepherds, Sheepdogs, and Hirelings: The Pastoral Ministry in Post-Reformation England.' In *The ministry: clerical and lay; papers read at the 1988 Summer Meeting and the 1989 Winter Meeting of the Ecclesiastical History Society*, edited by Ecclesiastical History Society. Summer Meeting Magdalene College Cambridge (1988), W. J. Sheils, Diana Wood and Ecclesiastical History Society. Winter Meeting, 185-220. Oxford: Published for the Ecclesiastical History Society by Basil Blackwell, 1989.

_____. 'Separation in and out of the Church: The Consistency of Barrow and Greenwood.' *Journal of the United Reformed Church History Society* 5, (1994): 239-258.

_____. 'Windows in a Woman's Soul: Questions about the Religion of Queen Elizabeth I.' In *Elizabethan essays*, 87-118. London: Hambledon, 1994.

_____. 'Barrow, Henry (c.1550–1593).' In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed. Edited by Lawrence Goldman. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/1540> [accessed 6 March 2013].

_____. 'Sandys, Edwin (1519?-1588).' In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed. Edited by Lawrence Goldman. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/24649> [accessed 5 June 2014].

_____. *The Reformation*. London: Phoenix, 2005.

_____. 'Antipuritanism.' In *The Cambridge companion to Puritanism*, edited by John Coffey and Paul Chang-Ha Lim, 19-33. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

_____. 'The politics of religion and the religion of politics in Elizabethan England.' *Historical Research* 82, no. 215 (2009): 74-92.

Como, David R. *Blown by the Spirit: Puritanism and the Emergence of an Antinomian Underground in Pre-Civil-War England*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2004.

_____. 'Radical Puritanism, c. 1558-1660.' In *The Cambridge companion to Puritanism*, edited by John Coffey and Paul Chang-Ha Lim, 241-258. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

Coolidge, John S. *The Pauline Renaissance in England: Puritanism and the Bible*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970.

Craig, John. 'Rogers, Thomas (c.1553–1616).' In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed. Edited by Lawrence Goldman. Oxford: Oxford

- University Press, 2004, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/23998> [accessed 17 June 2014].
- Cranfield, Nicholas W. S. 'Howson, John (1556/7–1632).' In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed. Edited by Lawrence Goldman. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/14006> [accessed 6 June 2014].
- _____. 'Sutcliffe, Matthew (1549/50–1629).' In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed. Edited by Lawrence Goldman. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/26792> [accessed 2 May 2014].
- Crawford, John R. 'Calvin and the Priesthood of all Believers.' *Scottish Journal of Theology* 21, no. 2 (1968): 145-156.
- Culpepper, Scott. *Francis Johnson and the English Separatist influence: the Bishop of Brownism's life, writings, and controversies*. 1st ed. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 2011.
- Cummings, Brian, ed. *The book of common prayer: the texts of 1549, 1559, and 1662*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Curtis, Mark H. *Oxford and Cambridge in transition, 1558-1642: an essay on changing relations between the English universities and English society*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1959.
- _____. 'Hampton Court Conference and Its Aftermath.' *History* 46.156, (1961): 1-16.
- Cust, Richard. 'Brinsley, John (1600–1665).' In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed. Edited by Lawrence Goldman. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/3441> [accessed 30 July 2014].
- Davies, Horton. *Worship and Theology in England*. 5 vols. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1961.
- Davies, Rupert E. *The Problem of Authority in the Continental Reformers: a Study in Luther, Zwingli, and Calvin*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1978.
- Davis, Kenneth R. 'No Discipline, No Church: An Anabaptist Contribution to the Reformed Tradition.' *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, no. 4 (1982): 43-58.
- Davis, Thomas J. *This is my body: the presence of Christ in Reformation thought*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2008.

- Dexter, Henry Martyn. *The Congregationalism of the last three hundred years, as seen in its literature: with special reference to certain recondite, neglected, or disputed passages. In twelve lectures, delivered on the Southworth foundation in the Theological seminary at Andover, Mass., 1876-1879. With a bibliographical appendix.* New York: Harper & brothers, 1880.
- Doney, Simon. 'The Lordship of Christ in the Theology of the Elizabethan Separatists with Particular Reference to Henry Barrow.' PhD Thesis, University of Lampeter, 2005.
- Dotterweich, Martin Holt. 'Balnaves, Henry (d. 1570).' In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed. Edited by Lawrence Goldman. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/1248> [accessed 10 March 2014].
- Duffield, G. E. 'Calvin's View of Ecclesiastical Discipline.' In *John Calvin*, edited by G. E. Duffield, 210-226. Abingdon: Courtenay, 1966.
- Durston, Christopher, and Jacqueline Eales. *The culture of English puritanism, 1560-1700.* Themes in focus. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1996.
- Eastwood, C. Cyril. *The priesthood of all believers; an examination of the doctrine from the Reformation to the present day.* Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Publishing House, 1962.
- 'ecclesiology, n.' In *Oxford English Dictionary*, online ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013, <http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/59277> [accessed 13 June 2013].
- Emerson, Everett H. 'Calvin and covenant theology.' *Church History* 25, no. 2 (1956): 136-144.
- Eno, Robert B. 'Some Nuances in the Ecclesiology of the Donatists.' In *Studia Patristica, XIV: Papers presented to the Sixth International Conference on Patristic Studies held in Oxford 1971, Part 3: Tertullian, Origenism, Gnostica, Cappadocian Fathers, Augustiniana*, edited by Elizabeth A. Livingstone. Berlin: Akademie-Verl., 1976.
- Enssle, Neal. 'Patterns of Godly Life: The Ideal Parish Minister in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth- Century English Thought.' *Sixteenth Century Journal* 28, no. 1 (1997): 3-28.
- Erickson, Millard J. *Christian Theology.* 2nd ed. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1998.
- Evans, G. R. *Problems of authority in the Reformation debates.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

- Fienberg, Stanley P. 'Thomas Goodwin's scriptural hermeneutics and the dissolution of Puritan unity.' *Journal of Religious History* 10, no. 1 (1978): 32-49.
- Fincham, Kenneth. *Prelate as pastor: the episcopate of James I.* Oxford: Clarendon, 1990.
- Finley, John D. 'A comparison of the concepts of Jean Calvin and Henry Ainsworth on the church.' MA Dissertation, Northeast Missouri State University, 1985.
- Franks, Robert S. *A History of the Doctrine of the Work of Christ.* Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 1962. Reprint, 2001.
- Frend, W. H. C. *The Donatist church: a movement of protest in Roman North Africa.* New ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985.
- Gadd, I. 'Gibson, Thomas (d. 1562).' In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed. Edited by Lawrence Goldman. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/10634> [accessed 16 March 2014].
- George, Timothy. *John Robinson and the English separatist tradition.* Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1982. Reprint, 2005.
- _____. 'Predestination In A Separatist Context: The Case Of John Robinson.' *Sixteenth Century Journal* 15, no. 1 (1984): 73-85.
- Gibson, Kenneth. 'Downham, George (d. 1634).' In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed. Edited by Lawrence Goldman. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/7977> [accessed 3 Sept 2012].
- Glebe Møller, Jens. 'Beginnings of Puritan covenant theology.' *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 14, no. 1 (1963): 46-67.
- Goehring, Walter R. 'Henry Jacob (1563-1624) and The Separatists.' PhD Thesis, New York University, 1975.
- Greaves, Richard L. 'The Origins and Early Development of English Covenant Thought.' *Historian* 31, (1968): 21.
- _____. 'Bernard, Richard (bap. 1568, d. 1642).' In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed. Edited by Lawrence Goldman. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/2249> [accessed 1 Oct 2013].

- _____. 'Charke, William (d. 1617).' In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed. Edited by Lawrence Goldman. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/5142> [accessed 29 Oct 2013].
- _____. 'Wotton, Anthony (bap. 1561?, d. 1626).' In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed. Edited by Lawrence Goldman. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/29997> [accessed 13 May 2014].
- Green, I. M. "'Reformed Pastors" and *Bons Curés*: The Changing Role of the Parish Clergy in Early Modern Europe.' In *The ministry: clerical and lay; papers read at the 1988 Summer Meeting and the 1989 Winter Meeting of the Ecclesiastical History Society*, edited by W. J. Sheils and Diana Wood, 249-86. Oxford: Published for the Ecclesiastical History Society by Basil Blackwell, 1989.
- _____. *The Christian's ABC: catechisms and catechizing in England c. 1530-1740*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.
- _____. *Print and Protestantism in early modern England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Gregory, Victoria Joy. 'Congregational puritanism and the radical puritan community in England c. 1585-1625.' PhD Thesis, University of Cambridge, 2003.
- Grenz, Stanley J. *Theology for the Community of God*. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 2000.
- Griswold, Barbara Stone. 'Congregational dynamics in the early tradition of independency.' PhD Thesis, Baylor University, 2006.
- Gurney, David William. 'Education and the early modern English Separatists.' PhD Thesis, University of London, 1998.
- Ha, Polly. *English Presbyterianism, 1590-1640*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2011.
- Haigh, Christopher. 'Anticlericalism and the English Reformation.' *History* 68, no. 224 (1983): 391-407.
- Hall, David D. *The faithful shepherd: a history of the New England ministry in the seventeenth century*. Harvard theological studies. Cambridge, MA: Distributed by Harvard University Press for Harvard Theological Studies, Harvard Divinity School, 2006.

- Harmes, Marcus. 'Orthodox Puritans And Dissenting Bishops: The Reformation Of The English Episcopate, ca. 1580-1610.' *Comitatus: A Journal of Medieval & Renaissance Studies* 39, (2008): 199-218.
- Harrap, David Alexander. 'Henry Barrow, The Bible and the language of separation.' MPhil Dissertation, University of Cambridge, 2012.
- Harris, Peter E. B. 'Bristow, Richard (1538–1581).' In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed. Edited by Lawrence Goldman. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/3452> [accessed 28 Feb 2014].
- Heide, Gale. *Timeless Truth in the Hands of History: a Short History of System in Theology*. Cambridge: James Clarke, 2012.
- Holifield, E. Brooks. *The covenant sealed: the development of Puritan sacramental theology in old and New England, 1570-1720*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974.
- Holmes, Stephen R. *Listening to the Past: the Place of Tradition in Theology*. Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 2002.
- Hoover, Jesse. "'They be Full Donatists'." *Reformation & Renaissance Review: Journal of the Society for Reformation Studies* 15, no. 2 (2013): 154-176.
- Houliston, Victor. 'Persons [Parsons], Robert (1546–1610).' In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed. Edited by Lawrence Goldman. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/21474> [accessed 5 June 2014].
- Hudson, Elizabeth K. 'The Catholic challenge to puritan piety, 1580-1620.' *Catholic Historical Review* 77, no. 1 (1991): 1.
- Hudson, Winthrop Still, and Leonard J. Trinterud. *Theology in sixteenth and seventeenth-century England: papers read at a Clark Library seminar, February 6, 1971*. William Andrews Clark Memorial Library seminar papers. Los Angeles: William Andrews Clark Memorial Library, University of California, 1971.
- Hughes, Philip Edgcumbe. *Theology of the English Reformers*. New ed. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1980.
- Humphreys, Jennett. 'Dod, Henry (fl. 1583?–1620).' In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed. Edited by Lawrence Goldman. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/7728> [accessed 17 March 2014].

Hunt, Arnold. 'The Lord's Supper in Early Modern England.' *Past & Present*, no. 161 (1998): 39-83.

_____. *The art of hearing: English preachers and their audiences, 1590-1640*. Cambridge studies in early modern British history. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

Ives, Samuel A. 'Henry Ainsworth, A Founding Father of Congregationalism and Pioneer Translator of the Bible.' *Transactions of the Wisconsin Academy of Sciences, Arts and Letters* 46, (1957).

Jansen, John Frederick. *Calvin's doctrine of the work of Christ*. London: J. Clarke, 1956.

Jenkins, Michael. 'Perkins, William (1558–1602).' In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed. Edited by Lawrence Goldman. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/21973> [accessed 28 Oct 2013].

Johnson, Adam J. 'The Servant Lord: A Word of Caution Regarding the munus triplex in Karl Barth's Theology and the Church Today.' *Scottish Journal of Theology* 65, no. 2 (2012): 159-173.

Johnson, John E. 'The Old Testament Offices as Paradigm for Pastoral Identity.' *Bibliotheca sacra* 152, no. 606 (1995): 182-200.

Johnson, Marcus P. 'New or nuanced perspective on Calvin? A reply to Thomas Wenger.' *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 51, no. 3 (2008): 543-558.

Jones, Mark. *Why heaven kissed earth: the christology of the Puritan Reformed orthodox theologian Thomas Goodwin (1600-1680)*. Reformed historical theology. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2010.

Jones, R. Tudur. 'Union with Christ: the existential nerve of Puritan piety.' *Tyndale Bulletin* 41, no. 2 (1990): 186-208.

Kanemura, R. 'Kingship by Descent or Kingship by Election? The Contested Title of James VI and I.' *Journal Of British Studies* 52, no. 2 (2013): 317-342.

Kärkkäinen, Veli-Matti. *Introduction to Ecclesiology: Ecumenical, Historical & Global Perspectives*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2002.

Kaufman, Peter Iver. 'Augustine, evil, and Donatism: sin and sanctity before the Pelagian controversy.' *Theological Studies* LI, (1990): 115-126.

- Kelso, Ruth. 'The doctrine of the English gentleman in the sixteenth century: with a bibliographical list of treatises on the gentleman and related subjects published in Europe to 1625.' PhD Thesis, University of Illinois, 1929.
- Knighton, C. S. 'Wiburn, Percival (1533/4–1606).' In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed. Edited by Lawrence Goldman. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/29346> [accessed 25 March 2014].
- Kraus, C. Norman. 'Anabaptist influence on English separatism as seen in Robert Browne.' *Mennonite Quarterly Review* 34, no. 1 (1960): 5-19.
- Lachman, David C., Frank Joseph Smith, and James E. Bordwine. *Worship in the presence of God*. Greenville, N.C.: Greenville Seminary Press, 1992.
- Lahey, Stephen E. *John Wyclif*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2009. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195183313.001.0001>.
- Lake, Peter. 'William Bradshaw, antichrist and the community of the godly.' *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 36, no. 4 (1985): 570-589.
- _____. *Moderate Puritans and the Elizabethan church*. 1st pbk. ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Letham, Robert. 'Amandus Polanus: A Neglected Theologian?' *Sixteenth Century Journal* 21, no. 3 (1990): 463-476.
- MacCulloch, Diarmaid. 'Putting the English Reformation on the Map: The Prothero Lecture.' *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, (2005): 75-95.
- Mandelbrote, Rev. Scott. 'Fowns, Richard (1561/2–1625).' In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed. Edited by Lawrence Goldman. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/10018> [accessed 26 Feb 2014].
- Marshall, Peter. *The Catholic priesthood and the English Reformation*. Oxford historical monographs. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994.
- Martin, J. W. 'English Protestant Separatism at Its Beginnings: Henry Hart and the Free-Will Men.' *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 7, no. 2 (1976): 55-74.
- Mateer, David. 'Boys, John (bap. 1571, d. 1625).' In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed. Edited by Lawrence Goldman. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/3144> [accessed 16 March 2014].

- _____. 'Marbeck , John (c.1505–1585?).' In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed. Edited by Lawrence Goldman. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/18026> [accessed 28 Feb 2014].
- McCulloh, Gerald W. *Christ's person and life-work in the theology of Albrecht Ritschl: with special attention to munus triplex*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1990.
- McGiffert, Michael. 'Bulkeley, Peter (1583–1659).' In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed. Edited by Lawrence Goldman. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/3901> [accessed 13 July 2015].
- McGinnis, Timothy Scott. 'George Gifford and the reformation of the common sort: Puritan priorities in Elizabethan religious life.' PhD Thesis, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 2002.
- Merritt, J. F. 'Tuke, Thomas (1580/81–1657).' In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed. Edited by Lawrence Goldman. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/27809> [accessed 2 May 2014].
- Milton, Anthony. 'Willet, Andrew (1561/2–1621).' In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed. Edited by Lawrence Goldman. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/29445> [accessed 29 Oct 2013].
- Milward, Peter. *Religious controversies of the Jacobean age: a survey of printed sources*. London: Scolar Press, 1978.
- _____. 'Kellison, Matthew (1561–1642).' In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed. Edited by Lawrence Goldman. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/15290> [accessed 2 May 2014].
- Moody, Michael E. "'A Man of a Thousand": The Reputation and Character of Henry Ainsworth, 1569/70-1622.' *Huntington Library Quarterly* 45, no. 3 (1982): 200-214.
- _____. 'The Apostasy of Henry Ainsworth: A Case Study in Early Separatist Historiography.' *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 131, no. 1 (1987): 15-31.
- _____. 'Ainsworth, Henry (1569–1622).' In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed. Edited by Lawrence Goldman. Oxford: Oxford

University Press, 2004, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/240> [accessed 6 March 2013].

_____. 'Browne, Robert (1550?–1633).' In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed. Edited by Lawrence Goldman. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/3695> [accessed 11 Nov 2013].

_____. 'Johnson, Francis (bap. 1562, d. 1617).' In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed. Edited by Lawrence Goldman. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/14877> [accessed 9 Sept 2013].

Morgan, Edmund Sears. *Visible saints: the history of a Puritan idea*. Ithaca, NY: New York University Press, 1963.

Morgan, John. *Godly Learning: Puritan Attitudes Towards Reason, Learning and Education 1560-1640*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.

Mullan, David George. 'Forbes, Patrick, of Corse (1564–1635).' In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed. Edited by Lawrence Goldman. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/9843> [accessed 16 March 2014].

Muller, Richard A. 'Covenant and conscience in English Reformed theology: three variations on a 17th century theme.' *Westminster Theological Journal* 42, no. 2 (1980): 308-334.

_____. *After Calvin: studies in the development of a theological tradition*. Oxford studies in historical theology. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

_____. 'Henry Ainsworth and the Development of Protestant Exegesis in the Early Seventeenth Century.' In *After Calvin: studies in the development of a theological tradition, 156-174*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

_____. 'Reflections on persistent Whiggism and its antidotes in the study of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century intellectual history.' In *Seeing things their way: intellectual history and the return of religion*, 134-153. Notre Dame: Univ of Notre Dame Press, 2009.

Ney, J. 'Ursinus, Zacharias.' In *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, online ed., <http://www.deutsche-biographie.de/ppn118803573.html> [accessed 7 May 2015].

Nuttall, Geoffrey F. *The Holy Spirit in Puritan Faith and Experience*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.

- _____. *Visible Saints: the Congregational Way, 1640-1660*. 2nd ed. Oswestry: Quinta, 2002.
- O'Collins, Gerald, and Michael Keenan Jones. *Jesus our priest: a Christian approach to the priesthood of Christ*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- O'Day, Rosemary. *The English clergy: the emergence and consolidation of a profession, 1558-1642*. Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1979.
- Orchard, Stephen. 'Congregationalism and Catholicity.' *International Congregational Journal* 8, no. 2 (2009): 104-119.
- Ortlund, Gavin. 'Resurrected as Messiah: the risen Christ as prophet, priest, and king.' *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 54, no. 4 (2011): 749-766.
- Otto, Randall E. 'Baptism and the munus triplex.' *Evangelical Quarterly* 76, no. 3 (2004): 217-225.
- Pannenberg, Wolfhart. *Systematic Theology*. 3 vols. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1991.
- Parr, Anthony. 'Nixon, Anthony (fl. 1592–1616).' In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed. Edited by Lawrence Goldman. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/20206> [accessed 2 May 2014].
- Partee, Charles. 'Calvin's Central Dogma Again.' *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 18, no. 2 (1987): 191-200.
- Pauck, Wilhelm. 'Luther and the Reformation.' *Theology Today* 3, no. 3 (1946): 314-327.
- Pauls, Peter. "'A Pestiferous Sect": The Anabaptists in England from 1530-1660.' *Journal of Mennonite Studies* 3, (1985): 60-72.
- Peterson, Robert A. *Calvin and the atonement*. Revised ed. Fearn, Ross-shire: Mentor, 1999.
- Poe, Harry L. 'From ecclesiology to eschatology: the changing Puritan understanding of the reign of Christ.' In *Looking into the future*, 157-173. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2001.
- Powell, Hunter. 'The Dissenting Brethren and the Power of the Keys, 1640-1644.' PhD Thesis, University of Cambridge, 2011.
- Powicke, Fred J. *Henry Barrow Separatist (1550?-1593) and the exiled church of Amsterdam (1593-1622)*. London: J. Clarke, 1900.

- Prior, Charles W. A. *Defining the Jacobean Church: the politics of religious controversy, 1603-1625*. Cambridge studies in early modern British history. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Reason, Joyce. *Henry Barrowe, 1550-1593, and John Greenwood, - 1593*. Heritage biographies. London: Independent Press, 1961.
- Rester, Todd M. 'Translator's Introduction.' *Journal of Markets & Morality* 14, no. 1 (2011): 235-244.
- Reynolds, Matthew. *Godly reformers and their opponents in early modern England: religion in Norwich, c.1560-1643*. Studies in modern British religious history. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2005.
- Richardson, William. 'Bilson, Thomas (1546/7–1616).' In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed. Edited by Lawrence Goldman. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/2401> [accessed 10 March 2014].
- Riggenbach, Bernhard. 'Polanus von Polansdorf, Amandus.' In *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, online ed., [://www.deutsche-biographie.de/ppn117688584.html](http://www.deutsche-biographie.de/ppn117688584.html) [accessed 7 May 2015 2015].
- Rittgers, Ronald K. *The reformation of the keys: confession, conscience, and authority in sixteenth-century Germany*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2004.
- Rogers, Mark. 'A dangerous idea? Martin Luther, E. Y. Mullins, and the priesthood of all believers.' *Westminster Theological Journal* 72, no. 1 (2010): 119-134.
- Ross, H. Chris. 'Puritanism's Ascetic Pedigree: Catholic Treatises and Protestant "Counterpoisons" in Early Modern England.' PhD Thesis, University of Edinburgh, 2009.
- Schaff, Philip, ed. *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*. Edited by Samuel Macauley Jackson. Vol. VI. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1953.
- Seaver, Paul S. *The Puritan lectureships: the politics of religious dissent 1560-1662*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1970.
- Selement, George. 'The Covenant Theology of English Separatism and the Separation of Church and State.' *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 41, no. 1 (1973): 66-74.

- Skinner, Quentin. 'Meaning and Understanding in the History of Ideas.' *History and Theory*, no. 1 (1969): 3-53.
- Smith, Dwight C. 'Robert Browne, Independent.' *Church History* 6, no. 4 (1937): 289-349.
- Sommerville, Margaret Ruth. 'Independent thought, 1603-1649.' PhD Thesis, University of Cambridge, 1982.
- Spinks, Bryan D. *From the Lord and "the best Reformed churches": a study of the eucharistic liturgy in the English Puritan and Separatist traditions, 1550-1633*. Bibliotheca "Ephemerides liturgicae": Subsidia 33. Rome: C.L.V.-Edizioni liturgiche, 1984.
- Sprunger, Keith L. 'Robinson, John (1575/6?–1625).' In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed. Edited by Lawrence Goldman. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/23847> [accessed 29 August 2012].
- Stanglin, Keith D., and Thomas H. McCall. *Jacob Arminius: theologian of grace*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Stroup, George W. 'The relevance of the munus triplex for Reformed theology and ministry.' *Austin Seminary Bulletin (Faculty ed.)* 98, no. 9 (1983): 22-32.
- Taplin, Mark. 'Ochino, Bernardino (c.1487–1564/5).' In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed. Edited by Lawrence Goldman. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/20489> [accessed 1 May 2014].
- Taylor, Larissa. *Preachers and People in the Reformations and Early Modern Period*. Boston: Brill Academic, 2001.
- Tovey, Alan. 'Forms of Authority in the Theology of the Elizabethan Separatists.' BD Thesis, University of Oxford, 1991.
- _____. *Whatever Happened to the Separatists?: A Commemoration of the Martyrdom of Barrow, Greenwood and Penry 1593*. Congregational lecture. London: Congregational Memorial Hall trust, 1993.
- 'tradition, n.' In *Oxford English Dictionary*, online ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015, <http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/204302> [accessed 7 May 2015].
- Trinterud, Leonard J. 'The origins of Puritanism.' *Church History* 20, no. 1 (1951): 37-57.

- Tyacke, Nicholas. *Anti-Calvinists: the rise of English Arminianism c.1590-1640*. Oxford historical monographs. Oxford: Clarendon, 1987.
- Usher, Brett. 'Gifford, George (1547/8–1600).' In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed. Edited by Lawrence Goldman. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/10658> [accessed 29 Oct 2013].
- van Asselt, Willem J. 'Protestant Scholasticism: Some Methodological Considerations in the Study of its Development.' *Dutch Review of Church History / Nederlands Archief voor Kerkgeschiedenis* 81, no. 3 (2001): 265-274.
- _____. 'Scholasticism Revisited: Methodological Reflections on the Study of Seventeenth-Century Reformed Thought.' In *Seeing things their way: intellectual history and the return of religion*, 154-174. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2009.
- Van Til, L. John. *Liberty of conscience; the history of a Puritan idea*. Nutley, NJ: Craig Press, 1972.
- Von Rohr, John. 'Extra Ecclesiam Nulla Salus: An Early Congregational Version.' *Church History* 36, no. 2 (1967): 107-121.
- _____. *The covenant of grace in Puritan thought*. AAR studies in religion. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986.
- Wabuda, Susan. *Preaching during the English Reformation*. Pbk ed. Cambridge studies in early modern British history. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002. Reprint, 2008.
- Walsham, Alexandra. 'Clapham, Henoah (fl. 1585–1614).' In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed. Edited by Lawrence Goldman. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/5431> [accessed 29 Sept 2011].
- _____. 'The godly and popular culture.' In *The Cambridge companion to Puritanism*, edited by John Coffey and Paul Chang-Ha Lim, 277-293. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- _____. 'The Reformation and the Disenchantment of the World Reassessed.' *The Historical Journal* 51, no. 02 (2008): 497-528.
- Wandel, Lee Palmer. *The Eucharist in the Reformation: Incarnation and Liturgy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Webster, Tom. 'Sprint, John (d. 1623).' In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed. Edited by Lawrence Goldman. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/26181> [accessed 5 June 2014].

Weir, David A. *Early New England: a covenanted society*. Emory University studies in law and religion. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 2005.

Wenger, Thomas L. 'The new perspective on Calvin: responding to recent Calvin interpretations.' *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 50, no. 2 (2007): 311-328.

White, B. R. 'The development of the doctrine of the Church among the English separatists with especial reference to Robert Browne and John Smyth.' DPhil Thesis, University of Oxford, 1961.

_____. *The English Separatist Tradition: From the Marian Martyrs to the Pilgrim Fathers*. Oxford theological monographs. London: Oxford University Press, 1971.

Williams, David T. 'The four-fold office of Christ.' *Expository Times* 100, no. 4 (1989): 134-137.

_____. *The Office of Christ and Its Expression in the Church: Prophet, Priest, King*. Lewiston: Mellen Biblical Press, 1997.

Williams, George Huntston. "'Congregationalist" Luther and the free churches.' *Lutheran Quarterly* 19, no. 3 (1967): 283-295.

Wood, Susan K. *Sacramental orders*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2000.

Wright, Stephen. 'Loe, William (d. 1645).' In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed. Edited by Lawrence Goldman. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/16927> [accessed 6 June 2014].

_____. 'Parr, Elnathan (1577–1622).' In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed. Edited by Lawrence Goldman. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/21394> [accessed 6 June 2014].

_____. 'Pye, Thomas (d. 1609/10).' In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed. Edited by Lawrence Goldman. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/22922> [accessed 5 June 2014].

_____. 'Wilson, Thomas (1562/3–1622).' In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed. Edited by Lawrence Goldman. Oxford: Oxford

University Press, 2004, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/29689> [accessed 5 June 2014].

Wyclif, John, Alfred W. Pollard, and Charles Sayle. *Iohannis Wyclif Tractatus de officio regis*. New York: Minerva, 1966.

Yarbrough, Slayden A. 'Henry Jacob, A Moderate Separatist, And His Influence On Early English Congregationalism.' PhD Thesis, Baylor University, 1972.

_____. 'Ecclesiastical development in theory and practice of John Robinson and Henry Jacob.' *Perspectives in Religious Studies* 5, no. 3 (1978): 183-197.

Yarnell, Malcolm B. 'Royal Priesthood in the English Reformation.' DPhil Thesis, University of Oxford, 2000.

_____. *Royal Priesthood in the English Reformation*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2013.

Yoder, John Howard. *Preface to theology: christology and theological method*. Grand Rapids, MI: Brazos Press, 2002.

Yoder, Michael L., Michael G. Lee, Jonathan Ro, and Robert J. Priest. 'Understanding Christian identity in terms of bounded and centered set theory in the writings of Paul G. Hiebert.' *Trinity Journal* 30, no. 2 (2009): 177-188.

Young, William. 'The Second Commandment: The Principle that God is to be Worshipped Only in Ways Prescribed in Holy Scripture and that the Holy Scripture Prescribes the Whole Content of Worship, Taught by Scripture Itself.' In *Worship in the presence of God*, edited by David C. Lachman, Frank Joseph Smith and James E. Bordwine, 75-90. Greenville, N.C.: Greenville Seminary Press, 1992.

Yule, George. 'Theological developments in Elizabethan Puritanism.' *Journal of Religious History* 1, no. 1 (1960): 16-25.

_____. 'Continental patterns and the Reformation in England and Scotland.' *Scottish Journal of Theology* 22, no. 3 (1969): 305-323.

_____. 'Calvin's View of the Ministry of the Church.' In *The ministry: clerical and lay; papers read at the 1988 Summer Meeting and the 1989 Winter Meeting of the Ecclesiastical History Society*, edited by Ecclesiastical History Society. Summer Meeting Magdalene College Cambridge (1988), W. J. Sheils, Diana Wood and Ecclesiastical History Society. Winter Meeting, 167-176. Oxford: Published for the Ecclesiastical History Society by Basil Blackwell, 1989.

Zaret, David. *The Heavenly Contract: Ideology and Organization in Pre-Revolutionary Puritanism*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985.