

Winter 2017

## Through Another's Eyes: The Reception of Luther Among Early English Baptists

Jonathan W. Arnold  
*Cedarville University*, [jwarnold@cedarville.edu](mailto:jwarnold@cedarville.edu)

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.cedarville.edu/biblical\\_and\\_ministry\\_studies\\_publications](https://digitalcommons.cedarville.edu/biblical_and_ministry_studies_publications)

---

### Recommended Citation

Arnold, Jonathan W., "Through Another's Eyes: The Reception of Luther Among Early English Baptists" (2017). *Biblical and Theological Studies Faculty Publications*. 557.  
[https://digitalcommons.cedarville.edu/biblical\\_and\\_ministry\\_studies\\_publications/557](https://digitalcommons.cedarville.edu/biblical_and_ministry_studies_publications/557)

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@Cedarville, a service of the Centennial Library. It has been accepted for inclusion in Biblical and Theological Studies Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@Cedarville. For more information, please contact [digitalcommons@cedarville.edu](mailto:digitalcommons@cedarville.edu).

# Through Another's Eyes: The Reception of Luther among Early English Baptists

*JONATHAN W. ARNOLD*

---

**Jonathan W. Arnold** is Assistant Professor of Christian Theology and Church History and the Director of *The Augustine Honors Collegium* at Boyce College, the undergraduate school of The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary. He earned his DPhil from Oxford University. Dr. Arnold also serves as a fellow of the Andrew Fuller Center for Baptist Studies and a visiting fellow of the Centre for Baptist History and Heritage at Oxford. He has published *The Reformed Theology of Benjamin Keach* (CBHH, 2013) and is currently working on projects focused on the theology of seventeenth century England. He and his wife, Lindsay, have four children.

In 1682, in the midst of a substantial polemical ministry, Benjamin Keach (1640-1704), the early leader of the association of churches that formulated and signed the so-called *Second London Confession of Faith* (1677), announced to what must have been an unsurprised readership his deep respect for the work of Martin Luther.

What Darkness did *Martin Luther* (that Star of the first Magnitude) drive away!  
That blessed Light which he afforded the World hath shone so gloriously, that  
the Devil, the Pope, and all their Adherents, notwithstanding all their Skill, have  
not been able to put out to this day.<sup>1</sup>

That glowing language—written over a century and a half after the dawning of the Reformation and repeated in various forms throughout the late

seventeenth century, did not—at least taken in isolation—believe the intense battle over the legacy of that earliest Reformation leader. However, as J. Wayne Baker has helpfully noted, even the most basic theological foundation of that Star of the Reformation, namely “the very idea of justification *sola fide, sola gratia*,” “was [by the 1680s] in bad repute: Luther’s doctrine of justification was upheld by only a few high Calvinists, dissenting Baptists and Independents.”<sup>2</sup> Baker argued his claim by detailing the far-reaching effects of the antinomian controversies that spanned seventeenth-century dissent, with the “high Calvinists” filling one side of the aisle and their opponents the other. Caught in the middle, Luther’s legacy was pulled to and fro and shaped according to the various views of the competing sides.<sup>3</sup> That very battle—the tug-of-war over Luther’s support—provides helpful insight into the respect with which the seventeenth-century Protestants viewed Luther. However, as will be seen in this article, the reception of Luther amongst one subsection of English Dissent—the seventeenth-century Baptists—proved to be far more complex than might appear on first glance.

### DOCTRINE OF JUSTIFICATION

For his part, Benjamin Keach represented that group of theologians who wholeheartedly adopted what they viewed as Luther’s understanding of justification *sola fide* and *sola gratia*. This understanding placed Keach squarely in the midst of the antinomian debates that plagued the English theological landscape, with Keach publishing no fewer than a half dozen works directly aimed at the second rendition of those debates, making him the most vocal Baptist among those labeled variously as “Antinomians,” “solafideists,” or “Crisprians” for their perceived agreement with Tobias Crisp (1600-1643), whose sermons, re-packaged and re-published in 1690, precipitated the second incarnation of the antinomian controversy. In the midst of those debates, Keach teased out his understanding of Luther’s core doctrine with a nod to Luther but also with a willingness to step beyond the mere language of his esteemed predecessor. In that vein, Keach saw fit to move the discussion away from the identifiably Lutheran concept of justification *sola fide, sola gratia*—with which he certainly agreed—to one which could better be described as justification *solo Christus*. In other words, faith, by itself, can not be said to justify; rather only “Jesus Christ that Faith takes hold of [could]

... Justifie us in the Sight of God.”<sup>4</sup> Though Keach only briefly mentioned Luther in that cited work—*The Display of glorious grace*, elsewhere he credited Luther for his understanding of justification.

Benjamin Keach certainly did not stand alone among Baptists with this reading of Luther. Keach's friend and fellow London pastor, Hanserd Knollys (1599?-1691), signed the introductory letter to the 1690 publication of Tobias Crisp's sermons. The signatories of that letter purported to do nothing more than verify the authenticity of the sermons included in the publication, but the theology of those signatories closely aligned with that of Crisp and rendered many of them, including Knollys, vulnerable to the pejorative “Crispian” charge. Knollys, like Keach, however, did not buy into the full version of antinomianism as identified by Crisp's opponents.<sup>5</sup> In addition, Thomas Edwards (d. 1699), another Particular Baptist divine, found himself dismissed as nothing more than an antinomian due to his views of justification by faith alone which he attributed to Luther in his 1699 attack on Baxterianism, entitled *The paraselene dismantled of her cloud*. In that work, Edwards aligned himself with Luther on numerous occasions even agreeing that he, alongside Luther, “could overlook many things in the Romanists, were they but clear and stedfast in this point of Justification.”<sup>6</sup>

To be fair, each of these Particular Baptist theologians identified the Lutheran concept of justification by grace alone through faith alone as being one of the “principles of divine truths, or fundamentals of Christian Faith,”<sup>7</sup> but they also highlighted the ever-present corrective that the faith which justifies is not alone.<sup>8</sup> The Particular Baptists even dogmatized this view in their *Second London Confession*:

Faith thus receiving and resting on Christ and his righteousness, is the alone instrument of justification; yet is not alone in the person justified, but is ever accompanied with all other saving graces, and is no dead faith, but works by love.<sup>9</sup>

That corrective certainly echoed Luther's own teaching that “works are necessary for salvation, but they do not cause salvation, because faith alone gives life.”<sup>10</sup> Evidently, the early iteration of the English antinomian controversies spurred this group of Baptists to re-consider their official stance on the necessity of works, because the updated and expanded version of the *First London Confession*, published in 1646, did not include a reciprocal statement.

On that issue, the Particular Baptists may have been behind the times. As early as 1624, Richard Montagu (d. 1641), later named Bishop of Norwich, observed not only that “Faith without Charity doth not iustifie” but also that this maxim could be heard “in euery Protestants mouth.”<sup>11</sup> This ever-present maxim even crossed the well-known divide between predestinarian and anti-predestinarian baptists. Henry Denne (1606?-1660), associated from 1643 with the anti-predestinarian wing of the Baptists, came under fire for his adoption of what Richard Baxter (1615-1691) referred to as a mere accident of “the heat of [Luther’s] Spirit,” namely the “mak[ing of] Christs own personal Righteousness in it self to be every Believers own by Imputation.”<sup>12</sup> In his writings, Denne sought desperately to prove that the gospel is no new law. According to Denne, the true gospel did not attempt to sell Christ “unto us, upon certeine conditions, by us to be performed.”<sup>13</sup> The commonly-held understanding of “Christ [being] made ours (*in the sight of God*) by Faith alone”<sup>14</sup> did not sit well with Denne who feared that this view placed some conditions upon the receipt of Christ. Echoes of Luther could be heard loud and clear when Denne “therefore professe[d] [him] selfe openly . . . that Christs righteousnesse is made ours *Coram Deo, before God*, by Gods imputation, before the act of our Faith, and therefore necessarily without it. Even as our sins were made Christs, so is his righteousnesse made ours.”<sup>15</sup> Or, in Luther’s words,

all they [the believing soul and Christ] have becomes theirs in common, as well good things as evil things; so that whatsoever Christ possesses, that the believing soul may take to itself and boast of as its own, and whatever belongs to the soul, that Christ claims as His.<sup>16</sup>

Faith, thus, could be said to justify only in so much as “we take Faith for the object of our Faith (that is Christ),”<sup>17</sup> or merely “*declaratively*, speaking to our Consciences, that we are the children of God, in Christ Iesus.”<sup>18</sup> In the end, Denne’s understanding of justification *sola fide*—or better, his understanding of justification *solo Christus*—aligned even closer to this aspect of Luther than many of his predestinarian colleagues. After all, Luther ascribed to the dreaded Papists and Anabaptists the error “that the worke of God dependeth upon the worthines of the person.”<sup>19</sup> Ironically, this position left Denne vulnerable to attacks from both sides of the theological aisle: dismissed as

an antinomian who had no use for the work of humanity, on the one hand, and as an Arminian who left no place for the work of God, on the other.<sup>20</sup>

Even Thomas Grantham (1634-1692), the prominent Messenger of the General Baptists, agreed with this rendering of Luther, arguing for an imputation of both Christ's passive and active righteousness in order for the sinner to be justified. Grantham argued, in true Lutheran fashion, the fact "[t]hat God imputes Righteousness to Men without Works, is so plain, that it can never be denied."<sup>21</sup> Grantham's understanding of *iustitia dei* left him arguing that God "is more just than to impute us Righteous, if indeed there were no Righteousness to be imputed to Sinners."<sup>22</sup> By this, Grantham meant the righteousness of Christ must become inherent in the believer or, in Grantham's words:

It is manifest that such as have Faith in *Christ*, shall not be saved unless they have the Life of Faith.<sup>23</sup>

Grantham combined this necessity of inherent righteousness with his own understanding of human depravity and personal inability to develop an idiosyncratic Lutheran understanding of justification *sola fide, sola gratia*.

Based on that understanding, Grantham sought to correct the views of some of his fellow General Baptists whose apparent attempts to avoid (or contradict) antinomianism left their teaching of justification by faith severely lacking in Grantham's eyes. Samuel Loveday (1619-1677), the pastor of the congregation which met at Tower Hill, for instance, argued that a person could be "declared just [solely] upon the account of pardon and non-imputation of sin,"<sup>24</sup> leaving Christ's active righteousness out of the equation altogether. Loveday intended this theological move in a Baxterian sense, ostensibly allowing God to accept the imperfect righteousness of the believer rather than still requiring perfect obedience because perfect obedience could only come from God himself. For Grantham, this view of God's relaxed requirements denied essential aspects of God's being.

In a similar vein, John Griffith (1622-1700), the General Baptist elder from London, also required correction as he argued that "justification, union and salvation are conditional"<sup>25</sup> and based upon "faith [which] is an act of the creature,"<sup>26</sup> thereby undermining justification *sola gratia*. The General Baptist congregations who, in 1660, signed the confession entitled *A Brief*

*Confession or Declaration of Faith* but more commonly known as *The Standard Confession*, followed Grantham's "Lutheran" understanding:

... yet confident we are, that the purpose of God according to election, was not in the least arising from fore-seen faith in, or works of righteousness done by the creature, but only from the mercy, goodness, and compassion dwelling in God, and so it is of him that calleth, ... whose purity and unwordable holiness, cannot admit of any unclean person (or thing) to be in his presence.<sup>27</sup>

Thus, an official position of the General Baptists could rightly be described as a Grantham-Lutheran rendering in which God remains exalted as holy and righteous, and the justified human *actually becomes* righteous only after an imputation of Christ's perfect obedience.

#### **THE SINFUL REGENERATE: THE KEY DISTINCTION**

Despite some shared views of Lutheran justification spanning the otherwise-usual doctrinal divides of the nascent Baptist world, Grantham's explication of inherent righteousness within the regenerate proved to be the key dividing line. Benjamin Keach again gave voice to the Particular Baptist view by maintaining a clear separation between justification—based solely on imputed, alien righteousness—and sanctification, the process of becoming holy. "We also infer," Keach averred, "that *new Obedience*, and holy a [sic] Conversation, tho' it be part of our Sanctification, yet it is no part of our Justification."<sup>28</sup> Keach, thus, worked hard both to avoid and to combat the error of "confound[ing] Justification with Sanctification" which left "no Believer ... compleat, or without sin in point of Justification in this life."<sup>29</sup> Keach's fellow signatories to the *Second London Confession* agreed wholeheartedly:

This sanctification is throughout the whole man, yet imperfect in this life; there abides still some remnants of corruption in every part, wherefrom arises a continual and irreconcilable war; the flesh lusting against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh.<sup>30</sup>

Significantly, this reality persists throughout the life of the "believing Sinner"—an important designation, in and of itself.<sup>31</sup> For these divines,

righteousness comes alone through Christ as a completed act of justification. The process of developing an inherent holiness, the process of sanctification, is an imperfect one. “[T]here is no other way it can be said to be fulfilled in us, but by imputation.”<sup>32</sup> In the midst of the early antinomian controversy, Hanserd Knollys concurred, extolling his audience to examine their own hearts continuously for the sin which certainly remains. Thus, Knollys prayed that his preaching would “occasion a deep Humiliation, and godly sorrow in believers for their unholinesse, carnalnesse, and sinfulness in heart or life.”<sup>33</sup> Knollys, like Keach, understood the saint to be a believing sinner.

Neither did Thomas Edwards neglect this Lutheran aspect of theology. Agreeing with his reading of the first generation reformer, Edwards noted “that there is some Blemish, Imperfection, and Desert, even in the best Works of the Saints.”<sup>34</sup> In Luther’s words, then, the believer remains *simul iustus et peccator*. Or, more specifically,

[s]ince the saints are always aware of their sin, and seek righteousness from God according to his mercy, they are always reckoned as righteous by God. Thus in their own eyes, and in truth, they are unrighteous. But God reckons them as righteous because of the confession of their sin. In reality, they are sinners; however, they are righteous by the reckoning of a merciful God. Unknowingly, they are righteous; knowingly, they are unrighteous. They are sinners in reality, but righteous in hope.<sup>35</sup>

Edwards delved further into the ramifications of this reading of Luther, considering the role of inherent righteousness in the life of the believer. Neither Edwards nor the Particular Baptists denied the existence of that “infused Charity in the Faithful,”<sup>36</sup> but they did adamantly deny both that those works of righteousness in any way caused justification and that the believer could be, in any way, purely righteous. With most of the Particular Baptists, this understanding of the believing sinner was fortified by a concept of the new covenant whose conditions were fulfilled completely by Christ, leaving nothing dependent upon the works of the mere human participant. According to this Luther-echoing view, God must provide everything for the unregenerate, even the faith by which one apprehends Christ.<sup>37</sup>

Thomas Grantham and many of the General Baptist congregations, on the other hand, presented a contrasting view, differing from the early reformer



over the issue of inherent righteousness. While Luther's understanding of human nature meant that justification was always based on alien righteousness—even for the regenerate, for Grantham and the General Baptists, God's acceptance of the believer stemmed—at least in part—from the individual's inherent righteousness. Even the moderate *Standard Confession* ended the previously-cited section by clarifying that God “cannot admit of any unclean person (or thing) to be in his presence, therefore his decree of mercy reaches only the **godly man**, whom (saith David) God hath set apart for himself,”<sup>38</sup> a concept with which the Particular Baptists had difficulty agreeing, at least arguably due to their reading of Luther. Likewise, Grantham's efforts to avoid the charges of antinomianism leveled against many of his fellow Baptists led to an emphasis on human response as the basis for continued inclusion in the covenant relationship with God. At some point, then, faith became a possible human addition to God's grace which, in his view, had “released [humanity] from the power of the fall.”<sup>39</sup> To be fair, Grantham did present contradictory views, at times—perhaps an echo of Luther's own sometimes-contradictory theological teachings. Specifically, Luther could, on the one hand, speak of the *always* alien righteousness of the believer while, at the same time, hold to a view of the inexplicable union of Christ with the believing soul which could reinforce Grantham's argument.

Thus the believing soul, by the pledge of its faith in Christ, becomes free from all sin, fearless of death, safe from hell, and endowed with the eternal righteousness, life, and salvation of its husband Christ.<sup>40</sup>

For a divine consciously avoiding any appearance of antinomianism, such as Grantham, that reading of Luther could only mean that the believing soul actually obtained and lived out some form of inherent righteousness.

Even on this theological locus, however, the Baptist distinctions were less than rigid. The General Baptist confession known as *The Orthodox Creed*—a confession adopted by the congregations in Buckinghamshire, Hertfordshire, Bedfordshire, and Oxfordshire—emphasized the imputation of “the Active and Passive Obedience of Christ ... [by which] we have deliverance from the Guilt and Punishment of all our Sins, and are accounted Righteous before God, at the Throne of Grace, by the alone Righteousness of Christ the Mediator, imputed, or reckoned unto us through Faith.”<sup>41</sup> That justification

necessarily leads to a union with Christ by which believers are “more and more quickened and strengthened in all saving Graces, in the practice of Holiness . . . And this Sanctification is throughout the whole Man though imperfect in this Life, there abiding still in the best Saints, some remnants of Corruption.”<sup>42</sup> According to this General Baptist confession of faith, the justified saint remains always a sinner.

### QUOTATIONS OF LUTHER?

Despite the debates over core Lutheran issues and a healthy respect for the Reformer, himself, the Baptists as a whole did not turn to Luther as an authority with any noticeable regularity. Even those accused of antinomianism—a debate which spotlighted Luther’s theology thanks to his role in the continental version of those debates in the sixteenth century—relied far more on other theologians—usually Reformed English divines—as authorities. For instance, in his more than four dozen publications, Benjamin Keach only mentioned Luther approximately one hundred times.<sup>43</sup> In almost every instance, Luther merely served as a heroic example for the faithful, a great preacher in the vein of Waldo,<sup>44</sup> and only rarely as a source of authority.<sup>45</sup> Interestingly, Keach’s specific references of Luther—including in his 1692 work entitled *The marrow of true justification* whose formal title included, “Justificatio est Doctrina stantis & cadentis Ecclesiae, saith Luther,”<sup>46</sup> found Keach relying more on secondary works than on Luther’s own publications. John Troughton (1637-1681), the Oxford-based nonconformist, for instance, provided Keach a set of lenses for reading Luther through his entry in the antinomian pamphlet war entitled *Lutherus redivivus* (1677), which focused solely on reclaiming Troughton’s vision of the Lutheran doctrine of justification by faith alone. Of the direct quotations of Luther, Keach culled the vast majority from Luther’s commentary on Galatians—something of an obvious choice given this particular debate. Keach’s fellow combatant in the antinomian debates, Thomas Edwards, followed largely the same path, citing Luther as a main source occasionally but also reading Luther through the work of secondary sources, especially Troughton.

Beyond Keach and Edwards, English Baptists were far less likely even to reference Luther let alone to quote him directly. In his 485-page magnum opus, the early Baptist systematic theology entitled *Christianismus primitivus*,

Thomas Grantham referred to Luther on only three different occasions: two of them focusing on Luther's historical importance and the other on an issue in the Psalms not related to the controversial Lutheran theology—despite discussing obvious issues of Lutheran import. Earlier in the century, Henry Denne set the pace for his compatriots by idolizing Luther as something of a prophet but neglecting to interact with his works at a scholarly level. Few of his Baptist compatriots in the following generation ventured beyond those boundaries.

To be fair, the lack of direct reference to Luther could have stemmed in part from an apparent lack of available resources—especially for those cut off from the university libraries. Subscription libraries—such as the one held at the Barbican by the end of the seventeenth century—provided some access for dissenters; however, those libraries were necessarily limited by donations from booksellers and publishers who were simply not printing Martin Luther's works.<sup>47</sup> The seventeenth century as a whole only saw the publication of a few dozen books attributed to Martin Luther with a large number of those being separate editions of the same work—often his commentary on Galatians. While this fact is not shocking given the animated death of Lutheran England only a few decades prior, the sudden lack of available resources in the marketplace—evidently even the underground version—suggests a more thorough cleansing than is often acknowledged. The result, at least in Baptist circles, proved to be less effective in removing the apparent blot of Luther than in simply removing the ability to cite an “authentic Luther.” The Luther of the English Baptists, at least, became a helpful weapon in the hands and minds of any number of theologians who—even with integrity—could summon the Luther of their memory, complete with their own theological slants and unencumbered by the weight of original proofs.

## CONCLUSION

Almost to a person, Baptists of all ilks did indeed revere Luther as a trailblazer, an important “Device” in the hand of God,<sup>48</sup> even while avoiding any reliance upon his pen. Baptists often hailed “holy Luther”<sup>49</sup> as the bold prophet of Wormes,<sup>50</sup> the “famous Protestant Reformer,”<sup>51</sup> and the personification of the light of the reformation.<sup>52</sup> But, for one reason or another, they simply did not view Luther as an active theological interlocutor.<sup>53</sup> Despite this neglect,

the English Baptists certainly proved themselves to be capable purveyors of their conception of Luther's *iustitia dei* and its closely-related counterpart *simul iustus et peccator*, thus demonstrating that Baker's claim that justification *sola fide, sola gratia* had been limited to the high Calvinists by the 1680s does not hold true for this significant subsection of English Dissent. Within this group, theologians on both sides of the quinquarticular divide could be classified as bearing the Lutheran torch, claiming to follow in his perceived legacy despite not fighting specifically for his name. Collectively, the Baptists consistently demonstrated an awareness of the Reformations-era debates, mining the legacy of this Reformer—and others—for theological truths which could buttress their views. No matter how closely they aligned, however, the Baptists were careful not to adopt wholesale views or uncritiqued traditions—those attached to Luther being no more (or less) of an exception to this rule than the views of Owen or Baxter or even of Calvin.

- 
- <sup>1</sup> Benjamin Keach and Thomas De Laune, *Troposchēmologia* (London, 1682).
  - <sup>2</sup> J. Wayne Baker, "Sola Fide, Sola Gratia: The Battle for Luther in the Seventeenth-Century England," *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 16:1 (1985): 115-133.
  - <sup>3</sup> For further discussion of this issue, see especially Alec Ryrie, "The Strange Death of Lutheran England," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 53:1 (2002): 64-92. Also see H. J. Selderhuis and J. Marius J. Lange van Ravenswaay, eds., *Luther and Calvinism: Image and Reception of Martin Luther in the History and Theology of Calvinism* (Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2017).
  - <sup>4</sup> Benjamin Keach, *The Display of Glorious Grace* (London, 1698), 81. Cf. Jonathan W. Arnold, *The Reformed Theology of Benjamin Keach (1640-1704)* (Oxford: Centre for Baptist History and Heritage, 2013), 194-96.
  - <sup>5</sup> See Barry Howson's doctoral dissertation for a full discussion of Knollys' theology of justification. Barry H. Howson, "The Question of Orthodoxy in the Theology of Hanserd Knollys (c. 1599-1691): A Seventeenth-Century English Calvinistic Baptist," PhD Thesis (McGill University, 1999), esp. 119-33.
  - <sup>6</sup> Thomas Edwards, *The Paraselene Dismantled of Her Cloud* (London, 1699), 24.
  - <sup>7</sup> Benjamin Keach, *The Travels of True Godliness*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. (London, 1684), 3.
  - <sup>8</sup> See *Second London Confession*, Art. XI.
  - <sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, ch. 11.2.
  - <sup>10</sup> Martin Luther, *Luther's Works* (WA) 39/L.96.6-8.
  - <sup>11</sup> Richard Montagu, *A Gagg for the New Gospell?* (London, 1624), 145. For a further discussion of this issue, see Jonathan W. Arnold, "The British Antinomian Controversies," *Journal of the Grace Evangelical Society* 25 (49) (2012): 37-53.
  - <sup>12</sup> Richard Baxter, *A Treatise of Justifying Righteousness* (London, 1676), 15.
  - <sup>13</sup> Henry Denne, *The Doctrine and Conversation of Iohn Baptist* (London, 1642), 34.
  - <sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, 35.
  - <sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, 35-36.
  - <sup>16</sup> Martin Luther, *Christian Liberty* (Lutheran Publication Society, 1903), 17.
  - <sup>17</sup> Denne, *The Doctrine and Conversation of Iohn Baptist*, 36.
  - <sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, 37.
  - <sup>19</sup> Martin Luther, *Commentary on Galatians* (1588) (London, 1588), Biiiv.
  - <sup>20</sup> Thomas Edwards, *The First and Second Part of Gangraena* (London, 1646), i.23. For a discussion of the fight

over Luther within the antinomian debates of the seventeenth century, see 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 Thomas Grantham, *Christianism Primitivus* (London, 1678), Book II, Chap. 3, Sect. VII, 67.
- 22 *Ibid.*
- 23 Thomas Grantham, *The Prisoner Against the Prelate* (London, 1662), 58.
- 24 Samuel Loveday, *Personal Reprobation Reprobated* (London, 1676), 34.
- 25 John Griffith, *A Treatise Touching Falling from Grace* (London, 1653), 8.
- 26 John Griffith, *Gods Oracle Christs Doctrine* (London, 1655), 17.
- 27 *The Standard Confession*, Art. VIII.
- 28 Benjamin Keach, *Gospel Mysteries Unveil'd* (London, 1701), Book I, 106.
- 29 *Ibid.*
- 30 *Second London Confession*, Chapter 13.2.
- 31 Benjamin Keach, *The Marrow of True Justification* (London, 1692), 16.
- 32 Benjamin Keach, *A Medium Betwixt Two Extremes* (London, 1698), 47.
- 33 Hanserd Knollys, *Christ Exalted* (London, 1646), 35.
- 34 Edwards, *The Paraselene Dismantled*, 322.
- 35 WA 56.269.26-30. Luther on Romans 4:7.
- 36 Edwards, *The Paraselene Dismantled*, 326.
- 37 *Second London Confession*, Chapter 11.1. See the discussion in Theodore Dwight Bozeman, *The Precisianist Strain: Disciplinary Religion & Antinomian Backlash in Puritanism to 1638* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2004), esp. Ch. 1. Unfortunately, Bozeman's discussion of Luther far too often falls victim to a monolithic and overly-simplistic reading.
- 38 *The Standard Confession*, Art. VIII.
- 39 Clint Bass, *Thomas Grantham (1633-1692) and General Baptist Theology* (Oxford: Centre for Baptist History and Heritage, Regent's Park College, 2013), 149, 162.
- 40 Luther, *Christian Liberty*, 18.
- 41 *Orthodox Creed*, Article XXIV.
- 42 *Ibid.*, Article XXVI.
- 43 By contrast, John Eaton's work at the center of the first incarnation of the antinomian controversy, *The Honey-Combe of Free Justification* (1642) included more than a hundred citations of Luther within its 484 pages.
- 44 Benjamin Keach, *Antichrist Stormed* (London, 1689), 176.
- 45 By contrast, Keach cites John Owen some 500 times with the vast majority of those being actual quotations from Owen's works. Only approximately a dozen of Keach's references to Luther are actual citations.
- 46 Keach, *The Marrow of True Justification*, title page.
- 47 17th century records from these private libraries are scant and often disorganized. The extant records from the Barbican library list works by Matthew Henry, John Owen, Matthew Poole, Henry Ainsworth, Charles Marie de Veil, Archbishop Ussher, and Thomas Goodwin. They do not list any works by Martin Luther.
- 48 Grantham, *Christianism Primitivus*, Book IV, 87.
- 49 Keach, *Marrow of True Justification*, 28.
- 50 Benjamin Keach, *A Feast of Fat Things* (London, 1696), cent. II, 25.
- 51 Benjamin Keach, *Light Broke Forth in Wales* (London, 1696), 226.
- 52 Keach and De Laune, *Troposchēmologia*, 180-81.
- 53 This aligns with Theodore Dwight Bozeman's reading of the wider English theological landscape of the seventeenth century. Cf. Bozeman, *The Precisianist Strain*, esp. 144.