

Mark Jones

Why Heaven Kissed Earth

The Christology of the
Puritan Reformed Orthodox theologian,
Thomas Goodwin (1600–1680)

Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht



Reformed Historical Theology

Edited by
Herman J. Selderhuis

in co-operation with
Emidio Campi, Irene Dingel, Wim Janse,
Elsie McKee, Richard Muller

Volume 13

Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht

Mark Jones

Why Heaven Kissed Earth

The Christology of the Puritan Reformed
Orthodox theologian, Thomas Goodwin
(1600–1680)

Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht

Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet über <http://dnb.d-nb.de> abrufbar.

ISBN der gedruckten Ausgabe 978-3-525-56905-4

ISBN der elektronischen Ausgabe 978-3-647-56905-5

© 2010, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht GmbH & Co. KG, Göttingen/

Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht LLC, Oakville, CT, U.S.A.

www.v-r.de

Alle Rechte vorbehalten. Das Werk und seine Teile sind urheberrechtlich geschützt.

Jede Verwertung in anderen als den gesetzlich zugelassenen Fällen bedarf der

vorherigen schriftlichen Einwilligung des Verlages. Hinweis zu § 52a UrhG:

Weder das Werk noch seine Teile dürfen ohne vorherige schriftliche Einwilligung

des Verlages öffentlich zugänglich gemacht werden. Dies gilt auch bei einer

entsprechenden Nutzung für Lehr- und Unterrichtszwecke.

Printed in Germany.

Druck- und Bindung: ⊕ Hubert & Co, Göttingen.

Gedruckt auf alterungsbeständigem Papier.

Contents

Preface	11
Introduction	12
1. Status Quaestionis	15
1.1 The State of Goodwin Research	15
1.1.1 Introduction	15
1.1.2 “Transmission and transformation”	16
1.1.3 Printed Editions of Goodwin’s Works (1861–66 or 1691–1704?)	19
1.1.4 Early Scholarship	21
1.1.5 Later Scholarship	26
1.2 Trajectory of Argument	32
1.2.1 Statement of the Problem	32
1.2.2 Methodology	34
1.2.3 Outline	35
2. The Life of Goodwin in the Context of His Times	37
2.1 Introduction	37
2.2 His Life	38
2.2.1 Education and Conversion	38
2.2.2 Early Career	43
2.2.3 The Westminster Assembly	44
2.2.4 The Interregnum	46
2.2.5 The Restoration	49
2.3 Puritan, Calvinist, or Reformed?	52

2.3.1 Statement of the Problem	52
2.3.2 Conclusion	55
3. Influences and Opponents	56
3.1 Introduction	56
3.2 Influences	56
3.2.1 Reformed Divines	57
3.2.2 Early Church Fathers	59
3.2.3 “The Schoolmen”	60
3.2.4 Pagan Philosophers	62
3.3 Goodwin’s Theology in Historical Context.....	64
3.3.1 Anti-Papist.....	65
3.3.2 Anti-Socinian	69
3.3.3 Anti-Arminian.....	71
3.3.4 Conclusion	74
4. The Tie That Binds	75
4.1 Introduction	75
4.2 A Covenant Theologian	76
4.2.1 The Covenant of Works	77
4.2.2 The Covenant of Grace	80
4.3 Principles of Interpretation	86
4.3.1 The Authority of Scripture.....	86
4.3.2 Analogia Fidei.....	88
4.3.3 Sensus Literalis	90
4.3.4 Typology	92
4.3.5 Distinctio Sed Non Separatio	94
4.3.6 The Spirit and Reason	95

4.3.7 Conclusion	97
5. Knowledge of the Triune God.....	99
5.1 Introduction	99
5.2 The Godhead	101
5.2.1 One God, Three Persons	101
5.3 Exegetical Considerations.....	102
5.3.1 “Let us make man”.....	102
5.4 Essential Unity	105
5.4.1 Substance, Essence and Subsistence.....	105
5.4.2 Union and Communion (circumincessio).....	106
5.5 Personal Distinctions.....	108
5.5.1 Opera Trinitatis ad extra sunt indivisa	108
5.6 Special Questions.....	110
5.6.1 Eternal Generation	110
5.6.2 God-of-himself (Autotheos).....	112
5.6.3 Double Procession	116
5.6.4 Conclusion	121
6. The Pactum Salutis	123
6.1 Introduction	123
6.1.1 Origins.....	124
6.2 The Eternal Covenant of Redemption.....	127
6.2.1 Reconciliation to the Father	128
6.2.2 Eternal Salvation.....	130
6.2.3 The Necessity of the Atonement.....	131
6.2.4 The Appointment of the Son	134
6.2.5 Christ’s Acceptance of the Terms.....	135

6.2.6 Christ's Reward	137
6.2.7 The Role of the Spirit	139
6.2.8 Concluding the Covenant.....	144
6.2.9 Conclusion	145
7. The Person of Christ	146
7.1 Introduction	146
7.2 The Divine Son	147
7.2.1 The Word	148
7.2.2 The Son of God.....	150
7.2.3 The Necessity of Divinity	152
7.3 Of Christ the Mediator	154
7.3.1 Why the Son Must be Mediator	154
7.3.2 Why the Mediator Should be a Man	156
7.3.3 The Incarnation	158
7.3.4 Communicatio Idiomatum	160
7.3.5 Communicatio Operationum.....	163
7.3.6 The Work of the Spirit on Christ	165
7.3.7 Conclusion	168
8. The Work of Christ	171
8.1 Introduction	171
8.2 Christ's Consent.....	172
8.2.1 The Eternal Basis for Christ's Work.....	172
8.2.2 Christ's Renewal of Consent.....	173
8.3 "For he hath made him to be sin"	174
8.3.1 Vicarious Mediation.....	175
8.4 The Obedience of Christ for Justification	179

8.4.1 Christ's Obedience	179
8.4.2 The Whole Righteousness Imputed	180
8.4.3 The Merit of Christ's Obedience	184
8.4.4 Sufficiency and Efficiency	186
8.5 Christus Victor	188
8.5.1 Christ's Victory Over the Devil	190
8.5.2 Genesis 3:15	192
8.6 Christ Set Forth	196
8.6.1 In His Resurrection	196
8.6.2 In His Ascension and Sitting at God's Right Hand	198
8.6.3 In His Intercession	199
8.6.4 Conclusion	201
9. The Lord of Glory	202
9.1 Introduction	202
9.2 Native Glory	203
9.2.1 The Image of the Invisible God	203
9.2.2 Christ and the Decree	205
9.2.3 The Glory Before the World Was	206
9.2.4 The Highest Manifestation of Glory	209
9.2.5 One Universal Lord	210
9.3 Mediatorial Glory	214
9.3.1 Reward of the Spirit	215
9.3.2 The Glory of His Bride	216
9.3.3 Christ's Kingdom	218
9.3.4 Conclusion	221
10. Conclusion: Cur Deus Homo?	222

10.1 Summary of Argument	222
10.1.1 Introduction	222
10.2 Goodwin's Contribution to Reformed Orthodoxy.....	223
10.2.1 Goodwin's British Context	223
10.2.2 Goodwin's Christology.....	224
10.2.3 Goodwin in Wider Perspective	227
10.2.4 Conclusion	229
11. Appendix A: Justification from Eternity.....	230
11.1 Introduction	230
11.2 Goodwin on Eternal Justification	232
11.2.1 Introduction	232
11.2.2 Tria Momenta	232
11.2.3 Union with Christ.....	235
11.2.4 Antinomianism?.....	237
11.2.5 Conclusion	238
Bibliography.....	239
Goodwin's Works	239
Primary Sources	239
Secondary Sources	247
Index	253

Preface

This book on the Christology of Thomas Goodwin is the result of my two years of study at Leiden Universiteit (2007–2009). I have made only a few slight alterations. There are a number of people I would like to thank who made this book possible. My supervisor Professor dr. Ernestine van der Wall kindly took me on as her student at Leiden Universiteit. Her supervision exceeded all of my expectations and I can only say that it was a great honor to study under her. Professor van der Wall also brought Professor dr. Michael Haykin on as an assistant supervisor, which was also a great honor. His keen eye and constant encouragement contributed in no small part to the completion of this work. I would also like to thank my examiners, Professors Carl Trueman, Willem J. van Asselt, E.P. Meijering, and dr. Jan Buisman, for their helpful suggestions. In particular, Carl Trueman, for suggesting this topic to me a few years back; and Willem J. van Asselt for correcting my interpretation of a certain relatively unknown “figure.” Two friends of mine deserve special praise for their proof-reading help: Dr. Todd Pedlar and Mr. Ruben Zartman. They went far beyond the call of duty in many ways and at various times, and each read through the entire manuscript. Also, my congregation at Faith Vancouver Presbyterian Church were immensely patient with their minister in so many ways. A number of other friends made helpful suggestions to me along the way. They include: Hunter Powell, Ryan Kelly, D. Patrick Ramsey, Donald John MacLean, Brannon Ellis, Edwin Tay, Marty Foord, Gert van den Brink, Jed Schoepp, Crawford Gribben, Robert McKelvey, Mark Herzer, John Craig, Cas Stewart, and Paul Walker. Many thanks are due to Tina Grummel of Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht for her assistance in bringing this book to the press. A special thank-you to Professor Herman Selderhuis and the editors for including my work in this excellent series.

Finally, and most importantly, I would like to thank my family. First, to my parents, Kevin and Patricia, I owe a great deal of gratitude for their help to me over the past 29 years. Without their financial support and encouragement I would not have been in a place to write this preface. Second, to my wife, Barbara, and our children, Kaitlyn, Joshua, Thomas, and Matthew, I have been blessed by their love and patience towards me. They shared me with my congregation and with my studies; and so I dedicate this work to them all. “Quoniam ex ipso, et per ipsum, et in ipso sunt omnia: ipsi gloria in sæcula. Amen” (Rom 11:36).

Introduction

“Heaven and Earth met and kissed one another, namely, God and Man.”¹

General Scope of this Study

Fundamental to historic Christian doctrine is a correct understanding of the Jesus Christ. Given the claims that are made about the person of Christ and his work it is not surprising that the topic of Christology has been a much-vexed issue over the course of the centuries, both inside and outside the Christian tradition. In the seventeenth century the polemical situation bore important similarities to that of the fifth century when the Christology of the Chalcedonian Creed (451 A.D.) was received as orthodox Christian doctrine amidst several competing Christologies. As in the fifth century, the output of literature on the person and work of Christ in the seventeenth century, particularly in England, was prodigious. In the same way that we find a number of important studies on Christology during the Early Church, and even during the sixteenth century, we should naturally expect to find a great deal of secondary literature addressing the various trinitarian and Christological controversies that erupted during the seventeenth century. However, for various reasons, that is not the case. This study on the Christology of the Puritan and Reformed orthodox theologian, Thomas Goodwin (1600–1680), intends to fill an important gap in the area of seventeenth-century Protestant orthodoxy.

With perhaps the exception of John Owen (1616–1683), Goodwin’s corpus contains a greater amount of literary output on the person and work of Christ than that of any other English Puritan theologian. This study would need to be three or four times its current length in order to capture all of the various emphases and nuances of Goodwin’s Christology. The goal, however, is to answer a hugely important question framed in the eleventh century by Anselm of Canterbury: *Cur Deus Homo?* The answer to the question “Why did God become man?” has not always met with the same response. This monograph attempts to answer this question with particular reference to Goodwin, and how he relates to the broader Reformed interpretative tradition.

¹ *Works*, II, *Of the Knowledge of God the Father*, 82.

In short, the central argument of this study posits that Goodwin's Christology is grounded in, and flows out of, the eternal covenant of redemption, also known as the *pactum salutis* or "counsel of peace". That is to say, his Christology does not begin in the temporal realm at the incarnation, but stretches back into eternity when the persons of the Trinity covenanted to bring about the salvation of fallen mankind. Goodwin's Christology moves from the pretemporal realm to the temporal realm with a decidedly eschatological thrust, that is, with a view to the glory of the God-man, Jesus Christ. What this work does is connect two vital aspects of Reformed theology, namely, the doctrine of Christ and the concept of the covenant. The findings of this study show that, for Goodwin, Christ is the Christ of the covenant.

Because this is a study in historical theology, the first few chapters attempt to take seriously the context in which Goodwin wrote. His theology did not, of course, occur in a vacuum. Rather, both his concerns and emphases reflect the social, political, and theological climate of seventeenth-century England. More than that, there is a decided emphasis on descriptive-historical analysis in terms of understanding his theology, but not to the exclusion of advancing the aforementioned thesis that his Christology is the outworking of the *pactum salutis*. Whether he is right or wrong about his understanding of the person and work of Christ is beyond the scope of the present work. Questions of that nature are left to studies in systematic theology. The main point, rather, is to understand what Goodwin said about Christology and why he said it in the way he did. The conclusion will show that besides being part of an ongoing Western theological tradition, with a particular dependence upon the Reformed tradition in the sixteenth century, his Christology is distinctively Reformed. That is to say, if one understands Christology to incorporate both the person and work of Christ, there is no doubt that a distinct Reformed Christology exists. Those who would agree with this basic approach to Christology understand that the person and work of Christ bear an organic relation to one another. This is particularly the case in Goodwin's own thought. Like Anselm, Goodwin understands that the debt owed by fallen man is so large that, although no one but man owed it, only God is capable of repaying it. The hypostatic union allows the worth of the person (i.e. the God-man) to give value to the work. However, even if one understands Christology to refer only to the person of Christ, the evidence suggests that the Reformed orthodox, particularly in the seventeenth century, had a view of Christ's person – if all of the particulars are included – unique to their own theological tradition, but nevertheless firmly rooted in Chalcedonian orthodoxy.

Consequently, this work, besides arguing for a specific thesis, has a number of goals in mind. First, to show that those Puritans whose theology is best characterized as Reformed orthodoxy gave a prominent place to

Christ in their theological writings, especially in the case of Goodwin. As noted above, Christology and covenant theology cannot be separated in his thought. Therefore, this study incorporates two of the most significant doctrinal loci in Reformed orthodoxy. Second, because there are so few studies on seventeenth-century British Christology, this work will evaluate one of the leading English theologians of the seventeenth century. A serious attempt has been made to incorporate a number of the leading Reformed theologians and their own thoughts on certain points of doctrine. This has the added value of bringing out the Christology of not only Goodwin, but his predecessors (e.g. John Calvin) and contemporaries (e.g. John Owen). For the most part, their inclusion signifies that Goodwin was not inventing his own theology, but instead was part of the ongoing Western Christian tradition, particularly that of Reformed orthodoxy. Where he does depart from his Reformed orthodox contemporaries will be made clear in the text. Finally, many of the historical-theological studies in British Puritanism have focused on dispelling the “Calvin against the Calvinists” thesis, to the point that such a thesis is not as significant as it was five years ago.² Current historiography has shown many of the presuppositions behind the “Calvin against the Calvinists” thesis to be false.³ As a result of these studies, the focus can now shift towards understanding – in this case Goodwin – what the seventeenth-century Reformed orthodox said and why. Consequently, this work will show why he has been justly remembered as one of the most significant Reformed theologians in the seventeenth century.

² A few representative works that advance this thesis are: Alan C. Clifford, *Atonement and Justification: English Evangelical Theology 1640–1790, An Evaluation* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990); Basil Hall, “Calvin Against the Calvinists” in G.E. Duffield, ed., *John Calvin* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996), 19–37; Brian Armstrong, *Calvinism and the Amyraut Heresy: Protestant Scholasticism and Humanism in Seventeenth Century France* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1969); R.T. Kendall, *Calvin and English Calvinism to 1649* (Carlisle: Paternoster, 1997).

³ For example, see: Carl Trueman and R. Scott Clark, eds., *Protestant Scholasticism: Essays in Reassessment* (Carlisle: Paternoster, 1999); Richard Muller, *After Calvin: Studies in the Development of a Theological Tradition* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003); idem, *Christ and the Decree: Christology and Predestination in Reformed Theology from Calvin to Perkins* (Durham: Labyrinth Press, 1986); Carl Trueman, *The Claims of Truth: John Owen’s Trinitarian Theology* (Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 1998).

1. Status Quaestionis

1.1 The State of Goodwin Research

1.1.1 Introduction

Despite his stature in the Civil War period, and his ongoing significance within Nonconformity and British Evangelicalism, Thomas Goodwin (1600–1680) has received relatively little attention in the secondary literature. Indeed, there is not a single published monograph devoted to this leading Puritan thinker. In 1998 Carl Trueman described John Owen (1616–1683) as the “forgotten man of English theology”.¹ With the publication of Trueman’s book on Owen, which in large part precipitated the subsequent renaissance of interest in Owen studies, Owen has quickly become unforgotten.² The title of the “forgotten man of English theology” is now more appropriately spoken of Thomas Goodwin, the seventeenth-century Reformed orthodox Congregationalist theologian.

There are, however, a number of unpublished doctoral theses and journal articles that address some of the more noteworthy aspects of Goodwin’s life and thought. Among the theses, only two attempt to address the state of Goodwin research, and they do so without going into significant detail. This chapter will, therefore, give what is believed to be the first detailed account of the secondary literature on Goodwin, assessing both the relative strengths and weaknesses of each study. In doing this, the present thesis will find both its justification and trajectory of argument.

¹ C. Trueman, *The Claims of Truth: John Owen’s Trinitarian Theology* (Carlisle: Paternoster, 1998), 1.

² For example, S. Rehnman, *Divine Discourse: The Theological Methodology of John Owen* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2002); R. Daniels, *The Christology of John Owen* (Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 2004); A. Spence, *Incarnation and Inspiration: John Owen and the Coherence of Christology* (London: T.T Clark, 2007); K. Kapic, *Communion with God: The Divine and the Human in the Theology of John Owen* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2007); C. Trueman, *John Owen: Reformed Catholic, Renaissance Man* (Ashgate, 2007); J. Payne, *John Owen on the Lord’s Supper* (Edinburgh: Banner of Truth, 2004); B. Kay, *When Doctrine Informs Devotion: John Owen and Trinitarian Spirituality in the West* (Carlisle: Paternoster, 2007).

1.1.2 “Transmission and transformation”

Since Goodwin has not attracted the same interest as some of his contemporaries, like John Owen (1616–1683), Richard Baxter (1615–1691) and John Bunyan (1628–1688), there are no significant competing interpretations in the secondary literature. However, a recent work by Michael Lawrence attempts to give the first comprehensive re-assessment of Goodwin’s life and work.³ The work succeeds where others failed in appreciating the historical context in which Goodwin wrote. For the most part, the theological and political agendas that confronted Goodwin the theologian had either been totally ignored or misunderstood among his interpreters. Lawrence’s work, however, makes significant inroads into the ecclesiastical and political context in which Goodwin lived, thus heightening the importance of why Goodwin wrote what he did. Lawrence remarks, “[t]he salutary effect of this recovery is to reconnect Goodwin’s theology with his life and times in such a way that each illuminates the other.”⁴

The provenance and contents of Goodwin’s collected *Works*, published posthumously between 1681 and 1704, in five large folio volumes, is one of the key areas that Lawrence seeks to address. Christopher Hill has suggested that Goodwin’s posthumous writings, which dwarf the amount that appeared during his lifetime, were written during the last twenty years of his life.⁵ Such an assumption is understandable given the passing of the Act of Uniformity (1662) which meant that all public pulpits and Universities were closed to men like Goodwin who, as a result, would have had significant time to devote to writing. Furthermore, Goodwin’s son, Thomas [junior] (c.1650–1708?), recorded, “It was now he liv’d a retir’d Life, spent in Prayer, Reading and Meditation, between which he divided his time.”⁶ “The result”, says Lawrence, “was a firm placement of Goodwin and his *Works* within the context of Restoration nonconformity and its emergent denominational character.”⁷ It is precisely this contention that Lawrence challenges: he is convinced that Goodwin’s posthumous *Works*

³ Michael T. Lawrence, “Transmission and Transformation: Thomas Goodwin and the Puritan Project” (unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Cambridge University, 2002).

⁴ Lawrence, “Transmission and Transformation”, 4.

⁵ Christopher Hill, *The Experience of Defeat: Milton and Some Contemporaries* (New York: Viking, 1984), 179. This contention has been subsequently repeated, see Robert Halley, “Memoir of Thomas Goodwin, D.D.”, *The Works of Thomas Goodwin* (12 Vol, Edinburgh, 1861–66, repr. Eureka, CA, 1996), II, xxxix; Joel Beeke, “Introduction”, *The Works of Thomas Goodwin* (12 Vol, Edinburgh, 1861–66, repr. Grand Rapids, 2006), 11.

⁶ Thomas Goodwin [junior], “The Life of Dr Thomas Goodwin; Compos’d from his own Papers and Memoirs”, *The Works of Thomas Goodwin D.D. Sometime President of Magdalen College in Oxford* (5 Vol, 1681–1704), V (1704), xviii. Hereafter cited “Life”.

⁷ Lawrence, “Transmission and Transformation”, 13.

are not essentially the result of the Restoration. Rather, “the available evidence suggests that the *Works* were largely written, though perhaps not edited, prior to 1660.”⁸ That much of Goodwin’s writing took place before the Restoration is based on the internal evidence in his own writings which includes, among other things, his detailed response to the rising influence of Socinianism in the 1640s. What they reveal is “the thought of a Puritan divine across the span of his career, and not simply at the end of it.”⁹

Importantly, in attempting to date Goodwin’s writings, Lawrence demonstrates that Goodwin maintained a theological consistency in his thought over the course of both his public and private career.¹⁰ Moreover, Lawrence argues that the internal evidence shows that Goodwin’s writings, considered against the backdrop of the threats of Socinianism, Arminianism, Roman Catholicism, Quakerism, and Pantheism, to Calvinism, displayed a non-polemical character. In other words, Goodwin “evidenced a pastoral emphasis on winning the consciences of heretics, rather than binding them.”¹¹ Resulting from the rising anti-Calvinist influence in England, his theological effort was principally taken up with the promulgation of a thoroughly Calvinistic soteriology rather than, though not to the exclusion of, Congregationalist ecclesiology, “just at the time one might have expected a principled Congregationalist to have pressed his advantage.”¹²

Lawrence’s goal of historical contextualization is further developed as he provides the first modern intellectual biography of a man whose unusually long life “offers an opportunity to view nearly the entire Stuart age.”¹³ Goodwin’s theological training in Jacobean Norfolk and Cambridge is examined before Lawrence describes at some length Goodwin’s conversion to Congregationalism during the 1630s. Goodwin’s millenarianism was actually decisive for his understanding of church polity. Central to Lawrence’s discussion of Goodwin’s ecclesiology is his contention that “Goodwin’s understanding of the nature of the church was directly impacted by his reading of Revelation 11.”¹⁴ While Lawrence’s work is principally a historical biography, the aforementioned insight is indicative of the strong theological subtext that pervades his account of the life of Goodwin. In fact, among the most important discoveries made by Lawrence is Goodwin’s participation, with fellow Congregationalists and

⁸ Lawrence, “Transmission and Transformation”, 16.

⁹ Lawrence, “Transmission and Transformation”, 51.

¹⁰ Contra Owen. See Carl Trueman, “John Owen’s *Dissertation on Divine Justice*: an Exercise in Christocentric Scholasticism”, *Calvin Theological Journal* 33 (1998), 87–103.

¹¹ Lawrence, “Transmission and Transformation”, 51.

¹² Lawrence, “Transmission and Transformation”, 52.

¹³ Lawrence, “Transmission and Transformation”, 2. Most of Lawrence’s work, however, focuses on the first fifty years of Goodwin’s life. More work needs to be done on the later years.

¹⁴ Lawrence, “Transmission and Transformation”, 141.

Presbyterians such as Owen, Philip Nye (*bap.* 1595, *d.* 1672), Sidrach Simpson (1600–1655), Richard Vines (1600–1656), Thomas Manton (1620–1677) and Thomas Jacomb (1624–1687), in two attempts to provide a confession of faith for the Interregnum church. The documents that resulted from these consultations show that “[f]ar from being either narrowly Congregationalist or rigidly Calvinist, Goodwin’s platform for the Church of England was both orthodox and inclusive, and sought [...] to safeguard a recognizably puritan understanding of salvation against its critics both new and old. Ultimately, the survey of Goodwin’s career suggests that he was as much one of the last of the puritans as the first of the Congregationalists.”¹⁵

The editorial process behind Goodwin’s posthumous *Works* has, until Lawrence’s work, received little attention. Edited by Goodwin’s son, Thomas (junior), in five large folio volumes these *Works*, including the writing of his “Life”, have “proved to be the foundation of almost all subsequent historical reflection on Goodwin and his career.”¹⁶ The editing process, however, left much to be desired. Lawrence argues that Goodwin’s son arranged the *Works* haphazardly, not taking into account his father’s plan and also arranging the *Works* so as to fight contemporary battles that Goodwin [junior] faced. As Lawrence notes:

[...] what is clear is that Goodwin’s son was not following the plan his father had left, but was instead moulding his father’s treatises into a well-established pattern within the Reformed tradition. Beginning with the Knowledge of God, the Works would lead the reader from “the firm Foundation” of the Trinity into “the beautiful and uniform Structure of all other Truths”. While this did not oblige him to change the content of his father’s writings, it did mean the abandonment of his father’s project.¹⁷

The internal evidence in Goodwin’s writings seem to suggest that rather than aiming to write a Reformed systematic theology, as his son seems to imply, Goodwin, especially during the 1630s–1650s, sought to defend Reformed soteriology against the rising influence of Roman Catholicism, Socinianism, Arminianism, and the Quakers. We should, therefore, understand that the ordering of Goodwin’s *Works* by his son does not reflect the order in which they were written, but rather reflects the dogmatic concerns of Restoration dissent. Despite the questionable editorial activity of Goodwin’s son, the historical theologian, while appreciating these complexities raised by Lawrence, should still be able to accurately assess Goodwin the theologian. After all, there is no evidence that Goodwin

¹⁵ Lawrence, “Transmission and Transformation”, 7.

¹⁶ Lawrence, “Transmission and Transformation”, 192. The “Life” of Goodwin, regarding both its shortcomings and subsequent influence on Goodwin scholars, will be referenced below in chapter two where Goodwin is placed in his seventeenth-century context.

¹⁷ Lawrence, “Transmission and Transformation”, 201.

underwent any significant changes in his theology as his contemporary John Owen did. The key, then, is to appreciate Lawrence's more nuanced approach to the details surrounding the life of Goodwin and the work of his son. In connection with this, Lawrence aptly remarks, "[t]o the extent that previous historical work on Goodwin has adopted either the 'Life' or the *Works* as an unmediated source into the life and thought of the man, that work has run the risk of anachronism."¹⁸ The Restoration construction, handed down to us by Goodwin's son, should be understood, indeed re-evaluated, in light of the Caroline and Interregnum reality and to that end Lawrence's work provides a helpful breakthrough in Goodwin studies that other Goodwin scholars had been unaware of.

1.1.3 Printed Editions of Goodwin's Works (1861–66 or 1691–1704?)

Arising from the above considerations, the question over which particular edition of Goodwin's *Works* will be used in the present study needs to be addressed.¹⁹ Except for Lawrence, and occasionally R.B. Carter,²⁰ the secondary literature on Goodwin references the twelve-volume (1861–66) re-print edition instead of the older five-volume (1681–1704) edition.²¹ While the text is largely similar, it is not identical. The later twelve-volume edition is missing a lot of the marginalia. Moreover, the twelve-volume edition re-orders the *Works*, further obscuring not only Goodwin's original program, but the revised program of his son that Lawrence attempted to elucidate. Nevertheless, Lawrence has provided an outline that attempts to place Goodwin's *Works* chronologically, thus doing justice to the Puritan project which Goodwin found himself engaged in over the course of his long career.²² The twelve-volume edition has been recently lauded by Joel Beeke as "superior" to the original five-volume edition.²³ However, a closer

¹⁸ Lawrence, "Transmission and Transformation", 222.

¹⁹ Cf. Thomas Goodwin, *The Works of Thomas Goodwin D.D. Sometime President of Magdalen College in Oxford* (5 Vol, 1681–1704); Thomas Goodwin, *The Works of Thomas Goodwin* (12 Vol, Edinburgh: Nichols ed., 1861–66).

²⁰ See below.

²¹ Besides the Ph.D. theses on Goodwin, other scholars that reference the 1861–66 edition are G.F. Nuttall, *The Holy Spirit in Puritan Faith and Experience* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992), 38–41; Trueman, *Claims of Truth*, 28; Muller, *PRRD*, IV, 114; M. Dever, *Richard Sibbes: Puritanism and Calvinism in Late Elizabethan and Early Stuart England* (Macon: Mercer University Press, 2000), 66,83,90–93; J.R. Beeke, *The Quest for Full Assurance: The Legacy of Calvin and His Successors* (Edinburgh: Banner of Truth, 1999), passim.

²² Lawrence, "Transmission and transformation", 228.

²³ For example, Beeke argues: "The first collection of Goodwin's works was published in five folio volumes in London from 1681 to 1704 under the editorship of Thankful Owen, Thomas Baron, and Thomas Goodwin, Jr. [...]. The presently reprinted twelve-volume authoritative edition was printed by James Nichol (Edinburgh, 1861–66) as his first choice in what would become

look at the differences between the 1861–66 Nichols edition and the 1691–1704 posthumous *Works* will show that the 1861–66 editors took too much license, thus obscuring not only Goodwin’s theological project in the reordering of the *Works*, but also omitting and adding words, sentences and paragraphs. For example, note the following comparison:

Works, V, *Glory of the Gospel*, 39 (1691–1704):

USE, My Exhortation shall be unto all, to procure and heap up to themselves what of spiritual Knowledge possibly they can, in these Mysteries of the Gospel, for you encrease your Riches: The Truth which by it, I speak unto all, but especially unto you that are Scholars, who come hither to furnish your selves, as Scribes fitted for the Kingdom of Heaven, to bring forth out of your Treasures and Store acquired here both New and Old, as Christ speaks, to buy the truth as Solomon, so as to be able to teach it to others; you come as Whole-sale Men to buy by the Great. Therefore Treasure up as much, and as many precious Truths as you can, and Grace withal to vent by Retail in the Country, where you are sent Abroad.

First, Enquire and Learn where these Treasures are to be had, even in the Scriptures. The Merchant who knew the Pearl, was fain to buy the Field, there the Pearl lay: Timothy from a Child had read the Scriptures, and so should you do [...]. Do as Merchants, who travel from Place to Place, so do you from Scripture to Scripture, comparing one with another, and Knowledge will be increased.

Secondly, Go to the Markets and Ware-houses, of those that have laid in, or discovered much of this Treasure (that is) use the Helps of Godly Mens Writings and Conferences: The Help of Saints both Dead and Alive, why? Because it is made manifest to the Saints. The Angels do learn of the Church, and why not we?

Works, IV, *The Glory of the Gospel*, 246–7 (1861–66):

Use First, If the gospel and the riches of it be thus great, then buy it, Prov. Xxiii. 23, “Buy the truth, and sell it not;” he names no price, for you are not like to lose by it, cost what it will. This place hath been the greatest mart of truth, and of the mystery of the gospel, that I know under heaven. Wisdom hath as it were cried all her wares at this great cross.

This truth has been purchased for you, and that dearly; it cost the blood of many martyrs to derive it to you, the sweat of many preachers, the prayers of many saints, and cost God the riches of his patience to see it contemned. Buy it therefore at any rate.

known as the well-edited and highly regarded *Nichol’s Series of Standard Divines*; not surprisingly, it is far superior to the original five folio volumes.” J. Beeke, “Introduction” In *The Works of Thomas Goodwin* (12 Vol, Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 2006), I.11.

Especially you who are scholars, you come hither and live under those who are wholesale men, and you should, whilst you are here, treasure up as much and as many precious truths as you can, and grace withal to vent by retail in the country, when you are sent abroad.

First, Inquire and learn where these treasures are to be had, even in the Scriptures. The merchant who knew the pearl, was fain to buy the field; Timothy, from a child had known the Scriptures, and so should you do [...]. That is, by doing as merchants do, travelling from place to place, comparing one with another, knowledge will be increased.

Secondly, Go to the markets and warehouses of those who have laid in or discovered much of this treasure; that is, use the help of godly men's writings and conferences. The angels do learn of the church, and why not we?

The above shows a number of interpolations by the nineteenth-century editors as well as a number of omissions from Goodwin's original writings.²⁴ As a result, the edition used in this study will be the five-volume 1691–1704 edition.²⁵ References to Goodwin's *Works* will use the 1691–1704 edition titles. Some of the posthumous *Works*, like *Exposition of Ephesians* and *Of the Object and Acts of Justifying Faith* are divided up into parts. Therefore, references to Goodwin's comments on Ephesians will have the part before the page number.²⁶ In an attempt to avoid historical anachronism, any work published during his lifetime will be looked at separately.²⁷

1.1.4 Early Scholarship

Besides Lawrence's historical work, Goodwin has attracted attention in two particular areas, ecclesiology and soteriology, though one should be careful not to posit a sharp dichotomy between the two, as will be seen below. The dissertations and published journal articles vary in quality and the dissertations especially suffer from a lack of historical contextualization.

²⁴ Lawrence shows how a marginal note in the 1681–1704 edition is not reproduced in later editions. The missing marginal note is actually decisive in terms of dating Goodwin's *Exposition of Revelation*, another reason why the 1681–1704 edition is superior to the Nichols edition. See Lawrence, "Transmission and Transformation", 125.

²⁵ The use of italics will be retained since copies of Goodwin's written MSS show that he underlined the words he wished to have italicized by the printer. I am thankful to Hunter Powell for this information.

²⁶ E.g. *Works*, I, *Ephesians*, Pt. 1, 25; *Works*, IV, *Of the Object and Acts of Justifying Faith*, Pt. 3, 21.

²⁷ For example, Goodwin, *Christ Set Forth in his Death, Resurrection, Ascension, Sitting at Gods Right Hand, Intercession, as the Cause of Iustification, Object of Iustifying Faith Together with a Treatise Discovering the Affectionate Tendernesse of Christ's Heart now in Heaven, unto Sinners on Earth* (London, 1642).

The focus of this chapter will predominantly center on how scholars have understood Goodwin's theology and the relative strengths and weaknesses of each work. This will show where, if any, there is need for further historical-theological reflection and what distinctive contribution can be made to studies on Goodwin.

The earliest dissertation on Goodwin is Paul Brown's work, "The principle of the covenant in the theology of Thomas Goodwin".²⁸ This work suffers from a number of methodological and interpretive flaws, some of which are so serious that the work can hardly be used for serious scholarly reference. Brown attempts to analyze Goodwin's theology in light of the doctrine of the covenant and its relationship to Puritanism and Calvinism. His thesis rests on an assumption that Jacob Arminius "is responsible for the development of the covenant theology."²⁹ According to Brown, covenant theology developed, particularly in England, in order to meet the arguments posed by Arminius. Further, "[t]his movement in England is a definite effort to offer a compromise between the two positions of Calvinism and Arminianism [...] Covenant theology came into being with English Puritanism."³⁰ Contrary to Brown's thesis, a thoroughgoing covenant theology was clearly present in the sixteenth century and so did not originate as "the Puritan" response to Arminianism in the seventeenth century.³¹ More specifically, Brown's historiography shows further

²⁸ Paul E. Brown, "The principle of the covenant in the theology of Thomas Goodwin" (unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Drew University, 1950).

²⁹ Brown, "The Principle of the Covenant", 74.

³⁰ Brown, "The Principle of the Covenant", 77–78. Elsewhere he argues: "We have previously endeavored to point out that Covenant Theology is a compromise theology arising out of the Arminian Theology", 122.

³¹ The literature on the covenant theology in the sixteenth century is vast. See W. J. Van Asselt, *The Federal Theology of Johannes Cocceius (1603–1669)*, trans. Raymond A. Blacketer (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 325–32; P. Lillback, *The Binding of God: Calvin's Role in the Development of Covenant Theology* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2001), passim; R.S. Clark, *Caspar Olevian and the Substance of the Covenant: The Double Benefit of Christ. Rutherford Studies in Historical Theology*, ed., David F. Wright (Edinburgh: Rutherford House, 2005), passim; L. Bierma, *German Calvinism in the Confessional Age: The Covenant Theology of Caspar Olevianus* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1997), passim; G. Schrenk, *Gottesreich und Bund im älteren Protestantismus vornehmlich bei Johannes Cocceius* (Gütersloh, 1923) passim; J. von Rohr, *The Covenant of Grace in Puritan Thought* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986), 1–37; C.S. McCoy/J.W. Baker, *Fountainhead of Federalism: Heinrich Bullinger and the Covenantal Tradition* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1991), 11–44; C. Graafland, *Van Calvijn tot Comrie*, 3 Vol. (Zoetermeer: Boekencentrum, 1992–1996), passim; S. Strehle, *Calvinism, Federalism, and the Covenant: A Study of the Reformed Doctrine of the Covenant* (Bern: Peter Lang, 1998); H. Heppe, *Geschichte des Pietismus und der Mystik in der Reformierten Kirche, Namentlich der Niederlande* (Leiden: Brill, 1879), passim; B. Lee, "Biblical exegesis, Federal theology, and Johannes Cocceius: developments in the interpretation of Hebrews 7:1–10:18" (unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Calvin Theological Seminary, 2003), 15–85; C. Williams, "The Decree of Redemption is in Effect a Covenant: David Dickson and the Covenant of Redemption" (unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Calvin Theological Seminary, 2005), 14–18; A.A. Woolsey, "Unity and Continuity in Covenantal Thought: A Study in the Reformed Tradition to the Westminster Assembly" (unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Glasgow, 1998),

weaknesses as he argues that the Puritans,³² like Goodwin, attempted to overcome Calvin's unconditional predestination through Federal theology.³³ However, not only did Goodwin hold to "unconditional predestination", he, unlike many of his Calvinistic contemporaries, adopted a supralapsarian order of the divine decrees.³⁴

Notwithstanding Brown's failure to understand the history of Reformed covenant theology in the sixteenth century, he rightly draws attention to the centrality of the pretemporal covenant of redemption (*pactum salutis*) between the Father and the Son and the significance it has in Goodwin's theology for the history of redemption.³⁵ Unfortunately, Brown does very little with this important insight. Moreover, there is no significant formal analysis of Goodwin's thought and there are serious omissions from his *Works* that would have added both clarity and substance to his discussion.³⁶ The remainder of Brown's thesis discusses various theological loci, such as justification, assurance, and the atonement, all of which are understood in the broader context of the covenants of works and grace. Here again, the criticisms already stated apply equally to this part of Brown's analysis. The need, then, still exists for a thorough evaluation of Goodwin's doctrine of the covenant, especially the pretemporal covenant of redemption and its significance for the history of redemption.

Following from Brown's work on Goodwin's covenant theology are studies in what Lawrence believes to be two distinct areas in Goodwin's thought, namely, his theology and ecclesiology.³⁷ As noted above, this line of demarcation has its problems. While it is true that Goodwin's ecclesiology has attracted a fair amount of attention, it is always in the context of historical theology. For example, the most significant work on Goodwin's ecclesiology, Stanley Fienberg's dissertation, "Thomas Goodwin, Puritan Pastor and Independent Divine", spends a considerable amount of time looking at several doctrines, besides Goodwin's ecclesiology, such as justification and sanctification.³⁸ His thesis represents the first meaningful contribution to Goodwin scholarship.

passim; D. Stoute, "The Origin and Early Development of the Reformed Idea of the Covenant" (unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Kings College, Cambridge, 1979), passim.

³² The nomenclature "Puritan" will be discussed below.

³³ Brown, "The Principal of the Covenant", 89.

³⁴ See Goodwin, *Works*, II, *Of Election*; Trueman, *Claims of Truth*, 127.

³⁵ Brown, "The Principal of the Covenant", 94–95.

³⁶ For example, Brown quotes extensively from Goodwin's work, *Of The Knowledge of God the Father, and His Son Jesus Christ*. However, in his discussion of the covenant of redemption, he would have been helped by referencing: *Works*, III, *Of Christ the Mediator*; and *Works*, III, *Man's Restoration by Grace*.

³⁷ Lawrence, "Transmission and transformation", 3–4.

³⁸ Stanley P. Fienberg, "Thomas Goodwin, Puritan Pastor and Independent Divine" (unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Chicago, 1974).

Fienberg's stated intention is to look at Goodwin's theology and its significance for "Puritanism, Independency, and English History" in the seventeenth century.³⁹ The work divides into three parts respectively. The first part considers Goodwin's doctrine of salvation with particular reference to justification and sanctification. In the second part, Fienberg discusses Goodwin's ecclesiology and, here too, there is a decisive theological focus, especially in terms of the impact of Goodwin's eschatological views on his commitment to Independency. In the final part, he draws attention to Goodwin's political and ecclesiastical involvement during the Interregnum. Fienberg's study leaves a number of issues that require further attention, especially as the trajectory of argument in this present study is narrowed.

Importantly, Fienberg spends a good deal of time attempting to understand the scope of Goodwin's writings. He succeeds where Brown failed by quoting widely from the vast corpus of Goodwin's *Works*. In doing this, Fienberg rightly stresses the strong Christocentrism of Goodwin's thought.⁴⁰ And while his discussion of the eternal character of salvation is brief, he does highlight its significance for the temporal aspect of redemption. However, though the pretemporal doctrines of election and predestination are referenced, there is no discussion of the pretemporal covenant of redemption.⁴¹ This fact is especially significant given that Goodwin spends the first part of his work on *Of Christ the Mediator* discussing the covenant between the Father and the Son.⁴² Furthermore, while certain studies have focused on comparing Goodwin to certain Reformed theologians, particularly John Calvin, in the sixteenth century, there are few who contextualize Goodwin among divines in the seventeenth century. Fienberg's study is no exception to this trend. In fact, in his discussion of Goodwin's soteriology, there is almost no interaction with some of Goodwin's seventeenth-century contemporaries, whether orthodox or heretical. So while the question of what Goodwin said has been adequately addressed by Fienberg, with regards to his particular emphases, the equally important question of why he wrote what he did and in what context is altogether missing from his study. In other words, the broader

³⁹ Fienberg, "Puritan Pastor and Independent Divine", ii.

⁴⁰ Fienberg, "Puritan Pastor and Independent Divine", 13–15, 41. The term "Christocentrism" can be infelicitous given that so many theologians from different traditions could be described as "Christocentric". Theologians such as Beza, Arminius, Goodwin, Baxter, John Wesley, and Cornelius Ellebogius have all been described as "Christocentric." That said, Goodwin's theology is nevertheless Christocentric. How that looks will be shown in this study. On the problematic nature of this term, see Richard A. Muller, "A Note on 'Christocentrism' and the Impudent Use of Such Terminology," *Westminster Theological Journal* 68.2 (2006), 253–60.

⁴¹ Fienberg, "Puritan Pastor and Independent Divine", 12–21.

⁴² See *Works*, III, *Of Christ the Mediator*.