INTRODUCTION

Would to God our religious Patriots assembled in Parliament would at length take care (as they have done of the Romish Emissaries) to suppress [Anabaptists], that the name of God be not blasphemed: that they may not infect the simple people with their abominable Errours.... The plague of Heresie is among us, and wee have no power to keep the sick from the whole.¹

So writes the London Puritan Ephraim Pagitt in the mid-1640s of English Anabaptists. One of those putative English Anabaptists and harbinger of “errours” and heresies was Hanserd Knollys. Knollys, a former Church of England clergyman, joined the Calvinistic Baptists sometime in 1644 and became one of their London pastors. In his polemical treatise of 1645/46 against heresy entitled, Gangraena, the Presbyterian Thomas Edwards accuses Knollys of Anabaptist heresy:

Whereas they [Anabaptists in England] plead a peaceable and quiet carriage, I can prove a tumultuous disorderly managing their opinions, as in Mr. Knols [Knollys], and Paul Hobson, besides of many other Anabaptists in the Kingdom, which particulars I thought briefly to hint, as an Antidote against that Book for the present, intending suddenly a more full discovery of the fraud and fallaciousnesse of this Confession of Faith of seven Churches.²

Edwards charges Knollys with “fraud and fallaciousnesse” as a leader of the confessional Anabaptist churches in England. This was a serious accusation. The Anabaptists of Europe were considered anarchists against the state, and heretics in their doctrine of God,
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¹ Ephraim Pagitt, Heresiography: or, A description of the Heretickes and Sectaries of these latter times (1647), p. 37.
² Thomas Edwards, The First and Second Part of Gangraena or a Catalogue or Discovery of many of the Errors, Heresies, Blasphemies and pernicious Practices of the Sectaries of this time, vented and acted in England in these four last yeers, 3rd ed. (1646), I, pt. 2, p. 109.
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Christology and soteriology. Was this charge true? Was Knollys an Anabaptist?

Knollys was not only charged with Anabaptism but also with various other heterodox teachings which, for many English people, went hand in hand with Anabaptism. The 1645 Minutes of the Westminster Assembly refer to “Information against Mr. Knowles, his preaching in private, and venting his Antinomian opinions.” An Antinomian was a person who denied the practical use of the law of God given in the Scriptures. Consequently, an Antinomian was not only free to a live a scandalous life but also to reject both church and state authority. Again this was a serious charge made against Knollys. Was Knollys an Antinomian? In addition, a notation in the Calendar of State Papers of 1661 ascribes Fifth Monarchism to Knollys: “[The Fifth Monarchists] have bought a small ship to convey each other abroad. Mr. Knowles and others, who were in Newgate, are sent into Holland, where they are in good condition, but act their business more secretly than here; they only wait an opportunity.” Fifth Monarchism was an eschatological movement of the 1650s which espoused the bringing in of the millennium by physical force. Many English people, who were concerned for order in state and church, feared this type of millennialist enthusiasm as tantamount to sedition. Knollys and other Fifth Monarchists were “only wait[ing] an opportunity” to bring in the millennium by force. Again this was a serious charge levelled against Knollys, particularly after the Restoration of Charles II to the throne in 1660. Was Knollys a Fifth Monarchist?

Knollys has also been suspected of hyper-Calvinism. This teaching, an extension of the teachings of John Calvin, became popular in Calvinistic Baptist circles in the eighteenth century. Hyper-Calvinism taught that it was wrong for the preacher of the gospel to “offer” Christ or salvation to all people indiscriminately. Hyper-Calvinists believed that only the elect could respond to this offer, therefore this ministry was the Spirit’s work, not the preacher’s. The father of Baptist hyper-Calvinism was John Skepp, a successor to Knollys, who, in his book entitled Divine Energy, cites Knollys as the
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one who previously laid the theological foundation upon which Skepp in the 1710s was building. This implicated Knollys as the grandfather of eighteenth-century hyper-Calvinism. The nineteenth-century Baptist historian Joseph Ivimey, and Knollys’ biographer James Culross deemed it necessary to defend Knollys against this implication. And the twentieth-century Baptist historian Michael Haykin writes in an article on Knollys that his “high Calvinist soteriology [was] developed by many of his eighteenth century heirs into a hyper-Calvinism that all but paralyzed evangelism.”

Was Knollys a proto-hyper-Calvinist? This is an important question, particularly for those confessional Baptist historians like Ivimey, Culross and Haykin who see evangelism as an important part of Baptist life.

The charges of Anabaptism, Antinomianism, and Fifth Monarchical were very serious ones. They would have caused much anguish and consternation for those who considered themselves orthodox Calvinists, as they did for Knollys who signed the 1644/46 Confession. This Confession declares in its title that the signatories are “commonly (but unjustly) called Anabaptists.” This anguish is evident in the preface of the Confession where they take great pains to defend themselves from the charge of heresy:

---

Wee question not but that it will seems strange to many men, that such as wee are frequently termed to be, lying under that calumniy and black brand of Heretickes, and severers of division as wee doo, should presume to appear so publickly as wee have done: But yet not withstanding wee may well say, to give answer to such, what David said to his brother, when the Lords battell was a fighting, I Sam. 29.30. Is there not a cause? Surely, if ever people had cause to speake for the vindication of the truth of Christ in their hands, wee have, that being indeed the maine wheele at this time that sets us aworke; for had any thing by men been transacted against our persons onely, wee could quietly have sitten still, and committed our Cause to him who is a righteous Judge, who will in the great day judge the secrets of all mens hearts by Jesus Christ: But being it is not onely, but the truth professed by us, wee cannot, wee dare not but speake; it is no strange thing to any observing man, what sad charges are laid, not onely by the world, that know not God, but also by those that thinke themselves much wronged, if they be not looked upon as the chief Wortheys of the Church of God, and Watchmen of the Citie: But it hath fared with us from them, as from the poor Spouse seeking her Beloved, Cant. 5. 6, 7. They finding us out of that common road-way themselves walke, have smote us and taken away our vaile, that so wee may by them be recommended odious in the eyes of all that
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behold us, and in the hearts of all that think upon us, which they have done both in Pulpit and Print, charging us with holding Free-will, Falling away from grace, denying Original sinne, disclaiming of Magistracy, denying to assist them either in persons or purse in any of their lawfull Commands, doing acts unseemly in the dispensing the Ordinance of Baptism, not to be named amongst Christians: All which Charges wee disclaieme as notoriously untrue, though by reason of these calumnies cast upon us, many that feare God are discouraged and forestalled in hazarding a good thought, either of us or what wee professe; and many that know not God incouraged, if they can finde the place of our meeting, to get together in Clusters to stone us, as looking upon us as people holding such things, as that wee are not worthy to live: Wee have therefore for the clearing of the truth we professe, that it may be at libertie, though wee be in bonds, briefly published a Confession of our Faith, as desiring all that feare God, seriously to consider whether ... men have not with their tongues in Pulpit, and pens in Print, both spoken and written things that are contrary to truth.6

In his 1672 autobiography Knollys, reflecting on his 1645 sufferings for Christ, wrote, “I was stoned out of the pulpit, and prosecuted at a privy session, and fetched out of the country sixty miles to London, and was constrained to bring up four or five witnesses of good report and credit, to prove and vindicate myself from false accusations [Anabaptism and Antinomianism].”7 For Knollys and his Baptist brethren the charge of heresy was not taken lightly.

This question of Knollys’ orthodoxy or heterodoxy has vexed historians from the eighteenth century to the present. The first historian who addressed this question was the Puritan biographer Daniel Neal who, reporting on Knollys’ preaching in Suffolk in the 1640s, mentions that Knollys was “accounted an Antinomian and Anabaptist, his supposed errors were deemed as criminal as sedition and faction.”8 Shortly after Neal’s work was published, the Baptist historian Thomas Crosby published his History of English Baptists in response to Neal’s treatment of Baptists “in odious colours, ... writ[ing] many bitter things, even notorious falshoods concerning them, nay to fasten doctrines upon them, which they never ap-
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7 Hanserd Knollys, The Life and Death of that Old Disciple of Jesus Christ, and Eminent Minister of the Gospel, Mr. Hanserd Knollys, who died in the Ninety-third Year of His Age written with his own hand to the year 1672, and continued in general, in an epistle by Mr William Kiffin (1692), p. 33.
proved.” Crosby gave an account of Knollys’ ministry identifying him as “among the sufferers of Antipaedobaptism” and a “pious and learned” man, maintaining that as “a zealous opposer both of episcopacy and common prayer, ... all this could not exempt him from the rage of the Presbyters; [nor will Mr. Neal’s invidious representation do any harm to his character] because he was a Sectary and an Anabaptist.” In further defence of Knollys, Crosby gives an example of his being arrested for preaching against Infant Baptism at Bow church in Cheapside. Crosby records that when brought before the Assembly of Westminster divines concerning questions of his authority to preach, the occasion of his preaching, and the doctrine he delivered in it, Knollys “gave such full answers, that they seemed ashamed of what they had done; and ordering him to withdraw, called in the gaoler, reproved him sharply for refusing bail, and threatened to turn him out of his place.” Crosby gives another occasion while in Suffolk in the 1640s of his being accounted “an Antinomian, and an Anabaptist” which “was looked upon to be sedition and faction, and the rabble being encouraged by the high-constable, set themselves zealously to oppose him.” After his arrest “he made it appear by witnesses of good reputation, that he had neither sowed sedition, nor raised tumults, and that all the disorders which had happen’d, were owing to the rage and malignity of his opposers, who had acted contrary both to law and common civility.” Throughout Crosby’s account of Knollys his purpose was to vindicate him from the charge of sedition that was attached to Anabaptism and Antinomianism; and in doing so he portrayed him as orthodox and pious.

The nineteenth-century Baptist confessional historians follow the same tack as Crosby, recording the charges against Knollys and vindicating him of heterodoxy. Early in the century Joseph Ivimey wrote his monumental work on English Baptists in order to correct some of the problems associated with Crosby’s work, and in particular, to show that the Baptists were the first Christians to establish the principle of religious liberty. In A History of the English Baptists Ivimey uses more primary documents than Crosby in his study of Knollys, and brings together more material on him. In his first volume dealing with the history of adult baptism Ivimey records that

Knollys was “among the sufferers of Antipaedobaptism,” giving Knollys’ own account of his suffering for preaching against paedobaptism in Suffolk. He vindicates Knollys with a record of the House of Commons of 1648 that stated, “Ordered that Mr. Kiffin and Mr. Knollys be permitted to preach in any part of Suffolk, at the petition of the Ipswich men.” He concludes by calling Knollys an “excellent man”, and, quoting Knollys’ own words, maintained that he had “to prove and vindicate [himself] from false accusations.”

In volume two on the ministers and churches of the English Baptists, Ivimey promotes Knollys’ character calling him the “pious and venerable Hanserd Knollys”, an “eminent servant of the Lord Jesus Christ”, and a “good man.” In this volume he gives a sympathetic biographical account of Knollys, defending him against the charges of Antinomianism and extreme Fifth Monarchism where they are mentioned or implied. For example, when Ivimey touches on Knollys’ time in New England where he was considered to be an Antinomian, he quotes Cotton Mather approvingly concerning Knollys’ “piety” and “respectful character.” And in accordance with his purpose for writing, Ivimey promotes Knollys as one who was “zealous to defend civil and religious liberty” and who “survived all these political persecutions.”

In Ivimey’s third volume which comprises the history of English Baptists from 1688 to 1760, he gives a history of the pastors of Knollys’ church. In a footnote he mentions that Knollys “has been stigmatized as of fifth-monarchy principles, and as the sentiments of many godly ministers upon that subject are but little known, the following extract from one of his works will explain them.” Ivimey then quotes from Knollys’ *The Parable of the Kingdom of Heaven Explained* which delineates the three comings of Christ: his first coming in the flesh; his virtual and spiritual coming as the Bridegroom to reign over the nations at the beginning of the millennium; and his coming as Judge at the last day called His appearance the second time. Ivimey believed Knollys held these principles. Further along in the history of this church Ivimey looks at Knollys’ third successor, John Skepp. In his brief vignette of Skepp, Ivimey mentions the book he published, namely, *Divine Energy* and quotes from

12 Ivimey, *English Baptists*, II, 261, 347-359
its preface where Skepp tells his readers that he is building on the foundation which Knollys had laid, thereby identifying Knollys’ theology with his own. In a footnote Ivimey seeks to distance Knollys from Skepp’s hyper-Calvinism. He writes,

> If Mr. Skepp meant to intimate that Mr. Knollys was of the sentiments propagated in the work on “Divine Energy,” respecting the non-invitations of the gospel to the unconverted, nothing could have been more erroneous. Mr. Knollys was one of those ministers who, as Mr. Skepp expresses it, used an Arminian dialect in addressing the unconverted.

He then quotes a passage from Knollys’ treatise *The World that now is, and the World that is to come*, where Knollys calls the unconverted to receive Christ, and tells lost sinners to consider that God offers Christ to them.\(^{14}\) Ivimey wanted to show that Knollys did not hold Skepp’s “no offer” theology.

James Culross, another nineteenth-century Baptist historian, wrote a sympathetic biography of Knollys as part of a series for the Assembly of the Baptist Union of Wales with the purpose of “illustrating the principles of Baptists.” His goal was to cover the life of Knollys in its seventeenth-century context in order to instruct his readers to this purpose. He writes, “[The] tracing of his career shews us that truth and patient, suffering meekness are mightier unspeakably than the world’s force.”\(^ {15}\) Culross addresses all four of the charges levelled against Knollys in one way or another. He acknowledges that Knollys became an “Anabaptist” sometime in the late 1630s or early 1640s, and that it was “of all names the most hated, dreaded, and maligned.”\(^ {16}\) His biography seeks to distance the Calvinistic Baptists and Knollys from the Continental Anabaptists, and in particular, the “excesses and enormities of the Munster men.”\(^ {17}\) On the charge of Antinomianism Culross writes that Knollys’ “Antinomianism was not more than that of Paul: ‘Ye are not under the law, but under grace,’” and later quotes a passage from a sermon Knollys published under the title, *Christ Exalted*, (which at the time of delivery was supposed to contain antinomian teachings) concluding that “no one who understands the doctrines


of grace will set these views [that Christ abolished the ceremonies, penalties, curse, covenant and schoolmastership of the Law — our new schoolmaster, to whom we yield obedience of faith to His Father’s will, is Christ] down as Antinomian.”

Concerning hyper-Calvinism Culross again quotes a passage from Knollys’ works to show that “though a decided Calvinist ... Knollys had no doubt or hesitation” about urging the unconverted to repent and believe in Christ. Differing from Ivimey’s representation of Knollys as a Fifth Monarchy man Culross more precisely defines what this teaching meant. Then he writes, “Some men dreamed of setting it up by force, and would have called ‘the saints’ to seize it. Knollys, too, believed in this kingdom, but not in setting it up by the sword.” Culross then cites parts of Knollys’ Parable of the Kingdom of Heaven Expounded, concluding, “This kingdom is not to be set up and sustained by the sword — as Venner and others dreamed of doing.” Unfortunately, the passage he quotes does not absolve Knollys of Fifth Monarchism.

The twentieth-century-historiographical approach to Knollys is more critical than that of its nineteenth-century counterpart. Pope Duncan published a sixty-page pamphlet entitled, Hanserd Knollys: Seventeenth-Century Baptist. Duncan believes that “to understand correctly the genius of Baptists, [one] must examine the lives, struggles, and thoughts of the people — even of individual persons.” Hence, “This thin volume is designed as a simple illustration of the importance and relevance of such an individual as Knollys to the Baptist story.” Duncan states that his book does not pretend to be a full account of Knollys’ life and work. He begins by briefly running through Knollys’ life, setting it in its seventeenth-century context. In this section he notes that while in New England Knollys’ “extreme religious views resulted in his being accused of being an antinomian.” In relation to his antinomianism Duncan acknowledges in a footnote the New England governor John Winthrop’s claim regarding Knollys’ “filthy dalliance” with two maids. Duncan gives several reasons why this might not have been true, not the

18 Ibid., pp. 29, 47.
19 Ibid., pp. 36-37.
20 Ibid., pp. 96-98.
22 Ibid., p. 10.
least of which is that “Winthrop regarded Knollys as an antinomian and could hardly be a candid judge of him.” The next section of Duncan’s little book examines three areas of Knollys’ thought: redemption, the church, and religious liberty. In this section he takes note of Knollys’ “strong Calvinism”, his belief in the universal church, the gathered-visible-congregational-independent church, his rejection of a presbyterial form of church government, and the affirmation of the authority of the church over itself. Moreover, he mentions Knollys’ rationale for believer’s baptism by immersion, and Knollys’ debate with John Saltmarsh over the difference between water baptism and Spirit baptism. When discussing the subject of infant baptism Duncan writes, “The denial of infant baptism was especially obnoxious to most of [the disputants of the seventeenth century]. Knollys and other Baptists were, consequently, often treated with utter contempt and bitter invective.”

In addition, Duncan touches on Knollys’ high view of the Baptist ministry, the topic of discipline in the church, and inter-church relationships. He also notes the Baptist position on liberty of conscience, and Knollys’ suffering for and encouragement of toleration. In Duncan’s last section he looks at the relationship of Baptists to more radical movements like the Seekers, Ranters, Familists, Diggers, Levellers, Quakers, and the Fifth Monarchists. He addresses Knollys’ involvement with this latter group by looking at some of Knollys’ eschatological writings, and noting some of his activities in the 1650s. He queries, “The question of the exact relationship of the Baptists, and particularly of Hanserd Knollys, to this movement is a complex one.” After perusing some of Knollys’ writings, he writes, “It is clear that Knollys shared millennial views which were in essential accord with those of the party of Fifth Monarchy Men.” However, he thought it was more difficult to ascertain “what specific relationship he had to the movement.” After giving some evidence for and against Knollys’ participation with the group, he concludes that whether “a party member or not, he was so closely associated with the movement by thought and action that he had to pay the penalty of being one both then and since.”
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23 Ibid.
24 Ibid., pp. 27-28.
25 Ibid., pp. 10, 46, 49-50, 50. Duncan also makes reference to Knollys and Anabaptism but without defence or accusation (Ibid., pp. 28).
Another critical Baptist historian of this century, who examined Knollys in his Dr. Williams’s Library Lecture of 1977 *Hanserd Knollys and Radical Dissent in the Seventeenth Century*, is B.R. White, the former principal of the Oxford Baptist college, Regent’s Park. White’s approach is different from Duncan’s in that he writes a critical historical account of Knollys’ life interspersed here and there with quotations from his writings. The significance of this study lies in White’s critical knowledge and retrieval of primary sources of the seventeenth-century context with respect to both the Calvinistic Baptists and Knollys. On the question of Knollys’ heterodoxy White addresses the subject of Fifth Monarchism. Like Culross he defends Knollys against this charge. White writes: “While there is no evidence that during the 1650s Knollys was anywhere near the heart of the Fifth Monarchy movement there is some indication that his sympathies were with a number of those who were themselves involved with it.” White goes on to give evidence of these “sympathies” from Knollys’ actions in those years. He then challenges any notion of Knollys’ commitment to the chief doctrine of the movement (bringing in the millennium by force) by quoting several passages from Knollys’ work, *An Exposition of the First Chapter of the Song of Solomon*, concluding, “Once more a Calvinistic Baptist drew back from urging the use of physical force to inaugurate Christ’s millennial Reign.”26

Having surveyed the historical landscape of important studies on Hanserd Knollys, it is clear that all of the historians who have examined Knollys’ life have sought on some level to address the question of Knollys’ orthodoxy. The eighteenth- and nineteenth-century historians have sought to vindicate him of these charges. The twentieth-century scholars have been on the whole more critical of Knollys.

My approach to the question of Knollys’ orthodoxy will necessarily be a synthesis of the historical and the theological. My aim is to examine these charges regarding Knollys’ orthodoxy in the light of their historical and theological context. This means we will sys-
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26 B.R. White, *Hanserd Knollys and Radical Dissent in the 17th Century* (London, 1977), pp.17-18. White also notes the charge of antinomianism levelled at Knollys in both the 1630s and 1690s but does not defend or accuse him of it (*Ibid.*, pp. 6-7). Muriel James has written a recent account of Knollys’ life as a defender of religious liberty (*Religious Liberty on Trial: Hanserd Knollys — Early Baptist Hero* [Franklin, TN, 1997]). See chapter two for an assessment of this work.
tematically and comprehensively weigh, in turn, each one of these charges of Antinomianism, hyper-Calvinism, Anabaptism, and Fifth Monarchism against Knollys’ extant writings. Such a systematic approach has hitherto not been undertaken in relation to these charges made against him. The full historical and theological context of this catalogue of charges has yet to be studied. Former studies have only examined the question of Knollys’ orthodoxy in a piecemeal fashion, frequently without due consideration to their theological context, or without due consideration given to all of his extant writings. Consequently, this present study undertakes the first consciously systematic and comprehensive approach to these various charges. In the end, it will enable us to assess the question of Knollys’ orthodoxy with improved clarity.

Besides the need for a thoroughly comprehensive study of Knollys’ thought in order to ascertain his orthodoxy, there is another important reason for such a study. Until recently most of the attention given to seventeenth-century English Baptists has been to the older General Baptists. As Leon McBeth writes, “Historians have tended to give more space to John Smyth and the General Baptists than to Richard Blunt or William Kiffin and the origin of the Particular Baptists.” However, in this century such scholars as B.R. White, Murray Tolmie, and W.T. Whitley have given more attention to the origins and history of the English Calvinistic Baptists. Moreover, numerous dissertations have been forthcoming in the past thirty years by Michael Novak, Richard Land, Barry Vaughn and Paul Gritz. These studies have explored the thought of Calvinistic Baptists collectively and individually. We are grateful


for these works but more study needs to be done on this group in order to better understand seventeenth-century Calvinistic Baptist thought. Consequently, one way we can further our understanding of these Baptists is to examine the thought of one of their most respected leaders Hanserd Knollys. In this regard it is important to note that none of those dissertations examined a Calvinistic Baptist who signed both their Confessions and remained a leader for the first fifty years of their existence. For example, Richard Land has looked at Thomas Collier’s thought. Collier joined the Calvinistic Baptists in the mid-1640s and became an important figure in the Western Association of Calvinistic Baptists during the Interregnum, but by the latter 1670s had become estranged from the group for his soteriology and Christology.29 Paul Gritz examined the thought of Samuel Richardson, an important figure during the Revolutionary years, signing the 1644 Confession, writing apologies on behalf of the Calvinistic Baptists, e.g., An Apology for the Present Government and Brief Considerations. However, Richardson died circa 1658, only approximately fifteen years into the life of the Calvinistic Baptist group.30 Barry Vaughn has written a dissertation on the thought of Benjamin Keach. He is an important figure in early Calvinistic Baptist history, but he did not join the group until about 1670, and consequently was not a part of the formative twenty years of the group’s history.31 Michael Novak has studied the writings of nineteen Calvinistic Baptists in order to understand the assumptions and theological backdrop by which they came to their convictions on the church, baptism, and the relation of church and state. But he focussed his attention only on their first twenty years.32 All of these studies elucidate the thought of seventeenth-century Calvinistic Baptists but none of them examines a Calvinistic Baptist leader who spanned their first fifty years.33 For this reason alone Hanserd

33 Only one other person of historical significance in the denomination lived over
Knollys’ thought ought to be explored more comprehensively.

In order to accomplish our primary task of ascertaining Knollys’ orthodoxy the first two chapters will set Knollys in his historical context. The first chapter will briefly note the religious and political history of the seventeenth century, and then outline in some detail the history of the Particular (Calvinistic) Baptist denomination. An important part of this chapter will be to define the term “orthodoxy” in its seventeenth-century theological context against which Knollys’ orthodoxy was measured by his contemporaries. The contemporary context is important because it provides the reader with an understanding of the theological standards according to which Knollys’ orthodoxy was initially questioned. The second chapter will sketch Knollys’ life and writings in the seventeenth-century context, using the presently available scholarship. Subsequent chapters will explore the specific context of the charges directed against Knollys’ orthodoxy, with each chapter being devoted to one of the principal charges. Knollys’ writings will be examined with each charge to see if it is valid. Chapters three through six will follow the Reformed Confessional order of soteriology, ecclesiology and eschatology. The reason for this order is twofold: Knollys’ heterodoxy in the seventeenth century was being measured against this Reformed confessional orthodoxy; and the first charge historically made against Knollys was that of his Antinomianism while in New England.

The third chapter will address the charge of Antinomianism made against Knollys by his contemporaries in the 1630s, 1640s and the 1690s. First, we will explore the meaning of Antinomianism in the seventeenth-century context of both England and New England where Knollys was accused of this heresy. Then Knollys’ writings will be compared with the antinomian tenets of his contemporaries to test whether their charges were in fact valid. We will also see something of Knollys’ teaching on such subjects as justification, sanctification, and the relation of the law and sin to the believer.

Since the charge of hyper-Calvinism is closely related theologically to Antinomianism, we will examine it in the fourth chapter. Rooted in the teaching of Joseph Hussey in the early 1700s, hyper-
Calvinism became an influential teaching in Particular Baptist churches in the eighteenth century. Was Knollys a High Calvinist like John Owen or did he go beyond High Calvinism and espouse a proto-hyper-Calvinism? This chapter will set out both High Calvinism in its seventeenth-century context, and hyper-Calvinism in the context of the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. In this latter context the works of John Gill and John Brine, the premier Baptist hyper-Calvinists of the eighteenth century, will be examined.\(^{34}\) Seventeenth-century English High Calvinism and eighteenth-century Baptist hyper-Calvinism will be measured against the writings of John Calvin since his theology is the standard of orthodoxy on this particular charge. Knollys’ writings will be compared in turn with the tenets of High Calvinism and hyper-Calvinism in order to examine whether he was a High Calvinist and/or a hyper-Calvinist. In this fashion we will be able to judge whether the charge of hyper-Calvinism is valid, as well as discern something of Knollys’ thought on such doctrinal themes as evangelism, the work of the Holy Spirit in salvation, and election.

The fifth chapter will address the charge of Anabaptism made against Knollys. First, we will examine the specific Anabaptist teachings with which Knollys was accused as a subscriber to the 1644/46 *Confession* and a member of the Calvinistic Baptists. Then the writings of such protagonists of anti-Anabaptism as Robert Baillie, Thomas Edwards, Ephraim Pagitt and Daniel Featley will be examined in order to ascertain what this charge meant in the 1640s context. Finally, Knollys’ writings will be examined in the relevant areas that address Anabaptism to see whether in fact this charge is valid. This chapter will also reveal Knollys’ thought on various ecclesiological issues.

The sixth chapter will examine the eschatological issue of Fifth Monarchism, hence it’s treatment last. Knollys was considered a Fifth Monarchist by his contemporaries and by several twentieth-century historians including A.C. Underwood and W.T. Whitley.\(^{35}\) There is much circumstantial evidence to support this claim includ-

\(^{34}\) Gill’s hyper-Calvinism has been questioned by some historians; but we will show from his writings that he espouses a Calvinism that certainly goes beyond High Calvinism, holding several tenets that were absent from it.

ing Knollys’ eschatological terminology in some of his writings. In this chapter we will examine seventeenth-century English eschatology in general, and the teachings of the Fifth Monarchists of the 1650s in particular, comparing them with Knollys’ eschatology in order to determine whether the remaining charge of Fifth Monarchism is valid.

The concluding chapter will summarize our findings, and seek to formulate an answer to the question of Knollys’ orthodoxy. In addition, we will summarize what we have learned of his theology in order to further our understanding of seventeenth-century Calvinistic Baptist thought.