

Editor's note: This is a pre-publication posting. In final form there will be various changes in form, formatting, and pagination. For the sake of immediate consideration of this article's significant ideas, we are making it accessible in advance of its scheduled spring 2007 publication date. It should be regarded as copyrighted material.

MEEK IMPERIALISTS: HUMILITY IN 17TH CENTURY ENGLAND

by Kari Konkola¹

Humility is the great ornament and jewel of Christian Religion, that whereby it is distinguished from all the wisdom of the world; [humility] not having been taught by the wise men of the Gentiles, but first put into a discipline, and made part of religion by our Lord Jesus Christ, who propounded himself imitable by his disciples so signally in nothing as in the twin sisters of meekness and humility. 'Learn from me, for I am meek and humble, and ye shall find rest unto your souls.'²

The above words come from a significant source: Jeremy Taylor (1613-1667) was a Bishop, Doctor in Divinity, Chaplain in Ordinary to King Charles II and one of the most popular religious authors in seventeenth-century England.³ Taylor's position and influence make it very probable that the view of humility as the main teaching of Christ and as the distinctive characteristic of Christianity was a fully accepted part of English Protestantism. The idea was also widely known, because the quotation comes from Taylor's *Holy Living*, a manual for virtuous life printed in 21 known editions between 1650 and 1700 -- i.e., about 60,000 copies of this book/paragraph circulated in England.⁴

The central place of humility in early modern English Protestantism highlights major change in religion, because this virtue has almost totally disappeared from modern Christianity.⁵ Historians have overlooked the transformation in religion, and this study begins to rectify the oversight by describing what being humble meant in 17th century England. Early modern investigations of humility were not limited to religion, and the latter parts of the study describe the effects humility was believed to have on the individual and on society.

The method used in the study is bibliometric analysis, which consists of identifying the most popular books and their most important ideas. This approach assumes that the best-selling texts reflect the preferences of the book-buying segment of the population, and that the ideas contained in "blockbusters" thus are likely to have been both well-liked and widely known. The "public opinion" revealed by best-selling books is limited to the literate part of the population, but the people who could read were the decision-making elite, and literacy was quite widespread. In England by 1650 about 350-450,000 of the 1.1 million households contained fluent readers.⁶

Estimating the number of books produced is made possible by the *Short Title Catalogue* (commonly abridged as STC), which documents English publishing from the beginning of printing to 1700. The STC contains an entry for each edition of a book published in England or intended for sale in English-speaking areas, and the catalogue thus includes books sold in New England as well as those produced by secret Catholic presses. The STC only lists editions of which copies still survive today, and this "conservatism" means that the number of copies very probably exceeded the estimates given below.⁷

The early decades of the seventeenth century are commonly called "Shakespeare's England," and this raises a question: is it possible to study early modern English morals solely from religious texts? The answer is simple: bibliometric analysis of book production shows that between 1610 and 1640 editions of long theological texts outnumbered editions of poems, plays and sonnets by a ratio of five to one.⁸ By an overwhelming margin, theology thus was the favorite subject of literate Englishmen. It can of course be argued that bibliometric statistics do not reflect people's experience, because the morals described in plays were "broadcast" to a wider audience via theaters. Yet, the morals of the theological texts were the content of seventeenth-century's real "mass media," the sermons preached every Sunday from England's 9000 pulpits. Religious bestsellers thus describe not only what the literate part of the population liked to buy, but what even the non-literate part of the

population was lectured on every week. The intense, widespread educational effort makes it very probable that the core ideas of Christian morality were familiar to the entire population. This again makes knowledge of humility a necessary requirement for understanding early modern England.

A Note on Style: According to best-selling English theologians, people usually were not aware of their sins such as pride, envy, or greed. This observation produced two important theological concepts: "detailed and particular application of sin" and "sight of sin." The first denoted the belief that people not only had to know sins and virtues well, they had to use this knowledge to investigate their thoughts, emotions and actions. This self-analysis commonly led to a discovery of the vast influence that passions such as pride exerted on what the person had previously believed to be free and rational behavior. This discovery was the "sight of sin," and theologians believed it to be crucial for further growth in religiosity, because only a person who realized how proud he really was, and how much he lacked in humility, would make a serious effort to change himself.

English divines emphasized time after time the importance of detailed self-application and its associated discovery of one's sins.⁹ Significantly, the detailed application was not limited to self-investigation. Preachers were advised to use the same style when talking about sin.¹⁰ Because of the importance given to the nuanced, "applied" style in early modern England, the descriptions of humility and pride in this paper use that style. This necessitates a cautionary note based on 17th century experience: all fallen humans were proud, and when the application was done correctly most hearers experienced the descriptions of pride as personal insults aimed specifically at them: "I well remember, when I first heard preaching, I was many times discontented . . . I had much ado at times, not to persuade myself that I was chiefly aimed at in some things, and that the preacher had received some secret informations touching me and my demeanor, which he here opened in the pulpit."¹¹ This perception triggered a fierce rage, which the preachers regarded as positive feedback: ". . . this hatred of

the world does so inseparably follow the faithful ministers (as the shadow does the body) as it is made a note of an unfaithful minister, not to be thus hated in the World", "The better and more wisely any preacher preaches, the more will be his opposition."¹² The detailed descriptions of humility and pride on the following pages thus may feel somewhat insulting, but readers are asked to keep in mind that early modern theologians believed this emotional reaction to be not only unavoidable, but a sign that the meaning of virtues and sins had been communicated successfully.

THE MEANING OF HUMILITY

Pride

Pride was the sin that opposed the virtue of humility, and one way to explain the meaning of humility is by describing proud behavior. Knowing pride is particularly important, because in the Bible this sin made Lucifer feel his subjection to God intolerable and caused his rebellion, his banishment from heaven and the entry of sin into the world. Pride thus was the sin of the devil and the original source of all evil, a combination which made it the worst of sins. The Old Testament's fierce condemnations reflected this central role: "Pride goeth before destruction, and an haughty spirit before a fall." (Prov. 16:18); "The Lord will destroy the house of the proud." (Prov. 15:25); "Every one that is proud in heart is an abomination to the Lord: though hand join in hand, he shall not be unpunished." (Prov. 16:5) ". . . the proud that are cursed." (Psalm 119:21) Popular English writers fully shared the view of pride as the sin of the devil and the worst of evils:

[The devil's] sin was Pride, and his Pride an emulation of God himself. I will ascend and be like unto God. He thought himself such a freeborn Subject, that he ought to cast all Sovereignty off him . . . this Leader the proud man follows; and with the same event likewise. His great design and aim is to be high, honoured, and applauded: and of all men, is the most odious to God and man.¹³

English theologians thus held pride to be an important, evil and dangerous sin. But what did they believe it to be? To answer this, we must note that early modern "religious psychologists" believed sins to influence thoughts, desires, instinctive emotional reactions and actions. All of these were controlled -- in religious terms, "corrupted" -- by the underlying sinful passion. This hidden, "behind the scenes" influence means that the only way to define pride is by listing its effects. Richard Baxter used this method:

Pride is an inordinate self-exalting; or a lifting up of ourselves above the state or degree appointed to us . . . it is an appearing to ourselves, and a desire to appear to others above what we are, or above others of our quality . . . It contains in it these following acts of parts. 1. A will to be higher or greater than God would have us to be. 2. An overvaluing of ourselves, or esteeming ourselves to be greater, wiser, or better

than indeed we are. 3. A desire that others should think of us, and speak of us, and use us, as greater, or wiser, or better than we are. 4. An endeavor or seeking to rise above our appointed place, or to be overvalued by others. 5. An ostentation of our inordinate self-esteem in outward signs of speech or action. Every one of these is an act of pride. The three first are the inward acts of it in the mind, and will, and the two last are its external acts.¹⁴

As can be seen, Baxter believed the root of pride to be an urge to raise above others: "a lifting up of ourselves above the state or degree appointed to us . . . A will to be higher or greater than God would have us to be." This deep-seated yearning for status and power was regarded as the "root" of all of the various manifestations of pride: "We would be the only Men or most considerable in the World; hence are we ambitious, hence continually with unsatiable greediness we do affect and strive to procure encrease of Reputation, of Power, of Dignity."¹⁵ One of the most visible effects of the desire for status was an "instinctive" feeling of pleasure in fame, admiration and power. This pleasure and the behaviors it motivated were such an essential part of pride that they were commonly used to define this sin:

[the proud] lift up the head and cast the Eye this way and that way, to see whose eyes are upon them, and may seem to admire them: and who shall say, That, that's he: which observed, or overheard . . . wonderfully delights the mind.

the disordinate affection which we have to be masters, and to have the highest roumes in assemblies, taking pleasure, as we pass in the streetes, to be pointed at with the finger, that some man may say, This is he.

Pride does tickle the heart of fools with content and pleasure to hear themselves applauded, or see themselves admired by people, or to hear that they have got a great reputation in the world, or to be flocked after, and cried up, and have many followers . . . It is a feast to the proud, to hear that men abroad do magnify him, or see that those about him do reverence, and love, and honor, and idolize him.¹⁶

Christ's Innovation?

The belief that pride caused Lucifer's fall and the entry of sin in the world made Christ's teaching -- and thus the central idea of Christianity -- easy to understand and accept. After all, if pride was the worst of sins, then humility must be the highest virtue. In emphasizing humility, Christ thus made a logical extension to the moral teaching of the Old

Testament. The extension may, however, have been very important. This possibility stems from the observation that in focusing on humility Christ moved religious thinking about morality into an area that had not been given much attention before. As we may recall, Jeremy Taylor believed humility to be Christ's innovation, and this view seems to have been common: "[Humility] A vertue which even the wisest of the old Pagans were for the most part strangers."¹⁷

The argument that Christ discovered humility may be historically significant. Quite a bit of research has been done on the origin of sins, and there is no doubt that the Old Testament and Greek philosophical and literary traditions knew well the idea that pride/hubris was a sin/vice which should be avoided¹⁸-- the view that pride caused Lucifer's fall and thus sin's entry in the world is stated explicitly and emphatically in the Old Testament. Yet, these two traditions do not seem to have pursued the idea to its logical conclusion: elevating pride/hubris into the most important vice turns humility into the most important virtue. The Greek classical tradition is totally silent about humility. In the Old Testament this virtue is mentioned several times -- Moses, for example, is praised for his exceptional humility (Numbers 12:3) -- but there is no special emphasis on it. The New Testament presents a very different view. The central person of the New Testament, Christ, the son of God, emphatically teaches humility and offers a role model for humble behavior with his own life and death. Not much work has been done on the "roots" of virtues, and the possibly central role of Christ in the introduction of humility to Western Civilization is a subject that needs a detailed investigation.

The Humble Personality

In seventeenth-century England, the expression "sin of pride" denoted all thoughts, emotions, desires and behaviors stemming from a deep-seated yearning for power, status, praise and admiration. Humility was the opposite to pride, and this position logically made a

low regard of oneself the most important part of humility: "Humiliation in the understanding consists in a low esteem of ourselves, and in self-abasing, self-condemning judgment on ourselves"; "true humility lies . . . in the mortification of our affections: & among other of this deadly and damnable pride . . . true humility consists not in the contempt of civility and good manners, much less in an affecting of rudeness and clownishness, but rather in a dislike and displeasure we take at ourselves . . ."; "Humility . . . a modest and slender opinion of a man's own self, whatever his endowments or circumstances are."¹⁹

One detail about the meaning of humility needs to be emphasized: according to English "religious psychologists," the acceptance of one's own worthlessness totally eliminated the desire for admiration, which was the central part of the vainglory branch of pride: "Humility is of two sorts, the first is, the having a mean and low opinion of ourselves, the second is the being content that others should have so of us. The first of these is contrary to pride, the other of vainglory."²⁰

Sins corrupted not just actions, but also the thoughts, emotions and desires that underlied those actions. This same depth-psychological view of human behavior applied to virtues, and true humility thus had to spread to affections, desires and will. Popular English writers pointed out often and emphatically that "outward" self-contempt in appearance and physical actions did not satisfy God: "Humility consists not in railing against yourself, or wearing mean clothes, or going softly and submissively: but in hearty and real evil or mean opinion of yourself. Believe yourself an unworthy person heartily, as you believe yourself to be hungry, or poor, or sick, when you are so."²¹

It may seem surprising to 21st century observers, but seventeenth-century English theologians believed a low self-image born of humility to have highly beneficial effects.²² Probably the most visible of these effects was a remarkable ability to bear insults. The causality was straightforward: insults did not bother a humble man because they did not contain anything new, they only confirmed the view which he had of himself. Indeed, a

humble man not only tolerated slander, he often agreed with it: "As the humbled soul has base thoughts of himself, so he is willing that others should esteem and think of him accordingly, even as a vile, unworthy sinner . . . His pride is so far taken down, that he can endure to be vilified with some consent."²³

The different reactions to insults were easy to notice -- to say the least -- and in early modern England the ability to "turn the other cheek" was a well-known sign of godliness:

[Humility manifests itself] in meek and quiet bearing of all injuries, unkindnesses, and disgraces whatsoever. An unhumbled wretch can not suspect the least wrong, but he swells presently. Whereas if a man is truly humbled, his humility will tell him; you deserve thus to be used, you are worthy of these wrongs . . . none can think or speak so vilely of an humbled repentant, as he himself thinks of himself . . . It is an ill sign when a man can put up no injury.²⁴

The expression " . . . none can think or speak so vilely of an humbled repentant, as he himself thinks of himself . ." is particularly intriguing in Dyke's portrait of the humble personality. After all, Dyke was describing the mentality and behavior required of every truly religious person in seventeenth-century England!

The Spread of Humility

Early modern descriptions of humility present a mindset quite different from what most people today regard as normal. More troubling yet, the old instructions describe a religious ideal quite different from anything that can be found in just about any branch of 21st century Christianity. This contrast raises a natural question: was humility really a widely known and important part of the moral thinking of early modern English Protestantism? The bibliometric approach provides a simple way to answer this question: did the most popular books and writers of the time discuss the details of humility?

The first text that stands out in a survey of early modern English "bestsellers" is a "Protestantized," English edition of Thomas Kempis' *The Imitation of Christ*. The huge sales of this book -- over 40 known editions, i.e., over 100,000 copies, before 1640 -- show that Englishmen enjoyed reading about a surprisingly demanding form of piety; the Christ

described by Kempis provided a role-model which adamantly required a Christian to mortify his pride and its concomitant desire for power and esteem:

Learn to obey, you dust; learn to bring down yourself, you earth and slime, and throw down yourself under all men's feet. Learn, I say, to break your will, and humbly to submit yourself to all. Wax hot against yourself, and suffer not pride to have place within you: but show yourself so lowly and simple, that all may tread you under foot like mire in the street.²⁵

A particularly intriguing aspect of Kempis' discussion of humility is that he saw this virtue as a sign of manliness.²⁶ Popular English theologians agreed with this view, and, as a result, they regarded as "manly" a person who was master of his passions, such as pride, envy, greed, lechery and anger: "be well assured, the stronger the passions are, the greater weaknesses they are; for he is not the strongest, nor wisest man that shows most passion, but he that subdues it most."²⁷ A truly masculine, pious seventeenth-century Englishman was humble, content and chaste, and he meekly suffered injuries without revenging them.²⁸ This ideal contrasted sharply with the medieval, chivalric understanding of masculinity, which required a true "man" to be strong, powerful, admired, a "ladies man," and capable of making everybody who insulted him regret their deed. To make the contrast starker yet, the chivalric code regarded the meek and humble Christian manliness as effeminacy.²⁹ The meanings of "manliness" and "effeminacy" had changed places!

Aside from proving the wide knowledge of humility in early modern England, the massive English sales of *The Imitation of Christ* also show that many core ideas of Christianity continued with small changes through the Reformation. The connection is very direct, because Kempis originally wrote his book in the early fifteenth century as a manual for people who desired to introduce the ideas of monastic piety to lay society. The willingness of large numbers of Englishmen in the Tudor and Stuart periods to buy a slightly modified version of the book shows that English Protestants eagerly embraced large parts of a moral system originally intended for Catholics living a semi-monastic life.

As to English writers, Jeremy Taylor's formidable credentials as an expert on the mainstream, Anglican branch of seventeenth century English Protestantism have already been noted. As we may recall, in his best-selling manual of religious life, *Holy Living*, Taylor argued that humility was the distinctive characteristic of Christianity. In the same book Taylor also described humility:

[A humble person] does not murmur against commands . . . He is meek and indifferent in all accidents and changes. 7. He patiently bears injuries. 8. He is always unsatisfied in his own conduct, resolutions and counsels . . . He is modest in his speech, and reserved in his laughter. 11. He fears when he hears himself commended . . . 12. He gives no pert or saucy answers when he is reprov'd, whether justly or unjustly. 13. He loves to sit down in private, and if he may he refuses the temptation of offices and new honours . . . He mends his fault, and gives thanks when he is admonished. 16. He is ready to do good offices to the murderers of his fame, to his slanderers, backbiters, and detractors.³⁰

According to the STC, the most widely published writer of the second half of the seventeenth-century was Richard Baxter, whose books went through 301 known editions between 1650 and 1700. Aside from being a best-selling author, Baxter was also the spiritual leader of the non-conformist branch of English Protestantism. Baxter's detailed description of humility shows that Anglicans and non-conformists agreed fully about the meaning and importance of this virtue. (Note Baxter's emphasis on what could be called "depth-psychological" understanding of sins and virtues: humility in external appearance did not suffice. This virtue had to be "in the soul"):

It is not all that are clothed in sackcloth, but to the humble soul that God has respect: even to the self-abhorring person, who judges himself unworthy to come among the people of God, or to be doorkeepers in his house . . . that patiently suffer the injuries of enemies and friends, and heartily forgive and love them; that bear the most sharp and plain reproofs with gentleness and thanks; that think the lowest place in mens esteem, affections, and respects, the fittest for them; that are much more solicitous of how they love others, than how others do what they ought for them; that will take up with smaller evidence to think well of the hearts or actions of others, than of their own; that reprove themselves oftener and more sharply than other men reprove them; and are more ready to censure themselves than others, or than most others are to censure them; that have a low esteem of their own understandings, and parts, and doings, and therefore are more ready to learn than teach, and to hear than speak . . . These are the humble that God accepts, and this is the fast that he requires. These are they that pray effectually, and that must save the land. These only are sensible of what sin is; when others feel it not, or are proud in the midst of their largest confessions and tears.³¹

Branches of Humility: Contentment

Early modern English divines commonly discussed the details of humility under "contentment." More than 35 editions of various manuals of "the art of contentment" were published in the second half of the seventeenth century,³² and they described people whose behavior was the opposite of that produced by pride -- particularly the ambition branch of this sin. By way of contraries, contentment thus illustrated the far-reaching influence which the deep-seated yearning for power and status was believed to have on thinking and behavior.

Contentment was defined as: "a resolution to be pleased, and sit down quiet, in what station soever God has appointed or allotted him, not to . . . be emulous of greatness, but in patience and meekness to undergo whatever shall befall him."³³ This peaceful, joyous state was always joined with humility, because only a person who regarded himself as utterly worthless and deserving absolutely nothing was likely to be satisfied with whatever he had: ". . . they who have a humble opinion of themselves must needs think they are well used, if they have any room assigned them by the Almighty, thou it be the lowermost seat."³⁴

English theologians had investigated the psychology of contentment in remarkable detail. The most important result of these investigations was the discovery that the feeling of satisfaction had no absolute connection to the external world. This belief produced a crucially important implication: contentment was created by the mind.³⁵ A person was content when his external conditions agreed with his desires and discontent when his desires exceeded his circumstances. This observation led naturally to a second idea: a person could make himself content by controlling his desires.³⁶ The observation that contentment was subjective and therefore fully controllable was made so often and so emphatically that it must have been another commonplace.³⁷

A third idea important for the psychology of contentment stemmed from the belief that sinful passions were insatiable, because they grew stronger with satisfaction. This implied that all efforts to satisfy passionate desires were bound to fail, and that the only way to contentment was by mortifying the passions.³⁸ For example, getting a promotion would not make ambitious people content, because they soon began to desire an even higher position.³⁹ In contrast, the humble enjoyed a happy and content life:

The meek man, where will not he live? What will not he enjoy? As on the contrary, if a man be proud, forward, passionate, what house is good enough? What fare fine enough? What estate will give him content? The meek think all too good, and that which the proud man scorns, would serve his turn well enough. Well, if you would make yourselves a lasting, comfortable estate, give way to meekness.⁴⁰

The Sin of Discontent Contentment was a religious duty, consequently, dissatisfaction with one's condition was sin.⁴¹ The "depth-psychological" view of sins and virtues made even the most secret unhappiness with one's present state sinful. Indeed, a special sin, "murmuring in spirit," explicitly condemned secret dissatisfaction with one's condition.⁴² The view of pride as the sin of the devil made discontent an extremely serious transgression, because Lucifer's pride had specifically appeared as discontentment in his subservient position to God: "The devil is the most discontented creature that is in the world . . . therefore so much discontentment you have, so much of the spirit of Satan you have."⁴³

The Sin of Ambition Discontent was closely connected with what early modern theologians called "the sin of ambition." According to popular English writers, ambition was the sub-branch of pride that opposed the contentment-branch of humility:

the *ambitious* man is always *disliking* his present condition, and that makes him so greedily to seek higher, whereas he that is content with his own lies quiet out of this temptation. Now *ambition* is not only a great sin in it self, but it puts men upon many other: There is nothing so horrid, which a man that eagerly seeks greatness will stick at; lying, perjury, murder, or any thing will down with him, if they tend to his advancement.⁴⁴

The contrast between what today is regarded as “normal” and the observation that ambition was “a great sin in itself” highlights the change that has taken place in the last three centuries. The difference is particularly impressive, because the book from which the quotation comes, Richard Allestree’s *The Whole Duty of Man*, went through 56 known editions -- i.e., about 200,000 copies -- between 1660 and 1700. This popularity means that the morals expounded in Allestree’s book must have been one of the best known sets of ideas in late seventeenth-century England. Significantly, *The Whole Duty of Man* devoted some thirty pages to pride, humility and contentment and it regarded humility as the most important virtue -- Allestree only gave five pages to chastity. Furthermore, the discussion of humility and pride followed closely along the lines laid out by Kempis, Taylor and Baxter. This agreement suggests that humility and pride maintained their central roles in English religious morality through the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

A Self-Test As we may recall, best-selling English theologians time after time emphasized the importance of "detailed and particular application of sin." To get a "history come alive" experience of how the introspective self-analysis worked, the reader is asked to read the following paragraph in the same self-applying way religious people in early modern England were instructed to read it: go through the text slowly, and at each point investigate your thoughts, emotions and actions to see whether you satisfy that demand of God's Law:

he is a truly humble Man, that does despise himself, and is contented to be counted not only humble, but vile, and wretched too; that . . . is contented his defects and infirmities should be known, bears Injuries patiently, is glad of mean employments to show his love to God, does not care for being known . . . and looks upon himself as nothing; is circumspect, and modest, delights not in superfluous talk, laughs but seldom . . . is well pleased with being made the filth of the World, and as the off-scouring of all things: That does think himself unworthy of the least crumb he eats, of the least drop of drink, he drinks . . . That can hear a friendly check with meekness, can ask forgiveness, in case he does unawares offend . . . That is contented, that those whom he loves, and in whom he trusted, and who have been kind to him, should forsake him, abandon him, and persecute him, and can bear with the ingratitude of men, to whom he has done many good turns . . . That can be contented to see his neighbour honour'd, and he himself slighted.⁴⁵

The meaning of Horneck's description to seventeenth century readers can be understood by noting that at the time humility was an inseparable part of a truly religious personality.⁴⁶ In early modern England, a man who did not meet the above requirements thus knew that he would spend his afterlife in the torments of hell!

HUMILITY AND SOCIETY

A survey of seventeenth century religious bestsellers shows that England's literate elite embraced moral ideals which to most 21st century readers seem rather strange -- if not positively dangerous. In fact, the first thought that comes to mind when reading the old theological texts is, 'Yes, humility has disappeared. And that was a darn good thing!'

There may, however, be a problem with this instinctive response, because early modern theologians did not base their praise of humility and criticism of pride only on Biblical dogmas; these arguments were supported by a large supply of psychological observations about the effects of sins and virtues. The "behavioral science" aspect of religious morality was highly counterintuitive and non-logical, and for this reason a detailed explanation of it has to be included in any discussion of 17th century theology. Otherwise the reasoning that underlied the moral ideals of English Protestantism will remain incomprehensible.

There is also a second reason that necessitates a close look at the old psychology of sins and virtues: during the commonwealth period the Puritans made an energetic effort to inculcate in people a strict, ascetical form of Christian morality. As a result, late seventeenth-century England is likely to have been one of the more pious areas in Europe. England's history since the 1650s thus provides "experimental evidence" about the effects of subduing pride and embracing humility. Due to space limitations, we can only look at the effect of this change in morality on three areas: violence, toleration and social success.

Humility and Violence

Humility's effect on violence is best explained via the dangers of its opposing sin, pride. The reason for this indirect approach is that, even though they are not aware of it, many educated persons today are familiar with the old, religious psychology of pride. This "unknown expertise" has come from the philosopher Thomas Hobbes. Though little known

in the seventeenth century,⁴⁷ Hobbes is famous today and his main work, *The Leviathan*, is required text for many undergraduates. Hobbes took his view of human nature from Christian pride,⁴⁸ and people who in their college days had to read *The Leviathan* thus have unsuspectingly studied theology.

Hobbes's use of religion made his ideas very similar to those of popular theologians: as we may recall, the sin of pride consisted of all thoughts, emotions and behaviors stemming from a deep-seated urge to rule others. In full agreement with this view, Hobbes held the most important motivating force in human nature to be “. . . a perpetual and restless desire for Power after Power, that ceaseth only in Death.”⁴⁹ Building on this assumption, a large part of *The Leviathan* consisted of a catalogue of the destructive social effects of the endless pursuit of power. According to Hobbes, the struggle for dominance was bound to grow so intense as to lead to a disastrous "warre . . . of every man, against every man."⁵⁰

This view about pride/desire for power agreed fully with that of the best-selling theologians, as can be seen in Baxter's description of the social consequences of pride:

pride is the gunpowder of the mind, the family, the church, and state: It maketh men ambitious, and setteth them on striving who shall be the greatest . . . If you (forgetfully) go before him, or overlook him, or neglect a compliment, or deny him something he expected, or speak not honourably of him, much more if you reprove him, and tell him of his faults, you have put fire to the gunpowder, you have broken his peace, and he will break yours, if he can . . . It is a matter of very great difficulty to live peaceably in a family, church, or any society with any one that is very proud . . . What is it but the lust of pride which causeth most of the wars and bloodshed throughout the world . . .⁵¹

People familiar with *The Leviathan* thus know the core idea of Christian pride: (fallen) human nature contains an innate yearning for power, which makes people inherently asocial. Yet, Hobbes used only a small part of religious psychology. As a result, he differed from theologians on two key points, the first of which was the question, ‘what to do about the asocial desire to dominate?’ According to Hobbes, only a strong fear produced by threat of ferocious punishments could check the lust for power.⁵² This assumption logically led to

Hobbes's famous conclusion: a peaceful society can exist only when there is an absolute ruler, who can apply harsh punishments to control the asocial human nature.

This conclusion shows that, even though Hobbes took his view of human nature from the Christian sin of pride, he totally overlooked the massive effort that 17th century English Protestantism made to overcome pride/lust for power -- i.e., he passed over in silence all the material described on pp. 1-13 above.⁵³ Failure to discuss this part of religion was central to Hobbes's philosophy, because the Christian effort to mortify pride and inculcate humility was a large-scale project to root out of Englishmen precisely the destructive desire for power that formed the foundation of the political theory set forth in *Leviathan*. A full investigation of Christian virtues and sins would have forced Hobbes to consider the possibility that the asocial human nature can be changed, and that a society thus can be both free and peaceful.

Surprisingly, Hobbes simply ignored the religious control of the desire to dominate. He never described this control or explained why he did not discuss it. This silence may have stemmed from the time and place: Hobbes wrote *The Leviathan* in the 1640s, when England was going through a civil war that culminated in the execution of King Charles I in 1650 -- *The Leviathan* came out in 1651. The failure of the Protestant effort to control lust for power may have seemed so self-evident that ignoring it needed no explanation.

The violence that surrounded Hobbes does in fact raise a very legitimate question: if English Protestants had internalized humility and its command not revenge wrongs, how could they revolt and kill the King? The explanation to this paradox is provided by a look at the wider context, which shows that Charles I was the exception. Aside from the King and some of his close advisers, very few people were executed. Indeed, the English revolution was exceptional in history because it lacked a period of "terror," in which the revolutionaries would have taken their revenge by killing large numbers of the King's supporters. This same "civility" can be seen in the war itself: unlike in the religious wars on the continent, large-scale massacres of political enemies, prisoners or civilians were rare in English fighting.

After about 1650, forgiving enemies appears to have become a general part of the English mentality, because executions in the Restoration were few -- not even all the people who had signed the death warrant of Charles I were put to death. At the glorious revolution in 1688, James II was not tried. He was allowed to escape. This reluctance to punish suggests that by the second half of the seventeenth-century Englishmen had internalized the central ideas of Christ's moral teaching: do not revenge wrongs and "turn the other cheek."

A look at England's post 1700 history reveals an even more impressive picture: there have been a few deaths in occasional riots and terrorist attacks, but they are so rare as to be "invisible" in any demographic analysis. For all practical purposes, it is factually accurate to say that mortality in domestic political violence in England has been nonexistent since 1650. From the perspective of comparative history, the 350 year period of tranquillity is very exceptional indeed, particularly considering that during this period England went through the massive social changes associated with industrialization and urbanization. Furthermore, England's central government was very weak until the late nineteenth century.

England's historical experience after 1650 looks very much like a case study of the beneficial effects of Christianity's ability to overcome the asocial lust for power. This evidence suggests that Hobbes's surroundings may have made him overly pessimistic. People's innate, asocial desire for power can be controlled by methods other than fear, and a harsh, absolute ruler thus is not necessary. A society can be both free and peaceful.

Fanatical Toleration

A virtuous Protestant had to adhere to religious morals in all situations and at all costs, and, after love of God, humility was the highest virtue. Combining these demands meant that a truly religious person had to be fanatically humble. The self-contradictory nature of this ideal becomes obvious when we recall the most important parts of humility: an "instinctive" pleasure in criticism; a meekness that was always combined with an eager

acceptance of one's inferiority in all things, including knowledge; and, a willingness to question one's ideas and to respect the knowledge and opinions of others.

A pious seventeenth-century Englishman thus had to be fanatically eager to doubt the wisdom of all his actions and beliefs, and to listen to other people's criticisms. Now, what kind of a personality ensues when people try to follow this rule? The answer to this question highlights a built-in conflict in early modern English religious morality: absolute, fanatical obedience to the commandments of God was a virtue, but the fanaticism was contradicted by the even more important virtue of humility. This inherent self-contradiction may have created an unexpected and counterintuitive causality: toleration grew out of a very special type of religious fanaticism. Significantly, historical evidence supports this illogical course of events: judged by the European standards of the time, exceptional openness has been the hallmark of England since the second half of the seventeenth century.

Humility and "Success"

Numerous writers have accused Christianity of weakening Western Civilization. The most influential advocates of this view have arguably been the 18th century English historian Edward Gibbon (1737-1794) and the German philosopher Friedrich Nietzsche (1844-1900). The writings of the latter, in particular, have had a massive influence since the last decade of the 19th century, and they are relevant to our investigation because Nietzsche believed Christianity's advocacy of humility to be the reason why it was dangerous: "*The root of all evil*: that the slavish morality of meekness, chastity, selflessness, absolute obedience, has triumphed."⁵⁴

England's history provides evidence relevant to the "Christianity causes decay" thesis, because the beginning of a large-scale effort to internalize Christian morals can be dated to the late sixteenth century, when Oxford and Cambridge started producing large numbers of well-educated clergy.⁵⁵ These experts in "religious psychology" went to the parishes and

launched an effort to inculcate the morals of Protestantism in their flocks by the conversion process.⁵⁶ This timing is significant, because the "long seventeenth century" also saw the rise of the British Empire, which has arguably been by far the most successful in modern Western Civilization. England thus shows an impressive correlation in time between the spread of deeply internalized, ascetical Christianity and political "success." This correlation poses an obvious problem to the thesis of Gibbon and Nietzsche, since in early modern England an intense application of strict Christianity coexisted with the strength and success of Western Civilization, not with its demise. At least in this case, the view that Christianity weakens society is not only false to facts, but diametrically contrary to them.

Yet, the "Christianity causes decay" thesis is understandable, because the evidence is indeed counterintuitive: in the seventeenth century, a large part of England's elite idealized humility and adopted what appear to have been remarkably effective methods to internalize this virtue. Yet, this very same, meek, self-deprecating, contentment-praising elite created the British Empire, one of the most expansionist states that has ever existed. The most obvious explanation for this non-logical development of course is that the talk about humility was just a hypocritical sham. Whatever the best-selling theologians may have written, in reality post-1650 England was an example of the beneficial effects of overweening pride and its associated pursuit for dominance. This theory could also explain the domestic peace: all the proud, ambitious aggressors went overseas to fight for the Empire.⁵⁷

The second possibility is that the humility was real, and that, illogical though their reasoning appears at first sight, early modern "religious psychologists" were onto something when they argued that over the long term humility produces success because it makes people rational, wise, amiable, social, highly respected and well-liked. (See below.) Pride, on the other hand, leads to failure because it creates personalities characterized by incompetence, stupidity, irrationality and an unconscious habit to pick quarrels with everyone. Considering the significance of these effects, it might be well worth the effort to investigate the

psychological ideas contained in the old, religious psychology of humility and pride with the experimental methods of modern behavioral sciences.

HUMILITY AND THE INDIVIDUAL

Counterintuitive though that possibility seems, humility may be quite beneficial to society. But what does this virtue do to a person? This question is the second point where Hobbes separated from popular theologians of his time: *The Leviathan* discussed in great detail those effects of pride that made this sin dangerous to society, but there was little about the effects that the desire for power had on an individual. The silence is surprising, because many religious moralists argued that, even on the level of an individual, pride was harmful while humility produced great benefits. Furthermore, religious bestsellers abounded in detailed descriptions of the reasons why pride was dangerous.

1) Proud people desired praise and esteem, and one way to satisfy this craving was ostentation. The conspicuous consumption produced by ostentation was a very expensive personality trait, and the disastrous financial consequences of proud spendthriftness were a commonplace in seventeenth-century theology.⁵⁸

2) When pride grew strong -- as it inevitably did over time -- it caused a loss of empathy, i.e., the ability to understand how others perceived one's actions. This loss had a very detrimental effect on proud people's interpersonal relationships.⁵⁹

3) Pride created an inherently quarrelsome personality. This trait grew out of the ever-present concern about esteem, which made the proud see insults and grow furious even when no harm was intended. As a result of this hypersensitivity, proud people had a tendency to get entangled in quarrels which wasted their time and energy while producing little in terms of useful results.⁶⁰

4) Their desire to appear flawless made it almost impossible for the proud to acknowledge that they were wrong or that they had made a mistake -- i.e., pride destroyed the ability to do self-criticism. As a result, proud people could neither notice nor correct their errors. (Paradoxically, this blindness applied especially strongly to noticing one's pride,

a property that made this sin very difficult to cure.) Proud people also lost their ability to learn, because the first step in learning is to acknowledge that there is something one does not know, and this step the proud could not take.⁶¹

5) The most dangerous "personal" effect of pride stemmed from the overpowering influence early modern religious psychologists believed passions to have on thinking. This effect was common to all passions, and theologians described it by the expressions "love is blind" and "passions extinguish the light of reason." Seventeenth-century religious bestsellers abound with warnings about this emotion-caused loss of rationality: "A man doth now for the most part reason, believe, and will according to his affections and passions . . . As every man is affected, so he judgeth." "Wise men confess, and ignorant men prove, that passions blind their judgments and reason." ". . . a man cannot be wise and passionate . . ." ⁶²

The personal dangers of pride made this sin self-limiting: over the long term the desire for power and esteem brought about destruction and shame, not the high status and admiration the proud sought. Popular English writers held this counterintuitive result to be the message of the ferocious Biblical condemnations of pride, and many of them warmly seconded these threats: "God is the proud man's professed enemy . . . it is most frequently seen, that this sin meets with very extraordinary judgements even in this life." ⁶³

The self-limiting property of pride highlights the significance of Hobbes' failure to discuss the "personal effects" of this sin: he overestimated the dangers of the lust for power to society. Many seventeenth-century religious psychologists believed proud people to sink in status and finances, and this decline reduced their ability to harm others. The perceived dangers of pride also made it logical to regard humility as beneficial. The reasoning was simple: people who had overcome pride had also freed themselves from the quarrelsomeness, spendthriftness, inability to learn and passion-caused irrationality.⁶⁴ Successful mortification of pride and inculcation of humility thus produced a person who was easy to get along with, and who was also eager to learn, rational, thrifty, hard-working

and honest. These virtuous traits not only led to paradise, they were likely to produce success already in "this life":

everybody loves a humble person, because humility is naturally amiable; and the more amiable, because it is attended with many such other graces, as win and endear the hearts of all mankind, with a power that is uncontrollable, and attractive like the faculty of a magnet. Where true humility is, there is Meekness, Charity, Candour, Affability, Courtesy, Gentleness, a serene Brow, kind Intreatings, and the like; nor is it possible but such graceful endowments must meet with kind entertainment, and be beloved everywhere.

no men on earth are more likely to attain Riches and Honor than virtuous men, by reason their minds are free from Sloth, Dullness, Carelessness, Intemperance, Riot, and such dissolute courses, as usually are the sources of dishonor and of declining in estates and fortunes. And no men living are more likely to gain riches and honor than the industrious, diligent, temperate, frugal, unpassionate, courteous, affable, and every way virtuous man.

everybody is willing to employ an honest industrious man, so that he shall seldom want work or trading. But idle, riotous people that follow whoring and drinking, gaming and cheating, and stealing . . . these are the people, if you observe it, that do commonly fall into the basest beggary and misery; and men do but little pity them, because they brought it all upon themselves . . . It is their own sin and folly, their lusts and passions that occasion most of those troubles and miseries which they meet with; though I know they use to cry out of their hard fortune, and to lay the blame upon others.⁶⁵

Interestingly, the belief that sinful passions had disastrous effects while Christian virtues would bring success was not shared by all religious writers. Several theologians -- including Baxter -- held a diametrically opposite view, believing that the motivation provided by greed and pride inevitably made sinners rich and powerful, while their honesty, humility and contentment kept the godly in a low position.⁶⁶

The effect of sins and virtues thus was one of the points where popular English theologians did not agree. Some thought virtues to produce wealth and esteem already on earth, others believed only an ambitious, greedy sinner could "succeed" in the world.⁶⁷ A bibliometric analysis points to the former as the mainstream view in the second half of the seventeenth century, because it was set forth emphatically in John Rawlet's *The Christian Monitor*, a synopsis of the effects of religion published in some 100,000 copies between 1680 and 1700.⁶⁸

HUMILITY AND HISTORIANS

Bestselling religious writers of seventeenth-century England described humility as Christianity's most important virtue and as its unique characteristic. These writers also believed humility to be highly beneficial to the individual and the society. In light of this central role, it is surprising to find that humility and its opposing sin, pride, have received almost no attention from historians. At first sight, the existence of such a large difference in perceptions seems impossible. Yet, a survey of recent research-trends leaves no doubt about the existence of a puzzling gap between what early modern English Protestants were reading and what modern historians are investigating.

The most influential study of Puritanism in recent decades has been Perry Miller's *The New England Mind*. Astonishingly, the word "humility" is not mentioned in this book. A search for the reason of this omission points to Miller's discussion of Puritan ideas about sin: *The New England Mind* surveys sin on a few pages that describe movingly the concern about a restless love ranging all over the world in search of temporary satisfaction.⁶⁹

Unfortunately, the eloquence hides a woeful inadequacy, because Miller passes over in silence numerous concepts that were common in Puritan religious literature and central to seventeenth-century English Protestant theology of sin: the words "flesh", "pride", "envy", "greed" and "lust" cannot be found in *The New England Mind*.⁷⁰ Neither are there any details of concepts such as "slavery to sin", "mortification of the flesh" and "hypocrisy", all of which were mentioned so often in popular texts that they must have been commonplaces in seventeenth-century England.

One way to illustrate the problem with Miller's work is to judge *The New England Mind* by historians' basic standard: the duty to communicate to readers an accurate picture of the past. Miller has part of the picture; the description of the love of the world is factually accurate. Yet, there was far more to sins and virtues than Miller discussed in his book, and

the concepts he left out -- flesh, mortification, pride, envy and humility -- were at the heart of early modern religious morality. By discussing only a small part of what the original sources said about sins and virtues, Miller presents to his readers a view of early modern English Protestantism that would have been unrecognizable to seventeenth-century Englishmen.

The oversight of humility and pride in historical research is not limited to Perry Miller. A more recent example can be seen in John Bossy's argument that in the sixteenth century the meaning of sin changed from the seven deadly sins to the ten commandments. According to Bossy, this change took place in both Catholic and Protestant areas and it was exemplified in the "universal diffusion of the Catechism in the sixteenth century."⁷¹ As could be seen in the survey of popular seventeenth-century religious texts on pp. 1-13, at least for England Bossy's thesis needs to be reconsidered. Books describing humility in great detail sold by the hundreds of thousands through the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and this bibliometric evidence makes it very probable that humility remained a widely known and important part of the moral code of English Protestantism until at least 1700.

The most likely reason for the over-emphasis on the Ten Commandments is a failure to notice the "step by step" approach of English Protestant teaching of religion. According to the most widely published theologian of pre-1640 England, William Perkins, the first thing a preacher had to do when dealing with people who were ignorant of any religion was to teach the basics contained in the catechism. Once the basics had been learned, people were to be taught the details of the law, which enabled them to introspect and thus discover the extent and power of sin in themselves -- this was the detailed and particular application of sin, mentioned above. The discovery of one's sinfulness triggered a depression, which started people on their journey through the conversion process. During that journey, the pastor was to teach the psychological nuances of the process, so the converts knew what stage they were on, and what to expect next.⁷²

As Perkins' description shows, the Catechism and its associated Ten Commandments were important in English Protestantism, but they were only the first step of a long program of religious education, which in its later stages included advanced instruction in the depth-psychology of sins, virtues and the conversion process. Bossy overlooked the later parts of the process, and, as a result, he failed to notice the continuing importance of emotion-based, psychological sins and virtues, such as pride and humility.

In the last few years, antinomianism has become a popular subject among historians of the English Reformation. This branch of seventeenth-century religion differed sharply from the "conversion Protestantism." Most importantly, antinomians did not need to know sins and virtues such as pride and humility and to use this knowledge in introspective "self application" to be saved. This difference naturally raises the question: which of the two, antinomianism or conversion Protestantism, was the mainstream in seventeenth century England? The obvious way to answer this question is via a bibliometric analysis.

The antinomian debates produced a total of some 60 titles,⁷³ most of which came out in two peaks, the first between 1640 and 1655 and the second in the 1690s. A survey of the STC shows that, with very few exceptions,⁷⁴ books defending or attacking antinomianism had only 1-2 editions -- i.e., about 1,000 - 4,500 copies satisfied the demand created by people so interested in the debates as to buy books discussing them. These sales suggest that the number of English families seriously involved in the antinomian debates is likely to have been between five and fifteen thousand, which translates to 1.5-3.5% of the 400,000 - 500,000 literate households of the time.⁷⁵

The relative historical importance of the two branches of English Protestantism becomes obvious when antinomianism's 60 titles with 1-2 editions each are compared with the publishing statistics of books describing the psychological nuances of the conversion process: hundreds of titles and print runs of ten to twenty editions -- i.e., 25,000 to 60,000 copies -- by no means uncommon.⁷⁶ This overwhelming bibliometric difference shows that,

compared to conversion Protestantism, the antinomians were a small, uninfluential tangent. Using their writings as a source on seventeenth-century English Protestantism means generalizing from an atypical exception and overlooking the mainstream.

The argument that historians have overlooked a large part of what early modern Protestants used to regard as sin needs two qualifications: in the first place, the disciplinary mechanisms established by various denominations have received abundant attention. An example of the careful research on this subject can be seen in Raymond Menzer, ed. *Sin and the Calvinists*, which is a collection of studies on the control of morals in Protestantism. The articles, however, focus entirely on the control of "external," visible behavior. What could be called "inner sins," such as "pride," "envy" and "hypocrisy" are not discussed in the book at all, even though the depth-psychological, "spiritual interpretation" of sin and its associated obedience in thoughts and emotions was central to Protestantism -- at least seventeenth-century English Protestantism. The problem produced by the narrow focus on external obedience is highlighted by the fact that none of the sins discussed in *Sin and the Calvinists* would catch hypocrites, who often performed all the "external works" of religion more punctually than the truly pious.⁷⁷

At least in the case of England, the focus on external discipline is seriously misleading because it overlooks the difference between controlling sin and mortifying sin, which popular English writers regarded as central to true religiosity. Any hypocrite could control sin, i.e., prevent sinful actions by willpower, but only the truly faithful had mortified sin, i.e., noticeably weakened the deep-seated desires that produced the sinful behaviors, for example the lust for power that was the root of pride. In everyday life, mortification manifested itself in the disappearance of the pleasure associated with sinful behaviors: ". . . real mortification wrought by the power of the Spirit of God, this is so powerful in your heart, that it implants in you a contrary and hateful disposition to that sin which you do not act . . . he does not only leave sin, but abhor it: there is not only a cessation from sin, but an indignation against it." “. . .

. . . when a man can truly detest sin in others, as Lot did, and does truly loath it in himself, then it is a true sign of true mortification."⁷⁸ The mortification-produced change in emotions from pleasure to revulsion was believed to make a huge difference in the ability to abstain from sin. After all, it was easy to refrain from doing something that felt disgusting, while willpower had great difficulties in controlling actions that felt pleasant: ". . . let men resolve never so strongly against sin, yet it will creep again into their favor, till the love of sin is quenched in the heart," ". . . it is almost unexpected, that [men] should leave to sin those sins, by which their laughter, heart's joy & firmest bond of fellowship is commonly occasioned."⁷⁹

The second qualification to the oversight of traditional sins and virtues is a very small sub-branch of Puritan studies that has investigated the introspective, "psychological" religion. In 1986 Charles Cohen published a study of Puritan conversion narratives, and he found pride to be a common sin in those narratives.⁸⁰ More recently, Theodore Bozeman surveyed the Puritan conversion process. He found that sins such as pride were important, and that they were thought to have a huge influence on thinking and behavior. Indeed, Bozeman went so far as to argue that there existed "a puritan depth psychology," and he even discussed similarities between old theological concepts and modern psychology.

Space limitations, however, prevented Bozeman from investigating the "Puritan depth psychology" in detail, a fact he acknowledged: "The present chapter only begins to plumb the story of self-analysis."⁸¹ This is unfortunate, because early modern theologians time after time argued that the psychological nuances of sins and virtues made a drastic difference in the effect religion had on people. As we may recall, knowledge of these details made possible a thorough self-analysis, which enabled people to notice sins in themselves and in others. This discovery was called "sight of sin" and it launched people into the conversion process. The omission of the details of sins and virtues such as pride and humility from historical writing thus means that precisely that part of early modern English Protestantism

which popular theologians at the time believed to make their religion effective has not been described at all.

IN SUM

A survey of popular seventeenth-century religious texts showed humility to have been one of the most important moral ideals of the time. A survey of modern writings, on the other hand, showed references to humility to be so rare as to be non-existent. (In fact, the sin of pride, which in early modern religious morality opposed the virtue of humility, currently seems to be in the process of turning into a virtue under the guise of "self-esteem.")⁸² One of the core ideals of Christian morality thus has disappeared, and this observation makes uncovering the full details of traditional humility and the "when, how and why" of its death an obvious next task for historians. There also raises an important historiographical question: how could a loss of this magnitude happen? This question is particularly mysterious in light of the massive interest in theology and in history, as well as the intense debate that has been going on for decades about religious control of sex. How could the central moral idea and special quality of Christianity, the virtue of Christ, fade into oblivion in the midst of all this attention?

The survey of recent work on English Protestantism provides a lead in the "how could we lose humility" mystery, because there is a pattern: the research is outstanding, but the subject of the study is defined in such a way that the research does not include all evidence that would be relevant to the investigation. This problem could be seen time after time: Miller left out most of the sins, as well as the depth-psychology of these sins; Bossy did not look beyond catechisms; Historians working on Antinomianism have focused on this small group and ignored the far more numerous conversion Protestants, who regarded the struggle to overcome sins as the central task of religion.

The failure to contextualize research is not a modern problem. Thomas Hobbes investigated pride and its dangers to society in great detail, but he failed to discuss the religious control of the asocial lust for power. The thriving cottage-industry of researchers

that has grown up around Hobbes's ideas has perpetuated his error, and they provide a case-study of the problem: historians and philosophers have investigated in microscopic detail the theory of the desire for power set forth in the "Leviathan." This very careful research has, however, ignored the massive Christian effort to root out of Englishmen precisely that lust for power which formed the foundation of Hobbes's philosophy. The oversight is particularly astonishing in light of the relative influences of Christianity and of Hobbes and his critics: Allestree's *The Whole Duty of Man* sold some 200,000 copies in the second half of the 17th century, at the same time when books written by Hobbes and by people who criticized him struggled to find more than 10,000 buyers.⁸³ Lack of attention to Christian thinking about the desire for power in the face of this 20 to 1 ratio in printed sources points to a serious flaw in the methods used to determine what was mainstream and what a little-known, atypical, uninfluential tangent.

Identifying the cause of the inability to contextualize evidence and correcting the flaw are obviously a task of utmost importance. The significance of this project was highlighted by the question a friend asked in a discussion about the disappearance of humility and pride: "What else has been lost?"

¹I wish to thank Yi-Fu Tuan, Sean Perrone, James Steadman and Andy Devine for their helpful suggestions and comments to earlier versions of this paper. My thanks as well to Professor Richard Gonce, who commented helpfully on an earlier draft. A summary of this article has been published as part of Kari Konkola, 'Have We Lost Humility?' *Humanitas*, Vol. XX, No. XX, XX-XX.

²Jeremy Taylor, *The Rule and Exercise of Holy Living*, (London, 1680), 85.

³"Popular" is based on the number of published editions. The STC gives Taylor a total of 160 known editions, which puts him to the third place among religious authors, after Richard Baxter (301 known editions) and William Perkins (214 known edition).

⁴For an estimate of edition sizes in 17th century England, see Kari Konkola, "'People of the Book': The Production of Theological Texts in Early Modern England" *The Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America*, 94:1 (March 2000), 16.

⁵Konkola, 'Have We Lost Humility?' *Humanitas*, Vol. XX, No. XX, pp. XX-XX.

⁶For the problems in defining "literacy" and the meaning of the expression "fluent literacy," see Konkola, "People of the Book", 22. fn 35. That discussion uses a literacy rate of 30% for mid seventeenth-century England, which is based on Cressy's estimate. However, Professor Diarmaid MacCulloch (personal communication) suggested a somewhat higher estimate, and this produced the 30-40%.

⁷A description of the STC as well as a summary of the bibliometric method and its application to the English Reformation can be found in Kari Konkola and Diarmaid MacCulloch, "People of the Book: Success in the English Reformation," *History Today*, October 2003, 23-29. For a more detailed discussion, see Konkola, "People of the Book".

⁸Konkola, "People of the Book", 24.

⁹Application was thought to be especially important in meditation: "*Be sure always in your meditation, to join application; be sure to join examination, and application, and contemplation, and consideration; this is a rule of great concernment to the weakest of Christians . . . general contemplation of things, though ever so excellent will not work upon the soul; I hardly ever heard of a man that was converted by Generals; it is the particular application that works upon the heart and affections . . . you shall seldom hear a general sermon do good, it is the particular application that works upon people's hearts. And therefore in all your exercise of Divine Meditation, be sure to draw things down to particular . . .*" Edmund Calamy, *The Art of Divine Meditation*, (London, 1680), 187-188. The italics are in the original. Calamy was very emphatic on the importance of application, he repeats the point on p. 108: "Divine meditation must be particular and applicative; for generals will not work at all . . . therefore the greatest part of meditation is application. You must apply the things you meditate of, to your own particular." See also Stephen Egerton, *The practise of Christianity*, (London, 1623), 319 and Henry Scudder, *The Christian's Daily Walke*, (London, 1652), 181. Both Egerton and Scudder call application "the life of meditation." The mentor of many of the Cambridge puritans, Richard Greenham (1539-1594), thought meditation and its associated application to be absolutely crucial for true religiosity: "Meditation is that exercise of the mind, whereby we calling to our remembrance that which we know, do further debate of it, and apply it to ourselves, that we might have some use of it in our practise. . . . For example, a man then meditates on the word, when he so remembers it and muses on it, that he goes from point to point, applying generally some things to

himself, and wisely examining how the case stands between the Lord and him in those things, whereby he seeing what is like to follow upon it, has his heart stirred up to put something in practise. . . . the knowledge which one gets, while it swims in the brain, and is not settled in the affections by meditation, is but vanishing knowledge.” *The Workes of the Reverend and Faithful Servant of Jesus Christ M. Richard Greenham*, (London, 1612), 22.

¹⁰ . . . the ministry that God has sanctified to convert sinners, and whereby he has been wont for to work most effectually, is such as applies the Word particularly, . . . the very life and power of preaching, consists in this . . . Till our sins are effectually discovered to us, we will never seek salvation seriously, and in good earnest.” Arthur Hildesham's, *CLII Lectures upon Psalme LI*, (London, 1635), 52. The importance of the detailed and particular application of sin was stated emphatically by almost every writer on practical divinity. Thomas Hooker in his *The Application of Redemption*, (London, 1656) pt. II p. 193 noted that "A plain and particular Application of special sins by the Ministry of the word is a special means to bring the soul to a sight of, and sorrow for them." This sentence is set out separately from text, printed in oversize type, and marked out as a specific doctrine. Robert Bolton in his *Works*, (London, 1641), 176-7 also set out the same point as a specific doctrine: "Pressing upon men's consciences with a zealous, discreet powerfulness, their special, principal, fresh-bleeding sins, is a notable means to break their hearts, and bring them to remorse."

¹¹Samuel Hieron, *The Preacher's Plea*, (London, 1604), 11. The same point was made also by William Perkins, *A Treatise of Man's Imaginations*, (London, 1607), 109: ". . . when men's faults are particularly rebuked in the ministry of the word, and the quick, as it were touched by applying the word to the conscience; then will the heart of the natural man, thus conceive of the minister that reproves sin; This man means me, he has some spite, and malice against me, that he thus reproves my particular faults; when as the minister knew them not to be his personal sins: but it is the power of the word that ransacks the sinful heart." See also Richard Bernard, *The Faithfull Shepherd*, (London, 1621), 329: "And by this they are said to name men in the Pulpit, and gall some personally: when no man is named: but the use of correction of some vice is made in the second person to the hearers." Bernard highly praised the detailed application of sin: "This home speaking is the sharp edge of the sword, the word of God, this brings the uses to their proper places . . . this indeed it is which makes faithful ministers' teaching unsavoury to carnall and evil men."

¹²The first quotation comes from Arthur Hildesham, *CVIII Lectures upon the fourth of John*, (London, 1632), 47. The second comes from Stephen More, *The Wise Gospel Preacher*, (London, 1650), 146.

¹³Matthew Scrivener, *The Method and Means to a true Spiritual Life*, (London, 1688), 104.

¹⁴Richard Baxter, "Christian Directory" in William Orme ed., *The Practical Works of The Rev. Richard Baxter*, (London: James Duncan, 1830) III, 2. This book will henceforth be referred to as "Baxter, *Directory*".

¹⁵Isaac Barrow, *A The Works of the Learned Isaac Barrow, D.D.* John Tillotson, ed. (London, 1700), I, 257.

¹⁶The first paragraph comes from Matthew Scrivener, *The Method and Means to a True Spritual Life*, (London, 1688), 204-205. The second comes from Jean de L'espine, *A very Excellent and Learned Discourse, touching the Tranquilitie and Contentation of the minde*, (Cambridge, 1592), fol 21. The last paragraph comes from Baxter, *Directory*, 38.

¹⁷Edward Pelling, *A Practical Discourse upon Humility*, (London, 1694). The discussion is in the introduction, which has no paging. Pelling noted that the ancients knew pride and warned about its “unseasonableness and folly.”

¹⁸For a general survey of the origin of the seven deadly sins in the Greek and Old Testament traditions, see Morton W. Bloomfield, *The Seven Deadly Sins* (Michigan State University Press, 1967). A detailed case study of hubris/pride in Greek literature can be found in Patricia M. Lines, ‘Antigone’s Flaw’ *Humanitas*, XII, No. 1, (1999), 4-15.

¹⁹The first sentence comes from Richard Baxter, *Directions and Persuasions to a Sound Conversion*, in William Orme ed., *The Practical Works of The Rev. Richard Baxter*, (London: James Duncan, 1830) VIII, p. 61. The second comes from Jean de L'Espine, *A Very Excellent and Learned Discourse, touching the Tranquillitie and Contentation of the minde*. (Cambridge, 1592), 38. The third comes from Edward Pelling, *A Practical Discourse upon Humility*, (London, 1694), 5. In his definition of humility Richard Rogers pointed out explicitly the benefits which ensued from the disappearance of the desire to dominate: "Humility is a virtue whereby one man thinks better of another than of himself: for this makes a man think basely of himself, in regard of his own sins and corruptions, whereupon he is contented to give place unto other, and to yeld of his own right, for the maintenance of peace: when as on the othe side, pride causes men to seek for more than their due, & so causes contention." Richard Rogers, *A Garden of Spiritual Flowers*, (London, 1625), fol. F.

²⁰Richard Allestree, *The Whole Duty of Man*, (London, 1663), 137.

²¹Taylor *The Rule and Exercise of Holy Living*, (London, 1680), 85.

²²For a detailed discussion of the benefits of humility see Edward Pelling’s popular, *A Practical Discourse upon Humility*, (London, 1694).

²³Richard Baxter, *Directions and Persuasions to a Sound Conversion*, in William Orme ed., *The Practical Works of The Rev. Richard Baxter*, (London: James Duncan, 1830) VIII, pp. 61 ff.

²⁴Daniel Dyke, *Two Treatises, The one on Repentance, the other, Of Christs temptations*, (London, 1616), 89-91.

²⁵Thomas A. Kempis, *Of the Imitation of Christ*, (London, 1587), 148.

²⁶Kempis was remarkably emphatic on this point. In the *Imitation* he repeated four times the observation that a truly manly man fought against his flesh and its sinful passions such as pride: “Sometimes . . . you must use violence, and resist manfully thy sensual appetite, not regarding what the flesh would, or would not; but rather taking pains that even perforce it may be made subject to the Spirit.” Thomas a Kempis, *Of the Imitation of Christ*, (New Canaan: Keats Publishing Inc., 1973), 99. For the other observations, see pp. 33, 56 and 110-111.

²⁷Timothy Rogers, *Good News from Heaven, of a Safe Conduct, Discovering Many Treasons Against Everyone's Soul*, (London, 1627), 193.

²⁸“It is a special point of manly wisdom, to passe by many petty provocations to wrath, without notice or acknowledgement, without wound or passion; and to digest many times the brawlings and indiscretions of hasty men, with the same patience that Surgeons do the injuries of mad men, when they let them blood.” Richard Bolton, *Some General Directions for Comfortable Walking with God*, (London, 1626), 96. Bolton specifically mentioned effeminacy as one of the causes of

anger: "Weaknesse of sprit, unmanlinesse of minde. . . . an effeminate facilitie to be moved and toucht with every trifle." See also Kempis, *Of the Imitation of Christ*, 110-111.

²⁹" . . . first, Machiavelli steps out, and tells us that meekness will weaken and emasculate men's minds, and make them silly, shiftless, effeminate, and take away their spirit. Next, Julian comes forth and says, that meekness renders a man ridiculous, makes him scorned and laughed at." Robert Harris, *The Workes of Robert Harris, Bachelor in Divinity*, (London, 1635), 293.

³⁰Taylor, *The Rule and Exercise of Holy Living*, (London, 1680) The first paragraph comes from pp. 95-96, the second from p. 86.

³¹Baxter, *Directory*, 51. Baxter was very explicit about the difference between internal and external humility: "Be much in humbling exercises; but so as to take heed of mistaking the nature of them, or running into extremes. I have told you the true nature of humility before. Abundance of Christians are tempted by Satan to think it consists much more than it does, in passionate grief, and tears, and bodily exercises, of long and frequent fastings, and confessions, and penance, or such like: and thus satan diverts them from true endeavours for true humiliation, by keeping them employed all their days, in striving for tears, or in these external exercises! Whereas, you should most strive, for such a sight of your sinfulness and nothingness, as will teach you highly to esteem of Christ, and to loathe yourselves, and take yourselves to be as vile and sinful as you are, and will make you humbly beg for mercy, and stoop to any means to obtain it; and will make you patient under the rebukes and chastisements of God, and under the contempts and injuries of men: this is the humility which you must labour for. But in order to this, external exercises of humiliation must be used: especially studying the holy law of God, and searching yourself, and confession of sin, and moderate, seasonable fastings, and taming of the flesh."

³²At least three very popular books treated this subject: Thomas Watson, *The Art of Divine Contentment*, (London, 1682). First ed. 1653, the 1682 edition is listed as the fifteenth; Richard Burroughs, *The Rare Jewell of Christian Contentment*, (London, 1685). First ed. 1648, 11 more editions by 1685. Richard Allestree, *The Art of Contentment*, (Oxford, 1675). 10 editions between 1675 and 1700.

³³Anon. *The Danger of Pride and Ambition*, (London, 1685), fol A3-A4. See also Richard Baxter, *A Treatise on Conversion*, in William Orme ed., *The Practical Works of The Rev. Richard Baxter*, (London: James Duncan, 1830) VII, pp. 86-87. Thomas Watson in his *The Art of Divine Contentment*, (London, 1682), 27-29, was more concise: "[contentment] a sweet temper of spirit, whereby a Christian carries himself in an equal poise in every condition." Burroughs was almost poetic: "Christian Contentment is that sweet, inward, quiet, gracious frame of Spirit, freely submitting to, and taking complacency in God's wise, and fatherly dispose in every condition." *The Rare Jewell of Christian Contentment*, (London: H. Sawbridge, 1685), 4.

³⁴Edward Pelling, *A Practical Discourse upon Humility*, (London, 1694), 166. Thomas Watson made the same point in his *The Art of Divine Contentment*, (London, 1682), 187: "The humble man is the contented man; if his estate be low, his heart is lower than his estate; therefore he is contented. If his esteem in the world be low, he that is little in his own eyes, will not be much troubled to be little in the eyes of others. He has a meaner opinion of himself, than others can have of him. The humble man studies his own unworthiness; he looks upon himself as less than the least of Gods mercies, and then a little will content him."

³⁵"Contentment does not so much come from outward arguments, or any outward thing that helps them to be content, as it does from the disposition of their own hearts." Richard Burroughs, *The Rare Jewell of Christian Contentment*, (London, 1685), 11.

³⁶“Contentment lies within man, in the heart; and the way to be comfortable, is not by having our Barns filled, but our minds quiet . . . Would we have comfort in our lives? we may have it if we will.” Thomas Watson, *The Art of Divine Contentment*, (London, 1682), 37.

³⁷“It is not usually our condition itself, but the unsuitableness thereof to our disposition and desires . . . that createth discontent; for, although it be very mean, others bear the same cheerfully; many would be glad therof: if therefore we will be content, we must bend our inclinations, and adapt our desires to a correspondence with our state.” Isaac Barrow, *A Sermon of Contentment*, in *The Works of Isaac Barrow, D.D.*, (New York: John C. Rikes, 1845), I, p. 421. Barrow repeated the observation on p. 452: “he that taketh himself to have enough, what doth he need? he that is well pleased to be as he is, how can he be better?” See also Ezekiel Hopkins, *The Vanity of the World*, (London, 1685), 144: “The Great ground of Discontent, is not our Wants, but our desires. There is scarce any condition in the World so low, but may satisfy our Wants: And there is no Condition so high, as can satisfy our Desires.”

³⁸“ . . . no outward accessions will every satisfy our cravings, our appetites must be tamed and reduced, and then they will never be able to raise tumults, or put us into mutiny and discontent.” Richard Allestree, *The Art of Contentment*, (Oxford, 1675), 201. On p. 6 Allestree connected this thinking to classics: “the compendious address to wealth, as Plato rightly observed, being not to increase possessions, but to lessen desires.” Burroughs specifically noted that contentment which came from mere “external” satisfactions will not last long. Richard Burroughs, *The Rare Jewell of Christian Contentment*, (London, 1685), 12.

³⁹“Ambition never suffers him that has once received her as a quest, to enjoy their present estate quietly . . . It causes them to contemne that which they have gotten by great pains and travell, and which not long before they desired very earnestly, by reason of their new imaginations and conceits of greater matters.” Peter de Primayde, *The French Academie*, vol 1. no paging, the quote comes from chapter 21.

⁴⁰Harris, *Works* (London: 1635), 295.

⁴¹“We must lay it down for a rule that discontent is a sin; so that all the pretences and apologies wherewith it labors to justify itself, are but the painting and dressing of a strumpet.” Thomas Watson, *The Art of Divine Contentment*, (London, 1682), 44.

⁴²For a detailed description of murmuring in spirit and its effects see Richard Burroughs, *The Rare Jewell of Christian Contentment*, (London, 1685), 118-151.

⁴³Burroughs, *Ibid.*, 147. The connection between discontentment and the character and actions of the devil was pointed out so often that every religious person in early modern England must have known it. Thomas Watson, *The Art of Divine Contentment*, (London, 1682), 17: “The Angels in Heaven had not learned [contentment]: Though their estate was very glorious, yet they were still soaring aloft and aimed at something higher . . . they kept not their estate, because they were not contented with their estate.” Richard Allestree, *The Art of Contentment*, (Oxford, 1675), 188: “Lucifer was happy enough in his original state, yet could not think himself so because he was not like the most high.”

⁴⁴Richard Allestree, *The Whole Duty of Man*, (London, 1663), 150. Italics in the original. The view of humility as the most important virtue is on p. 136: “The first of [virtues toward ourselves] is *Humility*, which may well have the prime place, not only in respect of the excellency of the *virtue*, but also of its usefulness towards the obtaining of all the rest. This being the foundation on which all others must be built.” (Italics in the original.)

⁴⁵Anthony Horneck, *The Happy Ascetic*, (London, 1651), 48-50.

⁴⁶Humility was thought to appear in the early stages of conversion, when introspection and the ensuing discovery of one's sinful passions such as pride and envy totally destroyed the self-esteem of all those who would be converted: "If your faith is right, it will bring that with it, to make you humble and vile in your own eyes . . . wheresoever Christ comes to dwell, he comes with a light, he shows the creature his vileness, he makes a man see his sin, he makes him see what creature he is; whereas another that has great hope, and professes that he has much assurance, his heart is lifted up and not cast down. Such are not men which think themselves vile, and naked, and miserable, but they think themselves better than other men, they are forwarder than others in any thing, they think other men are not like them. . . But now a true Christian is humbled with it, because when Christ comes into the heart, he makes a man to see his vileness. . . Therefore the spirit of Christians is a meek spirit, they are humble and gentle, they are little in their own eyes. Consider whether you have such a disposition bred in you, or no: it is a sign your faith is good, if there is; if there is not, it is a sign your faith is not true." John Preston, *Breastplate of Faith and Hope*, (London, 1634), 236.

⁴⁷For a bibliometric analysis that highlights Hobbes' meager popularity at his time, see Konkola and MacCulloch, "People of the Book: Success in the English Reformation," *History Today*, October 2003, pp. 29.

⁴⁸"Hitherto I have set forth the nature of Man, (whose Pride and other passions have compelled him to submit himselfe to Government;) together with the great Power of his Governour, whom I compared to *Leviathan*, taking that comparison out of the last two verses of the one and fortieth of Job; where God having set forth the great power of Leviathan, called him King of the Proud." Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan*, Richard Tuck, ed., (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 220-221.

⁴⁹*Ibid.*, 70.

⁵⁰*Ibid.*, 88, 90.

⁵¹Richard Baxter, *Christian Politics*, in William Orme ed., *The Practical Works of The Rev. Richard Baxter*, (London: James Duncan, 1830) VI, pp. 264-265. For additional descriptions of the harmful effects of pride and other sinful passions on society see Richard Allestree's popular, *The Causes of the Decay of Christian Piety*, (London, 1667), 325-337, and John Shower, *The Present Correction and Reproof of Sins*, (London, 1685), pp. 17.

⁵²Hobbes, *Leviathan*, Richard Tuck, ed., (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 117-118.

⁵³Hobbes's failure to discuss the religious effort to impose Christian morals is quite surprising, because he noted that pride needs to be controlled and humility inculcated. See Thomas Hobbes, *De Cive*, (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1983), 68-69, 80. Furthermore, Hobbes must have been familiar with the religious effort to achieve precisely this control of pride, because books describing the effort abounded all around him: "now in these daies all menne of worth, are taught by reading . . . that pride is the first step to the downefall of shame." Robert Greene, *A Quip for an Upstart Courtier*, (London, 1592), fol. C3.

⁵⁴Friedrich Nietzsche, *The Will to Power*, tr. by Walter Kaufman and R. J. Hollingade, ed. by W. Kaufman. (New York: Random House, 1967), 465, (Aph. 870) Italics are in the original.

⁵⁵Lawrence Stone, ed. *The University in Society* (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1973), 1: 6.

⁵⁶The timing of this effort agrees well with the observed increase in the sales of long religious texts. See Konkola, “People of the Book”, 12, 17.

⁵⁷The problem with this theory is the astonishingly small size of the army that defended the Empire: only some 2-4% of military age manpower was in the army. Niall Ferguson, *Empire: The Rise and Demise of the British World Order and the Lessons for Global Power* (New York: Basic Books, 2003), 245.

⁵⁸“Sin doth correct and reprove the sinner in this world, by impoverishing his Estate. . . . this needlesse expence is for their honour, or rather pride; and will not undoe them; that is for their pleasure, and diversion; and they think they may bear it, it will not ruine them: and so for others, no one of which alone brings poverty, but altogether in a little time do it. What large revenues have been wasted in vanity?” John Shower, *The Present Correction and Reproof of Sins*, (London, 1685), 19-21.

⁵⁹Joseph Hall, *Characters of Virtues and Vices*, (London, 1608), pp. 71ff. See also Hall’s, *The Hypocrite set forth in a Sermon*, (London, 1630), 12.

⁶⁰ . . . a proud man takes all things as heinous or intolerable that are said or done against him . . . Pride is a most impatient sin: there is no pleasing a proud person, without a great deal of wit, and care, and diligence. You must come about them as you do about straw or gunpowder with a candle.” Richard Baxter, *Christian Ethics*, in William Orme ed., *The Practical Works of The Rev. Richard Baxter*, (London: James Duncan, 1830) III, p. 295. Baxter described this branch of pride numerous times: “[pride] is so contentious a sin, that it makes men firebrands in the societies where they live . . . the missing of a word, or a look, or a compliment, will catch on their hearts, as a spark on gunpowder.” Baxter, *Directory*, pp. 46-48.

⁶¹ . . . let a proud man be admonished though never so mildly and lovingly, he looks on it as a disgrace. And therefore instead of confessing or amending the fault, he falls to reproaching his reprover as an over-busy or censorious person, and for that greatest and most precious of kindnes, looks upon him as his enemy.” Richard Allestree, *The Whole Duty of Man*, (London, 1663), 139. “Pride makes men hear their teachers as judges, when they should hear them as learners and disciples of Christ: they come not to be taught what they knew not, but to censure what they hear; and as confidently pass their judgement on it, as if their teachers wanted nothing but their instructions to teach them aright . . . the scholars that are still quarreling with their teachers, and readier to teach their masters than to learn of them, and boldly contradicting what they never understood, are too proud to become wise.” Baxter, *Directory*, p. 33.

⁶²The first quotation comes from Anthony Burgess, *A Treatise of Originall Sin*, (London, 1658), 215-216, 329. The second comes from Thomas Wright, *The Passions of the Minde*, (London, 1601), 86. The third comes from Richard Sibbes, *The Returning Backslider*, (London, 1639), 426.

⁶³Richard Allestree, *The Whole Duty of Man*, (London, 1663), 140.

⁶⁴Edward Pelling, *A Practical Discourse upon Humility*, (London, 1694), pp. 67 - 68 described the beneficial effects humble people's eagernes to investigate their faults: “Humility . . . posseses us with a genuine sense of our own Defects and wants; which is another way whereby it helps our progress and perfection in virtue. For this is necessary to all manner of improvements, that we see first wherein we are defective. That observation of Seneca, That many might be very wise in

time, but that they foolishly think themselves wise enough already, will hold true in all cases: Men might easily be better artists, better Scholars, better Christians than they are, if a false opinion of their accomplishments did not supersede their industry. And this is apparently the mischievous effect of Pride, That it shuts a Man (as it were) out of himself; makes him incapable of finding out that blind side, and ugly temper, which requires help, but admits of none for want of discovery.”

⁶⁵The first quotation comes from Edward Pelling, *A Practical Discourse upon Humility*, (London, 1694), 19 - 20. The second comes from Robert Crofts, *Paradise Within Us: or, The Happie Mind*, (London, 1640), 164. The third comes from John Rawlet, *The Christian Monitor, Containning an Earnest Exhortation to an Holy Life, With some Directions in order thereto*, (London, 1686), 18-20.

⁶⁶Baxter stated this view in several places: "There is somewhat in the nature of all worldly men which makes them earnestly desirous of riches and honors in the world and they that value them most will seek them, and they that seek them are more likely to find them than those that despise them." . . . "On the other side, there is that in the new nature of a spiritual believer, which inclines him to things above, and causes him to look at worldly grandeur and riches, as things more dangerous than desirable . . . no wonder therefore if few such attain great matter on the world, or never come to preferment of greatness upon earth." *Reliquae Baxterianae*, (London, 1696), 31. "A low, despised, suffering state, is it that believers must ordinarily expect, and prepare for, and study to be serviceable in. If better (may I call it better) come, take it as a feast, and grudge not when the table is withdrawn; and look not it should be our everyday fare." *The Vain Religion of the Formal Hypocrite*, (London, 1660). The quote comes from the introduction which has no paging. For another influential divine holding the view that religion kept a person in poverty see Richard Rogers, *Certaine Sermons Preached and Penned by Richard Rogers*, (London, 1612), 77-78.

⁶⁷The most interesting view was that of Thomas Adams, who saw a circular process: the poor became religious. Their godly behavior made these people wealthy, and their wealth made them forget religion: "Religion gives riches, and riches forgets religion . . . Thus do our affections wheel about with an unconstant motion. Poverty makes us Religious, Religion rich, and riches irreligious." Thomas Adams, *Diseases of the Soul: A Discourse Divine, Morall, and Physicall*, (London, 1616), 24.

⁶⁸John Rawlet *The Christian Monitor, Containning an Earnest Exhortation to an Holy Life, With some Directions in order thereto*, (London, 1686). This book can be summed by saying that it set forth the Weber thesis 200 years before Weber, as can be seen in Rawlet's observation on p. 18: “. . . it is a most certain truth, that the leading of a holy and good life, is in all respects very greatly for a man's own benefit and comfort, even in this present world. Godliness is profitable for all things. It makes for the quiet of our minds, the health of our bodies, the increase of our estates, and procures us much credit and esteem, much love and good will among our neighbors.” The publication numbers for Rawlet's book are given in the end of vol. I of John Scott's *A Practical Discourse Concerning Obedience and the Love of God*, (London, 1700). The 100,000 figure may not fully reflect the readership, because Rawlet's book seems to have been handed out by charity organizations. However, many people are likely to have read the book they were given. Furthermore, the fact that people who desired to spread religion chose to buy and hand out this book shows that the ideas in it must have agreed with their view of religion.

⁶⁹Perry Miller, *The New England Mind, The Seventeenth Century*, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1954), 21-25.

⁷⁰The second part of Miller's work, *From Colony to Province*, contains a short reference to pride. (pp. 34-35.) The reference is in the context of discussing the synod's condemnation of the

corruptions of the time. There are few details of pride, and there is nothing about mortification of the flesh or the conversion process, through which this mortification was accomplished.

⁷¹John Bossy, 'Moral arithmetic: Seven Sins into Ten Commandments', Edmund Leites ed. *Conscience and Casuistry in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge: The University Press, 1988), 215-216.

⁷²This description is greatly simplified summary of the instructions given by William Perkins in *The Art of Prophecy*, (London, 1607), 102-122.

⁷³The total is based on a count of the bibliography on antinomianism in Tim Cooper, *Fear and Polemic in Seventeenth-Century England; Richard Baxter and Antinomianism*, (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing Ltd., 2001.), 213-221. The count is inevitably somewhat uncertain because of the difficulty in setting the "cutoff point" between books that discuss antinomianism as part of general criticism of factions, and books the main theme of which was to attack antinomians or to defend them.

⁷⁴Two of Saltmarsh's books went through multiple editions in rapid succession: *Free Grace: or, the flowings of Christ's blood* (5 editions between 1646 and 1650 and at least two more by 1700), and *The Smoke in the Temple* (4 editions, i.e., about 10,000 copies, in 1646).

⁷⁵The use of household as the unit in calculations stems from the assumption that, considering the relatively high prices, it is unlikely that more than one copy of a book was bought by a family. The small proportion of England's population interested in the debates supports Baxter's later, "wisdom of hindsight" acknowledgment that he had been carried away in his initial reaction, and that in reality only a few people had adopted antinomianism. Cooper, *Fear and Polemic in Seventeenth-Century England; Richard Baxter and Antinomianism*, (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing Ltd., 2001.), 92-93.

⁷⁶Konkola, "People of the Book", 18-20, 32-33.

⁷⁷Raymond Menzer, ed. *Sin and the Calvinists*, (Kirksville: Sixteenth Century Publishers, 1994.) For a more recent update of current research on sin, see Katharine Jackson Lualdi and Anne T. Thayer eds. *Penitence in the Age of Reformation*. (Burlington: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2000.) This book continues the same focus on "outward behavior" as Menzer's work.

⁷⁸The first quotation comes from Christopher Love, *The True Doctrine of Mortification*, (London, 1654), 120. The second comes from John Preston, *Two Godly and Learned Treatises upon Mortification and Humiliation*, (London, 1635), 176. Preston was very emphatic, he repeated the point four times on two pages.

⁷⁹The first sentence comes from William Gurnal, *The Christian in Compleat Armour*, (London, 1669), 63. The second comes from Thomas Proctor, *The Righteous Man's Way*, (London, 1621), pp. 4-12.

⁸⁰Charles Cohen, *God's Caress*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986), 218-220. It needs to be noted that the faculty-psychology based view of sin presented in this work is quite different from what can be found in popular seventeenth-century texts, such as Richard Bernard's *The Legal Proceedings in Man-shire Against Sinne* (11 known editions between 1626 and 1640).

⁸¹Theodore David Bozeman, *The Precisianist Strain: Disciplinary Religion & Antinomian Backlash in Puritanism to 1638* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2004.) The quote

comes from p. 119. For the discussion of “Puritan depth psychology”, see pp. 155-165. Unfortunately, Bozeman does not seem to appreciate sufficiently the ability of the conversion process to change human nature, particularly by sublimating love to religion. This is surprising, because Bozeman gives examples of love in religion, and he has read Winthrop’s diaries, which contain a very detailed analysis of the role of love in Puritanism.

⁸²Konkola, ‘Have We Lost Humility?’ *Humanitas*, Vol. XX, No. XX, XX-XX.

⁸³Hobbes's *Leviathan* sold at the most 15,000 copies in the 50 years from 1650 to 1700. (Konkola and MacCulloch, “People of the Book: Success in the English Reformation,” 29.) Production of books criticizing Hobbes followed a pattern which makes it possible to estimate their sales: a first edition came out, followed immediately by a second edition and then either nothing or an additional edition many years later. The normal size for a first edition was between 1,000 and 1,500 copies, and a follow-up edition of a book known to be popular was 3,000. About 4,000-7,000 copies thus met the demand created by readers interested in the debates about Hobbes's ideas. It is difficult to estimate how many of those interested bought a copy of each book. However, bestsellers in late 17th century England easily went through 10-20 editions, and this shows that by the standards of the time interest in Hobbes's ideas was meager -- at the most, 10,000 - 20,000 of the well over 400,000 literate households in late 17th century England contained a person who paid serious attention to the Hobbes debates. The criticisms of Hobbes that show the pattern are: Thomas Tenison, *Creed of Mr. Hobbes Examined* (Two editions in 1670); John Eachard, *Mr. Hobbes' State of Nature Considered* (Two editions in 1672. Additional editions in 1685 and 1696.) Clarendon, *Brief View and Survey of the . . . Errors . . . in . . . 'Leviathan'* (Two editions in 1676.) Note that the critical works only started appearing two decades after the publication of *Leviathan*. For edition sizes in 17th century England, see Konkola, “People of the Book”, 16, 20 n. 30.