The eventful sojourn of Willem Teellinck (1579-1629) at Banbury in 1605

Willem J. op ’t Hof

Introduction
It has been after careful forethought that I have decided to submit, for the first edition of this journal on international Reformed Pietism, an article about the Dutchman Willem Teellinck1 (1579-1629). He is widely regarded as the father of the Dutch Pietist movement known as the Further Reformation, or *Nadere Reformatie*2. What is appealing about taking Teellinck as a theme for the initial number is that both his person and his written work are emblematic of the Dutch enculturation and character of the Further Reformation, besides the fact that his writings enjoyed great influence in Germany — and not with the Reformed alone, but among Lutherans also. The onward impact of Teellinck among the Reformed in Germany was of such a nature that a couple of scholars have recently advocated seriously in academic literature that one may speak of a German Further Reformation.3 This father of the Dutch Pietist movement, himself the product of a Puritanism flourishing across the North Sea, was equally one of the sources of German Reformed Pietism in general and the major initiator of the German Further Reformation in particular. As such, Teellinck is a convincing proof of the international nature of Reformed Pietism and reveals in microcosm the role of the Netherlands as a transit country not only for material goods but also for spiritual values.4

---


4 W.J. op ’t Hof, ‘Piety in the wake of trade. The North Sea as an intermediary of Reformed piety up to 1700’, in: Juliette Roding and Lex Heerma van Voss (eds.), *The North Sea and...*
A second reason to make Teellinck the first to be brought into the spotlight here among the global cadre of academic researchers of international Reformed Pietism is the fact that it was particularly in his striving for further reformation that he was most clearly internationally-minded. In the preface to his magnum opus, *Noodwendigh vertoogh* [A needful protest] (1627), in which he for the first time ever in the history of Reformed Protestantism set out an integrated programme for reform, Teellinck explicitly stated that in promulgating his reform ideas, he had a mind not just to the Dutch church but to the Reformed church worldwide.\(^5\)

In the work itself, Teellinck urged readers to correspond not merely nationally but internationally on the issue of what means in general should be brought to bear to remedy the prevailing abuses. This correspondence, he argued, should not only be between individuals but should also proceed via official ecclesiastical bodies at all levels, from congregations through presbyteries to synods.\(^6\)

One detail from the first decade of the twenty-first century amply bears out our subject’s status as role model for international Reformed Pietism: it is the fact that the most recent edition of a work of Teellinck’s was a Korean translation by Munjae Pak, published by Turanno, which also carried a brief overview of Teellinck’s life. This was an onward translation from the English translation of the work done by Annemie Godbehere, published in 2003 by Joel R. Beeke in Grand Rapids, Michigan.\(^7\) With this publication, then, the father of the Further Reformation has assumed intercontinental significance in our century.

Jonathan Israel’s standard work on the Dutch Republic is of great relevance to this article in two respects. In the first place, this is the first book offering a general survey of Dutch universal history to pay extensive attention to the Reformed devotional movement of the Further Reformation: no fewer than two whole sections, totalling twelve pages in all, are devoted to this subject.\(^8\) Secondly, Israel makes the following

---


\(^7\) Op ’t Hof, *Willem Teellinck*, 512-4, 582.

remark on the father of the Further Reformation, Willem Teellinck: “As a young man, he had studied for a time in Scotland, and England, and become strongly influenced by the attitudes of the English Puritans.”

Who was Willem Teellinck; what part did his stay in England, and in particular at Banbury, play in his development from a conventional Dutch Reformed figure into a Puritan; and how did this change manifest itself in the rest of his life and in his writings?

**Teellinck’s youth and studies**

Willem Teellinck was born at Zierikzee, a major city of Zeeland, on 4th January, 1579, the sixth of the nine children of Joos Teellinck (1543-1594) and Johanna de Jonge (1552-1609). Joos held various high offices in government. From 1573-78, he was steward of the ecclesiastical goods on the island of Duiveland, and he was elected annual mayor of Zierikzee in both 1576 and 1577. In the latter capacity, he witnessed the conclusion of the Union of Holland and Zeeland at Delft on 25th April, 1576. On 8th November of the same year, he was a delegate of Zeeland to the Pacification of Ghent. From 1579-1588 he was Representative Advisor in the States of Zeeland. In 1584 he reached the peak of his governmental career, being appointed to the Council of State by the Earl of Leicester, Robert Dudley (1532/3-1588), which membership he held until his death in 1594. It is likely that he had a good working relationship with this Englishman of Puritan sympathies. It is remarkable, at the very least, that Dudley appointed Teellinck senior a member of the Chamber of Finance in 1586, a body intended by the Earl of Leicester to deprive the Council of State of its control over the monies of the States. His duties gave Joos a direct involvement with the army of the States and accordingly he was often found in the immediate circle of Prince Maurits of Nassau (1567-1625). It is obvious that the Teellincks were one of the most exalted patrician families not only of Zeeland but of the Republic as a whole.

Had father Joos not been a convinced Calvinist, he would never have had such a career, because the abovementioned offices were in

---

9 Israel, *The Dutch Republic*, 474.
Zeeland open only to confirmed members of the Reformed Church. It was he who drafted the definitive version of the Reformed school ordinances for Zeeland in 1583.\textsuperscript{13} We can safely assume that Joos held the same religious views as his younger sister Cornelia Teellinck (1554-1577); she drew up a personal confession of Reformed faith in 1573, which was published posthumously in 1607.\textsuperscript{14}

That Joos did not allow his political assignments to deflect him from his duties as husband and father can be concluded from the request he sent to the States of Zeeland on 19th August, 1593. In it, he mentions the fact that for many years, both orally and in writing, he had asked to be discharged of his duties as a member of the Council of State. This request had never been complied with, so in 1593 he repeated his petition (in vain), citing the size of his family and his great number of children. At the same time, he asked to be reinstalled as Representative Advisor, which was possible at this juncture, as the man who had succeeded him in this former position had died.

On that same day Joos submitted another request to the States of Zeeland. On the grounds that he held the right of patronage in a chapter linked to the Pieterskerk in Middelburg, the provincial capital of Zeeland, he applied for scholarships for his two sons, who were to study at Leiden.\textsuperscript{15} We do not know the outcome, but it is probable that Joos did not have to pay his sons’ tuition fees, in spite of the fact that financially he was very able to do so.

On 29\textsuperscript{th} November, 1593, Willem Teellinck matriculated at Leiden University, together with his elder brother Johannes Teellinck (1577-1623).\textsuperscript{16} They were registered as Arts students, which implies that they had to start their studies from scratch. This bachelor’s degree in Arts was at the time seen as preparation for further, vocational, studies. Both brothers intended to go on to study law. A law degree was an excellent grounding

\textsuperscript{15} Zierikzee, Gemeentearchief Schouwen-Duiveland (GAS-D) [Municipal Archive of Schouwen-Duiveland], Stad Zierikzee [City of Zierikzee], Notulen van de Ed. Mog. Heren Staeten van Zeelandt, d’Anno 1593 [Minutes of the Honourable Gentlemen of the States of Zeeland, 1593], 149-50. I am greatly indebted to the municipal archivist, Mr. Huib Uil, for his kind co-operation; this applies likewise to footnotes 32, 48, 50, 56 and 58.
\textsuperscript{16} Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek (UB) [University Library], Archieven van Senaat en Faculteiten (ASF) [Archives of Senate and Faculties] 7, 67r.
for young men who wished to carve out a career for themselves in the administrative machinery of a city, a province or of the Republic. The Teellinck brothers boarded with Nicolaus Stochius (1534-1593), rector of the local Latin school, who had dozens of academic students in his house and under his tutelage.

In the course of his studies Teellinck also travelled abroad, like many other students from the upper echelons of society. According to a statement by Willem’s son Maximiliaan Teellinck (1605-1653), Willem visited French, English and Scottish universities over a period of no less than seven years, before preparing himself for the ministry at Leiden University. He arrived at Leiden in 1606, so he will have commenced his student tour in 1599. Seven years is an extremely long time for such a tour; it proves that he was descended from a very wealthy family.

The earliest available information on Teellinck’s foreign travels concerns his enrolment at St Andrews University in 1600. What is remarkable is the fact that he was enrolled at the theological faculty, St Mary’s College. According to his son Maximiliaan, Willem devoted all his time and faculties to the study of law, even though his original intention had been to read theology. Willem’s enrolment and stay at St Andrews, and more particularly St Mary’s, imply that he did not in fact apply himself to the study of law as fully as his son surmised.

One of the other university cities where Teellinck stayed during his student tours abroad was Paris. On 21st July, 1601, he wrote a contribution to the liber amicorum of a student of theology, Samuel Naeranus (1582-1641). Teellinck’s amicableness with a student of theology corroborates the abovementioned supposition that he had by this time already

---

17 Leiden, UB, ASF 23, 12v.
19 Willem Teellinck, De worstelinghe eenes bekeerden sondaers, Vlissingen, Samuel Claeyx Versterre, 1631, *3v.
21 Teellinck, De worstelinghe eenes bekeerden sondaers, *3r.
conceived a great interest in theology. In his contribution, Teellinck’s distanced wording clearly shows that he was not of one mind with Naeranus, who was later to become a convinced Remonstrant.\textsuperscript{23}

Teellinck’s detailed letter to the Leiden professor of theology Franciscus Junius\textsuperscript{24} (1545-1602), which was written on 13\textsuperscript{th} September, 1602 at the latest, is of eminent importance for a better understanding of the young man from Zierikzee in his student days.\textsuperscript{25} It provides a profound insight into Teellinck’s inner self, and from it we can learn something about his spiritual development. He seems to have been a man with many doubts, and he turned to Junius for help in this respect. The fact that he called on Junius points to Teellinck’s commitment to Reformed theology.

There were more healers of the mind than Junius. Why did Teellinck resort to Junius rather than to anyone else? In his letter, Teellinck himself intimates that it was not a question of personal ties. He knew Junius only by face and by name. As a (former) Calvinist student at Leiden, he must undoubtedly have known Junius. It is likely that he attended divine service on several occasions where Junius was preaching. This would explain the phrase in which Teellinck states that he knows Junius to be an excellent physician for the illness he suffers from. But it is even more probable that in these words Teellinck was referring to Junius’ famous work \textit{Le paisible chrestien, ou de la paix de l’église catholique. Comment il faut garder sainctement la paix, la nourrir, & entretenir, mesmes en la diversité & difference d’opinions} [The peaceable Christian, or, on the peace of the catholic church: how peace is to be guarded in sanctity, nourished and maintained, even amid diversity and difference of opinions], which had been published in Leiden in 1593. This was a plea for peace and tolerance among Christians of varying stances. Junius framed this eirenic appeal, moreover, with no detriment to his own Reformed stance. This aspect in particular may have appealed to Teellinck and have led him to confide in him and impart his doubts to him.

In his letter, Teellinck writes that he worries about the great number of different persuasions within the Christian faith. He himself

\begin{footnotes}
\footnote{The Hague, Koninklijke Bibliotheek [Royal Library], 74 H 21, 272r.}
\footnote{Leiden, UB, Pap. 2.}
\end{footnotes}
firmly believes in the truth of the gospel as expressed in the Apostles’ Creed. Other religions he regards as human inventions. He wonders whether a person can only be saved by Reformed faith. Or might a Roman Catholic be saved as well? Teellinck exclusively has in mind here Christians who both believe in Christ and live a godly life. He alludes to the martyrs who died because of their faith during the reign of Henry VIII (1491-1547; reigned from 1509). Both Roman Catholics and Protestants yielded life and property in like faith and strength. According to Teellinck, in God’s eyes it suffices if a man seriously seek to serve Him and sincerely attempt to know Him better.

This letter reveals that around the turn of the seventeenth century, Teellinck was in a deep spiritual crisis, one in which confessional differences were the stakes. It is possible that his interest in theology in 1600 and 1601 was linked with this crisis. When and how he overcame his doubts is not known. Was Junius’ reply an effective means to that end, or did he find peace and confidence when he came under the spell of Puritanism in England? His enthusiastic and exhaustive reportage on the Puritan atmosphere, which he twice and in different wordings offered to the readers of his oeuvre, points to the latter supposition. Whatever the truth of the matter, it is safest to assume both that he was saved from his great distress through Junius’ good offices and that his experiences of English Puritanism represented a decisive turn in his life.

According to a seemingly rather standoffish note written by Teellinck to Naeranus, who in the meantime had become a professor at Saumur, Teellinck was living at Poitiers at the beginning of July 1603. He was accompanied there by his brother Johannes. Before coming to live with Willem, Johannes had been staying at Naeranus’ house. The reason for his evidently hasty departure from Saumur was the prevailing plague. Like Willem, Johannes had been a student for a period of ten years by 1603. It was at Poitiers that Willem reached the pinnacle of his academic exertions: on 28th September, 1603, he took his doctor’s degree in both branches of law.

26 William Whately, Corte Verhandelinghe van de voornaemste christelicke oeffeninghen, Willem Teellinck (trans.), Middelburg, Adriaen van de Vivere, 1609, A3r.-A7r.; Willem Teellinck, Huys-boeckken, vol. 1, Middelburg, Heirs of Adriaen van de Vivere, 1618, 2*5r.-3*5r.
27 Amsterdam, UB, A. 82.
28 Teellinck, De worstelinghe eenes bekeerden sondaers, 3*r.
Teellinck in England

In the last quarter of 1603, Teellinck went to England and — possibly with some interruptions when he may have paid visits to his parental home — remained there until the beginning of 1606. Soon after his arrival in England, he drifted into the circle of acquaintances of Arthur Hildersham (1563-1632). At the time, Hildersham was a dissenting vicar at Ashby-de-la-Zouch in Leicestershire and one of the nation’s most prominent Puritan leaders. When Hildersham held a private day of prayer together with the well-known Puritan John Dod (1550-1632) and other Puritan ministers, Teellinck experienced a radical conversion. According to his son, from that day on, he forsook the world, desired to keep God’s commandments and turned to the most godly ministers.\(^{29}\) In all probability this private day of prayer was one of the gatherings held in January 1604 by about thirty ministers — including Hildersham and Dod — as a preparation for the Hampton Court Conference, the gathering at which the Millenary Petition (1603) and subsequent petitions submitted to King James VI of Scotland and I of England (1566-1625) were discussed.\(^{30}\) In concrete terms, this petition stipulated the points on which the Church of England ought to be further reformed.

The intimate ties that later arose between William Whately (1583-1639) and Willem Teellinck warrant the inference that it was Whately who invited his Dutch friend to come to Banbury when Hildersham was deposed from his ministry in 1605. Most probably, Teellinck found accommodation not at William Whately’s home but with his father, Alderman Thomas Whately, for in both accounts that Teellinck gives of the religious structure of daily life of the family with whom he stayed, he speaks of a citizen’s family. That Thomas Whately’s family was definitely Puritan is revealed not only by William’s religious views but also by the fact that the Puritan minister Robert Harris (1581-1658) married one of Whately’s daughters.

It was in Banbury that Teellinck was completely won over to Puritan ideals and practices. From the two autobiographical accounts, it emerges that he was especially, and permanently, impressed by the strictly-

\(^{29}\) Teellinck, *De worstelinghe eenes bekeerden sondaers*, 3*r*.

regulated family worship and the observance of the Lord’s Day as practised there by the Puritans.\textsuperscript{31} It was in this Puritan climate, too, that he felt the calling to the ministry arising in him. After his Puritan friends had examined him with regard to this vocation and had held a day of prayer with him, they declared that this was indeed God’s calling and that he was to obey it.\textsuperscript{32} Accordingly, Teellinck returned to his own country in early 1606. He was, however, not alone, but in the company of a wife, Martha Greendon, whom undoubtedly he had come to know in Puritan circles and with whom he had had the banns called at Zierikzee on 26\textsuperscript{th} September, 1604. It is possible that the marriage was celebrated at Derby, because in the register of the banns we read that Martha was a Derby woman and was still living there at the time.\textsuperscript{33} However, research has indicated that Willem and Martha did not say their wedding vows in the city of Derby. Might the Dutch banns have been referring to the county rather than the city of Derby?

The following document corroborates Maximiliaan’s testimony on his father’s sojourn at Banbury and provides evidence which up to now has been unknown to researchers outside the Netherlands. I found it in an unlikely place, the Archives of the Dutch Royal Family.\textsuperscript{34}

Universis in Christo fidelibus ad quos hoc praesens scriptum pervenerit, nos, quorum nomina infra scripta sunt, pro ciusque personae merito et dignitate debitam reverentiam. Cum Guilielmus Teelingius literas nostras testimoniales de vita sua pia morumque integritate sibi concedi peteret: nos tam honestae eius petitioni volentes quantum in nobis est obsecundare testamur et testatam facimus per praesentes praedictum Guilielmum Teelingium ab ornatissimo doctissimo gravissimoque domino Hildershamo cuiusdam ecclesiae anglicanae

\textsuperscript{31} In another place, I have pointed out the similarities between this domestic worship and medieval monastic daily schedules: Willem J. op ’t Hof, ‘Protestant pietism and medieval monasticism’, in: Fred van Lieburg (ed.), \textit{Confessionalism and Pietism. Religious Reform in Early Modern Europe}, Mainz 2006, 31-50, esp. 38, 42 footnote 42.

\textsuperscript{32} Teellinck, \textit{De worstelinghe eenes bekeerden sondaers}, *3v.

\textsuperscript{33} Middelburg, Zeeuws Archief (ZA) [Archives of Zeeland], Verzameling P.D. de Vos [Collection of P.D. de Vos], inv. no. 8, \textit{Uittreksels uit de (in 1940 verloren gegane) trouwoeken van Zierikzee} [Copies of entries in the marriage registers of Zierikzee (the registers being lost in the invasion of 1940)]. Copies are deposited with the Municipal Archives of Schouwen-Duiveland at Zierikzee.

\textsuperscript{34} The Hague, Koninklijk Huisarchief [Archives of the Royal Family], inv. no. G 15-4199 (4638). It is most curious that the former Director of the Koninklijk Huisarchief, Bernard Woelderink, in his article about Zeeland-related documents held in that archive, has not a word to say regarding this extremely significant English attestation of Teellinck’s character and conduct. B. Woelderink, “Zelandica” in het Koninklijk Huisarchief”, in: \textit{Archief. Mededelingen van het Koninklijk Zeeluwse Genootschap der Wetenschappen}, 1994, 1-19.
tum pastore, nobis commendatum vitam apud nos Banburiae sobriam piam pacificam et vere christianam et ab omni nostra representaione prorsus immunem per semiannum et amplius instituisse; sacros item et publicos coetus, tum ad conciones ecclesiasticas audiendum, tum ad sacram coenam dominicam celebrandum diligentem frequenter frequentasse: insuper in rebus quae ad religionem spectant nihil unquam quod novimus aut credidisse aut tenuisse contra fidem evangelicam veram orthodoxam in veteri et novo testamento comprehensam. In cuius rei testimonium nomina nos praesentibus literis apposuimus. Datum Banburiae duodecimo die septembris stylo veteri anno Domini 1606.

Joannes Dod
Robertus Cleaver
Joannes Lancaster
Guilielmus Whately.

[Translation]
To all believers in Christ to whom this present writing comes, we, the undersigned, give each the respect that his personal merit and dignity deserve. As Willem Teellinck has requested us to provide him with a testimony of his godly life and purity of morals, we hereby testify that we readily comply with this honourable request, and we hereby declare that the said Willem Teellinck, who was recommended to us by the most illustrious, most learned and most reverend Mr. Hildersham, at that time pastor of an Anglican parish, has for a period of well over six months lived a modest, godly, peaceable and truly Christian life here with us at Banbury. He has done so without in any respect giving any cause for criticism. We further declare that he has all the while faithfully attended divine service, both for hearing sermons in the congregation and for partaking of the Lord’s Supper. Moreover, to our knowledge, in religious matters he has never believed or supported anything contrary to the evangelical, true and orthodox faith as contained in the Old and the New Testament. As evidence of all which, we have signed our names underneath this present letter.

Banbury, 12th September, in the year of our Lord 1606, Old Style.

John Dod
Robert Cleaver
John Lancaster
William Whately.

This document justifies the following historical reconstruction. When Hildersham was deprived of his living on 24th April, 1605, Teellinck also left Ashby-de-la-Zouch and spent about nine months at another central English town, Banbury, which was a centre of Puritanism and, as such, a haven of

---

35 The author is aware that contemporary English historians avoid the use of the term ‘Anglican’ for the period before 1640 but maintains this translation of the Latin adjective here for the sake of straightforward representation of the usage of the signatories of this testimony. It would seem radically ahistorical to the present author to render the word otherwise in this documentary context.
refuge for various discharged Puritan ministers who, in turn, served as lecturers at weekday services. Their stipends were paid by private individuals.\textsuperscript{36} In Banbury, on weekdays, Teellinck was among the audience of Dod, Robert Cleaver (d. 1613), John Lancaster and Whately.

**William Whately**
The last-named of these, William Whately, who from 1605-1611 was to serve as lecturer and from 1611-1639 as vicar of Banbury,\textsuperscript{37} became a particular friend of Teellinck’s.\textsuperscript{38} It is to be assumed that it was Whately who took his foreign friend along to Emmanuel College, Cambridge, where Scripture conferences aimed at better equipping would-be preachers for their future office were held from the mid-1580s onwards. Minutes of the only such meeting for which records survive indicate that John Cotton (1585-1652) delivered the main lecture, on the timing of the weekly day of rest, and Whately served as co-referee. Such meetings were also held at various colleges of the university and in less official contexts. There was, for instance, a weekly conference which Dod attended. Hildersham and Cotton were members of other comparable study groups.\textsuperscript{39}

Teellinck kept up a correspondence with Whately after his return to his native country. Furthermore, over the course of 1607, the Englishman sent his Dutch friend various manuscripts.\textsuperscript{40} One of these had been especially dedicated to Teellinck and dealt with the main Christian practices, such as reading Scripture, prayer, Christian discussion, hearing the Gospel, the use of the sacraments, Sabbath-keeping, religious fasting and paying vows. This work was probably Whately’s response to a request


\textsuperscript{38} According to Tom Webster, Walter (sic!) Teellinck studied at Whately’s household seminary at Banbury and left a vivid description of his time in that seminary. Tom Webster, *Godly Clergy in Early Stuart England. The Caroline Puritan Movement c. 1620-1643*, Cambridge 1997, 27; Tom Webster, ‘Household Seminaries’, in: Francis J. Bremer and Tom Webster (eds.), *Puritans and Puritanism in Europe and America. A Comprehensive Encyclopedia*, 2 vols., Santa Barbara 2006, 416b-7a. His claim rests on a number of misinterpretations arising from an insufficient familiarity with Teellinck. Indirectly, this indicates the level of importance to be attached to that article.

\textsuperscript{39} Webster, *Godly Clergy in Early Stuart England*, 15-23.

\textsuperscript{40} According to Teellinck in his dedication of William Whately, *Corte verhandelinghe van de voornaemste christelicke oeffeninghen*, Middelburg, Adriaen van de Vivere, 1609, A2r.
by Teellinck. The latter considered it instructive not only for himself but also for others, and thus translated it into Dutch and had it printed, but only after prefacing it with an enthusiastic account of his experiences in a Puritan family at Banbury in the dedication to future ministers and the Christian congregations in the Netherlands. In this dedication, he minutely describes the religious programme of that family and its spiritual activities, both on weekdays and particularly on the Lord’s Day.

According to Teellinck’s description, each member of the family, including the servants, offered a prayer and read a chapter from the Bible before going to work in the morning. For dinner, the entire family gathered around the table. First of all a chapter was read from the Bible, then there were prayers and during dinner they discussed what had been read. After dinner, a psalm was sung, after which everyone went back to work. This ritual was repeated at suppertime. Before retiring for the night, each household member meditated on the day’s events and commended himself to God in prayer. On Saturday afternoons the unlearned, the servants and the children were taught in catechism.

On the Lord’s Day, the household gathered in the morning, read a chapter and offered prayers. They then went to church. After service, some of them wrote out the sermon that they had heard. Each of them applied to himself what he had learned and asked for a blessing. In the afternoon, the sermon was discussed while seated around the table together. After singing a psalm, they all retreated to prepare themselves for the afternoon sermon in prayer and meditation. After returning from church again, they contemplated the sermon, privately or in company. In the evening, the whole family came together again and the servants and children were asked to retell the sermon. Following collective prayers, each member of the household concluded the day in his customary manner.

On Lord’s Days, when going for a recreational walk, they sought the company of a person who was able to expound a psalm or a chapter. During the week, when coming across something that they did not fully understand whilst reading, meditating or discussing, they made a note of it. As soon as they came into the company of some wise persons, especially ministers of God’s Holy Word, they put their question to them in order to be enlightened. On special occasions, the entire family humbled themselves in prayer and fasting.

The fruits of this Christian conduct were displayed in giving to the poor, visiting and comforting the sick and oppressed, teaching the ignorant, convincing those who erred, reprimanding sinners, and the like.
This was not only the case in the family with whom Teellinck had stayed for about nine months, but for several families at Banbury. Christian conduct there was so edifying and convicting that no Roman Catholics or adherents of other sects were to be found in the town.

Teellinck deduced two key reasons for the conditions at Banbury, which he represented as ideal. In the first place, the ministers there preached in such a manner that they could be understood by all, and dogmatic points of contention were avoided. The sermons consisted of teachings and applications. In the second place, they did much in the way of pastoral visitation, and on calls they spoke exclusively about spiritual matters. They had accustomed members of their congregations to ask many questions about their sermons and about Holy Writ. That was the reason why Teellinck dedicated this work especially to future ministers in the Netherlands. It was his desire that they would hold the works of godliness discussed in this book before Dutch congregations and that they themselves would set their people an example of great devotion. After stating that Whately intended to write a work in Latin on the practice of theology, Teellinck highly recommended *Sacra theologia, sive veritas quae est secundum pietatem* [Holy theology, or the truth that is after piety] by the Puritan author Dudley Fenner (d. 1587), owing to that work’s discussion of the practice of piety. In 1609, Teellinck’s translation of Whately’s manuscript was published at Middelburg, entitled *Corte verhandelinghe van de voornaemste christelicke oeffeninghen* [A short treatment of the chief Christian exercises].

Teellinck’s experiences of devotion at Banbury exerted a decisive influence upon the rest of his entire life. This is a logical conclusion from the fact that in a preface to the fathers of families in his Middelburg congregation in his *Huys-boecxken* [Little domestic manual], Teellinck almost literally repeats the account of his sojourn at Banbury, be it with a few digressions and amplifications. One of these is that he now gives not two, but four reasons for the exemplary situation at Banbury. The third and fourth reasons, according to him, can be ascribed to the fathers of families
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41 In all probability, this plan was never put into effect, because no such work by Whately is known: A.W. Pollard et al., *A Short-Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland, & Ireland and of English Books Printed Abroad 1475-1640*, 2nd ed., vol. II, London 1976, nos. 25296-324.


there: they took great care that all members of the household sanctified the Lord’s Day according to the fourth commandment, and that they did their Christian duties on working days in a faithful manner. This amplification is entirely congruent with the content of the *Huys-boecxken*, in which we find an explanation intended for the home catechesis of questions and answers 1 to 42 of *Kort begrijp der christelicker religie* [Brief summary of the Christian religion], a catechetical textbook presenting the Heidelberg Catechism in a condensed and simplified form, which had been drawn up by Teellinck’s colleague in Middelburg, Herman Faukelius (d. 1625), in 1608 and published there in 1611.

In 1633, a second tract by Whately, translated by Teellinck, was published posthumously: *Cana Galileae, oete houwelycks predicatie* [Cana of Galilee, or a wedding sermon], edited by Teellinck’s eldest son Maximiliaan. Its original was called *A bride-bush, or a wedding sermon* (1617). Two small texts were added to the translation: *Een gulden cleynoot, behelsende twaelf christelijcke plichten om de ziele van een christen in wendich te vercieren; een ander cleynoot. bestaende uyt twee douzijn costelijcke medaelien ofte christelijcke plichten en betrachtinge van een godsalich man, ontrent zijn gheloove* [A golden jewel, containing twelve Christian duties to ornament the soul of a Christian inwardly; another jewel, consisting of two dozen precious medals or Christian duties and meditation(s) of a godly man upon his faith]. The second edition (1619) of *A bride-bush* is more than four times as copious as the first. In this second edition, Whately includes a dedication to his father-in-law which contains a number of details that shed more light on the background and editorial history of the work. The author tells us, among other things, that he had preached a wedding sermon “some tenne or eleven yeeres since” (i.e., circa 1608) and “delivered a copie thereof unto a friend”, the result being that the sermon had been “published without my privity” in 1617. This had induced Whately to publish the current, much fuller version,

---


47 The details that follow were kindly supplied to me by Christopher Godfrey M.A., M.Sc.
drawing on “certaine larger notes, which I had lying by me of that subject”.

It is remarkable that although the first edition of *A bride-bush* was published in 1617, its preface dates from 1608. Apparently, Whately had already made the work ready for press, but had not been able to find a publisher for it. Might he then not have repeated what he had done in 1607; that is, have sent a copy of the text to his spiritual friend in Middelburg? If that was indeed done, then it is very probable that Teellinck will also have translated this work into Dutch before it even came up for sale in the English language in 1617. All this may also well explain the striking fact that the translation of 1633 has a title greatly different from that of the English 1617 edition: *Cana Galileae*, rather than *A bride-bush*. The Dutch title might well be the original title of 1608, altered to *A bride-bush* in 1617 when it came into circulation. Whately left this latter title unchanged for his own 1619 edition of the work.

One aspect of *Cana Galileae* fits well into this hypothesis. The second and the third part of this book, consisting of Christian duties, have obscure origins. No author’s name is mentioned; neither is it clear whether this is an original Dutch text or a translation from English. Because the wedding sermon is said to have been translated from English, the two other parts may well have flowed from the pen of Teellinck himself. In view of the content, this is not unlikely. As regards the content, Whately could equally well have been the author. It is striking that duties are the subject matter of all three parts of *Cana Galileae* and that in both the first and the second part, the author expostulates that one should look to one’s own sins and not at those of others.

If Whately did also write the second and third parts, we may in this connection remind ourselves of other manuscripts that Whately sent Teellinck in 1607 or on other occasions. Perhaps, when Maximiliaan made *Cana Galileae* ready for the press, he came across these translations and added them to the translation of Whately’s wedding sermon, in order to obtain a publication of reasonable size. If this reconstruction is right, it would indicate that as a rule, Teellinck translated the manuscripts he received from his friend and colleague into his mother tongue whether or not he could interest a publisher in it. In the light of these considerations,

---

Cana Galileae could well have been translated in 1608 or shortly thereafter.49

Teellinck in Zeeland
Having arrived in Zeeland, Teellinck and his wife moved into his mother’s house, who was still living in Zierikzee. On 23rd March, 1606, he underwent confirmation there, as did his wife on 29th July.50 It was probably physical conditions, such as illness, pregnancy or childbirth, which had prevented her from being confirmed together with her husband.

Well over a month after his confirmation at Zierikzee, Teellinck left his native town for Leiden to study theology there, in the possession of a glowing letter of transfer. About three months later, he returned to Zierikzee, again with a favourable letter of transfer, dated 13th July, 1606, signed by Festus Hommius51 (1576-1642).52 Apparently, then, his level of knowledge was such that he had been able to complete his studies of theology within a quarter of a year. This is another strong indication that in the preceding years he may have attended both law and theology lectures. Teellinck must have requested a testimonial letter from his friends at Banbury with an eye to his forthcoming examinations for entry to the church ministry. This was drafted no earlier than 12th September, 1606, and was signed by Dod, Cleaver, Lancaster and Whately.

Within two months, Teellinck, who according to Maximiliaan’s later record had come back to live with his mother again in the interim, received a calling from the parish of Haamstede and Burgh on the island of Schouwen, dated 4th September, 1606. The fact that the Teellincks were one of the most powerful patrician families at Zierikzee, and consequently in the entire islands of Schouwen and Duiveland, may have played a part in this call. By the end of 1606, Willem had been installed at Haamstede and Burgh. After having preached the Word there for about seven years, he was honoured with a call to Middelburg, Zeeland’s provincial capital, where

50 Zierikzee, GAS-D, Archief Kerkenraad Hervormde gemeente te Zierikzee [Church Officers’ Archive of the Reformed Congregation at Zierikzee], inv. no. 29, Lidmatenregister [Membership Register], 1577-1626. This part of the register was damaged as a result of the flooding in 1953. P.D. de Vos has made extracts: Middelburg, ZA, Verzameling P.D. de Vos, inv. no. 8.
51 Pieter Janszn Wijminga, Festus Hommius, Leiden 1899.
52 Zierikzee, GAS-D, Archief Classis Zierikzee (ACZ) [Archives of the Zierikzee Presbytery], inv. no. 70.
Willem’s eldest brother Eeuwout Teellinck\textsuperscript{53} (1581-1629) was a church officer. Eeuwout was also Collector-General of the States of Zeeland, due to which office he wielded great influence in politics and church affairs. Indirectly, Willem may have been indebted to Eeuwout for this call to the regional metropolis, where he continued to discharge his duties until his death on 8th April, 1629.

During Teellinck’s life, no fewer than 47 texts of his were published, another thirteen works being brought out after his decease.\textsuperscript{54} As such, it is not surprising that Teellinck’s name can be found on the list of best-selling Dutch Protestant authors of the middle of the seventeenth century,\textsuperscript{55} and that one of the publishers of his works introduced a new advertising technique: the commercial list of a popular author’s works.\textsuperscript{56}

Teellinck’s Puritan contacts
First and foremost, the above sections have demonstrated that Teellinck remained in written contact with his Banbury friend after his return to the Netherlands. Although hard evidence for their exchange of letters dates exclusively from the year 1607, the wording of that evidence allows for no other conclusion than that this was no mere incidental correspondence but rather that the surviving letters are components of a coherent whole. A previously unknown piece of evidence supports this claim:\textsuperscript{57} on 25th July, 1623, a testimony regarding one Levinus Coolman was read out to the presbytery of Schouwen-Duiveland. This testimony had been penned by Whately, who had had Coolman as a house-guest.\textsuperscript{58} Unknown to us as the particular circumstances leading up to this testimony are, it is very plausible that Coolman, a Dutchman, had found his way to Whately by way of Teellinck, a former member of that presbytery.

\begin{footnotes}
\footnote{\textsuperscript{53} W.J. op ’t Hof, \textit{Eeuwout Teellinck. Leven, werk en betekenis}, Rumpt 1999.}
\footnote{\textsuperscript{54} Op ’t Hof, \textit{Willem Teellinck}, 94-454.}
\footnote{\textsuperscript{56} W.J. op ’t Hof, ‘The oldest Dutch commercial \textit{oeuvre} lists in print’, in: \textit{Quaerendo. A quarterly journal from the Low Countries devoted to manuscripts and printed books}, 23 (1993), 265-90.}
\footnote{\textsuperscript{57} I owe this find to the kind negotiating assistance of my VU Amsterdam colleague, Prof. Fred. A. van Lieburg.}
\footnote{\textsuperscript{58} Zierikzee, GAS-D, ACZ, inv. no. 1, Acta Classis Schouwen-Duiveland (ACS-D) [Proceedings of the Presbytery of Schouwen-Duiveland], 23\textsuperscript{rd} July, 1623, art. 1.}
\end{footnotes}
What made this lifelong continuance of Teellinck’s contact with Whately so important was that the latter sent his friend in Zeeland a number of manuscripts of his own composition. This correspondence was of such significance to Teellinck that he presumably translated the manuscripts rapidly upon their receipt; moreover, he published his translation of one of them without delay, in 1609. One or more manuscripts that Willem Teellinck had translated were published posthumously by Maximiliaan in 1633.

Even Teellinck’s debut publication was a translation of a Puritan work: *A dialogue of the state of a christian man* by the father of English Puritanism, William Perkins (1558-1602). Yet it is not just the choice of matter for his first publication that indicates how strongly Puritan-oriented Teellinck was. The contents of his preface, which he wrote on 5th December, 1607, likewise reveal his mindset, for the preface is one long diatribe over nominal Christianity.

Teellinck will not have remained in written contact only with this Puritan friend (and others); he will also have continued to meet them in person on the occasions when he was back in England to visit his in-laws. We do know for certain that Teellinck was in England during the latter half of 1610\(^{60}\) and in late summer 1615\(^{61}\).

Yet this proponent of the Further Reformation did not have to travel so far afield from Middelburg to keep in contact with Puritans: many of them had settled in the Netherlands after finding that the lie of the land at home had become too hostile to them. One of these English Puritans in the Dutch Republic was Thomas Brewer, the financier of the celebrated Pilgrim Fathers’ Press at Leiden, who was arrested by mistake during the suppression of that printing press in 1619. Even though he had been picked up by chance, he turned out to be an interesting catch for the authorities. Brewer enjoyed academic immunity but returned to England voluntarily for trial. Sir William Zouche, although not in government service, put himself forward for the duty of judicially repatriating Brewer to England. The party called in at Middelburg on their way to Flushing, where they were to board ship for the North Sea crossing. At Middelburg, Zouche and Brewer dined with four of Brewer’s sympathisers: Eeuwout Teellinck, Johannes Teellinck, Willem Teellinck and Josias van Vosbergen. Johannes Teellinck and Josias van Vosbergen were both employees of the Accounting Chamber of

\(^{59}\) Pollard et al., *A Short-Title Catalogue*, 2\(^{nd}\) ed., vol. 2, no. 19646.

\(^{60}\) Zierikzee, GAS-D, ACZ, inv. no. 1, ACS-D, 28\(^{th}\) July, 1610; Op ’t Hof, *Willem Teellinck*, 122.

Zeeland, while Eeuwout Teellinck was the head of the same service. During the meal, the four hosts made the most favourable impression they could upon Sir William on Brewer’s behalf.\(^6^2\)

Another friend of Teellinck’s was John Robinson (d. 1625), minister of the English nonconformist congregation at Leiden to which Brewer adhered. A deposition by Antonius Walaeus\(^6^3\) (1573-1639), since lost,\(^6^4\) preserved the knowledge that Robinson, aided by Teellinck and Walaeus, was seeking to persuade Middelburg citizens to fund the tuition fees of one of Robinson’s sons, this taking place by 10th September, 1619, at the latest, the date on which Walaeus left Middelburg\(^6^5\).\(^6^6\)

Willem Teellinck also enjoyed cordial relations with a Puritan actually resident in Middelburg: John Forbes\(^6^7\) (d. 1634), a Scot who served as Gospel minister to the English Merchant Adventurers in the city from 1610 to 1621. In 1619, his nephew, also John Forbes (1593-1648; later to become Professor of Theology at Aberdeen), visited him for several months, and Scots church historian Andrew L. Drummond (1902-66) concludes that Forbes junior came under Teellinck’s influence during that stay.\(^6^8\) Besides, more generally, Teellinck was a close follower of how the English-speaking churches in his area were faring, these being congregations of Puritan sympathies. When the English Church at Flushing was reinstituted in 1620 and a Puritan, John Wing, was appointed its first minister, it was Teellinck who preached his installation sermon on 19th June.\(^6^9\) Not a month had passed before Teellinck had a meeting with


\(^6^4\) At any rate, a written reply to this author from Amsterdam municipal archives dated 9th February, 1994, states that the document could not be found.


\(^6^8\) Andrew L. Drummond, *The Kirk and the Continent*, Edinburgh 1956, 86.

another Puritan, Thomas Gataker (1574-1654), who was passing through Middelburg as part of a Dutch tour that he made from 13th July to 14th August, 1620. Gataker formed a high regard for Teellinck upon making his acquaintance during this visit.⁷⁰

In 1626-27, Teellinck had a fairly high degree of contact with a Puritan professor at Franeker in Frisia, William Ames (1576-1633). This contact must have been established, or at least maintained, by Teellinck’s two sons, who matriculated at Franeker in 1624 as theology students. These were Maximiliaan Teellinck (studied 1624-25) and Justus Teellinck⁷¹ (1624-27).⁷² Their study dates indicate that only Justus was still enrolled in 1626-27. The Middelburg preacher and the Franeker professor developed such a rapport that the latter not only ensured that Teellinck’s initial proposal for his magnum opus Noodwendigh vertoogh was supplied with an approbation by the Franeker Faculty of Theology, but also saw to it that another work of Teellinck’s, Christelijke aensprake aen alle opsienderen van Gods kercke [A Christian address to all overseers of the church of God] (1626), was laid to press by the Franeker University printer himself, Ulderick Balck. Ames was clearly doing his utmost to support Teellinck’s reforming zeal, using all the means at his disposal. The wording of the approbation was that no more useful works could be published than the type of matter represented by the work in question (Noodwendigh vertoogh). In addition, the approbation contained a supplication that God would be pleased to move all preachers to implement in their own congregations the reformation set out by the author. Ames also made sure that when Teellinck’s magnum opus came out in its definitive version in 1627, it was likewise prefaced by a warm approbation from the Franeker Faculty of Theology, ending with the words “hoping and trusting that this true and earnest warning will be fruitfully read and put into action by all pious and upright patriots”.⁷³

⁷⁰ Gataker calls Teellinck “Reuerend Diuine” and “that worthy man”: Thomas Gataker, A sparke toward the kindling of sorrow for Sion, London, William Sheffard, 1621, A4r. and A4v. respectively.
⁷² Maximiliaan was enrolled as a student at Franeker on 25th October, 1624, Justus four days later: Album Studiosorum Academiae Franekerensis, 75 nos. 2162 and 2164.
⁷³ Teellinck, Noodwendigh vertoogh, *2v.: “verhopende, ende vertrouwende, dat dese getrouwe, ende yverige vermaninghe, van alle vrome ende oprechte patriotten, vruchtbaerlijck gelesen, ende in ’t werck gestelt sal worden”.
Once Teellinck’s eldest son Maximiliaan left Franeker, he became a candidate for the ministry in the presbytery of the island of Walcheren, on 8th September, 1625. On 11th July, 1627, he was ordained the minister of the English Church at Flushing by Forbes, the then minister of the English Church at Delft, assisted by the minister of the English Church at Middelburg, John Drake. The service was also attended by the minister of the English Church at Gorinchem (also spelt at the time as Gorkum), Samuel Bachiler, and by Teellinck senior.

From Cotton’s published correspondence, we know that Maximiliaan had been across the North Sea and moving in Puritan circles between the dates of his candidature and ordination, following in the footsteps of his father, who had had an English stay at the same stage of his own life at the turn of the seventeenth century. The minister of the Dutch Church in London, Timotheus van Vleteren (d. 1641), wrote Cotton a letter on 26th October, 1629, in which he reported that Maximiliaan Teellinck had received papers from the Netherlands together with a request to forward them to Cotton. Van Vleteren added that he was a close spiritual companion of Maximiliaan’s, that they had studied at school and university together, that the first congregations of each of them after ordination had not been far apart, that Maximiliaan had studied at Cotton’s household seminary in Boston together with Isaac Bisschop (d. 1661), van Vleteren’s successor as minister at Zoutelande on Walcheren, and that Maximiliaan had handed van Vleteren a number of manuscripts of Cotton’s. Cotton’s reply, dated 16th December, 1629, indicates that Maximiliaan had brought him, via van Vleteren, a letter and a memorial poem upon his father’s death. Yet the most intriguing detail in Cotton’s letter is the request in it that van Vleteren chase up with Maximiliaan what had become of a manuscript of his in which he had propounded that no amount of human effort nor dose of common grace could suffice to cause regeneration. Cotton had drafted this little treatise at Willem Teellinck’s request, never actually having met Willem personally. He wondered in the letter whether the delivery might have gone astray, since he had never had acknowledgement of receipt of the manuscript that he had sent Teellinck.

74 Brienen, ‘Maximiliaen Teellinck’, 70.
76 De Jong, John Forbes, 103.
It is unclear whether there was any direct correspondence between Willem Teellinck and Cotton; it is a distinct possibility that all contact between them was done through the former’s son Maximiliaan. Be that as it may, the discussion in the letter of a manuscript indicates that the relationship between the father of the Further Reformation and the prominent Puritan was no superficial or casual one.

Willem Teellinck had a hand not only in the reinstatement of the English Church at Flushing but also of the English Church at Middelburg, in 1623. At the time that Bachiler was called to serve as its first minister, he was the incumbent of the English Church at Heusden in the province of Brabant, which made him an immediate ministerial colleague of Gisbertus Voetius (1589-1676), who was also at Heusden. Given the close friendship between Teellinck and Voetius, it is an evident conclusion that the Middelburg minister had heard from Voetius of the qualities of his local English colleague and that it was Teellinck who thus recommended Bachiler to the church officers of the English congregation in his own city. In 1625 Bachiler published his *Miles christianus, or the campe royal in briefe meditations on Deut. 23, 9, 14* at Amsterdam. At that time he was minister of the English Church at Gorinchem. He sent a number of friends and ministerial colleagues a copy of the book, by the hand of his fellow Gorinchem minister Johannes Spiljardus (1593-1658). One of these recipients was Teellinck, who in his letter of thanks to Spiljardus expresses the hope that a work of Bachiler’s which he refers to as “Essais op Iosua” [Essays on Joshua] might be published. This indicates that Teellinck’s familiarity with Bachiler ran rather deep.

How intimately Teellinck followed the life of the English Church at Middelburg is seen in the fact that he participated in the first communion

---

78 Middelburg, ZA, Archief Engelse Gemeente te Middelburg (AEGM) [Archive of the English Church at Middelburg], inv. no. 1, Kerkenraadsnotulen (KN) [Church Officers’ Minutes], 47.
79 Middelburg, ZA, AEGM, inv. no. 1, KN, 2.
service held in that congregation, as did his wife — herself an Englishwoman. His involvement with the English congregation became even more pronounced towards the close of his life: when the church’s own minister, Drake, was incapacitated by sickness for six weeks in 1629, Teellinck shared with the minister of the English Church at Flushing the duties of standing in for him. Even once Drake was up and about again, he was only able to go to church on Sundays, yet he did as a sole exception also make himself visit Teellinck on his sickbed, which as it turned out would be his deathbed. He made several visits to Teellinck, until the time that — as it is put in the church officers’ records of the English Church at Middelburg — “to our perpetuall grief that excellent and moste deservedly famous instrument of mens true turning to the Lorde in this city was by death taken from us.” The record proceeds to describe the manner of Teellinck’s passing and concludes that it is an incalculable loss not only for the capital city of Zeeland but for the entire country, for the church universal, and for the departed’s own congregation in particular. The reason why it was such a loss, the clerk writes, is that Teellinck had played a vital role not only in the reinstituting of the city’s English Church but also in frequently preaching to that congregation, while always remaining willing to offer a helping hand. The writer concludes his tribute to Teellinck with the words, “In regarde whereoff we finde our selves bound to yeeld here this honourable recorde unto the holy mans memory, blessed for ever.”

Traces of Puritan influence in Teellinck’s works
The two enthusiastic accounts that Teellinck wrote of his time at Banbury, already mentioned more than once in this article, furnish proof that he remained profoundly and permanently affected by the Puritan atmosphere he had been immersed in in Oxfordshire. It also appears from these two records that it was Teellinck’s aim to have these Puritan views and practices take root in the Netherlands. As a final consideration on this point, the fact that Teellinck announces in the dedication of Corte verhandelinghe (1609) that Whately intended to bring out an academic work on the practice of theology, and that in the same dedication Teellinck also recommends Fenner’s Puritan dogmatic work, indicates that he was an admirer and promoter of this English piety movement. There follows an overview of

84 Middelburg, ZA, AEGM, inv. no. 1, KN, 18.
85 Middelburg, ZA, AEGM, inv. no. 1, KN, 46.
86 Middelburg, ZA, AEGM, inv. no. 1, KN, 47.
quotations, themes, trains of thought, and convictions that Teellinck acquired from Puritans.

The Puritan most mentioned and cited by Teellinck is William Perkins. Perkins is named even in the first published account of his experiences at Banbury. Teellinck also cites Perkins’ *Een ghereformeert catholijck*[^87] [A reformed catholicke] in his own anti-Roman Catholic work, *Ontdeckinge des vermomden Balaaams* [Disguised Balaam laid bare] (1611).[^88] In his tract on days of fasting and prayer, *Den christelijcken leytsman aen-wijsende de practijcke der warer bekeeringhe* [The Christian pilot, pointing out the practice of true repentance] (1618), Teellinck borrows, as part of a treatment of self-examination drawing on the Ten Commandments, the catalogue of sins written by Perkins in a brief work on conviction of sin.[^89] This list takes up more than a full four pages of Teellinck’s own book.[^90] In the second section of *Den volstandigen christen* [The steadfast Christian] (1620), Teellinck’s work against the Remonstrant movement, he devotes two pages to a defence of a controversial passage in a book by Perkins that Teellinck himself had translated into Dutch.[^91] In the fourth discourse in *Bueren-cout* [Neighbours’ gossip] (1620), a book whose theme is that men may not beat their wives, Teellinck defends another passage which had proved controversial from that same translation.[^92] When identifying in his magnum opus devotional authors who encouraged the practice of piety, the three men whom he mentions are, in sequence, two English Puritans, Perkins and Richard Rogers (1550/1-1618), and finally Gilbert Primrose (1566/7-1642), minister of the French Reformed Church in London.[^93] This last fact would on its own serve to demonstrate the extent to which Teellinck was moulded by Puritanism.

In one of his major works, *Sleutel der devotie* [Key of devotion] (1624), Teellinck includes four unaccredited quotations from the Dutch translation of one of the most successful of all Puritan piety manuals, *The

[^91]: Willem Teellinck, *Den volstandigen christen*, Middelburg, Geraert van de Vivere, 1620, 62-3 (second page numbering).
[^93]: Willem Teellinck, *Noodwendigh vertoogh*, Middelburg, Jacob van de Vivere, 1627, 405b.
practise of pietie (1612)\textsuperscript{94} by Lewis Bayly (d. 1631).\textsuperscript{95} The first three quotations concern, in this order, the following hindrances to the practice of piety: 1. a misconceived trusting to God’s mercy alone; 2. the fancy that one still has plenty of time left to live; 3. the impression that practising piety will turn people melancholy, especially the young. The final quotation is one combating the foregoing three objections with the contention that one must strive in all earnestness for the life of grace.

In the posthumously published work Order (1660), written at the end of Teellinck’s life,\textsuperscript{96} he makes passing reference to a work by Robert Bolton (1572-1631) while discussing Sabbath-keeping.\textsuperscript{97} Research has indicated that the work of Bolton’s being referred to is A discourse about the state of true happiness (1611)\textsuperscript{98} 99

Various of Teellinck’s original works reveal characteristically Puritan themes. The content of Een getrou bericht [A true report] (1608) concerns the earnest pastoring of the sick; the two volumes of Huys-boeckten (1618 and 1621) are written for family instruction; days of prayer and fasting are the theme of Den christelijcken leytsman (1618) and the sabbath is the theme of De rust-tydt [The time of rest] (1622), sabbatarianism also returning as a prominent subject in Noodwendigh vertoogh (1627). Soliloquium [Soliloquy] (1628) is a spiritual autobiography. Tydt-winninghe [Redeeming the time] (1629), in three volumes, falls under the genre of the spiritual journal. An overarching motif in all these works is that of general reformation. Many of Teellinck’s titles are devoted to that cause: Philopatris [Philopatris], Den christelijcken leytsman, Den spieghel der zedicheyt [The mirror of morality], Bueren-cout, Zions basuyne [Trumpet of Zion], Balsem Gileads [Balm of Gilead], Kole van den altaer [Coal from the altar], Davids wapen-tuygh [David’s panoply], Zephaniae waerschouwinge [Zephaniah’s admonition], Gesonde bitterheyt [Healthful bitterness], Godes handt [God’s hand], Wraeck-sweet [Sword of vengeance], Geestelijcke couranten [Spiritual news], Voor-looper, Christelijcke aensprake, Tweede geestelijcke couranten [Second spiritual news], Christi

\textsuperscript{94} Pollard et al., A Short-Title Catalogue, 2nd ed., vol. 1, no. 1602.8.

\textsuperscript{95} Willem Teellinck, Sleutel der devotie, vol. 1, Amsterdam, Jan Evertsz Cloppenburgh, 1624, 318a-9b, 230a[=330a]-335b, 337b-9a, 339b-43a. These passages correspond with Lewis Bayly, De practycke ofte oeffeninge der godsaligheyt, Amsterdam, Jan Marcusz, 1627, 144-7, 150-9, 148-50, 160-5.

\textsuperscript{96} Op ’t Hof, Willem Teellinck, 451.

\textsuperscript{97} Willem Teellinck, Orde, Utrecht, Johannes van Sambix, 1660, 30.

\textsuperscript{98} Pollard et al., A Short-Title Catalogue, 2nd ed., vol. 1, no. 3228.

\textsuperscript{99} Op ’t Hof, De theologische opvattingen van Willem Teellinck, 247.
waerschouwinge [Christ’s admonition], Noodwendigh vertoogh, Den politycken christen [The politic Christian] and Ordere.

It can also be stated overall that the theological and devotional insights of the father of the Dutch Further Reformation and those of the father of English Puritanism, Perkins, are like two peas in a pod. The commonalities between them are countless. Like Perkins, Teellinck calls the understanding the driver of man; uses the image of swine that cannot look upwards; suggests lying in the grave as a possible meaning of Christ’s descent into Hades; teaches that in the covenant of grace, God promises man Christ and His merits out of grace but that He simultaneously requires of man that he accept Christ by faith and turn from his sins; teaches that there is but one sense of Scripture; presents a range of descriptions of the ordo salutis, dominated by the relationship between law and gospel and by the distinction common versus special, the passageway between which is provided by the act of applying or embracing doctrine, which is done by way of a closing word of application; reduces, for pastoral reasons, faith to the seed of faith; posits, for the same reasons, that God accepts the intent as if it were the deed; states that in the battle spiritual, Satan seeks to tempt the believer to one of two attitudes of shipwreck, namely presumption on the one hand and spiritual despair on the other; ascribes major importance to the pastoral role of preachers and of mature Christians, in that he writes that those at a spiritual impasse ought to turn not only to God but also to those two categories of helpers; distinguishes between weak and strong believers; describes preachers, with reference to Job 33:23, as “messengers, one among a thousand”; invokes the analogy that as Elisha stretched himself out upon the body of the dead boy (II Kings 4:34), one must stretch himself out over the crucified Christ and emphasises the role of Christ as man’s Example.
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Moreover, a good many of the views of Perkins’ most significant pupil, Ames, run in parallel with those of the Dutchman, such as that theological study must be so crafted as to familiarise trainee preachers with the practice of piety; that there is only one sense of Scripture that ought to be applied spiritually, namely the literal sense; and that games of chance are to be repudiated.

Perkins and Ames were Englishmen. However, Puritanism also put down deep roots in Scotland, where John Knox’s views lent themselves outstandingly well to fertilization by English Puritanism. One exponent of Scots Puritanism was Forbes, who served as minister of the English merchants’ church at Middelburg for seven years and who was thus a colleague of Teellinck’s. Forbes’ biographer states that much of his theology can be traced back to Teellinck. Examples of positions shared by the two men include their belief that the true meaning of Scripture can be understood by the elect alone; their rejection of state interference in the liturgy or sacraments; their advocacy of the conditionality of the covenant; their insistence on believers’ conformity to the image of the Son of God; and their rejection — contra Knox — of the doctrine that subjects had any right to resist their government.

There are also matters raised in Teellinck’s writings that, while they cannot be ascribed to any particular Puritan, are traceable to Puritanism in general. These include the individual and collective closing of covenants; the use of Dutch expressions underlain by the English terms ‘free offer of grace’, ‘further reformation’ and ‘market-day of the soul’; the viewing of all manner of natural affairs in a spiritual light; the regarding of grace as preparatory to regeneration; the insistence on saints’ leading exemplary lives; the detailed regulation of the Sabbath; the moral
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interpretation of the Fourth Commandment as a creation ordinance;\textsuperscript{114} fasting;\textsuperscript{115} the order of life;\textsuperscript{116} the advocacy of family devotions (household religion);\textsuperscript{117} extemporaneous prayer;\textsuperscript{118} the holding of conventicles;\textsuperscript{119} the practice of preaching simply and edifyingly without displays of erudition;\textsuperscript{120} the belief in evident sanctification being a touchstone of justification;\textsuperscript{121} an aversion to the pagan-derived word ‘Sunday’;\textsuperscript{122} and his remarkably woman-friendly theology.\textsuperscript{123}

If we even can speak of a distinction between Teellinck’s religious views and Puritan theology, then such lies in the ecclesiological context alone, with England having a semi-reformed Church of England as its established denomination and the Netherlands having its Reformed Church. In addition, considerations that could be viewed as differences between Teellinck and the Puritans are that while it is Puritan of Teellinck to observe a rather detailed outworking of the \textit{ordo salutis}, he links this to and embeds it in the tripartite salvific scheme (misery, delivery and gratefulness) of the Heidelberg Catechism, a scheme not typically followed by Puritans; and that he has next to nothing to say about the doctrine of reprobation.

\textbf{Conclusion}

Having undergone his conversion and experienced his call to the ministry in the Puritan environment of Banbury, Teellinck’s ministry was in fact nothing but a propagation and dissemination in his own country — in sermons, pastoral visitations, publications and contributions at ecclesiastical meetings — of the Puritan views on, and practices of, piety that he had come to learn in England. In his drive to foster devotion in the Netherlands, Teellinck especially emphasized the Puritan elements of family worship (with all its appurtenances) and Sabbath observance; elements under whose influence he had come while at Banbury. In fact,
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Teellinck was the man who gave the impetus to the ‘puritanizing’ of Reformed devotion in the Netherlands.

Teellinck stripped Puritan devotion of its particular English idiosyncrasies and adapted it to the situation in the Dutch Republic. For instance, he severed Puritan devotion from its characteristically English ecclesiological framework of the dichotomy between episcopalianism and Puritan nonconformity, and integrated it into the fabric of the Dutch Reformed Church and Dutch society. Teellinck deserves praise for having introduced a wealth of distinctive Puritan motives and practices into Dutch life and for having ensured their long retention among Dutch ecclesiastical and devotional priorities. Examples of these introductions include the moral conception of and the strict observance of the Sabbath; the prescribed manner of daily life of families and individuals; the plain preaching, including extensive applications, whether with or without the use of a method of classification; an avoidance of the word ‘Sunday’; a preference for extempore prayers; the prevalence of accounts of conversions and of all kinds of experiences in the inner spiritual life; the writing of spiritual journals; a stringent sanctification of life; and the felt needs for discipline, continuous soul-searching, the necessity of conventicles and the urgency of an all-embracing further reformation.

In the Netherlands, the devotional movement of Dutch Reformed Pietism came into being in 1588. Within this Pietism, we can speak of the Further Reformation as a distinct movement whose aim was the absorption of Puritan piety into the Dutch framework. In imitation of Puritanism, the Further Reformation gave concrete expression to its pursuit of piety in the form of programmatic activities. Without neglecting the aspect of inner experience, the Further Reformation converted prior Pietistic expressions and grievances into actions: not only by developing detailed programmes that outlined which aspects of church, politics, society and family were to be reformed and in what manner, but also by submitting these programmes as concrete reform proposals to the relevant ecclesiastical, political and social authorities. This movement of the Further Reformation owes the fact of its historical origin at all, as well as its initial period of vigorous growth, largely to Teellinck, who had become thoroughly familiar with the notion of a reform programme in 1604 due to the Millenary Petition. Not for nothing, then, has Teellinck

125 In all probability, the expression Nadere Reformatie (with or without capitalization) was intended at the time as nothing more than a straight Dutch translation of the
been called the Father of the Further Reformation. I hope in a subsequent article to explore the Puritan influence that Teellinck brought to bear upon his own land.\textsuperscript{126}

Summary
The Reformed minister Willem Teellinck was the father of the Dutch Reformed devotional movement known as the Further Reformation. In his vast body of work, Teellinck twice stated that he was profoundly influenced by the Puritan way of life that he had experienced in the central English town of Banbury. His eldest son and colleague Maximiliaan later elaborated on these declarations, explaining that his father’s conversion had taken place among Puritans in England and that it was at that very time that he had immediately felt his call to the ministry. In spite of the fact that there is no reason to doubt the historicity of any of this, there remains a need for objective historical evidence to corroborate it. The present author fortunately came across just such evidence in an unthought-of place. This source not only provides corrections to the customary dates of Teellinck’s stay in Banbury but also proves that Teellinck was long in close contact with several Puritan leaders, including Arthur Hildersham, John Dod and William Whately. In the present article, the author also mentions his discoveries with regard to Teellinck’s student days. Finally, he demonstrates that Teellinck’s sojourn at Banbury was of great importance to the later life and writings of the initiator of the Further Reformation.
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\textsuperscript{126} I wish to express my special gratitude to one of my reviewers for his corrections and suggestions.
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