"Devils Clad in Flesh": The Significance of the Perceived Ranter Threat, 1649-1651

by

Katherine Lafreniere

Supervised by

Dr. Andrea McKenzie

A graduating Essay Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements, in the Honours Programme.

For the Degree of
Bachelor of Arts
In the
Department
Of
History

University of Victoria April 11, 2017

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
ii. The Historians	3
iii. The Ranters	10
iv. The Polemic Works of Contemporaries	19
v. The Official Response	30
Conclusion	42
Bibliography	
Primary Sources	44
Secondary Sources	46

The execution of Charles I in 1649 marked the elimination, not only of the monarch, but also of the head of the Church of England, creating religious uncertainty as well as a political vacuum. It was under these circumstances that the Ranters, one of the most infamous of all the radical religious sects to emerge during the Civil War and Interregnum, sprang up. The Ranters were notorious for outrageous behaviour such as preaching in the nude and having multiple sexual partners. They were antinomians, meaning they rejected conventional moral laws, both scripture and legal strictures, in favour of what they believed to be divine personal revelation. In the brief period from late 1650 until early 1651, the Ranters were the subjects of a number of polemic pamphlets

exist at all but were rather the fabrication of fearful contemporaries.

Rump Parliament. In order to truly uncover the historical significance of the Ranters, this paper will argue that a close examination of the content and the context of all three of these types of sources is necessary. This paper will therefore claim that the historical significance of the Ranters lies, not in their actual existence, but rather in the ways in which they were perceived by contemporaries. Furthermore, it will explain how this approach provides historians with a fascinating glimpse into a society grappling with a period of intense change and shifting concepts of authority following the upheaval of the Civil Wars and the regicide.

ii. The Historians

Up until the 1960s Ranters were largely ignored by historians, except as a radical fringe group whose behaviour undermined moral order. During the sexual and social

was writing for in a period in which social deviance was viewed as more shocking than religious pluralism. In his 1972 work, *The World Turned Upside Down*, Christopher Hill praises Morton and claims that he "knows more about the Ranters than anyone else." Like Morton, Hill concedes that Ranters did not constitute an organized sect in the way that other groups, such as the Quakers, did. He understands that the Ranters did not have a "recognized leader or theoretician" and that there was never "a Ranter organization." Nevertheless, Hill argues that, from 1649 to 1651, contemporaries were able to identify a group of individuals collectively referred to as members of a Ranter movement and, as a result, Hill feels confident in identifying these individuals as a movement.

This fascination with Ranters continued into the 1980s. In 1983 Nigel Smith released *A Collection of Ranter Writings*,

diversity amongst the views of these individuals.

'class-revolution'" and therefore found in Ranters such as Coppe "an extreme revolutionary intent on creating an 'apostolic, egalitarian communism'", when this may not have been the case. 28 Kenny ultimately explains how the twentieth-century historiography about Ranters has turned these religious radicals into "a wild, but blurred,

describes his transformative vision during which he "was utterly plagued, consumed, damned, rammed, and sunke into nothing..." before remerging, as though reborn, crying "Amen, Hallelujah, Hallelujah, Amen." ⁵¹ During this vision, God supposedly spoke to Coppe from within him, and the purpose of *A Fiery Flying Roll* is therefore to share God's message with the world as God intended Coppe to do. ⁵² In this work, as well as the preceding *A Second Fiery Flying Roule*, printed later in 1649, Coppe addresses the masses in order to share God's message with the world and enlighten them on the true ways of God. ⁵³ In this work Coppe directly laments the defeat of the Levellers, proving that his God was sympathetic to the levelling cause of creating a more egalitarian society. ⁵⁴

Following the removal of the monarch it seemed, for a moment, as though a new society would emerge. Following the establishment of the authority of Parliament, however, many, including Ranters, were unsatisfied. In his work *A Rout, A Rout*, Joseph Salmon describes how God previously "dwelt amongst us in the darkness of absolute and arbitrary Monarchy."

"as absolute and tyrannical as ever the King in his reign." ⁵⁷ One way in which Ranters criticized authority, therefore, was in terms of its inability to meet their desires for a postmonarchical society, one which was essentially more egalitarian. Coppe further expresses his desire for social equality when he argues that every time one sees a Beggar "you must Fall down before him, kisse him in the street." 58 Such an egalitarian perspective on society, which was shared by other sectarians such as the Quakers, can largely be attributed to Ranter antinomianism. As Jacob Bauthumley expresses in The Light and Dark sides of God, God is present "in all Creatures, Man and Beast, Fish and Fowle, and every green thing, from the highest Cedar to the Ivey on the wall." 59 It is this presence of God in all things that results in the Ranters viewing everything as equal and both divine authority and the bounties of nature as common to and accessible to all. This emphasis on natural law was contrary to the desires of Parliament who, as demonstrated in the Putney Debates, continued to defend property and social hierarchy in order to maintain their own power, despite similar opposition from Levellers and Diggers. Ranter antinomianism, however, can also be used to undermine the societal norms propounded by the authorities in other more radical ways, specifically in terms of rejecting conventional moral behaviour.

⁵⁷ **C**.

⁵⁷ Salmon, A Rout, A Rout, 193,

⁵⁸ Coppe, A Fiery Flying Roll, 90.

⁵⁹ Jacob Bauthumley, *The Light and Dark Sides of God.* in *A Collection of Ranter Writings from the 17th Century*, ed. Nigel Smith (London: Junction Books, 1983.), 232.

Both Coppe and Clarkson include the biblical phrase "to the pure all things are pure" in their writings. ⁶⁰ The way in which they interpret this statement often alarmed contemporaries. Coppe follows this statement by arguing that it logically follows that God therefore permits some to curse and swear and that, for these faithful individuals, cursing "is more glorious then praying and preaching in others." ⁶¹ Coppe is therefore propounding a belief that being saved is all that matters and that as long as one is elect and recognizes their divine inner light, then their individual actions are not important. Clarkson essentially argues that God rules over both good and evil and that "Scripture,"

In his 1660 autobiography, Clarkson describes his time as the "Captain of the Rant" when many "principle [sic] women came to [his] lodging for knowledge." ⁶³

Clarkson's justification for this sexual liberty lies in his extreme antinomian conception of sin. Clarkson ultimately believed "that there was no sin, but as man esteemed it sin, and therefore none can be free from sin, till in purity it be acted as no sin." ⁶⁴ It is this reasoning that alarmed contemporaries, especially as Clarkson himself proudly announced that he was therefore permitted to (and did) "brake the Law in all points (murder excepted:) and the ground of this my judgement was, God had made all things

could, therefore, unsurprisingly instill fear of a breakdown of societal conventions and the prospect of anarchy.⁶⁸

Beginning in the 1990s, historians have tended to see the Ranters as products of their age, as the result of contemporary religious and political conflict and regicide.

Kenny argues that it is impossible to understand Coppe's move to radicalism without looking at what was occurring around him and the lack of a prevailing authoritative structure, real or imagined, in England at this time. Such an examination of the context in which the Ranters were writing led Loewenstein to argue that Ranter works,

drunkenness, and the like." 72 Puritans cared very deeply about the dangers of "sins

millennium were also encouraged by the Civil War atmosphere. The works of Ranters can therefore be understood as their way of trying to make sense of the world around them, and the possible future, in a time of massive change. They attacked conventional seventeenth-century conceptions of social hierarchy, based on property ownership, a code of morality which viewed sex outside of marriage as a threat to the moral and social order and the legitimate transmission of property; most shocking of all, they questioned not only conventional church teachings but traditional religious authority based in scripture. They were, therefore, ultimately using religion as a way in which to both criticize and comprehend the role of political and religious authority within their own society.

iv. The Polemic Works of Contemporaries

Much scholarly work has focused on polemical primary sources concerning the Ranters. While these sources initially contributed greatly to the rediscovery of the Ranters in the works of Morton, Cohn and Hill, they later came under intense criticism from historians such as Davis. These sources are primarily made up of polemic pamphlets and heresiographies. William Lamont once pointed out that such pamphlets are often deceiving as they contain theological terms, such as antinomian, "which convey a delusive air of precision and even science about them," when in fact they are greatly simplifying an array of complex concepts in order to appeal to a wide readership. 81 Furthermore, recent historians have begun to recognize that heresiographers often had

⁸¹ William Lamont, "Pamphleteering, the Protestant consensus and the English Revolution," in *Freedom* and the English Revolution: Essays in history and literature, ed. R.C. Richardson and G.M. Ridden (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1986), 84,

author of this pamphlet does not make any distinction between these terms but is rather placing all of them under the overarching umbrella of general blasphemies, thus supporting Davis' argument. 90 In order to understand what makes the earlier pamphlets - those referring to a defined Ranter sect rather than a general polemic term - unique, one must therefore return to the sources Davis includes in this three-month period and attempt to discern the movement they are describing.

Davis argues that the Ranter "sensation" began with the appearance of the aforementioned pamphlet *The Ranters Religion*. ⁹¹ As previously stated, this pamphlet was targeting a very clearly defined group. Davis explains how the title page of *The Ranters Religion* "was adorned with a woodcut of naked men and women" and how the pamphlet was ultimately intended to depict the Ranters "as believing that God is pleased by acts of sin." ⁹² Likewise, in most of the pamphlets released during this brief period, Ranters are usually portrayed as dangerous blasphemers who deserve to be punished by the authorities. The pamphleteers primarily focused on the sexual permissiveness and drunken and disorderly behaviour the Ranters. In *The Ranters Recantation*, the anonymous author describes a Ranter meeting in Whitechapel on 17 December 1650 of around sixty people. ⁹³ The author discusses the outrageous behaviour of one Mrs Hull, who supposedly partook in "uncivil action" by being "set on her head, to go about the

⁹⁰ Ibid.

⁹¹ Davis, Fear, Myth and History, 77

⁹² Ibid., 78.

⁹³ The Ranters Recantation, British Library, Thomason collection, E.620[10], 1, 1650.

is specifically advertised "as a Warning-piece to the English Nation." These pamphlets uncover the fact that fears over the spreading of supposed Ranter ideals were so much of a threat that many were willing to pick up their pens in order to warn against the Ranters. In the seventeenth-century the Ranters were not merely viewed as potentially deranged individuals espousing bizarre beliefs, as they sometimes are by historians; rather, they were understood as a real danger to society. In the context of the war-torn seventeenth century in which English society was trying to return itself to order, the shocking ideas professed by the Ranters were viewed as a threat to a fragile religious and political détente.

In The Ranters Recantation, the author professes concern at the blasphemous

These pamphlets ultimately express concern over both the outrageous behaviour of the Ranters and their claims that God was within them. These two concerns together were often the defining features of the Ranters and what thus made them such a threat to contemporaries who desired to create a peaceful and godly society following the years of conflict.

After discussing these polemic pamphlets, Davis turns to what he describes as "more serious accounts" written about Ranters during the Interregnum. 102 Some of these accounts are those written by reputable figures in society, from a qo.2 (s) n s 64.9 (pof ti) (

recognizes how both these writers invoke imagery relating to "mass pestilence and disease" when discussing radical religious sects. ¹⁰⁵ In Edwards' work these sects were portrayed as a gangrene; in Pagitt's as a "plague of locusts,"-thus both representing "a festering infection eating away at the religious health of society." ¹⁰⁶ These heresiographies therefore, much like the pamphlets, discussed Ranters in terms of the role they played in the disintegration of the moral, religious and political order of midseventeenth-century England. It was not only Puritans, however, who discussed the Ranters in a polemic manner. As has previously been mentioned, the execution of the head of the Church of England and the deterioration of the national church had left behind a religious vacuum. There was therefore a great deal of conflict amongst different religious sects as they fought over who would fill this vacuum.

As has already been explained, later in 1651 the term Ranter began to evolve into a generic term of opprobrium, synonymous with bad behaviour and a breakdown of societal morals. As a result, associating others with Ranterish beliefs could be used as a weapon to dismiss the validity of their views. McGregor explains how, not only did Puritans accuse Baptists of being Ranters, but the Baptists then linked Ranterism with Seekers and Familists.

James Naylor critique a number of contemporary religious sects in order to prove the supremacy of their own beliefs. Fox and Naylor specifically refer to "Anabaptists, Independents, Presbyterians, Levellers and Ranters." 109 They claim that the Ranters, though starting on the right path, strayed off course and ended up turning "the grace of God into wantonness," resulting in "drunkenness, and cursed speaking." 110 This work is ultimately an attempt to dismiss other religious ideals by portraying them as undesirable alternatives in order to promote the Quaker doctrine.

The Digger Gerrard Winstanley also critiques the Ranters in his *A Vindication of Those, Whose endeavours is only to make the Earth a common treasury, called Diggers.*He argues that Diggers looked disdainfully upon the practices of the Ranters. ¹¹¹ He then identifies eleven in-depth criticisms of the Ranters and follows these with two statements which support the Digger position. ¹¹² The first of these statements shows how, once again, a criticism of the Ranters is being used as an attempt to vindicate the author's own group by comparing them to what many would consider a greater evil. Winstanley is explicitly making the case for the Diggers when he states that

every one that intends to live in peace, [should] set themselves with diligent labour to Till, Digge, and Plow, the Common and barren Land, to get their bread with righteous moderate working, long a moderat minded people, this prevents the evill of Idlenesse, and the danger of the Ranting power.

Ranters therefore served a purpose beyond their mere existence in their ability to be utilized as a tool to advance the agenda of other sects during the Interregnum, and thus tell us about the broader issues, debates and anxieties of contemporaries.

In her article, "'Not Heretofore Extant in Print': Where the Mad Ranters Are,"

Gucer argues that a study of the Ranters can expose "the process by which pamphleteers invented a linguistic means of talking about religious diversity before it was an accepted feature of English society." ¹¹⁴ Furthermore, she links this discussion of religious diversity to the political upheaval of the period. She explains how the literature pertaining to Ranters was utilized to analyze the ways in which religious radicals used their reason to criticise authority. ¹¹⁵ She suggests that the contemporary discussion of the Ranters illuminates the "*inchoate* nature of political groups in the period." ¹¹⁶ Gucer therefore shifts the discussion of the Ranters away from questions over their literal existence

such a tool could be utilized to "induce conformity" within the sects. 117 The very existence of contemporary polemical works concerning the Ranters, therefore, provides

v. The Official Response

The contemporary polemic literature surrounding the Ranters suggests that Ranters were viewed as a real threat during the early years of the Interregnum, whether or not this fear was rational. Likewise, upon examining the House of Commons records, it becomes clear that contemporary authorities also viewed the Ranters as a legitimate concern and therefore acted accordingly. Nevertheless, Davis points out how, with the

Journal of the House of Commons and their threat was largely responsible for the implementation of the August 1650 "Act against several Atheistical, Blasphemous and Execrable Opinions, derogatory to the honour of God, and destructive to human Society," now on referred to as the Blasphemy Act. 123 It will, therefore, be argued that the Ranters were dealt with more leniently than Naylor, not because they did not alarm authorities, but rather, due to the unique political period in which they were active, when Parliament was still struggling to come to terms with the very nature and extent of its own increased authority and still exercising a degree of religious toleration in regard to non-episcopalian Protestantism.

The role of Parliament was transformed by the English Civil Wars. Before 1640

Parliament had only met for rare and brief periods and had exerted very "little direct influence on the policies, and held no direct share in the executive powers, of governments which could dismiss them at will." ¹²⁴ After 1640, however, the Long Parliament achieved the unthinkable by establishing a republic in which power was centered in the hands of the House of Commons. The Rump Parliament, composed of the remaining members of the Long Parliament following Pride's Purge, sat from 1648 until 1653. Pride's Purge took place on 6 December 1648, the day after the House of Commons voted to continue negotiations with the King. ¹²⁵ The Purge was essentially intended to remove the moderates who were encouraging such negotiations from

¹²³ "House of Commons Journal Volume 6: 9 August 1650," in *Journal of the House of Commons: Volume 6, 1648-1651*, (London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1802): 454.

¹²⁴ Worden, Blair, The Rump Parliament 1648-1653, (London: Cambridge University Press, 1974): 2.

¹²⁵ Ibid., 23.

Parliament and ultimately resulted in the exclusion of half the members of the Commons. ¹²⁶ It was this Rump Parliament which then facilitated the regicide. The Rump is often believed to have been an extremely radical, although ultimately failed, political entity. As Blair Worden has pointed out, however, contemporary M.P.s of the Rump did not believe themselves to be part of a "political entity distinct in membership, aims and character from the Long Parliament of the 1640s." ¹²⁷ Worden portrays the Rump as "an uneasy coalition of interests whose members shared little beyond a willingness to sit in it." ¹²⁸ Furthermore, despite facilitating the regicide, the Rump was much less revolutionary than has been traditionally assumed.

regicide, or how revolutionary these policies should be. Oliver Cromwell, who is seen as

Moreover, following the unpopular reception of the regicide, the Rump was further encouraged to approach change with "caution rather than experiment." ¹³⁶ The discussions and decisions surrounding the Ranters, therefore, provide intriguing insight into the preoccupations of the Rump during its early years and its attempts to come to terms with its position in relation to maintaining moral, as well as political, order in the nation following the regicide. Furthermore, they demonstrate the Rump's manner of approaching radicalism with moderation, not as a planned method, but rather as haphazard way in which to legitimize their own authority and return order to England.

Both Coppe and Clarkson are directly discussed during the House of Commons debates in 1649 and/or 1650. Coppe is first mentioned on 1 February 1649 in regards to the blasphemies expressed in *A Fiery Flying Roll*. ¹³⁷ *A Fiery Flying Roll* was here described as containing "damnable and detestable Opinions, to be abhorred by all good and godly People," and it was thus ordered that all copies of the work be burnt. ¹³⁸

Correction: there to be kept to Labour for one Month; and from that Time to be banished out of this Commonwealth, and the Territories, thereof...not to return, upon Pain of Death." ¹⁴¹ Furthermore, it was ordered that all copies of *The Single Eye* be burnt. ¹⁴² At this same meeting the Committee was given one week to look into Coppe, with "power to send for persons and witnesses," before reporting their findings back to the House the following week. ¹⁴³

On this same day, 27 September 1650, the Rump also put in place its sole act of religious toleration. 144 This "Act for Relief of religious and peaceable People from the

"patron of the sects." ¹⁴⁷ As the period advanced, however, even previous advocates of religious toleration, such as Cromwell's chaplain, John Owen, went from scorning "the notion that the state should impose 'fundamentals' in religion" to eventually "seeking to impose them himself." ¹⁴⁸ This switch in attitudes was largely a result of the extremism of the religious sects, such as the Ranters, which had emerged, or were emerging, by the early 1650s. Furthermore, it represents a response to the political realities of the day, in which concessions to religious and social reform were not granted due to political concerns about preventing the outbreak of another civil war.

The extent of the religious radicalism experienced in the early 1650s alarmed even those who would usually accept a degree of religious toleration. The Rump ultimately desired "to dissociate itself from [these] growing and alarming manifestations of religious extremism," whose focus on a guiding "inner light" could ultimately lead to a rejection of Parliamentary authority. 149 Furthermore, there was a fear that permitting religious toleration would alienate Presbyterians who might then "be tempted to support the royalist cause." 150 The main religious disagreement between Presbyterians and Independents concerned the importance of a national church. Following the regicide and Civil Wars, which resulted in the dissolution of the national church, these differences were accentuated. Independents, unlike Presbyterians, did not believe that a national church was necessary and rather supported autonomous local congregations whose

¹⁴⁷ Worden, The Rump Parliament, 129.

¹⁴⁸ Ibid., 137.

¹⁴⁹ Ibid., 232.

¹⁵⁰ Ibid., 234.

Later beliefs, such as those of the Ranters, however, were viewed as even more destabilizing due to the fact that they appealed to completely different sources of authority, such as the "inner light of the spirit," and thus rejected conventional social understandings of authority. The Blasphemy Act was specifically intended to punish any sane individual who espoused the belief, either in writing or speech, that they themselves, "or any other meer Creature," is God. The Was argued that these individuals' rejection of the "use of any Gospel Ordinances" was also a denial of "the necessity of

as the exemplar of moral behaviour in the nation - moral behaviour which was understood through religion and which was ultimately being challenged by the Ranters. It was therefore the morals, or lack thereof, of the Ranters which were being directly attacked by Parliament due to the threat that they posed. From "1570-1640 the church courts...consistently upheld the immorality of incest, adultery and fornication and facilitated the decline in the incidence of illegitimacy which occurred in the early seventeenth century." ¹⁶⁰ The absence of these church courts during the Interregnum therefore left a gap in the nation's centre for religious authority, a gap which the Rump attempted to fill. In the preamble to the Blasphemy Act it is specifically articulated that Parliament was implementing this Act because they viewed it as their duty, as leaders of the nation, "to propagate the Gospel in this Commonwealth, to advance Religion in all Sincerity, Godliness, and Honesty." ¹⁶¹ Parliament aimed to further the "Reformation, in Doctrine and Maners," according to their own conceptions of acceptable behaviour. ¹⁶²

A similar pattern can be recognized in the Adultery Act which had been

legislation.¹⁶⁴ Adultery had been a crime only in the eyes of clerics, not Parliament, and had therefore fallen under the jurisdiction of the now-defunct church courts.¹⁶⁵ Keith Thomas argues that the Interregnum was therefore a unique point in the history of

during the Interregnum. 169 He argues, however, that the relative lightness of Coppe's

Conclusion

an important historical purpose in uncovering some of the deep rooted problems underlying the Rump Parliament's inability to gain widespread support. The plurality of ideas which thrived following the regicide were ultimately too widespread to be contained by a Parliament who was not yet even sure how to understand its own role. The Ranters represent one way in which to critique this new authority, as well as the dangers that emerge from overturning both the monarchy and the traditional sources of religious

<u>Bibliography</u>

Primary Sources:

Unless otherwise indicated, all primary printed sources are from Early English Books Online

- "August 1650: An Act against several Atheistical, Blasphemous and Execrable Opinions, derogatory to the honor of God, and destructive to humane Society." In Acts and Ordinances of the Interregnum, 1642-1660, edited by C H Firth and R S Rait (London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1911), 409-412. British History Online, accessed January 7, 2017, http://www.british-history.ac.uk/no-series/acts-ordinances-interregnum/pp409-412.
- Bauthumley, Jacob. *The Light and Dark Sides of God.* In *A Collection of Ranter Writings from the 17th Century*, edited by Nigel Smith 227-264. London: Junction Books. 1983.
- Clarkson, Lawrence. A Single Eye: All Light, no Darkness; or Light and Darkness One. In A Collection of Ranter Writings from the 17th Century, edited by Nigel Smith,

- "House of Commons Journal Volume 6: 9 August 1650." In *Journal of the House of Commons: Volume 6, 1648-1651*, (London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1802), 453-454. *British History Online*, accessed January 7, 2017, http://www.british-history.ac.uk/commons-jrnl/vol6/pp453-454.
- "House of Commons Journal Volume 6: 14 June 1650." In *Journal of the House of Commons: Volume 6, 1648-1651*, (London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1802), 423-424. *British History Online*, accessed March 3, 2017, http://www.british-history.ac.uk/commons-jrnl/vol6/pp423-424.
- "House of Commons Journal Volume 6: 27 September 1650." In *Journal of the House of Commons: Volume 6, 1648-1651*, (London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1802), 474-475. *British History Online*, accessed December 26, 2016, http://www.british-history.ac.uk/commons-jrnl/vol6/pp474-475.
- "May 1650: An Act for suppressing the detestable sins of Incest, Adultery and Fornication." In *Acts and Ordinances of the Interregnum*, 1642-1660, edited by C H Firth and R S Rait (London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1911), 387-389. *British History Online*, accessed February 18, 2017, http://www.british-history.ac.uk/no-series/acts-ordinances-interregnum/pp387-389.

Salmon, Joseph, A Rout, A Rout. TT3 1C0S Q 0.2 () 55.2 (A) -0.2 (n)55.2 (A) -0.2 (c) 0. -

Winstanley, Gerrard. A Vindication of those whose Endeavors is only to make the earth a common treasury, called Diggers. 1650. Bodleian Library, Thomason collection, E.1365[1].

Secondary Sources:

- Capp, Bernard. England's Culture Wars: Puritan Reformation and its Enemies in the Interregnum, 1649-1660. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Cohn, Norman. The Pursuit of the Millennium: Revolutionary Millenarians and Mystical Anarchists of the Middle Ages. London: Maurice Temple Smith Ltd., 1970.
- Davis, J.C. Fear, Myth and History: The Ranters and the historians. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.
- Davis, J.C. "Living with the living God: radical religion and the English Revolution." In Religion in Revolutionary England, edited by Christopher Durston and Judith Maltby, 19-41. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2006.
- Ellens, G.F.S. "The Ranters Ranting: Reflections on a Ranting Counter Culture." *Church History* 40 (January 1971): 91-107. http://www.jstor.org.ezproxy.library.uvic.ca/stable/3163110
- Friedman, Jerome. Blasphemy, Immorality and Anarchy: The Ranters and the English Revolution. Ohio: Ohio University Press, 1987
- Greaves, Richard L. Review of *Fear, Myth and History: The Ranters and Their Historians*, by J. C. Davis. *Church History* 57, no. 3 (September 1988): 376-378.

- Hill, Christopher. *The World Turned Upside Down: Radical Ideas during the English Revolution.* London: Maurice Temple Smith Ltd., 1972.
- Ingram, Martin. *Church Courts, Sex and Marriage in England, 1570-1640.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- Kenny, Robert. "'In These Last Dayes': The Strange Work of Abiezer Coppe." *The Seventeenth Century* 13, no. 2 (Fall 1998): 156-184. ProQuest.
- Labuzetta, Evan. "'This Diabolical Generation'-The Ranters and the Devil." *Literature Compass* 5, issue 3 (May 2008): 591-602.