

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *The Baptist Quarterly* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_bq\\_01.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bq_01.php)

## THE SPIRIT AND THE SWORD

### Bunyan and the Stuart State\*

'Oh I was as if I was on the Ladder, with the Rope about my neck', Bunyan mused about his early months in the cold cell of a Bedford jail, comforted only by the thought that his last words on the scaffold might convert another sinner.(1) He was now face to face with the resurrected Stuart state, the earlier demise of which he had probably pondered very little. His military service had been confined to a county garrison at Newport Pagnell rather than the New Model Army, which bore the brunt of the fighting against the royalist forces. Only in the heady days of religious enthusiasm following his conversion did he begin to consider political issues, and then it was almost certainly through the eyes of the Fifth Monarchists, such as John Child, a fellow member of the Bedford gathered church.(2)

Not until 1660 did Bunyan have to confront a government openly hostile to his religious principles, Charles' promise of liberty to tender consciences notwithstanding. Uncertain of their future, the Bedford congregation set apart 12 December as a day of special prayer for the churches and the nation, in order that God 'would direct our governors in their meeting together'.(3) Bunyan himself was scheduled to preach a month earlier, on 12 November, to a conventicle at Lower Samsell, though a warrant had already been issued for his arrest. 'Had I been minded to play the coward, I could have escaped...', he recalled, but he rejected a friend's plea to flee. In a spirit reminiscent of William Strode's defiance when Charles I schemed to arrest leading members of Parliament, Bunyan proclaimed: 'I will not stir... Our cause is good...'.(4) He was, in fact, resolved to ascertain what the magistrates could say or do to him, as he was convinced that he had done no wrong. Already, perhaps, John Foxe's *Acts and Monuments* was having an impact on him, for he was willing to suffer in God's cause in the expectation of a future reward. A sense of bravado and a determination not to provide a poor example to weaker saints were operative as well: 'I had shewed myself hearty and courageous in my preaching, and had... made it my business to encourage others; therefore... if I should now run, and make an escape, it will be of a very ill savour in the country...'.(5) In short, fidelity to the Gospel outweighed obedience to the state.

But what, precisely, was Bunyan's attitude toward the Stuart government? The answer to this question has been the subject of sharp disagreement among Bunyan specialists. On the one hand, Bunyan's prominent Evangelical disciple and editor, George Offor, was convinced that in his political views Bunyan was 'a thorough loyalist' and a proponent of 'high monarchial principles'.(6) At the other extreme, William York Tindall has asserted that 'Bunyan cherished a deep and natural hatred of both king and government, like any normal Baptist of the time...'.(7) While Bunyan proclaimed his loyalty to the monarchy and disavowed sedition, such statements, Tindall insisted,

---

\* A version of this article will be published in Robert Collmer, ed., *Bunyan in Our Time*, The Kent State University Press, Ohio, forthcoming.

were required by both expediency and conformity to Baptist practice. Although Particular and General Baptist confessions of faith typically contained articles professing obedience to magistrates, Tindall has pointed to the treasonous activities of such Bunyan acquaintances as Vavasor Powell, Hanserd Knollys, Henry Jessey, and Henry Danvers.(8) To mask his own seditious sentiments, according to Tindall, Bunyan used the oblique techniques of allegory and biblical exegesis. Such 'indirection relieved his feelings, communicated his ideas to the saints, and hid them from all but the closest scrutiny of the authorities'.(9) Despite the practice of this 'politic duplicity', Tindall argues, Bunyan was telling the truth when he professed his innocence of sedition, for in his mind those who were loyal to God's commands could not simultaneously be guilty of treason.(10)

Most writers have avoided the extremes presented by Ofor and Tindall, preferring to skirt the issue of Bunyan's attitude towards the magistrate. John Brown, in a biography that verges on making Bunyan heroic, contented himself with the observation that Bunyan 'was a law-abiding subject, and held it to be his duty to behave himself under the King's government as became a man and a Christian, and if only opportunity were given him he would willingly manifest his loyalty to his prince by word and deed'.(11) Brown provides no hint of sedition or hostility toward monarchy on Bunyan's part, even when he discusses the critical posthumous works, *Of Antichrist and His Ruin* and *An Exposition of the First Ten Chapters of Genesis*.(12) The leading modern authority on Bunyan, Roger Sharrock, has said only that he 'remained a staunch and consistent supporter of civil obedience'.(13)

Bunyan's conscious decision to disobey statutory law by addressing a conventicle in November 1660 and consequent imprisonment resulted in a temporary fear of the gallows but no remorse for his defiance. On the contrary, incarceration reinforced his resolve to stand firm for his right to preach. To Justice Wingate's offer to release him if sureties would guarantee his silence, Bunyan retorted: 'I should not leave speaking the word of God' or do anything to 'dishonour my God, and wound my conscience'.(14) For this recalcitrance, some two months after his arrest Sir John Keeling sentenced him to three more months in prison, and threatened perpetual banishment if he remained obdurate. Under the law, should he be found in the realm without a royal licence subsequent to being exiled, he faced the gallows.(15)

In the months that followed, Bunyan commenced the legal studies that are reflected in such later works as *The Advocateship of Jesus Christ*. When Paul Cobb, a well-meaning clerk sent by the justices of the peace, visited him in prison in a futile attempt to persuade him to capitulate, Bunyan lectured him on jurisprudence: 'I conceive that that law by which I am in prison at this time, doth not reach or condemn, either me, or the meetings which I do frequent: That law was made against those, that being designed to do evil in their meetings, make the exercise of religion their pretence to cover their wickedness'.(16) The act in question, 35 Elizabeth I, c.1, he insisted, did not ban private meetings solely for the purpose of worship. Nor would he accept Cobb's attempt to refute that argument by associating it with

the recent abortive rising of Thomas Venner and his Fifth Monarchist allies. Bunyan's own earlier attraction to the Fifth Monarchists notwithstanding, he joined most religious radicals in prudently disavowing the insurrection. Moreover, he pointedly underscored his loyalty to the state: 'I look upon it as my duty to behave myself under the King's government, both as becomes a man and a Christian; and if an occasion was offered me, I should willingly manifest my loyalty to my Prince, both by word and deed'.(17) But such a profession of loyalty did not bear the same meaning for Bunyan as it did for Cobb and his associates. To Bunyan, loyalty to the prince was predicated upon prior fidelity to God's precepts, which included the exercise of such divinely-bestowed gifts as preaching.(18)

In defending his position, Bunyan cited three authorities: Scripture, statute, and John Wyclif (as quoted in the *Acts and Monuments*). Willingly, he embraced the Pauline doctrine of obedience to the higher powers as divinely ordained (Rom.13.1-7), but he was also quick to point out that Jesus and Paul had suffered at the hands of magistrates even while accepting this 'ordinance'. The crucial key was in distinguishing the two forms of obedience: 'The one to do that which I in my conscience do believe that I am bound to do, actively; and where I cannot obey actively, there I am willing to lie down and to suffer what they shall do unto me'.(19) Here, then, is a clear affirmation of the classic doctrine of passive resistance, as espoused, for example, by Martin Luther.(20)

Statute too was used by Bunyan in his defence. Displaying a remarkable degree of sophistication in a person of his educational background, he distinguished between the letter of the law and the intent of its makers. 'I would not entertain so much uncharitableness of that parliament in the 35th of *Elizabeth*, or of the Queen herself, as to think they did by that law intend the oppressing of any of God's ordinances, or the interrupting [of] any in the way of God...'.(21) The statute itself, he pointed out, was concerned only with those who used religion to cloak incendiary designs. By way of substantiation, he deftly quoted the crucial clause of the Elizabethan act, which singled out meetings held 'under colour or pretence of religion'.(22)

Finally, Bunyan turned to John Wyclif for support. Although there is no evidence that he had ever read Wyclif's writings or subsequent Lollard literature, he knew Wyclif's story from Foxe's account. To Cobb's plea that he forbear preaching at least for the immediate future, Bunyan responded: '*Wickliffe* saith, that he which leaveth off preaching and hearing of the word of God for fear of excommunication of men, he is already excommunicated of God, and shall in the day of judgment be counted a traitor to Christ'.(23)

During the exchange with Cobb, Bunyan offered a revealing insight into his views about the critical issue of the nature of government. As Christopher Hill has pointed out, the influence of the radical tradition was greater on Bunyan than has his impact on it, and one might therefore expect to find him espousing republican ideology.(24) After all, many soldiers who fought on the parliamentary side in the civil war, as Richard Baxter observed, were persuaded 'sometimes for State Democracy...'.(25) The Presbyterian, Robert

Baillie, generalized - inaccurately - that sectaries sought the liberty to overthrow all kings and parliaments, and in their place to 'set up... the whole multitude, in the Throne of absolute Sovereignty...'.(26) The more extreme radicals did, in fact, oppose monarchy as the tool of the priests and the rich.(27) Within the Fifth Monarchy tradition there was also a pronounced anti-monarchical bent, as the saints called for action that would topple sovereigns preparatory to the rule of the godly. Thus John Tillinghast boldly proclaimed that 'the overthrowing [of] the Thrones of the kings, is to be performed by the Saints...', in whose hands both civilian and military power must reside.(28) Such was the ideological environment in which Bunyan began to formulate his concept of government.

Rather than embracing republican tenets, Bunyan steered an indifferent course. To Cobb he said; 'I did look upon myself as bound in conscience to walk according to all righteous laws, *and that whether there was a King or no...*'.(29) In other words, the precise form of government was of no immediate consequence to Bunyan (though he later was critical of absolute monarchy). His basic indifference reflects the influence of certain strains of the radical tradition, though clearly not the republicans, Levellers, or Diggers. Like Baxter, Bunyan was convinced that all forms of governing power originated with God, and he would have likely embraced Baxter's thesis that God did not prescribe a single polity.(30) 'The reason why God did not Universally by his Law tye all the World to One forme of Government', Baxter asserted, 'is because the difference of persons, times, places, neighbours, &c. may make one forme best to one people, and at one time, and place, that is worst to another'.(31) But whereas Bunyan was presumably content to let the matter rest at this point, Baxter proceeded to argue stringently that monarchy is the best form of polity because it corresponds the closest to nature.(32) The leading Arminian Independent, John Goodwin, was another who postulated that monarchy, aristocracy, and democracy were all divinely bestowed, 'not any of them determinately, or with exclusion of the rest'.(33)

Despite their theological differences, a statement made by George Fox to Charles II might just as well have come from Bunyan: 'We, for our selves, desire no greater Liberty, either in things Religious, or in things Civil... than we desire all others might enjoy: And if such a Government as this be set up, then if he that is Chief in taking care and seeing that Justice may be done to all without respect of persons, if he be called a King, a Judge, a Protector, or General, we shall not be against either or any of the Names...'.(34) While Bunyan did not embrace any single form of government, from the outset he insisted that a Christian must submit to duly-constituted authority, bearing 'patiently the penalty of the law' if in conscience he could not obey the dictates of the state.(35)

During his early years in the Bedford county jail, Bunyan set aside strictly political questions in order to concentrate on the subjects of prayer and Christian suffering. In his apology for extempore prayer, *I will Pray with the Spirit* (c.1662), Bunyan lashed out not at the king or his magistrates but at those doctors of the established church who imposed the Book of Common Prayer, a human invention 'neither commanded nor commended of God...'.(36) With obvious

personal bitterness, he protested that one who lived peaceably could nevertheless be condemned as seditious simply for refusing, in good conscience, to accept a form of worship which had not been divinely mandated. Silencing ministers and threatening offenders with the gallows or exile was, he claimed, blatantly antichristian persecution. (37)

Having established the context of righteous suffering in his prayer tract, Bunyan reinforced this theme in his *Prison Meditations* (1663). Jail became a school of Christ in which the elect prepared to die, victims of an ungodly régime. (38)

*Just* thus it is, we suffer here  
 For him a little pain,  
 Who, when he doth again appear  
 Will with him let us reign. (39)

Those who quailed before such suffering were exhorted to render the ultimate sacrifice:

...make the *Tree* your stage  
 For Christ *that* King potent. (40)

Bunyan was, in fact, less concerned with Charles II and his secular officials than with those propertied Puritans who had made their peace with the Restoration state.

When we did walk at liberty,  
 We were deceiv'd by them,  
 Who we from hence do clearly see  
 Are vile deceitful Men.  
 These Politicians that profest  
 For base and worldly ends,  
 Do now appear to us at best  
 But Machivilian Friends. (41)

Hypocrisy had a worse sting than persecution. Betrayal was particularly odious to those such as Bunyan who were embittered by the sudden collapse of the Good Old Cause.

Between 1663 and 1665 Bunyan turned increasingly to millenarian themes, reflecting perhaps his earlier attraction to the Fifth Monarchists. The promise that suffering saints would eventually reign with King Jesus was expanded in *One Thing is Needful* (1665) to include an apocalyptic vision of the Last Judgment, replete with a Christ who

... comes with Head as white as Snow;  
 With Eyes like flames of fire;  
 In Justice clad from top to toe,  
 Most glorious in attire. (42)

Those who persecute the saints have cells reserved for them in the great

... Prison with its locks and bars,  
Of Gods lasting decree.(43)

having denied the saints liberty to worship in accord with the dictates of their consciences, the condemned must suffer where

... Conscience is the slaughter-shop,  
There hangs the Ax, and Knife,  
'Tis there the worm makes all things hot.(44)

Although Bunyan clearly had his tormentors in mind when he penned this exercise in apocalyptic vengeance, he wisely refrained from making this explicit.

The millenarian themes are equally in evidence in *The Holy City*, a companion work to *One Thing Is Needful*, published the same year and certainly intended to be read in tandem. This time, however, the tone is quieter, the role of governors more explicit and positive. Bunyan is careful to assure traditional rulers that the holy city, the Gospel church, is not a revolutionary institution posing a threat to their sovereignty. 'The governors of this world', he wrote, 'need not at all to fear a disturbance from her, or a diminishing of ought they have'. Because the church's interests are not material, 'she will not meddle with their fields nor vineyards, neither will she drink of the water of their wells...'. Those who charge the church with treason lie, for it is not, nor has it ever been, 'a rebellious city, and destructive to kings, and a diminisher of their revenues'.(45)

Tindall's contention that Bunyan despised kings is roundly refuted in the pages of *The Holy City*. On the contrary, monarchs are accorded a clear measure of respect: 'The people of the nations they are but like to single pence and halfpence, but their kings like gold angels and twenty-shilling pieces'.(46) Yet his own knowledge of Charles I and Charles II, coupled with the influence of a radical tradition that depicted kings as the root of tyranny,(47) led him to the provocative conclusion that most rulers were enamoured with 'mistress Babylon, the mother of harlots, the mistress of witchcrafts, and abominations of the earth'. They not only fornicate with her but defend her from 'the gunshot that the saints continually will be making at her by the force of the Word and Spirit of God'.(48) Bunyan, however, resisted the conclusion that monarchs should be toppled as aiders and abettors of supreme evil. It was simply a matter, he said, that kings were the last to come to Christ, the first being the poor. But their coming was a certainty: 'The kings must come to Jerusalem...'.(49)

Victory over temporal sovereigns, however assured, would be a tumultuous business. Although rulers must eventually succumb to grace, this would only happen after an unsuccessful war with the Lamb. Just as Darius, Cyrus and Artaxerxes assisted Ezra and Nehemiah in reconstructing Jerusalem, so would some monarchs help build the holy city, but 'the great conquest of the kings will be by the beauty and glory of this city, when she is built'.(50) Rulers who ultimately refuse to accept the church 'must take what followeth',(51) a harsh fate vividly depicted in *One Thing is Needful*.

Perhaps the most striking fact about *The Holy City* is Bunyan's refusal to attribute final responsibility for the church's persecution to temporal sovereigns. Instead he laid it at the foot of the Antichrist, the 'mistress of iniquity', who used witchcraft to beguile rulers into vexing the saints.(52) As his own incarceration stretched from months into years, Bunyan sought a deeper meaning for this suffering. The answer lay in the form of an earthly purgatory in which saints were prepared for entry into God's presence: 'The church in the fire of persecution is like Esther in the perfuming chamber, but making fit for the presence of the king...', or like gold 'on which the fire of persecution and temptation hath done its full and complete work'.(53) Through the overarching work of providence, then, rulers who persecuted the church were, in Bunyan's mind, agents of the divine plan, more to be pitied than hated, but never to be violently resisted.

Bunyan's prison writings are straightforward in presenting a doctrine of passive resistance, and there is no evidence to indicate that they were intended as a mask to conceal covert support for insurrection. Between August 1661 and March 1662, Bunyan used the occasional liberty given to him by his jailor to travel to London. He may have gone solely to procure spiritual guidance from such friends as George Cokayne, John Owen, George Griffith, and Anthony Palmer, or he may have obtained legal advice. His enemies, however, were convinced that he went to the City to 'plot and raise division, and make insurrection...', but Bunyan denied the charge.(54) Cokayne and his associate, Nathaniel Holmes, both avowed millenarians, were preaching to illegal conventicles in this period, and Cokayne was suspected of writing seditious tracts. Palmer, a recent convert to the Fifth Monarchists, was regarded in government circles as one of the 'violent projecting men'. In 1661 he was preaching against the Restoration court, and late the following year the state suspected him of participating in Ensign Thomas Tong's plot to assassinate the king and the dukes of York and Albemarle, seize Windsor Castle, and reinstitute the republic.(55) There is no proof that Bunyan knew of such activities.

In the years that followed, Bunyan's imprisonment must have become stricter. His name is not recorded in the *Church Book* between October 1661 and November 1668, but in the latter year the expiration of the 1664 Conventicle Act led to an increase of Nonconformist activity.(56) As a direct consequence, fears of new plots began to spread. From York, a customs collector warned Joseph Williamson in October 1669 that unlawful meetings of Dissenters looked suspiciously like those which had preceded the recent rebellion,(57) while from Coventry another of Williamson's correspondents expressed concern the following month about the growth of conventicles.(58) In May Williamson had been warned by Daniel Fleming, writing from Westmorland, that the Presbyterians were 'now designing some mischief...'. 'Faction', he cautioned, 'will strike (notwithstanding all their fair & gilded pretences) at the crowne as well as at the miter...'.(59) While there was far more smoke than fire, the concerns were genuine enough. The Bedford church to which Bunyan belonged was itself caught up in these suspicions, particularly after brother Humphrey Merrill 'began in an obscure way to charge the Church with rebellion...'. In an appearance before the quarter sessions no later

than September 1669, Merrill recanted the profession of faith he had made to the Bedford church, but he went further in testifying 'that they had their hands in the blood of the king: that they were disobedient to government, and that they were not a church...'.(60) These were probably the emotional reactions of an embittered member or the inventions of a timid soul afraid of the justices before whom he stood. It can hardly be more than coincidence that in the first year of Bunyan's renewed attendance at church meetings, the congregation was accused of treasonable activity. The same year Bunyan's colleague, Samuel Fenn, was blamed for 'intending to incite and move rebellion and sedition in this realm of England', but apparently only because he denied the royal governorship of the Church of England.(61)

These were, in any case, the years in which Bunyan and the Nonconformists who were imprisoned with him worked out the strategy by which they established a network of preachers in Bedfordshire and the surrounding counties that enabled the Nonconformists to survive later attempts to suppress them. Specifically, the Bedford congregation joined forces with Dissenting churches at Stevington, Keysoe, Newport Pagnell, and Cranfield to provide a network of religious leaders and meetings throughout the region. When Bunyan and his colleagues sought licences to preach in May 1672 under Charles' Declaration of Indulgence, their application contained the names of no less than twenty-seven men in twenty-six towns and villages in six counties.(62) Such careful planning helped to ensure the ultimate right of Nonconformists to freedom of worship.

Released at last in 1672, Bunyan became embroiled almost immediately in a controversy involving one of his favourite themes, church membership and communion. In his initial contribution, *A Confession of My Faith* (1672), which sparked the dispute, he was at pains to insist that there was nothing in his principles that savoured of rebellion or heresy, or was in any way grounds for spending a dozen years in prison, threatened by perpetual exile or hanging. The *Confession* was intended as a vindication of his innocence, and for that reason he reiterated his doctrine of passive disobedience: 'Neither can I in or by the superstitious inventions of this world, consent that my soul should be governed in any of my approaches to God, because commanded to the contrary, and commended for so refusing'. On this point he would not relent, though professing himself 'at all times a peaceable and an obedient subject'.(63)

Most contemporary sectarian confessions of faith included an article on magistracy, which provided Bunyan with an obvious reason to include such a statement in his confession. A typical article is found in the 1656 Confession of the Western Association of Baptists, one of the leaders of which was Thomas Collier:

That the ministry of civil justice (being for the praise of them that do well, and punishment of evildoers) is an ordinance of God, and that it is the duty of the saints to be subject thereunto not only for fear, but for conscience sake... and that for such, prayers and supplications are to be made by the saints... (64)

In a similar fashion Bunyan postulated that magistracy is a divine ordinance, adding that it is a judgment of God to be without magistratés. After quoting Romans 13.2-6, he returned to the theme of passive resistance: 'Many are the mercies we receive, by a well qualified magistrate, and if any shall at any time be otherwise inclined, let us shew our Christianity in a patient suffering, for well doing, what it shall please God to inflict by them'.(65)

An illustration of how Bunyan intended this doctrine to be practised appeared in another work published the same year, *A Defence of the Doctrine of Justification by Faith*, a refutation of Edward Fowler's *The Design of Christianity* (1671). Bunyan had no use for the Latitudinarian Fowler, rector of Northill, Bedfordshire, whom he mercilessly castigated as one who could, 'as to religion, turn and twist like an eel on the angle; or rather like the weather-cock that stands on the steeple'. Because Fowler had turned his back on the Puritan principles he had espoused in the 1650s, Bunyan found it appropriate to lecture him that obedience to the state does not extend to the point of denying the fundamentals of the faith. The implicit lesson was sufficiently manifest: the turncoat rector should have stood his ground, rejected the demands of the Stuart state to conform, and suffered alongside Bunyan and his confederates.(66)

In the decade that ensued, not even a temporary return to prison in 1676-77 prompted Bunyan to deal with the issue of obedience to the state.(67) Only when Charles II dismissed three successive parliaments in the epic struggle over excluding the Duke of York from the line of succession did Bunyan choose to speak out once more on matters of state. This time he did so through the medium of a complex allegory with multiple levels of meaning. Critics who fault Bunyan for undertaking such a technically difficult and ambitious work ought to consider the need for such obliquity. Thanks to *The Pilgrim's Progress*, Bunyan was now an acclaimed author, with his first allegory reaching its eighth edition in the year *The Holy War* (1682) was published. The device of multiple allegory afforded him the opportunity to address several needs at once, ranging from the soul's struggle with evil to the contemporary political crises that boded ill for Nonconformists. The king and his agents had launched their scheme to remodel the corporations, thereby ensuring domination by men whose principles were staunchly Tory and Anglican. In August 1681, the state's decision to hang and quarter Stephen College for his intemperate advocacy of exclusion made him a Whig martyr. His declaration of innocence deliberately evoked memories of the Marian martyrs: 'I earnestly pray mine may be the last Protestant blood that murdering Church of Rome may shed in Christendom and that my death may be a far greater blow to their bloody cause than I could have been by my life'.(68) In these perilous times for the Nonconformists, Bunyan felt it was incumbent to address the major issues.

The political message of *The Holy War* was barely concealed. When Diabolus seized control of the town of Mansoul, he became not mayor but king - a pointed reference to Charles II. If that allusion slipped by, no reader could escape the obvious parallel when Diabolus remodelled the corporation, replacing Lord Understanding, the lord mayor, with Lord Lustings, and Mr Conscience, the recorder, with

Forget-good. Among the new burgesses and aldermen were caricatures of those Tory-Anglicans who were assuming office around the country - Mr Atheism, Mr Whoring, Mr False Peace, and Mr Haughty. Command of the castles was placed in the hands of new governors, Spite-God, Love-no-light, and Love-flesh.(69) As a former jailhouse lawyer, Bunyan could not resist having Diabolus 'make havock of all remains of the Laws and Statutes of *Shaddai*, that could be found in the Town of *Mansoul...*'. He 'spoiled the old Law Books'.(70) Not only did Diabolus treat Gospel ministers with hostility, but he allowed the town to be filled with atheistic pamphlets as well as obscene ballads and romances. In short, Diabolus was a 'rebellious Tyrant'.(71)

The radical nature of *The Holy War* stems from this attack on the government of Charles II, not from a revolutionary social vision. While Christopher Hill correctly calls attention to the large number of Diabolonian lords and gentlemen in the allegory,(72) there is a comparable contingent of aristocrats in Emanuel's service. In striking contrast to Gerrard Winstanley, who regarded Jesus as 'the greatest, first, and truest Leveller that ever was spoke of in the world', Bunyan made Christ the greatest peer in the kingdom.(73)

Bunyan was not content merely to deplore the ills of Charles' rule in the 1680s, but went on to provide a vision of the godly sovereign. When Emanuel regained control of Mansoul, he imposed 'new Laws, new Officers, new motives, and new ways'. The Diabolonians were committed to prison (Bunyan's touch of poetic justice), while Lord Understanding and Mr Knowledge were given positions of responsibility. In addition to providing Mansoul with ample ministers of the Gospel, Emanuel bestowed a new and just charter.(74)

During the brighter days of the 1670s, Bunyan depicted the life of the saints as a pilgrimage, but the Popish Plot, the exclusion crisis, Stephen College's execution, and the renewed repression of Nonconformists called for tougher imagery. Thus, *The Holy War* was conceived. Although he remained out of prison, Bunyan returned once more to the theme of persecution and suffering. It was because of sin, he said in *A Holy Life* (1683), that God had given the saints 'over to the hand of the Enemy' and delivered them 'to the tormentors'.(75) Still, Bunyan resisted a call to arms. Instead he wrote at length about Christian suffering at the hands of the state in a poignant treatise entitled *Seasonable Counsel: or, Advice to Sufferers* (1684).

Setting aside the theme of conflict, Bunyan took up his pen to write once more of passive disobedience. Christians, he acknowledged, are all kings, but he was quick to qualify this democratic theme by insisting that each had dominion only over himself. The saint's duty is to mind his own business, attend to his calling, and let the magistrates fulfil their responsibilities. If the rulers are wicked, the Christian can do no more than cry to God for deliverance, for all other attempts to secure relief are impermissible. 'Let not talk against governors, against powers, against men in authority be admitted... Meddle not with those that are given to change'. The believer is obligated to fear God, honour the monarch, and render appropriate duty to the magistrates, which entails obeying them and thanking God for their rule.(76)

The positive nature of Christian suffering is critical to the entire discourse. It is not enough to endure persecution, for the saint must *actively* suffer for righteousness by willingly accepting affliction instead of sinful action. Rather than rebel, Christians must 'sit still and be quiet, and reverence the ordinance of God: I mean affliction'.(77) Suffering thus becomes an aspect of Christian worship. 'Let us learn like Christians to kiss the rod, and love it'. While persecution is providentially determined, it is also a just consequence of sin. 'The rod is fore-determined, because the sin of God's people is foreseen... Let us not look upon our troubles as if they ... were managed only by hell'.(78) This point is crucial, for it prohibits active rebellion against agents of persecution, the tools of God in the providential administration of suffering for the cleansing and edification of the elect. Only in this context is it possible for Bunyan, after more than a dozen years in prison, to proclaim that he has 'ofttimes stood amazed both at the mercy of God, and the favour of the Prince towards us; and can give thanks to God for both; and do make it my prayer to God for the king, and that God will help me with meekness and patience to bear whatever shall befall me for my professed subjection to Christ, by men'.(79)

The positive affirmation of suffering was reinforced by a deeper understanding of the role of sovereigns and magistrates in the divine scheme. According to Bunyan, God has not only ordained the powers that be, but now orders them as well. They serve as his rod or staff for the ultimate benefit of his people. As his ministers, one of their functions is to execute his wrath on those who commit evil, but they are also his agents even when they persecute the saints. Eventually - and ironically - the elect will be avenged when the persecutors, though divine agents, are punished, but that task is reserved solely to God. In the meantime, Bunyan was convinced that the rage of the persecutors was always kept within the bounds determined by God. Every magistrate could therefore be said to render some good to Christians, even if it was only to exercise a purging function.(80) Acceptance of the doctrine of providence was basic to Bunyan's entire argument: 'Let us take heed of admitting the least thought in our minds of evil, against God, the king, or them that are under him in employ, because, the cup, the king, all men, and things are in the hand of God'. Tyrannicide is flatly unacceptable. Bunyan pointed to the story of Abishai in I Samuel 26.7-8 as an illustration of a good man who, because of an erroneous conscience, contemplated killing a king. One who cannot obey a ruler because of scruples of conscience has no option but to suffer meekly and patiently.(81)

Rather early in this discourse on Christian suffering, Bunyan went out of his way to signal his quiescent intentions to the masters of the Stuart state.

I speak not these things, as knowing any that are disaffected to the government; for I love to be alone, if not with godly men, in things that are convenient. But because I appear thus in public, and know not into whose hands these lines may come, therefore thus I write. I speak it also to show my loyalty to the king, and my love to my fellow-subjects; and my desire that all Christians should walk in ways of peace and

truth.(82)

In 1684 Bunyan was still in contact with Cokayne, who had been fined for illegal preaching in 1682 and 1683, though Palmer had died in 1679 and Owen in 1683. Griffith was fined for illegal preaching in 1684, two years after a member of his congregation admitted knowing Richard Goodenough, a suspected Rye House plotter in 1683. Another of Bunyan's London associates, the Independent minister, Richard Wavel, was frequently arrested in 1683 and 1684, and one of Bunyan's regular printers, Francis Smith, continued to experience legal difficulties in this period.(83) No wonder, then, that Bunyan felt he might be under observation and suspected of complicity in seditious plotting. There is, however, no evidence to connect Bunyan with active resistance to the Stuart regime.

The works Bunyan published in the period between 1685 and his death in 1688 contain only scattered references to the themes of magistracy, obedience and suffering. In his *Discourse upon the Pharisee and the Publican*, which deals essentially with justification and prayer, Bunyan reiterated his theme that God would avenge the elect against unjust magistrates, judges, and tyrants.(84) The companion notion of suffering was again stated in the poetic lines of *A Discourse of the ... House of God* (1688):

A Christian for *Religion* must not fight,  
But put up *wrongs*, though he be in the *right*.(85)

In the same year Bunyan returned in *Solomon's Temple Spiritualized* to his essentially positive view of kingship. As in *The Holy City*, he thought monarchs would some day be highly impressed with the glory of the church.(86)

Some of Bunyan's most important statements on the state and the role of Christian obedience appear in his posthumous publications, particularly *Of Antichrist and His Ruin* and *An Exposition of the First Ten Chapters of Genesis*. The posthumous works were probably written in the period between 1666 and 1672 or between 1682 and 1688. The former is a period of apparently little literary activity, unless, as is probable, Bunyan used this period to compose *The Pilgrim's Progress*. The bitterness of prison life would help to explain the explosively apocalyptic imagery in *Of Antichrist and His Ruin*, and the obvious political overtones of this work and the commentary on Genesis would account for his reluctance to see them through the press. The commentary, moreover, lay unfinished, perhaps because he was working on it at the time of his release. But there is nothing in the other posthumous works that would account for a lengthy delay in publication, and it therefore seems likely that all of these works date from the mid-1680s. But were the critical millenarian tract and the Genesis commentary written in the last years of Charles II's reign, against a background of remodelling and the imposition of Anglican domination, or do they date from James II's reign, with its heightened fear of Popery under a Catholic monarch, but also with two Declarations of Indulgence and an overt attempt to woo the support of Dissenters and offer them positions of authority? Unquestionably, the first part of this period was one of intensified radical activity that

included the abortive Rye House Plot and Monmouth's futile uprising.

The prefatory epistle to *Of Antichrist* contains a profession of loyalty to the king as well as a warning to Christians not to blame temporal authorities, especially monarchs, for the affliction of the church. They 'seldom trouble churches of their own inclinations...'.(87) The root cause of such vexation, Bunyan averred, was 'sin. As so often in his writings, he turned to Scripture to substantiate his case. Although the Persian kings hindered the Jews from building their temple, the Jews treated them tenderly and lovingly, submitting their bodies and goods, enduring affliction, serving them faithfully, and preserving their lives from the hands of assassins. If Persian decrees contravened divine law, the Jews remained loyal to God, 'yet with that tenderness to the king, his crown and dignity, that they could at all times appeal to the righteous God about it'.(88)

Bunyan gave monarchs a distinctive apocalyptic function. The Antichrist could be toppled only by the aid of kings, with the preachers slaying her soul and the sovereigns her body. This role, Bunyan explained, is divinely allotted to monarchs because of the gross abuse inflicted on them by the Antichrist. In undertaking this task, God will strip the rulers of all compassion in order to achieve total destruction. Certain kings (including Charles II?), however, are sufficiently bewitched by the Antichrist to stand by her, and thus by divine judgment must be 'left in the dark'. Provisionally, other rulers will be enticed away from the Antichrist by God in order that 'he might train them up by the light of the gospel, so that they may be expert, like men of war, to scale her walls, when the king of kings shall give out the commandment to them so to do'.(89) With this return to the imagery of *The Holy War*, Bunyan has provided a militancy that is lacking in the quiescent *Seasonable Counsel*. The violent images extend to the destruction of the Antichrist by sword-wielding kings who serve as divine agents to punish evil. The justice of such scourging is appropriate because the Antichrist has 'turned the sword of the magistrate against those that keep God's law' and has made that sword 'the ruin of the good and virtuous, and a protection to the vile and base'.(90)

Deliverance from the Antichrist, Bunyan avowed, is certain but not yet at hand. Before she can be overthrown, 'there will be such ruins brought both upon the spirit of Christianity, and the true Christian church state, before this Antichrist is destroyed, that there will for a time scarce be found a Christian spirit, or a true visible living church of Christ in the world...'.(91) From the depths of desolation God will call upon monarchs and other temporal rulers to deliver the elect from the grasp of the Antichrist. Obviously reflecting the concerns of the Nonconformists with whom he came into contact in the mid-1680s, Bunyan repeatedly urged the saints patiently to await the time when the kings would commence their work of deliverance. The task will begin in God's time, and if this does not occur as rapidly as Christians hope, they must, Bunyan exhorted, seek the fault in themselves. 'Know that thou also hast thy cold and chill frames of heart, and sittest still when thou shouldest be up and doing'. Displaying sympathy for rulers, Bunyan reminded his readers that

they were responsible for the government of entire kingdoms and additionally were hampered by the presence of flattering Sanballats and Tobiasess. (92)

Towards monarchs, then, the saints must be patient and understanding. 'Let the king have verily a place in your hearts, and with heart and mouth give God thanks for him; he is a better saviour of us than we may be aware of, and may have delivered us from more deaths than we can tell how to think'. (93) Perhaps Bunyan was contemplating here about how favourably Charles II compared to Mary I and Philip II, or perhaps even to Louis XIV. Bunyan insisted that every saint has a responsibility to pray for the king to have a long life, wisdom, an awareness of any conspiracies against him, and the ability to drive evil persons away. (94)

Reflecting on the discourse *Of Antichrist*, Tindall concluded rather sceptically that Bunyan's 'fulsome exculpation' of temporal rulers was due more to prevailing political conditions than to pity or love. (95) After the striking condemnation of Charles II in *The Holy War*, it is indeed difficult to find Bunyan looking upon monarchs positively. Yet *Of Antichrist and His Ruin* must have been composed about the same time as *Seasonable Counsel* (1684), which marks the maturation of Bunyan's doctrine of Christian suffering and a concomitant turning away from the militant imagery of confrontation. Bunyan can thus affirm that 'I do confess myself one of the old-fashion[ed] professors, that covet "to fear God, and honour the king"'. (96)

*An Exposition of the First Ten Chapters of Genesis* sets a different tone, so much so that Tindall has referred to it as an 'exercise in veiled sedition' and, less provocatively, 'a prophetic allegory of seventeenth-century politics'. While there is some merit in this characterization, he is incorrect in arguing that Bunyan refers unequivocally to kings as tyrants, and does not try to conceal the notion of open warfare between saint and ruler. (97) The crucial passages deal with the accounts of Cain and Nimrod.

To Bunyan, Cain was a destroyer, a curse, a disciple of the devil, and 'a figure of all such as make false and strange delusions...'. In contrast to Abel and his descendants, who were destined to be victims of persecution, Cain's posterity became rulers and lords who 'tyrannically afflict[ed] and persecute[d]...'. (98) When Cain murdered his brother, he was attempting to extirpate all true religion. With apocalyptic overtones, Bunyan even wrote of the great conflict between the armies of the Lamb and of Cain. Here, then, was the perfect occasion for Bunyan to espouse a theory of tyrannicide, but he went no further than to allow the godly to call for divine vengeance on their persecutors. Indeed, tyrants were virtually brushed aside as nuisances: 'Tyrants matter nothing... nor how much they destroy...'. (99) Rather than overthrowing them, the Christian must hope for their salvation, bless them while they curse, and pray for them while they persecute. Admittedly, said Bunyan, tyrants were used by Satan to threaten and molest the church, but in the face of laws contrary to Christian principles the saints had to 'stand their ground, and not... shrink like Saul, till God shall send others to take

part with them'. Tyrannical persecution served a useful function by purging the church of carnal predilections.(100)

Like the Seeker William Erbery, Bunyan regarded Nimrod as the instigator of absolute monarchy. Perhaps in company with some of the Baptists, he even viewed Nimrod as a symbol of Charles II, though he may have been thinking of Louis XIV or James II.(101) The biblical image of Nimrod as a hunter dovetailed nicely with Bunyan's depiction of Nimrod and others of his ilk as persecutors, for 'the life, the blood, the extirpation of the contrary party, is the end of their course of hunting'. Thus Bunyan reminded his audience that subsequent persecutors in Scripture were compared to Nimrod.(102) This interpretation was common enough, being found, for example, in the annotations to the Geneva Bible, which make Nimrod 'a cruel oppressor & tyrant' (Genesis 10.8). 'His tyrannie came into a proverb as hated bothe of God and man; for he passed not to commit crueltie even in Gods presence' (Genesis 10.9).

Bunyan was at pains to make Nimrod the creator of an iniquitous state religion, reminding Nonconformists of the established church in their own country. In the biblical account, those who did not accede to Nimrod's religion faced persecution. 'That sin therefore which the other world was drowned for was again revived by this cursed man, even to lord it over the sons of God, and to enforce idolatry and superstition upon them...'.(103) First Nimrod and then his followers ostentatiously exalted themselves by utilizing the state church to reinforce their political supremacy. On this point the radical influence on Bunyan is unmistakable: his thesis evokes the old Leveller and Digger assertion that the established clergy are a crucial prop of the monarchy.(104) In sharp contrast to the Levellers and Diggers, however, Bunyan had no interest in pulling up monarchy root and branch.

Despite his basic indifference to constitutional polity, Bunyan was sharply critical of absolute monarchy. 'First the tyranny began at Babel itself, where the usurper was seen to sit in his glory...'.(105) But Nimrod, the usurper, was, for Bunyan, the founder of absolute monarchy, leaving the inescapable conclusion that absolute kings are tyrants. Nimrod was particularly insidious, in Bunyan's estimation, because he provided an example for inferior rulers to impose their own 'pretended' religion rather than the simplicity of the Gospel. 'Hence note, that what cities, that is, churches soever have been builded by persons that have come from Romish Babel, those builders and cities are to be suspected for such as had their founder and foundation from Babel itself'.(106) Bunyan's direct link between absolute monarchy and Catholicism suggests that the immediate object of his attack in this commentary was James II or Louis XIV, not Charles II, who professed the Roman faith only on his deathbed. If Nimrod is in fact James II, the composition of this work probably followed *Of Antichrist and His Ruin*, which appears to have been written in the late years of Charles' reign. Bunyan probably began the commentary in the period from about 1686 to 1688, with his death accounting for its incompleteness.

The commentary on Genesis is neither hostile to monarchy *per se* nor a call to violent action as a means of deposing tyrants. Instead the

political thrust of the commentary is directed at absolute monarchs (tyrants) and state churches which persecute those who reject their tenets. With respect to the futility of forcing the ungodly and the godly alike into one ecclesiastical institution, Bunyan mused: 'What laws have been made, what blood hath been shed, what cruelty hath been used, and what flatteries and lies invented, and all to make these two waters and people one?' (107) Bunyan does not hesitate to castigate persecutors, even those who carry on this work in the guise of a reason of state, but nowhere does he call on the saints to rise and overthrow them. (108)

Several of the other posthumous works return to themes that appeared in Bunyan's earlier publications. One of the most interesting reflects the dismay manifested in *The Holy War* when Diabolus trampled the statutes of Shaddai. On one level this was a sign of the reprobate's disrespect for divine maxims, but on another it was an attack on the Magna Carta. Bunyan was sarcastic in his criticism of those who had no respect for the common law, regardless of their social status: 'The old laws, which are the Magna Charta, the sole basis of the government of a kingdom, may not be cast away for the pet that is taken by every little gentleman against them'. (109) This contrasts sharply with the view of extreme radicals, such as the Leveller Richard Overton, who referred disdainfully to the Magna Carta as 'a beggerly thing, containing many markes of intollerable bondage...'. (110)

Respect for the law - and ultimately the monarch - was also expressed in *Paul's Departure and Crown*. At the head of every statute, Bunyan observed, was the phrase, 'Be it enacted by the King's most excellent Majesty', which was intended to make the law respected and glorious. Bunyan understood, too, the general popularity of the monarchy among the masses, for 'we see... what power and place the precepts of kings do take in the hearts of their subjects, every one loving and reverencing the statute, because there is the name of the king'. Because of such respect, rebellion was a word that made the world tremble. (111) These are odd statements indeed if Bunyan was the inciter to sedition that Tindall makes him out to be.

Bunyan nevertheless cautioned against placing excessive trust in princes, citing Psalm 118.8-9 and Psalm 146.3. The Stuarts, he hinted, had betrayed such trust in the recent past. In *Israel's Hope Encouraged*, he remarked ruefully that since the discovery of the infamous Popish Plot, 'our days indeed have been days of trouble... for then we began to fear cutting of throats, of being burned in our beds, and of seeing our children dashed in pieces before our eyes'. The proper course of action, he asserted, would have been to trust in God, but instead the people put their faith in Charles II, Parliament, the city of London, good mayors and sheriffs, and anti-papal statutes. From the perspective of the reign of the Catholic James II, Bunyan regarded this trust as misplaced. (112) Yet he refused to call for a political revolution, reminding his readers in *The Saints' Knowledge of Christ's Love* that monarchs had their power from God and exercised it within his restraints. God retains 'the bridle ... in his own hand, and he giveth reins or check, even as it pleaseth him'. This was always

done, Bunyan assured his readers, for the well-being of the elect.(113)

In one of his last works, *The House of the Forest of Lebanon* (1692), Bunyan took the opportunity to refute those who continued to cling to the old Fifth Monarchy idea about instituting the kingdom of God by force.(114) It was 'extravagant', he insisted, to think of such a kingdom in temporal terms, or that it might be inaugurated by physical weapons. 'I confess myself alien to these notions, and believe and profess the quite contrary, and look for the coming of Christ to judgment personally, and betwixt this and that, for his coming in Spirit, and in the power of his word to destroy Antichrist, to inform kings, and so give quietness to his church on earth; which shall assuredly be accomplished, when the reign of the beast... is out'.(115)

As for the church, its role in these chiliastic events was not one to alarm the state. A hint of *The Holy War's* militancy remains, for the church is portrayed as 'God's tower or battery by which he beateth down Antichrist', but the weapons are only spiritual - the word of God, whose destructive power is restricted to Satan, sin, and lovers of evil.(116) Perhaps more significantly, Bunyan insisted that this spiritual war is not offensive but defensive. To temporal authorities, the church poses no threat, for the saints 'know their places, and are of a peaceable deportment...'.(117) The church has no mission to destroy monarchs, subvert kingdoms, or cause desolation. Christ 'designs the hurt of none; his kingdom is not of this world, nor doth he covet temporal matters; let but his wife, his church alone, to enjoy her purchased privileges [which are concerns of the soul], and all shall be well'. If, however, the saints are afflicted by persecution, those responsible will ultimately be slain by the sword of the Spirit, a threat Bunyan reinforced by quoting Revelation 11.5. Yet the church itself, Bunyan contended, engaged in no sedition.(118)

Throughout his career, excepting only his youthful period of military service (which predated his conversion), Bunyan stood constant in his advocacy of passive disobedience to state decrees which contravened divine precepts. In his own judgment he was no more guilty of sedition than were Jesus and Paul, Jeremiah and Daniel.(119) He came closest to treasonable assertions in *The Holy War*, with its striking parallels between Diabolus and Charles II, but nowhere in his writings does he call for Nonconformists to take up arms against a tyrannical Stuart sovereign. Neither is there any evidence to indicate that Bunyan plotted insurrection, despite the accusations of his enemies. Bunyan was no political revolutionary. Only if his recurring references to persecuting rulers and their ultimate judgment at the hands of God were misinterpreted as a call to rebellion could his views be seditious in their effect. There was indeed a militancy in works such as *The Holy War* and *Of Antichrist and His Ruin*, but this was a militancy of the spirit, not the sword. Compared to *Seasonable Counsel*, such works reflect the inherent tension embodied in the very concept of passive resistance. While the exhortations to suffer patiently in *Seasonable Counsel* exemplify passivity, so the more militant works encourage the saints to resist the forces of evil, albeit always in the context of a spiritual struggle.

Two things stopped Bunyan from advocating violent action. One was his conviction that temporal authorities always acted as divine agents, no matter how cruelly they persecuted the saints. Tyrannicide was therefore impossible because it was tantamount to an act against God himself. The other restraining factor was the positive way in which Bunyan conceived of suffering. It was not merely something to be endured but virtually an act of worship, calling for the active participation of the believer through willing acceptance. In the confrontation with the Stuart state, victory was only possible for those who could find 'joy under the cross', (120) the spiritual experience of suffering for the right cause in the right way. 'Wherefore, my brethren, my friends, my enemies, and all men', Bunyan concluded, 'what religion, profession, or opinion soever you hold, fear God, honour the king, and do that duty to both which is required of you by the Word and law of Christ, and then... you shall not suffer by the power for evil-doing'. (121) In the end, the sword would bow to the Spirit.

## NOTES

- 1 John Bunyan, *Grace Abounding to the Chief of Sinners*, ed. Roger Sharrock, 1962, para.335; cf. para.333. I am indebted to Professor Robert Zaller for his critique of a draft of this essay.
- 2 Richard L. Greaves, 'John Bunyan and the Fifth Monarchists', *Albion* 13, 1981, pp.84-6.
- 3 *The Minutes of the First Independent Church (now Bunyan Meeting) at Bedford 1656-1766*, ed. H. G. Tibbutt, Bedfordshire Historical Record Society, 55, 1976, p.36.
- 4 'A Relation of the Imprisonment of Mr John Bunyan', *ad.cal.Grace Abounding*, ed. Sharrock, p.105.
- 5 *Ibid.*, p.106. Powell, the Welsh Independent, similarly rejected advice to flee (after being summoned before the Privy Council), *The Life and Death of Mr Vavasor Powell*, 1671, p.131.
- 6 *The Works of John Bunyan*, ed. George Offor, 3 vols, 1861, 1:732n.
- 7 William York Tindall, *John Bunyan: Mechanick Preacher*, 1934, p.137.
- 8 *Ibid.*, p.136. For Powell, Knollys, Jessey and Danvers, see *Biographical Dictionary of British Radicals in the Seventeenth Century*, ed. Richard L. Greaves and Robert Zaller, 3 vols., 1982-4, s.vv.
- 9 Tindall, *John Bunyan*, p.139. 10 *Ibid.*, p.142.
- 11 John Brown, *John Bunyan (1628-1688): His Life, Times, and Work*, rev. Frank Mott Harrison, 1928, p.146.
- 12 Cf. the similar silence of Monica Furlong, *Puritan's Progress: A Study of John Bunyan*, 1975.
- 13 Sharrock, *Grace Abounding*, p.161.
- 14 'Relation', pp.107,109. 15 *Ibid.*, p.118.
- 16 *Ibid.*, pp.119-20. A letter from Cobb to Roger Kenyon, 10 Dec. 1670, has apparently not been noticed by Bunyan scholars: 'One Benyon was indicted upon the Statute of 35 Elizabeth, for being at a Conventicle. He was in prison, and was brought into Court and the indictment read to him; and because he refused to plead to it, the Court ordered me to record his confession, and he hath lain in prison upon that conviction, ever since Christmas Sessions, 12 Chas.II. And my Lord Chief Justice Keelinge was then upon the Bench, and gave the lord rule, and had the like, a year ago, against

- others. Benyon hath petitioned all the Judges of Assize, as they came [on] the Circuit, but could never be released. And truly, I think it but reasonable that if any one do appear, and afterwards will not plead, but that you should take judgment by *nihil dicit*, or confession'. Historical Manuscripts Commission 35, *Fourteenth Report*, Appendix, Part IV. p.86. This is definitive proof that Bunyan was not released and rearrested in 1666.
- 17 'Relation', p.120. 18 Ibid., p.122.
- 19 Ibid., pp.124-5.
- 20 Bunyan did not accept the active resistance of John Knox and John Milton. See Richard L. Greaves, *Theology and Revolution in the Scottish Reformation: Studies in the Thought of John Knox*, 1980, chap.7.
- 21 'Relation', p.121.
- 22 Ibid. See *The Statutes of the Realm*, 1819; repr.1963, vol.4, pt.2, pp.841-3: 'under colour or pretence of any exercise of Religion...'. The statute was clearly intended 'for the preventinge and avoydinge of suche great inconvenyence and perills as might happen and growe by the wicked and daungerous practises of seditious sectaries and disloyall persons'. Bunyan understood the statute correctly.
- 23 'Relation', p.122.
- 24 Christopher Hill, *The World Turned Upside Down: Radical Ideas During the English Revolution*, 1973 edn., p.328. Dr Hill's work is very valuable and always provocative.
- 25 Richard Baxter, *Reliquiae Baxterianae*, ed. Matthew Sylvester, 1696, bk.1, pt.1, sect.77, p.53.
- 26 Robert Baillie, 'Epistle' to *Anabaptism, the True Fountaine of Independency, Antinomy, Brownisme, Familisme*, 1647.
- 27 *Light Shining in Buckingham-shire*, 1648, reprinted in *The Works of Gerrard Winstanley*, ed. George H. Sabine, 1965, p.615. Far more radical than Bunyan, another anonymous radical asserted that 'God gave the office of a King in his wrath, and ... Kings and Priests are Jewish ceremonies...', *Tyraniocrit, Discovered in His Wiles, Wherewith He Vanquisheth*, 1649, p.3.
- 28 John Tillinghast, *Mr John Tillinghasts Eight Last Sermons*, 1655, p.68. For a summary of Fifth Monarchist politics, see B. S. Capp, *The Fifth Monarchy Men: A Study in Seventeenth-Century Millenarianism*, 1972, pp.50-55, 151-2.
- 29 'Relation', p.124 (my italics).
- 30 Richard Baxter, *A Holy Commonwealth, or Political Aphorisms, Opening the True Principles of Government*, 1659, pp.121, 127. In 1667 Bunyan's friend, John Owen, pleaded that 'we have no form of government, civil or ecclesiastical, to impose on the nation...', *The Works of John Owen*, ed. William H. Goold, 16 vols, 1850-3, 13: 549.
- 31 Ibid., p.78. 32 Ibid., pp.94-5.
- 33 John Goodwin, *Anti-Cavalierisme, or, Truth Pleading as Well the Necessity, as the Lawfulness of This Present War*, 1642, p.7.
- 34 George Fox, *A Collection of the Several Books and Writings*, 2nd edn., 1665, p.118.
- 35 'Relations', p.124.
- 36 *I Will Pray with the Spirit*, in *The Miscellaneous Works of John Bunyan*, vol.2., ed. Richard L. Greaves, 1976, p.283.
- 37 Ibid., pp.283-5.

- 38 *Prison Meditations, Miscellaneous Works*, vol.6., ed. Graham Midgley, 1980, p.45.
- 39 *Ibid.*, p.49. 40 *Ibid.*, p.50
- 41 *Ibid.*, p.47.
- 42 *One Thing Is Needful, Miscellaneous Works*, 6:72.
- 43 *Ibid.*, p.93. 44 *Ibid.*, p.94.
- 45 *The Holy City, Offor, Works*, 3: 410. For Bunyan's millenarianism, see introduction to *The Holy War in Miscellaneous Works*, vol.3, ed. J. Sears McGee, 1987.
- 46 *Ibid.*, p.444.
- 47 Cf. *Light Shining in Buckinghamshire*, p.613.
- 48 *The Holy City*, p.445. 49 *Ibid.*, pp.444, 445(quoted).
- 50 *Ibid.*, pp.444-5(quoted), 446. 51 *Ibid.*, p.440.
- 52 *Ibid.*, p.446. 53 *Ibid.*, p.431.
- 54 'Relation', p.130.
- 55 *Biographical Dictionary of British Radicals*, s.vv. Cokayne, Holmes, Palmer and Tong.
- 56 For persecution of Bedfordshire Nonconformists, see W. M. Wigfield, *Recusancy and Nonconformity in Bedfordshire: Illustrated by Select Documents Between 1622 and 1842*, Bedfordshire Historical Record Society, vol.20, 1938, pp.167-72.
- 57 Public Record Office, State Papers 29/266/30.
- 58 *Ibid.*, 29/267/89. 59 *Ibid.*, 29/260/23.
- 60 *Minutes of the First Independent Church*, pp.41-2.
- 61 Wigfield, *Recusancy and Nonconformity*, p.179. Suspicion of treasonable activity may have contributed to the congregation's persecution in May 1670. See *A True and Impartial Narrative of Some Illegal and Arbitrary Proceedings ... in and near the Town of Bedford*, 1670.
- 62 Richard Greaves, 'The Organizational Response of Nonconformity to Repression and Indulgence: The Case of Bedfordshire', *Church History* 44, Dec. 1975, 472-84.
- 63 *A Confession of My Faith, Offor, Works*, 2:593-4.
- 64 Printed in *Baptist Confessions of Faith*, ed. William L. Lumpkin, 1959, p.215. Cf. other confessions, pp.169, 194, 283-4, 331. John Owen's view was similar: '*Magistracy we own as the ordinance of God*, and his majesty as the person set over us by his providence in the chief and royal administration thereof. In submission to him, we profess it our duty to regulate our obedience by the laws and customs over which he presides in the government of these nations...', *Works of Owen*, 13: 548; cf.13: 578.
- 65 *A Confession of My Faith*, p.601. Cf. Fox, *A Collection*, p.120. In contrast, John Goodwin judged violent action against the civil authorities justifiable when their commands run counter to God's maxims. *Anti-Cavalierisme*, pp.9-10.
- 66 *A Defence of the Doctrine of Justification by Faith, Offor, Works*, 2: 322.
- 67 Richard Greaves, 'The Last Imprisonment of John Bunyan', *Northamptonshire and Bedfordshire Life* 5, June 1975, 17.
- 68 Calendar of State Papers, Domestic, 1680-81, pp.416-7.
- 69 *The Holy War*, ed. Roger Sharrock and James F. Forrest, 1980, pp.17, 25-6.
- 70 *Ibid.*, pp.24, 26. 71 *Ibid.*, pp.28(quoted), 30,40.
- 72 Hill, *The World Turned Upside Down*, p.329.
- 73 Winstanley, *Works*, p.386; *The Holy War*, p.67. The lack of radical

- social perspective in *The Holy War* is underscored by the absence of women.
- 74 *The Holy War*, pp.85(quoted), 119-32, 137, 145.
- 75 *A Holy Life, Miscellaneous Works*, vol.9, ed. Greaves, 1981, p.265.
- 76 *Seasonable Counsel*, Offor, *Works*, 2: 706, 708-9(quoted), 738.
- 77 *Ibid.*, pp.708(quoted), 710-11.
- 78 *Ibid.*, pp.707(quoted), 725(quoted), 737.
- 79 *Ibid.*, p.707.
- 80 *Ibid.*, pp.705, 706, 724, 725, 737, 739.
- 81 *Ibid.*, pp.705, 707(quoted), 709. In the Geneva Bible, the note to I Sam.26:9 explains that the restriction applies only to a 'private cause: for Jehu slew two Kings at Gods appointment'. Bunyan ignored this.
- 82 *Ibid.*, p.709.
- 83 *Biographical Dictionary of British Radicals*, s.vv. Cokayne, Goodenough, Wavel and Smith.
- 84 *Discourse upon the Pharisee and the Publican*, Offor, *Works*, 2:217.
- 85 *A Discourse of the ... House of God, Miscellaneous Works*, 6:302.
- 86 *Solomon's Temple Spiritualized*, Offor, *Works*, 3:474.
- 87 *Of Antichrist and His Ruin*, Offor, *Works*, 2:45.
- 88 *Ibid.*, p.73. 89 *Ibid.*, pp.61(quoted),74.
- 90 *Ibid.*, pp.72, 77(quoted). 91 *Ibid.*, p.66.
- 92 *Ibid.*, pp.62,73,74(quoted). 93 *Ibid.*, p.74; cf.p.62.
- 94 *Ibid.*, p.74. 95 Tindall, *John Bunyan*,p.135.
- 96 *Of Antichrist and His Ruin*, p.74.
- 97 Tindall, *John Bunyan*, pp.134, 141.
- 98 *An Exposition of the First Ten Chapters of Genesis*, Offor, *Works*, 2:442, 445. The Quakers too saw Cain as the symbol of a persecutor. Tindall, *John Bunyan*, p.266.
- 99 *Exposition of Genesis*, pp.445, 446(quoted), 447, 456.
- 100 *Ibid.*, pp.437, 445, 456(quoted), 473.
- 101 Tindall, *John Bunyan*, p.266; *Exposition of Genesis*, p.497.
- 102 *Exposition of Genesis*, p.497. Cf. Edmund Ludlow, *A Voycè from the Watch Tower, Part Five: 1660-1662*, ed. A. B. Worden, Camden Society, 4th Series, vol.21, 1978, p.11.
- 103 *Exposition of Genesis*, p.497.
- 104 *Ibid.*, p.498; Winstanley, *Works*, p.372; *Light Shining in Buckingham-shire*, p.615.
- 105 *Exposition of Genesis*, p.498. Bunyan accepts implicitly but appears reluctant to admit openly that tyrants are ordained by God. The Presbyterian, Thomas Hall, declared, 'If Tyrants were not ordained by God, we must exclude his providence from the greatest part of the world'. Tyrants are used by God to punish ungrateful and rebellious people. Both Hall and Bunyan repudiate anti-tyrannical risings and call for obedience as far as good conscience permits. Hall, *The Beauty of Magistracy*, 1660, pp.43-4, 46.
- 106 *Exposition of Genesis*, p.498.
- 107 *Ibid.*, p.420. Conversely, advocates of stringent religious uniformity argued that diversity would lead to armed conflict: 'Different Opinions and Practices in matters of Religion ... do naturally improve into contentious Disputes; and those Disputes, if not restrain'd, break out into Civil Wars'. Anon., *A Seasonable Discourse Against Comprehension*, 1676, p.10. An anonymous Nonconformist, possibly John Humphrys, retorted in 1675 that

