

Deity and Domination: I

David Nicholls

The first part of a paper presented at the International Symposium on Sociology and Theology, Oxford, January 1984.

From very early times men have spoken of and to their gods in political images, just as they have ascribed divine characteristics to their earthly rulers. This has been the case no less in the judaeo-christian tradition than in pagan cultures. Some of the most persistent images used of God in this tradition are taken from political discourse: king, lord, judge, to mention but three. Again, abstract concepts applied to God such as sovereignty, power, majesty and dominion have a strongly political connotation. Yet remarkably little attention has been paid to this phenomenon by theologians and historians of doctrine.

In the first part of this paper (published here) I wish to consider the way in which analogies between divine and civil domination were employed among some groups in seventeenth-century England, and set this in the context of a more general thesis about the use of such analogies. I shall conclude, in the second part of this paper (which will be published in the next issue), by suggesting certain significant implications which may be said to follow from this manner of thinking and talking about God and the state.

The political images and concepts used of God—in theology as well as in popular religious expression—have significant but indirect relationship to their use in political rhetoric and to the social structure and dynamics which this rhetoric reflects. At times political or other social developments appear to influence the predominant images and concepts used of God, who is seen as performing more adequately what the political system is striving unsuccessfully to accomplish. He is the judge to whom we look for perfect justice, the king who will bring that peace and order which the earthly king is patently failing to deliver. At other times an idea of God, derived from tradition, may lead to a critique of current political or, more generally, social arrangements. Again, the predominance of a particular concept in religious discourse may mirror its salience in contemporary political rhetoric or it may be accounted for by referring to social arrangements in a previous era. While there is frequently a relationship ‘downwards’

from the concept to the social structure, there is also a dynamic relationship at the level of ideas, so that, for example, the concept of the divine architect in eighteenth century rational religion may be seen both as reflecting a relatively stable political climate and as being a reaction to the excessive positivism of a previous generation. This, then, is the general framework within which the following discussion is set.

I

Medieval pictures of heaven, witnessed to in painting, liturgy and hymns, as well as in theological writings, are dominated by the order and hierarchy which characterised the feudal court. God presides over the heavenly city as the king presided over his court. Also divine attributes were ascribed to rulers but this was not normally thought to imply the right to arbitrary behaviour.¹ The order and law found in heaven was a model for earthly monarchs. The disruption of feudal social relations, the absolute claims being made by the papacy and the growth of nominalism in the late middle ages, followed by the reformation and the thirty years war on the continent, together with domestic religious conflicts, all had their effects on the way English people thought about civil and divine government. In such a period of disruption and strife, it was widely felt that questions of civil obedience could not safely be left to each man's interpretation of what is lawful or reasonable. There seemed to be a paramount need for some determinate person or body of persons to lay down in a definitive way the limits of liberty. God and the king were both characterised by will, command and sovereignty.

Despite these changes, legitimate earthly structures of order and authority were still thought to mirror the heavenly. One of the judges in the famous 'ship money' case of 1637 referred to the king in the following words: 'he is the first mover amongst these orbs of ours ... and he is the centre of us all'.² The anglican Richard Hooker had contemplated on his death bed both the blessed obedience and order of the angels, reflecting a characteristically medieval cosmology. It was on the other hand their unquestioning obedience to the commands of a divine sovereign rather than their settled hierarchy and order that impressed John Calvin.³

The analogy between God's government of the universe and a good king's government of his realm was, however, developed not only by lawyers and theologians but also by poets, preachers, playwrights and architects. The Jacobean court masques reflected the analogies. In these performances the kings and queens frequently appeared as characters on the stage. In one such masque by Ben Johnson King James I was represented as Jove. The maiden Astrea

summed up the theme of the drama:

Of all there seems a second birth;
It is become a heav'n on earth,
and Jove is present here:
I feel the Godhead! nor will doubt
but he can fill the place throughout,
whose power is everywhere.

James was often portrayed as Solomon, prince of peace and he himself wrote that Solomon is 'a figure of Christ, in that he was king of peace'. As Roy Strong remarks, 'The fete enabled the ruler and his court to assimilate themselves momentarily to their heroic exemplars. For a time they actually became the "ideas" of which they were but terrestrial reflections'.⁴

This use of a divine analogy to strengthen the claim to legitimacy of an earthly ruler should, of course, be distinguished from the theory of the divine right of kings. This latter theory was univocal or logical in its structure rather than analogical. The argument was that the king's authority is derived directly from God—neither through the people nor through the church. The analogical argument (if such it may be called) was employed by critics of divine right, such as Thomas Hobbes, as well as by its proponents. King James I, a leading theorist of divine right, also employed the rhetoric of analogy. 'Kings', he wrote,

are justly called gods, for they exercise a manner or resemblance of divine power upon earth. For if you will consider the attributes of God, you shall see how they agree in the person of a king. God hath power to create, or destroy, make or unmake at his pleasure, to give life or send death, to judge all and to be judged nor accountable to none: to raise low things high and to make high things low at his pleasure, and to God are both body and soul due. And the like power have kings...⁵

The king, wrote Henry Finch, is 'a God upon earth, as God is a King in heaven'. As God is infinite, he went on, so the king is everywhere present in his courts; God is perfect and 'in the king no imperfect thing can be thought'. Finch also saw the royal power of dispensing with statute law as analogous to divine omnipotence.⁶ The analogy was further extended to include the family and even the human body. As one God rules the world, one master governs the family and one head orders and controls the human body, 'so it seemeth no less natural, that one state should be governed by one commander'.⁷ The most celebrated seventeenth century exponent of patriarchalism, Sir Robert Filmer, asserted that the relationship between royal and

paternal authority was one of identity, yet he recognised that kings could claim only an analogical relationship to God in the government of their respective states. Filmer, however, embarrassed his fellow royalists by emphasising the arbitrary nature of both divine and monarchical authority. The 'question is not', he wrote, 'whether there shall be an arbitrary power; but the only point is, who shall have that arbitrary power, whether one man or many'.⁸

In Tudor and Stuart prayers the analogy between divine and political power was elaborated. In this period of civil unrest, God was seen as performing more perfectly the task that earthly government was proving incapable of achieving; it was he who is able to secure 'that peace which the world cannot give'. In one of the so-called 'state prayers' used at Morning and Evening Prayer, God is addressed as 'high and mighty, king of kings, lord of lords, the only ruler of princes, who dost from thy throne behold all the dwellers upon earth'. Also in the sermons of the early seventeenth century political imagery was frequently used of God, while divine government was seen as a model for the earthly. These images are perhaps most brilliantly managed by that celebrated preacher and poet, John Donne.

II

Donne was an unrepentant monarchist. God had in his mind and purpose, declared the poet, an idea or model of all that he would create, 'but of monarchy of kingdom, God who is but one, *is the idea*; God himself in his unity, is the model, he *is the type of monarchy*'. 'All governments', he continued,

may justly represent God to me, who is a God of order,
and fountain of all government, but yet I am more eased,
and more accustomed to the contemplation of heaven ... in
that heaven is a kingdom, by having been born and bred in
a monarchy: God is a type of that, and that is a type of
heaven.⁹

Donne compared a polytheism which 'broke God in pieces, and crumbled and scattered God into as many several gods as there are powers in God' to the 'cantonising' of 'a glorious monarchy into petty states, that could not subsist of themselves, nor assist one another'. As we shall see, he rejected tyranny, but anarchy for him was even worse: 'As in civil government ... a hard king is better than none, so when we consider religions, idolatry is better than atheism'.¹⁰ The soul is a direct infusion of spiritual life into the body, from God, so civil and ecclesiastical authorities derive their legitimacy from those 'beams of power' which God sheds on them, rather than from 'the consent, the tacit voice of the people'. Donne applied this notion to the priest as well as to the civil ruler. To reject such legitimate human authorities is

to 'sin against the Father'. In fact the preacher earlier defined sin as 'treason against God'.¹¹

Although Donne recognised a certain unpredictable aspect to the dominion exercised both by God and by the earthly sovereign, and was in this sense an apologist of absolute government, he rejected the model of arbitrary and unlimited power which was assumed by some of his contemporaries and which became increasingly popular as the seventeenth century proceeded. As insecurity increased in England and as civil war became imminent the claims to unquestioning obedience became more strident, as did insistence on the monolithic nature of authority. Donne was firm in his rejection of tyranny both with respect to divine and human systems of domination. God's kingdom, he insisted, is 'a kingdom and *no more*, not a *tyranny*'. We have 'a God that governs us by his *word*, for his word is truth, and by his *law*, for in his law is clearness'.¹² Despite the positivism of the late middle ages and of the reformation period, a strong tradition had continued into the seventeenth century which insisted that law is something other than the dictate of a sovereign, whether human or divine. It was represented by Hooker in the preceding century and had clearly influenced the thinking of Donne. It was to receive new life in the writings of Leibniz.

Donne also assailed the idea that political and divine authority must be seen as monolithic and undifferentiated. There is, he maintained, a plurality both in heaven and on earth. The state to which the Englishman belonged was 'a monarchy composed of monarchies'. 'There is', he wrote, 'not only a onely God in heaven; but a Father, a Son and a Holy Ghost in that God; which are names of a plurality'.¹³ He went on to observe that there are many angels, cherubim and apostles in heaven. Donne clearly linked this vision of the heavenly community with an appreciation of social pluralism. God himself is a figure of society, he wrote in his *Devotions*, 'In heaven there are orders of angels and armies of martyrs, and in that house many mansions; in earth, families, cities, churches, colleges, all plural things'.¹⁴

It is, of course, no accident that two of the leading theorists of absolutism, Bodin and Hobbes, were intransigently unitarian.¹⁵ In both cases their image of God's government was expressly related to their conception of political domination. The great puritan leader, Richard Baxter, in one of his works argued for a concept of unlimited and unified earthly sovereignty, quoting with approval the Pythagoreans' craving for unity and their curse on plurality. He was rebuked by Henry Stubbe, 'Is not this a fine argument for a theologue', he cried, 'Doth not it overthrow the Trinity, as well as a commonwealth?'.¹⁶

Though clearly a monarchist and an apologist of monarchy,

Donne's trinitarianism made it inappropriate for him to employ the divine analogy to justify monolithic and arbitrary power. Increasingly, however, the divine analogy was being used to legitimate precisely the kind of government which Donne rejected. There were two principal reactions to the use of analogy to defend absolutism. One was to maintain the validity of the analogy between the divine and human government, attempting with Donne, to reintroduce ideas of natural law as some kind of limit on arbitrary power. I have examined in some detail elsewhere the way in which Leibniz also tried to do this.¹⁷ Developments in puritan thinking, associated with "federal"—or covenant (Latin: *foedus*)—theology, and some tendencies found among radical protestants of the mid-seventeenth century, also point in this direction, as we shall see.

The second reaction was to deny the analogy. This denial is characteristic of many puritans of the period. They generally accepted the image of God as an absolute ruler whose will constituted law and whose actions were (at least from a human point of view) arbitrary. Like Thomas Hobbes and James I, these puritans were strongly influenced by Calvinist conceptions of divine authority. William Perkins had already stated their position as follows: 'God is an absolute Lord and so above the law; and therefore may lawfully command that which the law forbids'.¹⁸ Many of these puritans, however, rejected the idea that the civil ruler should be seen as relating to his realm as God relates to his. They argued *univocally* or logically, rather than analogically, insisting that if God is truly king, then all men—including kings—are his subjects and in this respect equal. God, if not 'the *only* ruler of princes', at least constitutes one of the limits to their authority. Archbishop Grindal had set the scene when he had opposed the majesty of God to the majesty of the queen. In a letter refusing to curtail the activity of preachers, he told Queen Elizabeth, 'I choose rather to offend your earthly majesty than to offend the heavenly majesty of God'.¹⁹

The English king, Finch had maintained, has 'a shadow of the excellencies that are in God', while James I had declared that kings are 'breathing images of God upon earth'.²⁰ Without explicit reference to these authors, Samuel Rutherford took up the images; kings, he claimed in a somewhat disparaging tone, are 'mere created and breathing shadows of the King of Kings'.²¹ His book *Lex, Rex or the Law and the Prince*, deals with such issues as the legitimate authority of kings, the sources of that authority and the limits to civil obedience. He considered whether and in what way kingly power is derived from God, but generally avoided the analogical mode of discourse. To argue, because God is a monarch and cannot err, that a 'sinful man' may be a monarch in the same sense, is 'miserable logic'. In one place he quite explicitly rejected the analogy between God and the king.

God is the only true king 'univocally and essentially'; men are merely ministers, servants, legates and deputies of God and 'in relation to him equivocally and improperly, judges or kings'.²² As one anonymous writer put it, although monarchy most resembles God's manner of governing his realm, 'this doth not prove it the most accommodate to human affairs'.²³

The insistence of many puritan writers that God rules directly had important political consequences. 'We are such a kingdom', wrote Paul Bayne, 'whereof not man but God is our king ... our king is God whose throne is for ever'. John Preston maintained that God governs the world immediately, 'and being everywhere present, he needeth no deputies'.²⁴ In the Putney debates Ireton spoke of God as 'president in our councils'. The consciences of kings, insisted Rutherford, are in 'an immediate subjection to the King of kings'.²⁵ All absolute claims are thus rejected.

Such was the power of the divine analogy, however, that many of the Parliamentary publicists agreed with the Royalists on the need for a sovereign; there must be, so they erroneously believed, a supreme and absolute authority somewhere in the polity. Although Henry Parker allowed only a very limited validity to analogical arguments, asserting that kings 'are most unlike God', he ascribed absolute sovereignty to Parliament. 'Every state', he wrote, 'has an arbitrary power over itself'²⁶ and in England this had been entrusted to Parliament. As W.K. Jordan pointed out, his complaint against the Stuarts was not their claim to arbitrary power but rather their political ineptitude.²⁷ William Prynne, who was commissioned by Parliament to write a defence of its rights, ascribed supremacy to that body, which being the sole law-maker in England, had 'an absolute sovereignty over the laws themselves'.²⁸ Earlier, Prynne had actually used the analogy the other way round, in order to defend Calvinist ideas of supernatural selection. Just as civil authorities arbitrarily advance one man and displace another at their pleasure, so with God there is 'an absolute, a free, a just prerogative ... he wrongeth none in pardoning some, or damning others'.²⁹

After the overthrow of the monarchy and the establishment of the protectorate many erstwhile supporters of the right of resistance argued the need for strong government and popular obedience. In reaction, various radical groups, however, used what had become a familiar puritan argument, with appropriate modifications. Following their disillusionment with Cromwell in 1653, some of the Fifth Monarchy Men demanded whether Oliver Cromwell or Jesus Christ would reign and they looked forward to a time in the near future when 'we shall have no Lord Protector but our Lord Jesus'.³⁰ James Parnel, the quaker, told Cromwell, 'You shall know that there is another Lord Protector whose dreadful hand you shall feel'. Christ, he maintained,

'comes to fulfil and end all outward laws and government of man'. 'Amongst us', he insisted, 'there are no superiors after the flesh, but Christ is the head ... here God alone is King and he alone is honoured, exalted and worshipped'.³¹ By arguing logically rather than analogically Parnel thus arrived at anarchism; if God is really ruler of the universe then all human government is superseded.³²

John Lilburne almost reached the same position as Parnel. God, 'the absolute Sovereign, Lord and King', who 'doth all things merely and only by his sovereign will and unlimited good pleasure' has created men and women all equal, 'none of them having (by nature) any authority, dominion, or magisterial power one over or above another'. Seeking to appropriate the authority of God was the sin of the devils; it is God 'who alone doth, and is to rule by his will and pleasure'. In order to justify civil government he resorted to the familiar hoax of a 'free consent' of the governed.³³

Lilburne himself may not have drawn the extreme conclusion but others did. For Gerrard Winstanley, Christ was the 'great leveller', whom Parliament and the array had set upon the throne of England. His role was to 'cast out kingly power' and to 'make England a free commonwealth'. If these bodies refused to co-operate in this work, he warned, 'the Lamb shall shew himself a lion, and tear you in pieces for your most abominable dissembling hypocrisy, and give your land to a people who better deserve it'. At times, Winstanley, however, used a military image of God, as 'our almighty captain'³⁴. Or again:

Commander in chief is God himself,
who rules the spirits of men;
Wait then on him, uproars to quell,
and settle peace again....

Cease striving then, ye sons of men,
destroy not one another;
God will avenge him that's oppressed,
by Christ our elder brother.

His turn is next, the realm to take,
and rule the sons of men.
And beast and devil, pope and sin,
shall never reign again.³⁵

Occasionally Winstanley adopted a different tactic, challenging the concept of God as an absolute ruler whose laws are merely arbitrary dictates of his will. Unlike most puritan theorists, he *accepted*, on these occasions, the analogy between divine and human structures of authority, but 'democratised' both. There is the image of God within

each person, immanent in the world, rather than of a transcendent ruler. 'The Body of Christ is where the Father is, in the earth, purifying the earth,' he wrote, 'and his spirit is entered into the whole creation which is the heavenly glory where the Father dwells'.³⁶ This theme emerges strongly in some of the familist and quaker preachers. 'Be not afraid of man', Margaret Fell (who later became wife of George Fox) told her first husband, 'greater is he that is in you than he that is in the world'. As Christopher Hill remarks, 'God has been democratized. He is no longer merely the greatest feudal lord, a kind of super-king. He is in all his saints'.³⁷ There is even in some of the radical thinkers of the interregnum the idea that God, thought of in the image of king, would abdicate in favour of the saints who have been incorporated into the body of Christ. William Empson has claimed to find such an idea in Milton.³⁸

Of importance to our theme is the development of federal theology, with its emphasis upon the God who binds himself by covenant to his people. Federal theologians accepted the basic Calvinist idea of God's sovereignty, but introduced the idea that he voluntarily limited himself by covenant. Henry Bullinger had already written of God's having 'most straightly bound himself to the faithful'.³⁹ Ideas of covenant are related to the commercial practice of the day, particularly to that of the master-apprentice relationship. Richard Sibbes wrote of 'articles of agreement' and 'indentures' drawn up between God and man.⁴⁰ Perry Miller referred to the development of federal theology as part of a move from status to contract, but in certain respects it also signifies a return to medieval ideas of limited authority, in the face of claims to unbridled sovereignty.⁴¹

John Cotton, born in 1584 in Derby, became fellow of that puritan centre of power, Emmanuel College, Cambridge, in 1603. Together with Thomas Hooker and Peter Bulkeley, he was eager to clear God of the charge of arbitrary government. The idea of covenant provided a way out and was also used in the social and political field. God 'cannot dispense with his own law, because his truth and righteousness engage him to it'. Thomas Hooker wrote, 'The Covenant which passeth between God and us, is like that which passeth between a king and his people; the king promiseth to rule and govern in mercy and in righteousness, and they again promise to obey in loyalty and in faithfulness'.⁴² Although puritan thinking in England is associated with the growth of liberalism and toleration this is not, as Figgis pointed out, because of a devotion to ideas of liberty but because of their determination to seek freedom for themselves.⁴³ In the American colonies where they were in a majority, contractarian ideas 'contributed to liberalism only inadvertently and accidentally'

—but contribute they undoubtedly did.⁴⁴

The second part of “Deity and Domination” will appear in the February issue.

The author would like to thank Helen Gardner, Christopher Hill, Jennifer Loach, Martyn Thompson, Roy Strong and John Bramble for helpful comments on an earlier draft of this article.

- 1 On some of the ways the analogy of divine and civil kingship was developed in the middle ages, see Ernst Kantorowicz, *The King's Two Bodies*, Princeton (NJ) 1957.
- 2 Quoted in Ray Strong, *Splendour at Court*, London 1973, p. 223.
- 3 Isaak Walton, ‘the life of Mr Richard Hooker’, in John Keble, ed., *The Works of that Learned and Judicious Divine Mr Richard Hooker*, Oxford 1874 ed., i, p. 85. J Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, London 1957, 1:4:5. On this subject see Robert West, *Milton and the Angels*, Athens (Georgia) 1955, and M. Walzer, *The Revolution of the Saints*, London 1966, pp. 155f.
- 4 S. Orgel, *Ben Jonson: the Complete Masques*, New Haven (Conn.) 1969, p. 232; Strong, *Splendour*, p. 76.
- 5 C.H. McIlwain, ed., *The Political Works of James I*, Cambridge (Mass.) 1918, pp. 307–8
- 6 H. Finch, *Law, or a discourse thereof*, London 1671, p. 81. For a discussion of these issues see C.C. Weston and J.R. Greenberg, *Subjects and Sovereigns*, Cambridge 1981. I have normally modernised the spelling &c. in these seventeenth century quotations, except in the case of the titles of books and pamphlets.
- 7 John Hayward, *An Answer to the First Part of a Certain Conference Concerning Succession*, London 1603, sig.b 4.
- 8 Filmer, ‘The Anarchy of a Limited or Mixed Monarchy’, in Peter Laslett, ed., *Patriarcha and Other Political Works of Sir Robert Filmer*, Oxford 1949, p. 277. See also G.J. Schochet, *Patriarchalism in Political Thought*, Oxford 1975, p.146.
- 9 G.R. Potter & E.M. Simpson, eds, *The Sermons of John Donne*, Berkeley & Los Angeles 1957, iv, p. 240
- 10 Potter & Simpson, iii, p. 262 & iv, p. 145.
- 11 Potter & Simpson, iii, p. 289 & ii, p. 314. The American theologian Walter Rauschenbusch criticised the way in which ideas of sin are influenced by ‘the monarchical institutions’ under which they were formulated, pointing particularly to the idea of sin as essentially rebellion. *A Theology for the Social Gospel*, New York 1918, p. 48; cf. David Nicholls, ‘Stepping out of Babylon: sin, salvation and social transformation’, in K. Leech & R. Williams, eds, *Essays Catholic and Radical*, London 1983.
- 12 Potter & Simpson, iii, p. 125–6. Compare Richard Hooker, writing of England in his day, ‘so is the power of the king over all and in all limited, that unto all his proceedings the law itself is a rule’. *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, 8:2:13; in J. Keble ed. *The Works of ... Mr Richard Hooker*, iii, p. 353.
- 13 Potter & Simpson, viii, p. 371.
- 14 John Donne, *Devotions upon Emergent Occasions*, Ann Arbor 1959, pp. 30–1.
- 15 Bodin’s position is fairly clear, see P.L. Rose *Bodin and the Great God of Nature*, Geneva 1980 and C.R. Baxter, ‘Jean Bodin’s Daemon and his Conversion to Judaism’, in *Verhandlungen der Internationalen Bodin Tagung*, Munich 1973. Hobbes’ position on the matter is somewhat more problematic, but I believe Bramhall’s assessment to be substantially correct, see David

- Nicholls, 'Images of God and the State', *Theological Studies*, 42:2, 1981, pp. 203—4
- 16 Henry Stubbe, *Essay in Aid of the Good Old Cause*, London 1659, Preface.
- 17 David Nicholls, 'Images of God and the State', pp. 205—14.
- 18 William Perkins, 'A Clowd of Faithful Witnesses', *Works*, London 1618, iii, p. 165.
- 19 W. Nicholson ed., *The Remains of Archbishop Grindal*, Cambridge 1853, p. 387.
- 20 H. Finch, *Law, or a discourse thereon*, p. 81; and James I, 'Defence of the Divine Right of Kings', in McIlwain, ed., *The Political Works*, p. 248.
- 21 *Lex, Rex or the Law and the Prince*, London 1644, p. 8.
- 22 *Lex*, pp. 69 & 195.
- 23 T.B. *The Engagement Vindicated*, London 1650, p. 7.
- 24 P. Bayne, *A Commentarie upon the First and Second Chapters of St Paul to the Colossians*, London 1634, p. 74; John Preston, *Life Eternal*, London 1631, p. 150
- 25 A.S.P. Woodhouse, ed., *Puritanism & Liberty*, London 1951, p. 49; and S. Rutherford, *Lex*, p. 8.
- 26 Henry Parker, *Observations on Some of His Majesties late 'Answers' and 'Expresses'*, London n.d. (1642), p. 18p. 21.
- 27 W.K. Jordan, *Men of Substance*, New York 1967 ed., p. 147.
- 28 William Prynne, *The Sovereaine Power of Parliaments*, London 1643, iv, p. 15. For a consideration of Prynne's extraordinary changes of position see W.M. Lamont, *Marginal Prynne: 1600—1669*, London 1963:
- 29 William Prynne, *God no Imposter nor Deluder*, London 1629, pp. 28f.
- 30 See L.F. Brown, *The Political Activities of the Baptists and Fifth Monarchy Men in England*, Baltimore 1912, p. 45; and P.G. Rogers, *The Fifth Monarchy Men*, London 1966, p. 43. While they were politically influential, in the 'Barebones' Parliament, these Fifth Monarchy Men had attempted to use the coercive power of the state to impose their ideas on others.
- 31 James Parnel, 'To you who be called Judges', in *A Collection of the Several Writings Given Forth from the Spirit of the Lord*, London 1675, p. 465 & Parnel, 'A Shield of Truth' (1665), in *A Collection*, pp. 84 & 88—9.
- 32 Analogically, of course, as James I had observed, anarchism is the companion of atheism. 'It is atheisme or blasphemy to dispute what God can do ... it is presumption and high contempt in a subject, to dispute what a king can do, or to say that a king cannot do this or that', in C.H. McIlwain ed., *The Political Works of James I*, p.333.
- 33 John Lilburne, *The Free Man's Freedom Vindicated*, London 1646, pp. 11—12, quoted in Woodward ed., *Puritanism & Liberty*, p. 317. Political theorists still gnaw at this old bone, see David Nicholls, 'A Comment on "Consent"', *Political Studies*, 27:1, 1979, pp. 120f.
- 34 G. Winstanley, 'A New Year's Gift for the Parliament and Army' (1650), in *The Law of Freedom, and other writings*, Harmondsworth 1973, p. 199; and G. Winstanley, 'The True Levellers' Standard Advanced' (1649), in *The Law of Freedom*, p. 83. Michael Walzer cites other examples of the military analogy in *The Revolution of the Saints*, p. 278.
- 35 G. Winstanley, 'The Breaking of the Day of God' (1648), in *The Law of Freedom*, p. 390.
- 36 In G.H. Sabine, ed., *The Writings of Gerrard Winstanley*, Cornell 1941, p. 114.
- 37 Isobel Ross, *Margaret Fell*, London 1949, p. 119; and C. Hill *The World Turned Upside Down*, Harmondsworth 1975 ed., p. 43.
- 38 *Milton's God*, London 1965 ed.
- 39 Henry Bullinger, *Decades*, London 1849—52, iii, p. 330.
- 40 Quoted in Perry Miller, *The New England Mind: the Seventeenth Century*, Cambridge, (Mass.) 1954 ed., pp. 376—7.
- 41 Miller, *The New England Mind*, p. 399
- 42 Quoted in Miller, *The New England Mind*, pp. 382 and 413.
- 43 'Political liberty, as such, never was and never will be an ideal of Puritanism', J.N. Figgis, 'A Puritan Utopia', *Church Quarterly Review*, 1903, p. 126. See David Nicholls, *The Pluralist State*, pp. 33f.
- 44 Miller, *The New England Mind*, p. 418.