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The President’s Column

Dear Bunyan Society members:

I feel honoured and privileged to take over the presidency from Tom Luxon. We thank him for all his work, particularly for such a splendid conference at Dartmouth last year. I also want to pay tribute to Ken Simpson for his immaculate editing of *The Recorder* for so many years, and to Chris Garrett for taking it on; and everyone who knows about the Society knows how faithfully David Gay keeps the show on the road.

I look forward to welcoming you to Keele in the summer of 2010, probably in early to mid-July, when our graduations are over. A call for papers will go out next year. I hope we can have a cluster of papers on the theme of Bunyan and Dissent. Already Isabel Rivers, co-director of the Dr Williams’s Centre for Dissenting Studies, London, and John Coffey, a historian who has published a number of important studies of Puritanism, have agreed to speak.

As you will all recognize, Bunyan has always meant a lot to readers outside the academy, and my first two emails in my new role weren’t from academics; one was from a man in Australia who wanted to know if a sentence that had helped him emerge from mental illness really was by Bunyan (it was), and the other from a publisher in Russia who wanted to know which version of *The Pilgrim’s Progress* would be best suited for translation for a Russian teenage readership. Just recently my family has been playing the new *Pilgrim’s Progress* board game (published in the UK by Lion Hudson). Not in the same artistic league as the one by Angela Lorenz we saw at Dartmouth, but bright, fun, and affordable, in a long tradition of popularization of the book.

I would welcome suggestions from members of ways we might continue to grow, and promote the study of Bunyan. Judging from recent publications, and others I know of in the pipeline, there is much to look forward to.

*Roger Pooley*
Opening Plenary Session, August 15, 2007

Paul Stevens (University of Toronto), “Bunyan and the Politics of Grace”

The opening plenary session of the 2007 International John Bunyan Society conference took place in the Hayward Lounge of the Hanover Inn on Wednesday, August 15. The speaker was Dr. Paul Stevens, Professor and Canada Research Chair in English Literature at the University of Toronto. Despite his expertise in early modern British literature, Dr. Stevens came as a relative newcomer to Bunyan studies. However, he has published extensively on the writings and influence of Bunyan’s contemporary John Milton, and so unsurprisingly he wished to establish the legacy of “Bunyan and the Politics of Grace” vis-à-vis a juxtaposition of those two great seventeenth-century dissenters.

The scope of Dr. Stevens’ presentation was ambitious, for it actually sought to connect two broad and seemingly different concerns that would each have merited full and separate treatment in their own right. In order to explain why The Pilgrim’s Progress had such a profound influence on British soldiers’ ruminations about World War I combat, Stevens first explicated why Bunyan’s convivial conception of divine grace could offer greater solace to those in harm’s way than the comparatively more individual expectation of grace by Milton. For Milton, Stevens contended, grace operates in a didactic manner: in the dialogues between God the Father and God the Son, or Michael and Adam, in Paradise Lost, and also in Milton’s late prose works like On Education, God assigns grace and purpose through a dialogical process that elicits from the recipient a posture of eager learning and civility. Such a strategy would have had appeal to educated readers like Milton himself, but probably not to persons who had neither the predisposition nor leisure to wait for grace to unfold through private tutoring—persons like the bucolic Bunyan and twentieth century servicemen under siege on Europe’s western front.

Bunyan understood grace, Stevens believed, much more communally than did Milton, and this helps to account for his much prompter invocation by later countrymen facing crisis. For Bunyan, grace is discovered most fully through friendship and shared experiences, like those of Christian with Faithful and Hopeful. Great fellowship can even triumph over death, as seen in the invocation of Faithful’s memory after Vanity Fair, or Bunyan’s own deeply felt kinship with the Christian martyrs extolled by John Foxe. And so, at a time as late as the 1910s, when virtually all English children still grew up with The Pilgrim’s Progress, imperiled soldiers far from home would think back to Bunyan because of two things he supplied them more amply than could any other familiar author: not only the language with which to comprehend “waste and horror and loss and fear,” but also the consoling realization that they were not alone in bearing burdens or crossing through the valley of the shadow of death. The quotation in the previous sentence comes from Paul Fussell’s The Great War and Modern Memory (Oxford, 1975, p. 139), which Stevens cited frequently because of its impressive accumulation of Bunyan allusions in the extant letters and papers of World War I.

Stevens’ final claim was that the grace Britain’s soldiers discovered through fellowship with Bunyan extended after the war even to their former German enemies, leading their mother country as a whole to think less jingoistically and more multi-nationally. Because this contention is somewhat tenebrous to verify, it provoked a lively question and answer session following the presentation. Professor Stevens delivered a very engaging opening address, effectively setting the tone of scholarship and discussion for the remainder of the conference.

-Review by Galen K. Johnson, John Brown University
Conference Reports (cont.)

Plenary Address, August 16, 2007

Elizabeth Sauer (Brock University): “Milton, Bunyan, the Holy Nation, and Trials of Toleration”

Professor Sauer began her plenary lecture on "Milton, Bunyan, the Holy Nation, and Trials of Toleration" by agreeing with such critics as Don Wolfe and Thomas Corns that Milton and Bunyan have almost nothing in common, but then she turned nonetheless toward some suggestive similarities. Both men constructed themselves as embattled authors at odds with their age, both explicitly found trials of faith necessary in the pursuit of truth, and both were also marginalized by those who conceived it their God-given duty to preserve a mundane political and civic unity that resisted toleration and threatened liberty. Milton and Bunyan were also alike well received in New England, where those who had fled intolerance in the Old World were in danger of becoming intolerant in the New.

Sauer’s presentation on Milton and Bunyan focused on how "these two complementary, radically different authors formulate a composite theory of toleration and nationhood in their major works." She traced the multiple representations in the two authors of the true church as a separate nationality. In the "Pisgah-Sight of Hebrew history" at the end of Paradise Lost, true nationality is contingent on obedience. "One peculiar nation" (12.111) springs from faithful Abraham but Eden itself is reduced to a wasteland (11.834). It is in the intervals between idolatrous prosperity and judgment in which toleration and liberty of conscience can put truth claims to the test. In Bunyan, the links between trials of conscience, intoleration, and mundane nationalism are particularly highlighted in the Vanity Fair sequence, where the outlandish pilgrims speak a foreign language and are thought to threaten the security of the state.

Of particular concern to Bunyan and also early New England authors is that the saints themselves not turn intolerant or betray liberty, especially in periods when persecution is eased and the church threatens to become like the world, a situation that becomes perhaps the greatest trial of faith. Though Milton was the more adventurous explorer of toleration and inquiry, both Milton and Bunyan proposed an alternate nationalism, one not conceived in political and civic terms, but rather in religious, prophetic, and even literary ones. And they also suggest that the experience of religion in the Old and New Worlds complicates any easy equation between this nationalism and biblical models.

-Review by Jameela Lares, University of Southern Mississippi
Conference Reports (cont.)

Plenary Address, August 16, 2007

Nigel Smith (Princeton University), “Puritans and Freethinkers in the Decade of The Pilgrim’s Progress”

In his lively and engaging talk, the third plenary of the conference, Nigel Smith gave us pretty much what we’ve come to expect from one of the leading scholars of seventeenth-century British radicalism, if not from Rackett’s bass player: quick riffs on a wide range of texts and a new paradigm within which those texts take on new meaning. In this case, the new context is related to work by Jonathan Israel in Radical Enlightenment (2001) and Enlightenment Contested (2006). For Israel, the fundamental values prized in liberal democracies today—toleration, racial and sexual equality, the freedom of enquiry and information, to mention only a few—have their roots not, as many intellectual historians have assumed, in Britain’s moderate Enlightenment, and particularly the thought of Locke, Newton, and Hume, but in the radical Enlightenment of materialism, atheism, and scepticism typified by Spinoza and those influenced by him. For Israel, with only a few exceptions (one of them is John Toland, Milton’s editor), there is no radical Enlightenment in Britain, but the purpose of Smith’s talk was to show that proto-radical Enlightenment thinking can be detected in the debates on toleration, republicanism and religious authority that unfolded during the 1670s.

After acknowledging the debt we owe to the Rev. Geoffrey Nuttall, who passed away 24 July 2007, Smith sketched the political landmarks of the toleration debates, from the Declaration of Breda (1660) and the Declaration of Indulgence (1672) to the Exclusion Crisis (1678-81), which changed the debates completely before the Bill of Rights was passed in 1689. Key figures in the development of radical Enlightenment thought include Martin Clifford (A Treatise of Human Reason, 1674), John Hales (1584-1656), whose Golden Remains was published in 1673, George Villiers, 2nd Duke of Buckingham, James Harrington, and Henry Neville (Isle of Pines, 1668). Linked with many of these writers, Andrew Marvell, a “neo-atheist,” according to Smith, received by far the most attention. His analysis of Marvell’s involvement in the “Rehearsal Controversy” with Samuel Parker, Bishop of London, a fierce anti-tolerationist, was especially noteworthy. Marvell appeals to toleration and reason to prove that Parker, who claimed to be defending the rule of reason over conscience and enthusiasm in debates with John Owen about religious authority, was, in fact, the enthusiast, not Owen, revealing Marvell’s scepticism about both Nonconformity and the established church. It would have been interesting to follow this thread further to see how Restoration politics transformed early tolerationist ideas. The ideas of John Hales and Henry More, for example, were appropriated by Marvell against Parker, but the ideas of both were also easily assimilated by the “latitude-men” of the established church. Can the tolerationist debates of the 1670s be the seedbed of radical Enlightenment when they serve both parties?

And what does this have to do with Bunyan? Not very much directly, but Smith provokes us to think about Bunyan differently as a result of seeing him alongside Marvell and other makers of the radical Enlightenment. There are parallels between Marvell’s Mr. Smirk and Bunyan’s Mr. Badman, but for Bunyan, Marvell would have been one of the “latitude-men” satirized in The Pilgrim’s Progress. Despite sharing printers, such as Nathaniel Ponder, and friends, such as John Owen, the two were worlds apart, and Marvell’s world was the most influential in shaping the values that made today’s secular liberal institutions possible. Once again we have Nigel Smith to thank for making sense of the racket of radical voices in early modern England and reminding us of how exciting and important “the decade of The Pilgrim’s Progress” really was.

-Review by Ken Simpson, Thompson Rivers University
Conference Reports (cont.)

Plenary Address, August 17, 2007

Julie Crawford (Columbia University): “How Margaret Hoby Read Her De Mornay”

Julie Crawford delivered “How Margaret Hoby Read Her De Mornay,” the fourth plenary of the conference, on Friday morning. In that paper she argued that Margaret Hoby’s marginalia and diary entries are “the testament to a public career” as this landed gentlewoman managed not only her estates, but the spiritual lives of her tenants and her neighbors. Hoby’s reading was, Crawford claims, part of her religious and political activism: “her dialogic and communal reading practices sought real world effects.”

To prepare us for her argument, Crawford criticized an eroticized view of the female reader, retiring to her closet to read privately. She pointed out that lap-books, often recruited as part of this eroticization, were large books meant to lie open easily so that one person might read to a group. Pointing to 17th century engravings of women reading in groups and to Hoby’s own reading practices, Crawford argued that “the inscription of women in the private sphere” may in fact be “our own creation.”

Working with the Hoby family library, as well as with Hoby’s diary, Crawford has paid close attention to Hoby’s marginalia, her summaries of what she read, what she thought about that reading, and whom she read and discussed it with. Crawford argued that Hoby deliberately chose authors, texts, and fellow readers, and that her reading included censored pamphlets, underground manuscripts, and works in which her interest would necessarily be more critical than devotional. For example, the diary records Hoby studying a “popish” book and then discussing it in the night with a “papist maid.”

In one of the most enjoyable parts of this lecture Crawford discussed Margaret Hoby’s marriage. The Countess of Huntington encouraged Margaret, who owned considerable property in Yorkshire, to marry Sir Posthumous Toby because of his religious positions and usefulness in holding the county against recusants. The couple certainly took that task seriously, but where Margaret engaged her neighbors in conversation and correspondence, Sir Posthumous reported them to the authorities or took them to court.

I took away from this presentation a strong sense of Margaret Hoby’s confidence in her own religious authority and responsibility. Crawford argued persuasively that Hoby did not defer to Richard Rhodes, her personal chaplain, but worked with him an ally. Not a passive recipient of instruction, Hoby meditated, examined, talked, debated, and wrote about what she read. As one might expect, Hoby talked about religious issues with her own women, the work women in the fields and villages on her estate, and with outsiders and “strangers who come to her.” But Crawford also documented moments when Hoby expresses criticism of the clergy with whom she interacts and confidence in her worthiness to judge them and their positions. Hoby wrote critically of the Elizabethan prayer book and of ecclesiastical orders, patronized and intervened on behalf of radical and unvested ministers, and even housed one when he lost his place. Far from the retiring devotional reader, Hoby records twice in May 1601 that she “took a lecture in rhetoric” and consistently chose “the most controversial men” as her reading partners.

-Review by Margaret Thickstun, Hamilton College
Conference Reports (cont.)

Plenary Address, August 18, 2007

Bob Owens (The Open University): “Bunyan and the Practice of Intensive Reading in the Seventeenth Century”

W. R. Owens, Director of The Reading Experience Database at the UK Open University, collects data about reading experiences of British subjects from 1450 to 1945. He asserts that early modern European readers had access to a limited range of literature and were inclined to read in a thoughtful and "intensive" manner, as opposed to the avid "extensive" reading that developed a century later.

Bunyan, characteristic of his time, was an intensive reader, says Owens, and he gives examples from Grace Abounding of Bunyan intensively exploring Dent’s The Plain Man’s Pathway to Heaven, Bayly’s The Practice of Piety, Luther's Commentary on Galatians, and Bacon's Relation of the Fearful Estate of Francis Spira, all of which moved Bunyan deeply.

By far the most important book for Bunyan was the Bible, and Owens demonstrates that intensive daily Bible reading, both privately and communally, was pervasive in Bunyan's time. Early modern readers also devoured the vast production of doctrinal commentaries, paraphrases, abridgements, concordances, manuals and guide books giving advice on how the Bible should be read. Intensive Bible reading captures the narrative qualities of the Bible and is an important divergence from the disjointed reading of the established church following the ecclesiastical calendar. Owens demonstrates that Bunyan was a product of his times and not exceptional in his practice of intensive reading.

Owens notes that Bunyan, who matures from reading the Bible frequently, repeatedly, and purposefully, to actually visualizing the biblical text and imagining himself into the situations, gradually learned how to interpret and understand the Bible and even reconcile apparently conflicting texts. Further progress takes Bunyan, and readers like him, to Bible reading that is heavily exegetical and homiletic, with every word and passage holding a deeper meaning to be puzzled out and given a personal application. One outcome was that Bunyan had "his mind saturated with Scriptural texts." Another was that Bunyan could write prose "infused in the most natural way with biblical references, phrases and idioms."

Dialogue following this presentation explored the importance of making literature our own through contemplation, an observation that some Bunyan scholars have not read the Bible the way Bunyan did, and a warning on the importance of suspending dogmatic conclusions. The intensive reader is never finished with a book.

The insights provided by Owens reinforced my passion to practice the art of intensive reading and apply it to Bunyan—for he has infused into his own writings the very depths and layers of meaning he found in the literature he read.

-Review by Daniel V. Runyon, Spring Arbor University
RICHARD L. GREAVES AWARD

The first Richard L. Greaves Award for an outstanding book in the period 2004-07 was presented at the Fifth Triennial Conference of the International John Bunyan Society at Dartmouth College. The announcement came at the conference banquet held on the evening of August 17, 2007.


The Richard L. Greaves Award is presented triennially to an outstanding book on the history, literature, thought, practices, and legacy of English Protestantism to 1700. The award is not limited to studies of Bunyan, and can be conferred on authors who are not members of the IJBS. A generous bequest from the family of Richard Greaves makes possible cash awards for our winners.

The Society is pleased to announce that Professor Galen Johnson of John Brown University will serve as chair of the next award committee (2007-2010).
Life, Life, Eternal Life: Uncle Wiggily Meets The Pilgrim’s Progress, 2006

edition of 17
wintergreen transfer printed on silk and linen, hand-woven hemp pages, felt, pen nibs, book pages, acid-free cardstock and conservation board, ink bottle, lens, safety pins, buttons, gum wrappers, needle threader, Velcro and antique textile fragments

It was my great pleasure to present this limited-edition artist's book and board game based on John Bunyan and his most famous work at the John Bunyan Society conference at Dartmouth. So rarely am I able to show my alternative form of non-fiction research to a group of people who know exactly what I am talking about. I am also inevitably enlightened by scholars doing serious research, and this was the case at Dartmouth. Below is a brief recapitulation of the work presented.

For over a decade I have been researching relics and souvenirs, tourism and pilgrimage in various cultures and religions in history for a forthcoming work. In the back of my mind there was this vague title: The Pilgrim’s Progress. A few months later, sitting in the parlor of my father's house in Maine, a re-installation of my grandmother's living room long ago in Massachusetts, I turned my head to the bookcase. There was her volume of The Pilgrim’s Progress (1678). As in a project on the poet Sir John Denham, a mild curiosity turned into an entire work. Actually, the two projects were started at the same time, and the research for one fed the research for the other, as John Bunyan and John Denham represented opposite factions in the English Civil War—the Protestant Roundheads who rallied behind Cromwell, and the Royalist Cavaliers who supported Charles I and Charles II. Both Denham and Bunyan had a huge impact in their own ways, yet are largely forgotten today by the general public. I think it is important, however, that people benefit from knowing who or what influenced books and people that do still resonate with them today: Robert Louis Stevenson’s mother sewed a pack on his doll’s back so it would appear he was playing Pilgrim’s Progress on the Sabbath. Benjamin Franklin's first book was The Pilgrim’s Progress, which he mentions in his autobiography. The Wizard of Oz has many similarities to The Pilgrim’s Progress, which was drawn directly from the Bible, one of the few books Bunyan had with him when he wrote this text in prison. The 19th century board games such as Pope and Pagan and Mohammed and Saladin were inspired by Bunyan's novel, and show how the book suited the Protestant missionary climate in the United States at that time.

Many of the materials used to make this book/game are old, from antique pen nibs to 19th century textiles from my family. I even incorporated linen sheets given at the time of my wedding, and my own wedding dress and scarf. While normally I shun materials that have intrinsic or sentimental value in my work, preferring to make facsimiles in another material, for this "arte-povera" scrounger recycled version of The Pilgrim’s Progress, I incorporated used but symbolically rich items to convey Bunyan's text. But I am using the materials in a non-precious and often invisible way. The wedding dress becomes an 18th century housewife's pocket, and the white wedding scarf is printed with a Xerox transfer of an intricate Victorian lace. These items appear on the first page of the book, and represent the home and family the protagonist Christian left behind in Part I of the book. They also symbolize the wife and children Bunyan abandoned while in jail. Bunyan was a tinker, and in jail he recycled a chair leg into a flute. Accordingly, I chose to use as many recycled materials as possible. Bunyan was trying to create a novel, amusing version of the Bible that would appeal to the barely literate. So I avoided using text on the game board, and tried to relay his narrative with the same kinds of allegorical methods and symbols. There is even a piece of ink-jet printed potato starch with the recipe for Mr. Skill's Pills, conceptual food Bunyan invented which is based on the Eucharist.

-Angela Lorenz

For more complete information on this work of art, contact: aslorenz@crocker.com or visit the artist's online archive at: www.angelalorenzartistsbooks.com

Investigation of ecclesiology, or theology of the church, in John Milton’s 1671 brief epic, *Paradise Regained*, finds an interplay between humanist textual and literary goals and Protestant theology, not previously acknowledged in Milton criticism. The spiritual architecture of the church (a term appearing in *Areopagitica* [*Complete Prose Works*, II, 555]) emerges from within the believer in Scripture as the Word of God through literary activity, writing, singing, speaking, and hearing the Word. Much criticism of the past, from the seventeenth century onward, has viewed the poem, inaccurately, as exhibiting a reduction of religious views as a function of diminished political aspirations on Milton’s part. Though judiciously Simpson does not berate those who have viewed Milton in his latter years as “isolated, defeated, and quietest” (a view that starts with Samuel Wesley in 1697 and John Dennis in 1704), he argues that Milton “continues to develop the consistent theology of the church that preoccupied him in his prose during the civil war and Interregnum” (xi). The poem depicts a false church, through Satan, and a true church, through Jesus as a “true minister,” one with knowledge of the Word and concern for the care of his flock. Milton presents a Son who knows the meaning of the kingdom he has come to proclaim, its birth, its growth, its glorification. Through emulation of the inner qualities, the spiritual architecture, of the Son, emergent through the temptations of the poem, a visible church is possible, to be disclosed as the invisible church with the Apocalypse.

Discussion of such authors as Erasmus and of *De doctrina christiana* and other works emboldens the argument that Milton’s church, a “Protestant” one, not a specific one like “Anglican,” reads God’s self-revelation through the Word, and thus the Son as *sermo* (that is, *logos*) joins philology and rhetoric to theology. Such a church becomes a textual community united by the textual practice of Christian liberty, which is the liberty to interpret God’s Word. Tradition is clearly rejected. Simpson’s thesis is that “Milton’s ecclesiology is literary . . . because each individual is saved by the Word, . . . because the Word is the central rite of a continually reforming church; . . . [and] because concepts and practices derived from poetics and rhetoric modify traditional ecclesiological ideas in his work” (25). The second chapter, “Silence and the Word,” is of major importance, not only because it rejects an equation of “silence” with “quietism,” but because it recognizes “silence” as major expression and allows its equation with “patience,” a significant aspect of both the poem and the theological need before the Apocalypse occurs. Patience is taken up in chapter three (101-02): self-discipline ties together patience, temperance, and “righteousness toward ourselves,” a prime need of a ministry and the church as a whole.

Milton’s rejection of the ritual activity and the liturgy of the church are pursued in chapter four, “Renovation of Worship,” through prayer as described in *De doctrina christiana*. The narrative of the brief epic “is best described as “liturgical congregationalism” (120), fulfilling “the imperative of worship,” inward worship being sufficient for God. But it also consists of good works, the result of the Spirit of God working within us. “Renovation,” including that of worship, lies for Milton in humankind’s “ability to hear or listen,” which is a gift from God (*CPW VI*, 457). In this final chapter Simpson explores “Astrology, Apocalypse, and the Church Militant.” “[T]he visible church consists of a textual community united by progressive revelation . . . until the revelation of the invisible church” (140). *Paradise Regained* . . . prefigures the apocalyptic battle at the end of history and is informed by both scriptural and astrological imagery” (186). Milton’s hero exhibits the “patience, endurance, and faith [that] were
the conditions for Nonconformity’s survival in the Restoration wilderness, giving it a strategy for resistance and a hope for renewal until the kingdom of glory arrived” (186).

Although Simpson does not mention John Bunyan, the concept of spiritual architecture that he develops for the 1671 Paradise Regained is consonant with Dennis Danielson’s analysis of Bunyan’s and Milton’s “common, radical vision of spiritual integrity . . . [and] the practice and mission of their literary imaginations” (“Milton, Bunyan, and the Speculative Imagination,” 248, in Heirs of Fame: Milton and Writers of the English Renaissance, ed. Margo Swiss and David A. Kent [Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 1995]). He stresses Paradise Lost and Pilgrim’s Progress, but we also remember works beginning with “A Confession of my Faith, and a Reason of my Practice” in 1671.


This volume contains ten essays based on papers delivered at the 2004 meeting of the International John Bunyan Society. In their different ways they all approach the afterlife of Bunyan’s great allegory. Some essays chart the specifically literary inheritance: Vincent Newey in a wide-ranging discussion of Cowper, Dickens, George Eliot, Mark Rutherford and Peter Ackroyd; Norman Vance on Charles Kingsley, Thomas Hardy and the late Victorian novelist Mary Ward; Richard Danson Brown on Louis MacNeice; and Julie Campbell on Samuel Beckett. Others focus on the way the text itself was edited and produced: David Walker on Bunyan’s reception in the Romantic period stresses the importance of Robert Southey 1830 edition and its reviews by Scott and Macaulay; Nathalie Collé-Bak discusses the importance of illustrations facilitating, and changing the wide reach of the book; and Mary Hammond surveys a number of editions and commentaries from the nineteenth century. Bunyan’s appearance in the 1946 film, A Matter of Life and Death, is discussed by Michael Davies. Finally, two essays discuss the reading of Bunyan from other angles: Isabel Hofmeyr, on ‘Evangelical Realism: The Transnational Making of Genre in The Pilgrim’s Progress’, and Stuart Sim, on ‘Bunyan and his Fundamentalist Readers.’

The act of simply describing such a collection testifies to the richness of its contents, the wide-ranging influence of The Pilgrim’s Progress, and the way in which imaginative attention to the reception of literary texts has become such a fruitful area of scholarship in recent years. Space precludes the essay by essay criticism that would do justice to the collection. But there are several things to be said. First, this is an essential reference for anyone pursuing the way in which Bunyan has been read, especially in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. There is some highly compressed, original scholarship here, and some significant discoveries. No-one writing about the importance of Bunyan, particularly in the nineteenth century, can afford to ignore this book. Second, if you’ve read their books, don’t ignore their essays. For example, Isabel Hofmeyr, already recognised as a path-breaking reader of Bunyan in the international context, puts us further in her debt with the concept of ‘evangelical realism’; and the graceful and witty essay by Michael Davies is quite different in tone and intention from his monograph on Bunyan. Bunyan conference volumes have (notoriously) battled for years to get into print; this one has taken a mere three years, and will be an influential resource for some time.

Students and teachers of Bunyan and of Milton should welcome this carefully edited collection of critical and scholarly studies by the late Christopher Q. Drummond, for it includes his brilliant monograph-length treatment of *Bunyan’s Pilgrims’ Progress*, and a series of essays—in effect, a monograph—on Milton’s *Paradise Lost*. Drummond, an American-Canadian, who was Professor of English at the University of Alberta from 1969 until his death in 2001, argues that Bunyan’s basic theological insight was that “believing and coming is all one,” and shows in an illuminating and meticulous analysis how this insight functions as an “artistic principle” (a principle of order) unfolding in the characters, events, and speeches of the work. By seeing Bunyan’s masterpiece first as a work of art, Drummond enables a reading that truly engages with the content.

After discussing Coleridge’s influential critical distinction between Bunyan’s theological aim and his literary aim, Drummond credits F. R. Leavis with the suggestive observation that Bunyan expressed a “religious ethos, or spirit” that transcended his theology and wrote out of a “moral sense that represented what was finest” in a living traditional culture that “went back beyond the Reformation, in unbroken continuity, deep into the Middle Ages.” Leavis noted further that the “sense of the eternal conveyed by *The Pilgrim’s Progress*” is a “sense of a dimension felt in the earthly life—in what for us is life, making this something that transcends time succession, transience and evanescence and gives significance.” Penetrating even deeper than Leavis into Bunyan’s master work, Drummond offers a “principle of organization that . . . has not earlier been discussed by scholars or critics” that helps to resolve the Coleridgean “split” between theological intention and literary effect. His editors (and former students) John Baxter and Gordon Harvey note in their preface that Drummond “rescue[s] that narrative from its reputation as a tract in Calvinist theology,” and thus revives “its claim to be regarded as the great proto-novel of the English tradition—a fictional representation of the good life, as shaped by a religious goal.” It may be argued that his essay does even more than that.

Drummond’s thesis is that Bunyan’s fiction—precursor of the major tradition of the English novel—is rooted in his major theological insight—that “believing and coming is all one.” The unifying principle of the fiction is the same as the theological insight. “Not only,” he writes, “does the narration of a pilgrimage or journey through this world, . . . manifest a point-to-point correspondence with the stages of personal salvation as Calvinist theology lays them out and explains them,” but “in a number of places in *The Pilgrim’s Progress* Bunyan explicitly asserts, and in many other places he implies, that his theological beliefs and his narrative embodiment of those beliefs are one and the same.” The pilgrimage is a unified illustration of Christian belief as “coming on pilgrimage.”

Drummond cites numerous passages in Bunyan’s contemporaneous sermon “Come, & Welcome to Jesus Christ” (1678) that state the basic theological insight—that “believing and coming is all one”—noting in particular Bunyan’s use of John 6:35, “He that cometh to me shall never hunger, and he that believeth in me shall never thirst.” This insight, Drummond claims, he then made the “guiding artistic principle of his narrative.” Moreover, this principle “allows it to speak more immediately to modern readers than does the Calvinism that Bunyan intended to embody.”

Bunyan shaped *The Pilgrim’s Progress* according to a principle that asserts first that believing in the imputed righteousness of Christ is a profound yearning for salvation by that means (the theme of “Come, & Welcome to Jesus Christ”) and second, that the coming or yearning is allegorically presented “under the similitude of coming as walking along a way.” As an example, Drummond cites Bunyan’s character Hopeful, near the end of Part I, who says: “Then I saw, . . . that believing and coming was all one,” and explicates thus: “believing in Christ as salvation and coming on pilgrimage to salvation is all
one.” This assertion of identity, Drummond argues, “is the idea that spurred and organized Bunyan’s verbal and narrative creativity.” And, “in terms of this identity, one can account for almost everything in the work, from the largest structures of narrative and characterization down to many of the smallest details of diction.” He analyses with great subtlety Bunyan’s characters and his text in terms of this identity.

In the relation of believing to coming Bunyan gives the primacy to believing; that is, he illustrates believing in terms of coming, not the reverse. Bunyan’s intention is “to bring us to an understanding of his primary theme—believing—by treating it in the simple terms that we all understand—coming as journeying.” The allegorical journey is a narrative technique for explaining what believing is. “Coming receives the elaborate narrative treatment, since it is of its very nature capable of that treatment.” The literal sense of “coming” is walking from the City of Destruction (our world) toward the goal of the Heavenly City. It is not possible to cite in detail here the wealth of quoted passages with which Drummond supports his analysis in terms of the artistic principle he defines. Line by line he illustrates the identity of “believing” and “coming” as it permeates the text. He scrutinizes and elucidates Bunyan’s prose, as well as his verse in the two “Prologues,” as the New Critics analysed short poems, drawing forth the full significance of meaning and richness of the writer’s metaphorical language as he carries out the organizing artistic principle.

In a short follow-up essay, “Sequence and Consequence in The Pilgrim’s Progress,” Drummond brings his understanding of St. Augustine’s famous passage on memory and reading a Psalm (Confessions, Book XI) to bear on literary critic Stanley Fish’s “dissembled” account of his reading of Pilgrim’s Progress in Self-Consuming Artifacts: The Experience of Seventeenth-Century Literature (1972). In a sharp blow at Fish’s poor and falsifying reading habits, this brief essay is an expert handling of Fish’s mishandling of the reading of Pilgrim’s Progress—or any coherent literary work, long or short.

The series of five connected essays on Milton in Drummond’s collection comprise an equally brilliant and important study of Paradise Lost. Approaching Milton’s masterwork with the frank critical judgment that it is a “disastrously flawed poem,” he offers an explanation of how and why it fails as an artistic whole, yet goes on to assert that although it is not a “great poem” it has “great poetry” in it—“perhaps the most beautiful love poetry in the English language” in Adam’s speeches to Eve in Book IX. Building on A. J. A. Waldock’s criticism of Milton’s “narrative consistency,” he applies Eric Auerbach’s definition of the classical epic literary mode (form and narrative style) as distinct from—and “antagonistic” to—the form and style characteristic of Biblical literature. Drummond claims that Milton did not “sufficiently understand how badly compromised he was by the contradictory demands of the antagonistic styles with their attendant conceptions of reality.” In Part II of “An Anti-Miltonic Reprise,” he illustrates through discussion of Satan and Belial the strength of his argument, while in another essay, in which he takes up Milton’s sonnet “On His Blindness,” he treats this poem as a small paradigm of “the whole vast problem of Paradise Lost.”

The shorter essays in Drummond’s valuable book are all on important themes, ranging from the Canadian philosopher George Whalley’s essays on Aristotle’s Poetics through a comparison and contrast of Emerson’s bad thinking in Nature to Melville’s clearer thought in Moby-Dick. His essays on the Renaissance short poem all make significant observations on specific poems, but perhaps the best of these is his treatment of the criticism of J. V. Cunningham and Yvor Winters in “What Is Rational Form in Poetry?” He expands considerably their perceptive definitions of rational form in ways that should be more widely understood both by scholars of English poetry and poets themselves.
BEZA’S CHART

Prompted by the Bolsec controversy in Geneva of 1551, Beza produced a diagrammatic outline of predestination from God’s decrees to the respective fates of the elect and reprobate. He called it the Summa Totius Christianismi. Apparently at the suggestion of Peter Martyr, he wrote a fairly brief commentary on it. The publication history is puzzling. The first extant version is an English translation in Geneva, possibly by Whittingham, a leading translator of the Genevan Bible. An English translation is recorded in Pollard and Redgrave’s Short Title Catalogue, dated 1575 – strangely, the diagramme is not there! Genevan publication is in Beza’s Tractiones.

Perkins produced a rather more elaborate but basically similar chart as the opening of his Armilla Aurea, the Golden Chain. Bunyan’s Mapp of 1663 is also basically similar, except for a radically christological godhead at the top.

Beza’s chart has no Trinity at the top (see photocopy provided on adjacent page). Christ is mentioned only after the decrees, creation and the fall, at the head of the line involving the elect. The impression is subordinationist. The reprobate has two lines of descent, those with an ineffectual calling and those with no calling at all. Much Calvinist discussion about temporary conversion or the formally pious is presaged, not least in Bunyan. A broader question is also raised – what kind of theodicy needs to be devised for a God that gives a delusive taste of grace to some of those predestinately damned by decree before creation?

-P. J. H. Titlestad, University of Pretoria

LATCH: A Journal for the Study of the Literary Artifact in Theory, Culture, or History

LATCH: A Journal for the Study of the Literary Artifact in Theory, Culture, or History is a new online journal (annual) with a small, print-copy archival analog. It seeks to publish papers that examine how texts both shape and are shaped by the material and ideological currents of their own time. It especially welcomes papers that examine the effect of Protestantism on literary culture. See www.openlatch.com for more information.
George Offor and the Case of T. S.

While performing research in Chicago in June of 2005, I discovered an unpublished letter written by George Offor inserted in a copy of *Youth’s Tragedy* (1671) by T. S. held at the Newberry Library. In this letter addressed to Alexander Gardyne dated February 16, 1861, Offor admits his perplexity regarding the problem of identifying T. S. Offor’s letter is a continuation of a discussion in *Notes & Queries* regarding the identity of T. S. For example, in *Notes & Queries* on October 20, 1860 J. O. responds to a previous submission by Offor regarding T. S. and concludes by “referring the Query back to Mr. Offor for confirmation and farther elucidation” (317). Evidently in an effort to assist Offor in that invitation, Alexander Gardyne lent two “pamphlets by T. S.” to Offor; we can assume that these were Gardyne’s copies of *Youth’s Tragedy* and *Youth’s Comedy* by T. S.¹ Offor returns the pamphlets and encloses a letter to Gardyne wherein he admits to the complexity surrounding the case of T. S. and declares that the identification of T. S. as Thomas Sherman depends upon the James Bindley copy of *Youth’s Tragedy.*²

Speculating that it is “very probably the same T. S. who published the Second Part of the Pilgrim’s Progress 1682” and that “[t]here’s some internal evidence that he was a Baptist,” Offor tends to agree with the proposal made by J. O. in *Notes & Queries* that the writer of *Youth’s Tragedy* and *Youth’s Comedy* was also the author of *Second Part of the Pilgrim’s Progress.* In response to J. O.’s prior assertion that “Sherman” was likely a Dissenter, Offor, who by this time has had the opportunity to examine these three literary works, believes that proof exists within these texts (“internal evidence”) that T. S. was a Baptist. In both this letter and in his brief expose in *The Works of John Bunyan* on this imitative allegory by T. S., Offor shows a particular fascination with the frontispiece and illustration included in the 1683 edition of *Second Part of the Pilgrim’s Progress.* As Offor describes in his letter, the illustration (found on page 26 of T. S.’s *Second Part of the Pilgrim’s Progress*) depicts “a round dance wherein [persons] skip and jump [around a pit that leads to] Hell.” Offor also records where he has consulted or searched for Thomas Sherman: Edmund Calamy’s *Register* (which includes an “Edward Sherman”), Palmer (likely his Nonconformist Memorial), Brooks, and a directory of *Dissenting Churches* (perhaps by Walter Wilson); he notes that in the latter source he found an entry for a “John Sherman.”³

At the conclusion of the letter, Offor states, “The T. S. we seek was an English Divine or preacher...[not a] [Q]uaker [but] a noncon[formist] [and] a [B]aptist.” By examining the frontispiece, which features two clergymen—one sleeping and the other standing—Offor makes these assumptions, as he notes the importance of these clergymen wearing “all black excl[cept] white band.”

Although his letter acknowledges and considers the possibility that T. S. is “Sherman,” Offor cautiously refrains from openly endorsing this identification. After making the initial disclaimer that the identification depends on the “evidence of Bindley’s copy that it represents Sherman,” Offor merely considers those candidates bearing the last name of Sherman who lived in that era. His statement that “Sherman” is “very probably the same T. S.” who authored the imitative allegory (i.e., *Second Part of the Pilgrim’s Progress*) is not rendered in a tone of confidence; in fact, he prefers for the remainder of the letter to use the initials T. S. when referring to the author in question. Perhaps most notable is his

---

1 Copies of *Youth’s Tragedy* and *Youth’s Comedy* that contain Gardyne’s stamp are currently held at the Newberry Library and the University of Illinois Library.

2 I am indebted to both Lawrence Mitchell and Maura Ives of Texas A&M University for their assistance in deciphering the handwriting of George Offor.

3 The “John Sherman” that Offor has mentioned resided in Dedham, Essex, and served as a rector in the Church of England. An MA graduate of Cambridge, John Sherman wrote a history of the nunnery of Harlton, Cambridgeshire, *Historia Collegii Jesu Cantabrigiae,* which was edited by J. O. Halliwell in 1840. By 1665 “he was admitted DD by royal mandate”; later “Sherman was appointed prebend and archdeacon of Sarum in 1670, [and] died in London on 27 March 1671” (Mullinger 329-330).

concluding sentence offered as a postscript to Gardyne: “Your pamphlets by T. S. are returned herewith.” Offor is apparently not convinced that T. S. should be labeled as Sherman since he has not had the opportunity to examine the Bindley copy and opts instead to wait for more reliable evidence before making a conclusion: “We may accidentally fall into [T. S.’s] company or some account of him....” Offor promises his correspondent that if that happens then he and Gardyne as partners in the venture “will share the spoils equally.” Unfortunately, no documentation in books, essays, or letters has been located showing any further work by Offor on this attribution; he died just three years later in 1864.

For additional information on T. S. and the problems of authorship and attribution of texts please see my dissertation, *Imitative Sequel Writing: Divine Breathings, Second Part of the Pilgrim’s Progress, and the Case of T. S. (aka Thomas Sherman).*

-Chris Garrett, Oklahoma City University

---

**The Congregational Library, London**

14 Gordon Square, London WC1H 0AR

The Congregational Library was founded in 1831, and the former Memorial Hall in Farringdon Street was built to house it in 1872. A rich source of material relating to Dissenting history and thought, it is now administered jointly with Dr. Williams’s Library. The Congregational Library has a website.

Among manuscripts held by the Library are those relating to Philip and Matthew Henry, Joseph Hussey and Isaac Watts; correspondence of James Peirce, Philip Doddridge, the Countess of Huntingdon, and Richard Slate; the papers of John Rippon, Sr., John Collett Ryland and John Ryland; and of the McAll Mission; diaries of Philip Henry and William Kingsbury; and the autobiography of William Kiffin. Among the 70,000 books is a significant collection of Hymns and Sacred Music; books and pamphlets concerning Congregationalism, Puritanism and Dissent. There are runs of the Congregational Year Book (1846-1972) and the Year Books of The United Reformed Church, the Congregational Federation and the Evangelical Fellowship of Congregational Churches; Transactions of the Congregational Historical Society, Journal of the United Reformed Church History Society, the Congregational History Circle [now Society] Magazine and the EFCC Studies Conference Papers; The Christian World; the Christian World Pulpit, and The Congregational Quarterly. Archives include those of the Congregational Union of England and Wales, the Congregational Church in England and Wales and the Memorial Hall Trust. The collection of archives and memoirs of ministers and others is an ongoing project.

The Friends of the Congregational Library are eager to develop the Library and to encourage its use. Among other things, they publish a Newsletter twice per annum; organize a summer visit to other libraries; and arrange the annual Congregational Lecture, the published version of which is issued free to Friends. Those interested in joining the Friends may obtain further information from the secretary, Rachel Gurney, Bunyan Meeting, Mill Street, Bedford MK40 3EU; telephone, 01234 353465; email, rachel@bunyanmeeting.co.uk.

-Alan P. F. Sell, FRHistS
Chairman, Friends of the Congregational Library

The Recorder

The Recorder is the Newsletter of the International John Bunyan Society. Published once a year, it offers members of the society a forum for notes, queries, conference announcements, calls for papers, news of members, reviews, abstracts, bibliographies: anything of interest to scholars and readers of seventeenth-century texts.

Submissions are gratefully received by 1 March 2009 for the Spring 2009 issue. Disk as well as paper submissions are welcome. E-mail submissions and all other inquiries should be sent to:

Chris Garrett, Editor
The Recorder

c/o Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning
Oklahoma City University
2501 N. Blackwelder
Oklahoma City, OK 73106
E-mail: cgarrett@okcu.edu
