LIBERTY UNIVERSITY DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY

Reclaiming the Church: Puritan Structure, Political and Theological Distinctions in a Transatlantic Context, 1603-1689

Submitted to Dr. Benjamin T. Esswein in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the completion of

HIST 989-A25

By

Kevan Keane

November 21, 2022

Contents

Introduction……..3

The Godly Dispersed: Puritans in the Colonial South, and the Influence of Puritans Across the Atlantic World…….37

The Triumph of Reformed Protestantism: The Puritans, Charles I, and the English Civil War…….89

No United Vision: Lack of Unity Among the Puritans and the Collapse of the Commonwealth of England…….145

A Protestant Overthrow: The Puritan Comeback and the Glorious Revolution Around the Atlantic World…….201

Conclusion…….253

Bibliography……..270

Introduction

Puritans were born out of the sixteenth century upheaval that the Protestant Reformation brought Europe. This Reformation had brought about monumental changes to the Christian religion and many rulers challenged the authority of the Roman Catholic Church, breaking off from it to form the several Protestant churches. The Reformation reached England under King Henry VIII. After Henry's reign the Reformation expanded under the brief, but formative reign of Edward VI, which produced notable Protestant scholars. Mary I, known as Bloody Mary, famously attempted to reverse the Reformation and return England to Catholicism by force between 1553 and 1558. Nevertheless, the Reformation took a renewed and notably different direction under Queen Elizabeth I, who issued a collective ecclesiastical policy, the Elizabethan Settlement, and defined the shape of English Protestantism for that period. With this prolonged Reformation, the Church of England adopted more Protestant beliefs, and made a distinct, but only partial, break with the Catholic Church.[1] Consequently, some did not feel that the Church of England under the Elizabethan Settlement went far enough in returning England to the straight and narrow road of true reform. They wanted a completion of the Reformation as promised under Edward VI, including a full purification of the Church of England from Catholic tradition as an antithesis to Catholicism.[2]

---

[1] This was in keeping with the principles of Thomas Cranmer, who, during the reign of Edward VI, believed in Protestant theology, but was not ready to completely part ways with the Catholic liturgy (at least not in the parts he deemed usable). Cranmer noteworthily affirmed that, "some [Catholic practices, brackets author's] at the first were of godly intent and purpose devised, and yet at length turned to vanity and superstition," but that others were "by undiscreet devotion, and such a zeal as was without knowledge, and for because they were winked at in the beginning, they grew daily to more and more abuses, which...are worthy to be cut away and clean rejected" and others that he saw as "devised by man, yet it is thought good to reserve them still, as well for a decent order in the church...as they pertain to edification" (Thomas Cranmer, "Introduction to the Book of Common Prayer," (1549) in Gerald Bray, ed., *Documents of the English Reformation*, [Bristol: James Clarke & Co., 2004], 243).

[2] This sums up the essence of what Puritanism was. Puritans took on many theological shapes and sizes throughout the seventeenth century, but all the various groups that were called "Puritans" had this in common.

These “Puritans,” as their opponents called them, wanted the Church of England to make a more complete break with the Roman Catholic Church, but also to make the church reflect the Biblical standard of a church, most notably, like the early church or the ones highlighted in the letters of Paul and the other Apostles. They attempted to “purify” the Church of England from what they felt were corruptions left over from the Roman Catholic Church. As a result, they refused to fully conform to the Elizabethan Settlement.

The Elizabethan Settlement was Queen Elizabeth I’s attempt to create a middle way in the Church of England that allowed for some traditional elements to remain while also reinstituting the Reformation of her brother. Its doctrinal statements allowed latitude for people coming from both Catholic and Protestant backgrounds, particularly concerning traditional practices (such as different beliefs about the nature of the Eucharist and the use of priestly attire), but still maintained a Protestant theology that adhered to the fundamentals (including salvation by faith alone). Elizabeth I’s reforms included making herself (and subsequently any reigning English monarch) Supreme Governor of the Church of England, use of the 1571 Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion and the Book of Common Prayer, and adherence to a decidedly Reformed theology that adhered to the basic tenets of the Reformation.

The Puritans, as staunch Reformed believers coming out of Geneva under John Calvin and his successor, Theodore Beza (i.e., adherents of Calvinism), adopted a firm policy of repudiation of all things Catholic, and felt that the Queen did not make a complete enough Reformation. Their refusal to conform to the Elizabethan Settlement resulted in many imprisonments and fines for the more stalwart Puritans (including Thomas Cartwright, John Field, and others such as Henry Barrow, who were executed for their beliefs). Puritans attempted to address their grievances while working within the system. Nonetheless, the wide gamut of

responses to Elizabeth included even more extreme groups, like the Separatists, who sought absolutely no compromise with the system and fled abroad, including to America.

Eventually, many Puritans followed the Separatists to the American colonies once the latter were firmly established on both sides of the Atlantic. Understanding the Puritans requires considering the way their Protestant beliefs shaped their participation and/or support of pivotal events in the history of the entire early modern Atlantic World, including the development of the Thirteen Colonies, the English Civil War, and the Glorious Revolution. It is also important to understand the ripple effect these events created on both sides of the Atlantic, as well as how the Puritans could and did affect each other across American colonies in a similar manner. As shall be discussed, many scholars over the twentieth century conceived of the Puritans in England and America as decidedly separate movements, but this is not accurate. Puritanism was a transatlantic movement that sought to purify the Church of England and to achieve a more complete Reformation that adhered to the Scripture alone as the rule of faith and exemplify godliness. Puritans on both sides of the Atlantic shared the goal of reforming the Church of England and producing a more godly English society (which would have included England and her colonies).

When Puritans crossed the Atlantic Ocean to populate the Thirteen Colonies (whether the Massachusetts Bay Colony, Virginia, Maryland, or others), they did so as loyal subjects of England who wanted a place to freely practice their religion. They never stopped their efforts at reforming the Church of England, nor did they stop seeing themselves as Englishmen. Neither did the Crown. As a result, if the Crown took measures that could affect Puritans in England, it could also affect Puritans in the colonies. In addition, if the Puritans in England became involved in a conflict, colonial Puritans often saw it as their duty to support their comrades in the mother

country. Colonial Puritans also knew that if England was reformed in their image (politically and religiously), this would have positive effects not only on the nation itself, but also the colonies. This was particularly true of Virginia and Maryland, where Puritans struggled against the established religious authorities of the Church of England for reform. A study of the struggles of Southern Puritans is critical to understanding the weight of the Puritans' conflict with the Church of England. Eventually, following the English Civil War, the Puritans temporarily achieved what they wanted in England. Nevertheless, their inability to agree on key matters concerning the government of England led to the collapse of the Commonwealth of England and much infighting within the movement in the decades that followed.

The Puritans were actively attempting to complete the English Reformation. They sought no middle ground, but to fully advance the Reformation to its logical conclusions. This firm resolve frequently put the Puritans at odds with the Crown and the Church of England, whether in the mother country or the colonies.

The Beginning of the Puritan Conflict

Elizabeth I, upon taking the throne, brought a doctrinal form of Protestantism back to England. In the Act of Supremacy of 1559, she forbade appeals to the Pope instead of the Crown for ecclesiastical matters.[3] She gave priority and prerogative back to the Crown, reversing the Catholic reforms of her sister, Mary I. She brought back "communion in both kinds" and forbade irreverence toward the "Sacrament of the Altar" (communion).[4] In 1559, she restored the liturgy of Edward VI, including the use of the Book of Common Prayer, Matins, Evensong, and

---

[3] Elizabeth I, "Act of Supremacy of 1559," in Henry Gee and Hardy, William J., eds., *Documents Illustrative of English Church History*, (New York: MacMillan Publishers, 1896), 444.

[4] Ibid., 446.

customary prayers before the administration of the Lord's Supper.[5] In both instances, she was attempting to reverse the reforms of Mary I, but not all of her subjects were satisfied. Anyone who did not go along with her reforms could be subject to loss of job, arrest, trial and imprisonment.[6]

These Puritans held to a rigid adherence to Calvinism, and a rejection of all things Catholic, or even simply extrabiblical traditions. As Joel Beeke, who has extensively studied Puritan theology, asserts, "Puritanism was a kind of vigorous Calvinism; experientially, it was warm and contagious; evangelistically, it was aggressive yet tender; experientially, it was theocentric and worshipful; and politically, it aimed to be scriptural and balanced."[7] Thomas Wilcox appealed to Parliament against Elizabeth on behalf of his fellow Puritans. His admonition shows that Puritans were not against use of the Book of Common Prayer in and of itself, but wanted "all and every the contents therin be such as are not repugnant to the worde of God."[8] The centrality of preaching was so important to him that he repudiated the idea of licensed preaching, celebrating saints' days, kneeling at communion, communion in one kind (bread only) and private baptism.[9] Wilcox, like those who came after him, believed the Scripture alone was sufficient for faith and practice, and repudiated any extrabiblical tradition of the Roman Catholic Church. While Elizabeth wanted to provide some latitude to different Protestant groups, and her

---

[5] Elizabeth I, "Act of Supremacy of 1559," in Gee and Hardy, eds., *Documents Illustrative of English Church History*, 459-460.

[6] Ibid., 454-460.

[7] Joel R. Beeke, Sinclair B. Ferguson, and Michael A. Haykin, *Church History 101: The Highlights of Twenty Centuries*, (Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 2016), 38.

[8] Thomas Wilcox, *Admonition to Parliament*, (Hempstead: J. Stroud, 1572).

[9] Ibid.

successors did not deviate from this, the Puritans wanted an uncompromised shift to a Reformed model of worship that included adherence to rigid biblicism. They wanted no accommodations for those coming over from Catholicism or other forms of Protestantism that still retained their elements.

The word "Puritan" from its inception proved a multifaceted one, the meaning of which depended on the theological leanings of the ones it described. While most of the Puritans that are the subject of historical scholarship were more radical in their outlook, Peter Lake also draws attention to those Puritans who took a more moderate course, most notably Edward Dering. Dering at first did not focus as much on criticizing the Church of England as advocating a New Testament ethic and the doctrine of salvation by faith alone.[10] This did not, however, stop him from calling Catholic practices "drunken dregs."[11] He also did not engage in the growing Presbyterian-Congregationalist-Episcopal debate (whether between different Puritans, or Puritans with conformist adherents to the Church of England), which was over the proper form of church government.[12] Notwithstanding, eventually Dering aligned himself with the more radical Presbyterian party while still trying to maintain a moderate doctrinal stance.[13] Lake presents Dering and Laurence Chaderton as more moderate as opposed to Thomas Cartwright and John Field, who, according to Lake were decidedly more adamant about trying to secure

---

[10] That is, his emphasis was less on what the church should not be/believe as much as it was on what it should be/believe.

[11] Edward Dering, *A Briefe and Necessarie Catechisme or Instruction, Very Needful to be Known of All Householders: Whereby They May Teach and Instruct Their Family in Such Poynts of Christian Religion as is Most Meete: With Prayers to the Same Adjoining*, (London: W. Jaggard, 1614), 9.

[12] Peter Lake, *Moderate Puritans and the Elizabethan Church*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), 19.

[13] Ibid., 19-20.

their desired reforms for a uniformity of the Church of England that would be enforced by the Crown.[14]

Thomas Cartwright is presented as a stauncher Puritan but is actually a more multifaceted figure than realized. He was notably not opposed to strictly licensed preaching to avoid the inexperienced preachers having free rein. Cartwright argued "no man can preach at his owne pleasure but by the admission of the congregation."[15] Nevertheless, contrary to those of his time who would do away with the Old Testament Law (antinomians), he argued "That all these Laws, Morall, Cermoniall, and Judiciall, being the Laws of God, and by his revealed will established, must so farre forth remaine, as it appeareth not by his will that they are revoked."[16] Cartwright was a strong advocate for living a godly life, but only wanted ministers in doctrinal alignment with the Puritan cause (but this is complicated since the various Puritan groups did not agree with one another).

Others refused to conform inasmuch as the Settlement violated the dictates of their consciences and pushed nonconformity throughout England. Of this, Richard Bancroft was one of the most notorious critics. He wanted all of England to know the inconsistencies with the

---

[14] Lake, *Moderate Puritans and the Elizabethan Church*, 23.

[15] Thomas Cartwright, *Certaine Articles, Collected and Taken (as it is Thought) by the Bishops out of a Little Boke Entitled An Admonition to the Parliament, With an Answere to the Same. Contayning a Confirmation of the Said Boke in Short Notes*, (London: J. Stroud, 1572).

[16] Thomas Cartwright, *Helpes for the Discovery of the Truth in Pointe of Toleration: Being the Judgment of That Eminent Scholler Thomas Cartwright, Sometimes Divinity-Professor in the University of Cambridge in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth of Happy Memory, and Then a Famous Non-conformist, for Which Through the Tyranny of the Bishops he Suffered Exile. Wherein the Power and Duty of the Magistrate in Relation to Matters of Religion is Discussed; as Also Whether the Judiciall Laws Given to Moses to the Jewes are Abrogate by the Coming of Christ. More Particularly in Relation to Some Sinnes, viz. Blasphemy, Adultery, &c. Occasionally Handled in a Controversy Between the Said Publike Professor T.C. and Doctor Whitgift. Here Also by the way is Laid Downe his Judgment in the Case of Divorce, and That the Party Innocent may Marrie Again*, (London: Thomas Banks, 1648), 2.

Presbyterian movement.[17] Bancroft did not believe the authenticity of Puritanism and expanded on multiple issues on which the Puritans (notably Presbyterians) did not agree. He noted that the Presbyterians (and in this was specifically most critical of Cartwright) could not agree on whether to call their form of church government, "Eldership, or consistory, or Synod."[18]

Bancroft states that the Puritans also could not agree among themselves as to whether to have "pastors and doctors" or to "divide Prophets, into pastors, and doctors."[19] He states further they could not agree on what to call their clergy, while some preferred to strictly use the title "elders" and others interchanged between this one as well as, "Prophets, Bishops, Ministers, Pastors, and Deacons."[20] Additionally, Bancroft says that the elders could be "Bishops and Deacons" or "Bishops and Elders," critical of the confusion that came with the title.[21] Bancroft was careful to note all inconsistencies he saw and believed the movement was full of confusion. Presbyterians briefly declined in influence in the wake of the Marprelate Controversy (which criticized episcopacy as a continuation of Catholicism in the Church of England), in which some of the Presbyterians' failed attempts to draw attention to their anonymous criticism of the Church

---

[17] However, it is important to note that Bancroft's quarrel was not merely with the inconsistencies of the Puritan movement. Bancroft saw the Puritans as a threat to the established order and used their inconsistencies to help his discrediting them in the eyes of the average English Protestant.

[18] Bancroft was highly critical of the Genevan Consistory under John Calvin and Theodore Beza and used any opportunity he could find to publicize his criticisms thereof. He wanted to portray the Presbyterians as closet authoritarians who wanted to force conformity, not true to the title of nonconformist at all (Richard Bancroft, *A Survey of the Pretended Holy Discipline. Contayning the Beginnings, Success, Parts, Proceedings, Authority, and Doctrine of it, With Some of the Manifold, and Materiall Repugnances, Varieties and Uncertainties in That Behalfe*, (London: John Wolfe, Thomas Scarlet, and Richard Field, 1593), 88, 92-93).

[19] Bancroft believed both of these notions were faulty at best (Ibid., 150).

[20] Ibid., 158-159.

[21] Ibid., 166-168.

of England resulted in the hanging of John Penry.[22] Nevertheless, the Puritan movement, including the Presbyterians, continued to go forth strongly.

Laurence Chaderton, one of the translators of the Authorized Version of the Bible, though classified as a moderate, certainly argued for a full separation from Roman Catholicism, such that even a hint of Catholic practice would have been unacceptable to him. He preached to his fellow Puritans that "when as we have but a bare and idoll resemblance of them, it maketh and speaketh a manifest and loud lye: and therefore is justly called of GOD the worde of lyes."[23] Even a faint resemblance of Catholicism would have crossed the line in Chaderton's mind, which is ironic as he is usually classed as a more moderate Puritan. It can be said that even the most moderate among the Puritans were anti-Catholic in every way.

Background: One Puritan Vision?

During the reign of Elizabeth I, those who refused to conform to the Elizabethan Settlement were not a monolithic movement. Many of the more conservative Puritans fought strongly for making the Church of England more like the Church of Scotland in that it would be ruled by a plurality of elders, and for the abolition of Catholic tradition. These were known as Presbyterians.[24] Having a plurality of elders ruling over a fully Protestant Church with no hint of

---

[22] Keith L. Sprunger, *The Life of the Learned Doctor William Ames; Dutch Origins of English and American Puritanism*, (Urbana: University of Illinois Press), 16.

[23] Laurence Chaderton, *An Excellent and Godly Sermon Most Needful for This Time, Wherein we Live in all Securitie and Sinne, to the Great Dishonour of God, and Contempt of His Holy Word*, (London: Christopher Barker, 1578).

[24] The Scottish Presbyterians also owed their origins to John Calvin and the spread of the Swiss Reformation. Their beliefs were very similar to the English Presbyterians, in that they were both staunch Calvinists who believed in a full purging of all Catholic elements from the church in order to make it fully Protestant. They also believed in a plurality of elders to rule for church government. The situation in Ireland during this time was also complicated. While the Irish had been predominantly Catholic, Protestantism was making its way into Ireland, most notably in the form of Presbyterianism. This gave Charles I incentive to try and push for a full Protestant unity of the model of the Church of England.

Catholicism, they felt, was viable in that it allowed for a group of leaders making decisions because of meetings rather than all decisions coming from a single minister.[25] Collinson identified this staunch Presbyterianism with the more militant wing of the movement. Some other Puritans maintained that the Church of England's episcopal (bishop-led) model was correct, which Collinson notes was common ground with the emerging Anglican establishment, and others preferred a more Congregational model, or were exasperated with the whole situation and ended up separating from the Church of England altogether.[26] These latter did so out of disgust for what they considered apostasy plaguing the Church of England.

Puritans were conceived, among themselves and their opponents, as those who were dissatisfied with the Elizabethan Settlement, which allowed for some latitude for those who held to some beliefs and practices in common with the Roman Catholic Church and wanted a more complete Reformation. Notwithstanding, the Puritans themselves did not agree on how this looked. As a result, they would often exclude one another if they felt one group or the other went too far in what they were doing (such as Presbyterians and non-separating Congregationalists excluding the Separatist Brownists, who had formerly been seen as being Puritans inside and outside Puritan circles). Though the movement was fractured, all the different Christians who could have been identified with the name Puritan had in common their desire to see the Church of England purged of Catholicism (whether they still felt this possible or chose to separate and

---

[25] Presbyterians included men like Thomas Cartwright, and Episcopalians eventually came to include men like the Puritan Archbishop George Abbot, who was one of the translators of the Authorized Version, known today as the King James Version of the Bible. Congregationalists initially included men such as Henry Barrow. Originally, the Congregationalists were also Separatists. However, this was eventually not always the case (Patrick Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967), 105-106).

[26] Ibid., 103.

repudiate their association therewith) and become completely Protestant in practice and not only in name.

Those called "Puritan" at first (before "Separatist") were not always in favor of reforming the Church of England. These included men such as Henry Barrow, Robert Browne and Francis Johnson. Eventually, a group of them went to Plymouth known as the "Pilgrims." As Separatists, they presented a challenge for Puritans, who felt the former went too far (notably Thomas Cartwright felt this way).[27] Nevertheless, the Separatists persisted well into the seventeenth century both in America and in England/Europe.

The disagreements between the different strands of Puritanism had potential to get out of hand, but Dering did his best to keep himself from the internal squabbles, as Lake presents him. Lake presents Puritans who thought like him as "challenging the status quo," yet wanting to keep their roles in the Church of England untouched.[28] Lake's presentation of the different types of early Puritans can lead many to think that a moderate Puritan did not believe as strongly that the Church of England deserved a total break from Roman Catholicism, and that ministers needed to push their congregations in this direction. In fact, moderate Puritans did believe these two tenets down to the smallest detail.

Under Elizabeth's successor, James I, the Puritans faced far more controversies. James wanted a united Church of England (and favored the structure of the Church of England as it was already established to this end), and so he was willing to elevate both Puritans and Catholics alike to greater positions of ecclesiastical authority, provided they were willing to conform to the

---

[27] Chaderton, *An Excellent and Godly Sermon*, 7.

[28] Lake, *Moderate Puritans and the Elizabethan Church*, 4.

degree with which he was comfortable.[29] James's reforms elevated many to power and saw some Puritans even conform and become bishops, yet still maintaining a distinctively Puritan theological outlook, including staunch biblicism and adherence to Reformed theology.[30] This was part of James's efforts to continue some of the accommodations that Elizabeth I had previously made for different Protestants in England. Despite James's efforts for ecclesiastical unity, disunity persisted first in the Church of England (viz., the Puritans were initially an internal conflict of the Church of England), and then among the Puritans who could not agree on how to dissent from the Elizabethan Settlement. This disunity persisted into the 1640s, when the English Civil War broke out. As Puritans found new opportunities to spread their message and come closer to achieving their goals of reforming the Church of England, the events of the 1630s and 1640s would put this ambition to the test.

Conformity or lack thereof to the Church of England was a multifaceted topic. As a result, Puritans' unwillingness to conform often took on multiple shapes and sizes. There were those who were most willing to conform on certain issues (who supported the Anglican Church's overall structures and wanted only minimal changes), those that wanted some structural changes but only what made the Church of England align with Reformed Churches abroad (known as Presbyterians), and those who wanted little to no conformity and more autonomy (Congregationalists). There were also Separatists (who, though classified as Puritans at first, eventually became recognized as a more distinct group, but were still good, confessional Congregationalists who wanted complete autonomy). Lastly, there were the Radicals, who did

---

[29] Daniel W. Doerksen, *Conforming to the Word: Herbert, Donne, and the English Church Before Laud*, (Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 1997), 20.

[30] Ibid.

not confessionalize in the traditional sense and rejected all forms outside their own communities (Quakers, Anabaptist groups such as the Mennonites, etc.).

It is essential to understand that politics and religion in this period were inextricably linked. As a result, political and religious belief often synchronized. Thus, one's political philosophy could be the result, or an essential component, of one's theology. The history of the Puritans is a critical part of the history of the Reformation, which is itself a history of the development of the notion that resistance to tyrants is obedience to God, which was a favorite motto of the American Founders.

Scholars tend to cover the Puritan movement in England and make attempts to define it, as well as trace its history throughout the Tudor and Stuart monarchs, and then trace its history to the colonies, but often do not interconnect the two. Others tend to focus on the Puritans in the Massachusetts Bay Colony and its history, development, and decline. Some of these historians have connected events in England with America and vice-versa, but do not acknowledge the transatlantic nature of the Puritan movement. That is, they do not see the Puritans of the Massachusetts Bay Colony and the Puritans of England as the same movement on different sides of the Atlantic, but as two separate movements, each with its own focus. This most likely is because many historians place the story of the Puritans in the development of revolutionary ideology and American freedom without considering its own nature as a transatlantic movement.

To study the Puritan movement from a transatlantic perspective is to better understand the history of seventeenth-century England. Events such as the development of the Thirteen Colonies, the English Civil War, and the Glorious Revolution are easier understood if one considers their developments in England and her colonies. In addition, the works of William Ames and William Perkins were critical in the Puritans' fight against Laudianism and

Arminianism, which created issues for Puritans on both sides of the Atlantic. When considering the magnitudinous effects of the Glorious Revolution, many do not consider the impact of this event on the American colonies or that of the colonies on the Glorious Revolution. Even after William and Mary seized power, many colonists were still not satisfied with the progress made, and as a result, colonists in several places revolted against established colonial authorities the English had put in place. This is more significant than most historians have considered and must be evaluated to truly understand the transatlantic nature of Puritanism. Puritanism was not merely a distinctly English or American movement, but a transatlantic movement to reform the Church of England in all its established locations that had common goals on all sides of the Atlantic World.

Historiography

The early historians of the Puritans were decisively hostile in nature. In contrast, Daniel Neal wrote a thorough history of the Puritans (published from 1732 to 1738 over four volumes) that covered the period from the Protestant Reformation to 1689. In his work, entitled *The History of the Puritans, or Protestant Nonconformists*, he highlighted several differences between the members of the established Church of England, whom he called "court reformers," and the Puritans. Neal claimed the difference between the two was in the way both parties viewed the Bible as well as how they viewed the role of the civil magistrate in church affairs. He argued that the Puritans, unlike the "court reformers," rejected any claim the Pope made as though it had come from the Antichrist. They also rejected any claims of the Roman Catholic Church, as well as the role of the civil authorities in regulating ecclesiastical affairs, arguing that they should instead leave it to church authorities to handle.[31] Neal also placed strong emphasis

[31] Daniel Neal, *The History of the Puritans, or Protestant Nonconformists*, (Buffalo: Harper, 1844), 78-79.

on the Calvinistic doctrines they preached.[32] He drew attention to the aspects of the Puritans that would capture the interests of those of his readers looking for a group more aligned with the Protestant Reformation and its goals and spoke in the Puritans' favor throughout the text. Nevertheless, his work did not come without its vehement challengers.[33]

Isaac Maddox directly challenged Neal's argument after the latter published his first volume. Maddox did so in 1733, with *A Vindication of the Government, Doctrine and Worship of the Church of England, Established in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth…Against the Injurious Reflections of Mr. Neal, in his Late History of the Puritans*. Maddox argued that the Puritans were intolerant and far from innocent, and argued in favor of the Church of England as being on the right side of the religious and political issues. He portrayed the Puritans, like others before and after him, as divisive and as launching a direct assault on true Christianity, which should be left as it had been established during the Reformation (whatever that meant).[34] Maddox and Zachary Grey, earlier in 1720, argued against the Puritans in favor of the Church of England. Later historians took broader approaches, as some research interests went beyond the scope of the religious and political disputes.

In the nineteenth century, histories of the Puritans began to take more positive approaches that vindicated, rather than condemned them. Benjamin Brook, in 1813, chronicled the history of the development of the Puritans and some of the opposition that arose in *The Lives of the*

---

[32] Neal, *History of the Puritans*, 425-426.

[33] Prior to Neal's first volume, Zachary Grey contended for Queen Elizabeth and the Church of England in 1720 in *A Vindication of the Church of England*. He harshly denounced the Puritans as disobedient and rebellious people who refused to obey the mandates of the crown "tho' it put 'em in rebellion" (Zachary Grey, *A Vindication of the Church of England*, (John Wyat: 1720), 59-60).

[34] Isaac Maddox, *A Vindication of the Government, Doctrine, and Worship of the Church of England, Established in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth* (A. Bettesworth and C. Hitch: 1733), 3-9.

Puritans. He acknowledged the various people who were against the Puritans, including some of the earlier histories that went against them. Brook went against those who put them down, and said that the Puritans wanted recognition, but were not as rebellious as their opponents portrayed them.[35] William Maxwell Hetherington also defended the Puritans in 1853 in *History of the Westminster Assembly of Divines*. Hetherington sought to vindicate them as oppressed people simply trying to bring reform to its appropriate conclusions.[36] He also presented the Puritans who emigrated to the American colonies as doing so for "no hope of redress," and that during this time, those in England recognized that their original approach to furthering the English Reformation was not going to work. Some decided to separate from the Church of England entirely, and Hetherington presents the Church of England as caring little for "religious duties" because they did not carry out the Puritans' reforms.[37] He displayed the Puritans as against those in the Church of England who oppressed them and refused to consider their reforms.

The Whig historians were a major school of thought that took a multifaceted view of the actions of the Puritans in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. John Burrow, providing a thorough analysis of Whig history, argues that much of it conceives of the seventeenth century as a conflict between the "Stuarts' cause with the Established Church vs. Puritan dissent," with the English Civil War looked upon negatively, with William III hailed as the "Whig hero of the Glorious Revolution."[38] Whig historians tended to be negative toward the actions the Puritans took from their inception to the English Civil War, but favorable toward the Glorious

---

[35] Benjamin Brook, *The Lives of the Puritans*, (J. Black: 1813), 117.

[36] William M. Hetherington, *History of the Westminster Assembly of Divines*, (New York: Robert Carter & Brothers, 1853), 35.

[37] Ibid., 59-60.

[38] John W. Burrow, *A Liberal Descent: Victorian Historians and the English Past*, (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 15-16.

Revolution. For example, Henry Hallam and Thomas Babington Macaulay, early Whig historians, present the Puritans in a negative light as overly scrupulous and rigid, and the cause of many of the political troubles of England during the seventeenth century.[39] David Hume, critical of the Whigs yet using similar historical methodology, was also sharply critical of the Puritans, blaming their problems exclusively on their scrupulosity.[40] George Bancroft, an early historian of the United States and its origins, presented the Puritans as refusing to adhere to any "church ceremony" that did not have some validation by the word of God.[41] George Brodie, in a comprehensive history of England, presents the Puritans as against the Roman Catholic Church and frequently questioning ecclesiastical policy in the Church of England, and faults Cromwell's program in England as not truly in the people's best interests no matter how he claimed to present it.[42] John Millar, in a political history of the English government, takes note of the Puritans' occupation with Parliament and contention with most ecclesiastical policies, presents it as the logical conclusions of Puritans' oppositional tendencies and determination to overthrow existing structures of the monarchy, particularly which gave the monarch an unquestioned elevation above his subjects without any checks on the power thereof.[43] He also presents the

---

[39] Henry Hallam, *The Constitutional History of England: From the Accession of Henry VII to the Death of George II*, vol. 2(Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 27, 55, 132; Thomas B. Macaulay, *The History of England*, vol. 2 (Columbia, NY: Columbia University, 1899), 211, 219.

[40] David Hume, *The History of England*, vol. 5 (Online Liberty Fund, Accessed November 20, 2022, https://oll.libertyfund.org/title/hume-the-history-of-england-vol-5).

[41] George Bancroft, *History of the Colonization of the United States*, vol. 1 (Boston, MA: Little Brown and Company, 1859), 279.

[42] George Brodie, *A Constitutional History of the British Empire From the Accession of Charles I. to the Restoration…Including a Particular Examination of Mr. Hume's Statements Relative to the Character of the English Government*, (London, UK: Longmans and Green, 1866), 381, 459.

[43] John Millar, et. al., *An Historical View of the English Government*, vol. 3 (Indianapolis, IN: Online Liberty Fund, 2006), 539.

Glorious Revolution as the logical conclusion of the Whigs' exposure of James II's conspiracy to bring England back under the authority of the Pope, which was a logical conclusion of their positions against absolutism.[44]

The first balanced approach came with William Henry Stowell in 1878 with *History of the Puritans in England*. He presented a multifaceted history of the Puritans that examined all sides of the debate, but still attempted to vindicate them. Stowell saw their views as more conclusive to the English Reformation, and their opponents as unjustly persecuting them. He claimed that their objection to the Church of England was not in their required adherence to it. Rather, he argues that their objection was to the "level of conformity" expected of them (i.e., conformity to customs they deemed a product of Catholicism), hence the historic title "nonconformists."[45] Alexander Ferrier Mitchell also wrote positively of the Puritans in his 1900 work, *The Scottish Reformation: Its Epochs, Epistles, Leaders and Characteristics*. He presented the Puritans as a "distinct school" formed in Geneva during the Marian exile, and more aligned to "patristic theology," viz., closer to the historic Christian faith in their revisions of the Westminster Confession of Faith.[46] However, the view of these historians was not the uniform view held in the nineteenth century.

John Waddington also took a more balanced approach to the Puritans in 1863 with *Congregational Church History: From the Reformation to 1662*. Nonetheless, Waddington's tone was not the same as Stowell's became in 1878. In his work, Waddington affirmed the Puritans as being victims of intolerance while in England but contended that once they and the

---

[44] Millar, et. al., *An Historical View of the English Government*, vol. 3, 440.

[45] William H. Stowell, *History of the Puritans in England* (1878), 100.

[46] Alexander F. Mitchell, *The Scottish Reformation: Its Epochs, Epistles, Leaders and Distinctive Characteristics*, (Project Gutenberg: 2007), accessed August 15, 2020, http://www.gutenberg.org/files/22023/22023-h/22023-h.htm.

Separatists who settled at Plymouth crossed the Atlantic, "acts of intolerance," were an accurate description of the Puritans' own conduct.[47] Waddington noticed the change in tone once the Puritans immigrated to North America. With the exception of Waddington, Hume, and the Whig historians, most historians of the nineteenth century either did more to try to vindicate the Puritans or set them in the background of a more radical Reformation, such as Ranters, Shakers, or Quakers.

By the twentieth century, historians developed broader research interests, and took wider and more varied approaches to studying the Puritans. John Brown, in 1900, in *Puritan Preaching in England: Past and Present*, presented a different take on the Puritans than simply an examination of their religious motives that would vindicate or condemn them. He argued that the authors of the Puritan movement were nearly all "university educated men" and portrayed the early Puritans as intellectually gifted individuals who used their positions of power to make numerous conversions throughout the universities.[48] Brown produced an additional work in 1906 entitled: *The Pilgrim Fathers of New England and Their Puritan Successors*. Here, he argued that the reason why Christianity was so important to the American founding had directly to do with a "mass exodus of Puritans from England to America," which included the Massachusetts Bay Colony and eventually other parts of the North American continent.[49] Brown focused primarily on the character of their religion as well as their influence on the religious life of early modern England and early America.

---

[47] John Waddington, *Congregational Church History: From the Reformation to 1662*, (Jackson, Walford, and Hodder: 1863), 129.

[48] John Brown, *Puritan Preaching in England: A Study of Past and Present*, (New York: C. Scibner's Sons, 1900), 38.

[49] John Brown, *The Pilgrim Fathers of New England and their Puritan Successors*, (London: Religious Tract Society, 1906), 311-312.

Perry Miller and Edmund Morgan both sought to understand the Puritans from the standpoint of intellectual history, primarily focusing on the ones who settled in America. Miller's major works included *Orthodoxy in Massachusetts, 1630-1650: A Genetic Study* (1933), *The New England Mind: The Seventeenth Century* (1939), *The New England Mind: From Colony to Province* (1953), and *Errand Into the Wilderness* (1956). He showed that the Puritans founded the laws of their colony upon the Bible as a "practical guide."[50] He argued that the Puritan colony was founded on "eternal and immutable principles," but simultaneously points out that while Puritan ministers regularly criticized the way their congregants lived with injunctions against what they considered sin, they never once warned their flock to steer clear of material pursuits, and in fact encouraged Protestants to prosper materially by working as hard as they possibly could.[51] Miller recognized the Puritans' value of hard work here and offered a unique take on it. He did not acknowledge the Protestant work ethic as far as Puritans are concerned.[52] Nevertheless, he recognized how much the Puritans valued hard work and imparted its importance to their congregants.

Miller also argued that the Puritans' efforts to establish the unique kind of colony they did were tighter in control than the Stuart monarchy could have ever conceived. He also argued that their foundational statements in which their political philosophy was evidence of a power grab rather than an attempt to advocate democratic or republican principles.[53] He saw the

---

[50] Perry Miller, *Orthodoxy in Massachusetts, 1630-1650: A Genetic Study*, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1933), 159-160.

[51] Perry Miller, *The New England Mind: From Colony to Province*, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1983), 38-41.

[52] The concept of a "Protestant work ethic" among historians owes itself to Max Weber, a socialist historian who directly linked Protestant theology and ethic with the pursuit of capitalism and acquisition of material wealth (Max Weber, *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, [New York: Routledge Classics, 1930], 3-7).

Puritans as power-hungry in a political sense but paid more attention to their political philosophy.

As his student, Edmund Morgan took a similar approach to Miller. His major works included *The Puritan Family: Religion and Domestic Relations in 17th-Century New England* (1944), *The Puritan Dilemma: The Story of John Winthrop* (1958), and *Visible Saints-The History of a Puritan Idea* (1963). Morgan argued that Puritanism stressed holy living.[54] In his research into the development of the Puritans, he argued that their desire was to purify the Church of England from any Catholic elements, which encompassed most of the common rituals, and to have a church that was composed of people living the way they ought to, with a strong and central focus on preaching in their worship, as opposed to the taking of communion that the Church of England centralized.[55] He also noted they were very family-oriented, and had a focus on preserving their faith for the younger generations.[56] The development of the Massachusetts Bay Colony, according to Morgan, was noteworthy in that while the Crown still maintained sovereignty over the colony and its sponsoring company, the company could relocate, which would reduce the risk of the Crown taking over the colony directly because of any perceived excesses.[57] In this way, the Massachusetts Bay Colony could be in blatant violation of the

---

[53] Miller, *The New England Mind*, 119-120.

[54] Edmund S. Morgan, *Puritanism Enlightened: The Life of Ezra Stiles, 1727-1735*, (Raleigh: University of North Carolina Press, 1962), 169.

[55] Edmund S. Morgan, *Visible Saints: The History of a Puritan Idea*, (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1963), 5-7.

[56] Edmund S. Morgan, *The Puritan Family*, (New York: Harper Scroll and Company, 1944), 168-169.

[57] Edmund S. Morgan, *The Puritan Dilemma: The Story of John Winthrop*, (Boston: Little Brown and Company, 1958), 59-60.

Church of England as well as the Crown and remain undetected. While Miller and Morgan examined the Puritans as intellectual historians, another examined them as a Marxist historian.

Christopher Hill examined the Puritans as a Marxist historian. His major works included *Puritanism and Revolution: The English Revolution of the Seventeenth Century* (1958) and *Society and Puritanism in Pre-Revolutionary England* (1964). Hill agreed with those writing before him that a Puritan was someone who wanted to purify the Church of England from within.[58] He also claimed that the word "Puritan" was a broad term that could take on multiple meanings, whether theological, social, political, etc.[59] He further argued that the local church was connected to "poor law and poor relief" because of the poor relying economically on it.[60] Ultimately, he claimed that the "godly" working class supported Puritanism because "it seemed to point the way to heaven because it helped them to live on earth."[61] Hill's research focus was on the economic and social aspects of Puritanism, which included the way it related to the Church of England but also to the common people. He further claimed that the English Civil War was over a strong clash of political philosophy between monarchists who valued the control of a state church and its persecuted dissidents who believed firmly in "the independence of free man."[62] Hill placed the Puritans' struggles in the ongoing struggle between the ruler and ruled. Although Hill, Miller, and Morgan deviated from the earlier religious histories of Puritanism,

---

[58] Christopher Hill, *Society and Puritanism in Pre-Revolutionary England*, (New York: Schocken Books, 1964), 17.

[59] Ibid., 24.

[60] Ibid., 429.

[61] Ibid., 511.

[62] Christopher Hill, *Puritanism and Revolution: The English Revolution of the 17th Century*, (New York: Schocken Books, 1958), 127.

they still held to the idea that, in some form, the Puritans were a radical group. Nonetheless, even this concept was eventually called into question.

Patrick Collinson challenged the standard view on the Puritans and presented a new interpretation. His major works included, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement* (1967), *The Religion of Protestants: The Church in English Society, 1559-1625* (1982), *Godly People: Essays on Protestantism or Puritanism* (1983), and (published posthumously) *Richard Bancroft and Anti-Elizabethan Puritanism* (2013). He claimed that the Church of England and the Puritans each accused each other of going along with the "folly of the people," but in both cases "people" referred to the "people of God."[63] Both sides knew their religious beliefs were incompatible with what the majority believed. He went on to claim that many laypeople among the Puritans "had no deep attachment to the gospel and were profoundly ignorant of its content," but still regularly attended church while partaking in things such as dancing, which the Puritans considered improper for Christians to do, noting that there was often a contrast between "popular religion" and the official beliefs to which the Puritans subscribed.[64]

In defining who the Puritans were, Collinson argued that they saw the Church of England as only having "reformed halfway," and saw their own beliefs and practices as a more complete reform due to their insistence on a complete separation from the elements of Catholicism that the Church of England had retained. In saying this, Collinson did not seem to believe they were much different from the Church of England, at least not enough to be considered radical.

---

[63] Patrick Collinson, *The Religion of Protestants: The Church in English Society, 1559-1625*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982), 189-190.

[64] Ibid., 200-205.

Collinson argued the Puritans believed the Church of England could only reach its fullest potential by removing Catholic elements.[65] While Collinson gave details on the multiple stripes of Puritanism in his work, he noted that the Puritans were "not excessively reliant upon either clerical or aristocratic leadership."[66] While the term "puritanism" certainly describes a different set of beliefs and practices than the Church of England, Collinson claimed that any history of the Church of England must include Puritanism, and he did not conceive of the Puritans as separate from the Church of England.[67] Collinson believed the Puritans were an important part of the history of the Church of England, but did not believe it was because they were an entirely separate group. He saw them rather as a faction within that may have aspired to be radical, but their members were not always so individually radical.

Collinson argued that the Puritans often saw themselves as separate from the mainstream Church of England and preferred the appellation "godly," but how separate they saw themselves was often relative, noting that some parishioners "refused to take communion from their own minister."[68] Collinson noted that the Puritans had in common with the French Protestants the adherence to John Calvin's doctrine, and shared various forms of worship with them.[69] Collinson also gave a critical examination of contemporaries like Richard Bancroft, who sharply criticized the Puritans in their early years. He went against Bancroft's portrayal of the Puritans as rebellious and treasonous by showing that their "Book of Discipline" was not universally

---

[65] Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 12.

[66] Ibid., 94.

[67] Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 497.

[68] Patrick Collinson, *Godly People: Essays on English Protestantism and Puritanism*, (New York: Bloomsbury Publishing Place, 2003), 5-9.

[69] Ibid., 247.

accepted among the Puritans and had a great deal of controversy about it.[70] Collinson's assessment of Puritanism was thorough and had a goal to understand them for who they were but challenged traditional interpretations of them being radical. He argued instead that though certain members may have taught or argued something, not all Puritans believed the same thing.

Peter Lake is the foremost living scholar of early Puritans in England and shares the idea that the Puritans were not a monolithic group. His major works include *Moderate Puritans in the Elizabethan Church* (1982) and *Anglicans and Puritans?-Presbyterianism and English Conformist Thought From Whitgift to Hooker* (1984). Like the others, he argues that the Puritans believed the Church of England had not fully departed from Roman Catholicism, and their beliefs and actions were the result of that dissatisfaction.[71] He argues that many things regarded typically as Puritan were actually part of mainstream religious belief in England and that the Church of England under Elizabeth I was every bit as Calvinist and anti-Catholic as anyone could have hoped.[72] This was so because the Church of England considered itself a Reformed Church, which to the Puritans, lent credibility to the idea that they were the one true Church and all others were impostors. He notes that one of the earliest differences the Church of England and its dissenters experienced was on the nature of "the visible and invisible church."[73] That is, their disagreement was over the two different churches, i.e., the physical assembly of Christians and

---

[70] Patrick Collinson, *Richard Bancroft and Elizabethan Anti-Puritanism*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 85-87.

[71] Peter Lake, *Moderate Puritans and the Elizabethan Church*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), 56.

[72] Peter Lake, *Anglicans and Puritans?: Presbyterianism and English Conformist Thought from Whitgift to Hooker*, (London: Unwin Hyman, 1988), 105.

[73] Ibid., 28.

the invisible body of believers since the beginning of Christianity. The dispute was as to which one constituted the real church that needed to be adhered to with all diligence and created publicized theological controversies in England. While Collinson and Lake challenged existing paradigms about the Puritans, still others have attempted to go back to the religious history surrounding them.

Francis Bremer hints at the Puritans being a transatlantic movement, particularly in the early years leading up to the English Civil War. He argues for the role of lay empowerment being critical in Puritanism's development.[74] Other major works of his include *Puritanism-A Very Short Introduction* (2009), *First Founders-American Puritans and Puritanism in an Atlantic World* (2014), and *The Puritan Experiment-New England Society from Bradford to Edwards* (2013). In addition, David Hackett Fischer also explores the Puritans from a transatlantic perspective. His significant major work for this type of study is *Albion's Seed, Four British Folkways to America* (1989), in which he argues for the Puritans of Massachusetts as a transplanted group from England that formed the basis for American political culture.[75] Both of these scholars have left substantive and lasting contributions to the field with their fundamental understanding of Puritans on both sides of the Atlantic.

David Hall explored the Puritans more directly from a transatlantic perspective in *Puritans-A Transatlantic History* (2019). He was, along with Winship, who showed the same thing in *Hot Protestants* in 2019, among the first to note outright that the Puritans were a transatlantic religious movement and examines their history on both sides of the Atlantic.

---

[74] Francis J. Bremer, *Lay Empowerment and the Development of Puritanism*, (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2015), 4.

[75] David H. Fischer, *Albion's Seed: Four British Folkways in America*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989), 6.

Puritans, Hall argues, after a lengthy contention with Charles I resulting in the departure of some to Massachusetts, were very concerned with protecting the interests of their church from the English monarchy, which resulted in anyone wanting to establish a new church in Massachusetts had to check with the local government.[76] Puritans wanted a complete breakaway from Catholicism and a return to true religion, and this governed the way they functioned as a community once they came to colonial America as well as the religious and political actions the ones who remained in England took in the name of true religion.

Michael Winship also explores the Puritans, both in England and the American colonies. His major works include *Making Heretics-Militant Protestantism and Free Grace in Massachusetts, 1636-1641* (2002), *Puritans Divided-The Times and Trials of Anne Hutchinson* (2005), *Godly Republicanism-Puritans, Pilgrims, and a City on a Hill* (2012), and *Hot Protestants-A History of Puritanism in England and America* (2018). He also wrote an article for *The New England Quarterly*, "Were There Any Puritans in New England?" (2001). Winship made careful note of the reign of Edward VI, whom he noted was "serious about his Protestantism" and a multitude of Protestant advisors surrounded him who sought to purge the Church of England of Catholicism, also noting the replacement of the traditional Catholic mass with a preaching service and the absence of traditional Catholic doctrine.[77] Winship noted further, that this agenda came "crashing down" when Edward died and his sister, Mary, reigned in his place.[78]

---

[76] Fischer, *Albion's Seed*, 238.

[77] Michael P. Winship, *Hot Protestants: A History of Puritanism in England and America*, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2018), 11-12.

[78] Ibid., 16-17.

Winship associated the Puritans' conflict with Elizabeth I directly with Geneva, noting specifically the reforms of John Calvin and John Knox's denunciation of female monarchs. He claimed that Elizabeth forever "associated the Puritan movement" with disloyalty to the crown and sought to remedy it.[79] Winship challenged the limited definition of the Puritans as "radical nonconformist ministers," which he argued grossly limits the term.[80] He cited the deficiencies of leadership in Charles I, the negative financial impact his reign had on the average Englishman, and Parliament's continued uncertain squabbling with Charles over freedoms that benefited Puritans as reasons why Puritans eventually began to immigrate to Massachusetts.[81]

According to Winship, the Puritans of Massachusetts often struggled internally. When deciding what to do with Roger Williams, for instance, the Puritans had to come to terms with what they truly believed about congregational autonomy. While they certainly believed that churches could not have authority over other churches, according to Winship, they also realized that Williams's message disrupted the goals of their colony.[82] Winship also notes that the Puritans could not even agree internally, citing the multiple expressions of "hot Protestantism" as a cause for how intolerant the Boston church eventually became.[83] Winship claimed the Boston church degenerated into intolerance due to a combination of internal differences and a central focus on preserving their church. Nevertheless, Winship also sees in the Puritans the early seeds

---

[79] Winship, *Hot Protestants*, 24.

[80] Michael P. Winship, "Were There any Puritans in New England?": *The New England Quarterly*, *74*, 1 (2001), 119.

[81] Ibid., 75-77.

[82] Michael P. Winship, *Puritans Divided: The Times and Trials of Anne Hutchinson* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2005), 32.

[83] Michael P. Winship, *Making Heretics: Militant Protestantism and Free Grace in Massachusetts, 1636-1641*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002), 64.

of republicanism. He notes a strong comparison of the preaching of John Cotton against the government of Charles I to the later revolutionaries' outcry against George III.[84] He based his argument on the similar rhetoric the Puritans used to the revolutionaries. Winship's interpretations were not entirely different from those that have gone before him. Nonetheless, he brought much more detail into his interpretations than earlier writers did.

Andrew Delbanco and Alan Heimert have chronicled an anthology of the American Puritans, in which they argue that many among the English saw the outbreak of Puritanism, including the struggles with William Laud and Charles I, and the repudiation of an episcopal church government, as the completion of the English Reformation.[85] Dewey Wallace, Jr., has also studied Puritanism. In *Shapers of English Calvinism, 1660-1714*, he gives brief biographies of several English Calvinists beginning at the Restoration, and presents English Calvinism as a multifaceted theological topic, but necessary to be understood in order to understand the theological developments in England from the eighteenth century onwards.[86] In *Puritanism and Predestination*, he argues that Puritan piety, theology, etc., is inextricably linked to their theology of grace and predestination, which is what drove the movement.[87] Charles Hambrick-Stowe, who studied Puritan devotional life, argues for the importance of Pietism to Puritans, and that Puritanism was at its core a devotional movement.[88] Charles Lloyd-Cohen, another historian

---

[84] Michael P. Winship, *Godly Republicanism: Puritans, Pilgrims, and a City on a Hill*, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2012), 183-184.

[85] Andrew Delbanco and Alan Heimert, eds., *The Puritans in America: A Narrative Anthology*, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1985), 6-7.

[86] Dewey D. Wallace, Jr., *Shapers of English Calvinism, 1660-1714: Variety, Persistence, Transformation*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 1-8.

[87] Dewey D. Wallace, Jr., *Puritanism and Predestination: Grace in English Protestant Theology, 1525-1695*, (Eugene: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2004), vii-xii.

of Puritan devotional life, argues that Puritan conversion produced a profound "psychological transformation" that was "fundamental to the movement."[89] Joel Beeke's work is also essential to the study, as he has studied the Reformed theology that is important in understanding Puritanism. His major works include *Reformed Systematic Theology*, *Church History 101: The Highlights of the 20th Century*, and *A Puritan Theology: Doctrine for Life*.

More recently, Rachel Monroy composed a doctoral dissertation that displayed the transatlantic networks Puritans created as they colonized the North American continent and the islands of the Caribbean. She explores the trade networks and presents them, especially in the Southern colonies, as out to make a profit as much as to ensure they could practice their religious beliefs.[90] Monroy also draws attention to how the Quakers eventually targeted the then-current and former Puritan settlements as fruitful soil for the propagation of their religious beliefs and message.

Methodology

As the topics are religious in nature, the study employed here is one of religious history, with a combination of political and social history. It involved the study of sermons and written discourses from fifteenth-century England and colonial America, legal documents of the Crown, etc. Journals of major Puritans were also consulted, as were their major theological writings (books, pamphlets, etc.). This study builds from the foundation of the work of David D. Hall, who argues that a study of the Puritans is a continuation of the study of the Reformation,

---

[88] Charles Hambrick-Stowe, *The Practice of Piety: Puritan Devotional Disciplines in Seventeenth-Century New England*, (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1986), v-viii.

[89] Charles L. Cohen, *God's Caress: The Psychology of Puritan Religious Experience*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986), 5.

[90] Rachel L. Monroy, "On the Trade Winds of Faith: Puritan Networks in the Making of an Atlantic World," (Doctoral Dissertation), University of South Carolina Charleston, 2018.

including their emigration to America.[91] While Hall recognizes the need to incorporate the English side of the study of Reformed Protestantism and the interconnection between England and Scotland and the events in England and America, he does not go as far as definitively saying Puritanism was a transatlantic movement, and does not directly combine the movements in England and America as a single movement. Nonetheless, this study makes use of Hall's research and source material to prove that Puritanism was indeed a transatlantic movement as well as that of Michael Winship on different Puritan colonies and the transatlantic nature of the Puritan movement. Winship goes into detail about the political philosophy of Puritanism and gives a history of Puritans around the Atlantic World. He attributes the cause of the failure of American Puritanism to the policies of James II. The author attributes the fall of Puritanism on both sides of the Atlantic to a lack of unity.

The events of primary focus in this study include the English Civil War, the Glorious Revolution, and associated colonial revolts, with attention to Puritan attitudes toward Catholicism on both sides of the Atlantic and how it shaped events in England and the American colonies. In particular, toward the end of the seventeenth century, there was growing unrest in the colonies as a result of fears of a Catholic coup. It focuses on the goals of the Puritans as a movement, how they went about achieving them, their attitude toward Church and Crown, their values and their fears. It makes much use of primary sources such as those of the Puritans of England during the reigns of the Stuarts, and even Separatists such as John Robinson, and takes into consideration the writings of figures of the opposing side such as Charles I, William Laud, Richard Baxter, etc. It incorporates Puritans' writings and quotations from the American colonies as well, and considers the work that other scholars previously have done (mentioned above) in

[91] David D. Hall, *The Puritans: A Transatlantic History*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2019), 10-12.

order to fully understand the Puritans and be able to effectively enter the historical conversation while offering a work of original research. It shows the Puritans as a transatlantic movement and displays the ripple effect that occurred on both sides of the Atlantic during the colonial period.

Overview of Chapters

Chapter Two provides an examination of Puritans in Virginia and Maryland (the colonial South). It studies their relationship to the colonial governments as well as the struggles they faced coming to the American colonies, particularly in light of the struggles their English counterparts faced during the reign of King James I. It details the role of Puritans in the early years of Virginia and Maryland, particularly noting their role in carrying out the mission of the First Charter of Virginia to evangelize the Native Americans, and some of the key theologians to whom they owed much of their development. Some attention is also given to the spread of Puritan influence between England, the Netherlands, and the American colonies.[92]

Chapter Three covers the causes the Puritans (and eventually, English Protestants in general) went to war with Charles I and his supporters and shows the effects of the writings of William Perkins and William Ames against the rise of Arminianism and Laudianism in England and the American colonies. These authors were more critical than previously realized in countering Charles I and William Laud and the forced subscription to the Thirty-Nine Articles that came with them, his appointed Archbishop of Canterbury and de facto theological enforcer. It shows the kind of monarch Charles I was and why his actions led to the English Civil War. It also shows how issues with Charles I and Laud affected the Puritans in the American colonies.

[92] However, it is not the purpose of this study to explore New Netherland in great detail. Some attention is given to it in Chapter 5 for context for the Leisler Rebellion. However, as New Netherland was part of the Dutch colonial empire, studying its early years is out of place, as this study is concerned with the English colonial empire.

Chapter Four explores in detail the points of contention among Puritans from the 1630s to the Restoration of Charles II. These include the Antinomian Controversy (particularly its aftermath from Massachusetts Bay), the theological issues that came up during the Westminster Assembly of Divines, and the development of the Commonwealth of England, as well as the reasons for its failure. It covers the events that occurred between the Three Kingdoms (England, Scotland, and Ireland) because of the controversy. It demonstrates that the Puritan vision of a godly England (including the English colonies) and godly Church was divided at best, and the Puritans degenerated into intolerance, not only with dissenters, but even amongst themselves. Antinomianism's continuation into England is explored, as well as its transatlantic nature. It also explores the Presbyterian vs. Congregationalist schism and touches on Puritans' internal struggles in the mother country and the colonies. It concludes with the Restoration of the Stuarts. Some focus is devoted to Oliver Cromwell and his leadership, and how the coming of the Commonwealth of England was received among the American colonies.

Chapter Five explores the history of Puritans in England and America during the initial Restoration under Charles II. It shows the changes made in the colonies in the wake of the crisis involving the Quakers of the 1650s (including the Half-Way Covenant), and also detail the issues surrounding the Exclusion Crisis of the 1670s, and why Puritans (and most Protestants) did not want James II ruling England. Included in the analysis is an exploration of the role of the Middle Colonies in the deposition of James II. It shows the building of revolutionary tension even beyond the conclusion of the Commonwealth of England, and that the Puritans were not giving up, but persisted in their goals despite assimilation into the overall Whig cause. It gives attention to the history of the development of the Glorious Revolution while James II ruled England. It brings to center stage the revolutionary tensions around the Atlantic World because of James II

inheriting the throne. In addition to the Glorious Revolution, conflicts of focus include the Boston Revolt of 1689, the Leisler Revolt, and Coode's Rebellion, otherwise known as the Protestant Revolution of 1689 in Maryland. These events occurred due to the lack of stability leading up to the Glorious Revolution and the continued instability in the colonies while William attempted to seize his power completely during the Williamite Wars, including King William's War.

The sixth and final chapter summarizes the outcome of the Puritan epoch and critically examines whether the Puritans truly achieved what they wanted over the seventeenth century. The author aims to conclude his research in showing that the Puritans were instrumental in the history of the religious and political developments that formed the United States of America. Attention will be drawn to how the transatlantic nature of Puritanism conducted a reciprocity of events that was influential politically and religiously on both sides of the Atlantic and led to the birth of the United States of America. This was especially true with New England being the hotbed of revolutionary thought and action, and some of the rhetoric of later Massachusetts colonists that owes its origins to the fear of monarchical tyranny and episcopacy that pervaded colonial Massachusetts in the seventeenth century.

These fears of tyranny from the episcopacy and the Crown played a key role in Puritan conflict in the colonial South. Puritans in Virginia and Maryland struggled against the authority of the Crown and the Church. In these colonies, the Church of England was established. Colonists who settled in the South were part of the Church of England, which brought with it notable controversies from England, including its conflict with the Puritans.

CHAPTER TWO: The Godly Dispersed: Puritans in the Colonial South, and the Influence of Transatlantic Puritanism Across the Atlantic World

Puritans in the Colonial South

In Massachusetts, Puritans succeeded in beginning a new society where they could thrive and show the world an example of their principles in practice, to the point that many Puritans elsewhere looked to them as examples. This attitude was particularly true in the colonial south, where Puritans faced a more uphill struggle against the established authorities of the Church of England that attempted to make them conform to practices with which they were uncomfortable and could not do in good conscience.

While the New England Puritans are well-known (as much then as now), the continuing fight in the colonial south to reform the Church of England and keep away the influence of Roman Catholicism is less well-known. [1] There, Puritans sought to establish themselves like those in New England and practice Reformed Christianity with strict Calvinistic Biblicism. For this, the writings of William Ames were integral in refuting the primary theological counters to Puritanism, viz., Laudianism and Arminianism. This was true not only in the colonies, but also in the mother country. In this area, historical research is not as prominent as it should be. The Puritans' measures gained further ground on both sides of the Atlantic as the political situation in England began to shift. This was particularly true in Massachusetts. However, the Puritans of the South were significantly more reliant on the writings of theologians from England to get the job done due to the lack of capable ministers to fit their needs.

That Puritans went to the colonial south is well-researched. J. Edward Kirbye, who provided a comprehensive study on southern Puritans, argues that contrary to the popular

[1] The New England Puritans faced the same struggles as their Southern counterparts. However, they had an established colonial society, whereas the Puritans of the South were struggling against the established Church of England in their respective colonies, leaving Puritanism without the foothold its adherents desired.

categorization of Puritans in the northern colonies and Cavaliers in the south, "the largest and most influential churches in the South in colonial days were dissenting" and that Puritanism was far more influential in the economic and political development in the colonial South than most realize.[2] Kevin Butterfield, focusing his research primarily on Virginia, argues that the Puritans were more than just a presence in New England, and that they were a larger established religious movement in many of the English colonies, such that they were part of the mainstream religious movements present there.[3] Babette Levy, who gave a large compendium on Southern Puritans, argues that Puritans were critically influential in the religious development of many colonies.[4] The studies that have surfaced already show that the Puritans in the South gained momentum and influenced the political and religious climate there.

Lacking attention is a description and weighing of their efforts considering the situation on both sides of the Atlantic. This is especially true of Virginia and Maryland. Several Puritans in these colonies still held onto the hope that they could purify the Church of England from afar and have their ideal society, just as they had in New England.[5] Their efforts caused a struggle with the colonial governments. Notwithstanding, it is their endurance, despite the pushback from the Church of England, which warrants the attention it has not yet fully received. Some of this pushback had to do with a portion of the colonial Puritans, particularly in the South, wanting

---

[2] J. Edward Kirbye, *Puritanism in the Colonial South*, (Boston: Pilgrim Press, 1908), 1, 127-130.

[3] Kevin Butterfield, "The Puritan Experiment in Virginia," (College of William and Mary: Williamsburg, 2004, Doctoral Dissertation).

[4] Babette S. Levy, "Early Puritanism in the Southern and Island Colonies," *Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society, 70*, 1 (1960): 73.

[5] There were others, both in New England and the South, that would settle for no compromise with the Church of England and wanted a complete break from it, which some called "Separatists." The line between Separatists and Puritans is blurred, as these groups often acted in sync with one another.

more of a congregationalist church government, where most Anglicans and many Puritans in England still valued another form, whether an episcopal church government, or, as was becoming popular among Puritans, a presbyterian form. A study, therefore, is in order to determine what the efforts of the Puritans in the colonial south were, why they continued to push for reform even though they were in a seemingly hopeless battle with the colonial governments to do so, and how it shaped the history of colonial America. Furthermore, the Puritans in the south were more politically active than most have previously thought, which in the long run contributed to greater political success for the movement.

Puritans Settle in Early Colonial Virginia and Maryland

Unlike the Massachusetts Bay Colony, Virginia was not founded exclusively with religious purposes in mind. Several of the initial colonists came in search of profit and prosperity. Nevertheless, Christianity was still at the forefront of the purpose for the founding of the Virginia Colony. The First Charter of Virginia, which defined its purposes, notes from the beginning that one of them was to evangelize the Native American population.[6] At the time, the early settlers of Virginia were still coming in, and most of them were devout members of the Church of England.

Among these settlers were some Puritans who hoped to establish a more radical religious foundation than many early colonists of Virginia would have desired. Daniel Randall reveals that Puritanism was alive and well at Virginia's founding. He showed that as early as 1611, Virginia's population already included a company of Puritans led by Thomas Dale and Alexander Whittaker, and several of these had silently left England because of their convictions. They had made their way to the colony without incident. In Virginia, the colonial governor did

[6] "First Charter of Virginia," The Avalon Project, accessed March 19, 2022, https://avalon.law.yale.edu/17th_century/va01.asp.

not have time to devote to schisms in the Church of England, nor is there evidence that he was interested in stopping Puritans from coming, due to the necessity to ensure there was a steady stream of colonists as well as food and protection from Native American raids.[7] As a result, Puritans were able to arrive in Virginia during its early years and flourish alongside other members of the Church of England.

Alexander Whittaker, the Puritans' first minister in Virginia, urged the English people to give a financial contribution to the efforts in Virginia, particularly to evangelize the Native Americans. He urged his fellow Englishmen as would-be "adventurers" to Virginia to "cast their bread upon the waters" of Virginia (i.e., to give money to the Protestant cause there), and compared the native populations to the "popish hermits" that lived in England.[8] From Whittaker's address, it is clear that while some colonists coming to Virginia were seeking an economic venture, others, like Whittaker, came with a purpose to spread the true Christian faith, which meant they were more likely to end up among Puritan-led congregations. Whittaker attempted an appeal to those seeking adventure in the colony who also shared an awareness that there was a spiritual need present to which they could all contribute.

Puritans settled in Virginia primarily in Nansemond and Lower Norfolk counties, where they had their own parish churches and attempted to mold Virginia according to their religious model from these.[9] Despite this, Kevin Butterfield notes that not all tenets of Puritanism were as far removed from the Church of England as some would believe. He states that "Puritans were

---

[7] Daniel Randall, *A Puritan Colony in Maryland* (Baltimore: Genealogical Publishing Company, 1886), 6.

[8] Alexander Whittaker, "Good News from Virginia," accessed April 17, 2022, http://www.virtualjamestown.org/exist/cocoon/jamestown/fha/J1024.

[9] Kevin Butterfield, "The Puritan Experiment in Virginia, 1607-1650," (doctoral dissertation), Williamsburg: College of William and Mary (1999), 7.

part of the religious history of Virginia from the beginning. Adherence to Puritan sentiments and theology was not in itself religious dissent or nonconformity to the Anglican creed."[10] Instead, Puritans identified themselves as a sort of "Reformed Anglican" and wanted to be recognized as such. This definition did not include the extra-biblical traditions found in the Roman Catholic Church, which many continued to fear the Church of England had not completely rid itself of upon its separation from the former. In line with the traditional definition of Puritan, and as a reminder of what was taking place in the colonies, as Butterfield notes, Virginia Puritans were not concerned with breaking off from the Church of England, but instead wanted to reform it internally so it could be more in line with the New Testament Church.[11] As long as the Church of England held a strict adherence to Calvinism, most Puritans in the colonies were satisfied and felt they were achieving their goals.

These Virginian Puritans faced a paradox. Already, they did not have many ministers in the colony to serve their needs. To make matters worse, if the ministers even appeared Puritan, most moderate Protestants (now beginning to be associated with the term "Anglicans") did not want to listen to them. However, if the congregants were Puritan, they often had difficulty finding a suitable minister, despite their tendency to gather in large numbers.[12] This problem remained ongoing for several decades into the seventeenth century. Puritans and other dissenters first came to Virginia in 1609 and in greater numbers by 1629 (these latter including Separatists

---

[10] Butterfield, "Puritans and Religious Strife in the Early Chesapeake," 5.

[11] It is noteworthy here that in this sense the Puritans of Virginia were not like their counterparts in the Massachusetts Bay Colony. In Massachusetts, Puritans still had a heart for the Church of England and their comrades overseas and elsewhere. They dominated the religious and political sphere of Massachusetts despite still technically being under the authority of the Church of England. In Virginia, the Puritans did not dominate, and the Church of England was the established church of the colony. As a result, the reforms Puritans desired for the Church of England were as much a real and present conflict in Virginia as they had been in the mother country (Ibid., 6).

[12] Ibid., 8.

from Plymouth).[13] Their ability to settle, as other Virginians, along rivers, was not always successful. Nonetheless, their influence was such that it still caused stirs in the colony. One of these stirs occurred in 1609, when several colonists refused to attend the services of an allegedly Puritan minister, which created a division in the community.[14] Later, two of the main figures involved in further disturbances were Christopher Lawne, a former Separatist turned Puritan, and the Bennett family (Edward Bennett and his two nephews, Richard and Philip Bennett).

Christopher Lawne initially belonged to the Brownists, who were a radical group (eventually dubbed "Separatists") who sought no compromise whatsoever with the Church of England, and gave up the idea of reforming it.[15] The Brownists themselves were named for Robert Browne, their founder, who had left England after multiple arrests for his preaching.[16] Browne presented himself, despite his flight from England, as a loyal servant to his country, and did the same for those who agreed with him. He answered to anyone who wondered why they left England, "they [those conforming to the Elizabethan Settlement] are the men who trouble Israel, and seek evill to the Prince, but not we. And that they forsake and condemn the Churche and not we."[17] Browne took all the accusations the Church of England accused his congregation

---

[13] At the core of the differences between the Puritans and the Separatists was how far they were willing to go to seek a New Testament-oriented church. The Puritans, as noted earlier, were willing and actively attempting to reform the Church of England from within. Separatists, alternatively, gave up on the Church of England altogether and sought to start their own church that was free of Roman Catholic elements. It is also noteworthy that their coming to Virginia predates their arrival in Plymouth or the Massachusetts Bay Colony.

[14] J. Beaulieu to William Trumbull, 30 Nov 1609, Trumbull Manuscripts, Berkshire Record Office, Colonial Records Project, Library of Virginia (Richmond), quoted in Butterfield, "Puritans and Religious Strife in the Early Chesapeake," 8.

[15] Keith L. Sprunger, *Dutch Puritanism: A History of English and Scottish Churches of the Netherlands in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1982), 29.

[16] Ibid., 29.

[17] Robert Browne, *A Treatise of Reformation Without Tarrying for any and of the Wickedness of Those Preachers Which Will not Reform Till the Magistrate Command or Compel Them*, (Middelburgh: 1582), 17.

of and put them back on the latter because of their refusal to go beyond what the Crown would allow. Like the Puritans, he considered it repugnant that the Crown should have any authority over the Church, claiming its authority was only over "civil" matters (i.e., political rather than religious).[18] He thought it an unacceptable matter that Christians allowed the court to control their religion, especially when they might be "enemies of Christ."[19] For Browne, there was nothing left to discuss with the Church of England, and a permanent separation was necessary for Christians. Also like the Puritans, he thought the Roman Catholic Church repugnant, and believed they did not have the authority over the Church they claimed, but instead that authority was reserved to pastors and teachers and those with similar gifts.[20]

Henry Barrow was another major Separatist in the early seventeenth century. As justification for why the Separatists could not be part of the Church of England, he wrote "Christ is thrown out of his house and antychrist exalted and raineth by his offices and lawes."[21] Part of this, he argued, was that wicked people should not be offered the Lord's Supper.[22] The Separatists envisioned a church made in a perfect divine image that was free of the compromises they saw in the Church of England.

---

[18] Browne, *A Treatise of Reformation*, 18.

[19] Ibid., 19-20.

[20] While Puritans still held an allegiance to the Church of England, Separatists no longer did. The emphasis on Reformed theology was essentially the same, but they disagreed on what to do with the errors of the Church of England. The Puritans tried to reform the Church from within, while the Separatists broke from it altogether (Robert Browne, *A Booke which Sheweth the Life and Manners of all True Christians and Howe Unlike They are Unto Turkes and Papistes, and Heathen Folke. Also the Pointes and Partes of all Divinitie, That is of the Revealed Will and Worde of God are Declared by Their Severall Definitions and Divisions in Order as Followeth*, [Middelburgh: Richarde Painter, 1582], 53).

[21] Henry Barrow, "Four Causes of Separation," in Leland H. Carson, ed., *The Writings of Henry Barrowe, 1587-1590*, (London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1962), 55.

[22] Ibid.

Lawne spent a brief period as an elder in the Brownist congregation in Holland, but later renounced his affiliation therewith, claiming that "it is a miserie unspeakable to be separate from the worship of all true churches, and to be shut out from any other Teachers whatsoever besides their owne; but yet it is a further bondage to be restrained from private conference with other learned men, and so to be deprived from the fruit of their counsell."[23] Lawne viewed the Separatists as "schismatikes" who had no sound counsel and rejected all counsel that came to them.[24] He felt the Separatists went too far by separating themselves altogether from the Church of England and this was where he as a Puritan (and others like him) differed from the Separatists.[25]

Lawne included in his evidence against the Separatists some correspondence with William Ames, an influential Puritan who himself was of a Congregational persuasion and carried on a debate with the Separatists while living in the Netherlands.[26] Ames contended with Francis Johnson, who wanted his congregants to have no communion with members of the Church of England. Ames asserted that communion with any church was possible if "wee visibly

---

[23] Christopher Lawne, *The Prophane Schism of the Brownists or Separatists*, (London: William Stansby for Walter Burre, 1612), 6.

[24] Ibid., 8.

[25] Up to this point, the lines between Puritans and Separatists had been blurred. To the Church of England, they both represented a problem in their refusal to conform to the Elizabethan Settlement. Both groups were initially referred to with the diminutive 'Puritan,' but eventually both groups separated as a result of theological indictments from Lawne and others who saw them as essentially separate from Puritans in the goals of their movement.

[26] Ames was not only a key figure among the Puritans in England, but also was very influential among the Dutch Reformed during his tenure as professor in two different settings, and he was among the Puritans in the Netherlands who eventually planted some theological seeds that contributed to the development of Dutch Pietism (Keith L. Sprunger, *Dutch Puritanism: A History of English and Scottish Churches in the Netherlands in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, [Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1982], 358-359). As the Dutch colonized New Netherland, and Puritans and Separatists in the Netherlands moved to the American colonies themselves (including Plymouth and Virginia), the influence of Dutch Pietism no doubt came with them. Additionally, Miller notes that Ames as well as Parker and Jacob did all they could to steer John Robinson away from a Separatist position to the point where he started to agree with Ames, though he did not separate from the position completely (Perry Miller, *Orthodoxy in Massachusetts, 1630-1650: A Genetic Study*, [Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1933], 82).

discerne, that they have communion with Christ."[27] He also claimed that Johnson's allegations that only groups like his constituted a true church was false on his own definition, as Johnson allowed for sincerity.[28] Lawne wanted to reform the Church of England, but he did not want to do so as a willing schismatic. He eventually came to Virginia and started a significant plantation in present-day Isle of Wight County, on which he died soon afterwards.[29]

The Bennetts, like others, came to Virginia in search of a profit. By the time they arrived, the Virginia Colony was in a pattern of decline. Edward Bennett blamed the colony's decline on James I's policy toward the importation of tobacco. He claimed it had given Spain the advantage, and that James I's efforts to hinder its production "brought more harm to this State [Virginia]."[30] Prior to his arrival, Bennett also had been involved with the Dutch Separatists, such that Lawne sharply denounced him. Bennett had participated in Lawne's own excommunication from the Separatists, which led to his eventual return to England. Lawne said about Bennett that "he is to be considered as a *horne of the beast*, that lends his power, wealth, and authoritie to the maintenance of the beast,…so that it is not unfittely spoken by some… *As the King of Spaine is unto the Pope: so is Master* Benet *unto Master* Iohnson."[31]

Nevertheless, Bennett eventually parted ways with the Separatists as well, and it was through his efforts and his family's, as well as Lawne's that, as Butterfield notes, hundreds of

---

[27] Lawne, *The Prophane Schism of the Brownists*, 47-48.

[28] Ibid., 48.

[29] John Rolfe, "Letter to Edwin Sandys," Ferrar Papers, (Cambridge: Magdalene College, 1619/20).

[30] Bracket's Author's; Edward Bennett, *A Treatise Divided Into Three Parts, Touching the Inconveniences, That the Importation of Tobacco out of Spain, Hath Brought Unto This Land*, For John Budge: London, 1620.

[31] Lawne, *The Prophane Schism of the Brownists*, 12.

Puritans were able to find settlement in Virginia before the 1630s.[32] The Puritans stayed consistent in their efforts to establish themselves in the colony and propagate their desired reforms. Aiding their efforts was the accusation against Anglican ministers in Virginia that they often lived very deplorable lives, and spent time doing immoral things, including worldliness and drunkenness.[33] The Puritans attempted to appeal to those dissatisfied with the inconsistency of ministers in the Church of England.

Yet, lacking sufficient ministers themselves, the Puritans of Virginia grew as a movement, but struggled such that in 1642, they sent letters to their fellow Puritans in Massachusetts to seek advice for church practice and asking for any available able ministers to come to Virginia.[34] The letters make it clear that the Puritans of Virginia were not simply trying to form their own unique take on Massachusetts's "city on a hill."[35] Rather, the tone of the letters suggests that the southern Puritans saw the Puritans of New England as comrades in the same struggle. They relied on them for support at a time when their efforts at keeping churches established in Virginia reached this crucial point. Proof of this is in William Durand's comment about Virginia to John Davenport, that there was "so much corruption and false worship, and nothing indeed done as it should be," yet still hoping that the Puritans' mission of Virginia would

---

[32] Kevin Butterfield, "Puritans and Religious Strife in the Early Chesapeake," *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography, 109*(1), 2001, 6-8.

[33] James P. Walsh, " 'Black-Cotted Raskolls': Anti-Anglican Criticism in Colonial Virginia," *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography*, vol. 8, no. 1 (1980), 21.

[34] Jon Butler, ed., "Two 1642 Letters from Virginia Puritans," *Proceedings from the Massachusetts Historical Society*, Vol. 84 (1972), 99-109.

[35] The use of the term comes from John Winthrop's *A Modell of Christian Charity*, which he preached aboard the *Arbella* on the way to the Massachusetts Bay Colony during the initial emigration to Massachusetts. It referred to a unique city, set apart from all others, as Jesus taught (47). This was accessed April 12, 2022. https://history.hanover.edu/texts/winthmod.html.

be successful.[36] Durand felt he and his fellow Puritans in Virginia were in the midst of a struggle against falsehood that they were going to fight to win. They saw themselves and those in Massachusetts as one cohesive movement, and not as separate ones.

New England responded by sending two able ministers to help in Virginia after one of their number paid a visit to New England. Winthrop notes of the visit that "it appeared that God had greatly blessed their ministry there, so as the people's hearts were much inflamed with desire after the ordinances, and though the state did silence the ministers, because they would not conform to the order of England, yet the people resorted to them in private houses to hear them as before."[37] Winthrop based his claims on the strengthening of churches in Virginia in which Puritans were the ministers. Though Puritans in Virginia all but completely retreated to Maryland eventually, the clergy sent to them enjoyed some success in the colony during the 1640s.

In both Virginia and Maryland, the Church of England dominated the religious scene. David Holmes notes that the Church of England's efforts to plant churches often revolved around heavily populated areas where people could come to church by foot or by horseback, and near the center of town.[38] The Church of England faced a religious battleground in both colonies. In Virginia, the Puritans were already establishing themselves in the southeast and areas south of the James River. Like Virginia, Maryland was established partially on "pious zeal for extending the Christian Religion."[39]

---

[36] Butler, ed., "Two Letters from 1642 Puritans," 108.

[37] Hosmer, ed., *Journal of John Winthrop*, vol. 2, 95.

[38] David Holmes, *Church Life and Worship in the Established Church of Virginia and Maryland in the Eighteenth Century*, (Baltimore: 1971), 2-3.

[39] The Charter of Maryland, 1632, The Avalon Project, accessed March 19, 2022, https://avalon.law.yale.edu/17th_century/ma01.asp.

The situation in Maryland was different for Puritans and all who settled the colony. While it is generally accepted that Maryland was founded as a religiously diverse colony or even one with a purpose of religious tolerance, this is not necessarily the case. Maryland was founded as a port colony from its inception, but in 1634, the citizens of Baltimore inherited it as a property.[40] Maryland began as a colonial property that was shared with Virginia, making it very much a colony of the Church of England at its core.[41] Bradley Johnson has chronicled some of the varying theories for why Maryland went in the direction of religious liberty despite its being a colony of the Church of England. He eventually concluded that both Puritans and Catholics were oppressed minorities in England, and that a colony with religious liberty protected Puritans from the implications of persecuting them for proprietary interests, and protected Catholics from persecution in the mother country, where they were under duress.[42] Johnson's argument has its weaknesses (viz., the struggles of Puritans against Catholics throughout the early history of Maryland). Nonetheless, proprietary motives certainly account for the lack of enforcement of the charter of Maryland and the ability for multiple sects to thrive on Maryland soil.

Puritans endured much conflict in their struggle against the Roman Catholic Church even in Maryland. Notwithstanding, they saw enough fruit not to surrender their vision altogether. The initial proprietor and first governors, the Calverts, were all Catholic and did what they could to

---

[40] Babette S. Levy, "Early Puritanism in the Southern and Island Colonies," *Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society, 70*, 1: 1960, 201.

[41] Ethan Allen, *Maryland Toleration, or Sketches of Maryland's Early History, to the Year 1650*, (Baltimore: John S. Waters, 1855), 5.

[42] Bradley T. Johnson, *The Foundation of Maryland, and the Origin of the Act Concerning Religion of April 21, 1649*, (Baltimore: Historical Society of Maryland, 1883), 5-9.

demonstrate their loyalty to the Crown.[43] However, there was still much tension between the Puritans of Maryland and the Calverts.

Even though religion is mentioned, the Charter of Maryland reveals the ambiguity towards religion at its foundation. It is clear that Charles I expected not only adherence to Christianity, but loyalty to himself and to the other royal officials.[44] This would convey a preference that all contention against the Church of England should be silenced, and that there should be no dissent. Charles I made it clear in the Charter of Maryland that his favor was with Lord Baltimore on the condition that should a question arise, "no Interpretation thereof be made, whereby God's holy and true Christian Religion, or the Allegiance due to Us, our Heirs and Successors, may in any wise suffer by Change, Prejudice, or Diminution."[45] Charles was willing to support Maryland, but only inasmuch as Lord Baltimore remained loyal to him, and Charles's word was still law, including on ecclesiastical matters.

Despite the language of the Charter of Maryland that would lean toward a full submission from the colonists to the Church of England, other sects both existed and flourished in the colony during the seventeenth century, including Puritans, Quakers, and Catholics. Nevertheless, Catholics at first held a position of power the colony, and enjoyed a visible and notable presence. This was in large part because of a policy of the Calverts, designed to give Catholic colonists a

---

[43] This does not mean that Maryland was a Catholic colony. Maryland was not a Catholic colony, but one that had Catholics in the government and allowed Catholics to safely live there and practice their religion. In fact, from Maryland's founding, there were never a large number of Catholics living there (Robert E. Curran, *Papist Devils: Catholics in British America, 1574-1783*, [Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 2014], 42-43. See also Denis M. Moran, "Anti-Catholicism in Early Maryland Politics: The Puritan Influence," *Records of the American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia, 61*, 3 (1950), 145; Sutto, *Loyal Protestants and Dangerous Papists*, 49-51.

[44] Johnson, *The Foundation of Maryland*, 5-9.

[45] "The Charter of Maryland."

safe haven.[46] Maryland's Puritans had both the presence of Catholics and Catholic elements of worship to contend with in order to achieve their goals. Babette Levy also notes that Puritans did not immigrate to Maryland on a large scale until the 1640s, when, despite a strong Catholic presence in the colony, much of Maryland was thoroughly Protestant in some form.[47] Their presence grew as Maryland progressed through the seventeenth century. During this time, the colony's Catholics and Protestants continued to have some difficulties with one another, and the Protestants had issue with the manifold sects that established themselves in Maryland.

As English politics went through many tumultuous changes in the seventeenth century, there was pressure on the Calverts from without and within to change the colonial agreement they were under to force compliance to the church and government in England.[48] Despite this constant pressure, the Calverts persisted in keeping Maryland as it was founded, which meant the diverse religious climate was able to flourish as long as they were in charge of the colony. However, their tension with the Puritans persisted as well as the religious climate. The dichotomy between the Calverts and the Puritans defined the course of events in seventeenth-century Maryland.

Transatlantic Tension Between the Puritans and the Crown

The Puritans' relationship with the English government was multifaceted. While they often presented themselves as loyal subjects to the Crown, this itself depended on how aligned with its divine calling the Puritans thought the Crown was. If the Crown was perceived to be leaning toward tyranny, Protestants as a whole, not simply Puritans, tended to become agitated.

---

[46] Levy, "Early Puritanism in the Southern and Island Colonies," 201.

[47] Ibid., 202.

[48] Sutto, *Loyal Protestants and Dangerous Papists*, 59.

To understand the concept of tyranny to the Puritans, it is necessary to understand the Reformed view of tyranny.

As staunch Calvinists, the Puritans preferred using the Geneva Bible, which contained many marginal notes that supplemented the Scriptures with the teachings of John Calvin, Theodore Beza, etc. The marginal notes in the thirteenth chapter of Romans gave the Puritans key teachings on how Christians should handle commands from the government. It said "he showeth severally, what subjects owe to their magistrates, to wit, obedience: from which he showeth that no man is free: and in such sort that it is not only due to the highest Magistrate himself, but also even to the basest, which hath any office under him."[49] In addition, the note on Exodus 1:19 says of the Hebrew midwives, Shiphrah and Puah, that "their disobedience herein was lawful."[50] The translators of the Geneva Bible did not recognize the authority of the Pope, but instead only of the apostles, prophets, and evangelists, claiming that "the tyranny of the Pope over all kingdoms must down to the ground."[51] They believed the kingdoms over which the Pope ruled should be free of his dominion altogether.

On the behavior of tyrants, the Geneva Bible had a direct link to Pharaoh in Exodus 1:22, where it said in the marginal notes "when tyrants cannot rule by craft, they burst forth into open rage."[52] Puritans tended to tolerate a monarch that would honor their ability to freely practice their religion, but some, in keeping with the Geneva Bible, preferred a government that involved magistrates. They tended not to favor the monarchy due to its propensity to decline into tyranny, which they would seem to define as abusing power to lord unfairly and unjustly over one's

---

[49] Romans 13:1 marginal note A, Geneva Bible (1599).

[50] Exodus 1:19 marginal note, Geneva Bible (1599).

[51] Romans 13:1 marginal note B, Geneva Bible (1599).

[52] Exodus 1:22 marginal note O, Geneva Bible (1599).

subjects, particularly over matters related to true worship and faith. John Calvin, in the *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, asserted "For where the glory of God is not made the end of the government, it is not a legitimate sovereignty, but a usurpation."[53]

John Knox, also taking inspiration from Calvin's teachings, argued that "it is not birth only nor propinquity of blood that maketh a king to lawfully reign above a people professing Jesus Christ and his eternal verity, but in his election."[54] He also claimed that the people "may justly depose and punish" an unsuitable ruler who clearly cannot handle the power he is given.[55] For the Puritans, if the king did not recognize his power came from God responsibly and for the propagation of his subjects, and that his power could be Providentially removed by these same people, or by another ruler who championed them, because of the practice of injustice, particularly in matters of faith and religion, he was unfit to rule. With this came the notion that they owed no ruler unconditional obedience, since a ruler clearly could not force them to injustice by believing falsely.

Ultimately, the Puritans' relationship with the Crown was directly linked to how well it was helping the Church of England break away from the Roman Catholic Church, including in practice. Whichever monarch was on the throne wanted the nation in full conformity with the Church of England. Puritans called for reforms that required a different type of conformity—conforming to their ideas about what the Church should be.

---

[53] John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, vol. 1, edited by John Allen, (Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication and Sabbath-School Work, 1921), 22-23.

[54] John Knox, *On Rebellion*, ed. by Roger A. Mason (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 128-129.

[55] Ibid.

The Protestant Reformation, of which the Puritans saw themselves as a fulfillment, was itself a movement of nonconformity to the Roman Catholic Church in several ways. Failure to conform to the Roman Catholic Church (whatever that meant) conversely meant conforming to a different one. In the case of the Puritans, they neither conformed to the Roman Catholic Church, nor to the Church of England, with its elements of Catholicism still retained. As early Puritan historian Daniel Neal notes, "A Puritan therefore was a man of severe morals, a Calvinist in doctrine, and a Nonconformist to the ceremonies and discipline of the Church, though they did not seem totally separate from it."[56] Neal not only associates them with rigid Calvinism, but also refers to them as "Nonconformists," a name their opponents gave them due to their refusal to conform to the practices of the Church of England and push their own reforms even when most other factions in England opposed them. As England began to colonize early into the seventeenth century, the efforts of the Nonconformists varied under the different Stuart monarchs. Puritans refused to conform fully to the practices of the Church of England. Since their goal was to reform it, they did not entirely separate from it.

In 1572, John Field had laid out exactly what practices of Catholicism remained that Puritans took issue with, whom he referred to as "godly ministers."[57] He took issue with clerical vestments, ritual prayers at infant baptisms, and rejected the regional authority of the bishop.[58] He did so on grounds of the lack of scriptural support and a desire for congregational autonomy,

---

[56] Daniel Neal, *History of the Puritans, or Protestant Nonconformists; From the Reformation in 1517 to the Revolution of 1688*, vol. 1, (New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1855), x.

[57] John Field, *A View of Popish Abuses yet Remaining in the English Church, for the Which Godly Ministers Have Refused to Subscribe*, (Oxford: 1572), 168.

[58] Ibid., 168-170.

and spoke on behalf of all Puritans in doing so. This desire to protect and preserve purity continued into the colonial South.

The Fight for Purity in the Colonial South

Because the Church of England was already established in Virginia and Maryland, the Puritans had to fight more aggressively to get a more explicitly New Testament modeled church that they wanted. Their efforts in the southern colonies were a continuation of the efforts they had already made in England at reforming the Church of England and more so than what was occurring in New England, where Puritans had been among those who established the colonial government in their own image. The Mayflower Compact, one of the key founding documents of Massachusetts, was a civil compact between many individuals who agreed to govern the colony as a "civil body politick," which would make laws in loyal service to James I.[59] The compact never openly mentioned the colony having an established church.

While the Plymouth Colony governed itself through the Mayflower Compact, the two southern colonies were both under direct authority of the King of England. Virginia's direct subordination to the Crown was present during the reign of James I but became more apparent when Charles I inherited the throne. Once Charles became King of England, Virginia was still not as prosperous as James had wanted it. To further his vision for a united kingdom, Charles declared:

> that Our full resolution is, to the end that there may be one uniforme course of Government, in, and through all Our whole Monarchie, That the Government of the Colonie of Virginia shall immediately depend upon Our Selfe, and not be committed to any Company or Corporation, to whom it may be proper to trust matters of Trade and

[59] "The Mayflower Compact." (1620). Accessed April 23, 2022. https://www.ushistory.org/documents/mayflower.htm.

> Commerce, but cannot bee fit or safe to communicate the ordering of State-affaires, be they of never so meane consequence.[60]

Charles brought Virginia directly under the Crown, believing himself the solution to the colony's problems. All colonial matters were now subject to the Crown. Since Charles also wanted a united Church of England, this meant that Puritans' desired reforms could easily become a point of tension with the Crown. Since Puritans, in and of themselves, were still members of the Church of England, it was very feasible that Puritans could come to colonies where the Church of England was in charge, and continue their contention for its purity. Both groups had different interpretations of how tradition played a role in Church and Puritans often called these practices into question.

George Abbot, in particular, condemned Catholic tradition in Protestant churches in strong language. He taught that "since the time of Our Saviour, at all times and without exception, there have been chosen children of God, who have retained his faith, and calling upon his name have studied to express their knowledge in their life."[61] To Abbot and other Puritans, the church consisted of true Christians living the Christian life. Abbot differed from the Roman Catholic Church in that "the Synagogue of Rome layes it down for a fundamentall Rule, that this Church hath been and must bee in all ages, a visible and conspicuous Congregation at the least, consisting of an apparent Hierarchy, so that at all times a man may poynt it out..."[62] While the Roman Catholic Church insisted on a visible church, the Puritans and other Protestants insisted on an invisible one. Abbot claimed the Catholic Church was full of idolatry and disorder, and

---

[60] Charles I, "A Proclamation for Settling the Plantation of Virginia," in Larkin, ed., *Stuart Royal Proclamations*, vol. 2, 28.

[61] George Abbot, *A Treatise on the Perpetual Visibilitie, and the Succession of the True Church in all Ages*, (London: Humfrey Louunes for Robert Milbourne, 1624), 2.

[62] Ibid.

that it could not possibly be the true Church, as it claimed. He believed the true Church was only composed of those who truly served God, even if it was "in the wilderness."[63] These may not, according to Abbot, even belong to the same group/sect, but are faithful believers wherever they are.[64]

For Abbot, the true Church needed to be completely free of idolatry from the Roman Catholic Church, which was by nature apostate and ungodly, and a church only in name. The true Church, Abbot argued, was one in reality and not only in name. He would not have accepted James's insistence that there was nothing Romish about the traditions but would have vehemently denounced them as inherently idolatrous. He believed that the Church of England was apostate until Henry VIII, as it was still at that time part of the Roman Catholic Church.[65] He echoed other Puritans in stating that the only logical conclusion was to purge the Church of England of all Roman Catholic traditions and leave the old ways completely behind.

In Virginia and Maryland, the shape of this conflict took different forms. In Virginia, the Puritans attempted to establish themselves and created a network that put them at odds with Virginia's Church of England. In Maryland, the Puritans settled, and the Calverts even eventually welcomed some from Virginia. Despite this, the Puritans found more issues with Maryland's religiously diverse culture that often put them at odds with the Calverts and others. This conflict would change shape often, as the political and religious climate in England

---

[63] Abbot, *A Treatise on the Perpetual Visibilitie*, 1-6, 20-22.

[64] Abbot's belief in an invisible church would later come to the forefront. Though his name is not mentioned as evidence for why the Massachusetts Bay Colony and others eventually embraced a different way that involved liberty of conscience, Abbot's transatlantic influence makes it very significant that he seemed to entertain the idea that the true church did not necessarily have to be the Church of England or even possibly another Reformed Church.

[65] Abbot, *The Reasons Which Doctor Hill Hath Brought for the Upholding of Papistry*, 5-6.

continued to shift. For example, according to Denis Moran, who studied Maryland during the 1630s, particularly as it related to Charles I's reign, in the years leading up to the English Civil War as well as immediately after it started, many fled England to get away from increasing royal corruption. In England, the ones who stayed included Presbyterians, who were "intolerant of all other sects, even other dissenters," and in Maryland, Puritans went increasingly on the offensive against the Catholic Church.[66] Though English Protestants did not all agree on various doctrines, the concern and tension about Charles I was only increasing.

George C. Mason, who provided details on the churches of Tidewater Virginia, states that "Nansemond County was a stronghold for Puritans, Quakers, and other Dissenters."[67] Different Puritan ministers held services at congregations in these areas, resulting in some considerable tension within and between congregations of the Church of England.[68] This tension was especially present once Thomas Harrison got involved. Harrison saw considerable success in ministry in Norfolk County in the 1630s and 1640s, despite the tension his Puritan leanings would often create around the colony. One may add Isle of Wight County to this list of heavily Puritan regions as well.

Harrison created tension between Virginia's colonial government and the emigrant nonconformists from England.[69] At first, he was Sir William Berkeley's chaplain, who advised Berkeley in his actions against the Puritans. Harrison eventually transitioned toward Puritanism,

---

[66] Moran notes that this was in spite of some lessening intensity in anti-Catholicism in England (Denis M. Moran, "Anti-Catholicism in Early Maryland Politics: The Puritan Influence," *Records of the American Catholic Historical Society in Philadelphia, 61,* 3 [1950]: 142).

[67] George C. Mason, "The Colonial Churches of Nansemond County," *The William and Mary Quarterly, 21,* 1 (1941), 37.

[68] Ibid., 43.

[69] Butterfield, "The Puritan Experiment in Colonial Virginia," 10.

and despite his having formerly caused a problem, Harrison was highly acclaimed among Virginia's Puritans such that different groups of them wanted him to travel everywhere to minister to them and preach to them.[70] This could be because Harrison took a strong stance against anything that remotely resembled "works salvation." He eventually said in *Topica Sacra*, his chief writing in which he discusses his theological stances, that, "thy heart is carried forth towards Him, only according to the terms and tenour of the Covenant of Grace, and not of works" and that "the sole ground of thy confidence is the precious and plenteous grace of the glorious Gospel of Jesus Christ, which tells us that Christ dyed for sinners, enemies, ungodly, impotent ones."[71] Harrison came to hold a strong Protestant theology that most Puritans would have welcomed. In fact, his change in theology was so evident that in April 1645, Matthew Phillips found it necessary to call him to task over his "failure to use the Book of Common Prayer, to administer the Sacrament of Baptism according to the canons, and to catechize Sunday afternoons" as agreed upon in the Act of Assembly.[72]

By 1648, Winthrop reported that their church at Nansemond, with Thomas Harrison as its minister, had 118 people and even more considering joining them, such that it was attracting the ire of Sir William Berkeley, then colonial governor of Virginia.[73] For that reason, Winthrop asserted "seeing God had so graciously carried on his work hitherto, etc., and there was so great

---

[70] Harrison, according to Randall, eventually went to the Puritan settlement in Barbados to lead it (Ibid., & Randall, *A Puritan Colony in Maryland*, 12-16).

[71] Thomas Harrison, *Topica Sacra: Spiritual Logick: Some Brief Hints and Helps to Faith, Meditation, Prayer, Comfort, and Holiness* (London: Francis Titon, 1658), 66-67.

[72] Rogers D. Whichard, *The History of Lower Tidewater Virginia*, (New York: Lewis Historical Publishing Co., 1959), 247.

[73] Harrison, *Topica Sacra*, 351.

a hope of a far more plentiful harvest at hand,…they should not be hasty to remove, so long as they could stay upon tolerable terms."[74]

Despite the presence of men like Thomas Harrison, who believed firmly in Puritan theology, Nansemond County experienced a crisis due to the lack of acceptable ministers to help the Puritans there, who reached out to their counterparts in New England for assistance in finding some, knowing they were well-established in comparison.[75] Eventually, the Massachusetts Bay Colony decided to send three able ministers: William Thompson, John Knowles, and Thomas James, all of which had established reputations with Puritans in New England and were judged trustworthy.[76] When the ministers came to Virginia, they enjoyed success preaching not only to the Puritans who requested them, but also to the population in Virginia in general.[77] While it seemed the Puritans in Virginia were struggling to get their ministerial needs met at first and propagate their mission throughout the colony, their presence was well-known by 1643.

William Durand, in particular, was a lay minister in Virginia gravely concerned with the spiritual progress and state of Virginia's Protestants. He and Thomas Harrison wanted desperately to see a new minister in Isle of Wight County to replace the one present, whom they clearly felt was incompetent and leading Christians astray. He described the current minister at Isle of Wight in strong language and spoke of him as though everyone in that region despised him.[78] Puritans in England were critical of the established Church of England and believed

---

[74] Harrison, *Topica Sacra*, 351.

[75] Butler, "Two 1642 Letters from Virginia Puritans," 99-109.

[76] Butterfield, "The Puritan Experiment in Colonial Virginia," 18-19.

[77] "A Perfect Description of Virginia: Being a Full and True Relation of the Present State of the Plantation," in Force, ed., Tracts and Other Papers, II, no. 8, 11.

ministers who were willing to make a compromise with Catholic belief and practice in any way were leading Christians astray. In Virginia, as in England, they wanted a complete break with the Roman Catholic Church and sought to install likeminded ministers in every congregation they had, but with this came much criticism for the clergymen. As conflict between Protestants and the Crown grew in the 1630s, this party became more aggressive.

John Woolverton, who studied the details of the Church of England in the colonies, notes that most of Virginia's early settlers had a strong Calvinist persuasion (which would have included strong iconoclasm and anti-Catholicism), and that even John Smith, a key figure in the settlement of Jamestown, was sympathetic toward Puritanism.[79] Smith shared the evangelistic zeal some of the early settlers of Virginia had toward the Native Americans. In his history of the happenings in colonial Virginia since its founding, argued that "religion, above all things should move us, especially the clergie, if we are religious, to shew our faith by our works, in converting those poor Salvages to the knowledge of God."[80] Smith was decidedly anti-Catholic, and thought it a matter of urgency that Protestants in Virginia work quickly to evangelize the Native Americans. Smith took it very seriously that the first of the charters of Virginia made plain that one of the purposes of the colony's founding was to convert the Native American population to Christianity.

---

[78] Butler, "Two 1642 Letters from Virginia Puritans," 99-109; Butterfield, "The Puritan Experiment in Colonial Virginia," 15-17.

[79] John F. Woolverton, *Colonial Anglicanism in North America*, (Detroit: Wayne State University, 1984), 37-42.

[80] John Smith, *The Generall Historie of Virginia, New England, and the Summer isles: with the names of the Adventurers, Planters, and Governours from their first beginning, Ano: 1584, to this present 1624. With the Proceedings of those Severall Colonies and the Accidents that befell them in all their Journyes and Discoveries. Also the Maps and Descriptions of all those Countryes, their Commodities, people, Government, Customes, and Religion yet knowne. Divided into sixe Bookes*, (London: I.D. and I.H. for Michael Sparkes, 1624), 221.

It is noteworthy that Virginia's early design was not completely removed from Puritanism. Babette Levy describes the early setup of Virginia in detail to contextualize the Puritans who played a role in its beginnings. According to Levy, most of the English settlers who came to Virginia knew that the Church of England needed reform, but were unwilling to separate from it, and for that reason alone belonged "to the right of the Puritan movement," but that several others would have been considered "radical" and thus belonging to Puritanism.[81] Some of these Puritans were known members of the Virginia Company of London. The Virginia Company of London, according to Levy, was very "tolerant" of Puritans and even wanted to issue a patent to the Leyden Separatists (then considered Puritan extremists) to come to Virginia.[82]

The early religious setup of Virginia, Levy argues, had a very strong Puritan feel to it, with all forms of blasphemy and games, including card-playing, forbidden, and morning and evening prayers mandated. The most successful Puritan settlement south of the James River was Edward Bennett's New Britain. Daniel Gookin, Sr., father of the younger, more famous minister, started another settlement outside of Newport News called "Marie's Mount," named after his wife. She also mentioned that some conforming ministers may only have been nominally so, indicating that some conforming ministers may have been more sympathetic to the Puritan cause than is thought. In addition, she argues that the question was not of "Anglican versus Calvinist as of how far a man's Calvinism would lead him, within or without the Established Church."[83] Puritanism underwent more changes than the Church of England itself, making it far from

---

[81] Babette Levy, "Early Puritanism in the Southern and Island Colonies," *Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society, 69* (6), Iss. 1 (1960): 73-75.

[82] Ibid., 80, 83.

[83] Ibid., 83, 93, 103, 107, 110, 120-121.

monolithic. She argues that Virginia was willing to welcome any Protestant, whether they conformed to the Church of England or not. While this may not have been the case in Virginia's written code, it often could be in practice the further one ventured into the colony. This made Virginia, the ideal colony of the Crown, far from an exemplary image of what an English king may have wanted.

In Henrico County, Virginia, the Puritans attempted to start a seminary. The seminary was not successful, but as a result of its presence, the writings of William Perkins, a well-known Puritan in England, appeared in Henrico.[84] Perkins believed "the body of Scripture is a sufficient doctrine to live well."[85] That is, he believed the Scripture alone was a sufficient rule of faith for the Christian, which was a chief tenet of the Puritans. Perkins looked at Catholic fasts (such as Lent) with contempt, arguing that "Popish fasting is mere hypocrisy, because it stands in the distinction of meats, and is used with an opinion of merit," and referred to it as "external abstinence from meats without internal and spiritual fasting from sin."[86]

Perkins saw the Catholic practice as without any real inner realities, and thus useless. Additionally, he also felt that Catholic tradition in general was to be rejected. He argued that "it is manifest that all popish traditions, they either on their own nature or others abusing them, serve as well to superstition and false worship as to enrich that covetous and proud hierarchy, whereas the Scriptures…are all sufficient not only to confirm doctrines but also to reform manners."[87] For Perkins, the Scriptures alone were essential, and tradition was out of place and

---

[84] Writings of Puritans in Virginia's early history exist today mostly in fragments in other literature. Thus, currently no evidence exists that pastors in Henrico used Perkins. However, his writings were there, and it is very possible they did (Woolverton, *Colonial Anglicanism in North America*, 37-42).

[85] Perkins, "A Golden Chain," in Beeke, ed., *The Works of William Perkins*, vol. 6, 43.

[86] Ibid., 101.

meaningless. Additionally, he believed the foundations for believing in extrabiblical tradition were faulty. He claimed "if the believing of unwritten traditions were necessary to salvation, then we must as well believe the writings of the ancient Fathers as the writings of the apostles."[88] For him, this was unacceptable because "we cannot believe their sayings as the Word of God, because they often err, being subject to error."[89] If the Scriptures alone were sufficient, then tradition was necessarily suspect, which meant that for Perkins, tradition from the Catholic Church was off limits for the Christian altogether.

The antithesis to Puritan emphasis on the Scriptures alone as the rule of faith was Catholic inclusion of tradition as an essential rule of faith. To this, Perkins replied, "We hold that the Scriptures are most perfect, and contain in them all doctrines needful to salvation, whether they concern faith or manners. And therefore, we acknowledge no such tradition beside the written Word which shall be necessary to salvation so as he which believes them not cannot be saved."[90] For Perkins and the Puritans, whatever tradition could not be found in Scripture should never be enforced as dogma. This formed a key difference between Puritans and their opponents, most notably Catholics. Since the Church of England did not agree with the Puritans' desired reforms, the Puritans realized this meant that the Church of England was not going to willingly adhere to a full break with the Roman Catholic Church.

On the Roman Catholic Church, Perkins condemned its practices in a harsh tone. For all its claims of unity and exclusivity, Perkins claimed that "the very religion of the Church of Rome is a kind of atheism. For whereas it makes the merit of the works of men to concur with the grace

---

[87] Perkins, "On Tradition," in *The Reformed Catholic*, in Beeke, ed., *Works of William Perkins*, vol. 7, 101.

[88] Ibid., 84.

[89] Ibid.

[90] Ibid., 82.

of God, it overthrows the grace of God [Romans 11]. In word they acknowledge the infinite justice and mercy of God, but by consequent both are denied."[91] For Perkins and all Protestants (not just Puritans), the requirement to merit oneself by good works was incompatible and irreconcilable with God's grace. For the Roman Catholic Church to insist on such a requirement in the minds of Perkins and other Puritans was reprehensible, and it only drove their mission to purify the Church of England further along.

Perkins also took issue with Catholic teaching on repentance. As opposed to Calvin's teaching, which attributed the work of repentance in the human heart to God alone, the Catholics, according to Perkins, "place the beginning of repentance [partly with themselves and] partly in the Holy Ghost, or in the power of their natural freewill, being helped by the Holy Ghost; whereas Paul ascribes this work wholly unto God: 'Proving if God at any time will give them repentance [2 Tim. 2:25].'"[92] Perkins, echoing Reformed teachings, believed that repentance was a work of God in the human heart, and not in any way a conscious decision people can make on their own, which differed from the Catholics. This marked a key component of the Protestant belief in salvation by faith alone, to which also Catholics were opposed.[93]

Perkins was also strongly opposed to the Catholic sacrament of penance, which he felt contrary to the nature of repentance itself.[94] He called prayers to Mary and the saints "making

---

[91] Perkins, "On Tradition," in *The Reformed Catholic*, in Beeke, ed., *Works of William Perkins*, vol. 7, 154-155.

[92] Ibid., 149.

[93] This was true not only of John Calvin, but also of Martin Luther and all of the other Protestants throughout Europe.

[94] Perkins, "On Tradition," in *The Reformed Catholic*, in Beeke, ed., *Works of William Perkins*, vol. 7, 149-150.

them into idols."[95] To Perkins and the Puritans, these things were completely out of place in the Christian life. Even before Perkins, Thomas Wilcox exhorted the Parliament that their top priority should be "the restitution of true religion and reformation of Gods churche…not onely in abandoning all popish remnats both in ceremonies and regiment, but also in bringing in and placing in Gods church those things only, which the Lord Himself in his word commundeth."[96] Perkins's attitude to the word was such that he was not about to consider metaphorical or allegorical interpretations to the Bible, but took it seriously as the word of God in all things.[97] He was a biblical literalist. For him, the Bible was not just the rule of faith and practice, but also a collection of stories to be taken seriously and literally.

Perkins considered even in his time that tradition was a serious problem. He stated that "notwithstanding our renouncing of popery, yet popish inclinations and dispositions be rife among us. Our common people marvelously affect human tradition. Yes, man's nature is more inclined to be pleased with them than with the Word of God."[98] He cited Christmas Day as a prime example of this kind of tradition, which he lamented English Protestants were more likely to remember than to be present for the Lord's Day service.[99] Perkins and those like him envisioned English society at its best potential, which was at the full implications of a Protestant reform. For him, this meant abandoning Catholic tradition. Otherwise, "popery denied with the mouth abides still in the heart, and therefore we must learn to reverence the written word by

---

[95] Perkins, "On Tradition," in *The Reformed Catholic*, in Beeke, ed., *Works of William Perkins*, vol. 7, 156.

[96] Thomas Wilcox, *An Admonition to Parliament* (J. Stroud: 1572).

[97] William Perkins, "Of the Scriptures," in *The Epistle Dedicatory to Lord Dennie*, in Beeke, ed., *The Works of William Perkins*, vol. 8, 222-231.

[98] Perkins, "On Tradition," in *The Reformed Catholic*, in Beeke, ed., *Works of William Perkins*, vol. 7, 86.

[99] Ibid.

ascribing unto it all manner of perfection."[100] It was not enough for Perkins and his fellow Puritans merely to vocally deny Catholicism, but to renounce all of its practices as well. They would settle for nothing less.

Perkins also saw inconsistencies with the Catholic Reformation. The Council of Trent, which anamethatized all who did not believe in its resolutions, was itself not consistent with the historic creeds of the Catholic Church, Perkins argued.[101] Perkins argued this especially about the Apostle's Creed, which contains no hint of doctrines of papal infallibility or purgatory, among others.[102] Perkins, like Ames after him, also conceived of the Catholic Church as "invisible" rather than visible, and simply the saints that had existed throughout the history of the Church, and not simply the visible Roman Catholic Church.[103] He urged those who were Catholics to come out of their church to the right side, where following the rule of the Scriptures had its actual fulfillment.

Most Puritans thought purging the Church of England of all Catholic elements was essential to that scriptural purity. William Ames, in particular, compared the leftover Catholic traditions (including clerical vestments, observing holidays not sanctioned in Scripture, etc.) to "whorish attire" left over from "Romish panders," using the illustration of a concerned father (the Puritan ministers) rescuing his daughter (the church) from the Catholic "lewd and dishonest house."[104] For Ames, it was not enough that staunch Puritan Protestant ministers take charge of

---

[100] Perkins, "On Tradition," in *The Reformed Catholic*, in Beeke, ed., *Works of William Perkins*, vol. 7, 86.

[101] Perkins, "An Advertisement to all Favorers of the Roman Religion," in Beeke, ed., *Works of William Perkins*, 162.

[102] Ibid.

[103] Ibid., 163.

the church, but that "they also put off from her all that dressing, which they know to be whorish…that no such thing be seene among them."[105] Ames not only called for a removal of all Catholic clerical vestments, but also proclaimed his alternative. He argued that "Scripture is not a partial but a perfect rule of faith and morals. And no observance can be continually and everywhere necessary in the church of God, on the basis of any tradition or other authority, unless it is contained in the Scriptures."[106] Catholics rested on the dual foundation of Scripture and tradition as authoritative for the Christian life, while Protestants rested on Scripture alone. He also referred to improper worship as "superstition."[107] By this, he meant that any form of worship not commanded explicitly in Scripture was improper, and it was superstitious to believe it essential.

Ames was fiercely devoted to the belief that only the Scriptures were the rule of faith, as was his contemporary, William Bradshaw. They wrote that "the Word of God contained in the writings of the Prophets and Apostles, is of absolute perfection, given by CHRIST the head of the Church, to be unto the same, the sole Canon and rule in all matters of *Religion*, and the worship and service of God whatsoever."[108] If there was a question on what to do, Ames,

---

[104] William Ames, *A Fresh Suit Against Human Ceremonies Used in God's Worship*, (Amsterdam: 1633), 2-4.

[105] Ibid., 4.

[106] William Ames, *The Marrow of Theology*, Translated by John D. Eusden, (Durham, UK: The Labyrinth Press, 1968), 187.

[107] Ibid., 280.

[108] Sprunger notes further that Ames and Bradshaw's line of reasoning hints at Ames's conversion from the viewpoint of a then-typical Puritan, which leaned toward Presbyterianism, to Congregationalism (Keith Sprunger, *The Learned Doctor William Ames: Dutch Origins of English and American Puritanism*, [Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1972], 36; see also William Ames and William Bradshaw, *English Puritanisme: Containing the Maine Opinions of the Rigidest Sort of Those That are Called Puritans in the Realme of England*, [London: 1641], 1).

Bradshaw, and more radical Puritans like them thought that the answer was contained exclusively within the Scriptures. On the contrary, "whatsoever is done in the same service and worship, cannot be justified by the Word, is unlawfull. And therefore that is a sin, to force any Christian to doe an act of Religion, or Divine Service, that cannot evidently be warranted by the same."[109] In Christian worship, what was commanded was mandated and what was not was necessarily forbidden according to Ames and Bradshaw. Since the Scriptures alone were the rule of faith and practice to Puritans, and extrabiblical tradition held no truly authoritative place, it was the duty of fervent Protestant ministers to purge the Church of all "whorish" remnants, and to Ames, the job was best suited to a Puritan minister.

It should be noted here that the concept of "Catholic" in and of itself was not repugnant to Ames and his fellow Puritans. Ames did not use the term "Catholic" in a derisive way to describe the traditions and practices of the Roman Catholic Church, but instead opts for the term "Romish" or "Papist."[110] Keith Sprunger, who studied Puritanism as it related to the Dutch at length, shows that when Laud tried to force his conformity on the Church of England, not only in the mother country but also in her colonies, and including English citizens who lived in the Netherlands, Ames and his fellow Puritans in the Netherlands put up a firm front of resistance via defiance, and *A Fresh Suit Against Human Ceremonies* was among the literature of his that helped fuel his resistance.[111]

Ames shared the Protestant conception of the Catholic Church as one to which all Christians belonged, but that was not defined by the See of Rome, but instead as composed of

---

[109] Ames and Bradshaw, *English Puritanisme*, 1.

[110] Ames, *A Fresh Suit Against Human Ceremonies*, 4-6.

[111] Sprunger, *The Learned Doctor William Ames*, 241.

Christians everywhere, even if it was not a visible organization. He tells his fellow Puritan ministers that they are "a part" of the "Holy Catholike Church" in this way.[112] Ames, along with Bradshaw, also claimed on behalf of Puritans that "every Company, Congregation, or assembly of true beleevers, joyning together according to the order of the Gospell, in the true worship of God, is a true *visible Church* of Christ."[113] This definition summed up the Protestant view (or at least the nascent Congregationalist one), as opposed to Catholics, who exclusively gave the title to congregations affiliated with the Roman Catholic Church.

Ames stood firmly against those who would force Christians to go against their consciences, particularly the Puritans in their participation in Anglican practices leftover from Catholicism. This would have included William Laud, Archbishop of Canterbury during the reign of Charles I, who emphasized uniformity over conscience. Ames so valued the conscience that he argued "neither are we bound onely to this *Accusation* and *condemnation* of our selves, as to a *meanes of Salvation*, but by *naturall justice* also."[114] He believed this was an essential tool in determining what people needed to repent from.[115] For him, it would have been a major error to go against it simply because the religious authorities of England said too, and Laudianism no doubt would not have satisfied him.

Ames, like many Puritans of his day, believed in congregational autonomy. Unlike the Brownists, he did not go so far as to cut himself off from the Church of England. In fact, even when he was in the Netherlands, he engaged in dialogue with the Separatists for a long time, but

---

[112] Ames, *A Fresh Suit Against Human Ceremonies*, 6.

[113] Ames and Bradshaw, *English Puritanisme*, 4.

[114] William Ames, *Conscience With the Power Cases Thereof, Devided Into V. Bookes*, (Leiden: W. Christaens, E. Griffin, J. Dawson, 1639), 35.

[115] Ibid.

never joined them, thinking their methods improper. In fact, he was a leading Puritan voice in the Netherlands in that he spent much of his time writing "polemics against Arminians and Separatists."[116] When Ames was converted, William Perkins was the minister.[117] Ames was a pupil of Perkins as a result.[118] Perkins felt it necessary to defend the Calvinist view of predestination against Arminians, whom he called "new Pelagians, who place the causes of God's predestination in man in that they hold that God did ordain men either to life or death according as they did foresee that they would by their natural freewill either accept or receive the grace offered."[119]

Ames was as much a fierce defender against Arminianism as Perkins had been. Arguing from a staunch Calvinist perspective, he argues that Adam's sin is imputed onto all of his descendants, claiming it does not happen "onely by way of imitation as the *Pelagians* teach; but also by way of propagation or natural descent."[120] While Ames could have been referring to the Pelagians of the fifth century, it is plausible he could be referring to Arminians here, who stress the will of man in salvation, believing that arbitrary predestination is a contradiction of free will,

---

[116] Arminianism owes its origins to Jacobus Arminius, a Dutch Protestant who, according to Delbanco and Heimert, "questioned the doctrines of predestination and irresistible grace," while Arminius argued instead for a conditional predestination based on divine foreknowledge and a stronger emphasis on the role of free will in salvation (Andrew Delbanco and Alan Heimert, eds., *The Puritans in America: A Narrative Anthology*, [Eugene: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2004], 7). See also Sprunger, *The Learned Doctor William Ames*, 35.

[117] Ibid., 11.

[118] Ibid., 12.

[119] It is important to note here that Arminians did not disbelieve in predestination. They only rejected arbitrary predestination, in which Calvinists believe. Rather, they believed in predestination based on foreknowledge rather than arbitrary divine choice (William Perkins, "A Golden Chain," in Joel R. Beeke, ed., *Works of William Perkins*, vol. 6, (Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage, 2011), 39).

[120] William Ames, *The Substance of Christian Religion, or, a Plain and Easie Draught of the Christian Catechism in LII Lectures on Chosen Texts of Scripture, for Each Lords-day of the Year, Learnedly and Perspicuously Illustrated With Doctrines, Reasons, and Uses*, (London: T. Mabb for Thomas Davies, 1659), 19.

as the Pelagians did in a different way before them. Ames likely saw the Pelagians in the same light as the Arminians. He also believed that man's will was "servile" as a result of original sin, and unable to choose for itself good.[121] Ames's anti-Arminian stance was such that he was even called to serve as an adviser to the Calvinist cause at the Synod of Dort in 1618 against the Arminians.[122] He also accepted a position at the University of Franeker, which held "no Arminians, no doubters, no bishops, no Separatists."[123] Ames sympathized with the Separatists' belief in congregational autonomy, but unlike them, he did not fully separate from the Church of England.

The condition of the Church, as the Puritans saw it, was utterly deplorable as a result of Roman Catholic tradition. George Abbot, the Puritan Archbishop of Canterbury during the latter years of James I, called it "most miserable" due to the rampant presence of "Idolatry."[124] The Puritans saw it as their duty to improve the state of the Church as the overall goal of their ministry. Abbot repudiated the Catholic notion that their church was united as opposed to Protestants, who were divided on multiple issues. He claimed that as opposed to Catholics' manifold internal arguments over theological issues, "Professours of the Gospell doe not in maine points vary one from another."[125] In keeping with the Protestant view of the Catholic

---

[121] Here, Ames shared the views of William Perkins, who dissented from the Catholic Church on original sin in that while Catholics believed original sin no longer governed human nature beyond baptism, the Reformed (and especially Puritans) believed that original sin still very much governed the human nature beyond baptism (Perkins, "The Reformed Catholic," in Beeke, ed., *Works of William Perkins*, 44). See also Ames, *The Marrow of Theology*, 21.

[122] The Synod of Dort was called to settle differences between Calvinists and Arminians in the Netherlands, and resulted in a repudiation of Arminianism (Sprunger, *The Learned Doctor William Ames*, 52).

[123] Ibid., 71-72.

[124] Abbot, *Treatise on the Perpetual Visibilitie*, 5.

Church, he referred to Roman Catholics as "Pseudo-Catholikes" who "arrogate to themselves the name of Catholikes."[126] For Abbot and other Puritans, the Catholic Church was still the true church, but it was not a visible organization. Instead, it was an invisible organization made up of Christians throughout the centuries.

By comparison, John Robinson, an early Separatist pastor, claimed that "the truth is, that all states and pollicies which are of God, whether Monarchycall, Aristocraticall or Democraticall, or how mixt soever, are capable of Christs goverment. Neyther doth the nature of the state, but the corruption of the persons hinder the same in one or other."[127] For Robinson, the form of government was not the issue. The issue was those ruling it. People could easily corrupt God-ordained governments in Robinson's view. Robinson was opposed to the close connection between the Church of England and the Crown. He argued that the government under Jesus, the spiritual King, "must needs be spiritual, and all the lawes of it" in all things, and not subject to the whim of the monarch.[128] Robinson's reasoning here became the thrust of his argument for separation from the Church of England altogether, which set his approach apart from the Puritans.

The Stuarts' method of ruling in England proved antithetical to Puritans' desired reforms. When James I took the throne, he wanted a church with an episcopal-style government, which he made very clear. He believed it to be an apostolic institution, and thought it kept proper order in

---

[125] George Abbot, *The Reasons Which Doctor Hill Hath Brought for the Upholding of Papistry, Which is Falsely Termed the Catholike Religion, Unmasked, and Shewn to be Very Weak, and Upon Examination Most Insufficient for That Purpose*, (London: J. Barnes, 1604), 94-95.

[126] Ibid., 95.

[127] John Robinson, *A Justification of Separation From the Church of England Against Mr. Richard Bernard, his Invective, Intituled, The Separatist Schisme*, (Amsterdam: G. Thorp, 1610), 17.

[128] Ibid., 38.

church. He denounced both Puritans and Jesuits when he said "That Bishops ought to be in the Church, I ever maintained it as an Apostolic institution and so the ordinance of God, contrary to the Puritans, and likewise to Bellarmine, who denies that Bishops have their jurisdiction immediately from God. (But it is no wonder he takes the Puritans' part, since Jesuits are nothing but Puritan papists.)"[129] He considered it a threat to stability that many Puritans did not believe in an episcopal form of church government, calling their political philosophy "confused anarchy and parity."[130] He thought the reign of kings in the nation and bishops in the Church was the portrait of stability, and did not want Puritans and others hindering this. According to Sutto, who examined Protestant fear of Catholics in seventeenth-century England, he was wary of Puritans because "they tended to criticize monarchs."[131]

James, having been the king of Scotland before inheriting the English throne, had been rumored to have Puritan sympathies before this occurred. He vehemently denied these claims, alleging that Puritans had "persecuted" him even before his birth, and citing that at the age of eighteen he had installed bishops in the churches of Scotland against the reforms for which they pushed.[132] When James became the king of England in addition to Scotland, the Puritans had a visible presence. With their presence came their favorite translation, the Geneva Bible of the Elizabethan era, for which James made no secret of his disgust.

---

[129] James I, "What I Believe," (Amberson: Scroll Publishing Company, 2022), accessed March 22, 2022, https://www.scrollpublishing.com/store/King-James-Beliefs.html.

[130] Ibid.

[131] Antoinette Sutto, *Loyal Protestants and Dangerous Papists*, (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2015), 16.

[132] James I, "What I Believe."

James, upon his accession to the English throne following the death of Elizabeth I, wanted to produce a united church to show the rest of Europe that it could be done. He was opposed to Catholic doctrine, but he had to say about the Catholic Church:

> I acknowledge the Romane Church to be our Mother Church, although defiled with some infirmities and corruptions, as the Jews were when they crucified Christ: And as I am none enemie to the life of a sicke man, because I would have his bodie purged of ill humours; no more am I enemie to their Church, because I would have them reforme their errors, not wishing the downethrowing of the Temple, but that it might be purged and cleansed from corruption: otherwise how can they wish vs to enter, if their house be not first made cleane?[133]

James believed the Catholics were in error, but communicated the best of his intentions towards them. However, according to Patterson, who studied in detail James's goals of making a united Christendom, he eventually wanted to check the power of the Pope so he could achieve this ecclesiastical unity.[134] In reality, James believed Christian unity in England was very possible if there could be some sort of meeting in the middle. To this effect, he asserted:

> that it would please God to make me one of the members of such a generall Christian vnion in Religion, as laying wilfulnesse aside on both hands, wee might meete in the middest, which is the Center and perfection of all things. For if they [the Roman Catholics] would leaue, and be ashamed of such new and gross Corruptions of theirs, as themselves cannot maintaine, nor denie to bee worthy of reformation, I would for mine owne part be content to meete them in the mid-way, so that all nouelties might be renounced on either side. For as my faith is the Trew, Ancient Catholike and Apostolike faith, grounded vpon the Scriptures and expresse word of God: so will I euer yeeld all reverence to antiquitie in the points of Ecclesiasticall pollicy; and by that meanes shall I euer with Gods grace keepe my selfe from either being an hereticke in Faith, or schismatick in matters of Pollicie.[135]

---

[133] Charles H. McElwain, ed., *The Political Works of James I*, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1918), 271-273.

[134] W.B. Patterson, *King James VI and I and the Reunion of Christendom*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 52.

[135] McElwain, ed., *Political Works of James I*, 275-276.

James hoped to achieve a Church of England that was a meeting in the middle of Protestantism and Catholicism, to show the rest of Europe that it could be done. He himself was not fond of division, and initially hoped for unity. However, the Puritans' desired reforms presented a polar opposite to his own desired reforms. James's next attempt was to hear them out for himself to see what the solution could be.

In 1604, James called the Hampton Court Conference. According to Samuel Gardiner, he called the conference to hear for himself exactly what the Puritans desired concerning ecclesiastical reforms. He was willing to adopt some of them without reservation, but on the issue of congregational autonomy and on a minister choosing for himself whether to follow his own course concerning tradition, James was unwilling to compromise.[136] By the conclusion of the conference, James was so disgusted with the Puritans that he asserted he would "make them conforme themselves, or I will harrie them out of the land, or else doe worse."[137] Peter Heylyn, a Royalist historian, claims that James, during the conference, greatly derided the Geneva Bible's marginal notes. He allegedly called them "partial, untrue, seditious, and favouring too much of dangerous and traytorous conceits."[138] James saw in the marginal notes of the Geneva Bible a threat to the concept of divine right of kings.

James held to a high view of the monarchy and believed the king had the utmost responsibility to hold himself to the highest standard. He believed the Puritans held to "sharp and

---

[136] Samuel R. Gardiner, *The First Two Stuarts and the Puritan Revolution*, (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1904), 14.

[137] William Barlow, *The Summe and Substance of the Conference, Which It Pleased His Excellent Majestie to Have with the Lords, Bishops, and Other of His Clergie (at Which the Most of the hordes of the Councell Were Present) in His Majesties Privy-Chamber, at Hampton Court, January 14, 1603; Whereunto Are Added, Some Copies, (Scattered Abroad,) Unsavory, and Untrue* (London: Mathew Law, 1604), 83.

[138] T. Fuller, *Church History of Britain*, (London, 1655), Book 10, 58.

bitter words" and believed it "their honoure [*sic*] to contend with Kings, and perturb whole kingdomes [*sic*]."[139] He believed the Puritans to be contentious and bent on upending the monarchical foundations on which a proper kingdom was built. It bothered James that the Puritans believed themselves the only true Church, only proper distributors of the Sacraments, that they were pure and free of sin, and that God felt the rest of the world was abominable. He was strongly opposed to their insistence that most forms of leisure (including dice, card-playing, and sports) were sinful. He claimed they brought "sedition and calumnies" everywhere they went, and that they were without excuse for doing so. He derisively accused them of being lawless people. He also felt that their accusations that the leftover traditions of the Church of England were Roman Catholic were uncalled for slurs. He made it clear he was not going to tolerate anything less than a full submission to the law he issued.[140] It was over this resolute determination to crush opposition from those who refused to conform to the Church of England that drove several of the early Puritans (including Separatists) out of England in the early seventeenth century into the Netherlands. Eventually, it also drove the Separatists to Plymouth.

James did not feel his power as king needed to be called into question. His issue with the Puritans involved their partial adherence to royal law rather than simply their theology (though the two go together with Puritans). He believed a king's power did not come from the people, but from God.[141] For this reason, he believed that the Scottish Reformation, while a move of God, was "blinded by passions" of the people of Scotland, and was done in disorder, as it did not have

---

[139] James I, *True Law of Free Monarchies (Basilikon Doron,* 1599*)*, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1918), 6.

[140] Ibid., 6-9, 23-24, 48-49.

[141] Ibid., 12-14.

a king guiding its direction, and rejected the notion of democracy as a sure method of disorder.[142] James believed that without a king, disorder was certain, and condemned Puritans in strong language for their refusal to unquestioningly obey the king.

While James was decidedly anti-Puritan, historian Michael Winship notes he was not always so. Winship argues that James only became as anti-Puritan as he did because it was non-Puritans who were strongly opposed to Puritanism naturally who stood by him.[143] James's contempt of the Puritans became more apparent with time. In 1624, toward the end of his reign, he issued a proclamation against:

> the printing, importing, and dispensing of Popish and seditious Bookes and Pamphlets, and seditious Puritanicall Bookes and Pamphlets, scandalous to Our person, or State, such as have been lately vented by some Puritanicall spirits" because their end was "the traducing of Religion, and the State, as that great inconveniences may grow thereby, if they be not prevented and punished.[144]

These "seditious Bookes and Pamphlets" included "any Booke or Pamphlet, touching, or concerning matters of Religion, Church government, or State, within any Our owne Dominions, which shall not first be perused, corrected, and allowed, under the hand of the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, the Lord Archbishop of Yorke, the Bishop of London, the Vicechancelour of one of the Universities, of Oxford, or Cambridge…or some other learned person or persons."[145] If James or one of his trusted officials did not approve the literature on politics or religion, it was a banned book and subject to punishment for the distributor.[146] James was not going to tolerate

---

[142] James I, *True Law of Free Monarchies*, 23-24.

[143] Michael P. Winship, *Hot Protestants: A History of Puritanism in England and America*, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2018), 74.

[144] James I, "A Proclamation Against Seditious, Popish, and Puritanicall Bookes and Pamphlets," (15 Aug 1624), in James Larkin, ed., *Stuart Royal Proclamations*, vol. 1, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973), 599.

[145] Ibid.

deviation from his royal policies or the established order of things. Within seven months of this proclamation, James died.

Among the key theologians steering James in the direction he was taking the Church of England were Lancelot Andrewes and Richard Hooker. Andrewes kept to the traditional liturgy, and urged that among the articles to be inquired of concerning the Anglican service, "whether doth your Minister observe the orders, rites, and ceremonies of the book of common prayer, in reading the holy Scriptures, prayers, and administration of the sacraments, without diminishing, in regard of preaching or any other respect, or adding any thing in the matter or forme thereof?"[147] In addition, holy days were to be enforced, which the Puritans would have despised.[148] James's ideas of a uniform church were being fueled. This was so much so that eventually, James called on the Dutch to renounce and condemn Arminianism as more English theologians began to embrace it, resulting in the Synod of Dort, in which this occurred.[149]

Vital to the Anglicans' centrality was the belief that the Church of England had a legitimate authority, from which it was a punishable offense and grievous error to deviate. Richard Hooker advocated for this when he claimed that division had at its root in error in

---

[146] However, this did not stop him from appointing George Abbot Archbishop of Canterbury, who was by this time a known Puritan. James did not deviate from his willingness to utilize Puritans to meet his ends inasmuch as they were willing to conform. As James got older, his contempt of Puritanism became more apparent and he sought to assert his absolute power more so than he had already toward the end of his reign.

[147] Lancelot Andrewes, *Articles to be Enquired of by the Church-Wardens and Sworne Men, in the Ordinarie Visitation of Lancelot Lord-Bishop of Elie, Within the Diocese of Elie*, (Cambridge: Cantrell Legge., 1610), accessed June 24, 2022, https://quod.lib.umich.edu/e/eebo2/B00010.0001.001/1:3.1?rgn=div2;view=toc.

[148] Ibid.

[149] Ames was also a chief adviser of the Synod of Dort to a leading divine and very influential in it. He was summoned due to the influence he had on the Calvinist teaching in the Netherlands. According to Sprunger, he also "promoted Puritan piety" to try and "make Dutchmen into Puritans" (Keith L. Sprunger, *The Learned Doctor William Ames: Dutch Backgrounds of English and American Puritanism*, [Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1972], 54-55, 260). See also Dewey D. Wallace, Jr., *Puritans and Predestination: Grace in English Protestant Theology, 1525-1695*, (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1982), 82.

people's minds, and that the Church "repented not to use the rod in moderate severity for the speedy reclaiming of men from error."[150]

Hooker and Andrewes both believed strongly in an episcopal form of church government, which only a minimal number of Puritans supported, most being of a Presbyterian or Congregationalist persuasion. Andrewes argued that the apostle Paul ordained the use of "overseers" to carry on church functions once he died, and claimed the support of Scripture and the early traditions of the church to prove his point.[151] Hooker suspected the Puritans' motives in desiring further Reformation, but argued that even if these were true, they needed scriptural authority. In addition, he felt the Puritans went too far in believing that if one did not commit every action with faith, they necessarily sinned.[152] Hooker and Andrewes fueled the Crown and gave it the direction it took that would later culminate in the rise of William Laud as the new Archbishop of Canterbury.

James eventually appointed Richard Bancroft as Archbishop in the wake of the Hampton Court Conference. Bancroft was of the old Elizabethan persuasion against Puritanism, and had been a fierce opponent of the Puritans ever since the latter years of Elizabeth.[153] Bancroft called the Puritans "pretended Reformers" and accused them of:

> labouring with all their might, by rayling, libelling, and lying, to steale a|way the peoples harts from their governours, to bringe them to a dislike of the present state of our Church,

---

[150] Richard Hooker, "The Causes of the Continuance of the Contentions Concerning Church-Government," in Lancelot Andrewes, et. al., *Certain Briefe Treatises Written by Diverse Learned men, Concerning the Ancient and Moderne Government of the Church, Wherein, Both the Primitive Institution of Episcopacie is Maintained, and the Lawfulnesse of the Ordination of Protestant Ministers Beyond the Seas Defended*, (Oxford: Leonard Lichfield, 1641), 1-2.

[151] Lancelot Andrewes, "A Summarie View of the Government Both of the Old and New Testament Whereby the Episcopall Government of Christs Church is Vindicated out of the Rude Draughts," in Andrewes, et. al., *Certain Brief Treatises*, 34-35.

[152] Richard Hooker, *The Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, (2 vols.), Online Library of Liberty, accessed June 24, 2022, https://oll.libertyfund.org/title/walton-the-works-of-richard-hooker-vol-1.

[153] Collinson, *Richard Bancroft and Elizabethan Anti-Puritanism*, 173.

> and to drawe them into parts-taking: the one sort, for the embracing of such directios, as should come unto them from *Rome:* the other for the establishing of that counterfeit and false Hierarchie, which they would obtrude uppon vs by the countenance and name of the Church at *Geneua*.[154]

Bancroft was anti-Catholic, but also anti-Puritan. He wanted to keep England away from the extremes of Rome or Geneva, and like James, wanted a middle way of some kind.

James's son and successor, Charles I, strengthened his policies toward a strong monarchy free of the checks that Puritans desired, and also believed in divine right of kings to a greater extent than his father had. When Charles I took the throne, Puritans had two options: to stay in the mother country or go to one of the colonies. The choices both groups made created a host of transatlantic networks of Puritanism that would have a ripple effect on each other as the seventeenth century progressed. It is from this ripple effect that the events in the colonial South involving Puritans must be understood. Southern Puritans were spurred on by the same rhetoric coming across the Atlantic.

Puritans responded directly to James's *True Law of Free Monarchies* with the Millenary Petition. In the petition, they respected the authority of the king, but refused to back down from their insistence that the Church of England stop enforcing manmade tradition and instead subscribe to the Bible as the rule of faith and practice. Regarding the service of the Church of England, they demanded "that there may be a uniformity of doctrine prescribed; no Roman Catholic opinion to be any more taught or defended; no ministers charged to teach their people to bow at the name of Jesus; that the canonical Scriptures only be read in the Church."[155] The

---

[154] Richard Bancroft, *Daungerous Positions and Proceedings Published and Practiced Within the Iland of Brytaine, Under Pretence of Reformation, and for the Presbiterial Discipline*, (London: J. Windet for John Wolfe, 1593), 3.

[155] That is, only Scriptures the Protestants accepted as canon should be read in church, which excluded the Apocrypha/Deuterocanonical books ("The Millenary Petition," in Henry Gee and William J. Hardy, eds., *Documents Illustrative of English Church History*, [New York: MacMillan Publishers, 1896], 508-11).

Puritans subscribed to the Bible as the rule of faith and practice, and they did not want Catholic tradition taught or practiced.

The Millenary Petition also revealed that the Puritans wanted congregational autonomy, and believed that the pastor of a church had the ultimate authority over his congregation. They asked in the petition that "no one be excommunicated without the consent of his pastor."[156] They did not believe that a king or a regional church official should be doing the excommunicating, rather that each congregation should have its own autonomy. Despite James's insistence on the supremacy of the king, the Puritans build a case that a church has an autonomy of its own. It was not that they did not depend on the king for protection, nor that they did not desire to submit to the authority of any king. However, they believed the church had a place of its own that the king did not have the authority to override. In 1604, at the Hampton Court Conference, James cooperated with some of what the Puritans desired, in that he steered toward a reduction of Catholic doctrine and practice. He abolished the baptism of laywomen and laymen and removed the Apocrypha from use in the church service. Nevertheless, James did not remove the sacrament of confirmation, nor did he address any of the issues pertaining to the autonomy of the congregation that the Puritans wanted.[157] He only agreed with what he felt he needed to in order to keep England Protestant.

---

[156] That Puritans wanted congregational autonomy and that some were of different persuasions regarding church government (be it Congregational or Presbyterian) are not mutually exclusive items. Differences will be explored in a later chapter (Ibid.).

[157] "Conference Conclusions," Hampton Court Conference (1604), accessed April 16, 2022. https://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/education/resources/james-i/conference-conclusions/.

The Ripple Effect: Puritan Attempts to Overthrow the Colonial Establishment in the 1640s

In Maryland, where the political situation was different and allowed, despite the established Church of England, Catholics, Quakers, and other dissenters to live there without penalty, Puritans were up against a considerable more in their efforts to carry out their mission to purify the Church of England from any leftover Roman Catholic elements. Maryland, like Virginia, was established with the Church of England as the colonial church.[158] However, since the proprietors were Catholic, an agreement with the Crown also allowed Catholics and others to settle there without hindrance. By 1640, both Virginia Puritans and even Charles Calvert himself had asked that Puritans come to Maryland.[159] Though Maryland had a large Catholic population even in its early years, it was merely allowed rather than openly endorsed. Since Puritans were not entirely separate from the Church of England, different views on how to conduct worship were very present.

At this time, as the Reverend Ethan Allen notes in his brief history of early Maryland, Lord Baltimore, in 1632, received his charter from Charles I, a "Protestant king of a thoroughly Protestant kingdom."[160] This included a ban on Catholics and Puritans. Allen also notes that penal laws were still in force against Catholic priests by 1637, such that it was unsafe to address one as "Rev."[161] By 1640, building conflict between English Protestants and Charles I had

---

[158] Maryland had been settled since 1619, but did not receive its charter until 1631, when Charles I reigned as King of England.

[159] Denis M. Moran, "Anti-Catholicism in Early Maryland Politics: The Puritan Influence," *Records of the American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia, 61*, 3 (1950), 139-140.

[160] Ethan Allen, *Maryland Toleration, or Sketches of Maryland's Early History, to the Year 1650* (Baltimore: John S. Waters, 1855), 5, 10, 12-13.

[161] Ibid., 5, 10, 12-13, 18-19, 21-23.

grown. Maryland saw an influx of Puritans in the 1640s that began to make a political shift parallel to what was happening in England. By the time the Puritans started immigrating to Maryland in larger numbers, England's political situation had become a growing storm that was quickly spreading across the Atlantic World. The resulting tension changed the shape of both colonies as it already had in England.

By the 1640s, England was on the brink of civil war. All the colonies felt the effects, but Virginia and Maryland saw political uprisings to champion the Protestant cause in England. In Virginia, the tension that led to these revolts saw the revolts as the final straw that eventually diminished much Puritanism there. However, in Maryland, the revolts were a step toward a major shift in the colony's politics. When the English Civil War reached its conclusion, the Commonwealth of England that resulted from the English Civil War began to reshape Maryland in the Puritans' image.

Tension with the Puritans had been around in Virginia as early as the 1630s. Puritan ministers were often at odds with other ministers of the Church of England who did not share their sympathies, and at times they found themselves misplaced (i.e., a Puritan minister preaching to an Anglican congregation). They also found themselves at odds with the colonial government. This only increased as the political situation in England began to shift.

By the early 1640s, several Puritans in Virginia were disillusioned with the quality of their ministers and wrote to John Winthrop in the Massachusetts Bay Colony and John Davenport in Connecticut to find suitable ministers to fit their needs. At the time, England was going through a political trial due to King Charles I being at odds with the Parliament due to his belief in the divine right of kings and rejection of Parliament's check on his power. According to

Butterfield, members of Parliament were more sympathetic to Puritanism, which empowered William Durand and others to spread Puritanism in Virginia.[162] In England, the Puritans had the advantage, as they had gotten most English Protestants to side with them and the Parliament against Charles.

Charles, however, was unwilling to go down without a fight, which further exacerbated the situation in both the mother country and the colonies. Puritans, by the early 1640s, were having some success in Virginia. To enforce uniformity, Charles appointed a new colonial governor, Sir William Berkeley, which only caused further agitation in the colonies. Berkeley was opposed to Puritans, and his coming was at the onset of a growing anti-Puritan sentiment throughout the colony, of which he was a fierce proponent. Butterfield notes he wanted to preserve the Church of England at any cost and rid it of anything that did not align.[163] Berkeley eventually started to remove the property rights of those who proved problematic. He claimed in a speech before the House of Burgesses to do so in the best interests of the king of England.[164] Berkeley was so willing to stamp out any opposition against the Crown that he would remove property rights from Puritans and others in the name of liberty.[165] While Charles struggled against Parliamentarians in England, he tried to keep both realms loyal to him. He did so by fighting the English Civil War on one side of the Atlantic, and let Berkeley fight his battles on the other. On both sides of the Atlantic, Puritans were united against this tyranny.[166] The

---

[162] Butler, "Two 1642 Letters from Virginia Puritans," 109; Butterfield, "The Puritan Experiment in Virginia," 17.

[163] Butterfield, "The Puritan Experiment in Colonial Virginia," 49-50.

[164] Sir William Berkeley, "The Speech of the Honorable Sir William Berkeley," Samuel Broun: 1651, 4.

[165] Ibid., 4.

colonies tended to move with what was happening in England. This was especially true of the Puritans, who saw themselves in solidarity with their comrades in England as one cohesive movement.

Berkeley took several legal measures against the Puritans to force conformity to the Church of England that further fueled the tension between Anglicans and Puritans. However, the Puritans did not waver in their determination to switch conformity from the model of the Stuarts to their own model. Though some Puritans, such as Richard Bennett, a member of a prominent Puritan family that had inhabited southern Virginia since early into its history, were in high positions of authority to help, the struggle was not a victorious one. Eventually, the Puritans lost the battle to purge Virginia of Roman Catholic elements and found themselves no longer welcome in Virginia.[167] When Sir William Berkeley began an aggressive campaign against the Puritans in Virginia that culminated in the arrest and exile of lay preacher William Durand and minister Thomas Harrison, several more Puritans left Virginia for Maryland.[168] The mission to purify the Church of England was seemingly over, and now Virginia's Church of England seemed to have won.

However, Virginia was not the only southern colony in which Puritans were found. Even though there had already been small movement in that direction, Puritans eventually started moving in large numbers from Virginia to Maryland. Events in Virginia were clustering the Puritans in Maryland and strengthening them in their efforts to purify the Church of England. Now, however, because Puritans in Virginia were not as welcome as they had once been, the

---

[166] Though as will be explored in a later chapter, this itself was not united. Puritans in England tended to handle their tensions with the Crown differently than did those in the colonies.

[167] Butterfield, "The Puritan Experiment in Colonial Virginia," 49-50.

[168] Edward W. James, ed., *The Lower Norfolk County, Virginia Antiquary*, No. 2, Part 1 (1951): New York, 1950, 14-15; Butterfield, "Puritans and Religious Strife in the Early Chesapeake," 29.

center of activity for southern Puritans shifted almost entirely to Maryland. However, unlike in Virginia, Catholics were openly tolerated in Maryland so long as Charles I was king and as Puritans immigrated to a colony that was more religiously diverse, it made some of them less comfortable. Their efforts to purify the Church of England and purge dissent (especially anything resembling Catholicism) intensified in Maryland.

The Puritans were not entirely opposed to religious freedom, if it meant they had the freedom to practice their religion. In 1649, an act was passed that formalized religious freedom for the colony of Maryland, but also made blasphemy in any form a crime.[169] While the Puritans would still have quite a bit to contend with, this came about at a time when the Parliament, who sympathized with their cause, was winning the English Civil War. Even if they temporarily had to make concessions with families and government officials who practiced Catholicism, these they did not perceive would last any significant length of time. If Parliament won the war, then the champions of their cause would soon be in charge of England, and along with it, the American colonies. No one, they thought, would be able to long resist their desired reforms.

William Stone was colonial governor of Maryland at that time, and he continued to invite some of the Virginia Puritans to settle there.[170] Though there were some struggles when the Puritans first populated Maryland (viz., in their new settlement Providence [later Saint Mary's County]), Puritans' lives, according to Butterfield, greatly improved once they left Virginia and were able to start a settlement in Maryland that would eventually become a seat of power for

---

[169] "Act Concerning Religion" (1649). Accessed March 27, 2022. http://www.let.rug.nl/usa/documents/1600-1650/the-maryland-toleration-act-1649.php. This definition of blasphemy included anything against the Trinity as well as the Virgin Mary.

[170] Clayton C. Hall, ed., *Narratives of Early Maryland, 1633-1684*, (New York: 1910), 210-219; Butterfield, "Puritans and Religious Strife in the Early Chesapeake," 33.

them as the seventeenth century progressed.[171] Puritans went from struggling to expand their movement in Virginia to finding a place from which they could advance their mission in Maryland. Though the Puritan strategy for taking the reins of the colony had to change, as their agreement with the Act of Toleration of 1649 evinces, they saw it as a temporary concession in a spiritual war that was far from over.

Conclusion

As efforts to reform the Church of England continued in the mother country, Puritans came to the American colonies perceiving they had a real chance at succeeding in having a fully Reformed Protestant Church, rid of leftover Catholic tradition. In the Massachusetts Bay Colony, the Puritans were able to get established and create a settlement founded on their principles (i.e., an attempt to purify the Church of England and make it more aligned to the New Testament Church), the case in the southern colonies was often more of a struggle due to the dominance of the Church of England. However, the relationships they had with their comrades in Massachusetts proved a strong point in achieving capable ministers for Puritans.

In Virginia, the Puritans had strongholds in Norfolk and Nansemond Counties. Though the Church of England dominated the colony, fear of a Puritan coup and schism was evident. This culminated in Sir William Berkeley's aggressive campaign against the Puritans, the eventual result of which was the Puritans' flight to Maryland, when William Stone was serving the latter as colonial governor. He welcomed the Puritans when Berkeley did not, and allowed them to establish themselves in Maryland's borders.

Once in Maryland, Parliament was winning the English Civil War and Puritans found religious freedom that they believed they could use to their advantage in changing the colonial

---

[171] Butterfield, "Puritans and Religious Strife in the Early Chesapeake," 34.

regime in Maryland if things in England continued to go well for Parliament. While the Puritans had begun in Virginia and Maryland in the colonial south, they shifted most of their activity to Maryland as the new central point. There, the Puritans changed their strategy and conceded to the Act of Toleration of 1649 with the thought that one day, they would take back what they felt was rightfully theirs (viz., the reins of church and state in the colony of Maryland, and possibly elsewhere if they could continue to spread their gospel and their political philosophy to other colonies). By doing so, felt they could become assimilated enough into Maryland's population and culture to make a difference in the colonial government. Eventually, they believed a Parliamentarian victory in the English Civil War would result in them being able to turn the tables on the Baltimores and establish a regime in their own image in Maryland.

CHAPTER THREE: The Triumph of Reformed Protestantism: The Puritans, Charles I, and the English Civil War

Puritans and the English Civil War

The Puritans had crossed the Atlantic Ocean to begin new opportunities. However, they had never lost sight of their identity as loyal subjects of England who lived under English law and were entitled to the rights of Englishmen. During the early seventeenth century, King Charles I's method of ruling threatened the rights most Englishmen held dear. Charles I, as a strong proponent of the divine right of kings, wanted his word as monarch to be law, with or without the consent of Parliament. In addition, Charles had married a French princess who was a staunch Catholic. Together, these things stirred up the fears of concerned English Protestants that Charles was attempting to subtly bring the Three Kingdoms back into unity with the Pope and invite tyranny to eliminate Protestantism in England specifically.

Puritans became increasingly involved in Parliament during Charles's reign. They did not want the episcopal form of church government of the Church of England, nor did they want an absolute monarchy hindering the progress they wanted for England and her Church. They saw several warning signs that caused them to believe Charles was subtly trying to bring about a Catholic coup and were soon able to get other English Protestants to join their efforts in stopping this from happening. Their fears about Charles I were further reinforced when he appointed William Laud Archbishop of Canterbury, who sought a united Church of England (including crushing any opposition thereto). Neither Parliament nor Charles's lowliest subjects were willing to go down without a fight. The resulting English Civil War as well as the tension that led to it were felt not only in the mother country, but also in the American colonies. England and her colonies were thrust into a large internal battle that engaged the Puritans, among other

Protestants. As Puritans gained further positions of power in Parliament and greater influence, they were able to steer English Protestants (or, more appropriately, much of English Protestantism) into a battle to preserve the rights of Englishmen.

To understand the English Civil War and its transatlantic nature as well as the pivotal role Puritans played, an examination of Charles's actions as king is in order. In addition, it is also necessary to explore the causes and progression of the English Civil War, particularly as they aligned with Puritan goals. Finally, the effects the English Civil War had on Puritans on both sides of the Atlantic also need attention. The Puritans ultimately dominated Parliament during the English Civil War as means to rid the Church of England of any Catholic elements, and deal with a monarch who appeared to have Catholic sympathies, who was provoking the tension. As a result of the English Civil War, the Puritans succeeded in overthrowing Charles I, allowing them to start their own regime to reshape England in their own image at home and abroad.

Puritans were not entirely disloyal to the Crown but kept their guard against any perceived form of tyranny. The Puritans were comfortable with Parliament placing a check on the power of the king. In addition, they were also wary of monarchs who wanted any kind of compromise with the Roman Catholic Church. This position, however, was radically opposed by James I, and his son and successor, Charles I. Like his father, Charles strongly held to the divine right of kings, but to an even more unbending severity. Charles's sympathies toward Catholicism and unwillingness to deviate from his desired reforms would begin his troubles with the Puritans, which would soon become his problems with Protestants in general in England. Charles's religious beliefs and practices gradually changed along with his politics. A study of the breakdown of his relationship with the Church of England is critical to understanding the

concerns of English Protestants. This included his marriage to Henrietta Maria, the French princess, as well as his actions as king toward the Church of England.

Additionally, Charles's reign began at a time of great unrest in England. There were some who believed and began debating whether Charles or those in his inner circle, including the Duke of Buckingham, had secretly murdered James I by poisoning.[1] Bellamy and Cogswell note that the rumors were "libellous," but it nevertheless contributed to the instability of Charles's relationship with Parliament.[2] In addition, the notion that Charles was responsible for James I's death became a key charge Parliament had in bringing him down, as it was enough for them to consider him unfit to rule.

Charles began his reign with clear attempts to present himself to the general population as the ideal monarch for the Church of England's reform. The decrees he issued initially displayed a very Protestant character.[3] He presented himself as wanting a Protestant Church of England and issued heavy fines against Catholic recusants who refused to conform.[4] In 1628, when these measures were not taken seriously, Charles reiterated his decree. He commanded "that carefull and diligent search bee made by all Our Officers and Ministers, and by all others to whom it may

---

[1] Bellamy and Cogswell note these rumors owed their origin to a Scottish physician named George Eglisham, who played on insecurities both the English and Scottish had concerning Charles to achieve his goals. Other circulating rumors included that Charles I and the Duke of Buckingham had been complicit in getting England embroiled in a war with Spain around the time of James I's death (Bellamy and Cogswell, *The Murder of James I*, xxvi, 166-168; Thomas Cogswell, *The Blessed Revolution: English Politics and the Coming of war, 1621-1624*, [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989], 315).

[2] Ibid.

[3] That is, Charles's decrees, on the surface, seemed to support the Church of England as it then was. Notwithstanding, Charles was in no way supportive of Puritans or others who did not conform to the Church of England.

[4] Charles I, "A Proclamation Declaring His Majesties Pleasure, Concerning the Proceedings had, and to be had, against Popish Recusants, According to the Lawes, and for Directions to His Majesties Commissioners for That Service, Both in the Southerne and Northerne Parts," (7 Jul 1628), in James Larkin, ed., *Stuart Royal Proclamations*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973), 199-201.

appertaine, for all Jesuites, Priests, and others, having taken Orders by authoritie derived or pretended to bee derived from the Sea of Rome" and to apprehend, try, and sentence these Catholic clergy accordingly.[5] In 1629, Charles took the additional step of prohibiting the aiding and abetting of Richard Smith, "a Popish Priest" who,

> with a high presumption taketh upon him to exercise Ecclesiasticall (*sic*) Jurisdiction, pretended to be derived from the Sea of Rome, within this Our Realme, and endeavoureth to seduce Our Subjects from the true religion established in the Church of England…" and "doeth also seditiously and traitorously hold correspondence with Our enemies, tending to the destruction of Our State.[6]

Charles presented himself as a truly Protestant monarch who would keep England free of the Roman Catholic Church and made proclamations against foreign papal interference. He would not permit any deviation from the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England, which the Puritans persisted in demanding whenever they felt the Thirty-Nine Articles contradicted Scripture.[7] Charles already had, even before his ascension to the throne, a well-established Protestant reputation, such that even John Rous, a Quaker, stated that his reign was "to Papists not very welcome."[8] However, these presentations disguised his true motives, as shall be discussed.

Charles wanted a united church in England and shared his father's disgust with the Puritans. Sutto notes that he "believed the greatest threat to his authority came not from

---

[5] Charles I, "A Proclamation Declaring His Majesties Royall Pleasure and Command, for Putting the Lawes and Statutes Made Against Jesuites, Priests, and Popish Recusants, in due Execution," (3 Aug 1628), in Larkin, ed., *Stuart Royal Proclamations*, vol. 2, 204.

[6] Charles I, "A Second Proclamation for the Apprehension of Richard Smith, a Popish Priest, Stiled, and Calling Himselfe, the Bishop of Calcedon," (24 Mar 1629), in Larkin, ed., *Stuart Royal Proclamations*, vol. 2, 225.

[7] House of Commons, "Resolutions on Religion Drawn by a Sub-Committee of the House of Commons," in Samuel R. Gardiner, ed., *The Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution, 1625-1660*, (Oxford: The Clarendon Press at the University of Oxford, 1899), 12.

[8] Tim Harris, *Rebellion: Britain's First Stuart Kings, 1567-1642*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 233-235; Mary A.E. Green, ed., *Diary of John Rous: Incumbent at Stanton Downham at Suffolk, 1625-1642*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), 1.

Catholics in England or popery abroad, but from 'factious spirits' or hard-line Protestants in Parliament itself."[9] As a result, he took measures to explicitly allow things such as sports that the Puritans wanted prohibited.[10] He sought to give strength to the bishops of the Church of England and stamp out Puritanism, just as his father had before him. Thus, many Puritans began to leave the mother country under his reign for the American colonies and other places, such as Ireland.[11] Charles dreaded division and disunity, and sought to create a united national church that was free of the divisions the Puritans created in propagating their message.[12] Charles, like his father, saw the Puritans as a disorderly faction, and accordingly sought to stamp out their influence and gave them incentive to leave England.

One of Charles's early actions as King that earned him the ire of his opponents was the way he handled John Pym, a key player in Parliament during the 1620s. While serving in the House of Commons in 1624, Pym attempted to draw the attention of the House to Richard Montagu, whom he claimed published a book "full fraught with dangerous opinions about Arminius."[13] However, Pym's petition was ultimately voted down because the Parliament "did

---

[9] Antoinette Sutto, *Loyal Protestants and Dangerous Papists*, (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2015), 27.

[10] Francis J. Bremer, *Puritanism: A Very Short Introduction*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 28.

[11] Ibid., 28-29.

[12] Francis J. Bremer, *The Puritan Experiment in New England Society From Bradford to Edwards*, (Hanover, UK: University Press of New England, 1995), 28.

[13] The book in question was Richard Montagu, *A New Gagg for the Gospell? No: A New Gagg for an old Goose who Would Needes Undertake to Stop all Protestant Mouths for Eve, With 276. Places Out of Their own English Bibles, or a Late Abridger to Controversies, and Belyar of the Protestants Doctrine*, (London: Thomas Snodham for Matthew Lownes and William Barrett, 1624). In the book, Montagu initially names a number of errors he felt the Protestants had, most of which were aligned with Catholic beliefs. For example, Montagu called it a lie "that the Scriptures are to be easie understood" and "that in matters of faith, wee must not relye upon the judgment of the Church, and of her Pastors, but only upon the written word" (Montagu, *A New Gagg*). In addition, Montagu repudiated the idea that church tradition had no value, that Christians could be assured of their salvation, and that prayer to the saints was out of place (Montagu, *A New Gagg*). These were all teachings that aligned with Catholicism, and in the minds of concerned Calvinists were problematic to the health of the Church of England ("13

not want to be judge in such matters of religion."[14] In return, Montagu published a work entitled *Appello Caesarem* in which he denied any charges of "Arminianisme and Popery" and accused the Puritans (including Pym) who made these accusations as being false to their name.[15] He asserted "THEY ARE NO PURITANS: which God in his goodness keep out of this *Church* and *State*, as dangerous as *Popery*, for any thing I am able to discerne: the onely difference being, POPERY is for *Tyranny*, PURITANISME for *Anarchy*: POPERIE is originall of *Superstition*; PURITANISME, the high-way unto *Prophaneness*; both alike enemies unto piety."[16] Montagu repudiated Puritans as being false to their name, and accused them of attempted anarchy, which would only result in lawlessness all over England. He appealed to Charles I's desire to present himself as the ideal Protestant monarch in doing this. In return, Charles made Montagu the chaplain of his court.[17] It appeared that Charles was more than ready to dismiss charges of Catholicism amongst his subjects despite his apparently pro-Protestant stance, and that Charles was not going to sympathize with English Calvinists in any way. He made this clearer when he did all he could to hinder the publication of tracts against Arminianism and Catholicism despite the legislation he put forth.[18]

May 1624" in Journal of the House of Commons, in Proceedings in Parliament in 1624: The House of Commons, accessed June 10, 2022, https://www.british-history.ac.uk/no-series/proceedings-1624-parl/may-13).

[14] Ibid.

[15] Richard Montagu, *Appello Caesarem: A Just Appeal From two Unjust Informers*, (London: Humphrey Lownes for Matthew Lownes, 1624), 320.

[16] Ibid., 320-321.

[17] Sheila Lambert, "Richard Montagu, Arminianism, and Censorship," *Past & Present*, No. 124 (1989), 53.

[18] Arminianism was a theology that came out of the Netherlands (specifically from Jacobus Arminius), and placed a strong emphasis on free will in the faith of a Christian as opposed to Calvinism, which stressed reliance on faith as a result of God's sovereign choice (Harris, *Rebellion*, 273; Joel R. Beeke and Mark Jones, *Puritan Theology: A Doctrine for Life*, [Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 2012], 63).

Charles's own concerns with enforcing the unity of the Church of England may have come from the Puritan settlements springing up in the English colonies. He seemed puzzled that any would suggest that the ministers of the Church of England should be anything but willing adherents to the Thirty-Nine Articles, and the established order of the Church of England. As King of England, Charles took pride in the title "Defender of the Faith" and "Supreme Governor of the Church," and made it clear that he "ratified and confirmed" the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England and he was "requiring all our loving subjects to continue in the uniform profession thereof, and prohibiting the least difference from the said Articles."[19] Charles wanted to dismiss the allegations of people like the Puritans who called for something other than the established order, and presented himself as keeping the order of the Church as it was. The House of Commons believed that Charles's concerns here may have sprang up "from the state of religion abroad, and partly from the state of His Majesty's own dominions, and especially within this Kingdom of England."[20] The comment about "the state of religion abroad" likely referred to Puritans in the American colonies, particularly the Massachusetts Bay Colony, where Puritans were in charge and had established the kind of society they wanted, over which Charles did not have the control or the ecclesiastical unity he desired.

Charles wanted a united kingdom and a united church. He thought that most of the clergy did also. He asserted that:

> though some differences have been ill raised…all clergymen within our realm have most willingly subscribed to the Articles established; which is an argument to us, that they all agree in the true, usual, literal meaning of the said Articles; and that even in those curious points, in which those present differences lie, men of all sorts take the Articles of the

---

[19] Charles I, "The King's Declaration Prefixed to the Articles of Religion," in Gardiner, ed., *Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution,* 9.

[20] House of Commons, "Resolutions on Religion," in Gardiner, ed., *Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution,* 13-14.

> Church of England to be for them, which is an argument again, that none of them intend any desertion of the Articles established.[21]

Charles demonstrated a concern for the dissension cropping up in England, which included but was not limited to the Puritans. However, he felt that with most of the bishops willing to adhere to the Thirty-Nine Articles and the established order enforced, that there should not be any problems enforcing adherence to it.

The House of Commons was also concerned for the state of Christianity in other parts of Europe, including France, Germany, and Scotland. As Protestants were increasingly losing battles (and as a result, the Reformation in those countries in which battles were lost) of the Thirty Years' War, the House of Commons asserted that Catholics were "aiming at the subversion of all Protestant churches in Christendom," and cited persecution of Protestants and struggles with Catholicism as proof thereof.[22] Charles was also concerned about this issue, as he lamented the upset of Protestantism in Germany, France, and Denmark, and expressed his grief that the King of France would "profess the rooting out of the Protestant Religion" and be willing to back up this threat with action.[23] Charles, however, did so in order to state his case as to why he was dissolving Parliament (which he stated as though he believed it unhelpful to the Protestant cause overall). Both the Parliament and the King were showing to the English people a concern for the state of Protestant Christianity, but it was not merely a contest of which side

---

[21] Charles I, "King's Declaration Prefixed to the Articles of Religion," in Gardiner, ed., *Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution*, 10.

[22] House of Commons, "Resolutions on Religion," in Gardiner, ed., *Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution*, 13-14.

[23] Charles I, "The King's Declaration Showing the Causes of the Late Dissolution," in Gardiner, ed., *Constitutoinal Documents of the Puritan Revolution*, 17.

would show itself true to its word on this subject. Parliament and the King each had their own interests in mind that they wanted to assert on England.

Charles presented himself as if he wanted to preserve traditional order in the mother country, and his actions demonstrated a feeling of threat from the Puritans. Charles's measures were intended to try to define the direction the Church of England was going to take under his reign. He made clear that he thought Puritans were the same level of threat as Catholics. Notably, Charles thought England was "infected" with them, and that they had "maliciously traduced and calumniated these our just and honourable proceedings," necessitating him to defend his own reputation and show the people what he was allegedly really trying to accomplish, including that he intended to act with their best interests at heart.[24] As Kevin Sharpe notes in his extensive study of Charles's rule of England, Charles "was personally tolerant; sure of his own faith, he could befriend Catholics and Presbyterians and respect men's private consciences. But the unity of the visible had to be preserved from public contest."[25]

Charles needed a uniform Church of England, and he was determined to get it. His aggressive measures toward Puritans contributed to many of them leaving the mother country for Massachusetts. This included the initial settlers of New England. However, even Puritans' departure did not stop Charles, as Winship notes that his councilors "would often set up 'loyalty tests' for those going to Massachusetts" and often tried to strike the colony's charter down in

---

[24] Charles I, "The Declaration of Sports," in Gardiner, ed., *Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution*, 32.

[25] Kevin Sharpe, *The Personal Rule of Charles I*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992), 282.

court.[26] For Charles, it was not enough for Puritans to leave England for the colonies, but he wanted the entire scope of the Crown's authority united under the Church of England.

The Puritans who left for the Massachusetts Bay Colony in response to Laud's crackdown sought to give the world an example of what following their beliefs and practices looks like in a community setting, and they made it their aim to achieve God's blessing in doing so. To do this, they needed to have an upright colony with godly residents, keep order, and keep heresy out. John Winthrop, their first colonial governor, preached to his fellow settlers on the way to Massachusetts and warned his listeners that:

> The Lord will be our God, and delight to dwell among us, as his oune people, and will command a blessing upon us in all our wayes. Soe that wee shall see much more of his wisdome, power, goodness and truthe, than formerly wee haue been acquainted with. Wee shall finde that the God of Israell is among us, when ten of us shall be able to resist a thousand of our enemies; when hee shall make us a prayse and glory that men shall say of succeeding plantations, 'the Lord make it likely that of *New England*.' For wee must consider that wee shall be as a citty upon a hill. The eies of all people are uppon us. Soe that if wee shall deale falsely with our God in this worke wee haue undertaken, and soe cause him to withdrawe his present help from us, wee shall be made a story and a by-word through the world. Wee shall open the mouthes of enemies to speake evill of the wayes of God, and all professors for God's sake.[27]

Winthrop believed he and his fellow colonists would need to be true to the faith they left the mother country to take into the American colonies. He believed that God's blessings upon the Massachusetts Bay Colony were conditional upon the Puritans staying true to what they had set out to do. As Bremer notes, "the men and women who came to Massachusetts during the 1630s hoped to do more than merely escape from persecution: they wished to strike a blow for the true faith by erecting a model Christian community."[28] To them, it was therefore critically important

---

[26] Michael P. Winship, *The Times and Trials of Anne Hutchinson: Puritans Divided*, (Lawrence: University of Kansas Press, 2005), 1.

[27] John Winthrop, "A Modell of Christian Charity," in *Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society*, 3rd Series (Boston: 1838), 46-48.

that they succeed, not only for their own sakes, but for Christians everywhere.[29] If they were faithful to what they set out to do, God would command His blessings, they thought. However, if they did not, they would become a byword. The next sixty-four years would determine just how true to their original mission the Puritans stayed. Winthrop warned his listeners that:

> wee must be knitt together, in this worke, as one man. Wee must entertaine each other in brotherly affection. Wee must be willing to abridge ourselves of our superfluities, for the supply of other's necessities. Wee must uphold a familiar commerce together in all meekeness, gentlenes, patience and liberality. Wee must delight in eache other; make other's conditions our oune; rejoice together, mourne together, labour and suffer together, allwayes haueving before our eyes our commission and community in the worke, as members of the same body. Soe shall wee *keepe the unitie of the spirit in the bond of peace*.[30]

Winthrop recognized the need for the Puritans of Massachusetts to have love for one another and be united for each other's benefit. However, as shall be discussed, unity was a delicate concept among the Puritans, both in England and New England.

In 1630, when Winthrop's wave of Puritans were starting to depart for Massachusetts, a man in England named John Cotton began to teach that assurance of justification could be found by looking toward God instead of toward oneself, using the Scriptures, even going as far as saying that the Scriptures could speak to their reader personally as a sign they were justified.[31] Winship argues that it was because of Cotton's teaching that Hutchinson eventually claimed to receive such a "witness," as Cotton termed it, about her own justification.[32] Those who taught

---

[28] Francis J. Bremer, *The Puritan Experiment: New England Society From Bradford to Edwards*, (Lebanon: University Press of New England, 1995), 55.

[29] This included their fellow Puritans in England who needed the encouragement from their comrades that this could work, and the Anglicans whom they were trying to convince of the orthodoxy of their ways.

[30] Winthrop, *A Modell of Christian Charity*, in Collections from the Massachusetts Historical Society, 46-47.

[31] Winship, *Hot Protestants*, 15.

[32] Cotton believed the "witness of the Spirit" was the "seal" by which believers could be assured of their own justification and believed this witness to be very personal (John Cotton, "Sixteene Questions of Serious and

this, which came to be termed "Antinomianism," believed that personal revelation from God through the Scriptures gave assurance of justification, and that to be justified was to no longer be under the obligation to the moral law.

In effect, the role humans played in salvation was personal, and not connected to a community or congregation of believers who watched over one's maturing salvation often directly from the pulpit, Cotton implied and many agreed. Cotton stated, "to take a mans sanctification, for an evident cause or ground of his justification, is flat Popery."[33] Furthermore, he argued that basing one's assurance of salvation on evidence in one's own life of personal sanctification was "utterly unsafe, for faith is built upon Jesus Christ, the head corner stone" and a "false and sandy foundation."[34] For Cotton, to trust in this was "a righteousness of our owne."[35] Trusting in one's own evidence of a righteous life went, for Cotton, against the very definition of faith as "evidence of things not seene."[36]

Cotton eventually came to Massachusetts, as did another English Puritan, Thomas Shepard, as the direct result of Laud's measures against Puritans. Cotton's new ideas went to Massachusetts with him, and Shepard, an avowed "heresy hunter," believed it an urgent matter to stop Cotton at all costs.[37] Cotton and Shepard carried on an exchange of letters. Shepard began

---

Necessary Consequence," in David D. Hall, ed., *The Antinomian Controversy, 1636-1638: A Documentary History*, [Durham: Duke University Press, 1990], 48). He also believed that the Christian experienced the greatest "peace and comfort" when walking perfectly with God and not sinning (Cotton, "Sixteene Questions," in Hall, ed., *The Antinomian Controversy*, 50). See also Winship, *Hot Protestants*, 16.

[33] John Cotton, "A Conference Mr. John Cotton had With the *Elders* of the Congregations of *New-England*, Touching Three Questions," in Hall, ed., *The Antinomian Controversy*, 177.

[34] Ibid., 177-178.

[35] Ibid., 180.

[36] Ibid., 182.

[37] Michael P. Winship, *The Times and Trials of Anne Hutchinson: Puritans Divided*, (Lawrence: University of Kansas Press, 2005), 41-43.

his letters with a tone of concern for the unity of the churches in Massachusetts. He inquired as to what Cotton believed about key doctrinal points among the Puritans, most notably the nature of Christian salvation and sanctification, and how Cotton felt this was experienced on an individual level.[38] Shepard did so in response to several circulating rumors that Cotton was teaching heresy.[39] Cotton denied these allegations and sought to explain to Shepard that he believed the power of assurance lay within God, but did not deny that personal revelations had some validity.[40]

Peter Bulkeley eventually attempted to answer the questions Cotton's teaching raised, and also carried on some correspondence with him. Bulkeley contended:

> If it be (the union) betweene Christ and the soule then there must be a mutuall giving and taking of each other: but in this union there is a mere taking on Gods part, noe giving: because here the fayth hath not power to receive; But on mans part neither receiving of Christ, nor giving back himself to christ again, for fayth doth nothing till the union be compleated, and so a consideration of one to be active in this union without the other.[41]

For Bulkeley, it was an essential component of faith to have a human response which could be measured with legal oversight via church authorities, which Antinomianism taught against. He was very critical of Antinomianism in that it presented faith as incapable even of receiving God's grace. On the contrary, Cotton believed that "the Spirit of God sent into the Soule worketh Faith, that is the union."[42] While Bulkeley contended this was not real faith, Cotton claimed that it was.

---

[38] Thomas Shepard, "Thomas Shepard to John Cotton" in Hall, ed., *The Antinomian Controversy*, 26-29.

[39] John Cotton, "John Cotton to Thomas Shepard" in Hall, ed., *The Antinomian Controversy*, 29.

[40] Ibid., 31-34.

[41] John Cotton, "Received from Mr. B," in Hall, ed., *The Antinomian Controversy*, 36. The correspondence between Cotton and Bulkeley is preserved in a point-by-point criticism of Bulkeley's theology that Cotton put to writing.

[42] Ibid., 37.

For the Puritans, the answer to this question was ultimately the answer of the covenant of grace, the antithesis of the covenant of works, which was an essential component of Calvinist theology. Antinomianism, to the Puritans, put far too much weight on the individual in determining his/her own salvation, and bypassed church authorities that they felt were divinely in place. This put the Antinomians on the verge of heresy (believing that salvation lay outside of the church) and became an even greater incentive to repudiate it. This was particularly true inasmuch as it was placing Massachusetts's right to exist in jeopardy, as disunity was grounds for invalidation of the colonial charter.

Cotton believed that God's grace was by nature a gift. He believed so on the basis that "God gave, and so it was a gift."[43] Whatever the Lord required of people, said Cotton, "I know that the Lord doth call for many things under a Covenant of Grace, because then the Lord doth: 1. Work those things in them; and 2. He will have them know, that those things are nothing, without the working of his grace."[44] According to Cotton, God will work in His people whatever it is He requires, and His work and requirements means nothing anyway apart from His grace. Cotton believed it impossible that man could in any way be qualified for God's grace, as he articulated to New England's elders.[45]

As Cotton's sermons continued to spread in Massachusetts, Anne Hutchinson was becoming more and more an adherent to his teachings, as was her brother-in-law, John Wheelwright, once he came to Massachusetts in 1636. Ironically, Cotton asserted that the desired unity of the churches was "to be perfectly joyned together in one mind and one judgment in one

---

[43] John Cotton, *A Treatise on the Covenant of Grace*, (Weston Rhyn: Quinta Press, 2006), 6.

[44] Ibid., 13.

[45] John Cotton, "A Conference," in Hall, ed., *The Antinomian Controversy*, 176.

truth and where wee cannot be of one judgment yet still to be of one heart."[46] Even Winthrop asserted that Cotton was not one to aggravate division, and "all the strife amongst us was about magnifying the grace of God" in an attempt to find common ground with each side of the dispute.[47] He did not portray Cotton as the author of division but focused his attention on the division Anne Hutchinson caused by her actions. However, as Winship noted, the Antinomian Controversy threatened the unity of the entire Massachusetts Bay Colony.[48] Massachusetts was able to deal with the controversy by silencing and eventually banishing Hutchinson to Providence, but the controversy's presence nevertheless proved that Massachusetts could be unsafe as long as Laud held the archbishopric. However, England had no shortage of issues while Antinomianism raged in Massachusetts.

Faith Lost in Charles I: The Fears of Tyranny

In 1637, Charles issued a harsh proclamation against Catholics, in which he threatened them "under pain of the severest punishments which by the Laws and Statutes in such case are provided" for their persistence in drawing members of the Church of England away to their church.[49] To Charles, this may have appealed to his thoroughly Protestant subjects. According to Sutto, English Protestants believed "the ultimate goal of popery was universal papal tyranny, the destruction of Protestantism, and the damnation of souls."[50] Anyone taking measures against

---

[46] John Cotton, *The True Constitution of a Visible Church, Proved by Scripture*, (London: Samuel Satterthwaite, 1642), 4.

[47] James K. Hosmer, ed., *Historical Early American Narratives: Journal of John Winthrop, "History of New England, 1630-1649,"* vol. 1, [New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1908], 209.

[48] Winship, *The Times and Trials of Anne Hutchinson*, 14-15.

[49] Charles I, "A Proclamation Restraining the Withdrawing His Majesties Subjects From the Church of England, and Giving Scandall in Resorting to Masses," in Larkin, ed., *Stuart Royal Proclamations*, vol. 2, 581-582.

[50] Sutto, *Loyal Protestants and Dangerous Papists*, 30.

them would, to some Protestants, have thoroughly helped their cause in Europe. However, devout Protestants in England began to increasingly suspect Charles due to other actions he took. As tension heated between Charles and those dissenting from the Church of England (which now was also a dissent from Charles himself), Charles began to re-examine England's ecclesiastical and political leadership. This included, among other things, the dissolution of Parliament for eleven years so he could rule England without their check on his power.

According to Sharpe, Charles's main reason for trying to rule without Parliament was failure to believe they were adequately supplying him with what he needed, particularly in the way of his military. Also, according to Sharpe, even before Charles ascended, there were concerns with what his succession would imply because of Charles's religious views, which differed considerably from his father, James I. However, James was ill at the time, which resulted in a crisis in England that could only be solved by getting a new king on the throne. Charles was comfortable with traditions left over from the Roman Catholic Church, while saying he believed that the Church of England was closest to apostolic religion. Charles went on the offensive against Puritans primarily because of their questionable loyalty to England. Sharpe also notes a contrast between Charles, who wanted a "narrowly defined dogma," and William Laud, his appointed bishop whom he felt would keep religious order in England as the fulfillment of Charles's corresponding goal, who focused his attention more on "community and uniformity of worship."[51] Charles also considered Puritans a problem because they had separated themselves from the Church of England and rejected any of the unity for which they called. If the unity of

[51] Kevin Sharpe, *The Personal Rule of Charles I,* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992), 120-132.

the Church of England was not down to the letter of the Puritans' definition, the Puritans would not concede and would continue the fight to purify the church from within.

Charles took great issue that Puritans "would fain have our good subjects imagine that we ourselfs are perverted, and do worship God in a superstitious way, and that we intend to bring in some alteration of the religion here established."[52] Charles vehemently denied these allegations and sought to prove the ceremonies of the Church of England to be normal. He did not want to alter the established order to the Puritans' expectations, but his need for ecclesiastical and political uniformity required, in his thinking, more extreme measures. Parliament, Charles felt, was only getting in the way. According to Sutto, "Charles believed that his prerogative preceded and limited the common law…To criticize his power was to undermine monarchical authority and was ipso facto evidence of disloyalty."[53] Charles rejected the concept of rule of law in the way he ruled. He did not submit to the authority of English law because he felt the law came from him as the monarch and not the reverse.

William Laud and the Puritans

Charles eventually appointed William Laud as Archbishop of Canterbury. Hirst notes that "Charles's own concern with hierarchy, order and reverence…drew him to Laud."[54] Charles needed a strong arm within the Church of England to ensure uniformity was intact. He denied any allegation that the Church of England retained Catholic practice, and even affirmed that "the said rites and ceremonies…were not only approved of, and used by those learned and godly

---

[52] Charles I, "Ecclesiastical Canons for the English Church," in Laud, *Works of William Laud*, vol. 5, pt. 2, 610.

[53] Antoinette Sutto, "Lord Baltimore, the Society of Jesus, and Caroline Absolutism in Maryland, 1630-1645," *Journal of British Studies, 48*, 3 (2009), 632-33.

[54] Derek Hirst, *Authority and Conflict, England: 1603-1658*, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1986), 164.

divines to whom at the time of the Reformation under King Edward the Sixth, compiling the Book of Common Prayer was committed…but also again taken up by this whole church under Queen Elizabeth."[55] However, Tim Harris, a notable scholar of Stuart politics and controversies, says of Laud and his followers that they "seemed to many to be more concerned about the threat of Puritanism than they were about the dangers of popery."[56] They wanted to restore order, but seem to have thought of the Puritans as too divisive to be left unaddressed, and felt their own differences from Catholicism were good enough for any English Protestant (as opposed to the Puritans, who wanted a fuller reformation).

Charles believed the practices of the Church of England were so normative that "it could not be imagined that there would need any rule or law for the observation of the same, or that they could be thought to savour of popery."[57] England witnessed a growing unrest among Protestants, who were increasingly uncomfortable with Laudian ecclesiastical policy.[58] Laud, like Charles, wanted a united Church of England. However, for him, this encompassed the "community and uniformity of worship."[59] Laud, unlike the Puritans, was not rigid in what he expected for congregational worship.[60] He and Richard Hooker believed "divine mandates were

---

[55] Charles I, "Ecclesiastical Canons for the English Church," in *The Works of William Laud*, vol. 5, pt. 2 (John Henry Parker: 1660), 610.

[56] Morrill argues as well that Laud was so concerned with internal problems such as the Puritans and enforcing doctrinal uniformity from an Arminian perspective in the Church of England that he turned a blind eye to a Catholic advance (Harris, *Rebellion*, 313; John S. Morrill, *The Nature of the English Revolution*, (London: Longman, 1993), 54.

[57] Charles I, "Ecclesiastical Canons for the Church of England," in *Works of William Laud*, vol. 5, pt. 2, 610.

[58] Sharpe, *The Personal Rule of Charles I*, 286.

[59] Ibid.

[60] However, Laud did rigidly enforce uniformity within the Church of England and tolerated no dissent. He used the forthcoming statements to insist that human reason allowed for the Church of England to remain as it is and consequently, strongly opposed the Puritans' rigidity.

few" and that God left a lot to human reason as far as worship practice was concerned.[61] Laud was not fond of the rigidity of the Puritans and did all he could to oppose it.

The Puritans, as staunch Calvinists, believed heavily in predestination and election. William Laud and his supporters took an Arminian view of predestination and election, which increased in popularity during Charles's reign. While Calvinists believed Christ had only died for the elected few, Arminians believed Christ died for all.[62] Both sides of this controversy believed the other a dangerous threat to English society, and that the other side was conspiring against them. An unidentified Calvinist named "Mr. Salisbury" soon began accusing supporters of Laud and Charles I as attempting to subvert their freedoms, which worried the Crown and seemed to prove that Calvinists did not respect royal authority and were, in fact, attempting to usurp it.[63] Como notes that "just as Calvinists at Salisbury had come to see Arminianism as a sort of ideological harbinger of popery and political tyranny, so, on the contrary side, many leaders of the Caroline regime had come to see predestinarian preaching as linked to the inherently popular, disruptive, even seditious, brand of political opinion and activity."[64] On both sides, the tension was fueled. Conflict was growing increasingly unavoidable.

Laud and his supporters believed the clear problem and resistance to their efforts came from predestinarian preaching, but as Como notes, "while they believed it absolutely necessary to suggest predestinarian discourse, they also realized that it was very difficult…perhaps even

---

[61] Francis J. Bremer, *New England Society from Bradford to Edwards*, (Lebanon: University Press of New England, 1995), 13.

[62] David R. Como, "Predestination and Political Conflict in Laud's London," *The Historical Journal*, vol. 46, no. 2 (2003), 270.

[63] Ibid.

[64] Ibid., 272.

impossible, to do so in an overt and frank manner" because of the negative political implications that it produced.[65] They feared it would only drive further agitation against them from their opponents, and push those without a developed opinion over to the Puritan side.

Arminians increased in number both in England and Scotland. In Scotland, they achieved several high-ranking university positions, and their advantage lay in Charles I, who was more sympathetic to their theology than the Calvinism of the Puritans and more likely to favor them. This raised grave concerns for Scottish Calvinists (known as Covenanters), who were also wary of Charles's rule.[66] To concerned English and Scottish subjects, Charles and those he appointed, such as Laud, were bent on taking their freedoms. Hirst notes that Charles's own "concern for uniformity was affronted by the dominance in Scotland of ways of worship he and Laud were endeavoring to root out in England. Besides challenging their own belief in the divine warrant for their chosen forms, the presence of presbyterianism in the Scottish kirk, or church, could only encourage puritan dissidents in England."[67]

To counter the growing unrest and rebellion in both kingdoms, Charles took extra measures to assert his authority in Scotland and attempt to push the form of the Church of England on the Church of Scotland, in blatant disregard of the latter as well as the Scottish Parliament.[68] Gardiner notes that "English Puritanism and Scottish Presbyterianism were not yet quite the same thing. But they were rapidly approaching one another. The Puritans had discovered that the king so detested their principles that he would rather engage in war with

---

[65] Como, "Predestination and Political Conflict in Laud's London," 278.

[66] Conrad Russell, *The Causes of the English Civil War*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), 110-11.

[67] Hirst, *Authority and Conflict*, 183.

[68] Ibid.

scarcely a prospect of success, than yield to their demands."[69] This was already apparent as the situation in Scotland had already taken a turn for the worse. Now, Charles's subjects in both kingdoms could see Charles had a will of his own that was not to be challenged, and that he was willing to fight to the last man even though he were to lose.

William Laud's view of Scripture itself was also more fluid than the Puritans, which did not help his case. While they believed in a clear reading of the Bible and that anything not explicitly commanded in Scripture was necessarily forbidden, Laud believed the opposite. For him, "the meaning of Scripture was not self-evident and self-authenticating but had to be interpreted by reason" and he saw the Puritans' rigidity as "blind biblicism."[70] Laud's view of worship allowed for some elements of human tradition, to which the Puritans were staunchly and increasingly opposed, which further aggravated them against Laud.[71]

Laud was also strongly supportive of Charles I. He believed it unjust that the opposition to Charles was building. Already he was upset that the bishops were subject to scathing criticism and now, he saw the King under attack as well. Laud believed the root of the problem of the opposition to Charles was the Puritans being, by nature, blasphemers. He was also a firm believer in the episcopacy and did not like the presbyterian (elder-led) model of church government for which the Puritans called. While Laud did not deny that the Church of England was thoroughly Protestant, and wanted it that way, he felt the Puritans' accusations of "Romish

---

[69] S.R. Gardiner, *The First two Stuarts and the Puritan Revolution*, (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1904), 113.

[70] Bremer, *New England Society from Bradford to Edwards*, 12.

[71] This was true in the sense that in Laud's view, it justified the practices of the Church of England and made it unreasonable to oppose them. However, this does not mean that Laud did not strictly enforce his own reading of Scripture that allowed him to justify opposing the Puritans.

superstition" were uncalled for and completely untrue.[72] He wanted a stable episcopal church government in which the king was given his due honor, and the rigidity of the Puritans was silenced. Laud proved unwilling to deviate from the traditional setup of the Church of England and required many extrabiblical things in line with the traditional Church of England that were repugnant to Puritans, such as the wearing of vestments, placing the altar back in churches and/or front and center, etc., which the Puritans never agreed with. His actions only further fueled Puritan tension and ensured that a heated conflict was inevitable.

Laud believed that obedience to the Church and the Crown were quintessential in maintaining the stability of England. He argued that the way to prevent England from "melting" (as one's heart melts under anxiety) was that "the King must trust his people" and "the people must honor, obey and support their King" and "both King, and peers, and people must religiously serve and honor God."[73] Laud wanted the church to stay united, believing that "it is not possible in any Christian commonwealth that the Church should 'melt' and the state stand firm. For there can be no firmness without law, and no laws can be binding if there be no conscience to obey them…wherever you find the Church 'melt' and 'dissolve,' there you shall also see conscience decay."[74]

Disunity and division posed a real problem for Laud's vision of a united Church of England. In his mind, adherence to the Church of England had to be enforced. For this to occur, Laud ordered all bishops in Scotland to strictly adhere to all royal laws, and that anyone who

---

[72] William Laud, *A Speech Delivered in the Star Chamber, Concerning Pretended Innovations in the Church*, 14 June 1637, accessed April 10, 2022. http://anglicanhistory.org/laud/laud1.html.

[73] William Laud, "Sermon on Psalm 91," (1625) in *The Works of William Laud*, vol. 1 (John Henry Parker: 1860), 104-106.

[74] Ibid., 112.

would "affirm, 'That the King's Majesty hath not the same authority in causes ecclesiastical'…or impeach any part of his authority in causes ecclesiastical, let him be excommunicated, and not restored but only by the archbishop of the province, after his repentance and public revocation of these his wicked errors."[75] He also was not going to accept anything that resembled Puritanism from Scottish Protestants, warning them that affirming any practice of the established order of Charles I and the court "do contain in them any thing repugnant to the Scriptures, or are corrupt, superstititious, or unlawful in the service and worship of God…let him be excommunicated."[76] For the English, Laud affirmed that kings had such authority over ecclesiastical affairs that "for any…to set up, maintain, or avow under any pretense whatever any independent coactive power either papal or popular…is to undermine their great royal office."[77] Laud would tolerate no dissent out of England or Scotland, or for that matter anywhere else in Charles's sphere of authority.

Laud tried stamping out Puritanism and enforcing uniformity throughout the Church of England. In 1631, he distributed an oath that churches were required to take in which they had to "present all and every such person and persons that now is, or of late was within your Parish, as hath committed any incest, adultery, fornication, or simony, and any midsdemeanour or disturbances committed or made in any Church or Chappell, in time of Common Prayer, Preaching, or divine service there used, to the disturbance thereof."[78] Any doctrinal division or

---

[75] William Laud, "Scotch Canons," in *The Works of William Laud*, vol. 5, pt. 2 (John Henry Parker: 1860), 586.

[76] Ibid., 587.

[77] William Laud, "English Canons," in *Works of William Laud*, vol. 5, pt. 2, 614.

[78] William Laud, "Articles to be Enquired of Within the Dioces of London, in the Second Triennial Visitation of the Right Honorable, and Right Reverend Father in God, William Lord Bishop of London," (London: E. Allde, 1631), accessed April 18, 2022. http://quod.lib.umich.edu/e/eebo2/B00013.0001.001/1:4?rgn=div1;view=fulltext.

deviation of standard practice would have to be reported to the proper authorities, which meant that uniformity according to the Thirty-Nine Articles and the Laudian order of worship was going to be enforced. Laud, like most supporters of royal ecclesiastical policy dating as far back as Elizabeth I, sympathized toward a policy that neither went completely away from Catholic liturgical elements, such as clerical vestments, altars, etc., nor did it remain in it. Collinson notes that Calvinists during the reign of Mary I had been wary of returning to England when it became clear that Elizabeth was not taking the Reformation in England back to the same level it had been on in the years of Edward VI.[79]

Elizabeth's way incorporated a removal of key Catholic elements from the liturgy such as anything to do with the Pope, as well as a formula for the administration of the Lord's Supper that allowed various schools of thought on the nature of the elements to meet in the middle. Decades later, Charles I, though having made a unique set of reforms, did not initially depart from a promotion of Elizabethan ecclesiastical policy. This meant that the Crown, which officially had authority over the liturgy, was able to tell the Puritans what they could preach on, with Laud as a key enforcer of royal authority.

The Puritans did not want to be told what to preach on, particularly if it was the Arminian view of salvation and predestination. They wanted to ensure that "the distinctive protestant doctrines of God's sovereignty, man's importence and the all-sufficiency of Scripture" were being taught and followed in the Church, from which the Elizabethan Settlement deviated.[80] They also did not want to have to wear clerical vestments, have altars and other features of the Church of England they felt were left over from Catholicism. One of the things Laud

---

[79] Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 29-31.

[80] Ibid., 37-38.

commissioned anyone holding churches accountable to look for was a church order set up that was not in line with his canons or according to his design, and refusal to do so being in the name of it being "Popish and Antichristian."[81] This meant that the Puritans would either have to accept Laud's prescribed order or face the consequences.

Even in 1628, when the controversial Parliament occurred, William Laud had publicly established himself as desirous of keeping the peace by ecclesiastical unity, and his definition of unity is critically important to understand the measures he took. Laud described unity as "so *One*, as that is the uniting of more than one: yet such a uniting of many, as that when the *Common Faith* is endangered, the *Church* appears for it as *One*."[82] Laud's description also included a united kingdom for purposes of safety and security. Thus, he argued that "no man can exhort unto, and endeavor for the *Unity of the Church*, but at the same time, he labours for the *good of the state*."[83]

To Laud, the Puritans were neither working for unity of church or state, as they upset the unity of the church with constant questioning of practices, which disrupted the church's uniformity and also that of England itself. He believed that those who disrupted such unity made "equal parts unequal" and created "fracture."[84] The Puritans, as challengers of what constituted the unity, presented a problem for Laud that he felt needed urgent attention. Laud's biographer, Peter Heylyn, presents him as caught between "Popery" and "Calvinism" as the only one who

---

[81] Laud, "Articles to be Enquired of Within the Dioces of London."

[82] William Laud, *A Sermon Preached on Munday, the Seaventeenth of March, at Westminster at the Opening of the Parliament* (London: B. Norton and J. Bill for Richard Badger, 1628), 1-3.

[83] Ibid., 7.

[84] Ibid., 8-9.

could properly define the direction of the Church of England.[85] Heylyn demonstrates in doing so that part of Laud's program of reform included taking the Church of England in a decidedly Arminian direction. This created numerous issues with the Puritans that would eventually spread to all Protestants throughout England. It contributed, as noted above, to Puritans leaving England for the Massachusetts Bay Colony in 1629 (and some successive attempts afterwards).

One example (but not the only one by any means) of the Puritans' issues with Laud came when William Prynne, a polemical Puritan layman, published an accusation against an alleged Catholic plot to force Charles to convert England to Catholicism. He alleged that the Roman Catholic Church had utilized a secret cabal with the Pope as its head to infiltrate England, and that if Charles did not immediately spread the Catholic faith he would be tried and executed for treason.[86] For this and for his sharp criticism of theater and the State, he was accused of treason before the Star Chamber.[87] Laud eventually greatly censured Prynne, which many saw as an example of Laud's ecclesiastical tyranny.

---

[85] Peter Heylyn, *Cyprianus Anglicus, or, the History of the Life and Death of the Most Reverend and Renowned Prelate William, by Divine Providence Lord Archbishop of Canterbury…Containing Also the Ecclesiastical History of the Three Kingdoms of England, Scotland, and Ireland From the First Rising Till his Death*, (London: A. Seile, 1668), 269-275.

[86] This was also not Prynne's first offense. Harris notes that he was in the Star Chamber earlier in the 1630s for publishing a rash criticism of royal custom and symbols and spoke "libellously" in doing so (Harris, *Rebellion*, 339). Prynne and others increased the criticisms against Charles, which contributed to the growing hostile political climate in England during this time (William Prynne, *Romes Master-Peece, or, The Grand Conspiracy of the Pope and his Jesuited Instruments, to Extirpate the Protestant Religion, Re-establish Popery, Subvert lawes, Liberties, Peace, Parliaments, by Kindling a Civill war in Scotland, and all His Majesties Realmes, and to Poyson the King Himselfe in Case hee Comply not With Them in These Their Execrable Designes Revealed out of Conscience to Andreas ab Habernfeld, by an Agent Sent from Rome into England, by Cardinall Barbarino, as an Assistant to con the Popes Late Nuncio, to Prosecute This Most Execrable Plot, (in Which he Persisted a Principall Actor Severall Yeares) who Discovered it to Sir William Boswell His Majesties Agent at the Hague, 6 Sept. 1640. He, Under an Oath of Secrecie, to the Arch-bishop of Canterbury (Among Whose Papers it was Casually Found by Master Pyrnne, May, 31. 1643) who Communicated it to the King, as the Greatest Businesse That Ever was put to him*, [London: Michael Sparke, Sr., 1644], 17-19; George Yule, *Puritans in Politics: Religious Legislation of the Long Parliament, 1640-1647*, [Cambridge: Cambrige University Press, 1982], 81-82).

[87] Samuel R. Gardiner, ed., *Documents Related to the Proceedings Against William Prynne, in 1634 and 1637*, (New York: Johnson Reprinting Corporation, 1877), 1.

Laud's measures affected Puritans not only in England, but also in New England. According to Winship, Laud received a new position in 1634—head of the Commission for Regulating Colonies. He could use this to his advantage in that he could strip the colonies of their charters, replace the colonial governments with ones that fit his expectations for ecclesiastical direction. Laud's authority to dissolve colonial governments and charters put the very existence of colonies at stake.[88] The Puritans in the Massachusetts Bay Colony became disturbed when this news reached them. As far as they were concerned, they had obeyed their charter and would continue to do so. Therefore, Laud had no right or reasonable grounds to dissolve the colony. They began to fear an impending war with the mother country as a result, since they were unwilling to go down without a fight.[89] The conflict with Charles I, if it ever had been, was now no longer restricted simply to the mother country. Now, even the colonies began to feel the tension as it became clear a side would have to be taken.

Charles endeavored to present himself as the ideal monarch to keep the Church of England Protestant. He did not see the need for Parliament to check his power at all, and felt his words and actions were enough to justify him before English Protestants that he had their best interests at heart. Charles took some measures to suppress Puritans early into his reign and continued into the 1640s. He wanted to strengthen the Church of England against theological opposition, even though it was unclear yet to what end this would be. John Ley and Henry Parker

---

[88] Winship, *Hot Protestants*, 96.

[89] However, things in Massachusetts were not going as perfectly as necessary in order to convince Laud to leave them alone. Puritans in Massachusetts were dealing with the Antinomian Controversy. As the Antinomian Controversy raged, matters could have potentially worsened when John Cotton's response to elders in New England who questioned his doctrine eventually reached William Laud. The Antinomian Controversy could have been reasonable grounds in Laud's mind for him to dissolve the colonial charter altogether (Winship, *Hot Protestants*, 96; David D. Hall, *The Antinomian Controversy, 1636-1638: A Documentary History*, [Durham: Duke University Press, 1990], 175).

came to the Puritans' defense when the measures of Charles, Laud, and other Anglicans against Puritans became intense. As England faced both internal and external threats into Charles's reign, Ley and Parker blamed the Puritans' persecutors for the problems going on in England, referring to them as "Antipuritans" and accusing them of being England's real problem.[90] They alleged that English Protestants wanted to call all who were not "Papists" but who did not subscribe to their way of thinking "Puritans," which was not helping England's worsening situation.[91] Charles's attempt to claim the allegiance of the Church of England seemed to be working. However, the question remained whether he was the ideal monarch for the English Protestant cause.

The Actions of Charles I and the General Protestant Cause

The actions of Charles I had many implications for Protestantism in general. As noted above, Charles's acts in favor of the Church of England seemed strongly against both Catholics and Puritans. However, both Puritans and non-Puritans eventually found opposition to Charles's measures. Due to the Thirty Years' War, Charles's actions initially did not stamp out the Protestant cause. He felt it his duty to give aid to his uncle, Christian IV of Denmark, a Lutheran king who had lost the Battle of Lutter tremendously, in the name of the cause of Christendom.[92] Charles had presented himself as a thoroughly Protestant monarch in 1628, and reaffirmed the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England as authoritative and of God, and reauthorized

---

[90] John Ley and Henry Parker, *A Discourse Concerning Puritans. A Vindication of Those who Unjustly Suffer by the Mistake, Abuse, and Misapplication of That Name. A Tract Usefull for These Times*, (London: Robert Bostock, 1641), 3.

[91] Ibid.

[92] Charles I, "The King's Declaration Showing the Causes of the Late Dissolution," in Gardiner, *Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution*, 17.

their printing.[93] In 1629, he also utilized parliamentary funds to raise up the size of his fleet to protect English Protestants and their liberties, and deter suspicion from Parliament and its supporters.[94]

Charles did not openly express his support for the Roman Catholic Church when he first inherited the throne in the 1620s. In his speech reaffirming the Church of England's Thirty-Nine Articles as authoritative for England, Charles lamented the state of Scotland and Ireland, over which he ruled, as being overrun with the Roman Catholic Church. He lamented the presence of zealous Catholics in Scotland, Catholic interests taking over in Ireland, etc., and made clear he wanted this influence kept out of England.[95]

Despite Charles's insistence he was as anti-Catholicism as any good English Protestant, the facts in the colonies were not validating his claims. Maryland tolerated the presence of Catholics despite having a charter that had the Church of England as the official colonial church. In 1637, penal laws in Maryland were still in place against Catholic priests, such that it was not safe to address one with the title of "Rev." However, this was almost a moot point, as Captain Cornwallis, colonial governor of Maryland, challenged the idea that the Pope was the Antichrist, and around this time went on a crusade to prove that all Protestant ministers were of the devil.[96] The struggle against Catholicism for English people was not merely theoretical. In Maryland, it

---

[93] Charles I, "The King's Declaration Prefixed to the Articles of Religion," in Gardiner, *Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution*, 10.

[94] Charles I, "To our Trusty and Well-Beloved the Lords Spiritual and Temporal of the Higher House of Parliament," in Sir Charles Petrie, ed., *Letters of King Charles I*, (London: Cassell and Company Ltd., 1935), 70.

[95] Charles I, "The King's Declaration Showing the Causes of the Late Dissolution," in Gardiner, *Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution*, 17.

[96] Ethan Allen, *Maryland Toleration, or Sketches of Maryland's Early History, to the Year 1650*, (Baltimore: John S. Waters, 1855), 5, 10, 12-13, 18-19, 21-23.

was already happening. Staunch Protestants were being accused of being of the devil and needlessly divisive. To fearful English Protestants, these colonial proofs indicated it was only a matter of time before the struggle came to the mother country itself.

In colonial Virginia, opposition to Catholicism was mounting. With Catholic pushback in Maryland and Laudian ecclesiastical policy threatening the existence of Massachusetts, as well as Charles's inconsistent measures in the mother country, Virginia ministers felt the need to strengthen themselves. John Woolverton claims that most ministers in early colonial Virginia were of a Puritan persuasion and strongly Calvinistic, including even John Smith. The writings of William Perkins, a key figure among the Puritans, went to a college in Henrico County in the early days of the colony (though this college did not end up being successful). Even in 1640, when military tension was beginning to build in Europe, most Virginia Protestants believed "the Pope, and not their king, was the Antichrist." This, however, was in opposition to England, which believed Charles I was "the Pope's second."[97]

Neither side of the Atlantic forsook the idea that the Pope was the Antichrist. However, while some Virginians were seemingly willing to give Charles the benefit of the doubt, this did not mean there was not a clear anti-Catholic struggle taking place in the colony at this time. Even in 1644, when Charles was clearly losing the English Civil War, he was ready to severely punish any and all opposition, including particularly harsh punishments for Puritans, whom he saw as a source of division and strife.[98] Charles still held onto his goals of unity for England and her Church.

---

[97] John F. Woolverton, *Colonial Anglicanism in North America*, (Detroit: Wayne State University, 1984), 37-42, 50.

[98] Joseph Frank, ed., "News From Virginny, 1644," 1644.

Charles, much to the chagrin of his staunch Protestant subjects, gradually revealed his many shared sympathies with Catholic teaching and practice and allowed it to influence his vision of unity in England, and even at one point tried to build a relationship with the Pope such that he could influence the Pope to "stop the deposition of heretical monarchs."[99] Arnold Meyer, who studied the flawed relationship between Charles I and his subjects, argues that Charles's relationship with the Catholic Church made him "a stranger to the English people, not only on account of his ideas of state and church government, but also on account of his ideas of culture. His culture was as predominantly aesthetical, as that of the Puritans was predominantly ethical."[100]

Charles's focus was on England's glory and that of his own as its king. To do that, Charles knew he needed the support of the people and did what he could to appease the growing concern of his subjects. However, Charles's relationship with an increasingly Puritan Parliament (who frequently questioned his royal actions and motives behind some of his unique measures) was not helping his public image, as his subjects in growing numbers fearfully believed him to be hiding his true intentions concerning the Roman Catholic Church. Charles eventually pardoned John Goodman, a convicted Catholic priest. Charles's actions fueled the rising anti-Catholic mass hysteria in England, and lent credibility to the belief that Charles was hiding his true intentions concerning the Catholic Church.[101] Charles's political actions with Parliament would also give validation to some of his subjects' fears. Charles was not only determined to

---

[99] Arnold O. Meyer, "Charles I. and Rome," *The American Historical Review, 19*, 1 (1913), 18-20.

[100] Ibid., 13.

[101] John S. A. Adamson, *The Noble Revolt: The Overthrow of Charles I*, (London: Weidenfield and Nicholson, 2007), 39-40.

enforce his vision for England, but he was not going to let anyone, even Parliament, stop him from achieving his goals.

Charles I and Parliament

When Charles first took the throne, he accepted the standard constitutional relationship between the Crown and Parliament, but only reluctantly. When he and the Lord Keeper gave a speech before Parliament, Charles went as far as calling both Houses of Parliament together simply to show them their "unparliamentary proceedings" in opposing his impeachment of the Duke of Buckingham.[102] Simultaneously, the Lord Keeper affirmed that "there was never any King more loving to his people, or better affectioned to the right use of Parliaments" than himself, which was evidenced in his calm demeanor and well-thought out comments.[103]

Charles wanted full control of Parliament to the degree that their actions and his were fully synchronized. However, the Lord Keeper denied this throughout the speech, and frequently reminded the people that Charles expected their "cheerful obedience."[104] Charles also wanted the English people so aligned with him, that he frequently disregarded the Magna Carta in imprisoning his subjects without a trial, which earned him criticism by 1628. Parliament criticized Charles because several of his "subjects have of late been imprisoned without any caused showed," and because Charles had been quick to issue the death penalty when "no man shall be forejudged of life or limb against the form of the Great Charter and the law of the land," and "no man ought to be adjudged to death but by the laws established in this your realm," and

[102] John Rushworth, 'Historical Collections: 1626, March-April', in *Historical Collections of Private Passages of State: Volume 1, 1618-29* (London, 1721), pp. 219-248. *British History Online* http://www.british-history.ac.uk/rushworth-papers/vol1/pp219-248 [accessed 21 April 2022].

[103] Ibid.

[104] Ibid.

"no offender is exempt from the proceedings to be used."[105] In truth, Charles was singling out certain of his subjects for punishment.

Charles was willing to work with Parliament inasmuch as they were willing to work the way he wanted them to compromise. If that relationship deteriorated, Charles saw it as necessary to take matters into his own hands rather than stay within constitutional checks. He warned them to "remember that Parliaments are altogether in my power for their calling, sitting and dissolution; therefore as I find the fruits of them good or evil, they are to continue or not to be."[106] Charles asserted for himself the right to control Parliament depending on whether or not their actions were pleasing to him. He asserted for himself the right to determine what constituted a parliamentary error. If the Parliament made errors according to Charles's judgment, he warned that he deemed it an act not only against him personally, but also against England as well as "the state of Christendom itself," and it would give him incentive not to continue calling Parliament into action.[107]

Charles saw Parliament as a means to an end, and not a necessary and authoritative check on his power as king. As a result, he quickly began to live up to his word. When his uncle, Christian IV of Denmark, lost at the Battle of Lutter, and Parliament refused to come to his aid, Charles bypassed them with a forced loan to raise the necessary money to give his uncle assistance.[108] He did not submit to Parliament's guidance and appealed to reason to get the people to side with him against Parliament. According to his speech at the prorogation of

---

[105]"The Petition of Right," in Sir Charles Petrie, ed., *The Letters of King Charles I*, 59.

[106] Rushworth, ed., "Historical Collections."

[107] Ibid.

[108] Berkeley, "The Argument of Sir Robert Berkeley," in Gardiner, *Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution*, 51-52.

Parliament, Charles felt he owed "an account [of his actions] to God alone."[109] According to the Root and Branch Petititon, he and his allies felt "their calling was from Jesus Christ" and that their government was "found by woeful experience to be a main cause and occasion of foul evils." [110] The actions Parliament was calling attention to included Charles's treatment of dissident ministers and anyone else who disagreed with him on the way the church and the nation should be run. Charles felt this action necessary to defend the cause of Christendom and felt Parliament's inaction was hindering him. Eventually, he dissolved Parliament formally and did not call them again for eleven years, which further displeased his subjects.

In response to all these concerns, Charles's subjects, in 1628, eventually brought before him the English Petition of Right. Charles had been prosecuting his noblemen and others against the dictates of the Magna Carta, and the interpretation of the Magna Carta was brought to center stage when his noblemen issued the Petition of Right. One of the things they called for on no uncertain terms was for Charles to act in accordance with Parliament.[111] They wanted him to surrender the due portion of authority to Parliament, and believed he was acting unjustly in the measures he was taking against his noblemen.

Charles made a point to respond to the Petition, but felt he was doing it justice by declaring Parliament had no power or authority over the law whatsoever unless he gave it to them. He argued that only to judges he appointed "belonged the interpretation of laws" and that

---

[109] He did not agree with their Remonstrance against the Duke of Buckingham and felt the need to incite the people of England to his side against Parliament as a result (Charles I, "The King's Speech at the Prorogation of Parliament at the end of the Session of 1628, and "The Root and Branch Petition," in Gardiner, *Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution*, 8, 66, 72-73).

[110] Charles I, "The King's Speech at the Prorogation of Parliament at the end of the Session of 1628, and "The Root and Branch Petition," in Gardiner, *Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution*, 8, 66, 72-73.

[111] "The Root and Branch Petition," in Gardiner, *Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution*, 66-70.

"none of the Houses of Parliament, either joint or separate, (what new doctrine soever may be raised), has any power either to make or declare a law without my consent."[112] Nevertheless, Parliament made clear that it was not going to compromise with Charles so as to give him more power than he had already that would not restrict him to the checks for which the Petition of Right called.[113] Charles was going to have to rule England as a constitutional monarch whether he wanted to or not.

Charles scorned the idea of Parliament limiting the scope of his authority, and accused them of "wasting so much time…blasting our government."[114] By the time the Petition of Right was passed, it was passed in such a way that "was destructive to itself" because it essentially nullified the powers of Parliament and was struck down as fast as it had risen.[115] With the Petition nullified, English Protestants saw themselves as deprived of essential protection against a king who seemed bent on his own agenda. Charles demonstrated himself unwilling to submit to parliamentary checks to take his royal prerogative and showed a resilience to the people's concerns even in the face of increasing concern against the measures he was taking.

Charles's anti-parliamentary stance was not without its opposition. Robert Berkeley opposed his methods on grounds of the Magna Carta and cited it as the "birthright" of the English that they be placed under "no new laws" and that the king ought to do nothing without the consent of Parliament.[116] Berkeley argued this regardless of the state of the nation and/or the

---

[112] Charles I, "The King's Speech at the Prorogation of Parliament," in Gardiner, *Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution*, 9.

[113] Charles I, "To our Trusty and Well-Beloved…," in Petrie, *Letters of King Charles I*, 61.

[114] Ibid., 65.

[115] "The Grand Remonstrance," in Gardiner, ed., *Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution*, 133.

risks to its own safety by Charles's inaction. He affirmed Parliament as "the greatest supreme court in the kingdom."[117] He thought it a grave error that Charles was not using them, but instead acting entirely without their approval as of 1628 when he dissolved it. To further prove his point, Charles even took the added step of trying and executing his contenders at the 1629 Parliament, and even when one died in prison, he refused to release the body.[118] Charles had a message to send—opposition to his rule was going to be costly and have dire implications for those who would.

The concerns of the English for the implications of Charles's actions on religion and the best interests of the people were not exclusively in England. They were felt throughout all the Kingdoms of the British Isles. Even his Scottish subjects were not satisfied with his repudiation of Catholicism and believed that Parliament was there to ensure that the religion of God was kept at the forefront via a check on the king's power, and also strongly opposed his attempts to force ecclesiastical unity on them.[119] Without Parliament, even the Scottish could not be sure that the Presbyterian Church they had established would be kept free of problems, including Catholic corruption.[120] Finally, the Scottish rebelled against Charles's authority, in large part because of Charles's attempts to force the model of English episcopacy on the Church of Scotland, and push

---

[116] Robert Berkeley, "Argument of Sir Robert Berkeley," in Gardiner, ed., *Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution*, 117-120.

[117] Ibid., 123.

[118] Conrad Russell, *The Crisis of Parliaments: English History, 1509-1660*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1971), 309-310.

[119] Berkeley, "Argument of Sir Robert Berkeley," in Gardiner, *Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution*, 53-54.

[120] As noted previously, Scotland also contained Puritans. The Scottish Presbyterians and the English Puritans shared many theological points. For the Scottish to be making a similar claim to the English Puritans shows that Charles's methods were perceived not only as a threat to Puritans, but also to Protestantism in general, making it easier for the Puritans to gain their appeal among other Protestants in England.

reforms that seemed Catholic in character, regardless of what his Scottish subjects thought of the matter.[121]

Charles sought to address the issue directly and contradicted any claims the Scots made of adherence to the Reformed faith. He argued "these men who give themselves out to be the onely Reformers of Religion, have taken such a course to undermine and blow up the Religion Reformed, by the scandall of Rebellion and Disobedience."[122] Charles presented the Scots as contradicting the essence of the Reformed faith he indirectly claimed to uphold. He asserted "that Religion is onely pretended and used by them as a cloak to palliate their intended Rebellion," and cited the existence of their covenant as proof of this.[123] Charles refused to answer Scottish demands in their petition due to their lack of shame in the rebellion, and decided to focus instead on "securing Our Counsell to signifie to Our good subjects Our aversness from Poperie, and detestation of superstition."[124] Charles was only determined to save face and prove the Scottish wrong before his subjects in England, who were at risk of joining the Scottish cause against him.

To keep order in England, Charles issued another proclamation in 1639 to prevent the further spread of chaos. He argued about the Scottish that "the aim of these Men is not Religion (as they falsely pretend and publish) but it is to shake off all Monarchicall government, and to

---

[121] Harris, *Rebellion*, 367-371.

[122] Walter Balancqhall, *A Large Declaration Concerning the Late Tumults of Scotland, From Their First Originals Together With a Particular Deduction of the Seditious Practices of the Prime Leaders of the Covenanters: Collected out of Their own Foul Acts and Writings: By Which it Doth Plainly Appeare, That Religion was Onely Pretended by Those Leaders, but Nothing Lesse Intended by Them, By the King*, (London: Robert Young, His Majesties Printer for Scotland, 1639), 3.

[123] Ibid., 6.

[124] Ibid., 45.

vilifie Our Regall power justly descended upon Us over them," and that they were now influencing Charles's English subjects to do the same.[125] The contents of the pamphlets the Scottish published he called "such Rebellious Doctrine, and so contrary to all which Protestant Divines teach towards the King and the Civill Magistrate."[126] By "all Protestant Divines," Charles no doubt referred to all divines in submission to Archbishop Laud and his enforcement of church uniformity. This would mean that Charles did not consider anyone to be a legitimate Protestant Divine who did not submit to Laudian policy.

By 1640, the situation with the Scottish continued to cause unrest. Charles was now at a point of realization that he could not solve this problem by himself. By this time, the goal was merely to call a new session of Parliament. However, by then, the Scottish army had already gone on the offensive and Charles's army had to be deployed to deal with the crisis. Within two months of the distribution of the Scottish pamphlets, Charles attempted to proclaim his goodwill to the Scots. He pledged to the Scottish that "if all Civil and temporal obedience be effectually and timely given and showen unto us, we do not intende to invade them with any Hostilitie; but if they shall…raise any armed troopes, and drawe them downe within Ten miles our borderes of England, we shall then interpret that, as an invasion."[127] Charles was still willing to show the Scots benevolence should they surrender their campaign against him. However, he was prepared to act swiftly to deal with the threat of a potential Scottish invasion of England.

---

[125] Charles I, "A Proclamation and Declaration to Inform Our Loving Subjects of Our Kingdom of England of the Seditious Practices of Some in Scotland, Seeking to Overthrow Our Regall Power Under False Pretences of Religion," (27 Feb 1639), in Larkin, ed., *Stuart Royal Proclamations*, vol. 2, 662-663.

[126] Ibid., 665.

[127] Charles I, "A Proclamation Declaring the King's Intention Toward the Scots," (14 May 1639), in Larkin, ed., *Stuart Royal Proclamations*, vol. 2, 680-681.

Though Charles attempted to keep the peace at home, he could only do so for so long. Soon, more of his English subjects began to jump on the bandwagon. A scandalous accusation was published against Charles in England within three months of his attempted peace treaty with Scotland. Charles issued another proclamation demanding that anyone in possession of this "scandalous Paper" to turn it over to him or face the penalty "to be publikely burnt by the Hangman."[128] Charles was trying desperately to save face in the midst of a Scottish revolt, but clearly failing to convince his subjects of his best intentions on both sides.

By early 1640, the Scottish were still refusing to surrender their campaign, and published additional pamphlets in England against Charles's measures. The focus now concerned, "His Majesties proceedings with His Subjects in Scotland" that were "of dangerous consequence to His Government."[129] Scotland was not only in the midst of an attempted overthrow of Charles's dominion over them but was now appealing to England to join them in the endeavor. Charles was actively engaged in trying to stop it but losing further and further ground. To save face, once he called Parliament back into play, he insisted they take the Oath of Supremacy and Allegiance.[130]

Charles's actions began to hinder the morale in England such that at the calling of the Long Parliament in 1640, many of his subjects put forward the Root and Branch Petition to appeal to him to correct the problems England faced. The English now faced both an internal and external crisis. Externally, the English army had to go out against the Scottish during the revolt.

---

[128] Charles I, "A Proclamation Publishing an Act of State, and His Majesties Command Concerning a Scandalous Paper Lately Dispersed Amongst Many of His Subjects," (11 Aug 1639), in Larkin, ed., *Stuart Royal Proclamations*, 688-689.

[129] Charles I, "A Proclamation Against Libellous and Seditious Pamphlets, and Discourses Sent From Scotland," (30 Mar 1640), in Larkin, ed., *Stuart Royal Proclamations*, vol. 2, 703-704.

[130] Charles I, "A Proclamation That the Members of Parliament Take the Oaths," (13 Apr 1640), in Larkin, ed., *Stuart Royal Proclamations*, vol. 2, 708.

Internally, the morale in England was weakening to the point that his subjects were gravely concerned.

Ireland also revolted against Charles's authority in 1641, in large part due to dissatisfaction with reforms under Thomas Wentworth, whom Charles had appointed to deal with Ireland.[131] Harris notes that despite Wentworth's push toward toleration for Catholics and policies that directly benefited Irish Protestants, his policies toward plantations upset Scottish Presbyterians and Ulster nonconformists.[132] However, even Catholics in Ireland were upset. In Charles's attempts to exercise his rule over the Irish and make brief compromises in efforts to eventually conform the Church of Ireland to his liking, he eventually upset both Catholics and Protestants of all persuasions there. With Scotland and Ireland in full-scale rebellion against the Crown and their concerns continuing to be dismissed, Charles's English subjects were beginning to believe their insecurities were justified.

As noted above, the Puritans believed that Charles's method of ruling was the cause of all of England's issues and left many of them extremely dissatisfied. The dissatisfaction came from bishops and their allies having the privilege to do what they wanted (as if they were above the law), ministers lacking courage or will to preach in accordance with Calvinistic doctrine, and removal of appointed ministers whom congregants trusted in exchange for those Charles approved (which many saw as false and evil), the disrespect of Parliament, and the remains of "superstitious" practices of Catholicism.[133] The character of the Root and Branch Petition was strongly Puritan in form in that it is very pro-Parliament, pro-Calvinist, and anti-theater. By

---

[131] Harris, *Rebellion*, 360.

[132] Ibid.

[133] House of Commons, "Resolutions on Religion Drawn by a Sub-Committee of the House of Commons," and "The Root and Branch Petition," in Gardiner, *Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution*, 12, 68-69.

1640, the situation in England for Puritans had gone from their being despised and scorned to becoming a major political faction in England. It was their theology and political philosophy that primarily composed the opposition to Charles I in England.

Charles, in1642, denounced the Puritans even further, whom he alleged were out for "a new Utopia of religion and government, into which they endeavor to transform this kingdom."[134] In response to the questioning of divine right of kings, John Maxwell published a defense of it against the Puritans. He himself was a firm believer in the divine right of kings.[135] In response to the growing antimonarchical climate, he issued the following defense:

> Puritan and Jesuit in this, not only consent and concur, but like Herod and Pilate are reconciled to crucifie the Lords anointed. A thousand pities it is, that our Sectaries, pretending such a Zeal against Popery, and who no less maliciously than confidently rub upon sound Protestants, the Aspersions of Popery and Malignancy, do joyn with the worst of Papists, in the worst at least most pernicious Doctrines of Papists. But ten thousand times more pity it is, that the true reformed and sound Protestant Religion should suffer by such miscreants, that sound Protestants should be charged with these Heresies in after Ages. We will be forced to disclaim them, and say with St. Iohn: They were amongst us, but were not of us, and they have gone out from us. It is not warrantable to be so large in our charitable Defence of any, as to prejudice the inviolable and sacred Truth of Almighty God.[136]

Maxwell disowned antimonarchical Christians and put Puritans and Jesuits on the same level, as having an opposition to something God-ordained, viz., monarchy. He thought it a defense of sound doctrine and good order to defend the monarchy. In response, Samuel Rutherford, a Scottish minister, said of monarchy that

---

[134] Joyce L. Malcolm, ed., *The Struggle for Sovereignty: Seventeenth-Century English Political Tracts*, vol. 1 (Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, 1999), 11.

[135] John Maxwell, *Sacro-Sancta Regum Majestas, or, The Sacred and Royal Prerogative of Christian Kings. Wherein Sovereignty is by Holy Scriptures, Reverend Antiquity, and Sound Reason Asserted, by Discussing of Five Questions. And the Puritanical, Jesuitical, Antimonarchical Grounds are Disproved, and the Untruth and Weakness of Their new Devised-State-Principles are Discovered. Dei Gratia mea lux*, (London: Thomas Dring, 1680), 30.

[136] Ibid., 5.

> The King is said to be from God, by way of naked approbation. God giving to a people power to appoint what Government they shall thinke good, but instituting none in speciall, in his Word. This way some make Kingly power to be from God in the generall, but in the particular to be an invention of men, negatively lawfull, and not repugnant to the Word, as the wretched Popish ceremonies are from God.[137]

Rutherford believed that while kings are in the Bible, they are not necessarily divinely endorsed. As a result, he felt the ground Maxwell and others used to justify the belief in the divine right of kings was shaky and in need of being called into question. To blindly follow the king was unacceptable to him.

Eventually, several opponents of Charles I issued the Root and Branch Petition. The Root and Branch Petition calls for major church reforms in line with Puritan theology.[138] With Catholicism and Arminianism taking root in England, many staunch Protestants, most notably Puritans, were concerned. Many believed the wrong monarch could bring England back under the tyranny of the Pope. By 1641, the Triennial Act was passed, which called for the King to summon Parliament for his checks without question.[139] The knights and burgesses believed that the people of England had even been led to a misunderstanding of Parliament due to Charles's method of rule.[140] A resolution was simultaneously passed that called for the Church of England

---

[137] Samuel Rutherford, *Lex, rex The law and the Prince : a Dispute for the Just Prerogative of King and People : Containing the Reasons and Causes of the Most Necessary Defensive Wars of the Kingdom of Scotland and of Their Expedition for the ayd and Help of Their Dear Brethren of England : in Which Their Innocency is Asserted and a Full Answer is Given to a Seditious Pamphlet Intituled Sacro-Sancta Regum Majestas, or, The Sacred and Royall Prerogative of Christian Kings, Under the Name of J. A. but Penned by Jo. Maxwell the Excommunicate P. Prelat. : With a Scripturall Confutation of the Ruinous Grounds of W. Barclay, H. Grotius, H. Arnisœus, Ant. de Domi P. Bishop of Spalata, and of Other Late Anti-Magistratical Royalists, as the Author of Ossorianum, D. Fern, E. Symmons, the Doctors of Aberdeen, &c. : in XLIV Questions*, (London: John Field, 1644), 5-6.

[138] House of Commons, "Resolutions on Religion Drawn on a Sub-Committee of the House of Commons," and "The Root and Branch Petition."

[139] "The Grand Remonstrance," in Gardiner, ed., *Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution*, 146.

[140] Ibid., 156.

to have services in the method Parliament ordered (as opposed to the king).[141] They also wanted bishops stripped of their political privileges in England and suppressed at any cost, because they saw them as a source of "oppression against religion, church government and discipline."[142] The movement of the Puritans to reform the Church of England was gaining traction under the circumstances.

In addition, many believed Charles's calling of the army against the Scottish to be a measure of injustice. For this reason, and also to prevent the Catholic Church from taking over England, the Ten Propositions were issued in 1641. These took extra anti-Catholic measures, including forbidding the King and Queen from using Jesuits for their spiritual counsel, and considering it an act of treason to deliver a message or follow the orders of the Pope upon entry into England.[143] Scotland, however, was not the only issue Charles's opponents had with his foreign policy. As noted above, Charles had acted without the consent of Parliament since 1628. He had been fervently passing measures that kept the Church of England especially Protestant, but had been sending mixed messages about what type of Protestantism it was.

The pattern of mixed messages from Charles included not only the appointment of bishops in line with the Laudian (some said Catholic) model (as opposed to Presbyterian or Congregationalist), but he also made peace with Catholic France and Spain in the early 1630s.[144] Many saw this as a means for Charles to bring England back to the Pope. Regardless, Sharpe

---

[141] "The Propositions at Uxbridge," in Gardiner, ed., *Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution*, 199.

[142] Ibid., 204-205.

[143] "The Grand Remonstrance," in Gardiner, ed., *Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution*, 164.

[144] "The Propositions at Uxbridge," in Gardiner, ed., *Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution*, 208.

notes that at the time the peace with France and Spain was procured, elements of England had been engaged in conflict against the two (viz., the Duke of Buckingham's naval expeditions against the Spanish and French coasts, and England's own use of privateers). Charles had his own reasons, related to his family ties on the opposing side, for procuring peace with France and Spain. However, it "ended any effectual role of England within Europe."[145] If England had acted as a strongly Protestant other in its relationship with the two Catholic powers in Europe, France and Spain, Charles had effectually surrendered England's uniqueness in making this peace, which lent credibility to many of his subjects' fears of an impending alliance with the Pope that could bring England back under tyranny.

Proof of Charles's true intentions came in that Charles's measures seemed to give strength to Catholics in most places and weaken Protestants. Puritans cited, among other grievances, that the measures being passed included common ground between Catholics and Protestants and expulsion of Puritans. They accused him and his court of saying that "there must be a conjunction between Papists and Protestants in doctrine, discipline, and ceremonies; only it must not yet be called Popery" and that "the Puritans, under which name they include all those who desire to preserve the laws and liberties of the kingdom, and to maintain religion in the power of it, must either be rooted out of the kingdom with force, or driven with fear."[146] The Puritans particularly did not like that their opponents under Charles presented them as congregational anarchists. According to the Grand Remonstrance, their opponents "infuse into the people that we mean to abolish all church government and leave every man to his own fancy

---

[145] Sharpe, *The Personal Rule of Charles I*, 65-70.

[146] "The Grand Remonstrance," in Gardiner, ed., *Constitutional Document of the Puritan Revolution*, 139.

for the service and worship of God, absolving him of that obedience which he owes God unto His Majesty."[147] To the Puritans, Charles was blatantly ignoring their desired reforms and actively working against them for harm. It was not that they believed they owed the king no allegiance. However, it was clear that Charles was attempting to turn the people against them by whatever means he found himself able, including portraying them as divisive.

Charles was quick to deny the influence of Catholicism on his ecclesiastical measures.[148] However, his subjects were not convinced due to the increasing inconsistency of his maneuvers, which only had in common an assertion of his own monarchical authority and a clear intent to pursue his own agenda at the expense of the English people. Even Charles's enforcement of the Church of England's order in 1641, which utilized Parliament for its execution, only showed his inflexibility with his subjects.[149] Whatever Charles was trying to do, he was trying to do it without universal popular support even amid growing opposition and unrest.

In August 1640, Charles finally decided he was through trying to pacify the Scottish and issued a proclamation that all Scottish rebels who would invade England and any English who aided and abetted them, "shall be adjudged and taken to be, and are hereby denounced and proclaimed Rebels and Traitors against His Majestie, His Crown and Dignity, and shall incur the just and deserved penalties and forfeitures of High Treason."[150] Despite this, Charles still attempted to refute the accusations that he would "hinder His Subjects of Scotland from the

---

[147] "The Grand Remonstrance," in Gardiner, ed., *Constitutional Document of the Puritan Revolution*, 151.

[148] Charles I, "The King's Answer to the Petition," in Gardiner, ed., *Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution*, 156.

[149] Ibid., 155.

[150] Charles I, "A Proclamation Declaring Those of Scotland, who Have Entred, or Shall Enter This Kingdom in a Warlike Manner, and Their Adherents, to be Rebels and Traitours to His Majestie," (20 Aug 1640), in Larkin, ed., *Stuart Royal Proclamations*, vol. 2, 727.

enjoyning of their Religion and Liberties."[151] Finally, Charles had a threefold war to fight. Anger in Scotland had already reached its peak, and now Ireland and England too shared such sympathies. The English Civil War, or the War of the Three Kingdoms, was raging now, and there was no turning back.

Outbreak of the English Civil War

By 1640, the increasing English tension with Charles I had brought about the precipice of the English Civil War. Already, Charles was fighting his own subjects in Scotland and Ireland. Now, even his own subjects in England found themselves taking the side of an increasingly agitated Parliament to restore order to England, which Charles was determined to completely reshape in his own image. In 1641, in the name of "Peace and Tranquillitie of the Church," he issued a proclamation that he would "require Obedience to the Lawes and Statutes ordained for establishing of the true Religion in this Kingdom" (i.e., adherence to the Church of England in its current established form).[152] This included the prohibition of anything not already allowed under his royal policy to go on in church. In addition, he attempted to secure the arrest of his old opponent, John Pym. Pym was now in a leadership position in Parliament, along with other Puritans, and he boldly asserted that the King had no right to dissolve Parliament, which was illegal.[153]

---

[151] Charles I, "A Proclamation Declaring Those of Scotland, who Have Entred, or Shall Enter This Kingdom in a Warlike Manner, and Their Adherents, to be Rebels and Traitours to His Majestie," (20 Aug 1640), in Larkin, ed., *Stuart Royal Proclamations*, vol. 2, 727-728.

[152] Charles I, "A Proclamation for Obedience to the Lawes Ordained for Establishing of the True Religion in This Kingdom of England," (10 Dec 1641), in Larkin, ed., *Stuart Royal Proclamations*, vol. 2, 753-754.

[153] Pym also blamed Charles for the emigration of Puritans and others to the colonies, as well as England's growing economic crisis, which he felt was due to Charles's tax increases, and called Charles out on his abuses of power, including his dissolution of Parliament every time they criticized him (John Pym, "On Grievances in the Reign of Charles I," in William J. Bryan, ed., *The World's Famous Orations*, vol. 3: England [New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1906], 9-10, 30-34).

Scotland had already defeated the English Army twice in the Bishops' Wars. No resolution had been reached by 1642, and an increasingly angry Parliament was unwilling to back down once Charles had called the Long Parliament in 1640 reluctantly. Between these and Charles's own image as King being reduced to that of a rebel who simply would not submit to established authority and out of touch with the reality of his citizens' needs and desires, the English Civil War erupted.[154] Both sides gathered their supporters in a conflict to restore order (whether the constitutional monarchy Parliament and its supporters wanted, or submission to the King that Charles and his supporters wanted). Hirst notes that "It was a war of religion on both sides. Despite the prominence of Catholics in their ranks, royalists claimed to be fighting for the true protestant religion no less than did parliamentarians."[155] All parties involved on either side of the conflict had vested interests in the direction the Church of England would take. It would either go in a direction that would ultimately lead back to Catholicism after a while, or a further Protestant direction.

Charles and his supporters were willing to fight to the last man despite growing opposition. As riots increased in London, Charles attempted ordering the rioters go back home or face severe punishment.[156] He also threatened anyone who would dare aid and abet a Catholic recusant with severe punishment.[157] By late 1642 and into 1643, Charles had a full-scale revolt

---

[154] Conrad Russell, *The Causes of the English Civil War*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), 24-25.

[155] Hirst also notes that both religion and politics played a role in the conflict at this point. For Scotland, the entire cause of the war was religious. England had religious reasons to be involved in the war, but they placed a stronger emphasis on the political implications of Charles's actions for the good of England (Hirst, *Authority and Conflict*, 226, 239).

[156] Charles I, "A Proclamation Against Riotous Assemblies in London and Westminster," (28 Dec. 1641), in Larkin, ed., *Stuart Royal Proclamations*, vol. 2, 756.

[157] Charles I, "A Proclamation for Putting the Laws Against Popish Recusants in due Execution," (16 Mar 1642), in Larkin, ed., *Stuart Royal Proclamations*, vol. 2, 763.

from many subjects on all sides, and attempted to pacify each rebellion with a proclamation of his goodwill addressed individually to each locality.[158] However, these attempts Charles made at restoring order betray a monarch who had completely lost control of those under his charge and was now desperate to get it back, but attempting measures that were simply not going to be effective.

In the 1640s, it is not accurate to say that there was no loyalty to Charles. There was certainly the share of Parliamentarian opposition (which largely included Puritans, and there was also Puritans outside of Parliament who opposed him). However, Charles had his Royalist supporters. Chief among these were the prelates of the Church of England of which he had himself favorably promoted. George Brydon, who details the history of the Church of England in Virginia during this time, notes that in the southern colonies and in England, the Laudian Church of England was so loyal to Charles that it took extra measures in that it made ministers swear an Oath of Allegiance as a condition of appointment.[159] The intent was to ensure that loyalty to the Supreme Head of the Church of England (a title which Charles certainly appreciated having) was the norm among the clergy. Despite these extra measures, to have a united church was impossible, as Charles did not even have a truly united kingdom and was out of touch with what he should have done all along to achieve this. Additionally, Parliament had gained some Puritan members, and the Puritans regularly preached sermons to Parliament, which Zakai, who studied the concepts of orthodoxy at stake in the controversy with the Puritans, says revealed their intent for England and helped to steer Parliament toward the ends the Puritans desired.[160]

---

[158] See Larkin, ed., *Stuart Royal Proclamations*, vol. 2, 803-868.

[159] George M. Brydon, *Virginia's Mother Church and the Political Conditions Under Which it Grew*, (Richmond: Virginia Historical Society, 1948), 89, 119-121.

[160] Zakai, "Orthodoxy in England and New England," 407.

The Scottish grew tired of Charles's attempts to force unity on them and their church and responded with an attempt to do the same to England.[161] Though Charles lost these Bishops' Wars, he was not about to surrender so easily to his subjects. In 1641, the Irish revolted against Charles as well. With the Long Parliament open, Charles found himself unable to continue in the full implications of unrestricted monarchical power, as he had so fervently defended for eleven years.[162] The Scottish were also further enraged that Charles eventually moved away from a Calvinistic theology, in which they (like the Puritans) fervently believed. They eventually brought up the question that Charles's subjects had already been frequently contesting, which was the legitimacy of Charles's sole monarchical rule over the land.[163]

The three-front war Charles fought solidified the case against his methods of imposition without regard for his subjects and general disdain for people. The Scottish, like the Puritans, did not enjoy episcopal rule in the church. Parliament tried to rid England of bishops, but this bill only further fueled Charles's rage and resistance against Parliament.[164] Russell notes that this further solidified the impossibility of the King and Parliament coming to some sort of settlement. Parliament was now in an equally heated struggle to suppress him as Charles had been (and continued to be) against it. Ironically, Parliament named as its cause of fighting the English Civil War "to rescue [the king] from the evil counsellors that surrounded him."[165] These "evil

---

[161] That is, Charles wanted the Scottish in line with the Church of England. What that meant to Charles was looking increasingly like an eventual unity with the Roman Catholic Church. The Scottish responded with an attempt to make England submit to the authority of their Presbyterian Church (Russell, *The Causes of the English Civil War*, 31-32).

[162] Russell, *The Causes of the English Civil War*, 31-32.

[163] Ibid., 51-52, 60.

[164] Russell, *The Crisis of Parliaments*, 335-336.

[165] Ibid., 345.

counsellors" no doubt included Laud. By 1645, Charles's attempts to reclaim his position in England were a lost cause, as the Parliamentarians had gained the upper hand. However, Parliament was growing in concern that Charles still refused to surrender even after the great losses he had incurred.[166]

In Virginia as well as in Maryland, opposition to the Catholic threat in Maryland was explosive by this time. Charles wanted the Oath of Allegiance from anyone going to Maryland, and the issued oath called for an affirmation that Charles "is lawful and rightful King of this realm, and of all other his Majesty's dominions and countrie, and that the Pope neither of himself, nor by any authority by the Church, or See of Rome, or by any means with any other, hath any power or authority to depose the King."[167] This would be followed by a sworn affirmation of allegiance to Charles and to never raise a traitorous hand against him.[168] The Oath, as Charles was aiming for, was strongly Protestant in character, but of a Royalist leaning. The Calvert regime wanted to ensure loyalty to Charles, and Neill notes that in 1643, a ship that included Richard Ingle sailed in from Britain to Saint Mary and was immediately served an "oath against Parliament," but Ingle escaped.[169] Ingle eventually joined the English Civil War on Parliament's side, and was given a commission to patrol the waters of the Chesapeake near Maryland "against friends of the King" with the ship *Reformation*.[170] This began a period known

---

[166] Russell, *The Crisis of Parliaments*, 361.

[167] Edward D. Neill, *The Founders of Maryland as Portrayed in Manuscripts, Provincial Records, and Early Documents*, (Albany: J. Munsell, 1876), 87.

[168] Ibid.

[169] Ibid., 74.

[170] Ibid., 75, 103.

as the Plundering Time, in which Protestants in Maryland attempted to take all that the Catholics had.

Eventually, Ingle captured a Jesuit priest, brought him back to England, and Thomas Cornwallis, then commissioner of Maryland, filed a suit against Ingle for this.[171] Ingle responded with a petition in which he sharply denounced Charles and his allies. He claimed their aim was "to execute a tyrannical power against Protestants, and such as adhered to the Parliament, and to press wicked oaths upon them, and to endeavor their extirpation."[172] He also referred to their allies as "Papists and malignants."[173] The Calverts and other Catholics pledged and wanted to ensure loyalty to the Crown, but several Protestant colonists, especially Puritans, were pushing for the cause of Parliament against the Crown.

Several Protestants were concerned about the religious climate in Maryland at the time. Neill notes that several Jesuits were spreading Catholic teaching all over the colony, and that there was a severe lack of Protestant teachers at the time, which was upsetting to most staunch Protestants and prompted them to push back.[174] Lord Baltimore wanted to attract Protestants to the colony, which also upset the Jesuits.[175] Eventually, Lord Baltimore invited some Puritans to Maryland, who gladly accepted, angering Jesuits.[176] Puritans agreed to the invitation despite the presence of Catholics, but seemed to appreciate the religious freedom offered to them, and felt

---

[171] Neill, *The Founders of Maryland*, 75.

[172] Ibid., 76.

[173] Ibid.

[174] Ibid., 100.

[175] Ibid., 101.

[176] Ibid., 109.

they could use the freedom to continue to preach their message. By the time the English Civil War broke out, tensions were already high between both.

In Virginia, tensions between Anglicans and Puritans also mounted. Neill states that William Berkeley, colonial governor, and his chaplain, Thomas Harrison, "coldly received" the incoming Puritans in 1643, including John Knowles and William Tompson, two of the ministers they had requested from Massachusetts. However, Harrison eventually joined the nonconformist cause.[177] Berkeley wanted to ensure loyalty in Virginia to the Crown and wanted to stamp out the nonconformist ideals of the Puritans. He eventually stamped out Puritans in Virginia, which gave way to their being invited to Maryland.[178]

William Claiborne became the most predominant fighter for the Protestants' cause, and joined with several others, including Richard Ingle, Josias Fendall, William Davyes, and John Pate, who wanted to overturn the proprietorship under the second Lord Baltimore. They led a revolt to accomplish this in the late 1640s, but it was unsuccessful in overthrowing Lord Baltimore. Ingle received no severe punishment for his involvement therein, and escaped with Claiborne, causing chaos in Maryland.[179] In addition, most staunch Protestants in Maryland, including the "golden-voiced" Henry Smith and John Yeo, were strongly opposed to the religious toleration in Maryland, including that of Quakers, Catholics, and proponents of "phanaticisme".[180] The Puritans' stauncher Protestantism that did not allow for diversity of religious thought was gaining a foothold.

---

[177] Neill, *The Founders of Maryland*, 110.

[178] Butterfield, "The Puritan Experiment in Colonial Virginia," 49-50.

[179] "Claiborne's Rebellion," Radio Script No. 7, New England Historical and Genealogical Society, 5, 12.

[180] Levy, "Early Puritanism in the Southern and Island Colonies," 73-75, 80, 83, 93, 103, 107, 110, 120-121, 150-152, 210, 220-221.

In New England, most Puritans had come to establish a new life overseas. However, they could not help but sympathize with their fellow Puritans in the mother country. O'Toole notes that "the settlers of New England were extremely interested in the events in their mother country, especially those events in the continuing struggle over religion" and openly sympathized with Parliament when their efforts to contain Charles I failed and civil war finally broke out.[181]

In Virginia and in New England, reactions to the outbreak of the English Civil War varied. However, as Pesta notes in her study of the English Atlantic at this time, both William Berkeley of Virginia and John Winthrop of Massachusetts kept the Puritans in the colonies out, deciding on "noninvolvement."[182] However, Puritans of Massachusetts cheered on the Parliamentarians overseas, and even the poet Anne Bradstreet boldly declared "blest be thy preachers, who cheer thee on" and pledged to help with her prayers.[183] Puritans in Massachusetts gathered for days of prayer and fasting in support of their fellow Puritans in England fighting in the English Civil War.[184] The Massachusetts colonists stood in solidarity with their counterparts in England, and did not forget them. William Hooke preached a sermon in 1645 lamenting the sad condition of England and Ireland during the war. As some Puritans began returning to England to help fight in the war, he called Puritans "messengers to England [of God, brackets author's]" whom much of England continued to reject and persecute.[185] They lamented their

---

[181] James M. O'Toole, "New England Reactions to the English Civil Wars, 1640-1660," (Master's Thesis, Williamsburg: College of William and Mary, 1973), 6.

[182] In addition to this, Pesta notes that many English parliamentarians were leaving the mother country for the American colonies as new colonies started to develop that were sympathetic to the parliamentarian cause (Carla G. Pesta, *The English Atlantic in an age of Revolution, 1640-1661*, [Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2004], 26).

[183] Anne Bradstreet, "A Dialogue Between Old England and New; Concerning Their present Troubles, Anno, 1642," lines 224-233; in Anne Bradstreet, Works, ed. Jeannine Hensley (Cambridge: 196?). 185-186.

[184] O'Toole, "New England Reactions to the English Civil Wars," 9.

fellow Puritans' struggles as the war raged on and saw the defeat of the English Puritans as their own as well. Victory or defeat in England meant the continuation or the end of Puritans around the Atlantic World. However, O'Toole, in detailing the Puritan sermons in Massachusetts during the English Civil War, also states that most of the Puritans of New England did not return home to help.[186] Some Puritans, however, were returning to the mother country to help their comrades back home fight the war against the tyranny of Charles.[187] This aided the Parliamentary cause and kept the Puritan vision alive on both sides of the Atlantic.

Opposition to Charles's measures (or deviations thereof) on both sides of the Atlantic was increasing. Charles, however, refused to surrender. He dissolved the Long Parliament in 1641, but it promptly reasserted its own authority to stay in power and protect its own members from Charles's attempts to suppress them.[188] Parliament was gradually reasserting its own authority and Charles's rule was eroding despite his refusal to back down.

Derek Hirst presents Charles as a monarch detached from the political reality he faced in the name of unity and order. Charles wanted unity and order but did not want to go through the proper channels of Parliament. He abolished all claims to church lands in 1640 by declaration and was determined to suppress the rebellious Scots without the authority of Parliament. Charles attempted to persuade the Church of England he was on their side of the problem during the English Civil War. However, his efforts were primarily to preserve his reign. Both sides,

---

[185] William Hooke, *New-Englands Sence, of Old-England and Ireland's Sorrowes: A Sermon Preached Upon a Generall Day of Humiliation in the Churches of New-England: In the Behalf of Old-England and Irelands Sad Condition*, (London: Joseph Caryl, 1645), 6.

[186] O'Toole, "New England Reactions to the English Civil Wars," 35.

[187] An example of this would be William Rainborowe, who returned to fight against the King (Adrian Tinniswood, *The Rainborowes*, (New York: Basic Books, 2013), 1-2).

[188] David D. Hall, *Puritans: A Transatlantic History*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2019), 256.

however, claimed to be fighting for true Protestantism. Both sides saw in each other "blasphemy and subversion of the social order."[189] All over the English Atlantic World, the balance of order was growing increasingly delicate. It was threatened at every level, but neither side was going to back down. Either Charles would have his way, or his Protestant subjects would have theirs.

As the English Civil War dragged on, the question involved alternatives to the old regime Charles already had in place. The Parliamentarians were united in that an episcopal government for the Church of England was not going to work, but there was a debate as to whether it would be Congregationalist or Presbyterian instead (with the latter being argued from a biblical perspective).[190] The Church of England emerged at first in 1646 as "a toothless version of voluntary religion."[191] Before this, in 1643, William Laud was arrested, imprisoned, tried and executed for his attempted ecclesiastical tyranny. However, bringing Charles down was a different matter altogether.

Charles surrendered to his subjects, and afterwards agreed to "some religious and political compromises provided he would be allowed to nominate twenty additional divines," which Levitt, Ambrose, and Greene approved.[192] He even gave his blessing on the Shorter Catechism once the House of Lords had properly evaluated it.[193] However, despite the seeming compromises he was willing to make, Charles was still bent on achieving his goal (now modified to include a return to the throne) of a more absolute monarchy and refused to back down until he

---

[189] Derek Hirst, *Authority and Conflict: England, 1600-1668*, (Boston: Harvard University Press, 2003), 180-200.

[190] Hall, *Puritans*, 281.

[191] Ibid., 274.

[192] Chad Van Dixhoorn, ed., *Minutes and Papers of the Westminster Assembly, 1643-1652*, vol. 4, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 785.

[193] Ibid., 788-789.

was eventually tried and beheaded for his actions as a traitor (after a formal conversion to Catholicism at the end) to the English people in 1648.[194] Puritans on both sides of the Atlantic seemingly had what they wanted. Now the Puritan vision of the Church of England manifested in the Commonwealth of England for the next decade.

Conclusion

The Puritans were of a Parliamentarian persuasion inasmuch as they wanted to see the power of the king checked. They rejected the belief in the divine right of kings. In addition, Charles was very obstinate in what he wanted and would not back down to any opposition that came his way. He shut down Parliament from 1629 until 1640, and then Parliament struck back with a vengeance. The Scottish and the Irish rebelled against his authority due to his overstepping his bounds on numerous occasions, and eventually the English followed suit as Charles's anti-Catholic policies were contradicted in the face of his sympathies for Catholicism, and his appointment of William Laud to the archbishopric of Canterbury, who went on the offensive against Puritans and eventually met his own end due to the forcefulness of his measures. He wanted a united nation and a united church but was out of touch with the reality of his people. The colonial Puritans faced great opposition from what was going on in the mother country and fought to protect themselves and entered a spiritual fight for their fellow countrymen back home. Anti-Catholic tension raged on both sides of the Atlantic, and eventually the Puritans got their fellow English Protestants to join with them, which allowed them to succeed in overthrowing Charles I and his ilk (including William Laud), temporarily ending the Stuart monarchy's rule of England and establishing England briefly as a republic.

---

[194] Van Dixhoorn, ed., *Minutes and Papers of the Westminster Assembly*, vol. 4, 798.

CHAPTER FOUR: No United Vision: The Failed Attempt of the Commonwealth of England

By the conclusion of Charles I's trial and execution, Puritans seemed to have gotten what they wanted. The Church of England (and English society with it) was set to become completely Protestant (free of leftover Roman Catholic elements), and England would no longer be under the tyranny of absolute monarchy. The Scriptures alone would rule faith and practice throughout the new republic, now to be known as the Commonwealth of England. Puritans in the colonies cheered their counterparts in England on as this magnanimous accomplishment was achieved. Under the Commonwealth of England, Oliver Cromwell and his allies sought to ensure England would stay true to the accomplishments the Puritans had thus far made. However, the defect of division and disunity was present from the beginning. Puritans never agreed on the way they wanted the Commonwealth to be governed, or the specific direction the Church of England should take. They tried but failed to unite for the good of England. Even before this, Puritans never came to a consensus on what defined them. These divisions and quarrels eventually moved popular opinion against them and lead to the Restoration of the Stuart monarchy under Charles II following the death of Oliver Cromwell. Many cited Cromwell's dictatorial ways as the cause of the Commonwealth's failure. Nonetheless, Cromwell's methods alone cannot account for the decline of the Commonwealth of England. The fall of the Commonwealth of England also resulted from heated disagreements among Puritans which became more pronounced over time. It became increasingly clear that there was no apparent solution.

The Commonwealth of England resulted in regime changes in New England and the South, which Puritans welcomed as a political advantage. However, just as in England, Puritans failed to achieve a united vision in the colonies. The amount of infighting present between

various Puritan factions contributed to the collapse of the Commonwealth of England's control of the colonies. Thus, political changes lasted only until the collapse of the Commonwealth. The Restoration of Charles II restored the South back to its original state and left New England Puritans fearing for their liberties. Many of the reverses of Charles II and their consequences on Nonconformists occurred in the wake of the collapse of the Commonwealth of England. The Commonwealth collapsed because of constant bickering among Puritans and their fellow colonists.

New Challenges to the Vision: Controversies the Puritans Faced Across the Atlantic World

Despite having a vision for a godly community, the Puritans of New England did not have a plan to deal with many of the major problems that would arise from their efforts. William Lamont, in a study of Protestant conceptions and goals of government of the seventeenth century, notes that "some Protestants in 1603 wanted a Geneva in England; others wanted to preserve, or to modify slightly, the Elizabethan Church; others wanted separate congregations of the faithful. These were differences over means, not over ends."[1] They all wanted a purified Church of England and a godly people, but they disagreed on how to achieve these things. Lamont, however, while acknowledging the similarities of these goals' ends, does not account for the anxieties of the different factions within Puritanism. These anxieties regarded how the various "means" of one faction would lead to alternate "ends" with which all of the various factions were uncomfortable. Even in the colonies, controversy was not obsolete. Babette Levy notes that the disunity also persisted in some of the English colonies. In Bermuda, for example, Puritans had a real chance of controlling the religious outlook of the colony. However,

[1] Lamont notes further that the concept of "godly rule" was a "set of assumptions" (viz., that a ruler would be in accord with the Christian faith, ruling his subjects justly and respecting their rights, etc.) but was not a clear-cut political philosophy (William M. Lamont, *Godly Rule: Politics and Religion, 1603-1660*, [New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 1969], 25).

one of their key weak points was that the two major ministers of the colony, Lewis Hughes and Samuel Lang, "could not agree on the nature of the Reformation to be made" even if they "both could see the malpractices of the Church of England."[2] Their controversy involved differences in how the church should be governed—viz., Presbyterian (Hughes) and Congregationalist (Lang). As a result, while the Puritans controlled Bermuda's time as a colony, their efforts were not as fruitful as they would have hoped because colonists grew tired of the controversy.[3]

Bremer notes that "just as the Puritans had no blueprint for civil government, so too their concepts of church order were imprecisely defined."[4] The Puritans knew they wanted a "shining light" and "city on a hill," but not how they were going to go about achieving this. Nevertheless, they were confident that their fellow Puritans would all share the same opinions.[5] Winship states that among the Puritans of Massachusetts, church and state were two different realms that required two different authorities to deal with them.[6] However, the events of the next several decades would cross the lines between church and state. The Massachusetts Bay Colony would act in both realms to resolve a coming controversy, but in doing so only succeeded in stirring additional controversy.

Initially, the Puritans who went to Massachusetts still had a significant connection with the Church of England. Nevertheless, Congregationalism began to be a visible presence in

---

[2] Levy, "Early Puritanism in the Southern and Island Colonies," 172.

[3] The controversy over Presbyterian and Congregationalist forms of church government had already been present in England, with no apparent solution, and found its way to colonies such as Bermuda.

[4] Bremer, *The Puritan Experiment*, 62-63.

[5] Winthrop, "A Model of Christian Charity," in *Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society*, 46.

[6] Winship, *The Times and Trials of Anne Hutchinson*, 23-24.

Massachusetts shortly after the Puritans' initial arrival. It began in Salem with a minister named Samuel Skelton, who refused either to hold communion with John Winthrop or baptize the latter's children due to continued association with the Church of England on Winthrop's part. Initially, when John Cotton first arrived in the colony, he did not approve of Skelton's actions, but eventually came to recognize and appreciate the autonomy of the local congregation and became a strong advocate thereof.[7] As the conflict in the Church of England (including internal conflict among the Puritans) became more evident in England and the American colonies, several disgruntled Christians in both locations sought answers in other places. Concurrently, the development of a subsequent major controversy—the Antinomian Controversy—proved problematic for Puritans all over the Atlantic World. Antinomianism rocked the foundations of Massachusetts and went on to create further difficulties for England.

There is no consensus on where Antinomianism developed. However, it made its way to England in the early seventeenth century, and became especially popular through the ministry of John Cotton, who, from there, went to the Massachusetts Bay Colony. Though Cotton did not identify as an Antinomian, the controversy in the wake of his preaching took root through the work of Anne Hutchinson and her brother-in-law, John Wheelwright, and others.[8]

The Antinomian Controversy created a stir in the Massachusetts Bay Colony between 1636 and 1638. Winship claims that the major issues of the Antinomian Controversy, which he terms the "Free Grace Controversy" for its emphasis on the grace of God as a free gift, were about how people could be assured of God's justification, and whether or not they were bound

---

[7] Winship, *Hot Protestants*, 85-86; Everett H. Emerson, *John Cotton*, (New York: Twayne Publishers, 1990), 35.

[8] Winship, *The Times and Trials of Anne Hutchinson*, 32.

by God's moral laws once they were justified.[9] Notwithstanding, Winship also shows that most Puritans, by this time, were teaching that if there were "convincing signs of genuine sanctification and faith," which included "pious thoughts, struggles against sin, good deeds and reliance on Christ," that these were enough evidence of justification.[10] However, even this was not a foolproof test, as they also taught that the fallen nature of man had a tendency toward self-deception. One could easily be deceived into assuming justification when they were still under a "covenant of works."[11]

Cotton's teachings had already caused division among the New England Puritans. Before Thomas Hooker went with a group of others to found Connecticut, he issued a sharp denunciation of Cotton and his teachings from the pulpit.[12] This led to the founding of the Connecticut Colony because of the division Cotton's teachings was beginning to create, which split the unity that the New England Puritans desired. In 1637, Wheelwright preached a fast-day sermon that finally brought the Antinomian Controversy to a climax. In this sermon, Wheelwright contended that "if he [Christ] be present with his people, then they have no cause to fast: therefore it must be his absence that is the true cause of fasting."[13] During the sermon, he did not openly preach not to fast, but instead gave the reasons and character of fasting for the Christian. Nonetheless, he also taught of the "Pagonish and antichristian" enemies of God who ran under a "covenant of works."[14] Though there is no indication he meant to call out the

---

[9] Winship, *The Times and Trials of Anne Hutchinson*, 3.

[10] Ibid., 15.

[11] Ibid.

[12] Ibid., 42-43.

[13] John Wheelwright, "A Fast-Day Sermon," in Hall, ed., *The Antinomian Controversy*, 154.

[14] Ibid., 163.

majority of Boston's ministers, the contents of Wheelwright's sermon solidified the notion that this controversy was a serious threat, as they felt he had called them antichrists.[15] Wheelwright was eventually put out of the Massachusetts Bay Colony for a time, although Cotton later advocated strongly for him to the point where Wheelwright was let back in eventually.

Already the elders of Boston had questioned Cotton, and the theological dispute got even the attention of William Laud in 1637. Laud received a copy of Cotton's *Sixteene Questions* at a time when he was concerned for the unity of the Church of England and taking more aggressive measures to enforce it.[16] Cotton's goal, which he made very clear, was to achieve peace with the rest of his fellow Puritans, and he was certainly not inclined to contention over his views.[17] That said, Cotton's popularity in New England was beginning to wane, and the Antinomian Controversy had caused quite the stir. The severity of the Antinomian Controversy was so evident that John Davenport, whose participation in the trial of Anne Hutchinson had helped end the controversy in Massachusetts, sought to found a new colony in the form of New Haven, urging Cotton to join him, which the latter declined.[18]

Though Cotton's teachings were of a controversial nature, he himself was not inclined to contention and knew the limits as to how far he should carry his teaching. However, the same lack of inclination to contention could not be said of Anne Hutchinson. Hutchinson took

---

[15] Hall, ed., *The Antinomian Controversy*, 8.

[16] Ibid., 175.

[17] Ibid., 173.

[18] During this time period, several Puritans were fleeing England as a result of Laud's crackdowns. New Haven itself was involved in the development of several towns along Long Island (part of present-day New York), which created some Puritan strongholds in close proximity to the Dutch (Charles E. Craven, "The Planting of the Puritans on Long Island," *New York History*, vol. 14, no. 4 (1933), 401-402; Isabel M. Calder, "John Cotton and the New Haven Colony," *The New England Quarterly*, vol. 30, no. 1 (1930), 84).

Cotton's teachings even further, particularly on free grace and personal revelation as assurance. She held meetings in her home in which she insinuated that most of Massachusetts's ministers were preaching a covenant of works and operating in the "spirit of Antichrist."[19] In addition, Winship notes that Wheelwright "used reckless terminology and did not back away from fights."[20] Eventually, once John Winthrop was re-elected governor, he put Hutchinson on trial over these home meetings and alleged prophecies she would make there.[21]

During the trial, Hutchinson held firmly to acting according to her conscience. She then made several allegations against the ministers in New England as being under a covenant of works and were not "sealed with the spirit."[22] She also alleged that God had given her the clarity to see the correctness of her actions. She contended that God had shown her and told her to do what she was doing (even if everyone else believed she was wrong).[23] At that point, the court viewed her as speaking "revelations that may deceive."[24] Hutchinson was exiled to Providence afterwards. She eventually went to New Netherland (present-day New York and New Jersey, a Dutch colony in which most Protestants enjoyed liberty of conscience, including English Puritans and Separatists, throughout most of the colony's history). Winthrop said of her once she

---

[19] At this point, the Antinomian Controversy truly became a major controversy. While Cotton had been non-divisive, Hutchinson was the opposite. She had begun a new movement within the colony that acted outside the authority of the established church, which threatened to tear the colony apart (Winship, *The Times and Trials of Anne Hutchinson*, 46).

[20] Ibid., 51.

[21] Ibid., 106.

[22] "The Examination of Mrs. Hutchinson at the Court in Newtowne," in Thomas Hutchinson, *History of the Massachusetts Bay Colony*, (Boston, MA: 1637); quoted in Hall, ed., *The Antinomian Controversy*, 325-335.

[23] Ibid., 336-337.

[24] Ibid., 338-339.

left for Providence that "she thought it now needlese to conceale herself any longer, neither would Satan lose the opportunity of making choyce of so fit an instrument, so long as any hope remained to achieve his mischievous end in darkning the saving truth of the Lord Jesus, and disturbing the peace of his Churches."[25] Winthrop believed Hutchinson to be a troubler to the Churches of New England and a tool of Satan, and saw her divisive conduct as proof. By 1641, Winthrop viewed those who had continued to embrace Hutchinsonian teaching as "given up" by God to error.[26]

Cotton had never intended for his teachings to create this kind of upheaval. After his disagreement with Hooker, Cotton preached a sermon in which he contended that "the ultimate resolution…ought to be in the whole body of the people, etc., with answer to all objections, and a declaration of the people's duty and right to maintain their true liberties against any unjust violence, etc."[27] On Winthrop, Cotton argued "it pleased the Lord so to assist him," and no one feared division as a result of Hooker's company going to Connecticut after the magistrates had approved it.[28]

Despite the intentions of Cotton or the banishment of his radical adherents as a resolution of the Antinomian Controversy, the effects of Hutchinson's chaos did not go away. The stir it created crossed the Atlantic Ocean back to England. There, Richard Baxter, in 1647, came to fear it so much that he blamed Calvinism for its generation.[29] Baxter, an important Presbyterian

---

[25] Winthrop, "A Short Story Concerning the Rise and Fall of Antinomianism," in Hosmer, ed., *Journal of John Winthrop*, 243.

[26] Hosmer, ed., *Journal of John Winthrop*, vol. 2, 28.

[27] Hosmer, ed., *Journal of John Winthrop*, vol. 1, 133-134.

[28] Ibid.

[29] Winship, *Hot Protestants*, 269-270.

in post-Civil War England, came instead to believe that sanctification was "proportionably" and "by degrees."[30] Winship argues that the "Free Grace Controversy was the greatest internal dispute of pre-civil war puritanism, either in England or in New England."[31] Henry Vane, a lesser-known figure who had come to Massachusetts with the Hutchinsons, eventually went back to England, where he brought Antinomianism with him.[32]

Prior to the controversy in Massachusetts, Cotton had not been the only one teaching unique doctrines of assurance. There was also Robert Bolton, who had been a fellow at the Brasenose College (though he did not stress the level of personal revelation that Cotton's followers did). Bolton taught that people should "not trust in man, but in the LORD."[33] In so doing, Bolton believed that the Church would truly glory in its answer before its enemies, despite the suffering Christians would have to endure.[34] He believed that if a Christian were fortified with the knowledge that he/she had God's favor, it was the greatest weapon the Church had against the devil.[35] It is important to note that despite Bolton placing a strong emphasis on the

---

[30] At this point, the Antinomian Controversy truly became a major controversy. While Cotton had been non-divisive, Hutchinson was the opposite. She had begun a new movement within the colony that acted outside the authority of the established church, which threatened to tear the colony apart (Richard Baxter, "The Character of the Persons for Whom This Rest is Designed," in *Saints' Everlasting Grace*, accessed July 15, 2022, https://ccel.org/ccel/baxter/saints_rest.iii.IV.html).

[31] Michael P. Winship, *Making Heretics: Militant Protestantism and Free Grace in Massachusetts, 1636-1641*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002), 14.

[32] Winship argues that Vane's involvement in the Antinomian Controversy is often overlooked. However, though it was Wheelwright and Hutchinson who primarily stirred the controversy in the colonies, Vane was a noted adherent who was able to contribute to its spread in England during the latter years of Charles I (Winship, *The Times and Trials of Anne Hutchinson*, 15).

[33] Robert Bolton, *A Cordiall for Christians in Time of Affliction*, (London: George Miller, 1640), 3.

[34] Ibid.

[35] Robert Bolton, *Instructions for a Right Concerning Afflicted Consciences With Special Antidotes Against Some Grievous Temptations*, (London: Felix Kyngston, 1631), 2-6.

inner life of the Christian, he cannot be conceived of as an Antinomian. Yet, Bolton urged his listeners to "trie then the truth of thy spiritual state by this marke of a sober and sincere singularitie."[36] This, Bolton argued, could be determined by the degree of attachment one had to the world's things, and the fruit of holiness in one's life, and whether one was practicing gross sin. If any of these things were true, then the Christian was "utterly undone."[37] Bolton's teachings and Cotton's, though neither would have accepted the title "Antinomian," took hold on both sides of the Atlantic. Christians had multiple questions on how to be assured of justification, and Antinomianism, despite its defeat in Massachusetts, would continue to grow in England at one of its most critical junctures. By the end of the problems in Massachusetts, England was in upheaval due to the English Civil War between Charles I and Parliament.

During the rising tensions England experienced, existing Antinomians in England began to increase in significance. John Eaton differed from traditional Antinomians in that he believed the "seal" that most of the Massachusetts Antinomians made a point of contention was conferred at the moment of baptism rather than merely on faith. Eaton asserted that "when a man is baptized, he receiveth this benefit of grace, signed and sealed unto him, as the very seale of God; whereby the inward washing and making cleane, which is wrought by the blood of Christ, is given, ratified, and sealed to him that is baptized, if afterwards being come to yeeres, his unbeliefe do not seclude him from this benefit."[38] For Eaton, faith was still a key component.

---

[36] Robert Bolton, *Some General Directions for a Comfortable Walking With God, Delivered at the Lecture at Kettering*, (London: Felix Kyngston, 1626), 5.

[37] Ibid., 5.

[38] It is important to note that Antinomians did not call themselves by this term, but it was a term their opponents gave to them in criticism of their teachings. Eaton is no exception (John Eaton, *The Honey-Combe of Free Justification by Christ Alone Collected out of the Meere Authorities of Scripture and Unanimous Consent of the Faithfull Interpreters and Dispensers of God's Mysteries Upon the Same, Especially as They Express the Excellency of Free Justification*, [London: R.B., 1641], 31). Wallace notes this work was published posthumously

Nonetheless, his emphasis on baptism would have diverged from those who had developed from Cotton's teachings. He also believed that justification would make the Christian "compleatly, fully, sufficiently, and perfectly righteous in the sight of God freely."[39]

An early inspiration for Antinomianism may have come from the ministry of Ezekiel Culverwell, who placed strong emphasis on God's grace in his preaching. He asserted that to be assured of one's salvation one needed to rely on God's promises, to "establish our hearts in this confidence, that *he who hath begun a good worke in us, will perform it unto the day of Christ Jesus*."[40] Another prominent Antinomian in England was Tobias Crisp, whose preaching gained notoriety in England that remained even into the 1690s.[41] He believed strongly in Christ's free grace, and considered himself an agent of God's Providence. He claimed in a sermon that "the provident care of the Lord Christ is manifested towards you his people, whose eyes of faith he hath opened; so especially in sending this faithful 'man of God' among you, 'who came in the abundance of the blessing of the gospel of Christ;' the very prints and the footsteps of the Lords favor are conspicuous."[42] Crisp's preaching gained notoriety in England, and several notable Puritans (Presbyterian and Congregationalist alike) sought to refute him.[43]

(Dewey D. Wallace, Jr., *Puritans and Predestination: Grace in English Protestant Theology, 1525-1695*, [Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1982], 115).

[39] Eaton, *The Honey-Combe of Free Justification*, 313.

[40] Philippians 1:6 (KJV); Ezekiel Culverwell, *A Treatise of Faith Wherein is Declared how a man may Live by Faith and Finde Relief in all his Necessities: Applied Especially Unto the use of the Weakest Christians*, (London: I.L., 1623), 470.

[41] Winship, *Hot Protestants*, 268.

[42] Tobias Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted, in the Perfection and Encouragement of the Saints, Notwithstanding Sins and Trials*, (London: Dr. Gill, 1791), 33.

[43] Winship, *Hot Protestants*, 268.

To counter Eaton and those like him, John Sedgwick published a scripted simulated dialogue to expose and refute Antinomianism in 1643. He asserted "the Churches of God never held any honorable opinion" of those who accuse ministers of being heretical who hold Christians accountable to the moral law.[44] He thought of them as accusative in speech that would one day land them in trouble.[45] Sedgwick sought to expose them as incorrectly labelling obedience to the commands in the moral law of the Old Testament as a "covenant of works."[46]

The Westminster divines had also petitioned the House of Commons to put a stop to Antinomian teaching because, among other things, they "pervert the most fundamentall Doctrines of free grace, justification by faith in Christ & of sanctification & turne all into confusion."[47] While their decided opinion did not completely rid England of Antinomianism, when the Assembly revised the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England, it came to this agreement concerning the Christian's relationship to the moral law:

> Although the Law given from God by Moses, as touching Ceremonies and Rites, do not binde Christians, nor the civil precepts given by *Moses*, such as were peculiarly fitted to the Common-wealth of the Jews, are of necessity to be received of any Common-wealth: yet notwithstanding no Christian man whatsoever is free from the obedience of the Commandments which are called Moral. By the Moral Law we understand all the ten Commandments taken in their full extent.[48]

---

[44] John Sedgwick, *Antinomianisme Anatomized. Or, a Glass for the Lawlesse:: who Deny the Ruling Use of the Morall Law Unto Christians Under the Gospel*, (London.: Samuel Gellibrand, 1643), 2.

[45] Ibid., 3.

[46] Ibid., 22-32.

[47] "Petition to the House of Commons Against Antinomian Teachers, 10 August 1643," in Chad Van Dixhoorn, ed., *Minutes and Papers of the Westminster Assembly, 1643-1652*, vol. 5 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 22.

[48] "Article 7" in Westminster Assembly, *The Proceedings of the Westminster Assembly of Divines Upon the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England*, (London: 1647), 6.

Thus, the Westminster Assembly would try to settle the issue by condemning Antinomianism at its core and giving the Moral Law a place in Christian life.

A United Puritan Vision?: The Westminster Assembly of Divines and Theological Divides Across the Atlantic World

During the English Civil War, Puritans came to the forefront as Parliament gained the upper hand. Several concerned Puritan ministers petitioned both Houses of Parliament for a fast and religious reform. They asked Parliament to "vouchsafe instantly to take it into your more serious consideration, how you may most speedily set up CHRIST more gloriously in all his Ordinances within this Kingdome, and reforme all things amisse throughout the Land, wherein God is more specially and most immediately dishonoured."[49] Though most of the reforms they wanted were moral (such as civil enforcement of Sabbath-keeping, removing unfit persons from the Lord's Supper, etc.), there is no doubt this included some theological reforms. Proof of the urgency of theological matters is that one of the actions that the petitioners called for was:

> that there may be a thorough and speedy proceeding against blind guides and scandalous Ministers, by whose wickednesse people either lack or loath the Ordinances of the Lord, and thousands of soules perish...and that your Wisedomes would find out some way to admit into the Ministery such godly and hopefull men as have prepared themselves and are willing thereunto, without which there will suddenly be such a scarcity of able and faithfull Ministers, that it will be to little purpose to cast out such as are unable, idle or scandalous.[50]

The Puritans wanted true ministers in the pulpit (a difficult concept that already proved problematic in Massachusetts in the 1630s), and (with more widespread agreement) also "that all monuments of Idolatry and Superstition, but more especially the whole body and practice of

---

[49] "Petition to Both Houses of Parliament for a Fast, 19 July 1643" in Van Dixhoorn, ed., *Minutes and Papers of the Westminster Assembly*, vol. 5, 10.

[50] Ibid., 11.

Popery may be totally abolished."[51] If their endeavors were not successful, these divines feared Roman Catholic error would take over and there would be no capable Protestant ministers left.

John Milton was one Puritan keeping a close eye on the progress of English reform. He believed England should have a sense of urgency at bringing Reformation to fruition, and that there were gross consequences for not doing so. He argued:

> …in *purity* of *Doctrine* we agree with our Brethren; yet in *execution* and *applying* of *Doctrine* home, and laying the *salve* to the very *Orifice* of the *wound;* yea tenting and searching to the *Core,* without which *Pulpit Preaching* is but shooting at Rovers; in this we are no better then a *Schisme,* from all the *Reformation,* and a sore scandall to them; for while wee hold *Ordination* to belong onely to *Bishops,* as our *Prelates* doe, wee must of necessity hold also their *Ministers* to be no *Ministers,* and shortly after their *Church* to be no *Church.* Not to speake of those sencelesse *Ceremonies* which wee onely retaine, as a dangerous earnest of sliding back to *Rome,* and serving meerely, either as a mist to cover nakednesse where true *grace* is extinguisht; or as an Enterlude to set out the *pompe* of *Prelatisme.*[52]

For Milton, it was not enough to profess faith without action, which included separation from the Roman Catholic Church and less focus on continued theological wrangling, especially if the goal was to stay true to the Reformation itself. Without this, he believed, the inevitable result would be to go back to the same Catholic elements Puritans were leaving behind (including episcopacy, clerical vestments, kneeling for communion, etc.).

In 1643, The Westminster Assembly of Divines was convened to mold a new vision for the Church of England in blatant defiance of the prohibitions of Charles I.[53] In it, English

---

[51] It is important to note here that by now, what constituted doctrinal purity (and the very definition of Puritanism as a result) was getting harder and harder to define. While most Puritans were Calvinist, there were some, such as Richard Baxter, who embraced Arminianism while still maintaining a strong stance against episcopacy ("Petition to Both Houses of Parliament for a Fast, 19 July 1643" in Van Dixhoorn, ed., *Minutes and Papers of the Westminster Assembly*, vol. 5, 11).

[52] John Milton, *Of Reformation Touching Church-Discipline in England, and the Cases That Hitherto Have Hindered it, in two Bookes, Written to a Freind [sic]*, (London: Thomas Underhill, 1641), 7.

[53] John H. Leith, *Assembly at Westminster: Reformed Theology in the Making*, (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1973), 25.

Puritans of all stripes as well as Scottish Presbyterians united to bring about the desired change. Roman Catholicism, Arminianism, and any semblance thereof would be prohibited when it was over.[54] Despite this, many different opinions were present during the assembly that made what would be allowed and enforced a matter of heated debate.

In 1643, the English Parliament and the Scottish Covenanters agreed to work together in the English Civil War against Charles I and the Royalists. The *Solemn League and Covenant* was drawn up to formalize the unity both groups (and consequently, Reformed Churches everywhere) were after. Both agreed that the Three Kingdoms needed to be "united in Doctrine, Worship, Discipline and Government, according to the Word of God, and the Example of the best Reformed Churches."[55] The stated goals of the *Solemn League and Covenant* were "the neerest conjunction and Uniformity in Religion, Confession of Faith, Form of Church Government, Directory for Worship and Catechizing."[56] They knew they wanted to get rid of,

> …Popery, Prelacy (that is, Church Government by Arch-bishops, Bishops, their Chancellours and Commissaries, Deanes, Deanes and Chapters, Archdeacons, and all other Ecclesiastical Officers depending on that Hierarchy) Superstition, Heresie, Schisme, Prophanenesse, and whatsoever shall be found contrary to Sound Doctrine and the power of Godlinesse; lest we partake in other mens sins, and thereby be in danger to receive of their plagues, and that the Lord may be one, and his name one in the Three Kingdoms.[57]

However, when the Westminster Assembly formed, it was not in line with their desired unity from its inception. The Westminster Assembly included Presbyterians, and

---

[54] Leith, *Assembly at Westminster*, 26.

[55] England and Scotland, *A Solemn League and Covenant for Reformation, and Defense of Religion, the Honour and Happinesse of the King, and the Peace and Safety of the Three Kingdoms of England, Scotland, and Ireland* (London: 1643).

[56] Ibid.

[57] Ibid.

Congregationalists (also known as Independents), as well as Erastians, who could be Presbyterians or Episcopalians and did not distinguish civil from ecclesiastical authority. That is, they saw the church as an extension of the state. All factions agreed that by the end of the Assembly an agreement would have to be reached. Nevertheless, from the beginning, the factions' existence presented a challenge to the Westminster Assembly. Hetherington notes that "the Parliament had to choose—to retain the Prelatic system, with all the tyranny and oppression that had become absolutely intolerable—to adopt the Presbyterian, to which the Puritan ministers were already predisposed, or to have no national church at all, with the imminent peril."[58] In order to stabilize the Church of England, a palatable agreement for all sides would have to be reached.

Each of the above-noted opinions represents the Church of England as it was then or one of the first two factions of the Westminster Assembly (Prelatics [Episcopal] and Presbyterians versus the Independents who opted for no national church). Hetherington notes that the existence of the Erastians was due to the lack of a national government in England when the Assembly was called, which gave Parliament de facto authority over ecclesiastical matters in the Church of England until the Westminster Assembly could determine a solution.[59]

To solidify the Church of England against any extrabiblical tradition, the revised Articles of the Church of England also stated that "Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation; so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be believed as an Article of Faith, or as necessary to salvation."[60] This solidified the notion that only the

---

[58] William M. Hetherington, *History of the Westminster Assembly of Divines*, (New York: Robert Carter & Brothers, 1856), 87.

[59] Ibid.

Scriptures were sufficient as a rule of faith, and nothing else. On the doctrine of original sin, they believed "corruption doth remain" although it would not follow with condemnation for the "regenerate" who believed in Christ once they did so.[61] As the Assembly, the issues continued to have their rounds. Salvation was seen as "Gods act" first.[62] Eventually, the revision of the Articles had to stop early (at only 15 of the 39 revised) to deal with further issues. William Hetherington, in chronicling the history of the Westminster Assembly, notes Parliament ordered them to temporarily stop deliberating the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England (which had been their first order of business) and focus instead on settling the rising Independent controversy.[63]

At first, the divines debated the issue of church government, and the nature of church officers. In late 1643, they determined that a pastor is a biblical church office, who is entrusted with authority in the church to teach the Word of God, to "feed the sheep," and "hath a ruling power over the Flock" as well as to pray for the people in the church.[64] The divines also agreed that teachers were to have some power to administer sacraments and hold an equal office with the pastor.[65] Nonetheless, the nature and scope of church government was still a major issue.

---

[60] However, the reading of the Nicene, Athanasian, and Apostle's Creeds was still to be carried on because these creeds were regarded as verifiable in Scripture ("Article 6" in Westminster Assembly, *Proceedings of the Westminster Assembly Upon the Thirty-Nine Articles*, 5, "Article 8," in Westminster Assembly, *Proceedings of the Westminster Assembly Upon the Thirty-Nine Articles*, 7).

[61] "Article 8" in Westminster Assembly, *Proceedings of the Westminster Assembly Upon the Thirty-Nine Articles*, 7.

[62] Van Dixhoorn, ed., *Minutes and Papers of the Westminster Assembly*, vol. 2, 113.

[63] Ibid., 135.

[64] Ibid., 6-8.

[65] Ibid., 9-12.

Though most of the ministers present were of a Presbyterian persuasion, five of them were outspoken Independents—Thomas Goodwin, Philip Nye, Sidrach Simpson, Jeremiah Burroughs, and William Bridge. The Independents presented more of a major controversy than all other factions present during the Assembly. In 1644, they issued a defense of their Congregationalist views to add to the many contested issues. The Independents shared many sympathies with the Puritans of Massachusetts, who were of a more Congregational model. John Cotton in particular was a staunch Congregationalist and paid close attention to the Assembly. They held a noted opposition to other Puritans and attested:

> We have this sincere profession to make before God and all the world, that all *that* conscience of the defilements we conceived to cleave to the true worship of God in them, or of the unwarranted power in Church Governours exercised therein, did never work in any of us any other thought, much lesse opinion, but that multitudes of the assemblies and parochiall congregations thereof, were *the true Churches and Body of Christ, and the Ministery thereof a true Ministery*.[66]

The Five Dissenting Brethren, as they came to be called, saw themselves as proponents of the true gospel, as well as the true church. As a result, the Presbyterian vision of the Church of England's reforms, which had previously held a majority view, was disrupted. The Independents wanted to return to the "primitive pattern of the Apostles."[67] They wanted the Church of England to be reformed to allow for the autonomy of individual churches. They took issue with some flaws they saw in the Presbyterian design, in that if the eldership proved deficient, the church had the final authority (which, in their minds, necessitated a congregational church government).[68] They felt it improper that churches could excommunicate other churches.[69] In addition,

---

[66] Van Dixhoorn, ed., *Minutes and Papers of the Westminster Assembly*, vol. 2, 6.

[67] Bridge, et. al., *An Apologeticall Narration*, 8.

[68] Ibid., 12-13.

[69] Ibid., 19.

Jacqueline Rose, in detailing the politics of the Commonwealth, argues that they took issue with the growing climate of sectarianism and intolerance present among the Presbyterians.[70]

Philip Simpson, in his study of Jeremiah Burroughs, also shows the intolerance of the Presbyterians toward Independents such as the five dissenting brethren, particularly when "the unity of the Puritans was beginning to fray."[71] England had experienced great disunity. However, the Puritans who wanted a new vision for England were not united on what that meant and tensions already rose. In addition, much of England outside of Puritanism was watching. Simpson notes that "the Independents also gained favor with English citizens because many of the sectarians—including Anabaptists, Brownists, Quakers, and Antinomians—had a vested interest in seeing the Independents' vision realized. If each church had the right to govern its own affairs, there would be increasing toleration for all of these groups."[72]

The other divines immediately sought to distance themselves from the Five Dissenting Brethren by warning Parliament of what was happening in 1644. They reiterated their blessing to Parliament "for the sure Reforming of this Church according to the Word of God, and for Uniformity in Religion, Public Worship and Discipline in all the Three Kingdoms."[73] They wanted Parliament to know they still shared these goals, but also that they had absolutely nothing

---

[70] This was not to say that the Independents believed in freedom of religion in the modern sense of the term. Rose also notes that they were heavily opposed to Catholicism, the Quakers, and made it a point to denounce "popery, idolatry and blasphemy" and felt these should be the limits a Christian state should give in the name of toleration. In particular, the Independents took issue with the Presbyterians' refusal to grant liberty of conscience and made the church fully accountable to a body of elders (Jacqueline Rose, *Godly Kingship in Restoration England: The Politics of the Royal Supremacy, 1660-1688*, [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011], 80-81).

[71] Philip L. Simpson, *A Life of Gospel Peace: A Biography of Jeremiah Burroughs*, (Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 2011), 100.

[72] Ibid.

[73] "Disclaimed to Both Houses of Parliament Against the *Apologeticall Narration, c.* 6 March 1644," in Van Dixhoorn, ed., *Minutes and Papers of the Westminster Assembly*, vol. 5, 50.

to do with the writing of the *Apologeticall Narration*.[74] As far as the Westminster Assembly was concerned, the actions of the Five Dissenting Brethren did not represent the opinions of the Westminster divines in general. Despite the minor nature of their opinions, the controversy they created would do great damage to the Assembly's aims.

Among the Five Dissenting Brethren, Jeremiah Burroughs took a stand that offered a possible solution. Simpson notes that Burroughs, though an Independent, did not seek to establish his own church or sect, and repudiated the idea of doing such among his fellow Independents. He sought a more moderate course rather than a divisive one.[75] However, this does not mean he advocated for full freedom of religion. Simpson argues that Burroughs "did not favor complete separation of church and state," but believed in the protection and preservation of true Christian religion as a basic responsibility of government.[76] Burroughs may not have favored these dissident groups' protection as much as they would have liked. He repudiated the idea of blind religious tolerance. Burroughs believed that Christian duty called one to stand firm against false religion, including the use of the magisterial authorities to punish those partaking of blasphemous religion.[77]

No Independent truly favored the toleration of sects, as they stood firm against false religion. Nevertheless, the effects of their proposed ideas were self-evident. Hetherington notes that not only did their policies favor the toleration of sects, but that the Independents also had

---

[74] "Disclaimed to Both Houses of Parliament Against the *Apologeticall Narration, c.* 6 March 1644," in Van Dixhoorn, ed., *Minutes and Papers of the Westminster Assembly*, vol. 5, 50.

[75] Simpson, *A Life of Gospel Peace*, 100.

[76] Ibid., 145.

[77] Jeremiah Burroughs, *Irenicum, to the Lovers of Truth and Peace Heart-Divisions Opened in the Causes and Evils of Them: With Cautions That we may not be Hurt by Them, and Endeavours to Heal Them*, (London: Robert Dawlman, 1653), 18-20.

strong support from Oliver Cromwell, with whom they carried on much correspondence.[78] This only increased the tension already present. Despite this, Burroughs's moderate tone persisted.

Burroughs was against the manifold division in England during this period. He asserted of the English, including himself, that,

> we are a divided people, whose hearts are divided, and heads too, and hands too; peace and unity seems to be flown from us, and a spirit of contention and division has come upon us: Kings and Subjects are divided, Parl. is divided, Assemblies are divided, Armies are divided, Church is divided, & State is divided, City is divided, Country is divided, Towns are divided, Families divided, godly people are divided, Ministers almost everywhere are divided; yea, and what heart almost is there at this time but is divided in itself?[79]

Burroughs hated the disunity that occasioned the English Civil War and its effects on the politics, religion, and everyday life in England that characterized the 1640s. He attributed divisions to the devil, but also to "dividing principles, dividing distempers, and dividing practices," which he felt had their origins in the human mind and heart.[80]

Burroughs's most important work is known today as *The Rare Jewel of Christian Contentment* (previously a collection of sermons compiled into one volume). There, Burroughs preached the virtue of contentment in multiple ways to his fellow Puritans (with his influence extended on both sides of the Atlantic) and Parliament, and for contentment in all things, considering it an ill spiritual condition to lack contentment. He argued contentment consists of "submitting to God in what ever afflictions befalls us: for the kind, for the time and continuance of the affliction, and for the variety and changes of affliction."[81] During the Westminster

---

[78] Hetherington, *History of the Westminster Assembly*, 132.

[79] Ibid., 4.

[80] Burroughs, *Irenicum*, 14.

[81] Jeremiah Burroughs, *The Rare Jewel of Christian Contentment*, (London: Ben Billingsley, 1666), 22.

Assembly, he preached similarly to Parliament that "it hath been the way of God constantly to keep his people downe in a low estate, especially in the times of the Gospell."[82] For Burroughs, suffering and affliction were the normal Christian way.

Burroughs, like any other Westminster divine, believed in Christian unity. He believed that "in the essentials of worship, unity is necessary; therein all are bound to go by the same rule, and to do to the uttermost they are able, the same thing."[83] Burroughs, as noted above, was not one who would force his opinions on his fellow Englishmen, but would sometimes make compromises because of his convictions concerning unity. However, Burroughs's vision did not guide the Westminster Assembly as he might have hoped.

The Five Dissenting Brethren presented one challenge to the Westminster Assembly in that they had a difficult time consenting to a church government that would not allow them to live by their perception of principles of Scripture in good conscience. This fueled the rise of men like Roger Williams, but the Presbyterian-dominated Westminster Assembly was not easily going to let this go. In the Massachusetts Bay Colony, colonial Puritans were already having a difficult time under the measures of William Laud, which had, up until his execution, threatened their existence. In 1644, with the unity of Massachusetts under fire, Puritans supported the idea of a state-enforced religious conformity against the Antinomian Controversy. In New England, however, not all were persuaded.

Roger Williams, a vocal opponent, carried on a lengthy written debate with Cotton over the issue of Christian states persecuting dissidents of the state church. Williams had come to the

---

[82] Jeremiah Burroughs, *A Sermon Preached Before the Right Honourable House of Peeres*, (London: Robert Dawlman, 1645), 27.

[83] Burroughs, *Irenicum*, 14.

Massachusetts Bay Colony in the 1630s (when William Laud was first coming to power as Archbishop), but had spent time between Boston and Plymouth, was openly Separatist rather than Puritan, and refused to join with the colonial church of Massachusetts due to its failure to fully separate from the Church of England.[84] His controversial views had already earned him the ire of colonial governments of both Plymouth and Massachusetts a decade earlier, most notably his rejection of the idea of royal English authority over the colonies.[85] He was exiled from the Massachusetts Bay Colony for his views. He eventually became one of the founders of Providence (present-day Rhode Island), where he settled in 1636. In Providence, multiple religious groups were welcome.[86] However, this never stopped his repudiation of his fellow colonists who operated differently, especially where he had already lived.

Williams believed that the government had no business suppressing individual conscience. He was thoroughly against Christians persecuting other Christians with the arm of the state. He attested "Soule yokes, Soule oppression, plundrings, ravishings, &c. are of a crimson and deepest dye, and I believe the chiefe of Englands sins."[87] He lamented the bloodshed of Christians during religious wars that was a part of England's recent history.[88]

---

[84] Additionally, Francis Bremer notes that Williams refused to accept a position as minister in Boston unless they were going to repudiate the Church of England. After Williams's expulsion and the Antinomian Controversy, John Winthrop enacted some measures that produced a tighter council composed largely of "ex-governors" to preserve the way of life the Puritans in New England had secured against schismatics (Nandini Das, ed., *Lives in Transit in Early Modern England: Identity in Belonging*, (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2022), 142; Francis J. Bremer, *The Puritan Experiment: New England Society From Bradford to Edwards*, [Lebanon: University Press of New England, 2012], 62-63; Edmund S. Morgan, *The Puritan Dilemma: The Story of John Winthrop*, [Boston: Little Brown and Company, 1958], 160-161).

[85] Ibid., 143.

[86] Jonathan B. Field, "A Key for the Gate: Roger Williams, Parliament, and Providence," *The New England Quarterly*, vol. 80, no. 3 (2007), 356.

[87] Roger Williams, *The Bloudy Tenent of Persecution, for Cause of Conscience, Discussed in a Conference Between Truth and Peace, who, in all Tender Affection, Present to the High Court of Parliament (as a Result of Their Discourse) These, Among Other Passages, as of Highest Consideration*, (London: 1644).

Williams even went as far as to assert against Parliament's severity toward dissidents from the Church of England that "What ever way of worshipping God Your owne Consciences are perswaded to walke in, yet (from any bloody act of violence to the consciences of others) it may bee never told at Rome nor Oxford, that the Parliament of England hath committed a greater rape, then if they had forced or ravished the bodies of all the women in the World."[89] To Williams, it was unacceptable, no matter what the content of the heresy, to force people to violate their consciences. It did not matter if there were Catholics, Protestants who held to a different confession, or even dissenters from Protestantism altogether.

Williams no doubt had in mind the controversies going on in England when making some of the critical comments he did. He sarcastically remarked "that Englands Parliament (so famous throughout all Europe and the World) should at last turne Papists, Prelatists, Presbyterians, Independents, Socinians, Familists, Antinomians, &c. by confirming all these sorts of Consciences, by Civill force and violence to their Consciences."[90] He ridiculed the idea that eventually all attempts to suppress individual conscience would eventually win out to a single persuasion that Parliament enforced. While the Parliament at the time had some sympathies toward Presbyterianism, already Puritan sects in England such as the Independents were competing for Parliament's primary attention. Williams did not seem convinced that Parliament could remain Presbyterian for long under the circumstances and took issue with this ethic not only as it played out in England but also in Massachusetts.

---

[88] Williams, *The Bloudy Tenent of Persecution*. These included the Thirty Years' War, the English Civil War, and others.

[89] Ibid.

[90] Ibid.

Williams opposed persecution on grounds of Jesus harvesting wheat with tares at the end without uprooting them prior to this.[91] To Williams, the question was not about who was right and thus got to rule the state. The issue was that right or wrong, the Parliament was going about the issue the wrong way, since Jesus had taught that tares and wheat could not be separated before the harvest.[92] He also believed firmly in the power of persuasion and felt that even if one fell into the category of tares, they could "become wheat" later.[93] Not only did his ideas threaten the unity of Massachusetts, but they also spoke to the times he was living in, where a single conviction was not easily manifested among English Puritans. Williams seemed to have given up on the idea that full uniformity could be achieved using the then-typical means in England.

In 1647, John Cotton, needing to fix his tarnished reputation, finally challenged Williams's radical ideas. He directly called Williams out for advocating for liberty of conscience, yet in publishing his letter against persecution, which had previously been part of private correspondence between the two men. This had subjected Cotton to open rebuke for advocating for persecution according to the dictates of his conscience, thus not being consistent with his own arguments.[94] Cotton denied that any church in New England or the mother country

---

[91] Williams, *The Bloudy Tenent of Persecution*. Williams also did not think the division between the Independents and Presbyterians constituted the separation of the wheat from the tares.

[92] Ibid.

[93] Ibid.

[94] John Cotton, *The Bloudy Tenent, Washed, and Made White in the Bloud of the Lambe: Being Discussed and Discharged by Bloud-Guiltinesse by Just Defence. Wherein the Great Questions of This Present Time are Handled, viz., how Farre Liberty of Conscience Ought to be Given to Those That Truly Feare God? And how Farre Restrained to Turbulent and Pestilent Persons, That not Onely Raze the Foundations of Godlinesse, but Disturb the Civill Peace Where They Live? Also how Farre the Magistrate may Proceed in the Duties of the First Table? And That all Magistrates Ought to Study the Will and Word of God, That They May Frame Their Government According to it. Discussed. As They are Alleged From Divers Scriptures, out of the Old and New Testament. Wherein Also the Practise of Princes is Debated, Together With the Judgment of Ancient and Late Writers of Most Precious Esteeme. Whereunto is Added a Reply to Mr. Williams Answer, to Mr. Cottons Letter*, (London: Matthew Symmons for Hannah Allen, 1647), 2.

persecuted anyone who questioned them.[95] He claimed that if the worship of the Church of England was unorthodox, "fellowship with God would be lost."[96]

Cotton conceived of "liberty of conscience" as Williams asking for the freedom of Christians in any given church to believe and teach what they wanted, even if it was unbiblical, and refuse to submit to the judgment of the church authorities. He claimed "that fundamentalls are so cleare, that a man cannot but be convinced in the Conscience of the Truth of them after two or three Admonitions, and that therefore such a person, as still continueth obstinate, is condemned of himself: and if he then be punished, He is not punished for his conscience, but for sinning against his conscience."[97] Cotton advocated for punishing those refusing to submit to church authorities in the name of violation of their conscience. For him, the teachings of the Scriptures were so clear that any rational person would accept them.

Due to Cotton's conception of the clarity of Christian doctrine and the human conscience, he also advocated for the necessity of the government's involvement with the Church in the name of keeping the peace. He claimed that "in a way of ungodlinesse, and Idolatry, it is an wholesome faithfulnesse to the Church if Princes trouble the outward peace of the Church, that so the Church finding themselves wounded and pricked in the house of their friends, they may repent, and return to the first Husband, Zach. 13.6. Hosea 2.6.7."[98] Cotton felt civil intervention in ecclesiastical affairs was essential to steer the Church in the right direction and keep it from going astray and claimed Christians should be on board with it. He argued,

---

[95] Cotton, *The Bloudy Tenent, Washed, and Made White in the Bloud of the Lambe*, 6.

[96] Ibid., 7.

[97] Ibid., 9.

[98] Ibid.,13.

> for surely the faithfull are called to contend earnestly for the Faith (Jude 3.), and have as much cause to be troubled at the holding forth of the worship of *Baal*, as corrupt States be at the holding forth of the worship of *Jehovah*. If his meaning be, that vigilant and faithfull Persons, are not so troubled at the false Religion of *Jew* or *Gentile*, but that they can tolerate them to live amongst them in a Civill Body: we say so too: And therefore the *Indians*, who have submitted to the government of this jurisdiction, are not compelled to the Profession or Acknowledgment of our Religion, either by Force of Armes, or Poenall Lawes. But yet if Christians should seduce Christians to turn apostate from the Faith, and to imbrace *Judaisme*, or *Paganisme*: Or if *Jewes* or *Pagans* living amongst us should openly blaspheme the God of heaven, & draw away Christians to *Atheisme*, or *Judaisme*, I should not account them either vigilant, or faithfull Christians, that were not such troubled at the destroying of the true Religion, and the propagating of the false."[99]

For Cotton, Williams's principles could mean the end of true religion in England and her colonial empire as the English people knew it. It could mean that false religion would eventually triumph. Thus, people like Williams, in Cotton's mind, were insincere and apostate who would advocate for freedom of conscience. They did not see the necessity of the measures Cotton advocated.

Strangely, Cotton advocated persecution of heretics simultaneously with vehement rejection of persecution for conscience.[100] He did not want to hinder Christians from acting according to a good conscience, but he also believed that to disobey the truth was to have a problem with one's conscience in the first place. This problem needed a ready solution. As a result, Cotton saw persecution by the state against dissidents as a necessity to keep proper order and worship.[101] He even went as far as saying "persecution is affliction of another for

---

[99] Cotton, *The Bloudy Tenent, Washed, and Made White in the Bloud of the Lambe*, 18.

[100] Ibid., 21-22.

[101] It is important to note here that Cotton was also by this time an Independent himself. For this reason, when invited from England to come back to the mother country to participate in the Westminster Assembly, he did not do so (however, he did exchange much written correspondence with some of the divines, including Richard Mather, in which he weighed in on some of the controversies). He, Thomas Hooker in Connecticut, and John Davenport in New Haven, were all invited to return urgently to participate, but none reciprocated. In fact, Ziff notes that no one in New England attended, but the interests of the churches of New England "became a matter of widespread interest to those assembled (R.T. Kendall, *Calvin and English Calvinism to 1649*, [Eugene: Wipf and

righteousnesse sake."[102] Cotton also claimed Williams's conscience was "overladen with much prejudice."[103] Despite Cotton's sharp criticism, Williams was not about to back down.

Robert Baillie, the Scotsman who chronicled the events of the Westminster Assembly, was of a decidedly Presbyterian persuasion. He wrote against the Independents and believed that if their theory of congregational church government was true, it meant that God gave the entire church the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, but "to none of the people hath he given these keys."[104] Cotton wrote a response to Baillie and argued that the fruit of the Congregational churches speaks for itself since many had fled from "episcopal tyranny" to go to a colony whose churches govern that way.[105] Cotton staunchly defended the independence of individual congregations. His position of defending persecution of dissenters was current with the thought of other Independents like Jeremiah Burroughs, who believed in freedom of conscience but not of disorderly heresy running rampant.

Once the English Civil War had concluded, and the Commonwealth of England had been established, Williams issued a 1652 reply to Cotton in which he further defended his innovative views. He did not deny that Cotton's response was according to the dictates of his conscience. However, he argued "the *times* advise him, with as little noise as may be, and it seems with no

---

Stock Publishers, 1997], 168; Larzer Ziff, *The Career of John Cotton: Puritanism and the American Experience*, [Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1962], 178-179).

[102] John Cotton, *A Reply to Mr. Williams Letter*, (London: Matthew Symmes for Hannah Allen, 1647), 14.

[103] Ibid., 18.

[104] Robert Baillie, *A Dissuasive From the Errors of the Time Wherein the Tenets of the Principal Sects, Especially of the Independents, are Drawn Together in one map, for the Most Part in the Words of Their own Authours, and Their Main Principles are Examined by the Touch-Stone of the Holy Scriptures*, (London: Samuel Gellibrand, 1645), 184.

[105] John Cotton, *The way of Congregational Churches Cleared in two Treatises. In the Former, From the Historical Aspersions of Mr. Robert Baylie, in his Book, Called, A Disswasive From the Errors of the Time. In the Latter, From Some Contradictions of Vindicæ Clavium : and From, Some Mis-constructions of Learned Mr. Rutherford in his Book Intituled The due Right of Presbyteries*, (London: Matthew Simmons, 1648), 99.

great willingness, that that *high* and *searching house* of *Englands Parliament* should search and scan his *Meditations*."[106] Williams accused Cotton of letting his conscience cave to the scrutiny of Parliament of theologians unlike himself, who went against the grain.

Williams denied Cotton's accusation that he was calling the scrutiny, questioning, and examination of one's theology a form of persecution.[107] He called Cotton's argument "the *guise* and *profession* of all that ever *persecuted* or *hunted* men for the sake of *Religion* and *conscience*" and asserted that Cotton and those like him must repent of their ways or they are not qualified to have this bloody tenent "washed in the blood of the Lamb."[108] Williams saw enforcement of a state religion as comparable to the golden statue of Nebuchadnezzar, among other related things.[109] For Williams, there was no excuse for persecution of dissidents or nonconformists. Though Williams's separatism, as noted earlier, had been refuted and disowned by most mainstream Puritans, his existence in the Massachusetts Bay Colony and his accusations and debate with John Cotton added further controversy to an increasingly tense situation in the mother country.

Thomas Edwards, in 1644, published the *Antapologia* as an answer to the Five Dissenting Brethren. Edwards accused the Independents of hiding their true factious motives and revealing the kind of people they were by the tone of the *Apologeticall Narration*, which the *Antapologia*

---

[106] Roger Williams, *The Bloody Tenent Yet More Bloody: by Mr Cottons Endevour to Wash it White in the Blood of the Lambe; of Whose Precious Blood, Spilt in the Blood of his Servants; and of the Blood of Millions Spilt in Former and Later Wars for Conscience Sake, That Most Bloody Tenent of Persecution for Cause of Conscience, Upon a Second Tryal, is Found now More Apparently and More Notoriously Guilty*. (London: Giles Calvert, 1652), 3.

[107] Ibid., 5.

[108] Ibid., 6.

[109] Ibid., 8.

was an attempt to directly answer. Edwards wanted to build a case for their expulsion from the Assembly. He claimed they misrepresented the attempts of the divines as being something other than what they were, which was "a middle ground between the Episcopal and Presbyterian forms of Church Government."[110] Their way, Edwards argued, was admittedly "different than all Reformed Churches."[111] Since the division present went against the *Solemn League and Covenant* and the unity of the English and Scottish Churches, this could not be tolerated. Edwards attributed their opposition to having never seen the "order and peace" of the Reformed Churches.[112] He repudiated any notion they held of tolerance and ultimately called for the Five Dissenting Brethren and their churches to be required to show public repentance or be barred from communion in their churches once the Assembly was over.[113] Presbyterians and Independents continued to struggle, and even Burroughs's attempts for a moderate solution did not go as hoped. As a result, Hetherington notes that both sides became inexcusably hostile to each other.[114]

Other key figures in the Independent Controversy that came up during the Westminster Assembly show that the debate crossed to different sides of the Atlantic. What was happening between Williams and Cotton in New England was not simply an isolated incident. Richard Mather had by this time become established in the Massachusetts Bay Colony and carried on

---

[110] Thomas Edwards, *Antapologia, or, a Full Answer to the Apologeticall Narration of Mr. Goodwin, Mr. Nye, Mr. Sympson, Mr. Burroughs, Mr. Bridge, Members of the Assembly of Divines Wherein is Handled Many of the Controversies of our Times, viz…Humbly Also Submitted to the Houses of Parliament*, (London: G.M. for Ralph Smith, 1644), 8.

[111] Ibid., 11.

[112] Ibid., 31.

[113] Ibid., 302, 307.

[114] Hetherington, *History of the Assembly of Divines*, 199.

debate with two of the Westminster divines, Charles Herle (England) and Samuel Rutherford (Scotland). Herle and Rutherford were of a Presbyterian persuasion while Mather was of a Congregational persuasion.

Herle criticized the Independents because "they acknowledge that neighbour Churches may meet and consult, and advise each other in what may concerne all or either" and accused them of cutting themselves off from fellowship with the neighboring churches simultaneously.[115] He also pointed out the inconsistency with the Independents, asserting that they "admit of no other rule in Church-government but the Scripture practice or institution…but where in all Scripture read we of any ordination of Pastors but by Presbyters?"[116] Notwithstanding, during the Assembly, Nye (an Independent) pointed out the Presbyterian inconsistency that they insisted on "teaching and governing" presbyters but ruled deacons (an apostolic institution, Acts 6), as "incompatible."[117] While each side was quick to point out inconsistencies, both sides seemed to allege that neither was being truly honest with the Bible.

Herle asserted that "this word Church (as hath sufficiently appeared) is no way restrainable to a single Congregation."[118] He rested in his defenses against the allegation that a presbyterial government is similar to a papal hierarchy with the notion that a plurality of presbyters had safety in numbers concerning accountability.[119] He also called out the

---

[115] Charles Herle, *The Independency on Scriptures of the Independency of Churches: Wherein the Question of Independency of Church-Government is Temperately,* First, *Stated;* Secondly, *Argued:* Thirdly, *Cleerd From the Objections: and* Fourthly, *Appeald in, to the Judgments of Such as Stand for it*, (London: Thomas Brudenell, 1643), 2.

[116] Ibid., 26.

[117] Van Dixhoorn, ed., *Minutes and Papers of the Westminster Assembly*, vol. 2, 579.

[118] Herle, *The Independency on Scriptures of the Independency of Churches*, 17.

[119] Ibid., 18.

Independents for alleging that the synods were only for special occasions of doctrinal difficulties.[120] He ultimately argued the Independents were inconsistent with their own arguments.

Richard Mather (in Massachusetts) begged to differ. He and William Tompson penned a direct answer to Herle not long after Herle published his book. Mather and Tompson argued that "there ought to be Synods when occasion requires," but questioned their power to "ordain and excommunicate," as the Presbyterians held.[121] Mather and Tompson defended congregational autonomy throughout their reply, and even when raising the possible objection of a congregation in error, they did not deviate. They said "they may; But in our Judgment that needs not to hinder, but they may have entirenesse of Jurisdiction within themselves, and not be under the power of any other."[122] Even doctrinal error in a congregation was not sufficient grounds, according to Mather and Tompson, to interfere with a congregation's autonomy.

Contrary to the argument of Herle and others, who thought Independents' means would ultimately end in monarchy, Mather and Tompson argued the opposite. They argued "if Churches must be dependent upon the government of Synods, because the very light of nature teacheth a communion and assistance in government to all Societies whatever, then we see not how it will be avoyded, but by the same reason Churches must end in a Monarchy upon

---

[120] Herle, *The Independency on Scriptures of the Independency of Churches*, 19-20.

[121] Richard Mather and William Tompson, *A Modest & Brotherly Answer to Mr. Charles Herle his Book, Against the Independency of Churches. Wherein his Foure Arguments for the Government of Synods Over Particular Congregations, are Friendly Examined, and Clearly Answered. Together, With Christian and Loving Animadversions Upon Sundry Other Observable Passages in the Said Booke. All Tending to Declare the True use of Synods, and the Power of Congregationall Churches in the Points of Electing and Ordaining Their Owne Officers, and Censuring Their Offendors*, (London: Henry Overton, 1644), 6.

[122] Ibid., 14.

Earth."[123] To Herle's allegation that Christ never uses the word "church" for a single congregation, Mather and Tompson replied that "nor can other place be shewed where he used the word *Church* for a Synod."[124]

Another Westminster divine, Samuel Rutherford, responded to Mather and Tompson with a defense of the presbyterial form of church government, which the Church of Scotland had embraced. Rutherford argued that the elders (presbyters) in a church had "the power of the Keyes" given to them "by Christ," which gave them some due measure of authority.[125] However, he rejected the idea that this authority extended to "private brethren" to make judgments against others on behalf of the entire Church (i.e., excommunication).[126] Rutherford pointed out inconsistencies in the logical conclusions he felt the Independents' aims would reach. He argued:

> Here we see our brethrens minde cleare, Ten or twenty believers in a congregation have from Christ, 1. The supreme power of the keyes. 2. They are the supremest and highest Church on earth. 3. Above Pastours and Elders, even convened in a Synod in Christs name. 4. Some few believers cloathed with no ecclesiasticall office may ordaine Pastours, and Elders, deprive and excommunicate them. 5. Give ordinances and lawes to the Eldership. 6. When Synods or assemblies of office-bearers are met in assemblies, and cannot agree in their canons, the matter is to be referred by appeale or reference to a company of believers cloathed with no ecclesiasticall function, as to the most supreme ecclesiasticall judicatorie on earth. These are points unknown to Scripture, which our brethren hold.[127]

Rutherford repudiated the idea that individual believers' gatherings in and of themselves constituted a true church that had been given the power of the keys. He believed the way of

---

[123] Mather and Tompson, *A Modest and Brotherly Answer*, 20-21.

[124] Ibid., 31.

[125] Samuel Rutherford, *A Peaceable and Temperate Plea for Pauls Presbyterie in Scotland, or, A Modest and Brotherly Dispute of the Government of the Church of Scotland Wherein our Discipline is Demonstrated to be the True Apostolick way of Divine Truth, and the Arguments on the Contrary are Friendly Dissolved, the Grounds of Separation and the Indepencie [sic] of Particular Congregations, in Defence of Ecclesiasticall Presbyteries, Synods, and Assemblies, are Examined and Tried*, (London: John Bartlet, 1642), 7.

[126] Ibid., 29-30.

[127] Ibid., 33.

thinking noted above was where Independents' ideas ultimately would lead and that pastors needed "a multitude" to ordain them (viz., a synod), and rejected the idea that individual believers alone could ordain their ministers.[128] To Rutherford, the Independents' model of congregational autonomy failed to draw distinctions with a proper body for church government and was therefore improper.

Mather soon issued a reply of his own to Rutherford in 1647.[129] Since the Presbyterian Rutherford had argued for a synod as a proper form of authority for erring churches, Mather struck at this logic. He claimed that "When wee doe enquire about Power of appealing, and unto what Courts appeales must be brought, our way is not to seeke for such courts as cannot Erre, for such wee shall never find."[130] While Rutherford seemed to have an inherent assumption that a synod would be above error, Mather believed this was not capable of any church. In fact, he doubted whether a synod truly had "juridical power."[131] If nothing else, the synod, Mather argued, commanded individual churches to excommunicate heretics and did not take it upon themselves to do so.[132]

---

[128] Rutherford, *A Peaceable and Temperate Plea*, 37.

[129] The dates of these events are critically important to understanding the problem of Puritan disunity. The Independent Controversy was allegedly "settled" in 1644 after Parliament ordered the divines to make it a top priority, after long debates. However, there were those, like Richard Mather, who believed so firmly in congregational autonomy that he was unwilling to back down even after it was settled (which was not unique to Mather but was the case in Massachusetts throughout the colony). In addition, as noted above, Oliver Cromwell, who would lead the newly developed Commonwealth of England, had Congregationalist sympathies and kept close contact with the Independents. Thus, even with the Independents' cause dismissed in the Assembly, they still believed their cause defensible and attainable. Even after some problems seemed to be dealt with, the authors of these alleged "problems" would always return to debate more, which only drove disunity further.

[130] Richard Mather, *A Reply to Mr. Rutherfurd, or A Defence of the Answer to Reverend Mr. Herles Booke Against the Independency of Churches. Wherein Such Objections and Answers, as are Returned to Sundry Passages in the Said Answer by Mr. Samuel Rutherfurd, a Godly and Learned Brother of the Church of Scotland, in his Boke Entituled The due Right of Presbyters, are Examined and Removed, and the Answer Justified and Cleared*, (London: J. Rothwell and H. Allen, 1647), 6.

[131] Ibid., 11.

It is important to note here that the Independents did not reject the idea of presbyters as a biblical form of church government. Both sides of the debate (Presbyterians and Independents) believed in some form of a presbytery. They differed on the scope of church government. Presbyterians typically believed that each congregation would have multiple presbyters, to teach and to rule, and that these would be assigned (one or two each) to govern multiple churches in the same locality, with a synod of presbyters ruling all the churches in each locality. Independents rejected the idea of a synod and believed there should be multiple presbyters governing the same congregation rather than divide their responsibilities between multiple local congregations.[133] Bridge claimed "the government <which is> according to the mind of Christ & His Word revealed is this: that every perticular congregation should have power within itselfe. The minor is proved [in] 18 Math. 15."[134] Nonetheless, the Presbyterian Stephen Marshall was also concerned that a church in error should be held accountable to presbyters whose scope of authority lay outside that congregation.[135]

As the debate dragged on, neither side was willing to back down and kept bringing their arguments and counterarguments for several weeks. Both sides were determined to prove their case. Both sides agreed that each congregation needed a pastor to rule it, and that presbyters served the purpose of preserving doctrinal purity.[136] In the end, the Independents' cause did not win out. The Assembly decided in favor of a regional presbytery based on the conduct of the

---

[132] Mather, *A Reply to Mr. Rutherfurd*, 13.

[133] Van Dixhoorn, ed., *Minutes and Papers of the Westminster Assembly*, vol. 2, 594-595.

[134] Ibid., 498.

[135] Ibid., 503.

[136] Ibid., 601, 610-612, 679.

apostles at the Council of Jerusalem (Acts 15).[137] Independents believed that "there may be a sufficient Presbytery in a particular Congregation."[138] Rutherford and George Gillespie, among other Presbyterian divines, agreed that even if the Independents were right about the authority of pastors in the congregation, it would still require ordination through a presbytery.[139] As a result, use of a synod was eventually ruled valid, despite Independent objections. Despite their measures being struck down, the Dissenting Brethren eventually submitted their own dissenting report to Parliament along with that of the Presbyterians, just to show that the effort had been made.[140]

The Dissenting Brethren would not stop despite their efforts continually being stricken down. Knowing they would be under the authority of a presbytery, they then raised the question of whether they would be allowed to separate their congregations in the event that heresy was taught. Gillespie called this way of thinking "I must rather doe that which is in itselfe a sin than doe that which apeares to be a sin."[141] The Presbyterian Herbert Palmer also issued a denunciation of this view by calling this "liberty" the Independents wanted something that would "destroy all congregations."[142] In the end, despite reluctant persistence from the Five Dissenting Brethren, their cause ultimately lost, and the Church of England was set on course for a Presbyterian direction.

---

[137] By the time the controversy got underway, William Greenhill and William Carter had also joined the number of dissenting brethren (Van Dixhoorn, ed., *Minutes and Papers of the Westminster Assembly*, vol. 2, 614-616, vol. 5, 116).

[138] "The Reasons of the Dissenting Brethren Concerning the Power That is in Congregations, 12 December 1644," in Van Dixhoorn, ed., *Minutes and Papers of the Westminster Assembly*, vol. 5, 144.

[139] Van Dixhoorn, ed., *Minutes and Papers of the Westminster Assembly*, vol. 3, 13.

[140] Van Dixhoorn, ed., *Minutes and Papers of the Westminster Assembly*, vol. 5, 448, 451.

[141] Ibid., 581.

[142] Van Dixhoorn, ed., *Minutes and Papers of the Westminster Assembly*, vol. 3, 588.

Westminster produced a confession and catechism and ended on a note that in the minds of the divines would have given a new shape to the Church of England. However, the various rifts had far from finished. Richard Baxter later pointed out that "if all the Episcopalians had been like Ussher, all the Presbyterians like Mr. Stephen Marshall, and all the Independents like Jeremiah Burroughs, the breaches of the church would soon have healed."[143] Nevertheless, the contending parties in the Westminster Assembly had not matched these more moderate voices, setting the tone for even more polarization and militance.

Among the Presbyterians, John Dury offered a solution for reconciling differences with the Independents before it was too late. He argued that if the factions could not learn to get along "*debates would be sharp and endlesse, about every small matter, and for every trifle; the affections of love would bee lost, the peace of the Churches disturbed, Schismes made unavoidable, and the healing or preventing of breaches become altogether impossible*."[144] Notwithstanding, Dury's voice was not heard and the division persisted. The Westminster Confession and Catechism were not released until 1649, when the Assembly finally concluded. The Church of England was set to become Presbyterian and purge the bishops from power.[145] In

---

[143] James Ussher was an Irish-born priest who held to a moderate Calvinist persuasion, and certainly did not match the tone of his fellow Prelatics. Stephen Marshall had been a Presbyterian, also of a moderate persuasion, who certainly did his share of contending in written form against schisms that came about but did not have the harsher tone of some of his fellow Presbyterians. This observation is quoted from Richard Baxter, quoted in John Hunt, *Religious Thought in England*, vol. 1 (London: Strahan and Company, 1870), 205.

[144] The original quotation is in italics (John Dury, *A Peace-Maker Without Partiality and Hypocrisie. or the Gospel-way to Make up the Present Breaches of Brotherhood, and Heale the Divisions, Whereby Some of the Reforming Professors and Ministers of the Kindome at the Time, Sadly Dishonour Their Profession, Mainley Obstruct our Reformation, Utterly Destroy the Safe Constitution Both of Church and State. Wherein are Handled, 1. How the Meanes of Christian Peace, as Well Civill as Ecclesiasticall, may bee Found and Ought to bee Followed, Both by Pastors and People. 2. What are the Speciall lets of Ecclesiasticall Reconciliation, and What the Causes of Divisions are, and how to be Remedied. 3. What are the Grounds, Termes and Motives of Brotherly Unitie and Forbearance, Which the Ministers and Members of the Churches of England Ought to Professe and Practise one Towards Another for the Gospels Sake*, [London: R. Cotes, 1648], 56-57).

[145] George Abernathy, Jr., "The English Presbyterians and the Stuart Restoration, 1648-1663," *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, 55*, 2 (1965), 6.

fact, Rogers Whichard, relating the history of colonial Virginia at the time of these events, states that Presbyterianism was by this time the official policy of the Church of England.[146] Nonetheless, Parliament went through an upheaval of its own that changed the direction in which the Assembly was taking England.

Pride's Purge and the Establishment of the Commonwealth of England

The Presbyterians and the Independents both had vested interests in Parliament, and Parliament included adherents of both sides, which intensified the weight of their debate. Clement Walker gave voice to dissatisfaction with both sides of the divide. He thought of Presbyterians and Independents as self-interested parties with their own ends. He argued "the *Independent* groundeth his strength upon the *Army*, which if he can keep up, he hopes to give the Law to all, and to produce the great Chymaera, *Liberty of Conscience*: not considering that the confusion and licentiousnesse will destroy it self."[147] If the Independents, said Walker, got what they wanted, it would be the collapse of order as England knew it. Sir Edward Dering (son of the earlier baron from the Elizabethan Era) also held a noteworthy concern for both Independents and Presbyterians. He believed that the triumph of neither would represent nor be accurate to the views of everyone present.[148]

The Presbyterians, on the other hand, Walker further argued simply used the city's militia to their advantage in enforcing their own agenda and had monetary interests in Parliament through which they exerted a fair degree of control. If they succeeded in getting their agenda, he

---

[146] Rogers D. Whichard, *The History of Lower Tidewater Virginia*, (New York: Lewis Historical Publishing Co., 1959), 248.

[147] Clement Walker, *Relations and Observations, Historical and Politick, Upon the Parliament*, (London: 1648), 12.

[148] Noteworthily, Dering was by now arguing for a moderate episcopacy (Lamont, *Godly Rule*, 83).

said, "by overawing mens Consciences with their Doctrine, will subdue and work mens minds like wax to receive any impression of bondage that tyranny and oppression can set before them, as they do in *Scotland*."[149] Walker noted the privileged status Presbyterian clergy in Scotland enjoyed, and compared it with contempt to Catholic priests who enjoy political privilege where the Catholic Church had power.[150] If the Presbyterians achieved their aims, England would be forced to turn in a Presbyterian direction, and the liberty gained as a result of victory against Charles I would be lost. Walker claimed to speak on behalf of those to whom neither side was paying attention, viz., "the honest middle men."[151] England's transformation would soon be complete, but the outcome was not what many expected.

The divisions within Puritanism extended even into Parliament. Underdown argues that the parliamentary division was:

> between a peace party and a war party. The peace party wanted settlement with the king on almost any terms, even if it meant abandoning the Grand Remonstrance and the Nineteen Propositions, abandoning the Root-and-Branch Reformation of the Church (though they would prevent the restoration of Laudian episcopacy, forgetting the militia question and the Parliament's grasp at executive power by nomination of the King's councillors. Always on the lookout for negotiation, they wished to do nothing to make the peace difficult…Essentially the peace party's position rested on a willingness to trust the King.[152]

The "peace party" Underdown speaks of did not want to destroy Charles I. They wanted to believe they could take his proposed negotiations seriously.[153] Nonetheless, the Independents within Parliament were determined to see their cause through.

---

[149] Walker, *Relations and Observations*, 12-13.

[150] Ibid., 13.

[151] Ibid., 4.

[152] David Underdown, *Pride's Purge: Politics in the Puritan Revolution*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1971), 60.

Henry Marten, an Independent member of Parliament, spoke on behalf of his fellow Independents, when he took initiative to ensure that Parliament's cause was upheld, and the English Civil War would not be fought in vain. His answer would not only divide the English from the Scots at a critical time, but also would ensure no settlement could be reached. Marten told the Scots "that it was no part of your first business… to settle Religion, not to make a Peace in *England;* so as all those devout-like and amicable Endeavors for which you think to be thanked, were not onely Intrusions into Matters unconcerning you, but so many Diversions from performing, as you ought what was properly committed to you."[154] He took a sharp tone with the Scots, and claimed that "your Advice therein to the Parliament is to be but an Advice, and that an humble one."[155] Marten did not believe the Scots had any right to inspect the Laws of England or to participate in the negotiation of terms of peace or even give advice to that effect with the English Parliament.[156] He and his fellow Independents saw their presence as intrusive and undermining Parliament's authority.

Marten's belief proved true when the Scottish Army assisted the Royalists in the final days of the English Civil War. He upbraided the Scots for betraying the English in conspiring to reconcile with Charles I against what they told Parliament, and only participating in the earlier conflicts and the Westminster Assembly to fulfill their own interests, which he considered

---

[153] Charles I had agreed to some political and religious compromises with the Westminster divines, but still wanted some stakes in the Westminster Assembly, and even went as far as giving his blessings on the shorter catechism (Van Dixhoorn, ed., *Minutes and Papers of the Westminster Assembly*, vol. 5, 785-789). However, Charles's ends were still to regain his power.

[154] Henry Marten, *The Independency of England Endeavored to be Maintained*, (London: Peter Cole, 1648), 3-4.

[155] Ibid., 4.

[156] Ibid., 6.

treasonous and of no concern whatsoever for the English.[157] He told the Scots "you would certainly have been ashamed to disavow the busying your selves with our *RIGHTS, LAWS* and *LIBERTIES,* and with the same breath to dispute our Rights, correct our Laws, and infringe our Liberties."[158]

Marten was out to prove that the Scots had no chance of convincing the English to make peace with Charles, of which he and his fellow Independents were afraid. He made it clear that the Scots would have no say in Charles's fate.[159] The only peace in which Marten and other Independents were interested in was that "of conquest."[160] To the Independents, nothing less than Charles's surrender and England's freedom from his tyranny would be acceptable. They would not allow a chance for this even if it meant driving a wedge between England and Scotland in the process. Scotland and the Presbyterians continued to grow resentful of the presence of the New Model Army and vowed to push back strongly against them. The Independents of Parliament determined that they needed to be united against Charles having any chance of getting his power back. As a measure to ensure the cause of Parliament was successful, the Independents, led by Thomas Pride, purged all MPs who were suspected of disloyalty and formed the Rump Parliament in its place.[161] Pride's Purge would now allow Parliament some unity, albeit forced.

---

[157] Marten, *The Independency of England*, 17-18.

[158] Ibid., 8.

[159] Ibid., 26-28.

[160] Ibid., 15.

[161] These included several Presbyterian members. The Independents were determined that whatever happened next in England was going to happen on Parliament's terms and any member who was willing to compromise with the King was deemed suspect (Underdown, *Pride's Purge*, 118-120, 126-128).

Prior to the Westminster Confession, Presbyterians and Congregationalists were able to coexist within England despite each believing the other was in severe error. However, this did not remain. Abernathy notes that "the differences between the Presbyterians and the Congregationalists were subtle at first and did not cause alarm for either group so long as each group solicited the assistance of the other in a seemingly common battle against surviving or reviving Romanism within the Church of England."[162] Once Pride's Purge began, the differences between both sides became more pronounced, but Cromwell was determined to see his vision for England realized at any cost.

Oliver Cromwell, still in control of the New Model Army, continued to have strong Independent sympathies. Initially, he wanted to avoid executing Charles at all costs, and sought to come to an agreement with him.[163] As it became clear that Charles was unwilling to end his pursuit to restore his power, which also led to a renewal of the English Civil War (known as the Second English Civil War), it became clear to Cromwell and his compatriots that trial and execution were the only viable solution.[164] They succeeded in their aims, as in 1648 Charles was tried and executed as a traitor.

The Puritans of the Atlantic World and the Struggles of the Commonwealth of England

With the Westminster Assembly concluded and the King executed, England needed a new governorship. For this, England and Wales established an act that gave birth to the Commonwealth of England. England and all its territories would be a free state under the rule of

---

[162] Abernathy, "The English Presbyterians and the Stuart Restoration," 5.

[163] Underdown, *Pride's Purge*, 85-90.

[164] Ibid., 118-120.

Parliament.[165] In Massachusetts, John Cotton spoke highly of the outcome of the English Civil War. He asserted "I know not how they could have approved their faithfulnesse better to the state and cause than by purging the Parliament of such corrupt humours, and presenting the King to public tryall."[166] Cromwell appreciated the praise of Cotton, and also asked for his prayers and those of his fellow colonists.[167]

In other colonies, the situation was mixed. Maryland had put out the Act of Toleration in 1649 and Virginia's Puritans left for Maryland in 1649 due to the purge of all that did not favor royalism. Bermuda also sought to purge itself of all non-royalist inhabitants two years earlier, which resulted in the settling of Puritans amidst other islands in the Caribbean Sea, including Barbados and Antigua. Many of the Bermudan Independents were encouraged by the actions of the New Model Army.[168] Nevertheless, Wilkinson notes that "religious differences probably more than anything else fomented misunderstanding on the island during these years [i.e., of English Civil War, brackets author's], and these disagreements, like the tactics of the 'Army,' were in reality but reflections of the revolution occurring in England."[169] Eventually, the Independents would not marry couples or baptize the children of those who did not accept their creeds.[170] While the Independents wanted to push a form of toleration, Presbyterians on the

---

[165] England and Wales, *An Act Declaring and Constituting the People of England to be a Commonwealth and a Free-State*, (London: Edward Husband, 1649).

[166] John Cotton, "Copy of a Letter From Mr. John Cotton to Lord General Cromwell," in Thomas Hutchinson, ed., *A Collection of Original Papers Relative to the History of the Colony of Massachusetts-Bay*, (Boston: 2010), 233-234.

[167] Oliver Cromwell, "Copy of a Letter From Lord General Oliver Cromwell to Mr. John Cotton," in Hutchinson, ed., *A Collection of Original Papers*, 236-237.

[168] Henry Wilkinson, *The Adventurers of Bermuda*, (London: Oxford University Press, 1933), 278.

[169] Ibid., 278.

[170] Ibid., 281.

island loved order and uniformity. The tension between toleration and the order of conformity existed with their counterparts in England did as well. In 1645, the "aggressive party" eventually took the name "Parliamentary Christians" and tried to reverse the course the New Model Army had set an example for by their actions in England.[171] By 1646, Henry Smith was ignoring Parliament's edicts and refused to allow three Independent ministers to preach.[172]

The Bermudans who left became known as the Eleutheran Adventurers, and part of the agreement to join them included "no names of distinction or reproach, as Independents, Antinomians, Anabaptists, or any other."[173] The Eleutheran Adventurers recognized that keeping the peace was essential. Bermuda remained a Royalist colony, but by the end of the Commonwealth of England, Wilkinson notes that though Puritans remained there, their fervor was lost.[174] Cromwell had support in some places, but not in others. Virginia and Bermuda supported the Royalist Cause against Maryland and Massachusetts. By now, the Puritans had overthrown the tyrannical king, and could now achieve their goals to make the Church of England completely Protestant, and the Commonwealth of England purged of all the elements of corruption from an absolute monarchy. However, this feat had barely been achieved by 1649, and by the early 1650s, did not have united support abroad, or even at home.

Oliver Cromwell had achieved his goals of purging the Parliament of opposition and beginning the process of reforming England in a Puritan image. Despite this, as noted above, the Puritans did not have a united vision of what that meant. The Westminster Assembly had been

---

[171] Wilkinson, *Adventurers of Bermuda*, 278.

[172] Ibid., 286.

[173] Eleutheran Adventurers, *Articles and Orders*, (London: 1647).

[174] Wilkinson, *Adventurers of Bermuda*, 313.

the grandest attempt at coming to a united vision, but Cromwell and his allies' desperate attempt to purge Parliament of any opposition, which led to Charles I's execution, created problems for the new Commonwealth from its inception. Cromwell himself in wanting true reform in England, did not believe this should come about through centralized authority, but from "individual actions."[175]

Toward the end of the Second English Civil War, the Scots had deviated from the English and attempted to assist Charles I in regaining his power against the Parliamentarians. This conflict continued into the early 1650s in what is known today as the Third English Civil War. The English fought back against what they perceived as the risk of the Scots installing Charles II as king in his father's place (which fears proved not to be unfounded). The Commonwealth had problems within and without. Without, it continued to struggle against the Scots and Irish who supported Charles II. Within, it had to deal with a Puritan front that was far from united (Presbyterian opponents to Cromwell still ran rampant), the emergence of new sects that threatened the Commonwealth's stability, and some of the colonies failed to submit to the new regime.

Cromwell and the Rump Parliament had worked together in the final deposition, trial and execution of Charles I. Nevertheless, their relationship was beginning to sour early into the Commonwealth of England. Even in 1651, when a conference was held, Cromwell agreed that the question remained how England should be governed. Cromwell agreed the issue to be discussed was whether to have "an absolute Republic, or with any mixture of Monarchy."[176] Sir

---

[175] That is, Cromwell wanted the rest of England to want reform as badly as he did and exactly as he wanted it. It only frustrated him as he went along that not everyone shared his vision of a godly Commonwealth (Lamont, *Godly Rule*, 158).

[176] "Conference at Lenthall," in Thomas Carlyle, ed., *The Works of Thomas Carlyle*, vol. 8: Oliver Cromwell's Letters and Speeches, III, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 12.

Thomas Widdington argued in favor of giving one of Charles I's surviving sons the throne under a mixed monarchy, and Lord Chief-Justice St. John argued that "the Government of this Nation, without something of Monarchical power, will be very difficult to be so settled as not to shake the foundation of our Laws, and the Liberties of our People."[177]

An English republic was hard to be conceived of, as the English could not conceive of a government where there was no king to enforce the laws and protection of liberties. Colonel Whalley, however, wanted "nothing of Monarchical power" in England, and considered the surviving Stuarts (Charles II as well as James, Duke of York) to be enemies of the people, especially in light of the recent Third English Civil War.[178] Cromwell himself was not opposed to a mixed monarchy in which one of the Stuarts achieved some authority, in some form, even if it were on the Parliament's terms.[179] While Cromwell did not want to be king, he also wanted to ensure England went in the direction (particularly religious and moral) that it ought. Despite Cromwell's persistence, the Rump Parliament could not settle on this issue.

As a result of continued disagreements on passing reforms, in 1653, Cromwell took it upon himself to dismiss and dissolve the Rump Parliament altogether, even to the alienation of his former allies altogether.[180] Cromwell told the Rump Parliament that they "are no Parliament" and of "living in open contempt of Gods Commandments. Following your own greedy appetites, and the Devils Commandments."[181] He accused Parliament of hypocrisy and asserted

---

[177] "Conference at Lenthall," in Carlyle, ed., *The Works of Thomas Carlyle*, vol. 8, 12-13.

[178] Ibid.

[179] Ibid., 14.

[180] "Dissolution of the Rump," in Carlyle, ed., *The Works of Thomas Carlyle*, vol. 8, 34.

[181] Ibid., 35.

"scandalous to the profession of the Gospel, how can you be a Parliament for God's people? Depart, and let us have done with you."[182] Though Cromwell had once considered the Rump Parliament his closest allies and means to his ends, he could no longer stand their failure to uphold the same values as himself. In his mind, now there needed to be a new Parliament over England to enforce the order he sought. Cromwell justified his actions in the name of "the peace, safety, and good Government of this Commonwealth."[183] His new aim was to form a new Parliament, by which the English Puritans could make a united front to accomplish their mission. The result was the short-lived Barebone's Parliament.

Cromwell had been planning to take some action with Parliament and realized from early on he may have to dismiss the Rump Parliament if he wanted to see the changes he proposed. Upon his dismissing them, Cromwell claimed "I have sought the Lord night and day, that He would rather slay me than put me upon the doing of this work."[184] In addition, he also claimed "perceiving the spirit of God so strong upon me, I would no longer consult flesh and blood."[185] Cromwell initially had not planned on being so abrupt and seemingly wanted to be able to continue to work with the Rump Parliament, but suddenly dismissed them. Cromwell was confident that God had given him the authority to take England's matters out of the hands of the Rump Parliament and into his own.

Cromwell did not stop at claiming divine authority for dissolving the Rump Parliament. He also presented a divine calling for those who would join the new one. He asserted:

---

[182] "Dissolution of the Rump," in Carlyle, ed., *The Works of Thomas Carlyle*, vol. 8, 35.

[183] "Summons," in Carlyle, ed., *The Works of Thomas Carlyle*, vol. 8, 39.

[184] Oliver Cromwell, "Speech I," quoted in Carlyle, ed., *The Works of Thomas Carlyle*, vol. 8, 36.

[185] Ibid.

> Truly God hath called you to this Work by, I think, as wonderful providences as ever passed upon the sons of men in so short a time. And truly, I think, taking the argument of necessity, for the Government must not *fall*; taking the appearance of the hand of God in this thing, --'I think' you would have been loath it should have been resigned into the hands of wicked men and enemies! I am sure, God would not have it so. It's come, therefore, to you by the way of necessity; by the way of the wise Providence of God.[186]

While Cromwell admitted to using his own human reasoning as well as believing a divine calling, he did not seem to think the two were incompatible. He wanted to do what was necessary to fulfill the Puritan goal of a Godly Commonwealth and urged the people to follow their own good sense.

Cromwell's confidence that God stood with him was so apparent that when giving a speech to the House of Commons in 1653, he kept the same tone he had put in his letters while leading the New Model Army in the 1640s, only now attributed it to England's present circumstances. When explaining his rationale for dismissing the Rump Parliament and recruiting for the Little Parliament (also known as Barebone's Parliament), Cromwell claimed the Rump Parliament was not focusing on a critical issue for the liberties and freedoms of Englishmen, and that it was necessary for Cromwell himself to intervene now or the Royalists among the Scots and Irish would make a comeback. He asserted, "When it pleased God to lay this close to our hearts; and indeed to show us that the interest of His People was grown cheap, 'that *it* was' not at all laid to heart, but if things came to real competition, His Cause, even among themselves, would also in every point go to the ground: That there was a duty incumbent upon us, 'even upon us.'"[187] Cromwell saw it as a God-given responsibility to dissolve the Rump Parliament

---

[186] Cromwell, "Speech I," quoted in Carlyle, ed., *The Works of Thomas Carlyle*, vol. 8, 58.

[187] Ibid., 50.

and make a new one who would defend the "cause of God's people." He wanted to preserve what he and the New Model Army had gained for England at any cost.

Even the Barebone's Parliament did not last long before Cromwell dissolved it also (once again due to his disagreements with them) and ruled England alongside the leaders of the former New Model Army (the equivalent of a military dictatorship today). Austin Woolrych, in his detail of the Cromwellian Protectorate, argues that Cromwell's Council of Officers, upon his dissolution of Barebone's Parliament, had designed "a living constitution" that was there to "define the terms of a limited monarchy—though this time with Cromwell as king."[188] Cromwell refused, but still believed in accepting an office comparable to it that he was acting for "the mind of God," which according to him, seemed to be "the peace of God's people."[189] In 1654, when he was established formally as Lord Protector, he continued to attribute his actions to be about "approving" himself "to God" and his own conscience and that of the people.[190] Part of Cromwell's reforms that he now insisted on was "liberty of conscience" to be allowed for all Protestants (not Catholics), with the exception of heretics.[191] Cromwell's determination to see his agenda fulfilled saw him dispose of Parliament when it no longer served that agenda, much like Charles I had done, whom Cromwell had ironically helped to execute. Additionally, Cromwell also commissioned major-generals to get rid of any "royalist conspiracy."[192] By now, Bremer

---

[188] Austin Woolrych, "The Cromwellian Protectorate: A Military Dictatorship?", *History*, vol. 75, no. 244 (1990), 209.

[189] Oliver Cromwell, "Speech III," in Carlyle, ed., *Works of Thomas Carlyle*, vol. 8, 133-134.

[190] Ibid., 145.

[191] Ibid., 147-148.

[192] This continued to strain Cromwell's relationship with Parliament, as he continued to exclude moderate Presbyterians from the Parliament he seemed to still be trying to form. Cromwell wanted there to be some form of parliamentary rule, but could not begin it once the Protectorate began due to his unwillingness to compromise (Woolrych, "The Cromwellian Protectorate: A Military Dictatorship?", 221-222; Jonathan Fitzgibbons, *Cromwell's*

notes that most Puritans in England were "restricting access to the Lord's Supper" and their solution for protecting the average Englishman against heresies was a rigorous emphasis on catechesis.[193] Cromwell's program was antithetical to what they had hoped.

Little and Smith note that "Cromwell's criterion for a successful Parliament was whether it encouraged godliness in ways that would enable the godly people gradually to become coterminous with the nation as a whole."[194] Cromwell wanted the advancement of a nation of godly people, but he asserted that "Liberty of Conscience, and Liberty of the Subject" were "two as glorious things to be contended for, as any that God hath given us."[195] He was willing to get rid of Parliament.

Cromwell's desire for toleration as well as godly discipline left the Commonwealth of England not as most Puritans hoped. Abernathy notes that the Presbyterians "attempted to overcome the lack of discipline and organization resulting from Cromwell's religious policy."[196] He notes further that the Presbyterians, throughout the Commonwealth of England, could not come to an understanding with the Independents, but eventually found enough common ground with moderate Anglicans that gave them "reason to hope for a reconciliation with a future modified Anglican establishment."[197] While Cromwell and the Independents attempted to achieve "liberty of conscience," the Presbyterians wanted some form of order.

House of Lords: Politics, Parliaments, and Constitutional Revolutions, 1642-1660, [Rochester: Boydell and Brewer, 2018], 45).

[193] Bremer, *Lay Empowerment and the Development of Puritanism*, 155.

[194] Patrick Little and David L. Smith, *Parliament and Politics During the Cromwellian Protectorate*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 133.

[195] Oliver Cromwell, "Speech II," in Carlyle, ed., *The Writings of Carlyle*, vol. 8, 111.

[196] Abernathy, "The English Presbyterians and the Stuart Restoration," 7.

[197] Ibid.

Cromwell's leaning toward liberty of conscience gave way a number of dissenters gaining ground in England during the Commonwealth. Antinomianism still held ground in England despite the ruling against it at Westminster. William Eyre, for one, argued that the New Covenant consisted of "Free Grace" for which there was "no condition required on our parts to entitle us to the blessings of it."[198] Antinomianism also persisted through a group known as the Ranters. Among these was Abiezer Coppe, who proclaimed:

> Thus saith the Lord, *I inform you, that I overturn, overturn, overturn*. And as the bishops, Charles and the Lords have had their turn, overturn, so your turn shall be next (ye surviving great ones) by what name or title soever dignified or distinguished whoever you are that oppose me, the eternal God who am UNIVERSAL LOVE and whose service is perfect freedom and pure libertinism.[199]

Coppe and other Ranters believed, as Antinomians, that the true gospel was that of free grace. Since it was clear that Cromwell's grace was no more free than any other Puritan or Anglican, they believed it was their God-given duty to prophesy their doom. Many additional sects rose in England during this time, which created problems for Cromwell's Protectorate and the Church of England. Though Cromwell and his allies resisted the idea of a national church (as the Presbyterians pushed), Puritans all over the Atlantic World were not united on how to deal with the growth of sects. As Bremer notes, "the diversity of Puritanism was reflected not only in the proliferation of sects, but in the disputes within puritan communities over how diverse ideas should be dealt with."[200] The Puritans of New England tended more toward strictness and

---

[198] William Eyre, *Justification Without Conditions, or the Free Justification of a Sinner, Explained, Confirmed, and Vindicated by the Exceptions, Objections, and Seeming Absurdities Cast Upon it, by the Assessors of Conditional Justification; More Especially, From the Attempts of Mr. B. Woodbridge, in his Sermon Entitled "Justification by Faith," of Mr. Cranford, in his Epistle to the Reader; and of Mr. Baxter, in Some Passages That Relate to the Same Matter. Wherein Also, the Absoluteness of the New Covenant is Proved, and the Arguments Against it are Disproved*, (New Salem: 1653), 17.

[199] Abiezer Coppe, "A Flying Fiery Roll," (London: 1649), accessed July 6, 2022, https://www.exclassics.com/pamphlets/pamph003.htm.

suppression of sectarian preaching, up to and including via banishment or execution. The Puritans of England, under the direction of Cromwell, tended toward looking the other way at someone's possible heresy, despite anti-heretical policies in place.

The Presbyterians saw the disorder that was growing in England because of Cromwell's mixed bag of ideas. Prior to the development of Cromwell becoming Lord Protector alongside his generals, the Presbyterians had attempted to form a potential solution to the growing problems. They realized that failure to achieve some form of unity among the Puritan Commonwealth would ultimately result in its collapse.[201]

Already, the Presbyterians had contended with Cromwell and the Rump Parliament for the length of its existence to keep what they had built with the Westminster Assembly in force despite Cromwell's attempts to do away with it.[202] By 1652, Richard Baxter was one such moderate Presbyterian who sought to be part of the solution.[203] He corresponded regularly with John Dury to negotiate a modified plan of peace, but this failed. Some of the Presbyterians even considered the idea of negotiating with moderate Anglicans to restore the Church of England to a modified version of its state when the Stuarts were in power.[204] Nonetheless, their efforts failed. Some of the Presbyterians, led by Goodwin and John Owen, attempted to meet in the middle with Nye and Simpson. In so doing, they proposed to Parliament that, among other things, only

---

[200] Francis J. Bremer, *Lay Empowerment and the Development of Puritanism*, (London: Palgrave MacMillan, 2015), 148.

[201] As noted above, the Puritans never had a united front from the movement's inception. Only now were some of them beginning to see the fruit of this disunity. Cromwell was going to remove anyone who stood in the way of his ideas and desired reforms, and now his opponents needed a solution in hopes of preserving what the Puritans had attained.

[202] Abernathy, "The English Presbyterians and the Stuart Restoration," 8.

[203] Ibid.

[204] Ibid., 7, 8-13.

church-approved ministers should be ordained to preach, but continued the push to remove hypocritical ministers as well as those whose practice still resembled Catholicism.[205] Attempts had been made to truly hold a meeting of the minds, but Cromwell had a mind of his own.

The Scottish Parliament had declared Charles II king in 1649 under the condition that he accepted terms they issued.[206] This led to further fighting between the English and Scottish, in which Charles II hoped to gain some Royalist support where he already had it in Scotland and Ireland. However, he was unsuccessful in stopping the Commonwealth of England. Ultimately, the Scots lost, which resulted in the Scottish absorption into the Commonwealth.[207] Cromwell also had the Southern Colonies' submission with which to be concerned.

New England supported the transition of England from a monarchy to a republic. Notwithstanding, Virginia and Maryland, other southern colonies, and many of the Caribbean Islands, did not. Cromwell and the Rump Parliament initially retaliated with an embargo against Virginia and the islands to give them incentive to submit.[208] Eventually, in 1652, Sir William Berkeley reluctantly agreed to surrender to Parliament. This resulted in his temporary abdication

---

[205] John Owen, *The Humble Proposals of Mr. Owen, Mr. Tho. Goodwin, Mr. Nye, Mr. Sympson, and Other Ministers, who Presented the Petition to the Parliament, and Other Persons, Febr. 11. Under Debate by a Committee This 31. of March, 1652. for the Furtherance and Propagation of the Gospel in This Nation. Wherein They Having had Equall Respects to all Persons Fearing God, Though of Differing Judgements, doe Hope AlsoThat They Will Tend to Union and Peace. With Additionall Propositions Humbly Tendred to the Committee for Propagating the Gospel, as Easie and Speedy Means for Supply of all Parishes in England With Able, Godly, and Orthodox Ministers. For, Setling of Right Constituted Churches, and for Preventing Persons of Corrupt Judgements, From Publishing Dangerous Errours, and Blasphemies in Assemblies and Meetings, by Other Godly Persons, Ministers, and Others*, (London: Robert Ibbitson, 1652), 2, 5.

[206] Austin Woolrych, *Britain in Revolution, 1625-1660*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 481.

[207] Kirsteen Mackenzie, "Oliver Cromwell and the Solemn League and Covenant of the Three Kingdoms," in Patrick Little, ed., *Oliver Cromwell: New Perspectives*, (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2009), 159.

[208] As noted above, the Puritans of Bermuda had largely fled the colony in the aftermath of the English Civil War due to their Royalist sympathies (a deviation from many of the American colonists), where they established themselves on other islands. For purposes of this study, Virginia and Maryland will be the primary focus (Henry Scobell, *An Act Prohibiting Trade With the Barbada's, Virginia, Bermuda's, and Antegua*, [London: Edward Husband and John Field, 1650]).

in favor of the Puritan Richard Bennett as the new colonial governor.[209] From here, the colonial focus would necessarily be on getting Maryland to submit.

Cromwell's policy did not resonate with what was happening in Massachusetts. Now that the Puritans of Massachusetts had seen a hint that their dreams would be fulfilled, and the government of England aligned with some of their goals, they felt they had to stamp out any hint of heresy within the colony. This included one of the original land patent holders of Massachusetts, William Pynchon. Pynchon wrote *The Meritorious Price of our Redemption, Justification, &c.*, in which he argued against the traditional Calvinist understanding of Christ's atonement. Instead of Christ paying the wrath of God on the cross, Pynchon argued, "Christ did not suffer any degree of Gods wrath at all for us, but that all his sufferings were inflicted upon him from the rage and enmity of the old Serpent and his wicked instruments, being all comprised under this one sentence, Thou shalt pierce him in the footstools, *Gen. 3.15*."[210] Pynchon's book was banned (notably the first banned book in the American colonies) and he subsequently returned to England sometime afterwards.[211]

---

[209] Bennett came from one of the most prominent Puritan families in colonial Virginia, as previously noted. Although Puritanism had waned in Virginia under Charles I, through Richard Bennett and the Commonwealth of England, it now had a chance to make a comeback. Though there is no record of this occurring, Virginia was nevertheless under some form of Puritan control during Bennett's time as colonial governor until Bennett left for England temporarily in 1655 (Joshua D. Warfield, ed., *The Founders of Anne Arundel and Howard Counties, Maryland: a Genealogical and Biographical Review From Wills, Deeds, and Church Records*, [Baltimore: Kohn and Pollock, 1905], 41; John B. Boddie, *Seventeenth-Century Isle of Wight County, Virginia: a History of the County of Isle of Wight, Virginia, During the Seventeenth Century, Including Abstracts of the County Records*, [Baltimore: Genealogical Publishing Co., Inc., 1980], 74).

[210] Pynchon did not deny that God played some role in the atonement also, arguing instead for Him allowing the crucifixion as the ultimate test of obedience and of Christ's human nature (William Pynchon, *The Meritorious Price of our Redemption, Justification, &c. Cleering it From Some Common Errors*, (London: George Wittington and James Moxon, 1650), 2).

[211] Philip F. Gura, " 'The Contagion of Corrupt Opinions' in Puritan Massachusetts: The Case of William Pynchon," *The William and Mary Quarterly*, Vol. 39, No. 3 (1982), 470.

John Clarke eventually wrote of the increase of persecution occurring in Massachusetts during the Commonwealth. He was critical of the colonial government and drew a negative comparison to Rome due to the growth of intolerance of dissidents there. He enumerated laws that prohibited any church from being established unless it was authorized by the colonial government among these.[212] Cromwell's vision of allowing liberty of conscience for Protestants was not resonating with his subjects in Massachusetts, who were now trying to preserve what they had at the expense of anyone else who passed through.

William Stone, colonial governor of Maryland since 1649, was fiercely loyal to the Baltimores. He served them despite the Puritan regime in England, which earned him the ire of Puritans in Maryland. Upon the arrival of Richard Bennett and William Claiborne (the fierce fighter for the Puritans during the 1640s, when the First and Second English Civil Wars raged), Stone had to abdicate his position as governor, realizing where the colonies' loyalty lay. Stone returned with some troops to try to regain his power. The result was the Battle of the Severn, which was among the bloodiest battles in Maryland's history. Maryland's Puritans won and gained control of the colony, and Stone's life was spared, but Gambrill notes he was "treated with great cruelty."[213] Threats to Cromwell's power in the colonies had seemingly been eliminated. Cromwell spent the rest of his days ruling England, as noted above, through a military dictatorship with his generals at his side. The vision of a Godly Commonwealth seemed lost even before Cromwell's death in 1658.

---

[212] John Clarke, *Ill Newes from New-England, or, A nar[r]ative of New-Englands Persecution Wherin is Declared That While Old England is Becoming New, New-England is Become Old : Also Four Proposals to the Honoured Parliament and Councel of State, Touching the way to Propagate the Gospel of Christ ... : Also Four Conclusions Touching the Faith and Order of the Gospel of Christ out of his Last Will and Testament, Confirmed and Justified*, (London: Henry Hill, 1652), 35.

[213] J. Montgomery Gambrill, *Leading Events of Maryland History*, (Boston: Ginn & Co., 1904), 41-45.

Conclusion

Going all the way back to Elizabeth, the Puritans never had a consensus on how to achieve their goals. Under James I, those of a Separatist mindset eventually had an irreparable rift with the Puritans, who no longer considered them equals. Eventually, Antinomianism threatened to divide Massachusetts, and gained a foothold in England afterwards. During the Westminster Assembly of Divines, the various factions could not easily come to a meeting of the minds. This gave way to Pride's Purge and Cromwell seizing control of England. While Cromwell wanted liberty of conscience for Protestants, he could not come to an agreement with Parliament easily. The Commonwealth of England ultimately failed because of Oliver Cromwell's inability to work well with Parliament. By the end of the Commonwealth of England, Puritans had still not resolved their differences.

The Puritan movement may have been doomed from the start. While the events of the 1660s did not destroy Puritanism altogether, lack of unity from the inception of the movement kept the Puritans from maintaining their goal of running a Commonwealth. Moreover, they were now attempting to preserve what they had left of their original goals rather than simply trying to continue their reform of the Church of England.

CHAPTER FIVE: From the Restoration to the Glorious Revolution: Puritans Regroup and Change Direction

Puritans had goals of reforming the Church of England but had difficulty maintaining a consistent vision for reform. Puritans tried to secure their place in the American colonies amid a growing struggle with the Quakers as well as how to address various dissenters in their midst, while in England the Puritans were being suppressed as a result of the policies of Charles II. However, Puritans made a political comeback in the 1670s because of their association with the developing Whig movement. England was going through one of its most significant transitions of power, viz., the Restoration of the Stuarts. The political turmoil in its wake resulted in the Glorious Revolution, a time of intense political transition resulting in the overthrow of James II, the last of the Stuart monarchs. Naturally, its effects were not only felt in England, but the Restoration as well as the Glorious Revolution carried over into colonial America, and the latter resulted in several upheavals throughout the American colonies, including Coode's Rebellion, as well as Leisler's Rebellion in New York and the Boston Revolt of 1689 in Massachusetts Bay. The Glorious Revolution, the struggles that accompanied its arrival, and its subsequent upheavals in the colonies resulted in a redefinition of Puritanism. This redefinition came from the Puritans' desire to preserve themselves and hold onto what they had, that ultimately strengthened them against all perceived threats, but turned them into the very centralized political force they had reckoned with throughout the seventeenth century.

Further evidence of the extensive nature of the transatlantic Puritan movement is the role the Puritans played in the Glorious Revolution of 1688 and the events that followed it. The Puritans and Protestants in England actively sought to purge the Crown of any remaining allegiance to the Pope and consequently, Puritans in America began to purge their own colonies

of the same. The chain of political upheavals in the colonies in the late seventeenth century were connected to common suspicions on both sides of the Atlantic of threats to the Protestants' freedom and safety in the British Empire, and the Protestants' protective measures to preserve them.

Background: The Puritans, The Quakers, The Restoration and Protestant Liberty

To understand the Glorious Revolution and its aftermath in colonial America, it is first necessary to understand the Puritans' political philosophy and struggles in the wake of the failure of the Commonwealth of England. For Puritans to achieve their goals of a fully Protestant Church of England, they needed the support of Parliament and the Crown. The Puritans had failed to achieve this during the Commonwealth of England but were not giving up their ambitions altogether. However, the royal policies of the later Stuart monarchs were a hindrance to this effort.

Puritans, as devout Protestants, from their inception, saw themselves as having the best interests of England at heart. They considered themselves exemplary loyal Protestants. Consequently, they saw Catholics as inherently seditious and a threat to the Crown. By the time of the Restoration, this dichotomy was nothing new. Depending on who was in power, the dangerous party could be Catholics or Puritans.

To keep England uniform, the Crown saw it as quintessential to maintain a united Church of England. Naturally, this led to questions as to what to do with the colonies, since these were an essential part of the British Empire. Sutto argued that perception of motive by one side or the other (Catholic or Puritan) strongly depended on one's religious views.[1] Puritans and Catholics,

---

[1] Sutto, *Loyal Protestants and Dangerous Papists*, 15.

who both refused to conform to the Church of England, presented a challenge to this unity, and also pushed for their own conception thereof.

To a Protestant, a good Catholic was no Catholic at all. They believed (especially true of the Puritans) that Catholics were the problem despite their calls for tolerance. Even Andrew Marvell, a "puritan-leaning conformist," believed that there was a definite aim on the part of Catholics to take away Protestant freedoms. He argued that Catholics were attempting to "change the lawful government into outright tyranny, and to convert the established Protestant religion into downright popery."[2] Marvell's beliefs about Catholicism matched the attitude toward Catholics of his time. Catholics had been suspected of being inherently seditious since England had broken with the Catholic Church. These fears continued even into the Restoration because Charles II eventually grew to have Catholic sympathies. Marvell's indictment against Catholics would later fuel the rise of the growing Whig party within Parliament.[3]

This fear of a Catholic conspiracy to deprive Protestants of freedom and religion was notably present in England and her colonies. However, as John Kenyon notes, because the Protestant religion served as a fortification against attacks from without (including from Rome), most Protestants believed the greater danger had to come "from within," as a conspiracy, which left them on their guard.[4] In this way, the Puritans' measures to eliminate the Catholic elements of worship can be seen not only as a step toward true religion, but also protection from losing the freedoms from Catholic tyranny and oppression that they had in a thoroughly Protestant nation.

---

[2] Andrew Marvell, *An Account of the Growth of Popery and Arbitrary Government in England*, (Amsterdam, 1677), 1.

[3] Winship, *Hot Protestants*, 225.

[4] John Kenyon, *The Popish Plot*, (London: Phoenix Press, 1972), 3.

Catholics would often call for "toleration" of their refusal to adhere to the religious reforms of the Church of England.[5] However, Puritans saw these calls for toleration as a subtle ruse to eventually bring England back into the Catholic Church and eliminate Protestants from England altogether. Puritans in England, New England, and the colonial South all held to this idea of Catholics as suspect in subtly bringing in papal tyranny. This tension between the Protestant establishment in Great Britain and the existence of Catholics in Maryland had existed since the beginnings of the English colonies. However, Maryland's established government was able to endure for a while despite the shifting politics in the mother country. The situation did not begin to change until the decades following the Restoration of the Stuart monarchy.

James, the Duke of York (later James II when he became King of England and Ireland and James VII of Scotland), by the end of the 1660s, was a committed Catholic, and very outspoken about it. Despite this, he showed no open hostility to the Church of England before his coronation. According to Vincent Buranelli in his close examination of York, "he accepted the traditional scheme of a church, a hierarchy, a sacramental system" and for this reason accepted the Church of England as it was when he became king.[6] Additionally, he opposed Puritanism and wanted to make his own reforms to the Church of England to allow it to accommodate his religious belief and practice. This served only to confirm the Puritans' fears of a conspiracy to

---

[5] Michael Questier, "Catholic Loyalism in Early Stuart England," *The English Historical Review*, vol. 123, no. 504, 1133-1134. In England, as in other nations, ecclesiastical uniformity was greatly stressed. The thought of anyone living there who did not conform to the common religion was unthinkable, and to the minds of many, dangerous. This included Catholics and Puritans, and any other dissenter who did not walk in uniformity with the Church of England. Despite this, Catholics attempted to prove themselves loyal despite their disagreements, and to disprove the many accusations of conspiracy they faced from their fellow Englishmen.

[6] Vincent Buranelli, *The King and the Quaker: A Study of William Penn and James II*, (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1962), 69.

bring about a Catholic coup d'état.[7] From the start, then, many questioned his fitness to be King of England.

When it became clear that the Protectorate under Oliver Cromwell, and briefly, his son, Richard, could not endure without a united vision under a respectable leadership, an effort went underway to bring Charles II out of exile that ultimately resulted in his restoration to power in 1660. Richard Cromwell had not been able for the brief period he was in office to keep the reigns of the military or Parliament. As a result, the military dictatorship destabilized. In 1659, Parliament assembled and began to speak where they had been silent since the Cromwellian Protectorate began. The occasion showed that Cromwell had no real control and was even less capable of keeping unity in the Commonwealth of England than his father. It was clear that the Commonwealth of England was going to be short-lived. Richard Cromwell was ousted from power, and thus began the transition of England back to its original, monarchical form.[8] Puritans seemingly had what they wanted, but the collapse of the Commonwealth proved a decisive blow to the Puritan cause.

John Milton was a vocal opponent of the Restoration and saw in it the undoing of all for which the Puritans had stood. Milton warned that "if we return to kingship, and, when we begin to finde the old incroachments coming on by little and little upon our consciences, which must necessarily, inseparably in one interest we may be all that we have fought, but are never likely to attain so far as we are now advanc'd, to the recovery of our freedom."[9] Milton enjoyed the

---

[7] Graham Goodlad, "Before the Glorious Revolution: The Making of Absolute Monarchy?" *Historical Review, 58* (2007), 15.

[8] J. R. Jones, *Country and Court: England, 1658-1714*, (London: Edward Arnold, 1978), 113-120.

[9] John Milton, *The Ready and Easy Way to Establish a Free Commonwealth* (1660), accessed July 6, 2022, https://oll.libertyfund.org/title/clark-the-ready-and-easy-way-to-establish-a-free-commonwealth.

Commonwealth of England, even going as far as arguing that a "Commonwealth, without single person or house or lords, is by far the best government."[10] Milton did not believe that the Restoration would bring the same security he had enjoyed as a Puritan during the Commonwealth, and defended the idea of keeping the Commonwealth in place.

However, Milton's fears were not universally felt on the other side of the Atlantic. Puritans in the colonies had been struggling against the Quakers, whose origins lack a definitive date, but the movement grew in notoriety in the early 1650s with the ministry of George Fox. Fox held to a different conception of the "church" than did the Church of England, including Puritans, as well as other sects in England, in that he affirmed that the "church" was a priesthood of all believers and consisted only of those who had their own assurances they were true Christians.[11] Fox was dissatisfied with all Protestants in England, whether Church of England, Puritan, or another group of dissenters. They believed themselves divinely sent to admonish Protestants and spread their new message, which earned them the fierce ire of many Protestants, especially in New England.

Among the Quakers, Anthony Pearson claimed divine authority to seek the protection of his fellow Quakers. He claimed to be "moved of the Lord" to write a letter to Parliament, in which he asked them to restrain the hands of ministers who violently persecuted the Quakers.[12] He did not understand why his fellow Quakers were being imprisoned and advocated their

---

[10] Milton, *The Ready and Easy Way to Establish a Free Commonwealth*.

[11] Rufus M. Jones, ed., "The Early Years of Ministry, 1648-1649," in *George Fox: An Autobiography*, (Haverford: Haverford College, 1990), accessed July 6, 2022, https://www.ccel.org/ccel/fox_g/autobio.vii.html.

[12] Anthony Pearson, "To the Parliament of the Commonwealth of England," (1653).

innocence.[13] Pearson was sharply critical of the persecution of Quakers for claiming to speak on the Spirit's behalf when he felt a message from a minister was the same thing. He asserted,

> Doth not the Minister of God speak the word of the Lord from his own mouth? When, where, and how the Lord please, for it is not he that speaks but the Holy Ghost that dwells in him. He that hath his words from his own wit and memory may speak and be silent when he will: he that hath them from the Holy Ghost must speak as he is moved and as they are brought to his remembrance by the Spirit of Truth: be careful how ye meddle in these things! Oh ye powers of the Earth; men have long been taught one by another but now the Lord is come to teach his people himself.[14]

Pearson's words came with a dire warning. He claimed that Protestant ministers (whether conformist or Puritan) were hypocritical to come after a Quaker for speaking on God's behalf when, in preaching, their ministers do likewise.

Eventually, Pearson got an audience with Oliver Cromwell. He claimed Cromwell respectfully greeted him, and that he informed Cromwell he was "moved of the Lord" to come to him.[15] However, he warned Cromwell that his rise to power in England was "to establish his own law & to sett up righteousnesse."[16] In his later reflection to Fox, he claimed "it was shewn to me since y^{t} there is nothing left in him of God."[17] Pearson believed that Cromwell had lost sight of God and had become self-interested, which had dire implications for the Commonwealth of England.

Cromwell also carried on some correspondence with Fox. Fox urged Cromwell to leave Quakers alone and not persecute unauthorized ministers, claiming "you Majestrates, shall not

---

[13] Pearson, "To the Parliament of the Commonwealth of England."

[14] Ibid.

[15] Pearson, "Letter to George Fox," quoted in Giuseppina I. Lobo, *Writing Conscience and the Nation in Revolutionary England*, (Ontario: University of Toronto Press, 2017), 77.

[16] Ibid.

[17] Ibid.

need to medle in this thing, seeing God never required it at your hands, to force a maintenance neither under Law nor Gospel."[18] He believed Cromwell and his allies had overstepped their bounds. Furthermore, he also claimed "he that hath not a principle of God in himself to carry on in his worship, without forcing, is a Heathen, and knows not God, and his worship and prayers is abominate to God," and that to force him to worship is to contribute to his heathenism.[19] To persecute others, Fox contended, is to be unfit in God's sight to rule.[20]

Cromwell was in favor of liberty of conscience and treated Fox and other Quakers with respect when talking with them in person. However, he never stopped local magistrates from persecuting the Quakers in England. Over time, Quakers traveled across the English Atlantic World. They began making converts in all the colonies they ventured to, many of which had been established places where Puritans were active.[21] These included Virginia, Maryland, Barbados, and eventually, Massachusetts.

John Rous was one Quaker who took issue with much of what he saw in the English colonies. As a result, he began publishing several works against the colonies. Disgusted by the excesses he saw in Barbados, Rous claimed to be "moved to write" to the leaders of Barbados that they should "turn not the Sword which is put into your hands against those who do well, but against those who do evil."[22] This no doubt had reference to the fact that Quakers experienced

---

[18] George Fox, *To Thee Oliver Cromwell Into Whose Hands God Hath Committed the Sword of Justice, That Under Thee all may be Godly and Quietly Governed*, (London: Giles Calvert, 1655), 2.

[19] Ibid.

[20] Ibid., 7.

[21] Rachel L. Monroy, "On the Trade Winds of Faith: Puritan Networks in the Making of the Modern Atlantic World," (Doctoral Dissertation), (Columbia: University of South Carolina-Columbia, 2015), 19.

[22] John Rous, *A Warning to the Inhabitants of Barbados*, (London: 1656), 7.

persecution in most of the colonies (including Barbados) as well as in England. He further issued a lament against Barbados, which he claimed the Lord commanded him to do.[23] Among other things, Rous chided the residents of Barbados, including the Puritans there,

> the servants of the Lord, who have been sent to warn you, have ye despitefully used, some with scoffs and reproaches, some with blowes and punches, and some with shedding their blood, as I am a witness against you, and being willfully mad, many of you have said (when ye have taken those who have been sent unto you, and used them according to your unreasonable wills) hang them, others have said hanging is too good for them, and this is because they lay before you your wickedness, and declare against your service, wherefore you mock God and dishonor his name, for if Turks and Indians should see your violence and madness…would they not cry shame on you?[24]

Rous upbraided the hypocrisy of the residents of Barbados, who were persecuting Quakers. From this quote it is evident that Quakers such as Rous and Pearson saw themselves as God's messengers, and felt the English Atlantic World badly needed reform, which the Puritans did not bring while treating the Quakers as dangerous heretics. For this, Rous further upbraided them,

> Be ashamed ye wicked ones who take the name of God into your mouthes, who hate to be reformed, who hate to be reproved, who hate to return from your filthiness, sit down and lament ye careless ones, cast off your garments of mirth and joy, and take unto you sackloath, humble yourselves lest ye be destroyed, for the day is coming and neer at hand, that your joy and rejoicing shall fly from you, and howling and lamenting shall overtake you.[25]

Rous believed that much of the problems with the Puritans and others in Barbados was their unwillingness to accept any form of criticism. By now, some of the colonies where Puritans still took refuge were desperately trying to hold onto what they had by purging their settlements of anyone who dissented (whether merely theologically or in practice).

---

[23] John Rous, *The Sins of a Gainsaying and Rebellious People Laid Before Them…: Also a Word to Foolish Merchants*, (London: 1659), 1.

[24] Ibid., 2.

[25] Ibid.

Rous also had negative things to say about New England, calling it a degenerate plant for its stance against Quakers.[26] Of them, Massachusetts argued:

> there is a cursed Sect of Hereticks lately risen up in the World, which are commonly called *Quakers*, who take upon them to be immediately sent of God, and infallibly assisted by the spirit to speak and write blasphemous opinions, despising Government, and the order of God in Church and Common-Wealth, speaking evil of Dignities, reproaching and reviling Magistrates and Ministers, seeking to turn the people from the faith, and gain proselytes to their pernicious wayes.[27]

For proselytizing in the colony, Quakers were subject to a fine.[28] If it escalated beyond this, Quakers could face exile. If, after their exile, they returned to the colony, the punishments got harsher. For both the first and second offenses, the punishment was to "have one of his Ears cut off, and be kept at work in the House of Correction until he can be sent away at his own charge," with the third time punishable by a fine.[29] It was also illegal to house Quakers for protection or to do the same for any other "blasphemous heretick."[30] Free from monarchical tyranny, Puritans wanted to keep their godly commonwealth free of influences of those that held to different opinions.

The resistance of the Puritan settlements, however, did not stop the Quaker missionary efforts. Since the Antinomian Controversy had made its way around the Atlantic World in the

---

[26] John Rous, *New-England a Degenerate Plant who Having Forgot Their Former Sufferings ...are now Become Famous Among the Nations in Bringing Forth the Fruits of Cruelty ...Published for the Information of all Sober People who Wish to Know how the State of New-England now Stands*, (London: 1659), 2.

[27] Rous cited this among other statutes and proceedings in Massachusetts because he wanted to prove that their own laws condemn them as a "degenerate plant" and not at all what it claimed to be for those seeking a godly commonwealth. Rous, as can be seen, was sharply critical of the Puritans' conception of the godly commonwealth having only one way it could be conceived of in the colonies (Ibid.).

[28] Ibid.

[29] Ibid., 7.

[30] Ibid., 4.

decades preceding these efforts, Monroy has argued that "many of the Quakers being former puritans themselves were likely aware of the puritan want for assurance, and probably targeted these puritan communities as potential sites for evangelization."[31] In Barbados, Virginia, Maryland, and Providence (Rhode Island), Quakers were having a lot of success in these missionary efforts.[32] However, in New England, the Massachusetts Bay Colony was nowhere near as ready to receive the Quakers. Rogers has noted that at first, the Quakers made it there in 1656, at which time the colony had no law specifically against their efforts, but plenty of intolerance.[33]

Over four years, however, the Quakers gained enough notoriety in Massachusetts that, three months before the Restoration of Charles II, the General Court of Massachusetts addressed the prince directly to deal with the Quakers, whom they considered a dire threat. In their address to him, they seemed to welcome the idea of him being restored to the throne, addressing him "May it please your Majesty (in the day wherein you happily say, You now know that you are again King over your *Brittish* Israel, to cast a favorable eye upon your poor *Mephibosheths* now…we mean New-England, kneeling with the rest of Your Subjects, before Your Majesty, as her *Restored King*."[34] However, from him they also expected "both of our Civil Privileges…and our Religious Liberties" as the original charter had provided for.[35] However, they wanted the Quakers stopped. They explained,

---

[31] Monroy, "On the Trade Winds of Faith," 18-19.

[32] Ibid.

[33] Horatio Rogers, *Mary Dyer of Rhode Island: The Quaker Martyr That was Hanged on Boston Common, June 1, 1660*, (Providence: Preston and Rounds, 1896), 2.

[34] Massachusetts General Court, *The Humble Petition and Address of the General Court Sitting at Boston in New England,: Unto the High and Mighty Prince Charles the Second. And Presented Unto his Most Gracious Majesty February 11, 1660*, (Cambridge: S. Green, 1660), 3-4.

> Concerning the *Quakers*, open Capital Blasphemers, open Seducers from the Glorious Trinity, the Lords Christ, our Lord Jesus Christ, the blessed Gospel, and from the Holy Scriptures, as the rule of life, open enemies to Government it self, as established in the hands of any but men of their own Principles, Malignant and Assiduous Promoters of Doctrines, directly tending to subvert both our Churches and State.[36]

They saw the Quakers as a threat because of their refusal to submit to religious authority and considered their preaching/prophesying blasphemous in the highest degree. They believed that if the Quakers' teachings were taken literally, it would be the overturning of authority in Church and State. Massachusetts had tried banishing them, but to no avail, as they would come back knowing they would face execution boldly.[37] Persecution against Quakers in New England continued to rise, but so also did the conversions to the Quaker movement.

Quakers in the Plymouth and Massachusetts Bay Colonies as well as Providence were all being persecuted and killed for their beliefs. Among the most famous of these martyrs was a woman originally from Providence named Mary Dyer. She and her husband, William Dyer, had both been devout followers and supporters of Anne Hutchinson and John Wheelwright during the Antinomian Controversy of the 1630s, and were banished from Massachusetts along with them afterwards.[38] After some time in England, the Dyers returned to Massachusetts, where they were banished in 1659 on pain of death.[39] However, the Dyers, like other Quakers, were not afraid of this, and in fact seemed to goad their persecutors into doing it. As Rogers notes, "the issue was now clearly made between Quaker and Puritan. The Quaker defied the unjust Puritan

---

[35] Massachusetts General Court, *Humble Petition and Address*, 4.

[36] Ibid., 5-6.

[37] Ibid.

[38] Rogers, *Mary Dyer of Rhode Island*, 32.

[39] Ibid., 38.

laws, and dared martyrdom. Dare the Puritan authorities inflict it?"[40] As her fellow Quakers were being sentenced to prison and death, Mary Dyer proclaimed "the will of the Lord be done."[41] Governor Winthrop of Connecticut begged the Massachusetts authorities not to execute her, but to instead give her and her family house-arrest. However, the General Court would not relent.[42] However, she received a reprieve with the noose around her neck, and was committed back to prison briefly, and given 48 hours to leave the colony due to her son, William Dyer, Jr., intervening on her behalf.[43]

Dyer, however, refused her reprieve. Two of her fellow Quakers, Marmaduke Stephenson and William Robinson, had already been executed just before her. She chose to stand in solidarity with her fellow Quakers and accept the sentence of death by staying in Massachusetts. She wrote to the General Court,

> My life is not accepted, neither availeth me, in comparison with the Lives and Liberty of the Truth and Servants of the Living God, for which in the Bowels of Love and Meekness I sought you; yet nevertheless with wicked Hands you put two of them to Death, which makes me to feel that the Mercies of the Wicked is cruelty; I rather chuse to Dye than to live, as from you, as Guilty of their Innocent Blood.[44]

After some time in Rhode Island, Dyer returned to Massachusetts, where she was promptly and willingly imprisoned and executed by hanging on the Boston Common. Dyer likely felt her death would be exemplary to her fellow Quakers. Winship notes she was "keen to offer the ultimate testimony of martyrdom against those who vainly tried to repress the message of the inner

---

[40] Rogers, *Mary Dyer of Rhode Island*, 40.

[41] Ibid., 42.

[42] Ibid., 45-46.

[43] Ibid., 51-53.

[44] Ibid., 54.

light."[45] However, in so executing her, the Massachusetts Puritans were doing nothing to silence the accusations of Quakers such as John Rous, and fueled their zeal in making such accusations.

Rous's voice was not the only one against the Puritans. One year later, Charles II was back on the English throne and doing what he could to stop the Puritans from ever having the power they once had again. Edward Burrough sent him a petition for his fellow Quakers detailing the horrors of the Quaker experience in Massachusetts. He asserted,

> …the Pastors and Members of the Church of New-England want the Spirit of God that gave forth the Scriptures, and follow the spirit of Persecution, Violence and Cruelty, and are void of a Good Conscience both to God and Men : To prove this, there needs no greater Evidence than their own Deportment towards the Harmless Quakers for these five years time, who, as I have said, have spoiled their Goods, and imprisoned their Persons, cut off their Ears, banished them and Inhumanely put them to death ; and all this only, because of difference in judgment and practice in Religious matters ; when as no manner of Evil could be charged upon them in the things between Man and Man : And if these be not works contrary to the Scriptures, and the Spirit that gave them forth, and contrary to a good Conscience, I am yet ignorant, and must leave it to the Judgment of the King, before whom this matter is brought to receive his Judgment.[46]

Burrough thought all the evidence the King needed to realize there was something wrong with the Church of New England was that they would treat the Quakers as perpetrators of a capital crime when they had done nothing to harm their fellow man in New England, but only had a difference in religious belief. His cries echo those of John Rous only two years earlier toward Barbados and New England. Whatever the opinion of the Quakers, the Puritans of New England were showing themselves unwilling to hear criticism and desperately trying to preserve what they had against the Quakers and other dissenters. However, eventually the Puritans relaxed their policies toward the Quakers as changes came anyway to New England at the end of the Commonwealth.

---

[45] Winship, *Hot Protestants*, 186.

[46] Edward Burrough, *A Declaration of the Sad and Great Persecution and Martyrdom of the People of God, Called Quakers, in New-England, for the Worshipping of God*, (London: Robert Wilson, 1661), 4.

During the final years of the Commonwealth, Puritans in New England had experienced an influx of new residents. Not all of these, however, fit the theological beliefs of the older generation of Massachusetts residents. Among them had been William Pynchon (a Massachusetts magistrate). Still others, such as Michael Powell, came over as ministers but lacked appropriate theological training (i.e., the Bible in its original languages). Parliament had been allowing these new residents to come over in the 1650s under Cromwell's lack of enforcement of his policies against heretics, which created a stir in Massachusetts.[47] Although the Puritans had by now relaxed their position on the Quakers somewhat, the Puritans of Massachusetts did not have a plan to deal with these other newcomers. In addition, the first generation of Puritans who had come before were now starting to die, and the younger generation were more inclined to engage in activities the older generation did not allow (such as drinking, gambling, and sensuality).[48] The younger members of Massachusetts's churches could not consistently give testimonies showing their status as "visible saints."[49]

Between 1657 and 1662, a plan was developed to deal with the straying of the young people and to keep the church's influence going. The official term for the plan was "large Congregationalism," but its critics referred to it as the "Half-Way Covenant."[50] The Half-Way Covenant, decided between prominent ministers of Massachusetts and Connecticut, allowed

---

[47] Winship, *Hot Protestants*, 181.

[48] Ibid., 186.

[49] Ibid., 186-187; Edmund S. Morgan, *Visible Saints: The History of a Puritan Idea*, (Plano: Papamoa Press, 2018), 72-73.

[50] The Half-Way Covenant sought to preserve the Churches of New England by retention of those baptized as infants as members (though not of a "full covenant"), but not to allow them "voting privileges" or participation in the Lord's Supper (Edmund S. Morgan, *Visible Saints: the History of a Puritan Idea*, [Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2013], 81-82). Morgan also notes that in doing this, the Puritans became very similar to the Separatists of Plymouth, who by now only required their church members to hold to Calvinist orthodoxy and live godly lives (Winship, *Hot Protestants*, 192; Morgan, *Visible Saints*, 73).

people who did not completely hold to the beliefs of the Churches of New England to baptize their children, but were restricted from other church privileges, such as taking communion. However, different Puritans in New England felt different ways about this new plan to be more inclusive to those who were not full members of the churches. Neither side was willing to back down. Some of the leading ministers wholeheartedly endorsed it, while others vehemently repudiated it.[51]

A synod finally came up in the early years of the Restoration in 1662, in which many of the theological points of contention were discussed, as was how to handle them. John Davenport and Richard Mather disagreed concerning the results of this Boston Synod, as it came to be called. Davenport saw the implications of not considering attendants of a church to be full members in the event of necessary church discipline. He argued,

> Formal Excommunication doth not suit their state; they are within the Church onely *mediately,* by their Parents confederation: Therefore are not to be cast out of the Church *immediately and personally* by formal Excommunication. 2. Besides, they are, in respect of strength, *weak;* and in respect of state, *dead:* especially being considered as in this third Proposition, *without qualifications,* even such as are mentioned in the fifth Proposition, which yet are *separable from true and saving grace:* They are too weak to bear the weight and strength of that Censure, which is *mighty through God,* 2 Cor. 10. 4. it is to *put new wine into old bottles,* which Christ doth dislike in Spiritual matters, *Mat.*9.[52]

If someone, according to Davenport, was not a full member of the church, they were not in the same spiritual condition as those who were and were therefore not subject to the same discipline

---

[51] Noteworthily, while the Presbyterian and Independent controversy of England did not persist into Massachusetts, certain machinations of it are evident here. The Independents wanted liberty of conscience, while the Presbyterians wanted order and structure. Likewise, among the Massachusetts and Connecticut Congregationalists, there were two groups: one who wanted liberty of conscience and another who wanted order and structure (Winship, *Hot Protestants,* 90).

[52] John Davenport, et. al., *Another Essay for the Investigation of the Truth, in Answer to two Questions Concerning I. The Subject of Baptism. II. The Consociation of Churches,* (Cambridge: Samuel Green and Marmaduke Johnson, 1663), 66.

as members of a church would be. Davenport saw disorderly implications for the Churches of New England in the Half-Way Covenant.

Davenport was also not fond of the idea of doctrinal disunity, of which now those who supported the Boston Synod seemed to be in favor. Under the Boston Synod, the only requirements for full church membership were "*Understanding the Doctrine of Faith, and professing their Assent thereunto; Not scandalous in life*."[53] Davenport felt this was too basic and lenient, and allowed for too many problems to arise. Feeling there was more to faith, he asserted, "He ought, in a competent measure, to *understand Church-Order and Discipline appointed by Christ,* otherwise he cannot Covenant in judgement, or own the Covenant; neither doth he *know how to behave himself in the House of God,* as a Member thereof."[54] If, argued Davenport, a church member did not understand the proper order in church and how to behave therein, he also would not understand the theological matters, such as the covenant.

Davenport was firmly against the idea of church members not agreeing on the entire covenant and order and discipline. He asserted "The Devil doth *understand the Doctrine of Faith,* and doth *assent thereunto,* Jam.2.19."[55] For Davenport, it was not enough to merely give an assent to what the church was teaching, as even the devil could do that. In addition, it was not enough for him simply to live a respectable life. He asserted boldly, "*Not scandalous in life,* is wholly Negative, and may be said of irrational Animals. *He* onely *that doth righteousness,* positively, can be denominated *righteous,* 1 Joh.3.7."[56] To Davenport, a higher standard was required (and the same could be said for anyone else who did not agree with the Boston Synod).

---

[53] Davenport, et. al., *Another Essay for the Investigation of the Truth*, 67.

[54] Ibid.

[55] Ibid.

[56] Ibid., 67.

Someone had to live a truly righteous life, and not simply avoid living a scandalous life. To the older generation of American Puritans, this seemed to go directly against what the first Puritans who left England left for. As a result, Davenport argued against baptizing the children of people who had not become full members of the church.[57]

Richard Mather issued a reply to Davenport and his allies in support of the Boston Synod. On excommunication, he argued that while full excommunication is not possible for those who are not full members, "*That persons not in full communion may be under the Watch, and Discipline, and Government of the Church:* and how much more if even such persons may be *cut off* from their Church-membership, and so from what *Church-communion* they had?"[58] Mather's argument was not for full excommunication, but only for a partial one, inasmuch as the church members in question were not partial. Though he is not specific as to what he means by it, it is clear church discipline was still an option for these people. He also felt it was too difficult to prove that someone in the church as a child could then be a castaway as an adult, and felt the matter was not clearly defined enough for Davenport and his allies to make such a judgment.[59] The Half-Way Covenant persisted despite Davenport's opposition thereto.

To be a Puritan in New England was not obsolete, but now the foundations of the Congregational Churches of New England were no longer the same. Dissenters were

---

[57] Davenport, et. al., *Another Essay for the Investigation of the Truth*, 68.

[58] Richard Mather and Jonathan Mitchel, *A Defence of the Answer and Arguments of the Synod met at Boston in the Year 1662. Concerning the Subject of Baptism, and Consociation of Churches. Against the Reply Made Thereto, by the Reverend Mr. John Davenport, Pastor of the church at New-Haven, in his Treatise Entituled, Another Essay for Investigation of the Truth, &c.: Together With an Answer to the Apologetical Preface set Before That Essay*, (Cambridge: S. Green and M. Johnson, 1664), 12.

[59] Mather and Mitchel, *A Defense of the Answer*, 42.

allowed some church privileges even if not full membership. For all the efforts the Puritans had made to preserve what they had, it seemed the Half-Way Covenant was a surrender of the idea of all but a colony in which the church had societal influence.

Charles II, upon his Restoration to the throne, had some support from the Puritans of New England, who believed his reign a good thing, and encouraged him to protect and preserve the religious liberties and progress they had achieved for themselves. The Quakers also backed him and appealed to him against the Puritans due to the latter's persistent persecution of them. John Milton deplored the idea of the restoration of a monarch in England, thinking it would be several steps back on the freedoms and progress of the Puritans. Charles II quickly proved Milton right, and early into his reign sought to strip the Puritans of the influence they had gained. He reversed the Puritans' reforms altogether and returned to the early Stuarts' method of forced conformity. Among the Puritans who left the mother country for New England for failure to comply was Increase Mather, son of Richard Mather, in 1661.[60] In 1662, Charles II (hereafter Charles) enacted the Act of Uniformity that required all ministers to commit to using the Book of Common Prayer once more "morning and evening," or face ejection.[61] Eventually, Charles carried out his word. He carried out an ejection of several Puritan ministers from positions of power, known to many as "Black Bartholomew's Day."[62] This event purged many of the Puritan ministers that gained traction in England of their power, and was part of the process of restoring the Church of England back to its former state. Charles ensured the regicides who had his father

---

[60] The younger Mather had been in England prior to the Restoration, though he was initially from Massachusetts (Winship, *Hot Protestants*, 265-266).

[61] "Act of Uniformity 1662" in Henry Gee and William Hardy, eds., *Documents Illustrative of English Church History*, (New York: MacMillan Publishers, 1896), 602-603.

[62] David J. Appleby, *Black Bartholomew's Day: Polemic, Preaching, and Restoration Nonconformity*, (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2013), 19.

executed were punished, pursuing two who had fled to Massachusetts, and eventually found safe harbor in New Haven. As a result, England disbanded New Haven.[63]

To solidify his stronghold against the Puritans, Charles next enacted the Conventicle Act in 1664, which prohibited religious assemblies of more than five people outside of immediate family and the meetings overseen by the Church of England (viz., meetings on Sundays in a Church of England).[64] He also enacted the Five Mile Act in 1665, which, among other things, prevented defrocked ministers from being able to preach within five miles of the city or town where their former parish was.[65] The Puritan that had been achieved during the Commonwealth of England crumbled now that it lacked any proper foundation.

In the American colonies, Virginia and Maryland returned to their former states prior to Cromwellian rule (including the restoration of William Berkeley as colonial governor of Virginia and the Church of England in Virginia returning to a conformist state, and the return of Maryland to being a colony in which the Church of England was the colonial church but religious diversity was tolerated under the now restored Baltimores), as did the Caribbean colonies (i.e., back to their status as colonies with the Church of England as the colonial church).[66] Massachusetts and the rest of New England did not make significant changes during the Commonwealth of England. However, they, like any others, felt threatened by the Restoration. Viola Barnes, a

---

[63] Bremer, *Lay Empowerment and the Development of Puritanism*, 147.

[64] "An Act to Prevent and Suppresse Seditious Conventicles," 1664, in John Raithsby, ed., *Statutes of the Realm*, vol. 5: 1628-80, (London: Great Britain Records Commission, 1819), 516-520.

[65] "Five Mile Act of 1665," in Gee and Hardy, eds., *Documents Illustrative of English Church History*, 620-621.

[66] That is, they returned to their status as royal colonies with the same political and religious climate as before the Commonwealth of England. For Virginia, this returned the Church of England to its former state as the colonial church, with conformity demanded, and William Berkeley was restored to his position as colonial governor. For Maryland, this meant that the Baltimores were back in power, and their policy toward religious toleration resumed despite the Church of England's official status in the colony.

scholar of colonial reactions to the Restoration and the Glorious Revolution, states that when Charles was given the throne, Massachusetts almost did not accept the Restoration as legitimate.[67] However, the Puritans of Massachusetts did eventually accept the Restoration when they realized it was a better alternative to being treated as rebels and losing their colony. However, Charles II had restored much of the Church of England's former rigidity against nonconformists as had been present when his father, Charles I, was in power. Puritans' goals in England were seemingly crushed. However, as the final decades of the seventeenth century progressed, Puritans would see new opportunities to make significant changes to the Church of England and England itself.

Eventually, Charles came to favor a policy of religious toleration toward his subjects (viz., inasmuch as it did not disturb the peace). Keay argues that "the events of the exile convinced Charles II that unless he showed himself to be a committed Anglican he could have no hope of reclaiming his kingdom. But at the same time he took the view that there was nothing to be gained by hard-line enforcement of religious conformity."[68] Charles's parents and predecessors, Charles I and Henrietta Maria, had been Catholic, and a number of religious sects had arisen in England and her colonies by this time. Charles and his brother and heir apparent, James the Duke of York, shared sentiments toward religious freedom. By 1667, nonconformists were enjoying a wider audience in England and Charles's court included those more sympathetic towards them.[69] In 1673, John Milton argued that in no way could Catholics be tolerated, as

---

[67] Viola F. Barnes, *The Dominion of New England: A Study in British Colonial Policy*, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1960), 6.

[68] Anna Keay, *The Magnificent Monarch: Charles II and Ceremonies of Power*, (London: Bloomsbury Publishing Place, 2008), 146.

[69] Winship, *Hot Protestants*, 213.

holding a false religion, and that while punishment would be necessary for practicing such, the Protestants' best defense was to unite on Scripture alone.[70] However, while Charles showed no sign of a conspiracy to make a Catholic coup and even seemed to tolerate Puritans and other Protestants despite his increasingly apparent Catholic sympathies, most of the English did not share the same sense of security toward James.[71]

Graham Goodlad disputes the notion that James had any intention of making a Catholic coup, but only wanted to achieve toleration for his fellow Catholics. He paints his actions as a monarch being sincere toward his comrades, but tactless and failing to assuage the Puritans of their fears, which validated them into mistakenly thinking he was merely a Catholic tool.[72] W. A. Speck also disputes the notion that James was seeking to develop an outright tyranny over the

---

[70] John Milton, *Of True Religion, Haeresie, Schism, Toleration, and What Means may Best be Us'd Against the Growth of Popery*, (London: 1673), 11-13.

[71] This is not to say that the Puritans experienced no trouble whatsoever in Restoration England. Though some of the nonconformist sects were getting along, among them the Presbyterians and the Congregationalists, the Church of England was not going to give up its crackdown on Puritanism without a fight. They secured the passage of an act in 1670 that increased the fines for refusal to attend church, which was only relaxed when Charles shifted his interests to his French relatives, specifically King Louis XIV, and began to make the choice to eventually convert to Catholicism himself (Winship, *Hot Protestants*, 216-217). Charles II eventually shifted his attention away from a Protestant Church of England, which changed the priorities and brought about political and ecclesiastical changes that resulted in increased tension as the final decades of the seventeenth century progressed. Winship notes that by 1680, Puritanism was once again under fire (Winship, *Hot Protestants*, 218). It should be noted here that conspiracy theory was often used as a tool to play on the fears of others and incite action, and was very normative in the English Atlantic World (Gordon S. Wood, "Conspiracy and the Paranoid Style: Causality and Deceit in the Eighteenth Century," *The William and Mary Quarterly*, vol. 39, no. 3 [1982], 11-12). In addition, though Puritans were still very active in England, the center of Puritan activity had arguably shifted to Massachusetts. By this time, Increase Mather had become active. Mather was a staunch providentialist who believed that the natural disasters occurring in New England as well as Virginia and Barbados were clear examples of loss of God's favor and the coming of His judgment, and called on his fellow Puritans in Massachusetts for "a sincere Reformation of those evils which have provoked the eyes of God's glory" (Increase Mather, *An Earnest Exhortation to the Inhabitants of New-England to Hearken to the Voice of God in His Late and Present Dispensations As Ever They Desire to Escape Another Judgement, Seven Times Greater Then Any Thing Which as Yet Hath Been*, (London: 1676), 2, 5). For Mather, the mission to purify the Church of England from Catholic traditions was still very real and very present. He was also critical of the lack of discipline in the churches of New England, which he saw as "a form of godliness," but that his fellow Puritans "knew little the power of" (Mather, *Earnest Exhortation*, 11). He criticized New England's inhabitants as coming to grab more and more land, and failing to recognize the need for Reformation of the Church, and that the children dishonored their parents, which hindered the progress of Reformation (11-15).

[72] Goodlad, "Before the Glorious Revolution," 15.

people. He claims that James, once he became king, was seeking "toleration as well as power for his Catholic subjects."[73] However, James only worsened the colonists' anxieties when, in 1676, he finally broke from the established Church in his refusal to attend Easter Communion.[74] It became clear to many that James was going to steer the nation in a Catholic direction if he were to inherit the throne.

When time began to approach for James II to inherit the throne, more people called into question whether he would be a problem as a known Catholic. As a result, the new Whig party tried to exclude him from becoming king beginning in 1679 in what is now known as the Exclusion Crisis. The English wanted to preserve themselves from losing their established political order and Protestant religion. The Whigs saw themselves as a continuation in the line of succession of revolutionary movements of the past, up to and including the Puritans who revolted from King Charles I during the English Civil War.[75] As the English Civil War had been an attempt to protect England from a Catholic tyranny, so also was the attempted exclusion of James II from the monarchy. English Protestants were not about to allow a Catholic monarch to rule England without a fight.

---

[73] W. A. Speck, *James II: Profiles in Power*, (London: Pearson Education, 2002), 36.

[74] Kenyon, *The Popish Plot*, 23. These insecurities were further heightened when Titus Oates brought before the authorities information that the Jesuits were secretly plotting to overthrow Charles II and install the Catholic James as King of England (Kenyon, *The Popish Plot*, 64-67).

[75] Caroline Robbins, *Eighteenth-Century Commonwealthman*, (New York: Atheneum, 1968), Online Edition, Location 19. This did not make "Whig" necessarily synonymous with "Puritan" altogether in the sense that not all Whigs were Puritans, but most Puritans were Whigs. They believed that a Catholic could not rule England because he would not put England's subjects first, but his own religion, which necessarily meant that he would try to bring England back under the dominion of the Roman Catholic Church. James II's attempted reforms and Parliament-free rule only validated this stance once James inherited the throne (J. R. Jones, *The First Whigs: The Politics of the Exclusion Crisis, 1678-1683*, [London: Oxford University Press, 1961], 217).

The Whigs, Feared Catholic Conspiracy and the Exclusion Crisis

When it became clear that Charles's heir apparent was going to be York, Puritans and others united once more in their concern to protect their interests. The result of their concerns was the development of the Whig Party in England. The Whigs' first move was to attempt to block York's succession. The Whigs feared that a Catholic monarch would, given the history of queens such as Mary Tudor, necessarily go for absolute power to restore England to Rome. Among the Whigs, John Locke, himself of a Puritan background, eventually argued that man was created in a naturally free state, and that having a king with absolute power betrayed such a notion.[76]

By the late 1670s, Charles's ecclesiastical reforms, which changed direction notably, had served to further polarize Puritans and the Church of England against each other.[77] Both wanted to outperform the other and would not allow attendance at each other's services without retaliation from church authorities. In addition, the laws still favored the Anglicans, who were determined to enforce conformity. Finally, Charles issued the Royal Declaration of Indulgence in 1672, which essentially nullified enforcement of the laws he passed against religious dissenters. However, this came inconveniently, because Charles passed the Declaration at a time when it was clear his Catholic brother would succeed him. While several Puritan ministers favored the Declaration, others panicked.[78]

Fear of a Catholic takeover prompted Parliament to issue the Test Act of 1673, which ultimately forced Charles's withdrawal of the Declaration and began to target Catholics for

---

[76] John Locke, *Second Treatise of Government*, Project Gutenberg, accessed October 10, 2020, https://www.gutenberg.org/files/7370/7370-h/7370-h.htm.

[77] Winship, *Hot Protestants*, 219.

[78] Ibid., 222-223.

removal from political office. It required the one making it to issue a solemn denial of transubstantiation to pass.[79] Those who refused to take it were promptly removed from and/or deemed unfit for public office in Great Britain.[80] The same restriction also applied to anyone who converted to Catholicism from Protestantism and attempted to teach their children Catholic doctrine.[81] However, the universal enforcement of the Act would soon be put to the test. James, Duke of York, refused to comply with the Test Act when it was first issued.[82] English Protestants were so concerned, that, as Harris notes, Lord Danby arranged the marriage of Mary, daughter of James Duke of York, to William of Orange (who was, consequently, also James and Charles's nephew, as he was the son of their sister) as a preventative measure against the impending Catholic coup.[83]

Try as Parliament did, they were unable to stop the presumed Catholic coup completely. Winship notes that eventually, word of a Catholic plot reached the ears of Parliament. Once this occurred, Charles met with three Whig-dominated Parliaments between 1679 and 1681. At this time, Titus Oates had begun spreading a conspiracy theory that the Catholic Church was actively planning to assassinate Charles and execute Protestants all over England as part of their alleged takeover.[84] The goals of these Parliaments were to stop this alleged "Popish Plot," as it came to

---

[79] Charles II, "An Act for Preventing Dangers Which may Happen From Popish Recusants," in John Raithsby, ed., *Statutes of the Realm*, vol. 5 (1628-1680), (1819), 782-785.

[80] Ibid.

[81] Ibid.

[82] Speck, *James II*, 24-25.

[83] Tim Harris, *Restoration: Charles II and his Kingdoms, 1660-1685*, (London: Allen Lane, 2005), 75-76.

[84] The allegations were entirely false, but many concerned Protestants in England believed them at the time (Tim Harris, *Politics Under the Later Stuarts: Party Conflict in a Divided Society, 1660-1715*, [London: Longman, 1993], 78).

be called before anyone knew of its falsehood, prevent the succession of York, and to relax the laws against Puritans (Presbyterian or Congregationalist).[85] The Whigs wanted to ensure Protestants (not simply Puritans, but certainly including them), would be tolerated, and to do this the Test Act would need to be reversed.

The irony is that the Puritans got behind Parliament and the Whigs. Up until now, the Puritans had been pushing for their own supremacy in English religion and politics like others (whether Catholics or conforming members of the Church of England). However, once again, they seemed willing to cave to some form of religious toleration if it meant they could avoid persecution.[86] As a result, over time, in England, their cause got absorbed into the Whigs. In 1677, the new colonial governor of North Carolina (founded during the reign of Charles II), Samuel Stephens, was given orders not to harass the nonconformists of the colony.[87] Harris notes the meeting of the minds that occurred toward the end of Charles II's reign. Charles II himself sympathized with the idea of religious tolerance, and the Puritans took comfort in the conformist-dominated Parliament against the growing threat of a Catholic coup. Simultaneously, in the 1670s, the established Church of England began to divert their attention away from persecuting dissidents in exchange for promoting a front against the Roman Catholic Church.[88]

The Whigs continued to fight against York's succession. Harris notes that by now, this included parties in England far and wide, which created a united front against Catholic tyranny.[89]

---

[85] Winship, *Hot Protestants*, 225-226.

[86] Ibid., 226.

[87] William Saunders, ed., *The Colonial Records of North Carolina* (Raleigh: Josephus Daniels, 1886), I.45.

[88] Harris, *Restoration*, 77-78.

[89] Ibid., 142-143.

However, they were not the only ones fighting for the proper direction of royal succession in England. While they staunchly opposed the succession of York, there was another party who, on the contrary, fully supported it. This party, called the Tories, believed the Whigs' ideas were ridiculous and that York was of good character and perfectly fit to be king.[90] They defended him against what they saw as false accusations coming from the Whigs. Eventually, Charles dissolved the second Parliament, which shot down Whigs' and Puritans' goals of stopping York's succession and prevented them from signing into law what would have secured their toleration and began to crack down on suspected rebels.[91] Finally, the Whigs changed tune. Now, they believed that not only was there indeed a Catholic conspiracy to install York as king, but that Charles, a Catholic sympathizer, was aiding and abetting it.

Tension was already in place in the colonies. In 1676, Nathaniel Bacon and John Ingram led a revolt against Sir William Berkeley, known today as Bacon's Rebellion. By this time, Puritans had shifted much of their activity from Virginia to Maryland. However, at a time when questions arose as to the legitimacy of absolute monarchy, Bacon's Rebellion was the first wave of transatlantic tension concerning absolute authority, with more problems in England to follow.

Though Bacon's Rebellion had more to do with a contest against Berkeley's preferred method of absolute rule and the ideology itself, Levy notes that one of the leading figures in it was William Drummond, who Berkeley had appointed thirteen years earlier to the position of colonial governor of Albemarle, part of what would eventually become North Carolina.

---

[90] Winship, *Hot Protestants*, 228-229.

[91] It is also important to note that not all Whigs got behind the Exclusion Crisis. In fact, there were a variety of opinions on how to limit the constitutional powers of the king and give Parliament a more active role in politics in England. However, the solutions proposed never made it to fruition (Winship, *Hot Protestants*, 228-229; Harris, *Restoration*, 148-149). Harris also notes that the irony of the Exclusion Crisis was that it would not have actually favored Monmouth in any way, but actually would have been on the side of William and Mary. However, it was blocked regardless (Harris, *Restoration*, 161).

Drummond held, at the very least, Presbyterian sympathies.[92] The revolt did not overthrow the colonial government, but it was partly successful in that it required a compromise to be put down. Bacon, Ingram, and the others cited as their grievances that Berkeley raised taxes too highly without their consent, appointed only his favorites to political office, and favored Native Americans, whom they had been engaged in constant warfare with over the last several decades, as had other colonists.[93] Several of their grievances were addressed to quell the violence.

In North Carolina also, several colonists engaged in the Culpepper Revolt due to their dissatisfaction with royal enforcement of the Navigation Acts, which restricted their ability to trade.[94] Though this revolt was not explicitly Puritan in form, Levy notes that Puritans in both North Carolina and the Massachusetts Bay Colony supported the cause of the revolt and fought against the Crown on the Navigation Acts.[95] Massachusetts was much more openly opposed to the Navigation Acts and openly refused to submit to them, which concerned the Crown, as an uprising could, and did, clearly break out.[96]

Whether the Crown liked it or not, the events of the last several decades (from the English Civil War to the Exclusion Crisis) had positively reinforced the idea that the people had some say in the way they were governed, and the Crown was not above the law. In England, resistance to apparent tyranny was beginning to take the shape of preventing royal heirs who

---

[92] Drummond was later executed for his role in the rebellion (Babette Levy, “Puritanism in the Southern and Island Colonies,” *Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society*, vol. 70, no. 1 (1960), 247).

[93] Nathaniel Bacon, et. al., "Declaration of Nathaniel Bacon in the Name of the People of Virginia, July 30, 1676," *Massachusetts Historical Society Collections*, 4th ser., 1871, vol. 9: 184–87.

[94] Levy, “Puritanism in the Southern and Island Colonies,” 250.

[95] Ibid.

[96] Barnes, *The Dominion of New England*, 15-19.

they felt too power hungry to accept the principle of rule of law. However, the monarchy of England proved equally unwilling to surrender its authority over the colonies.[97]

It is important to note here that the Puritans' attitudes and political direction were both shifting, while their overall outlook remained roughly the same. The Puritans had been previously exclusively trying to get their reforms passed, but their attempts at reform with the Commonwealth of England had ultimately not been successful. However, once again, the Puritans had the attention of most English Protestants to keep Parliament strong and prevent an absolute monarch, who was himself a known Catholic, usurping political power. However, this is not to say that even the opponents of the Exclusion Crisis were necessarily in favor of absolute monarchy. Harris notes that both Whigs and Tories were champions of Parliament and wanted to act in the best interests of keeping the English system alive.[98] It was their level of trust in the shape the system would take were York to become king where they differed.

For the Whigs, it was inexcusable that a Catholic monarch should inherit the throne, as the character of such had already been proven. Elkanah Settle, in 1681, argued that Protestant kings were good for the kingdom, because they strengthened England against her adversaries and discouraged Catholic activity. However, a Catholic king, "when the Fraternity of their Religion shall encourage the Pope to make his working emissaries ten times more numerous…'til they are become our most threatening and formidable enemies. And if ever the Protestant religion wanted a defender, 'tis then."[99] Settle further argued that a Catholic king would be "the greatest Barbarian in all creation; a Barbarian that shall cherish and maintain the Dissenters from Truth,

---

[97] Barnes, *The Dominion of New England*, 25.

[98] Harris, *Politics Under the Later Stuarts*, 98-99.

[99] Elkanah Settle, *The Character of a Popish Successour, and What England may Expect From Such a One*, (Oxford: 1681), 3.

and punish and condemn the pillars of Christianity and proselytes from Heaven."[100] To Settle, a Catholic king would "break an Oath for his own faith."[101] This necessarily meant that a Catholic king not only could not be trusted, but would be the instrument of destruction the Pope could use to tyrannize England. Though Whig concerns were not simply for Puritans but for Protestants in general, their arguments echoed earlier remarks of the Puritans.

Conversely, the Tories begged to differ and did not believe there was anything to fear of York's Catholic faith. John Nalson, for example, acknowledged that the Whigs' arguments about the Catholics were not entirely wrong, but their propagation thereof served an end that benefited them. He claimed, "All honest men believe the Popish Plot, and have a Detestation, both against the Principles and Practices of Popery; and it would be more vigorously prosecuted, if more Commonwealth Protestants did not endeavour so visibly to make a hand of it, to play their own game."[102] Nalson saw the Whigs' arguments as a tool to advance their agenda. In addition, he believed the arguments the Whigs made about the course of events in English history at that point to advance the Popish Plot as their main conspiratorial cry were logically inconsistent.[103] He wanted to restore morale and order to England. However, neither side's appeal to reason for its own position was enough to silence the controversy.

In 1683, the Whigs and others decided to take matters into their own hands. They plotted the murder of Charles II and James, Duke of York in what is now known as the Rye House Plot, in which James, Duke of Monmouth, illegitimate son of Charles II, and the earl of Argyll, were

---

[100] Settle, *The Character of a Popish Successour*, 4.

[101] Ibid., 11.

[102] John Nalson, *The True Protestants Appeal to the City and the Countrey*, (London: 1681), 1-2.

[103] Ibid., 6-7.

also implicated and exiled for their role.[104] The plot failed. However, Charles spent much of the final years of his reign attempting to flush out the conspirators violently, though it was never discovered exactly who was involved.[105] None of these attempted preventions succeeded in keeping York from the throne, and he was eventually crowned James II of England and James VII of Scotland (hereafter James or James II) in 1685. However, his reign would not prove to be without its contention.

The suspicions that James II was not to be trusted eventually led to the attempted revolt of Monmouth and Argyll, who appealed to James's frustrated opponents to try and seize the monarchy for Monmouth. By now, James had gathered a lot of support from the establishment of the Church of England, who did not believe him to be a threat to Protestants' security at all.[106] He quickly put down this revolt. However, "in press and pulpit, the rebellion's defeat was the occasion of the final flowering of divine right royalism in its pre-Revolution form."[107] Monmouth became a byword in the media and in the Church, and the antithesis to Monmouth's attempted coup clearly became submission to James II as the divinely appointed monarch. Though it may have helped in the actual succession of James II in 1685, it certainly did nothing to quell the fears of Protestants who rejected the notion of divine right of kings.

---

[104] Tim Harris, *Revolution: The Great Crisis of the British Monarchy, 1685-1720*, (London: Penguin Books, 2007), 73-75.

[105] Ronald Hutton, *Charles the Second: King of England, Scotland, and Ireland*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989), 423-428.

[106] Winship, *Hot Protestants*, 230.

[107] Tim Harris and Stephen Taylor, *The Final Crisis of the Stuart Monarchy: The Revolutions of 1688-91 in Their British, Atlantic, and European Contexts*, (Suffolk: Boydell and Brewer, 2013), 35.

Already, the colonial government of Maryland had been under much criticism throughout the seventeenth century because it allowed Catholics to live and freely practice their religion within its borders.[108] The tension born out of these criticisms frequently put the initial colonial governors of Maryland into conflicts with the colonies. However, for the colonists in Maryland, the issue was not simply Puritans vs. Catholics. Many colonists in Maryland were against both Puritans and Catholics, and both were present there in the middle and eventually the latter decades of the seventeenth century.[109] However, fears of Catholic conspiracy were a point on which Puritans and the Church of England found common ground. This common ground would only increase with time as English politics declined in stability in the 1680s. James II had succeeded the throne despite multiple attempts to prevent it. The outlook for the continuation of Puritanism and the fulfillment of its mission did not look pleasant.

When James first took the throne, one of his actions that the colonists most despised was the creation of the Dominion of New England. This new agreement served to unite, for administrative purposes, all colonies in New England and the Mid-Atlantic, except for Delaware and Pennsylvania, but including New York (formerly New Netherland when under Dutch control, but which Charles II had sent Richard Nicolls to, who succeeding in taking it over in 1664). James did this not only to consolidate the colonies but to reassert royal authority in the face of resistance from the colonies, particularly Massachusetts.[110] This union was unpopular with the colonists from the beginning, as it restricted their ability to manage their own affairs and

---

[108] Sutto, *Loyal Protestants and Dangerous Papists*, 71-72. The exception to this, however, was during the 1650s, when the Puritans had more direct influence over the colony and excluded others as a result (Levy, "Puritanism in the Southern and Island Colonies," 243).

[109] Ibid., 131.

[110] Barnes, *The Dominion of New England*, 25.

removed the provisions of the colonial charters.[111] In addition, it also revoked all existing colonial charters, which further angered many colonists. The colonists also did not like Edward Randolph, whom James had appointed to collect taxes and related revenue from the colonists. Randolph's observation was that "though he be the man loaded with their displeasure yet they are plainly against any man whosoever to be sent from this kingdom deterring your Honrs. with the charge of Advance money as if it were a hard thing to be repaired from stopping the abuse of such a law."[112]

The Dominion of New England only decreased in popularity when James appointed Sir Edmund Andros as Governor in Chief, which he did to try to keep the peace in the colonies and reduce the risk of rebellion.[113] James tried to unite the entire empire to his design. In addition, James eventually dissolved Parliament to eliminate the religious tests to hold office required under the Test Act so his Catholic subjects could have more power.[114] James's determination to bring in religious toleration was an undermining of the Church of England to many concerned Protestants. He sought to promote the Catholic cause, and this raised the anxieties of many Protestants in England. Once again, the Puritans (and now the Whigs also), who to some may have been promoting preposterous ideas, now had the attention of the rest of the English Protestants, who believed their fears right.

At a time when the colonists already did not understand why the existing colonial arrangements were not good enough to stand, James's policies only served to reinforce the

---

[111] Barnes, *The Dominion of New England*, 25.

[112] Alfred T.S. Goodrick and Robert N. Toppan, eds., *Edward Randolph, Including his Letters and Official Papers*, (Boston: Prince Society, 1809), 79.

[113] James II, "Commission of Sir Edmund Andros for the Dominion of New England," (April 7, 1688), (New Haven: Avalon), accessed October 11, 2020, https://avalon.law.yale.edu/17th_century/mass06.asp.

[114] Speck, *James II*, 55.

notion that he was a tyrant seeking to bring England and her colonies under a Catholic absolute monarchy. Dunn, who studied the Winthrop family's time in colonial Massachusetts during the seventeenth century, argues that the Dominion of New England was James's break with the entire old order of English government, and that "as the King broke with Parliament in England, so he abolished representative institutions in New England."[115] Laurie Hochstetler, who studied the Dominion of New England's social and religious dimensions, further argues that the Dominion of New England was James's attempt to enforce order by taking away the "sense of self-government" among the colonists of Massachusetts Bay and populating the colony with royal authorities.[116] James's attempts at reform only stirred the colonists (particularly the Puritans of Massachusetts and Maryland and other staunch Protestants elsewhere such as New York) as well as the other English people that it was time for a change in the regime.

The Puritans of the Massachusetts Bay Colony especially did not like Edmund Andros, the appointed colonial governor under the Dominion of New England. Increase Mather believed that the interests of the American colonies were at risk of ruin so long as Andros was in charge.[117] Mather despised the idea of the revocation of the Charters of Massachusetts and called Andros's commission "illegal," challenging its right to exist on the grounds it had no aid from "Parliament, Assembly, or Consent of the People."[118] Mather and his fellow Puritans of

---

[115] Richard S. Dunn, *Puritans and Yankees: The Winthrop Dynasty of New England*, (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1962), 229.

[116] Laurie Hochstetler, "Making Ministerial Marriage: The Social and Religious Legacy of the Dominion of New England," *The New England Quarterly, 86*, 3 (2013), 493.

[117] Increase Mather, *A Narrative of the Miseries of New-England, by Reason of an Arbitrary Government Erected There. Under Sir Edmond Andross. To which is Added, Some Account of the Humble Application of the Pious and Noble Prelate, Henry Lord Bishop of London, With the Reverend Clergy of the City, and Some of the Dissenting Ministers in it, to the Illustrious Prince William Henry, Prince of Orange on Fryday [sic], September 21. 1688. : Also the Address of the Noncomformist Ministers (in and About the City of London) to His Higness [sic] the Prince of Orange*, (Boston: Richard Pierce, 1688), 1.

Massachusetts had had enough and were now resorting to other measures to protect their own rights as English citizens and the interests of the Massachusetts Bay Colony in general. It was time to take action to begin to take back some of their lost power.

The Glorious Revolution and the Colonies

James II's reforms were not welcome in England or her colonies in the Atlantic World. His open embrace of Catholicism and tendency toward an absolute monarchy upset his Protestant subjects and gave them the fuel they needed to bring about a change in the monarchy. For Protestants, a change in the regime meant a return to established political order and Protestant religion as it had been before the reign of James II. This brought about a concerted effort among the Puritans and others to recruit William III of Orange, son-in-law of James and king of the Dutch, and his wife, Mary II (James's daughter) to invade England and take it over. They sought William's assistance to help them "defend themselves" from the politically precarious position they were in, in which James had the upper hand.[119] They were determined to purge England of an overtly Catholic monarch, particularly once James II had produced a male heir that he made clear would be raised Catholic.

William and Mary, as their answer to the invitation, deposed James and took the English throne. In accepting his help, the Whigs believed they were taking the best step to preserving the old order.[120] Most of those behind this "Glorious Revolution," as it eventually came to be known,

---

[118] Mather, *A Narrative of the Miseries of New-England*, 2. These complaints were similar to those Protestants made against James's father, Charles I, when he had ruled without Parliament for eleven years and trampled on the rights of his subjects.

[119] Henry Sydney, et. al., *Invitation to William III* (1688), (London: National Archives of England), accessed October 11, 2020, https://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/education/resources/significant-events/glorious-revolution-1688/.

[120] Robbins, *Eighteenth-Century Commonwealthman*, Location 16.

wanted a return to England as it had been prior to the reforms of James II. His reforms brought about change beyond what most English Protestants were willing to accept.[121] In this revolution, they had established a very clear precedent that a Catholic was disqualified from the monarchy (and could not be trusted to preserve the England to which Protestants held dearly).

When the English Bill of Rights was developed as a settlement agreement for the transfer of power, it listed the grievances the English had with James II primarily as ruling without the consent of Parliament (including executive decisions he made), taking monarchical matters into his own hands, and tyrannizing the people to get his way, and would allow William to rule only if he would do so in the style of a constitutional monarch.[122] Many believed James had been subtly waging a "counter-revolution," and his welcoming a Catholic heir into his family shortly after he began to reign was only agitating Protestant anxieties further.[123] This was not a risk most English Protestants felt they could take, and so they invited Mary, James's daughter, and her husband, William whose Protestantism was assured.

A common misconception about the Glorious Revolution is that James II merely stepped down without a fight, gave the throne to William and Mary, and then the Revolution was over. However, the Glorious Revolution was a much more complex event. James was far from ready to surrender the throne without a fight, and as a Catholic, he was well-received in Ireland, which was one of the three kingdoms England controlled at this time. From Ireland, James launched the unsuccessful campaign to regain the throne, known as the Williamite War, with his son-in-law. When this was over, William and Mary devoted their attention to a war with France and paid

---

[121] J. R. Jones, *The Revolution of 1688 in England*, (New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1972), 328.

[122] English Bill of Rights (1689), (New Haven: Avalon), accessed October 11, 2020, https://avalon.law.yale.edu/17th_century/england.asp.

[123] Curran, *Papist Devils*, 128.

little attention to what was happening in the colonies.[124] With conflict raging in the mother country, the colonies too began to act on the tension they were feeling. In 1689, William passed the Toleration Act successfully, which "guaranteed freedom of worship to all non-Catholic Christians."[125] Increase Mather had returned to England to gain a new colonial charter for Massachusetts.[126] However, this alone was not enough to quell Protestant fears in the colonies. James had already upended their institutions and establishments while flaunting his Catholicism, and colonial Protestants had had enough. It was time for change, and many in the colonies did not feel that the new monarch was answering their concerns with a sufficient sense of urgency.

Some colonies had already engaged in revolt against their established colonial governments in the decade preceding these events. Now, tension was at a new peak. Curran, who studied Protestant anti-Catholicism throughout the English Empire in the seventeenth century, argues concerning the colonial reaction that "like a match striking wood so dry that combustion seemed almost instant, the rumors of a regime change fed the paranoia about a transatlantic Catholic conspiracy threatening local rights and liberties."[127] To colonial Protestants, if those in the mother country could not trust the monarch to protect their freedoms, neither could they trust

---

[124] John Childs, *The Williamite Wars in Ireland, 1688-1691*, (New York: Bloomsbury Academic, 2007), 12-14; Allison R. Anderson, "The Salem Witch Trials and the Political Chaos That Caused Them: How the Glorious Revolution Kindled the Fires of Colonial Unrest," *Western Illinois Historical Review*, Vol. 10 (2019), 4-8.

[125] In the wake of the Toleration Act, both Presbyterians and Congregationalists continued to have problems with the Church of England, who Winship describes as "vengeful" (Steven C. A. Pincus, *England's Glorious Revolution, 1688-1689: A Brief History with Documents*, [Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2006], 29; Winship, *Hot Protestants*, 279). Increase Mather and some others attempted several unions between the Presbyterians and Congregationalists to make them one group of Puritans again. However, Winship notes that the only unity they achieved was that both groups, though ultimately remaining separate, believed in liberty of conscience now (279). Waddington argues that it was the Congregationalists who continued to carry the mantle in the wake of the Restoration and Clarendon Codes (John Waddington, *Congregational Church History: From the Reformation to 1662*, [London: Jackson, Walford, and Hodder, 1863], 136).

[126] Winship, *Hot Protestants*, 267.

[127] Curran, *Papist Devils*, 129.

his established government. New revolts broke out in different parts of colonial British America as a direct result of the Glorious Revolution. These were the Leisler Rebellion in New York, Coode's Rebellion in Maryland, and the Boston Revolt of 1689. These revolts had as their aim an overthrow of the Catholic order that James II had been trying to create.

Encouraged by the outcome of the Glorious Revolution, several angry colonists in Boston rose up and took advantage of colonial dislike of the Dominion of New England. Puritans felt the Dominion of New England threatened them due to the abrupt revocation of their existing colonial charters and allowing "liberty of conscience."[128] For the Puritans, it had been quintessential to have a colony in which their church was in charge to conduct their holy experiment. For dissidents and/or Catholics to be able to openly live in the colony while questioning the established Puritan order for which their ancestors had left the mother country went against all for which they had founded the Massachusetts Bay Colony.

Cotton Mather and others laid out their issues with the Dominion of New England in 1689. They were dissatisfied that the mother country seemed preoccupied with a conflict of its own and took advantage of the situation to revolt against their oppressors. Mather would not entertain the notion that the Popish Plot (in which residents of New England still seemed to believe) was not a threat to New England, which he alleged was "so remarkable for the true Profession and pure Exercise of the Protestant religion."[129] They felt that their charter had been quickly and suddenly violated, removed, and were extremely dissatisfied with the Dominion of

---

[128] To devout Puritans, a Catholic monarch pushing "liberty of conscience" implied allowing toleration for Catholics, which would necessarily bring on papal tyranny. In addition, to the Puritans and other concerned Protestants, tolerating those whose beliefs represented extreme dissent from typical Protestant churches such as Quakers would necessarily bring on disorder, which the Puritans of Massachusetts were unwilling to put up with (David S. Lovejoy, *The Glorious Revolution in America*, [Hanover: Wesleyan University Press, 1972], 191).

[129] Cotton Mather, et. al., *The Boston Declaration of Grievances* (April 18, 1689), 1, accessed July 15, 2022, http://nationalhumanitiescenter.org/pds/amerbegin/power/text5/BostonDeclaration.pdf.

New England as well as Sir Edmund Andros.[130] They did not understand why William seemed more interested in sending soldiers from England to conquer the Native Americans (which had been reduced to few in number) when there were bigger things at stake.[131] Mather and others claimed of James's unjust proceedings, "we did nothing against these Proceedings but only cry to our God; they have caused the cry of the Poor to come unto Him, and he hears the cries of the Afflicted. We have been quiet hitherto, and still should have been, had not the Great God at this time laid under us a double engagement to do something for our security."[132]

Bradstreet and others later sought William's aid to restore the colonial charter that had been taken away from them during the Dominion of New England, and that he should take notice of the violation of the rights of Englishmen that had been occurring.[133] However, the colonists' appeals were at first largely ignored, which provoked them to try and do something about it themselves. The solution, for them, came in the form of the Boston Revolt.

Puritans in Boston had had enough of seeing their charter taken away from them, and finally broke into Andros's house, arrested, and jailed him to put an end to the Dominion of New England at its seat of power.[134] Colonists also arrested several other people in positions of power with the Dominion.[135] They overpowered the Dominion in forces and sought to restore the old

---

[130] Mather, et. al., *The Boston Declaration of Grievances*, 2.

[131] Ibid., 3.

[132] Ibid.

[133] Simon Bradstreet, et. al., *The Humble Address and Petition of the Governor, Council and Convention of Representatives of the People of Your Majesties Colony of the Massachusetts, in New-England*, (London: Richard Baldwin, 1689).

[134] Curran, *Papist Devils*, 129.

[135] Stephen S. Webb, *Lord Churchill's Coup: The Anglo-American Empire and the Glorious Revolution Reconsidered*, (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1998), 33.

order of things in Massachusetts at all costs. They reclaimed the place from which Andros had ruled and officially reclaimed Massachusetts for themselves.[136]

The Dominion of New England was over. All that needed to happen now was to ensure that it would never rise again. To this effect, in 1691, Increase Mather petitioned William for a new charter to replace the one James II had revoked. In his petition, Mather's loyalty to William is plainly visible. He considered the Glorious Revolution "happy" and when Parliament did not want to deal with New England's political problems, he appealed to William, who considered the matter and agreed to look into it, and in so doing Mather gave William very high praise.[137]

In 1689, another group followed the previous examples in Boston and in England. In the wake of his coronation, William suspended Catholics from holding public office. Protestants of New York followed the example of William's England and suspended Catholics from office.[138] Shortly thereafter, a man named Jacob Leisler, taking encouragement from William III's political victory, led a troop in and seized control of New York City as its self-appointed lieutenant governor for two years.

New York had been an English colony since 1674 as a result of a concession of the Dutch. Prior to this, it had been a Dutch colony founded in 1614, then known as New Netherland. Though the Dutch Reformed Church was established in the colony, the colony was

---

[136] Samuel Prince, *Letter Describing the Boston Uprising* (1689), accessed October 12, 2020, http://www.swarthmore.edu/SocSci/bdorsey1/41docs/42-pri.html. See also W.H. Whitmore, ed., *The Andros Tracts: Being a Collection of Pamphlets and Official Papers Issued Between the Overthrow of the Andros Government and the Establishment of the Second Charter of Massachusetts, With Memoirs by Sir Edmund Andros*, (Boston: T.R. Mavin and Son, 1868), 1-10.

[137] Increase Mather, *A Brief Account Concerning Several of the Agents of New-England, Their Negotiation at the Court of England With Some Remarks on the New Charter Granted to the Colony of Massachusets Shewing That all Things Duely Considered, Greater Privileges Than What are Therein Contained, Could not at This Time Rationally be Expected by the People There* (London: 1691), 5, 7-8.

[138] A Gentleman of the City of New York, *Leisler's Rebellion*, Western Standard, 2020, accessed October 11, 2020, https://www.originalsources.com/Document.aspx?DocID=4V388SLAARKE8BQ.

not founded as an outpost of the Dutch Reformed Church. However, according to the Charter of Freedoms and Exemptions, "as they are able" people there should have sought out a minister to tend to their spiritual needs and keep "zeal for God" from growing cold.[139] Other groups who made home in New Netherland included Jews, Lutherans, Muslims, and eventually Presbyterians and Independents.[140] Initially, the Dutch tried to stop the religious diversity because they feared it would bring a "Babel of confusion."[141] As a result, they appointed a new colonial governor over New Netherland, Peter Stuyvesant, to enforce adherence to the Dutch Reformed Church. Stuyvesant's crackdown, however, was short-lived. Eventually, the residents of the town of Flushing petitioned against his harsh measures against Quakers with the Flushing Remonstrance. They stated:

> The law of love, peace, and liberty in the states extending to Jews, Turks and Egyptians, as they are considered sons of Adam, which is the glory of the outward state of Holland, soe love, peace, and liberty, extending to all in Christ Jesus, condemns hatred, war and bondage. And because our Saviour sayeth it is impossible but that offences will come, but woe unto him by whom they cometh, our desire is not to offend one of his little ones, in whatsoever form, name or title hee appears in, whether Presbyterian, Independent, Baptist or Quaker, but shall be glad to see anything of God in any of them, desiring to doe unto all men as we desire all men should doe unto us, which is the true law both of Church and State; for our saviour sayeth this is the law and the prophets.[142]

Included in the sects the residents of Flushing pleaded for who took residence in New Netherland were "Presbyterians and Independents," two offshoots of English Puritanism. Even after the

---

[139] "Extract from the Charter of Freedoms and Exemptions to Patroons, June 7, 1629", American History: From Revolution to Reconstruction and Beyond, http://www.let.rug.nl/usa/documents/1600-1650/extract-fromcharter-of-freedoms-and-exemptions-to-patroons-june-7-1629.php, accessed August 22, 2022.

[140] Evan Haefeli, *New Netherland and the Dutch Origins of American Religious Freedom*, (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2016), 53-54.

[141] Ibid., 54.

[142] Edward Hart, "Remonstrance of the Residents of the Town of Flushing to Governor Stuyvesant, December 27, 1657", http://www.nyym.org/flushing/remons.html, accessed August 22, 2022.

English acquired the colony and divided and renamed it New York (for James, Duke of York) and New Jersey, the religious diversity continued to be prevalent in the colony. Many of the residents there feared a Catholic conspiracy as much as Protestants anywhere else, and by 1689, Leisler and his fellow Protestants could no longer stand to see their freedoms eroded. During Leisler's rule, he committed any who would not submit to him to prison. It was only in 1691 that the British tried and executed Leisler and his allies for treason.[143]

Leisler had attempted to purge New York of any remnant of the Dominion of New England, including Sir Edmund Andros and anyone else James II had appointed, and largely succeeded despite his rule lasting only for a brief period.[144] Lovejoy argues that Leisler took courage from the Boston Revolt to lead his own rebellion in New York.[145] However, Leisler's establishment of himself did not last particularly long, as he was eventually executed for his actions once it was clear that William and Mary were in charge of England and her colonies.

The Dominion of New England was over indeed, as was any remnant thereof. Massachusetts and New York, and any other place in New England or the Mid-Atlantic associated therewith, were now separate colonies again. However, tension between Protestants

---

[143] A Gentleman of the City of New York, *Leisler's Rebellion*, Western Standard, 2020, accessed October 11, 2020, https://www.originalsources.com/Document.aspx?DocID=4V388SLAARKE8BQ.

[144] This was in large part because Jacob Leisler, to the English Crown, was a largely obscure figure from Germany whom most had not heard of prior to his leading the revolt (Lovejoy, *The Glorious Revolution in America*, 256-257). William certainly wanted to put down any semblance of disorder in the colonies but had more pressing matters to take care of in England prior to dealing with this. Leisler and his followers had a lot of built-up tension from the takeover of New Netherland, of which they did not approve. In addition, they also feared the Canadian French, who were Catholic (like the feared monarch James II). The Dutch Reformed clergy of New York did not support Leisler's Rebellion, which greatly frustrated him (Randall Balmer, *A Perfect Babel of Confusion: Dutch Religion and English Culture in the Middle Colonies*, [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989], 31, 39). Leisler acted as a Protestant rebel, which would no doubt have generated sympathies from the Puritans of Long Island. However, it did not help his relationship with the Dutch Reformed.

[145] Lovejoy, *The Glorious Revolution in America*, 257.

and Catholics in the colonial South was now also at a peak. As a result, a revolution broke out in Maryland. This revolution had much longer-lasting effects.

While Massachusetts violently overthrew the Dominion of New England to restore the original "city on a hill," New York was somewhat aiding the process in the Leisler Revolt (since the Dominion of New England included it). The political turmoil in England had proven to be of no help to the religious tensions between Protestants and Catholics, which had been present in Maryland since the colony's founding. In 1689, just like the other two revolts, those tensions came to a head and the Protestants revolted against the established colonial government.

Since the founding of Maryland, several English Protestants (including Puritans and conformists) lived alongside Quakers and Catholics. However, these groups did not typically get along, and often experienced conflict over political agendas. By 1676, the Church of England, in particular, were upset about the lack of ministers who could serve them in Maryland, such that one fell in danger of falling into "Popery, Quakerism, or Phanaticisme [*sic*]."[146] Yeo lamented that most of the Church of England's clergy sent were not as authentic as they presented themselves, and that the Church of England was in decline as a result, against the growing threats of the Catholics, Quakers, and others.[147] Despite this, Lord Baltimore still was able to claim the colony was very tolerant of diverse religions who could practice freely, including "Praesbiterians, Independents, Anabaptists and Quakers, those of the Church of England and those of the Romish being the fewest."[148] The situation in Maryland was such that even as early

---

[146] John Yeo, "A Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury," in Michael G. Hall, et. al., eds., *The Glorious Revolution in America: Documents on the Colonial Crisis of 1689*, (Durham: University of North Carolina Press, 2012), 152.

[147] Ibid.

[148] Lord Baltimore, "Paper Setting Forth the Present State of Religion in America" (1676) in Hall, et. al., eds., *The Glorious Revolution in America*, 153.

as 1676, the Protestants of Maryland petitioned Charles II for the establishment of Protestant schools and further protections of the Protestant churches there.[149] Catholics were still a minority in Maryland twelve years before the Glorious Revolution broke out. However, due to James II's attempts to counteract established laws Protestants had refuge in, the number of Catholics did not matter. What mattered was that they were in Maryland, and their presence signaled a danger to the other colonists.

It is important to note here that initially, when James II took the throne, most of his subjects on both sides of the Atlantic gave him the benefit of the doubt. These included the Tories, who had fought for him to succeed Charles II against the Whigs in Parliament, and some of his subjects in Maryland. Several colonists in Maryland initially rejoiced at his welcoming an heir at first, expressing their best wishes and the highest blessing of the Lord upon him.[150] They gave him their congratulations, and seemed to enjoy the prospect of him continuing the Stuarts' reign with a legitimate heir. However, this was not universal, as tension between the Crown and the Puritans of Maryland was escalating due to it becoming clearer that James had every intention of bringing Catholicism back to Great Britain. Soon, all Protestants would unite in their concern against James, just as they had decades earlier against his father, Charles.

In this respect, when the Glorious Revolution broke out and the tension from it traveled across the Atlantic, differences that Maryland's resident Protestant sects (those of the Church of England and Independent Puritans) had with each other did not take priority. What mattered to both sides of the divide was eliminating the Catholic threat in the name of protecting the Protestant cause and freedoms. It was out of these tensions that the Protestant Revolution of

---

[149] William H. Browne, ed., *Proceedings and Acts of the General Assembly of Maryland*, vol. 5, 149.

[150] Inhabitants of Maryland, "Letter of Congratulations to the King," (Annapolis: Maryland State Archives, 1688).

1689, otherwise known as Coode's Rebellion, developed. The Protestants believed they could no longer tolerate a Catholic presence in a country promising them freedom if there really was a subtle Catholic conspiracy to reclaim England for the Catholic Church. They saw Catholics as obvious enemies of the Crown, and unsuccessfully tried getting Virginia's help in getting rid of them.[151] Like the other colonial revolutions that sprung up in 1689, the one building in Maryland had as its goal to install proper Protestant protections in the local government that would keep a seditious Catholic from bringing in any foreign agenda. Soon, Maryland's Puritans took matters into their own hands.

In 1682, Josias Fendal and John Coode had already been arrested for attempting to incite a rebellion in Maryland. The results of this rebellion would have been to expel Catholics from the colony (which would have occurred via the deprivation of the right to own property).[152] Seven years later, Protestants in Maryland initiated a rebellion that deposed the old regime, tolerant of Catholics, and installed one that they felt was more guaranteed to protect Protestants. They felt justified in doing so because they believed the Catholics were trying to sway their loyalty away from the Crown.[153] Eventually, they published a set of reasons to William and Mary why they rebelled. All the reasons they listed, however, were the very things that Protestants had not favored about Maryland all along.

The Protestants of Maryland had had enough of the various threats to their freedom in the mother country to not take action, and finally became encouraged at the results of the Glorious

---

[151] Curran, *Papist Devils*, 134.

[152] Philip Calvert, *A Letter from the Chancellour of Maryland to Colonel Henry Meese*, (Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan), accessed October 12, 2020, https://quod.lib.umich.edu/e/eebo/A32345.0001.001/1:1?rgn=div1;view=fulltext.

[153] General Assembly of Maryland, *Correspondence with the Secretary of State, 1688-1696: Addresses from Maryland to Their Majesties King William and Queen Mary*, (Marlborough: Adam Matthew Digital, 2015).

Revolution, like others before them. They had already tried starting a revolt in 1682, which was put down. In the wake of the Glorious Revolution, Maryland's Protestants acted again in 1689 in response to the "Plots, Contrivances, Insinuations, Remonstrances, and Subscriptions, carried on, suggested, extorted, and obtained by the Lord Baltimore, his Deputies, Representatives, and Officers here."[154] They felt that Lord Baltimore had used the Dominion of New England to his advantage and was bringing about subtly all the Protestants feared. Coode and the others accused Catholics of disloyalty and attempting to recruit to a like cause, and of the charter's failure to meet the requirements for a church that it called for, in that only what was "erected and converted to the use of Popish Idolatry and Superstition" (i.e., Catholic churches) had clergy provided to them.[155] Protestants did not feel they were getting what the charter rightfully gave them while Catholics were. The Church of England was not the exclusive religion of the colony and therefore, Catholic Churches, though noted a decade earlier to be among the fewest, still held a presence (religious as well as political given the Baltimores' Catholicism) that made Coode his fellow revolutionaries uncomfortable.[156]

Protestants had built their case that to be Catholic was to be inherently disloyal and had James II's reforms to secure this notion. Though they had initially arrested Fendal and Coode for their earlier attempted revolt, they now sided with these men in getting their desired reforms to protect what mattered to them.[157] Colonial Maryland would never again be the same. The

---

[154] Protestant Association of Maryland, *The Declaration and Reason for the Motives for the Present Appearing in arms of Their Majesties' Protestant Subjects in the Province of Maryland*, (London: William Nuthead, 1689), 1-2.

[155] Ibid., 3.

[156] Coode himself was a Protestant. However, his grandfather, who may have been a lapsed Catholic priest, had been the first in his family to come to Maryland ("Coode Family Papers," St. Mary's County Historical Society [Leonardtown: 2021]).

revolutionaries overthrew the old regime and replaced it with one to secure their rights as Protestants and keep away the dangers of Catholicism. However, they still needed to prevent their efforts being put down.

Additionally, the revolutionaries felt the rights under the charter were under attack. They still clung to the original charter's provisions, like other colonists in other locations, even despite its dissolution with the Dominion of New England. Lord Baltimore, they claimed, was only acting in his own interests, which put their "liberty and property at stake."[158] That is, Lord Baltimore was only acting when convenient for him and what he was attempting to push, and not at all concerned about the colonists' rights to liberty and property.

The colonists also held a grievance with the lack of enforcement of a law that allowed "orphan children to be disposed of to persons of the same religion with that of their deceased parents," which would benefit the cause of Protestantism in that it would allow Protestant infants to be kept with Protestant families.[159] However, the law was not being properly enforced, because despite this law, "several children of *Protestants* have been committed to the tutelage of *Papists*, and brought up in the *Romish Superstition*."[160] The revolutionaries cited this along with another case of a woman leaving her husband for a Catholic suitor, and converting thereto, and nothing being done to stop it.[161] For the revolutionaries, it was clear where Lord Baltimore's true

---

[157] Sutto attributes the reason for Coode's Rebellion as having to do with Lord Baltimore failing to verbally acknowledge the legitimate coronation of William and Mary and deposing of James II, which would have solidified any Protestant notion that Catholics were not loyal to the Crown, and that this was as true in Maryland as it was in England (Sutto, *Loyal Protestants and Dangerous Papists*, 159, 164).

[158] Protestant Association of Maryland, *Declaration of the Reasons*, 3.

[159] Ibid., 4.

[160] Ibid.

[161] Ibid.

loyalties lay, and he was not going to hear the concerns of those under his charge, but simply commit to punish all perceived opposition to him.[162] Further proof of this was in Lord Baltimore's refusal to uphold a provision of the charter that required the consent of the freedmen in the passing of laws, and his refusal to address the violence committed against Protestants by Catholics in recent days.[163]

To be sure, the revolutionaries wanted to "defend the Protestant religion" and to achieve deliverance from "tyranny and popery."[164] To devout Protestants, these two were one and the same. Protestants, aligning themselves more closely to the Puritan cause, wanted to purge Maryland of any Catholic tyranny, and in so doing created a situation in which conservative Protestants had control of Maryland and successfully eliminated any vestige of freedom of religion that was there when the colony was founded. The tone of the revolutionaries gives evidence that in light of the regime change in England, Catholics were empowered by Lord Baltimore's inaction to violence against Protestants and were causing problems in an outrageous fashion within the colony. The political and religious climate in Maryland was eroding by 1689, and Coode's Rebellion, for the Protestants, seemed to provide a feasible answer. Later in 1689, the Protestant Association reiterated their claims of liberty and property being violated, and petitioned William to have a stricter regime. They asked specifically for a "Protestant government."[165] They felt that under this model their "Rights and Libertyes may be secured."[166]

---

[162] Protestant Association of Maryland, *Declaration of the Reasons*, 4.

[163] Ibid., 5-6.

[164] Ibid., 7.

[165] Protestant Association of Maryland, *The Address of the Representatives of Their Majestyes Protestant Subjects, in the Province of Mary-land Assembled, to the Kings Most Excellent Majesty*, (London: William Nuthead, 1689), 2.

Protestants in Maryland were pleased with the results of William's reign and pledged their utmost loyalty to him were he to give them what they wanted.[167] All William had to do was ensure the rights of Protestants will be protected.

Further evidence that the colonists of Maryland continued to lean increasingly in a Catholic direction came from an avowal of Protestantism to the Crown. In Somerset County, Maryland, Protestant subjects wrote the crown. In their letter, they urged the crown to defend the Protestant religion against the "French and other Papists that Oppose and trouble us."[168] By the time the transition of power took place, it was clear that earlier Protestant predictions had proven true. Catholics in other major powers of Europe, such as France, were taking encouragement from the presence of a Catholic monarch to do harm to the cause of Protestantism. To concerned Protestants, William's reforms were their only defense, and he was succeeding, which gave them fuel to act on their own initiative in the colonies. As far as staunch Protestants were concerned, Maryland was turning Protestant, and all who did not go along were considered a threat.

The list of grievances had served its purpose, which was to ensure to William and Mary that there was no disloyalty in the motives of Coode and his comrades.[169] In the end, Coode and his fellow revolutionaries were not prosecuted for their actions. However, as Sutto notes, the Crown brought Maryland promptly under its jurisdiction as a royal colony, with no evidence that they did or did not believe Coode's allegations.[170] Protestants had gone on a steady campaign of

---

[166] Protestant Association of Maryland, *The Address of the Representatives of Their Majestyes Protestant Subjects*, 2.

[167] Ibid.

[168] Inhabitants of Somerset County, MD, "An Avowal of the Protestant Religion to the King," (Annapolis, MD: Maryland State Archives, 1689).

[169] Nuthead, *Declaration of the Reasons*; Sutto, *Loyal Protestants and Dangerous Papists*, 169.

[170] Sutto, *Loyal Protestants and Dangerous Papists*, 174.

Catholic removal, and the Crown did not reverse this. It even went as far as to ban Catholics from holding public office in Maryland.[171] Coode's Rebellion ended with a Protestant victory, an overthrow of the Baltimores, and an establishment of a decidedly Protestant colonial government that would last for nearly a century. Catholics would never again be in a position in colonial Maryland to usurp any kind of power to themselves at the expense of Protestants.

Conclusion

Puritans in England had had their reforms were rejected, and the English people vigorously opposed them. Yet, in Massachusetts, the Puritans were able to conduct a "holy experiment" with a "city on a hill," and in the colonial South they often contended with the established authorities. This was especially true in Maryland, a colony with established freedom of religion and a proprietary government that the Catholic Calverts oversaw.

Previously, Puritans had left the mother country to have a place where they could freely establish churches and live in a community built on the principles they strongly advocated. However, they lacked a plan for dealing with dissidents. They were initially harsh with the Quakers who made considerable effort to evangelize the colonies. However, the Half-Way Covenant eventually allowed for some liberty of conscience for dissenters. The situation, however, sparked concern for Charles II, who was already concerned with keeping the Puritans from ever attaining power again. Charles eventually relaxed his policies, which allowed the remnant of Puritans in England to resume some political involvement with the Whigs. However, he refused to deviate from having his brother, James, Duke of York, as heir apparent. Despite Whig attempts to prevent it from occurring, James's coronation eventually happened, sparking fears among Protestants all over the English Atlantic World.

---

[171] Moran, "Anti-Catholicism in Early American Politics," 222.

The Glorious Revolution crossed the Atlantic Ocean into several of the American colonies in a decisive effort to purge the remnants of the Roman Catholic Church and absolutist tyranny of the monarchs. James, as an outspoken Catholic, wanted to promote toleration for himself and his fellow Catholics. However, he did so in blatant disregard of his subjects' concerns and even dissolved Parliament. While his motives are a subject of debate among historians, it is generally agreed that the effect of James's reforms was to convince the people he did not have their best interests at heart, but instead sought to overturn the established constitutional monarchy and Protestant Church of England and replace it with an unchecked Catholic, absolute monarchy. This signal concerned Protestants in England that his reign was a danger to their rights and freedoms, and it needed to be overturned.

James's opponents solicited the help of his son-in-law, William III, to overthrow him and make England Protestant again. The tension continued for two years during the Williamite War in Ireland. While William purged England of any remnants of Catholicism and James II's reforms, colonists sought to do likewise. The Leisler Rebellion and the Boston Revolt of 1689 eliminated the Dominion of New England and purged Catholics from political office in New England and the Mid-Atlantic. Simultaneously, Protestants in Maryland believed Catholics were attempting to sway their loyalty to the Crown, and sought protection from an alleged Catholic conspiratorial coup by revolting against the established colonial authorities, initiating a coup of their own. In the end, the colonists succeeded, as their English counterparts had, in making the colonies more solidly Protestant (or at least protective of Protestantism to their desired level) less than a century before the American Revolution. In achieving their goals of having a staunchly Protestant colony free of Catholic influence, the Puritans resorted to similar means to those who had driven them out of England. In their attempts to stop a Catholic tyranny, they used tyrannical

means to overthrow their oppressors. As a result, the Puritans went from being the oppressed who sought refuge in the American colonies to the oppressors who sought to drive out any perceived threat to their freedoms.

CHAPTER SIX: War and Peace: The Native Americans and the Legacy of Puritanism

The Puritans, by the conclusion of the seventeenth century, had certainly achieved a godly community of their own design. They had overall uniformity in belief and practice throughout the colony, and recognition from the Crown with a new colonial charter. However, the Puritans did not achieve the shining example Winthrop had wanted when they first came. They continued to exist all over the Atlantic World and would remain. The networks they built over the seventeenth century would also continue (i.e., the ripple effect of what would happen in both England and her colonies affecting each other directly). However, their legacy was not what they would have hoped.

Puritans began with an aim to complete the Reformation in England, abandon Catholic tradition, and ensure the Bible alone was the rule of faith and practice. When it became a transatlantic movement, the Puritans shifted to two goals. The first was to create a godly community founded on their principles, which was biblical in its inception. The second was to be a shining example to others who witnessed them. By the 1690s, the Puritans achieved a colony in which their principles were being practiced. However, the example they left behind was not what John Winthrop, their first colonial governor, had envisioned when he issued his initial exhortation aboard the *Arbella* on the way to Massachusetts.

In conjunction with their goals of a New Testament church, from the inception of the Massachusetts Bay Colony, the Puritans carried out various missions among the Native Americans. By 1643, things were going well enough for the Massachusetts Bay Colony that Winthrop could say "the plantations in New England have, by the blessing of Almighty God, had good and prosperous success without any charge to this state, and are now likely to prove very happy for the propagation of the gospel in those parts, and very beneficial and commodious for

this kingdom and nation."[1] By now, Winthrop felt ready to evangelize the Native Americans around the colony. The blessings of Providence, to him, were proof that some missionary efforts would be in order.

Winthrop chronicles some of these early efforts among the Native Americans. John Eliot had "taken great pains to get their language" and rendered the message in such a way that those who were not adherents to it among the Native Americans could better understand.[2] As Eliot and others taught the Native Americans, "some of them began to be seriously affected, and to understand the things of God, and they were generally ready to reform whatsoever they were told to be against the word of God."[3] Eliot and others seemed to be enjoying success in making converts among the Native Americans. Thomas Mayhew believed it was within God's providence to put churches near where they lived.[4] Mayhew records in his account that several significant figures among the Native Americans of New England fell ill, asked him and other missionaries for prayer, and saw their maladies healed.[5] Nevertheless, despite the number of conversions among the Native Americans, the relationship between the Puritans and the Native Americans was not defined according to the relationship between missionaries and their potential converts.

---

[1] James K. Hosmer, ed., *Journal of John Winthrop*, (New York: Charles' Scribner's Sons, 1908), vol. 2, 97.

[2] Ibid., 318-319.

[3] Hosmer, ed., *Journal of John Winthrop*, vol. 2, 320.

[4] Thomas Mayhew, "The Glorious Progress of the Gospel Amongst the Indians in New-England," in Edward Winslow, et. al., *The Glorious Progress of the Gospel Amongst the Indians in New England Manifested by Three Letters Under the Hand of That Famous Instrument of the Lord, Mr. John Eliot, and Another from Mr. Thomas Mayhew, Jun., Both Preachers of the Word, as Well to the English as Indians in New England ... : Together With an Appendix to the Foregoing Letters, Holding Forth Conjectures, Observations, and Applications*, (London: Edward Winslow, 1649).

[5] Ibid.

Puritans of New England also were involved in violent, military conflict with the Native Americans in the lands they went. The first of these conflicts was the Pequot War during the 1630s. It began when one of the more decidedly hostile tribes of Native Americans, known as the Pequots, began selling lands to the New England settlers in the 1630s.[6] However, the Pequots had previously killed a man among them named Captain John Stone, for which the New England Puritans demanded satisfaction in the form of the guilty party.[7] However, Cave, a scholar of the Pequot War, notes that since Winthrop initially believed that the Pequots handled the situation appropriately, there may have been other ulterior motives in declaring war against the Pequots.[8] One of these may have been Puritan suspicion that the Native Americans were under the control of a demonic force due to the Native Americans' worship of idols, which the Puritans saw as their mission to stop.[9] The New England settlers defeated and massacred the Pequots in the war. Even more conflict came in the following decades.

Increase Mather chronicles the history of New England conflict with the Native Americans since the English began to colonize. Even during the years of James I, Mather claimed, that when one of the Native Americans asked about the diseases that came over from Europe that were killing off their populations, the Puritans replied (and likely sincerely believed) that "the God whom they served had power to send that or any other disease upon those that should doe any wrong to his people. The Consideration of that also, was some terror to the

---

[6] Alfred A. Cave, *The Pequot War*, (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1996), 70.

[7] Ibid., 71.

[8] Ibid., 72.

[9] Ibid., 75.

Indians."[10] The Puritans wanted to convert the Native Americans, but they also wanted them to fear them and the God they served.

Noteworthily, Mather did not separate from Plymouth from the Massachusetts Bay Colony in his narratives of these years. He relates of the Plymouth colonists that "God who saw that they designed something better then the world, in their planting here, brought it to pass" (i.e., their victory against the Native Americans there).[11] One way he claims this occurred was that during the conflict, "The Lord made them very successful in their expeditions against those enemies that first sought their destruction."[12]

Mather further claims that when in need, the settlers "prevailed with God by Fasting and Prayer to look upon them and bless them with special mercy when it was a time of need, which did greatly affect and astonish the Indians: some of them therefore conceiving high thoughts concerning the English mans God, and his love to his people, that truly fear and serve him."[13] He also claimed God assisted the Puritans of the Massachusetts Bay Colony in their endeavors to "avenge themselves" on the Pequots who refused to grant them proper passage.[14] Mather believed it was by God's Providence that the Pequot War was won. He urged his listeners,

> And here we may take notice of Gods judgement upon this bloody Generation, in sending the very night before the assault an hundred and fifty men from their other fort to join

---

[10] Mather's claim here, however, was a bluff. Puritans knew the Native Americans outnumbered them, and wanted to seem confident to prevent these numbers from mattering (Increase Mather, *A Relation of the Troubles Which Have Hapned in New-England, by Reason of the Indians There. From the Year 1614 to the Year 1675. : Wherein the Frequent Conspiracyes of the Indians to Cutt off the English, and the Wonderfull Providence of God, in Disappointing Their Devices, is Declared. : Together With an Historical Discourse Concerning the Prevalency of Prayer; Shewing that New Englands Late Deliverance From the Rage of the Heathen is an Eminent Answer of Prayer*, [Boston: John Foster, 1677], 8).

[11] Ibid., 21.

[12] Ibid.

[13] Ibid., 22.

[14] Ibid., 29.

> with this fort, who were designing (as some of themselves have related) to go forth against the English at that very instant when this stroke came upon them, where the most of them perished with their fellows, so that the mischief they intended against us came upon themselves; they were taken in their own state and we through the mercy of God escaped.[15]

Mather took proof of his assertions that God's Providence was behind the Massachusetts Bay Colony and He approved of all they did in that they won the Pequot War. He cited this as evidence that "the face of God is against them that do evil, to cut off their remembrance from the Earth."[16] On the contrary, "the Lord hath done great things for His people among the Heathen."[17] Later, in the 1670s, New England became involved in another brutal conflict known as King Philip's War. The Puritans claimed justification for the slaughter of these Native Americans when they discovered that one of them, named Tobias, had murdered a settler. The settler's corpse allegedly bled afresh when Tobias approached it. At the time, none of the settlers of Massachusetts could discern who committed the murder.[18]

Plymouth won King Philip's War and executed the Native American chiefs behind the Massasoits against whom they fought. Mather concluded his narrative with "*This is the Lords doing, and it is marvellous in our eyes*."[19] He further cited the atrocities committed on the Native Americans' side of King Philip's War as proof of why the English settlers (Plymouth and Massachusetts Bay) won the conflict.[20] In doing so, Mather evidently believed some deficiency

---

[15] Mather, *A Relation of the Troubles Which Have Hapned in New-England*, 33.

[16] Ibid., 39.

[17] Ibid., 41.

[18] Ibid., 75.

[19] Ibid., 76.

[20] Increase Mather, *An Earnest Exhortation to the Inhabitants of New-England to Hearken to the Voice of God in His Late and Present Dispensations As Ever They Desire to Escape Another Judgement, Seven Times Greater Then Any Thing Which as Yet Hath Been*, (London: John Foster, 1676).

existed within the colony that gave him incentive to urge his listeners to pray for God's "healing" to come upon the "Jerusalem" they had built.[21] In 1682, one of the hostages the Native Americans took, Mary Rowlandson, was restored to the English. This was called "the sovereignty and goodness of God, together with the faithfulness of his promises displayed."[22] Rowlandson saw her deliverance in light of the faithfulness of God.

Just like in the Commonwealth, the legacy the Puritans left with the Native Americans was a mixed one. On the one hand, they had enjoyed much success in evangelism with the Native Americans. However, this was in the backdrop of larger military conflicts in which all New England was embroiled. These began with the Pequot War and lasted until King Philip's War. Many Native Americans converted. However, many more saw them as invaders who needed to be wiped out, and both sides of the conflict committed their share of brutal acts during these wars. In the end, the Puritans did not achieve the shining example they had hoped to set. They wanted to be a light to the Native Americans and others. Nevertheless, their actions generated accusations from many, including but not limited to the Quakers.

The Puritans, the Quakers, and the Salem Witch Trials

The Puritans had already contended with the Quakers in the 1650s and had killed four of them in Massachusetts when they refused to leave. Over time, however, as noted above, policies began to relax toward Quakers and other dissenters. This, however, did not stop the Quakers from their drive to speak against the Puritans and in 1690s Massachusetts, the Quakers were far from finished. George Keith, a new Quaker missionary, began to renew heavy preaching against

---

[21] Mather, *An Earnest Exhortation*.

[22] Mary Rowlandson, *The Sovereignty and Goodness of God*, (1682), accessed July 15, 2022, https://teachingamericanhistory.org/document/the-sovereignty-and-goodness-of-god/.

the New England Puritans, in a similar manner to the former Quakers. Cotton Mather rose up as Massachusetts's defense. He argued against Keith, "*That where God has His Church*, there will be something else!"[23]

Mather saw Quakerism as antithetical to Christianity, and said "it attempts nothing but the leaving our whole sacred glorious gospel in such a *confusion*, as that it shall no longer give any plain and clear conduct unto us, in our *drawing near to God*; and though it pretends unto *Light* yet it leaves the bewildred Souls of men, *in Chains under darkness, unto the Judgment of the Great Day*."[24] He wanted the Massachusetts churches to be aware of Quakerism's false claims to provide any kind of light to its adherents, which he saw as a distraction. Winship notes that at the same time as this occurred, Increase Mather returned from London, and the new charter he brought with him brought a different form of government from which the Puritans of Massachusetts were familiar. Plymouth and the Massachusetts Bay Colony were now under the same colonial government, and citizenship in the colony became a question of ownership of property rather than an embrace of godliness.[25] In addition, it was guaranteed that all Protestants would have "liberty of conscience."[26]

Concerned English Protestants, only three years earlier, had summoned the Protestant William III from the Netherlands to take over the English throne. William brought with him a

---

[23] The italics in this quotation are in the original quote (Cotton Mather, *Little Flocks Guarded Against Grievous Wolves. An Address Unto Those Parts of New-England Which are Most Exposed Unto Assaults, From the Modern Teachers of the Misled Quakers. : In a Letter, Which Impartially Discovers the Manifold Haeresies and Blasphemies, and the Strong Delusions of Even the Most Refined Quakerism; and Thereupon Demonstrates the Truth of Those Principles and Assertions, Which are Most Opposite Thereunto. : With Just Reflections Upon the Extream Ignorance and Wickedness, of George Keith, who is the Seducer That now Most Ravines Upon the Churches in This Wilderness*, [Boston: Benjamin Harris and John Allen, 1691], 2).

[24] Ibid., 2-3.

[25] Winship, *Hot Protestants*, 281.

[26] Ibid., 280.

zeal for Protestantism, but much like the Dutch from which he came, not a single particular strand.[27] The Dutch William's reign meant that Protestantism would stand in England and her colonies, but not necessarily the Congregationalism that had once dominated Massachusetts. According to Winship, while several attempts were made to "revive" the old Puritanism under the former charter, the damage was done. A new colonial governor, William Phips, was appointed, who did not fit the bill of "godliness" by any means.[28] Phips took less interest in punishing Baptists, Quakers, and other dissenters and focused his attention on prosecuting alleged witches.[29]

To the colonists, they were already under satanic assault from the Quakers, and now Massachusetts was under mass hysteria from various accusations against potential witches. From this mass hysteria, ministers and government officials alike began prosecuting alleged witches.[30] Most famously, this included the Salem Witch Trials (though several earlier trials in England and Massachusetts had been much more severe), and though they ended, it proved a disgrace for the Puritans of New England to those outside. Many of the accused strongly maintained their

---

[27] Evan Haefeli, *New Netherland and the Dutch Origins of American Religious Freedom*, (Plano: Papamoa Press, 2018), 13-14.

[28] Ibid., 281-285.

[29] So, too, did Cotton Mather, who eventually left it up to divine vengeance to deal with Quakers rather than urge their punishment by magistrates (Winship, *Hot Protestants*, 292). While Winship places the blame for the inattention to Baptists and Quakers on the new colonial charter that Increase Mather procured from William III, the foundations for this departure from the Congregationalists of Massachusetts having exclusive control had already been laid decades earlier with the Half-Way Covenant, in which privileges had been granted for a partial church membership to dissenters. As a result, the overall theology of Massachusetts was no longer exclusively Puritan/Congregationalist. Though there were some, such as the Mathers, who clung to some form of Puritanism, even the younger Mathers' Puritanism had departed from that of Richard Mather decades earlier. He argued that "Every *particular Church* is to consider it self as a part of the *Catholic*, and owes a Duty to the *whole Visible Church* of our Lord in the World" (Cotton Mather and Increase Mather, *Ratio Disciplinae Fratrum Nov-Anglorum. A Faithful Account of the Discipline Professed and Practised; in the Churches of New-England. : With Interspersed and Instructive Reflections on the Discipline of the Primitive Churches*, [Boston: S. Gerrish, 1726], 33). The younger Mathers may still have clung to some Congregationalist ideals, but certainly this was not the uniform faith of Massachusetts anymore, and they both promoted a form of ecumenism that departed from that of their forebears.

[30] Winship, *Hot Protestants*, 282-287.

innocence. Cotton Mather presented the accounts of the accused witches as though the accusations were very real. He took the accusations of demonic activity and witchcraft seriously, and he believed them plausible on grounds of these types of events occurring in the Scriptures, such as Saul's possession in 1 Samuel 15.[31] However, another clergyman, Thomas Brattle, disagreed. Brattle lent credence to tangible evidence, but he thought the use of "spectral evidence" (viz., evidence related to spiritual matters that cannot be measured physically) was not an appropriate ground upon which to measure the guilt of the accused.[32] Regardless, several accused died during these events, whether in prison or by execution.

Anderson argues for multiple factors in the Salem Witch Trials. She specifically argues for the Puritans' fears of Native American attacks which were only increasing as the decades progressed. Anderson argues as well for "political instability" in the wake of the Glorious Revolution and the Boston Revolt, "religious insecurity" due to the unstable relationship with the mother country and the Church of England, and a desire to combat godlessness. The fight against godlessness she speaks of included dealing with presumed cases of witchcraft (which had occurred in England in 1645 and were, by the 1690s, occurring in Scotland).[33] The Puritans were under attack from multiple directions, and had become desperate over the three decades preceding the trials to ensure they could hold onto what they still had. Many came to discredit the trials, which ultimately led to some less than desirable changes in Massachusetts. Thomas

---

[31] Cotton Mather and Increase Mather, *The Wonders of the Invisible World: Being an Account of the Tryals of Several Witches Lately Executed in New England. To Which is Added a Farther Account of the Tryals of the New-England Witches*, (London: John Russell Smith, 1862), 4.

[32] Thomas Brattle, "Letter to an Unnamed Clergyman," in George L. Burr, ed., *Narratives of the Witchcraft Cases, 1648-1706*, (Whitefish: Kessinger Publishing, 2003), 164.

[33] Allison R. Anderson, "The Salem Witch Trials and the Political Chaos That Caused Them: How the Glorious Revolution Kindled the Fires of Colonial Unrest," *Western Illinois Historical Review*, Vol. 10 (2019), 4-8.

Maule, a Quaker, believed many of the accused were accused falsely, and asserted that "it were better that one hundred Witches should live, than that one person be put to death for a witch, which is not a Witch."[34] The trials fueled Quaker accusations against the New England Protestants. In the end, the trials were scandalous to Massachusetts and several ministers and court officials greatly embarrassed, as they had no way to prove the guilt of those they accused.

Conclusion

The Puritans had set out to bring the English Reformation to completion in a way not achieved under Edward VI. Dissatisfied with the Elizabethan Settlement, they attempted to push further reform from the reign of Elizabeth I into the reign of James I. Eventually, their efforts took them to the American colonies, where they hoped to establish a settlement founded on their principles. In New England, the Puritans were able to achieve a notable presence and set up a society founded on their principles in the Massachusetts Bay Colony. They also went to Virginia and Maryland. In Virginia, they lacked capable ministers and struggled against the Church of England, eventually writing to the Massachusetts Bay Colony to get some ministerial help and guidance. During this period, they relied heavily on the writings of William Ames and William Perkins to guide them in a way they saw fit. Under Charles I, the colonies were under pressure to take additional measures to ensure conformity. Charles appointed Sir William Berkeley as the colonial governor, who took additional measures to pressure the Puritans to conform and issued heavier punishments for failure to do so.

In Maryland, Puritans struggled not only against the established Church of England but against the Catholic proprietors, viz., the Baltimore family. The Baltimores allowed for Catholics and Quakers also to establish themselves in the colony, which the Puritans saw as a hindrance to

[34] Thomas Maule, *Truth Held Forth and Maintained*, (New York: William Bradford, 1695), 185.

their desired reforms, and a threat to the colony. However, when Berkeley took aggressive measures against the Puritans in Virginia, colonial governor William Stone of Maryland invited them to settle in Maryland. As a result, Maryland became the Puritan stronghold of the South. Eventually, the Act of Toleration of 1649 was passed in Maryland, which issued a heavy punishment for blasphemy but allowed latitude for the various sects that had settled in Maryland.

Charles I, upon his ascension to the throne, sought to present himself as the ideal monarch for a strong Church of England. He signed into law several measures against Puritans and Catholics, but did not consistently enforce the ones against Catholics, and dissolved Parliament for eleven years and ruled without them to the chagrin and horror of his Protestant subjects. Charles eventually appointed William Laud to the archbishopric of Canterbury, who began cracking down on Puritans in the name of ecclesiastical uniformity. Several Puritans went to the Massachusetts Bay Colony because of Laud's measures, where they would ideally be free not to conform, since the colony was able to manage itself. Others did not escape England. However, by 1640, the Puritans began to dominate Parliament by the time Charles called them back into session, as civil war was breaking out in his kingdoms.

In the colonies, most Puritans did not return to England to help in the war effort. However, some families did. Additionally, Puritans in Massachusetts stood in solidarity with their counterparts in England by praying and fasting for their success and exhorting their fellow colonists in Massachusetts to do the same. Eventually, when it became clear Charles was unwilling to hear the concerns of his subjects and deviate from what he was trying to do, and calm their fears concerning a subtle Catholic coup, he and William Laud were (at different times) arrested, tried, and executed, resulting in the Commonwealth of England. In the Commonwealth

of England, the Puritans seemingly had what they wanted in that now England and her Church would be able to complete the Reformation they began.

However, the Puritans' goals were not sustained, and the Commonwealth of England collapsed by 1660. This was, in large part, because Puritans on all sides of the Atlantic had consistently not been able to come to a consensus on what defined their movement. Consistently, Puritans had in common their desire to complete the Reformation in England, using the Scriptures alone as the rule of faith and practice, and abolishing Catholic tradition, as well as creating a godly community. However, how this looked in greater detail had multiple answers. Puritans divided into camps in England, whether Presbyterian (in accordance with the Church of Scotland and others who had followed the example of the Genevan Reformation), Congregationalist (which stressed the autonomy of individual congregations and allowed for more liberty of conscience for sincere Protestants), or others who were mostly willing to conform to the Elizabethan Settlement.

In the colonies, controversy ensued with the coming of John Cotton, who stressed God's ability to communicate the witness of Himself to the individual believer without the measurement of the validity of a minister. It was only then, according to Cotton, that one could ensure they were trusting in the grace of God through Jesus Christ by faith. Anne Hutchinson and John Wheelwright, among others, followed Cotton's teachings, but took them to a level he did not intend, viz., contention against established church authorities. This created the Antinomian Controversy in Massachusetts, in which Hutchinson held meetings in her home in which she prophesied that most of New England's ministers were operating in the spirit of Antichrist, and under a covenant of works, as opposed to a covenant of grace (a fundamental of Calvinism). Hutchinson, Wheelwright, and others were eventually banished from Massachusetts.

However, Antinomianism went to England, where it became force to be reckoned with for two decades. As a result of the controversy, Thomas Hooker took a group of Puritans and formed the Connecticut colony, in part because of his opposition to Cotton. John Davenport supported Cotton and formed the New Haven Colony, but Cotton chose not to involve himself and instead attempt to redeem his position in Massachusetts. Cotton found his opportunity with the rise of Roger Williams, a Separatist who sharply denounced the persecution of Christians by Christians and promoted liberty of conscience, which Cotton and other Puritans did not feel they could allow and ensure ecclesiastical and colonial stability.

In England, the Westminster Assembly of Divines was convened to redefine the direction the Church of England would take in the wake of the English Civil War. Presbyterians and Congregationalists (Independents) engaged in much debate throughout the assembly. Some of this debate extended into the colonies, since John Cotton and Richard Mather had been invited to attend. Although they declined the invitation, they participated in some written debate to weigh in on the controversies as they occurred.

The Independents stressed the need for liberty of conscience and congregational autonomy against the Presbyterians, who wanted churches to be able to have authority over other churches in the form of synods and believed liberty of conscience was antithetical to order and structure. The Presbyterians eventually won the controversy but could not stop the Independents completely. However, the Independents were not going to take anything other than an affirmative answer. Oliver Cromwell had Independent sympathies and steered the New Model Army in the direction of taking over the setting of the Assembly's agenda with an agenda of his own.

While the Presbyterians had entertained the idea of reasoning with Charles I to come to some sort of agreement. However, Cromwell, the New Model Army, and the Independents would not take this risk. They carried out Pride's Purge, which removed any Presbyterian who would not go along with Cromwell's ideas from Parliament, leaving only the Rump Parliament, which sympathized with his agenda. Next, they tried and executed Charles, and established Oliver Cromwell and the Rump Parliament over a new, republican England, known as the Commonwealth of England. Cotton and other Puritans in Massachusetts rejoiced at the news. However, the Southern and Island colonies put up a strong Royalist front until it became clear they had no choice but to submit to Cromwell.

Cromwell issued an embargo against the Southern and Island Colonies. Virginia responded to the embargo with the installation of Richard Bennett, member of a prominent Puritan family in the South, as colonial governor. Bermuda eventually drove all but the most conforming Puritans out of their midst, who expanded to Barbados to establish their own settlement. Maryland put up a fierce resistance to the Commonwealth, but eventually came under direct authority of the Commonwealth when they suffered a crushing defeat in the Battle of the Severn in 1655. Temporarily, religious toleration stopped until the end of the Commonwealth of England.

In England, Cromwell also sought to rid the Commonwealth of any influence he felt would not further his agenda. However, he also believed in liberty of conscience and sought to allow latitude for the various sects that had developed in England. However, many Presbyterians in England worked behind the scenes to create a solution in which some order and structure would return to England, but with no success. When Cromwell died and his son, Richard, was incapable of handling the reins of the Commonwealth, Presbyterians drafted an agreement to

hand the throne back to Charles II, when it became clear the Protectorate could not ensure the continuation of Puritan progress, let alone liberties in the colonies.

Upon his ascension to power, Charles II issued the Clarendon Codes, which were preventative measures to keep the Puritans from ever having the power and influence they once had again. Many were purged from their positions of power in 1662 on Black Bartholomew's Day. It seemed for the moment that Puritan progress had been lost. However, despite the remaining fears of episcopal tyranny, the Puritans in the colonies were still able to maintain a stronghold.

Both the Cromwellian Protectorate and Charles II had to deal with the rise and increase of the Quakers in the 1650s and 1660s. Cromwell had given Quakers some latitude. However, the Quakers saw themselves as divine agents who were there to warn all English Protestants that they lacked understanding of the church as the people of God (and not a building), and to speak against the material focus of England and the colonies. Persecution against them increased in England, but even more so in the colonies, where they made many converts. This culminated in the execution of four Quakers in Massachusetts, including the adamant and resolute Mary Dyer. Both Puritans and Quakers in the colonies appealed to Charles II against each other.

Charles II's measures restored many of the old Laudian ecclesiastical policies. As a result, while the Southern and Island colonies began returning to normal, New England did not want to go along and nearly did not agree to the Restoration. While New England Puritans were still steadfastly against episcopacy, they had to come to terms with the loss of many of their original members, and the increase of dissenters in the colonies. Now, Puritans in New England were left trying to preserve what they had left, which led to the development of large Congregationalism, otherwise known as the Half-Way Covenant. Though there was much

opposition to the Half-Way Covenant, it won out, which defined the course of Puritanism in New England from the 1660s to the 1690s.

In England, Charles II eventually relaxed some of his enforcement of policies against the Puritans. However, when it became clear that his Catholic brother, James II, was the heir apparent, Protestants throughout England and her colonies began to fear a Catholic coup. James II consolidated the American colonies into the Dominion of New England, revoking all existing colonial charters and establishing his approved officials, including Sir Edmund Andros, in power. Puritans and Protestants everywhere felt the need to avow their Protestantism amid growing fears that Catholic tyranny was afoot. Several Protestants in England invited King William III of the Netherlands, James's son-in-law, and his wife, Mary (James's daughter) to take England over. James II was ousted from power, but waged war for three years with William from Ireland in the Williamite Wars.

While the Williamite Wars raged, William did not devote much attention to breaking up the Dominion of New England. Puritans in Massachusetts and Maryland did not feel he treated their problems with enough of a sense of urgency, and neither did Protestants in New York. As a result, three separate revolts broke out in 1689. In the Boston Revolt, Andros was arrested and jailed, and Massachusetts was able to re-establish itself on its own terms. Eventually, Increase Mather went to England and secured a new colonial charter. Jacob Leisler in New York took courage from this example and issued a revolt of his own, in which he took over and purged any disloyal to him with execution by hanging. He was eventually executed for treason, and William and Mary asserted their authority back over the colony. In Maryland, tension had already been on the rise due to the Baltimores' Catholic leanings and the presence of Catholics in the colony. John Coode, in 1682, had already attempted a revolt with Josias Fendel in 1682, but it was put

down. However, in 1689, he took courage and got more Protestants behind him to revolt against the Baltimores again. The Protestants of Maryland grew tired of being ignored, and overthrew the Baltimores to establish a colony dominated with Puritan measures for nearly a century. They were not prosecuted for their actions.

The Puritans had, by the 1690s, succeeded in establishing a godly commonwealth. However, since the Half-Way Covenant's inception, a growing acceptance of those who did not fully share the beliefs of the older generation of Puritans set the stages for a climate toward liberty of conscience for Protestants. As the Dutch colonial empire already leaned in this direction, and by then, their king was now also the King of England, it was the Dutch way of thinking that eventually won out. As a result, the Puritans, who had fought for their place on the land of Massachusetts against the established Church of England as well as the Crown, now began to abandon their ideals for a more general form of Protestantism. It was in this time that the Salem Witch Trials occurred, as this was the climax of the residents of Massachusetts holding onto what they had. In the end, the Puritans achieved their rights to worship according to their conscience, but did so by welcoming in a monarch who would insist they also give it to everyone else. As a result, they became enveloped in the larger, more diverse body of English Protestantism. While they no longer retained the same structure they once did, the Puritans' legacy of revolutionary ideology (including what led to their involvement in the English Civil War and Glorious Revolution) is evident in the American Revolution. Their denominational descendants include Congregationalist churches, with some remnants of Puritanism visible in Dutch Reformed, Presbyterian and Baptist churches.

Bibliography

Archives

Maryland State Archives. Annapolis, MD: 2021.

a. Charles I. *Charter of Maryland*. London: 1632.
b. Inhabitants of Maryland. *Letter of Congratulations to the King*. Annapolis: 1688.
c. Inhabitants of Somerset County, MD. *Avowal of the Protestant Religion to the King*. Somerset: 1689.

St. Mary's County Historical Society. Leonardtown, MD: 2021.

a. Coode Family Files. St. Mary's County Historical Society: Leonardtown, 1780.
b. Everstine, Carl N., ed. *The General Assembly of Maryland, 1634-1776*. The Michie: Charlottesville, 1980.

Primary Sources

A Declaration Against the Antinomians and Their Doctrine of Liberty. John Jones: London, 1644.

A Gentleman from the City of New York. *Leisler's Rebellion*. Western Standard: 2020. Accessed October 11, 2020. https://www.originalsources.com/Document.aspx?DocID=4V388SLAARKE8BQ.

Abbot, George. *A Treatise on the Perpetual Visibilitie, and the Succession of the True Church in all Ages*. Humfrey Louunes for Robert Milbourne: London, 1624.

_____. *The Reasons Which Doctor Hill Hath Brought for the Upholding of Papistry, Which is Falsely Termed the Catholike Religion, Unmasked, and Shewn to be Very Weak, and Upon Examination Most Insufficient for That Purpose*. J. Barnes: London, 1604.

"Act Concerning Religion of 1649." Accessed March 27, 2022. http://www.let.rug.nl/usa/documents/1600-1650/the-maryland-toleration-act-1649.php.

Ames, William. *Conscience With the Power and Cases Thereof, Devided Into V Bookes*. W. Christaens, E. Griffin, J. Dawson: Leyden, 1639.

_____. *Fresh Suit Against Human Ceremonies in God's Worship*. Amsterdam: 1633.

_____. *The Marrow of Theology* (1628). Translated by John D. Eusden. The Labyrinth Press: Durham, 1968.

_____. *The Substance of Christian Religion, or, a Plain and Easie Draught of the Christian Catechism in LII Lectures on Chosen Texts of Scripture, for Each Lords-day of the Year, Learnedly and Perspicuously Illustrated With Doctrines, Reasons, and Uses*. T. Mabb for Thomas Davies: London, 1659.

Ames, William and William Bradshaw. *English Puritanisme: Containing the Maine Opinions of the Rigidest Sort of Those That are Called Puritans in the Realme of England*. London: 1641.

Andrewes, Lancelot. *Articles to be Enquired of by the Church-Wardens and Sworne Men, in the Ordinarie Visitation of Lancelot Lord-Bishop of Elie, Within the Diocese of Elie*. Cantrell Legge.: Cambridge, 1610.

Andrewes, Lancelot, et. al. *Certain Briefe Treatises Written by Diverse Learned men, Concerning the Ancient and Moderne Government of the Church, Wherein, Both the Primitive Institution of Episcopacie is Maintained, and the Lawfulnesse of the Ordination of Protestant Ministers Beyond the Seas Defended*. Leonard Lichfield: Oxford, 1641.

Andrews, Charles M., ed. *Narratives of the Insurrections, 1675-1690*. Barnes and Noble, Inc.: New York, 1915.

Baillie, Robert. *A Dissuasive From the Errors of the Time Wherein the Tenets of the Principal Sects, Especially of the Independents, are Drawn Together in one map, for the Most Part in the Words of Their own Authours, and Their Main Principles are Examined by the Touch-Stone of the Holy Scriptures*. London: Samuel Gellibrand, 1645.

Balancqhall, Walter. *A Large Declaration Concerning the Late Tumults of Scotland, From Their First Originals Together With a Particular Deduction of the Seditious Practices of the Prime Leaders of the Covenanters: Collected out of Their own Foul Acts and Writings: By Which it Doth Plainly Appeare, That Religion was Onely Pretended by Those Leaders, but Nothing Lesse Intended by Them. By the King.* Robert Young, His Majesties Printer for Scotland: London, 1639.

Barlow, William. *The Summe and Substance of the Conference, Which It Pleased His Excellent Majestie to Have with the Lords, Bishops, and Other of His Clergie (at Which the Most of the hordes of the Councell Were Present) in His Majesties Privy-Chamber, at Hampton Court, January 14, 1603; Whereunto Are Added, Some Copies, (Scattered Abroad,) Unsavory, and Untrue*. Mathew Law: London, 1604.

Bancroft, Richard. *A Survey of the Pretended Holy Discipline. Containing the Beginnings, Success, Parts, Proceedings, Authority and Doctrine of it: With Some of the Manifold, and Material Repugnances, Varieties and Uncertainties in That Behalf*. John Wolfe, John Thomas, and Richard Field: London, 1593.

_____. *Daungerous Positions and Proceedings Published and Practiced Within the Iland of Brytaine, Under Pretence of Reformation, and for the Presbyterial Discipline*. J. Windet for John Wolfe: London, 1593.

Baxter, Richard. *Saints' Everlasting Rest*. Accessed July 15, 2022. https://ccel.org/ccel/baxter/saints_rest.iii.IV.html.

Beaulieu, J. *J. Beaulieu to William Trumbull*. (30 Nov. 1609). Trumbull Manuscripts. Berkshire Records Office. Colonial Records Project. Library of Virginia: Richmond, 1609.

Beeke, Joel R., ed. *The Works of William Perkins*. 10 vols. Reformation Heritage Press: Grand Rapids, 2020.

Bennett, Edward. *A Treatise Divided into three parts, touching the inconveniences, that the Importation of Tobacco out of Spain, hath brought into this land*. For John Budge: London, 1620.

Berkeley, William. *The Speech of the Honorable Sir William Berkeley*. Samuel Broun: 1651.

Bilson, Thomas. *The True Difference Between Christian Subjection and Unchristian Rebellion*. London: 1585.

_____. *The Perpetual Government of Christ's Church*. London: 1593.

Bolton, Robert. *A Cordiall for Christians in the Time of Affliction*. George Miller: London, 1640.

_____. *Instructions for a Right Comforting Afflicted Consciences With Special Antidotes Against Some Grievous Temptations*. Felix Kyngston: London, 1631.

_____. *Some General Directions for a Comfortable Walking With God, Delivered at the Lecture at Kettering*. Felix Kyngston: London, 1626.

Bradstreet, Anne. *Works of Anne Bradstreet*. Edited by Jeanine Hensley. Cambridge: 196?.

Bradstreet, Simon, et. al. *The Humble Address and Petition of the Governor, Council and Convention of Representatives of the People of Your Majesties Colony of the Massachusetts, in New-England*. Richard Baldwin: London, 1689.

Bray, Gerald, ed. *Documents of the English Reformation*. James Clarke & Co.: Bristol, 2004.

Bridge, William, et. al. *An Apologeticall Narration, to the Honourable Houses of Parliament*. Robert Dawlson: London, 1643.

Browne, Robert. *A Booke which Sheweth the Life and Manners of all True Christians and Howe Unlike They are Unto Turkes and Papistes, and Heathen Folke. Also the Pointes and Partes of all Divinitie, That is of the Revealed Will and Worde of God are Declared by Their Severall Definitions and Divisions in Order as Followeth*. Richarde Painter: Middelburgh, 1582.

_____. *A Treatise of Reformation Without Tarrying for any and of the Wickedness of Those Preachers Which Will not Reform Till the Magistrate Command or Compel Them*. Middelburgh: 1582.

Browne, W.H., ed. *Proceedings and Acts of the General Assembly of Maryland*. (64 vols.) Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1883.

Bryan, William J., ed. *The World's Famous Orations*. 10 vols. Funk and Wagnalls: New York, 1906.

Burr, George L., ed. *Narratives of the Witchcraft Cases, 1648-1706*. Kessinger Publishing: Whitefish, 2003.

Burrough, Edward. *A Declaration of the sad and Great Persecution and Martyrdom of the People of God, Called Quakers, in New-England, for the Worshipping of God*. Robert Wilson: London, 1661.

Burroughs, Jeremiah. *A Sermon Preached Before the Right Honourable House of Peeres*. Robert Dawlman: London, 1645.

_____. *Irenicum, to the Lovers of Truth and Peace Heart-Divisions Opened in the Causes and Evils of Them : With Cautions That we may not be Hurt by Them, and Endeavours to Heal Them*. Robert Dawlman: London, 1653.

_____. *The Rare Jewel of Christian Contentment*. Ben Billingsley: London, 1666.

Bush, Sargent, ed. *The Correspondence of John Cotton*. University of North Carolina Press: Chapel Hill, 2001.

Calvert, Philip. *A Letter from the Chancellour of Maryland to Colonel Henry Meese*. University of Michigan: Ann Arbor. Accessed October 12, 2020. https://quod.lib.umich.edu/e/eebo/A32345.0001.001/1:1?rgn=div1;view=fulltext.

Calvin, John. *Institutes of the Christian Religion* (2 vols.). Edited by John Allen. Presbyterian Board of Publication and Sabbath-School Work: Philadelphia, 1921.

Carlyle, Thomas, ed. *The Works of Thomas Carlyle*. (8 vols.). Oxford University Press: Oxford, 2012.

Carson, Leland H., ed. *The Writings of Henry Barrowe, 1587-1590*. George Allen and Unwin, Ltd.: London, 1962.

Cartwright, Thomas. *Certaine Articles, Collected and Taken (as it is Thought) by the Bishops out of a Little Boke Entitled An Admonition to the Parliament, With an Answere to the Same. Contayning a Confirmation of the Said Boke in Short Notes*. J. Stroud: London, 1572.

_____. *Helpes for the Discovery of the Truth in Pointe of Toleration: Being the Judgment of That Eminent Scholler Thomas Cartwright, Sometimes Divinity-Professor in the University of Cambridge in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth of Happy Memory, and*

Then a Famous Non-conformist, for Which Through the Tyranny of the Bishops he Suffered Exile. Wherein the Power and Duty of the Magistrate in Relation to Matters of Religion is Discussed; as Also Whether the Judiciall Laws Given to Moses to the Jewes are Abrogate by the Coming of Christ. More Particularly in Relation to Some Sinnes, viz. Blasphemy, Adultery, &c. Occasionally Handled in a Controversy Between the Said Publike Professor T.C. and Doctor Whitgift. Here Also by the way is Laid Downe his Judgment in the Case of Divorce, and That the Party Innocent may Marrie Again. Thomas Banks: London, 1648.

Chaderton, Laurence. *An Excellent and Godly Sermon Most Needful for This Time, Wherein we Live in all Securitie and Sinne, to the Great Dishonour of God, and Contempt of His Holy Word*. Christopher Barker: London, 1578.

"Charter of Maryland" (1632). The Avalon Project. Accessed March 19, 2022. https://avalon.law.yale.edu/17th_century/ma01.asp.

Clarke, John. *Ill Newes from New-England, or, A nar[r]ative of New-Englands Persecution Wherin is Declared That While Old England is Becoming New, New-England is Become Old : Also Four Proposals to the Honoured Parliament and Councel of State, Touching the way to Propagate the Gospel of Christ ... : Also Four Conclusions Touching the Faith and Order of the Gospel of Christ out of his Last Will and Testament, Confirmed and Justified*. Henry Hill: London, 1652.

Clarke, Samuel. *The Lives of Two and Twenty English Divines Eminent in Their Generations for Learning, Piety, and Painfulnesse in the Work of the Ministry, and for Their Sufferings in the Cause of Christ: Whereunto are Annexed the Lives of Gaspar Coligni, the Famous Admiral of France, Slain in the Parisian Massacre, and Joan Queen of Navarre, who Died a Little Before*. London: A.M., 1660.

Coleman, Thomas. *Hopes Deferred and Dashed, Observed in a Sermon to the Honorable House of Commons, in Margarets Westminster*. Christopher Meredith: London, 1645.

Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society. Boston: 1838.

"Conference Conclusions." Hampton Court Conference (1604). Accessed April 16, 2022. https://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/education/resources/james-i/conference-conclusions/.

Coppe, Abiezer. "A Flying Fiery Roll." London: 1649. Accessed July 6, 2022. https://www.exclassics.com/pamphlets/pamph003.htm.

Cotton, John. *A Treatise on the Covenant of Grace*. Quinta Press: Weston Rhyn, 2006.

_____. *A Reply to Mr. Williams Letter*. London: Matthew Symmes for Hannah Allen, 1647.

_____. *The Bloody Tenent, Washed, and Made White in the Bloud of the Lambe: Being Discussed and Discharged of Bloud-Guiltinesse by Just Defence. Wherein the Great Questions of This Present Time are Handled, viz., How Farre Liberty of Conscience Ought to be Given to Those That Truly Feare God? And how Farre Restrained to Turbulent and Pestilent Persons, That not Onely Raze the Foundation of Godlinesse, but Disturb the Civill Peace Where They Live? Also how Farre the Magistrate may Proceed in the Duties of the First Table? And That all Magistrates Ought to Study the Word and Will of God, That They may Frame Their Government According to it. Discussed. As They are Alleged From Divers Scriptures, out of the Old and New Testament. Wherein Also the Practise of Princes is Debated, Together With the Judgement of Ancient and Late Writers of Most Precious Esteeme. Whereunto is Added a Reply to Mr. Williams Answer, to Mr. Cottons Letter*. London: Matthew Symmons for Hannah Allen, 1647.

_____. *The True Constitution of a Visible Church, Proved by Scripture*. London: Samuel Satterthwaite, 1642.

_____. *The way of Congregational Churches Cleared in two Treatises. In the Former, From the Historical Aspersions of Mr. Robert Baylie, in his Book, Called, A Disswasive From the Errors of the Time. In the Latter, From Some Contradictions of Vindicæ Clavium : and From, Some Mis-constructions of Learned Mr. Rutherford in his Book Intituled The due Right of Presbyteries*. London: Matthew Simmons, 1648.

Crisp, Tobias. *Christ Alone Exalted, in the Perfection and Encouragement of the Saints, Notwithstanding Sins and Trials*. (2 vols.). Dr. Gill: London, 1791.

Culverwell, Ezekiel. *A Treatise of Faith Wherein is Declared how a man may Live by Faith and Finde Relief in all his Necessities: Applied Especially Unto the use of the Weakest Christians*. I.L.: London, 1623.

Davenport, John, et. al. *Another Essay for the Investigation of the Truth, in Answer to two Questions Concerning I. The Subject of Baptism. II. The Consociation of Churches*. Samuel Green and Marmaduke Johnson: Cambridge, 1663.

Dering, Edward. *A Briefe and Necessarie Catechisme or Instruction, Very Needful to be Known of All Householders: Whereby They May Teach and Instruct Their Family in Such Poynts of Christian Religion as is Most Meete: With Prayers to the Same Adjoining*. W. Jaggard: London, 1614.

Dury, John. *A Peace-Maker Without Partiality and Hypocrisie. or the Gospel-way to Make up the Present Breaches of Brotherhood, and Heale the Divisions, Whereby Some of the Reforming Professors and Ministers of the Kindome at the Time, Sadly Dishonour Their Profession, Mainley Obstruct our Reformation, Utterly Destroy the Safe Constitution Both of Church and State. Wherein are Handled, 1. How the Meanes of Christian Peace, as Well Civill as Ecclesiasticall, may bee Found and Ought to bee Followed, Both by Pastors and People. 2. What are the Speciall lets of Ecclesiasticall Reconciliation, and What the Causes of Divisions are, and how to be Remedied. 3. What are the Grounds,*

Termes and Motives of Brotherly Unitie and Forbearance, Which the Ministers and Members of the Churches of England Ought to Professe and Practise one Towards Another for the Gospels Sake. R. Cotes: London, 1648.

Eaton, John. *The Honey-Combe of Free Justification by Christ Alone Collected out of the Meere Authorities of Scripture and Unanimous Consent of the Faithfull Interpreters and Dispensers of God's Mysteries Upon the Same, Especially as They Express the Excellency of Free Justification*. R.B.: London, 1642.

Edwards, Thomas. *Antapologia, or, a Full Answer to the Apologeticall Narration of Mr. Goodwin, Mr. Nye, Mr. Sympson, Mr. Burroughs, Mr. Bridge, Members of the Assembly of Divines Wherein is Handled Many of the Controversies of our Times, viz…Humbly Also Submitted to the Houses of Parliament*. G.M. for Ralph Smith: London, 1644.

Eleutheran Adventurers. *Articles and Orders*. London: 1647.

England and Scotland. *A Solemn League and Covenant for Reformation, and Defense of Religion, and the Honour and Happinesse of the King, and the Peace and Safety of the Three Kingdoms of England, Scotland, and Ireland*. London: 1643.

England and Wales. *An Act Declaring and Constituting the People of England to be a Commonwealth and Free-State*. Edward Husband: London, 1649.

English Bill of Rights. 1689. Avalon: New Haven. Accessed October 11, 2020. https://avalon.law.yale.edu/17th_century/england.asp.

English Petition of Rights. 1628. George Mason University: Fairfax. Accessed October 11, 2020. https://www.law.gmu.edu/assets/files/academics/founders/petitionofright.pdf.

"Extract From the Charter of Freedoms and Exemptions." American History: From Revolution to Reconstruction and Beyond. Accessed August 22, 2022. http://www.let.rug.nl/usa/documents/1600-1650/extract-fromcharter-of-freedoms-and-exemptions-to-patroons-june-7-1629.php.

Eyre, William. *Justification Without Conditions, or the Free Justification of a Sinner, Explained, Confirmed, and Vindicated by the Exceptions, Objections, and Seeming Absurdities Cast Upon it, by the Assessors of Conditional Justification; More Especially, From the Attempts of Mr. B. Woodbridge, in his Sermon Entitled "Justification by Faith," of Mr. Cranford, in his Epistle to the Reader; and of Mr. Baxter, in Some Passages That Relate to the Same Matter. Wherein Also, the Absoluteness of the New Covenant is Proved, and the Arguments Against it are Disproved*. New Salem: 1653.

Field, John. *A Godly Exhortation*. London: 1583.

_____. *A View of Popish Abuses yet Remaining in the English Church*. 1572.

Fielde, John D. *An Admonition to the Parliament*. University of Michigan: Ann Arbor. Accessed October 9, 2020. https://quod.lib.umich.edu/e/eebo/A00718.0001.001/1:3?rgn=div1;view=fulltext.

"First Charter of Virginia." The Avalon Project. Accessed March 19, 2022. https://avalon.law.yale.edu/17th_century/va01.asp.

Force, Peter, ed. *Tracts and Other Papers Relating Principally to the Origin and Progress of the Settlement of the Colonies in North America From the Discovery of the Country to the Year 1776*. (4 vols.) Washington: 1836.

Fox, George. *To Thee Oliver Cromwell Into Whose Hands God Hath Committed the Sword of Justice, That Under Thee all may be Godly and Quietly Governed*. Giles Calvert: London, 1655.

Frank, Joseph, ed. *News From Virginny, 1644*. Jamestown: 1644.

Fuller, T. *Church History of Britain* (10 vols.). London: 1654.

Gardiner, Samuel R., ed. *Documents Related to the Proceedings Against William Prynne, in 1634 and 1637*. Johnson Reprint Corporation: New York, 1877.

_____. *The Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution, 1625-1660*. Oxford University Press: New York, 1906.

Gee, Henry and William J. Hardy, eds. *Documents Illustrative of English Church History*. MacMillan Publishers: New York, 1896.

General Assembly of Maryland. *Correspondence with the Secretary of State, 1688-1696: Addresses from Maryland to Their Majesties, King William and Queen Mary*. Adam Matthew Digital: Marlborough, 2015.

Goodman, Christopher. *How Superior Powers Ought to be Obey'd by Their Subjects*. University of Michigan: Ann Arbor. Accessed October 9, 2020. https://quod.lib.umich.edu/e/eebo/A01880.0001.001/1:18?rgn=div1;view=fulltext.

Goodrick, Alfred T.S. and Robert N. Toppan, eds. *Edward Randolph; Including his Letters and Official Papers*. Prince Society: Boston, 1809.

Green, Mary A.E., ed. *Diary of John Rous: Incumbent of Santon Downham, Suffolk, From 1625 to 1642*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 2014.

Greville, Richard. *A Discourse Opening the Nature of That Episcopacie Which is Exercised in England*. 1642.

Hall, David D., ed. *The Antinomian Controversy, 1636-1638: A Documentary History*. Duke University Press: Durham, 1990.

Hall, Michael G., et. al., eds. *Glorious Revolution in America: Documents on the Colonial Crisis of 1689*. University of North Carolina Press: Chapel Hill, 1964.

Harrison, Thomas. *Topica Sacra, Spiritual Logicke: Some Brief Hints and Helps to Prayer, Meditation, Faith, and Holiness*. Frances Titon: London, 1658.

Hart, Edward. "Remonstrance of the Residents of the Town of Flushing to Governor Stuyvesant, December 27, 1657." http://www.nyym.org/flushing/remons.html. Accessed August 22, 2022.

Herle, Charles. *The Independency on Scriptures of the Independency of Churches: Wherein the Question of Independency of Church-Government is Temperately,* First, *Stated;* Secondly, *Argued:* Thirdly, *Cleerd From the Objections: and* Fourthly, *Appeald in, to the Judgments of Such as Stand for it*. Thomas Brudenell: London, 1643.

Heylyn, Peter. *Cyprianus Anglicanus, or, The History of the Life and Death of the Most Reverend and Renowned Prelate William, by Divine Providence Lord Archbishop of Canterbury ...Containing Also the Ecclesiastical History of the Three Kingdoms of England, Scotland, and Ireland From his First Rising Till his Death*. A. Seile: London, 1668.

Hooke, William. *New-Englands Sence, of Old-England and Ireland's Sorrowes: A Sermon Preached Upon a Generall Day of Humiliation in the Churches of New-England: In the Behalf of Old-England and Irelands Sad Condition*. Joseph Caryl: London, 1645.

Hooker, Richard. *The Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity* (2 vols.). Online Library of Liberty. Accessed June 24, 2022. https://oll.libertyfund.org/title/walton-the-works-of-richard-hooker-vol-1.

Hosmer, James K., ed. *Original Narratives of Early American History, Winthrop's Journal, "History of New England, 1630-1649*. (2 vols.). Charles Scribner's Sons: New York, 1908.

Hutchinson, Thomas. *A Collection of Original Papers Relative to the History of the Colony of Massachusetts-Bay*. Boston: 2010.

_____. *History of the Massachusetts Bay Colony*. Boston: 1637.

James I. *True Law of Free Monarchies (Basilikon Doron*, 1599). Harvard University Press: Cambridge, 1918.

_____. "What I Believe." Scroll Publishing Company: Amberson, 2022. Accessed March 16, 2022. https://www.scrollpublishing.com/store/King-James-Beliefs.html.

James II. "Commission of Sir Edmund Andros for the Dominion of New England." April 7, 1688. Avalon: New Haven. Accessed October 11, 2020. https://avalon.law.yale.edu/17th_century/mass06.asp.

Jones, Rufus M., ed. *George Fox: An Autobiography*. Haverford College: Haverford, 1990. Accessed July 6, 2022. https://www.ccel.org/ccel/fox_g/autobio.toc.html.

Kidd, B.J., ed. *Documents Illustrative of the Continental Reformation*. Nabu Press: Charleston, 2010.

Knox, John. *On Rebellion*. Edited by Roger A. Mason. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1994.

Larkin, James, ed. *Stuart Royal Proclamations*. 2 vols. Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1983.

Laud, William. *A Sermon Preached on Munday, the Seaventeenth of March, at Westminster at the Opening of the Parliament*. B. Norton and J. Bill for Richard Badger: London, 1628.

_____. *A Speech Delivered in the Star Chamber Concerning Pretended Innovations in the Church* (14 June 1637). Accessed April 10, 2022. http://anglicanhistory.org/laud/laud1.html.

_____. *Articles to be Enquired of Within the Dioces of London, in the Second Triennial Visitation of the Right Honorable, and Right Reverend Father in God, William Lord Bishop of London*. E. K. Allde: London, 1631. Accessed April 18, 2022. http://quod.lib.umich.edu/e/eebo2/B00013.0001.001/1:4?rgn=div1;view=fulltext.

_____. *The Works of William Laud* (7 vols.). John Henry Parker: 1860.

Lawne, Christopher. *The Prophane Schism of the Brownists or Separatists. With the Impiety, Dissensions, Lewd, and Abominable Vices of That Impure Sect. Discovered by Christopher Lawne, John Fowler, Clement Sanders, and Robert Bulward. Lately Returned From the Company of M. Johnson, That Wicked Brother, Into the Bosome of the Church of England, Their True Mother*. William Stansby for Walter Burre: London, 1612.

Ley, John and Henry Parker. *A Discourse Concerning Puritans. A Vindication of Those who Unjustly Suffer by the Mistake, Abuse, and Misapplication of That Name. A Tract Necessary and Usefull for These Times*. Robert Bostock: London, 1641.

Locke, John. *Second Treatise of Government*. Project Gutenberg. Accessed October 10, 2020. https://www.gutenberg.org/files/7370/7370-h/7370-h.htm.

Malcolm, Joyce L., ed. *The Struggle for Sovereignty: Seventeenth-Century English Political Tracts*. (2 vols.). Liberty Fund: Indianapolis, 1999.

Marten, Henry. *The Independency of England, Endeavored to be Maintained*. Peter Cole: London, 1648.

Marvell, Andrew. *An Account of the Growth of Popery and Arbitrary Government in England*. Amsterdam. 1677.

_____. *Prose Works* (2 vols.). Yale University Press: New Haven, 2003.

Massachusetts General Court. *The Humble Petition and Address of the General Court Sitting at Boston in New England,: Unto the High and Mighty Prince Charles the Second. And Presented Unto his Most Gracious Majesty February 11, 1660*. S. Green: Cambridge, 1660.

Mather, Cotton. *Little Flocks Guarded Against Grievous Wolves. An Address Unto Those Parts of New-England Which are Most Exposed Unto Assaults, From the Modern Teachers of the Misled Quakers. : In a Letter, Which Impartially Discovers the Manifold Haeresies and Blasphemies, and the Strong Delusions of Even the Most Refined Quakerism; and Thereupon Demonstrates the Truth of Those Principles and Assertions, Which are Most Opposite Thereunto. : With Just Reflections Upon the Extream Ignorance and Wickedness, of George Keith, who is the Seducer That now Most Ravines Upon the Churches in This Wilderness*. Benjamin Harris and John Allen: Boston, 1691.

Mather, Cotton, and Increase Mather. *Ratio Disciplinae Fratrum Nov-Anglorum. A Faithful Account of the Discipline Professed and Practised; in the Churches of New-England. : With Interspersed and Instructive Reflections on the Discipline of the Primitive Churches*. S. Gerrish: Boston, 1726.

Mather, Cotton and Increase Mather. *The Wonders of the Invisible World: Being an Account of the Tryals of Several Witches Lately Executed in New England. To Which is Added a Farther Account of the Tryals of the New-England Witches*. John Russell Smith: London, 1862.

Mather, Cotton, et. al. *The Boston Declaration of Grievances (Excerpts)*. April 18, 1689. Accessed July 15, 2022. http://nationalhumanitiescenter.org/pds/amerbegin/power/text5/BostonDeclaration.pdf.

Mather, Increase. *A Brief Account Concerning Several of the Agents of New-England, Their Negotiation at the Court of England With Some Remarks on the New Charter Granted to the Colony of Massachusets Shewing That all Things Duely Considered, Greater Privileges Than What are Therein Contained, Could not at This Time Rationally be Expected by the People There*. London: 1691.

_____. *A Call From Heaven to the Present and Succeeding Generations or a Discourse Wherein is Shewed, I. That the Children of Godly Parents are Under Special Encouragement to Seek the Lord. : The Exceeding Danger of Apostasie, Especially as to Those That are the Children and Posterity of Such as Have Been Eminent for God in Their Generation. III: That People Ought to Remember God Their Creator*. John Foster: Boston, 1685.

_____. *A Narrative of the Miseries of New-England, by Reason of an Arbitrary Government Erected There. Under Sir Edmond Andross. To which is Added, Some Account of the Humble Application of the Pious and Noble Prelate, Henry Lord Bishop of London, With the Reverend Clergy of the City, and Some of the Dissenting Ministers in it, to the Illustrious Prince William Henry, Prince of Orange on Fryday [sic], September 21. 1688. : Also the Address of the Noncomformist Ministers (in and About the City of London) to His Higness [sic] the Prince of Orange*. Richard Pierce: Boston, 1688.

_____. *A Relation of the Troubles Which Have Hapned in New-England, by Reason of the Indians There. From the Year 1614 to the Year 1675. : Wherein the Frequent Conspiracyes of the Indians to Cutt off the English, and the Wonderfull Providence of God, in Disappointing Their Devices, is Declared. : Together With an Historical Discourse Concerning the Prevalency of Prayer; Shewing that New Englands Late Deliverance From the Rage of the Heathen is an Eminent Answer of Prayer*. John Foster: Boston, 1677.

_____. *An Earnest Exhortation to the Inhabitants of New-England to Hearken to the Voice of God in His Late and Present Dispensations As Ever They Desire to Escape Another Judgement, Seven Times Greater Then Any Thing Which as Yet Hath Been*. John Foster: London, 1676.

Mather, Richard. *A Platform of Church Discipline Gathered out of the Word of God, and Agreed Upon by the Elders, and Messengers of the Churches, Assembled in the Synod at Cambridge in New England, to be Presented to the Churches and Generall Court for Their Consideration and Acceptance in the Lord*. S.G.: Cambridge, 1649.

_____. *A Reply to Mr. Rutherfurd, or A Defence of the Answer to Reverend Mr. Herles Booke Against the Independency of Churches. Wherein Such Objections and Answers, as are Returned to Sundry Passages in the Said Answer by Mr. Samuel Rutherfurd, a Godly and Learned Brother of the Church of Scotland, in his Boke Entituled The due Right of Presbyters, are Examined and Removed, and the Answer Justified and Cleared.* J. Rothwell and H. Allen: London, 1647.

Mather, Richard, et. al. *Church-Government and Church-Covenant Discussed, in an Answer of the Elders of the Severall Churches in New-England to two and Thirty Questions, Sent Over to Them by Divers Ministers in England, to Declare Their Judgments Therein. Together With an Apologie of the Said Elders in New-England for Church-Covenant, Sent Over in Answer to Master Bernard in the Yeare 1639. As Also in an Answer to Nine Positions About Church Government. And now Published for the Satisfaction of all who Desire Resolution in Those Points.* R.O., G.D., T.P., and M.S.: London, 1643.

Mather, Richard and Jonathan Mitchel. *A Defence of the Answer and Arguments of the Synod met at Boston in the Year 1662. Concerning the Subject of Baptism, and Consociation of Churches. Against the Reply Made Thereto, by the Reverend Mr. John Davenport, Pastor of the church at New-Haven, in his Treatise Entituled, Another Essay for Investigation of*

the Truth, &c. : Together With an Answer to the Apologetical Preface set Before That Essay. S. Green and M. Johnson: Cambridge, 1664.

Mather, Richard and William Tompson. *A Modest & Brotherly Answer to Mr. Charles Herle his Book, Against the Independency of Churches. Wherein his Foure Arguments for the Government of Synods Over Particular Congregations, are Friendly Examined, and Clearly Answered. Together, With Christian and Loving Animadversions Upon Sundry Other Observable Passages in the Said Booke. All Tending to Declare the True use of Synods, and the Power of Congregationall Churches in the Points of Electing and Ordaining Their Owne Officers, and Censuring Their Offendors*. Henry Overton: London, 1644.

Maule, Thomas. *Truth Held Forth and Maintained*. William Bradford: New York, 1695.

Maxwell, John. *Sacro-Sancta Regum Majestas, or, The Sacred and Royal Prerogative of Christian Kings. Wherein Sovereignty is by Holy Scriptures, Reverend Antiquity, and Sound Reason Asserted, by Discussing of Five Questions. And the Puritanical, Jesuitical, Antimonarchical Grounds are Disproved, and the Untruth and Weakness of Their new Devised-State-Principles are Discovered. Dei Gratia mea lux*. Thomas Dring: London, 1680.

"Mayflower Compact." Accessed April 23, 2022. https://www.ushistory.org/documents/mayflower.htm.

McElwain, Charles H., ed. *The Political Works of James I*. Harvard University Press: Cambridge, 1918.

Milton, John. *Of Reformation Touching Church-Discipline in England, and the Cases That Hitherto Have Hindered it, in two Bookes, Written to a Freind [sic]*. London: Thomas Underhill, 1641.

_____. *Of True Religion, Haeresie, Schism, Toleration, and What Best Means may be Us'd Against the Growth of Popery*. London: 1673.

_____. *The Ready and Easy Way to Establish a Free Commonwealth* (1660). Online Library of Liberty. Accessed October 10, 2020. https://oll.libertyfund.org/titles/milton-the-ready-and-easy-way-to-establish-a-free-commonwealth.

"Minutes of the Council and General Court 1622-1629." Accessed September 18, 2021. https://archive.org/stream/minutesofcouncil00virg/minutesofcouncil00virg_djvu.txt.

Montagu, Richard. *A New Gagg for the Gospell? No: A New Gagg for an old Goose who Would Needes Undertake to Stop all Protestant Mouths for Eve, With 276. Places Out of Their own English Bibles, or a Late Abridger to Controversies, and Belyar of the Protestants Doctrine*. Thomas Snodham for Matthew Lownes and William Barrett: London, 1624.

_____. *Appello Caesarem: A Just Appeal From two Unjust Informers*. Humphrey Lownes for Matthew Lownes: London, 1625.

Nalson, John. *The True Protestants Appeal to City and Countrey*. London: 1681.

Owen, John. *The Humble Proposals of Mr. Owen, Mr. Tho. Goodwin, Mr. Nye, Mr. Sympson, and Other Ministers, who Presented the Petition to the Parliament, and Other Persons, Febr. 11. Under Debate by a Committee This 31. of March, 1652. for the Furtherance and Propagation of the Gospel in This Nation. Wherein They Having had Equall Respects to all Persons Fearing God, Though of Differing Judgements, doe Hope Also That They Will Tend to Union and Peace. With Additionall Propositions Humbly Tendred to the Committee for Propagating the Gospel, as Easie and Speedy Means for Supply of all Parishes in England With Able, Godly, and Orthodox Ministers. For, Setling of Right Constituted Churches, and for Preventing Persons of Corrupt Judgements, From Publishing Dangerous Errours, and Blasphemies in Assemblies and Meetings, by Other Godly Persons, Ministers, and Others.* Robert Ibbitson: London, 1652.

Pearson, Anthony. *To the Parliament of the Commonwealth of England*. 1653.

Petrie, Charles, ed. *The Letters of King Charles I*. Cassell and Company Ltd.: London, 1935.

Prince, Samuel. *Letter Describing the Boston Uprising* (1689). Accessed October 12, 2020. http://www.swarthmore.edu/SocSci/bdorsey1/41docs/42-pri.html.

Proceedings of Parliament in 1624: The House of Commons. Accessed June 10, 2022. https://www.british-history.ac.uk/no-series/proceedings-1624-parl/may-13.

Protestant Association of Maryland. *The Address of the Representatives of Their Majestyes Protestant Subjects, in the Province of Mary-land Assembled, to the Kings Most Excellent Majesty*. London: William Nuthead, 1689.

_____. *The Declaration and Reason for Motives for the Present Appearing in arms of Their Majesties' Protestant Subjects in the Province of Maryland*. London: William Nuthead, 1689.

Prynne, William. *Romes Master-Peece, or, The Grand Conspiracy of the Pope and his Jesuited Instruments, to Extirpate the Protestant Religion, Re-establish Popery, Subvert lawes, Liberties, Peace, Parliaments, by Kindling a Civill war in Scotland, and all His Majesties Realmes, and to Poyson the King Himselfe in Case hee Comply not With Them in These Their Execrable Designes Revealed out of Conscience to Andreas ab Habernfeld, by an Agent Sent from Rome into England, by Cardinall Barbarino, as an Assistant to con the Popes Late Nuncio, to Prosecute This Most Execrable Plot, (in Which he Persisted a Principall Actor Severall Yeares) who Discovered it to Sir William Boswell His Majesties Agent at the Hague, 6 Sept. 1640. He, Under an Oath of Secrecie, to the Arch-bishop of Canterbury (Among Whose Papers it was Casually Found by Master Pyrnne, May, 31. 1643) who Communicated it to the King, as the Greatest Businesse That Ever was put to him*. Michael Sparke, Sr.: London, 1644.

Pynchon, William. *The Meritorious Price of our Redemption, Justification, &c. Cleering it From Some Common Errors*. George Whittington and James Moxon: London, 1650.

Raithsby, John, ed. *Statutes of the Realm* (5 vols.). London: 1819.

Ridgely, David, ed. *Annals of Annapolis*. Annapolis: 1812.

Robinson, John. *A Justification of Separation From the Church of England Against Mr. Richard Bernard, his Invective, Intituled, The Separatist Schisme*. G. Thorp: Amsterdam, 161

_____. *The Works of John Robinson, Pastor of the Pilgrim Fathers*. 3 vols. Harvard University: Boston, 1851.

Rolfe, John. "Letter to Edwin Sandys." Ferrar Papers. Magdalen College: Cambridge, 1619/20.

Rous, John. *A Warning to the Inhabitants of Barbados*. London, 1656.

_____. *New-England a Degenerate Plant who Having Forgot Their Former Sufferings ... are now Become Famous Among the Nations in Bringing Forth the Fruits of Cruelty ... Published for the Information of all Sober People who Wish to Know how the State of New-England now Stands* ... London: 1659.

_____. *The Sins of a Gainsaying and Rebellious People…Also a Word to Foolish Merchants*. S.W.: London, 1659.

Rowlandson, Mary. *The Sovereignty and Goodness of God*. 1682. Accessed July 15, 2022. https://teachingamericanhistory.org/document/the-sovereignty-and-goodness-of-god/.

Rushworth, John, ed. *Historical Collections of Private Passages of State: Volume 1, 1618-29*. 219-248. London, 1721. *British History Online*. http://www.british-history.ac.uk/rushworth-papers/vol1/pp219-248. Accessed April 21, 2022.

Rutherford, Samuel. *A Peaceable and Temperate Plea for Pauls Presbyterie in Scotland, or, A Modest and Brotherly Dispute of the Government of the Church of Scotland Wherein our Discipline is Demonstrated to be the True Apostolick way of Divine Truth, and the Arguments on the Contrary are Friendly Dissolved, the Grounds of Separation and the Indepencie [sic] of Particular Congregations, in Defence of Ecclesiasticall Presbyteries, Synods, and Assemblies, are Examined and Tried*. John Bartlet: London, 1642.

_____. *The Divine Right of Church-Government and Excommunication: or a Peacable Dispute for the Perfection of the Holy Scripture in Point of Ceremonies and Church Government; in Which the Removal of the Service-Book is Justifi'd, the six Books of Tho: Erastus Against Excommunication are Briefly Examin'd; With a Vindication of That Eminent Divine Theod: Beza Against the Aspersions of Erastus, the Arguments of Mr. William Pryn, Rich: Hooker, Dr. Morton, Dr. Jackson, Dr. John Forbes, and the*

Doctors of Aberdeen; Touching Will-Worship, Ceremonies, Imagery, Idolatry, Things Indifferent, an Ambulatory Government; the due and Just Powers of the Magistrate in Matters of Religion, and the Arguments of Mr. Pryn, in so far as They Side With Erastus, are Modestly Discussed. To Which is Added, a Brief Tractate of Scandal. John Field: London, 1646.

_____. *Lex, rex The law and the Prince : a Dispute for the Just Prerogative of King and People : Containing the Reasons and Causes of the Most Necessary Defensive Wars of the Kingdom of Scotland and of Their Expedition for the ayd and Help of Their Dear Brethren of England : in Which Their Innocency is Asserted and a Full Answer is Given to a Seditious Pamphlet Intituled Sacro-Sancta Regum Majestas, or, The Sacred and Royall Prerogative of Christian Kings, Under the Name of J. A. but Penned by Jo. Maxwell the Excommunicate P. Prelat. : With a Scripturall Confutation of the Ruinous Grounds of W. Barclay, H. Grotius, H. Arnisœus, Ant. de Domi P. Bishop of Spalata, and of Other Late Anti-Magistratical Royalists, as the Author of Ossorianum, D. Fern, E. Symmons, the Doctors of Aberdeen, &c. : in XLIV Questions*. John Field: London, 1644.

Saunders, William, ed. *The Colonial Records of North Carolina*. 10 vols. Josephus Daniels: Raleigh, 1886.

Scobell, Henry. *An Act Prohibiting Trade With the Barbada's, Virginia, Bermuda's, and Antegua*. Edward Husband and John Field: London, 1650.

Sedgwick, John. *Antinomianisme Anatomized. Or, a Glass for the Lawlesse:: who Deny the Ruling Use of the Morall Law Unto Christians Under the Gospel*. London: Samuel Gellibrand, 1643.

Settle, Elkanah. *The Character of a Popish Successour, and What England may Expect From Such a One*. Oxford: 1681.

Shurtleff, Nathaniel B., ed. *Records of the Governor and Company of Massachusetts Bay in New England*. 5 vols. Boston: 1853-1854.

Smith, John. *The Generall Historie of Virginia, New England, and the Summer Isles: With the Names of the Adventurers, Planters, and Governours From Their First Beginning, Ano: 1584, to This Present 1624. With the Proceedings of those Severall Colonies and the Accidents That Befell Them in all Their Journyes and Discoveries. Also the Maps and Descriptions of all Those Countryes, Their Commodities, People, Government, Customes, and Religion yet Knowne. Divided into Sixe Bookes*. I.D. and I.H. for Michael Sparkes: London, 1624.

Stanard, W.G. "Abstracts of Virginia Land Patents." *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography*. Vol. 1. Issue 3 (1894). 436-452.

Sydney, Henry, et. al. *Invitation to William III*. National Archives of England: London. Accessed October 11, 2020. https://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/education/resources/significant-events/glorious-revolution-1688/.

Van Dixhoorn, Chad, ed. *The Minutes and Papers of the Westminster Assembly, 1643-1652*. 5 vols. Oxford University Press: Oxford, 2012.

Walker, Clement. *Relations and Observations, Historical and Politick, Upon the Parliament*. London: 1648.

Warfield, Joshua D., ed. *The Founders of Anne Arundel and Howard Counties, Maryland: A Genealogical and Biographical Review From Wills, Deeds, and Church Records*. Kohn and Pollock: Baltimore, 1905.

Westminster Assembly. *The Proceedings of the Westminster Assembly of Divines Upon the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England*. London: 1647.

Whitaker, Alexander. *Good News From Virginia*. Colonial Williamsburg: Williamsburg, 2021. Accessed September 13, 2021. http://www.virtualjamestown.org/exist/cocoon/jamestown/fha/J1024.

Whitmore, W.H., ed. *The Andros Tracts*. Boston: 1868-1874.

Wilcox, Thomas. *Admonition to Parliament*. J. Stroud: Hempstead, 1572.

Williams, Roger. *The Bloody Tenent of Persecution, For Cause of Conscience, Discussed, in a Conference Between Truth and Peace, who, in all Tender Affection, Present to the High Court of Parliament, as the Result of Their Discourse, These, Among Other Passages, of Highest Consideration*. London: 1644.

_____. *The Bloody Tenent Yet More Bloody: by Mr Cottons Endevour to Wash it White in the Blood of the Lambe; of Whose Precious Blood, Spilt in the Blood of his Servants; and of the Blood of Millions Spilt in Former and Later Wars for Conscience Sake, That Most Bloody Tenent of Persecution for Cause of Conscience, Upon a Second Tryal, is Found now More Apparently and More Notoriously Guilty*. Giles Calvert: London, 1652.

Winslow, Edward, et. al., *The Glorious Progress of the Gospel Amongst the Indians in New England Manifested by Three Letters Under the Hand of That Famous Instrument of the Lord, Mr. John Eliot, and Another from Mr. Thomas Mayhew, Jun., Both Preachers of the Word, as Well to the English as Indians in New England ... : Together With an Appendix to the Foregoing Letters, Holding Forth Conjectures, Observations, and Applications*. Edward Winslow: London, 1649.

Secondary Sources

Abernathy, Jr., George. "The English Presbyterians and the Stuart Restoration, 1648-1663." *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society*. Vol. 55. No. 2 (1965): 1-101.

Adamson, John S.A. *The Noble Revolt: The Overthrow of Charles I*. Weidenfield and Nicholson: London, 2007.

Allen, Ethan. *Maryland Toleration, or Sketches of the Early History of Maryland, to the Year 1650*. James S. Waters: Baltimore, 1855.

Anderson, Allison R. "The Salem Witch Trials and the Political Chaos That Caused Them: How the Glorious Revolution Kindled the Fires of Colonial Unrest." *Western Illinois Historical Review*. Vol. 10 (2019). 1-24.

Appleby, David J. *Black Bartholomew's Day: Preaching, Polemic, and Restoration Nonconformity*. Manchester University Press: Manchester, 2013.

Ashe, Dora J., ed. *A Maryland Anthology, 1609-1986*. University Press of America, Inc.: Lanham, 1987.

Balmer, Randall. *A Perfect Babel of Confusion: Dutch Religion and English Culture in the Middle Colonies*. Oxford University Press: Oxford, 1989.

Bancroft, George. *The History of the Colonization of the United States*. 10 vols. Little Brown & Co.: Boston, 1859.

Barnes, Viola F. *The Dominion of New England: A Study in British Colonial Policy*. Yale University Press: New Haven, 1960.

Beeke, Joel R., Sinclair B. Ferguson, and Matthew A. Haykin. *Church History 101: Highlights of Twenty Centuries*. Reformation Heritage Books: Grand Rapids, 2016.

Beeke, Joel R. and Mark Jones. *A Puritan Theology: Doctrine for Life*. Reformation Heritage Books: Grand Rapids, 2012.

Beeke, Joel R. and Paul Smalley. *Reformed Systematic Theology*. 3 vols. Reformation Heritage Books: Grand Rapids, 2019.

Bellamy, Alistair and Thomas Cogswell. *The Murder of King James I*. Yale University Press: New Haven, 2015.

Benham, Amy (radio script). "Captain Richard Ingle's Invasion of Maryland." St. Mary's County Historical Society: Leonardtown, 1959.

Bennett, John B. *Seventeenth-Century Isle of Wight County, Virginia: a History of the County of Isle of Wight, Virginia During the Seventeenth Century, Including Abstracts of the County Records*. Genealogical Publishing Co., Inc.: Baltimore, 1980.

Billings, Warren M., ed. *The Old Dominion in the Seventeenth Century: A Documentary History of Virginia, 1606-1689*. Chapel Hill: 1975.

Bremer, Francis J. *First Founders: American Puritans and Puritanism in an Atlantic World*. University of New Hampshire Press: Concord, 2012.

_____. *Lay Empowerment and the Development of Puritanism*. Palgrave MacMillan: New York, 2015.

_____. *Puritanism: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford University Press: Oxford, 2009.

_____. *The Puritan Experiment: New England Society From Bradford to Edwards (Revised Edition)*. University Press of New England: Lebanon, 1995.

Brodie, George. *A Constitutional History of the British Empire From the Accession of Charles I. to the Restoration…Including a Particular Examination of Mr. Hume's Statements Relative to the Character of the English Government*. Longman and Green: London, 1866.

Brook, Benjamin. *The Lives of the Puritans: Containing a Biographical Account of Those Divines who Distinguished Themselves in the Cause of Religious Liberty, from the Reformation Under Queen Elizabeth, to the Act of Uniformity in 1662, Volume 2*. J. Black: 1813.

Brown, John. *Puritan Preaching in England: A Study of Past and Present*. C. Scribner's Sons: New York, 1900.

_____. *The Pilgrim Fathers of New England and their Puritan Successors*. Religious Tract Society: London, 1906.

Brydon, George M. *Virginia's Mother Church and the Political Conditions Under Which it Grew*. The Virginia Historical Society: Richmond, 1948.

Buranelli, Vincent. *The King and the Quaker: A Study of William Penn and James II*. University of Pennsylvania Press: Philadelphia, 1962.

Burrow, John W. *A Liberal Descent: Victorian Historians and the English Past*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1983.

Butler, Jon. *Awash in a Sea of Faith: Christianizing the American People*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1992.

_____. "Two 1642 Letters From Virginia Puritans." *Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society*. Vol. 84 (1972): 99-109.

Butterfield, Kevin. "Puritans and Religious Strife in the Early Chesapeake." *The Virginia Memory of History and Biography*. Vol. 109. No. 1 (2001): 5-36.

_____. "The Puritan Experiment in Virginia, 1607-1650" (Doctoral Dissertation). College of William and Mary: Williamsburg, 1999.

Calamy, Edmund. *A Letter to a Divine in Germany Giving a Brief but True Account of the Protestant Dissenters in England*. 1717.

Calder, Isabel M. "John Cotton and the New Haven Colony." *The New England Quarterly*. Vol. 3. No. 1 (1930): 82-94.

Campbell, Douglas. *The Puritan in Holland, England and America* (2 vols.). Harper & Brothers Publishers: New York, 1893.

Cave, Alfred A. *The Pequot War*. University Press of Massachusetts: Amherst, 1996.

Childs, John. *The Williamite Wars in Ireland, 1688-1691*. Bloomsbury Academic: New York, 2007.

"Claiborne's Rebellion." Radio Script No. 7. New England Historical and Genealogical Society.

Cogswell, Thomas. *The Blessed Revolution: English Politics and the Coming of war, 1621-1624*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1989.

Cohen, Charles L. *God's Caress: The Psychology of Puritan Religious Experience*. Oxford University Press: Oxford, 1986.

Collinson, Patrick. *Godly People: Essays on English Protestantism and Puritanism*. Bloomsbury Publishing Place: New York, 2003.

_____. *Richard Bancroft and Elizabethan Anti-Puritanism*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 2013.

_____. *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*. University of California Press: Berkeley, 1967.

_____. *The Religion of Protestants: The Church in English Society, 1559-1625*. Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1982.

Como, David R. "Predestination and Political Conflict in Laud's London." *The Historical Journal*. Vol. 46. No. 2 (2003): 263-294.

Craven, Charles E. "The Planting of the Puritans on Long Island." *New York History*. Vol. 14. No. 4 (1933): 401-410.

Curran, Robert E. *Papist Devils: Catholics in British America, 1574-1783*. Catholic University of America Press: Washington, 2014.

Das, Nandini, ed. *Lives in Transit in Early Modern England: Identity in Belonging*. Amsterdam University Press: Amsterdam, 2022.

Davies, Horton. *The Worship of the English Puritans*. Soli Deo Gloria Publications: Grand Rapids, 1997.

Delbanco, Andrew and Alan Heimert, eds. *The Puritans in America: A Narrative Anthology*. Harvard University Press: Cambridge, 1985.

Emerson, Everett H. *John Cotton*. Twayne Publishers: New York, 1990.

Field, Jonathan B. "A key for the Gate: Roger Williams, Parliament, and Providence." *The New England Quarterly*. Vol. 80. No. 3 (2007): 353-382.

Firth, Charles H. *Oliver Cromwell and the Rule of the Puritans in England*. 2018.

Fiske, John. *Old Virginia and her Neighbours*. Houghton Mifflin and Company: Boston, 1900.

Fischer, David H. *Albion's Seed: Four British Folkways in America*. Oxford University Press: Oxford, 1989.

Fitzgibbons, Jonathan. *Cromwell's House of Lords: Politics, Parliaments, and Constitutional Revolutions, 1642-1660*. Boydell and Brewer: Rochester, 2018.

Foster, Stephen. "New England and the Challenge of Heresy, 1630 to 1660: The Puritan Crisis in Transatlantic Perspective." *The William and Mary Quarterly*. Vol. 38. No. 4 (1981): 624-660.

Gambrill, J. Montgomery. *Leading Events of Maryland History*. Ginn & Co.: Boston, 1904.

Gardiner, Samuel R., ed. *The First Two Stuarts and the Puritan Revolution*. Charles Scribner's Sons: New York, 1984.

Goodlad, Graham. "Before the Glorious Revolution: The Making of Absolute Monarchy?" *Historical Review, 58* (2007). 10-15.

Grey, Zachary. *A Review of Mr. Daniel Neal's History of the Puritans. With a Postscript, in Which the Exceptions to That Author, to the…Lord Bishop of Worcester's Vindication of the Government, …of the Church of England*. Gale ECCO: New York, 2010.

_____. *A Vindication of the Church of England, in Answer to Mr. Peirce's Vindication of the Dissenters: Wherein Abundance of Historical Mistakes are Rectified; Several Groundless Calumnies Thrown Upon the Most Worthy and Deserving Prelates of Our Church, Refuted; and Many Fathers of the Most Primitive Ages of Christianity Clear'd from Misrepresentations. In Two Parts*. John Wyat: London, 1720.

_____. *Presbyterian Prejudice Displayed*. Oxford University Press: Oxford, 1722.

Gura, Philip F. " 'The Contagion of Corrupt Opinions' in Puritan Massachusetts: The Case of William Pynchon." *The William and Mary Quarterly*. Vol. 39. No. 3 (1982): 469-491.

Haefeli, Evan. *New Netherland and the Dutch Origins of American Religious Freedom*. University of Pennsylvania Press: Philadelphia, 2016.

Hall, Clayton C., ed. *Narratives of Early Maryland, 1633-1684*. New York: 1910.

Hall, David D. *Puritans: A Transatlantic History*. Princeton University Press: Princeton, 2019.

_____. *Worlds of Wonder, Days of Judgment: Popular Religious Belief in Early New England*. New York: 1990.

Hallam, Henry. *The History of England: From the Succession of Henry VII to the Death of George II*. 3 vols. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 2012.

Hambrick-Stowe, Charles E. *The Practice of Piety: Puritan Devotional Disciplines in Seventeenth-Century New England*. University of North Carolina Press: Chapel Hill, 1986.

Harris, Tim. *Politics Under the Later Stuarts: Party Conflict in a Divided Society, 1660-1715*. Longman: London, 1993.

_____. *Rebellion: Britain's First Stuart Kings, 1567-1642*. Oxford University Press: Oxford, 2014.

_____. *Restoration: Charles II and his Kingdoms, 1660-1685*. Allen Lane: London, 2005.

_____. *Revolution: The Great Crisis of the British Monarchy, 1685-1720*. Penguin Books: London, 2007.

Harris, Tim and Stephen Taylor. *The Final Crisis of the Stuart Monarchy: The Revolutions of 1688-91 in Their British, Atlantic, and European Contexts*. Boydell and Brewer: Suffolk, 2013.

Hetherington, William M. *History of the Westminster Assembly of Divines*. Robert Carter & Brothers: 1853.

Hill, Christopher. *Puritanism and Revolution: Studies in the Interpretation of the English Revolution of the Seventeenth Century*. Palgrave MacMillan: New York, 1997.

_____. *Society and Puritanism in Pre-Revolutionary England*. Schocken Books: New York, 1964.

Hirst, Derek. *Authority and Conflict: England, 1603-1658*. Harvard University Press: Cambridge, 1986.

Hochstetler, Laurie. "Making Ministerial Marriage: The Social and Religious Legacy of the Dominion of New England." *The New England Quarterly*. Vol. 86. No. 3 (2013). 488-499.

Holmes, Clive. "The Trial and Execution of Charles I." *The Historical Journal*. Vol. 53. No. 2

(2010). 289-316.

Holmes, David. *Church Life and Worship in the Established Church of Virginia and Maryland in the Eighteenth Century*. Baltimore: 1971.

Hume, David. *The History of England*. 6 vols. Online Liberty Fund. Accessed November 20, 2022. https://oll.libertyfund.org/title/todd-the-history-of-england-6-vols.

Hunt, John. *Religious Thought in England*. 3 vols. Strahan and Company: London, 1847.

Hutton, Ronald. *Charles the Second: King of England, Scotland, and Ireland*. Oxford University Press: Oxford, 1989.

James, Edward W., ed. *The Lower Norfolk County, Virginia Antiquary*. 2 vols. New York: 1950.

Johnson, Bradley T. *The Foundation of Maryland, and the Origin of the Act Concerning Religion of April 21, 1649*. Historical Society of Maryland: Baltimore, 1883.

Jones, J. R. *Country and Court: England, 1658-1714*. Edward Arnold: London, 1978.

_____. *The First Whigs: The Politics of the Exclusion Crisis, 1678-1683*. Oxford University Press: London, 1961.

_____. *The Revolution of 1688 in England*. W. W. Norton and Company: New York, 1972.

Keay, Anna. *The Magnificent Monarch: Charles II and Ceremonies of Power*. Bloomsbury Publishing Place: London, 2008.

Kendall, R.T. *Calvin and English Calvinism to 1649*. Wipf and Stock Publishers: Eugene, 1997.

Kenyon, John. *The Popish Plot*. Phoenix Press: London, 1972.

Kirbye, J. Edward. *Puritanism in the South*. The Pilgrim Press: Boston, 1908.

Kupperman, Karen O. *Providence Island, 1630-1641: The Other Puritan Colony*. New York: 1993.

Lake, Peter. *Anglicans and Puritans?: Presbyterianism and English Conformist Thought from Whitgift to Hooker*. Unwin Hyman: London, 1988.

_____. *Moderate Puritans and the Elizabethan Church*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1982.

_____. *The Culture of English Puritanism, 1560-1700*. Basingbroke: 1996.

Lake, Peter and Michael Questier, eds. *Conformity and Orthodoxy in the English Church, c. 1560-1660*. The Boydell Press: Woodbridge, 2000.

Lambert, Sheila. "Richard Montagu, Arminianism, and Censorship." *Past & Present*. No. 124 (1989): 36-68.

Lamont, William M. *Godly Rule: Politics and Religion, 1603-1660*. Palgrave MacMillan: New York, 1969.

Leith, John H. *Assembly at Westminster: Reformed Theology in the Making*. John Knox Press: Atlanta, 1973.

Levy, Babette S. "Early Puritanism in the Southern and Island Colonies." *Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society*. Vol. 70. No. 1 (1960): 1-230.

Little, David, ed. *Oliver Cromwell: New Perspectives*. Palgrave MacMillan: New York, 2009.

Little, Patrick and David L. Smith. *Parliament and Politics in the Cromwellian Protectorate*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 2007.

Lobo, Giuseppina I. *Writing Conscience and the Nation in Revolutionary England*. University of Toronto Press: Ontario, 2017.

Lovejoy, David S. *The Glorious Revolution in America*. Wesleyan University Press: Hanover, 1972.

Lucas, Paul R. "Presbyterianism Comes to Connecticut: The Toleration Act of 1669." *Journal of Presbyterian History*. Vol. 50. No. 2 (1972): 129-147.

Macaulay, Thomas B. *The History of England*. 4 vols. Columbia University Press: Columbia, 1899.

Maddox, Isaac. *A Vindication of the Government, Doctrine, and Worship of the Church of England, Established in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth*. A. Bettesworth and C. Hitch: 1733.

Mason, George C. "The Colonial Churches of Nansemond County." *The William and Mary Quarterly*. Vol. 21. Issue 1 (1941): 37-54.

Meyer, Arnold O. "Charles I. and Rome." *The American Historical Review*. Vol. 19. No. 1 (1913): 13-26.

Millar, John, et. al. *An Historical View of the English Government*. Online Liberty Fund: Indianapolis, 2006.

Miller, Perry. *Errand Into the Wilderness*. The Belknap Press: New Haven, 2007.

_____. *Orthodoxy in Massachusetts, 1630-1650: A Genetic Study*. Harvard University Press: Cambridge, 1933.

_____. *Puritans: A Sourcebook of Their Writings*. HarperCollins: New York, 2001.

_____. *The New England Mind: The Seventeenth Century*. Harvard University Press: Cambridge, 1936.

_____. *The New England Mind: From Colony to Province*. Harvard University Press: Cambridge, 1983.

Milton, Anthony. *Catholic and Reformed: The Roman and Protestant Churches in English Protestant Thought, 1600-1640*. Cambridge: 1995.

Mitchell, Alexander F. *The Scottish Reformation: Its Epochs, Epistles, Leaders, and Characteristics*. Project Gutenberg (2007). Accessed August 15, 2020. http://www.gutenberg.org/files/22023/22023-h/22023-h.htm.

Monroy, Rachel L. "On the Trade Winds of Faith: Puritan Networks in the Making of the Modern Atlantic World." (Doctoral Dissertation). University of South Carolina: Columbia, 2015.

Moran, Denis M. "Anti-Catholicism in Early Maryland Politics: The Puritan Influence." *Records of the American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia*. Vol. 61. No. 3 (1950): 139-154.

Morgan, Edmund S. *The Puritan Dilemma: The Story of John Winthrop*. Pearson: Boston, 2006.

_____. *The Puritan Family*. Harper Scroll and Company: New York, 1944.

_____. *Visible Saints: The History of a Puritan Idea*. Cornell University Press: Ithaca, 1963.

Neal, Daniel. *The History of the Puritans, or Protestant Nonconformists*. Harper: Buffalo, 1844.

Neill, Edward D. *The Founders of Maryland as Portrayed in Manuscripts, Provincial Records, and Early Documents*. J. Munsell: Albany, 1876.

New, John F.H. *Anglican and Puritan: The Basis of Their Opposition*. Stanford University Press: Stanford, 1964.

O'Toole, James M. "New England Reactions to the English Civil Wars, 1640-1660." (Master's Thesis). College of William and Mary: Williamsburg, 1973.

Patterson, W.B. *King James VI and I and the Reunion of Christendom*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1998.

Pesta, Carla G. *The English Atlantic in an Age of Revolution, 1640-1661*. Harvard University Press: Cambridge, 2004.

Pincus, Steven C. A. *England's Glorious Revolution, 1688-1689: A Brief History With Documents*. Bedford/St. Martin's: Boston, 2006.

Questier, Michael. "Catholic Loyalism in Early Stuart England." *The English Historical Review*. Vol. 123. No. 504. 1132-1165.

Randall, Daniel R. *A Puritan Colony in Maryland*. Baltimore, MD: Genealogical Publishing Company, 1886.

Robbins, Caroline. *Eighteenth-Century Commonwealthman*. Atheneum: New York, 1968.

Rogers, Horatio. *Mary Dyer of Rhode Island: The Quaker Martyr who was Hanged at the Boston Common, June 1, 1660*. Preston and Rounds: Providence, 1896.

Rose, Jacqueline. *Godly Kingship in Restoration England: The Politics of Royal Supremacy, 1660-1688*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 2011.

Russell, Conrad. *The Causes of the English Civil War*. Clarendon Press: Oxford, 2009.

_____. *The Crisis of Parliaments: English History, 1509-1660*. Oxford University Press: Oxford, 1971.

Sharpe, Kevin. *The Personal Rule of Charles I*. Yale University Press: New Haven, 1992.

Shaw, William. *A History of the English Church During the Civil Wars and Under the Commonwealth, 1640-1660*. London: 1960.

Simpson, Philip L. *A Life of Gospel Peace: A Biography of Jeremiah Burroughs*. Reformation Heritage Books: Grand Rapids, 2011.

Singleton, Ogle R. *Early History of the Anglican Church in the Colonies*. Saint Mary's College of Maryland: Saint Mary's City, 2021.

Speck, W. A. *James II: Profiles in Power*. Pearson Education: London, 2002.

Sprunger, Keith L. *Dutch Puritanism: A History of English and Scottish Churches of the Netherlands in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1982.

_____. *The Learned Doctor William Ames: Dutch Backgrounds of English and American Puritanism*. University of Illinois Press: Urbana, 1972.

Stout, Harry. *The New England Soul: Preaching and Religious Culture in Colonial New England*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Stowell, William H. *History of the Puritans in England*. Thomas Nelson and Sons: Edinburgh, 1878.

Sutto, Antoinette. "Lord Baltimore, the Society of Jesus, and Caroline Absolutism in Maryland, 1630-1645." *Journal of British Studies*. Vol. 48. No. 3 (2009): 631-652.

_____. *Loyal Protestants and Dangerous Papists*. University of Virginia Press: Charlottesville, 2015.

Tinniswood, Adrian. *The Rainborowes*. Basic Books: New York, 2013.

Underdown, David. *Pride's Purge: Politics in the Puritan Revolution*. Oxford University Press: Oxford, 1971.

Waddington, John. *Congregational Church History: From the Reformation to 1662*. Jackson, Walford, and Hodder: London, 1863.

Wallace, Jr., Dewey D. *Puritanism and Predestination: Grace in English Protestant Theology, 1525-1695*. Wipf and Stock Publishers: Eugene, 2004.

_____. *Shapers of English Calvinism, 1660-1714: Variety, Persistence, Transformation*. Oxford University Press: Oxford, 2011.

Walsh, James P. " 'Black-Cotted Raskolls': Anti-Anglican Criticism in Colonial Virginia." *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography*. Vol. 80. No. 1 (1980): 21-36.

Webb, Stephen S. *Lord Churchill's Coup: The Anglo-American Empire and the Glorious Revolution Reconsidered*. Syracuse University Press: Syracuse, 1998.

Weber, Max. *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. Routledge Classics: New York, 1989.

Whichard, Rogers D. *The History of Lower Tidewater Virginia*. Lewis Historical Publishing Co.: New York, 1959.

Whitsach, Paul. *Tidewater Maryland*. The Bobbs Merrill Company: Indianapolis, 1931.

Wilkinson, Henry. *The Adventurers of Bermuda*. Oxford University Press: London, 1933.

Winship, Michael P. *Godly Republicanism: Puritans, Pilgrims, and a City on a Hill*. Harvard University Press: Cambridge, 2012.

_____. *Hot Protestants: A History of Puritanism in England and America*. Yale University Press: New Haven, 2018.

_____. *Making Heretics: Militant Protestantism and Free Grace, 1636-1641*. Princeton University Press: Princeton, 2002.

_____. *Puritans Divided: The Times and Trials of Anne Hutchinson*. University of Kansas Press: Lawrence, 2005.

_____. "Were There Any Puritans in New England?" *The New England Quarterly, 74*, 1 (2001): 118-138.

Wood, Gordon S. "Conspiracy and the Paranoid Style: Causality and Deceit in the Eighteenth Century." *The William and Mary Quarterly*. Vol. 39. No. 3 (1982): 401-441.

Woolrych, Austin. *Britain in Revolution, 1625-1660*. Oxford University Press: Oxford, 2002.

_____. "The Cromwellian Protectorate: A Military Dictatorship?" *History*. Vol. 75. No. 244 (1990): 207-231.

Woolverton, John F. "An Address Before the Convocation of Annapolis of the Protestant Episcopal Diocese of Maryland Commemmorating the 275th Anniversary of the Colonial Establishment of the Church of England in Maryland." Baltimore: 1967.

_____. *Colonial Anglicanism in North America*. Wayne State University: Detroit, 1984.

Worden, Blair. *God's Instruments: Political Conduct in the England of Oliver Cromwell*. Oxford University Press: Oxford, 2012.

Yule, George. *Puritans in Politics: the Religious Legislation of the Long Parliament, 1640-1647*. Sutton Courtenay Press: Melbourne, 1981.

Zakai, Avihu. "Orthodoxy in England and New England: Puritans and the Issue of Religious Toleration, 1640-1650." *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*. Vol. 135. No. 3 (1991). 403-441.

Ziff, Larzer. *The Career of John Cotton: Puritanism and the American Experience*. Princeton University Press: Princeton, 1962.