71-758

CORKRAN III, David Hudson, 1935-
THE NEW ENGLAND COLONISTS' ENGLISH IMAGE, 1550-1714.

University of California, Berkeley, Ph.D., 1970
History, modern

University Microfilms, A XEROX Company, Ann Arbor, Michigan

The New England Colonists' English Image, 1550-1714

By

David Hudson Corkran III

A.B. (Middlebury College) 1957
M.A. (University of California) 1960

DISSERTATION

Submitted in partial satisfaction of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in

History

in the

GRADUATE DIVISION

of the

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY

Approved:

Robert Middlekauff

Walter D. Jordan

Richard V. Bridgman

Committee in Charge

Degree conferred DEGREE CONFERRED MARCH 24, 1970
Date

# THE NEW ENGLAND COLONISTS' ENGLISH IMAGE

## 1550-1714

David H. Corkran III

TABLE OF CONTENTS


| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| I | GOD'S ENGLISH NATION, 1550-1620 | 7 |
| II | THE ENGLISH ISRAEL CORRUPTED, 1620-1660 | 40 |
| III | ANTICHRISTIAN ENGLAND, 1660-1688 | 76 |
| IV | GLORIOUS ENGLAND, 1689-1714 | 118 |
| V | CONCLUSION | 154 |
| | FOOTNOTES | 163 |
| | SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY | 196 |

# INTRODUCTION

This thesis was planned originally as a study of the eighteenth century American colonists' image of England. My intent was to examine how the colonists viewed the mother country prior to the American Revolution in hopes of throwing further light upon that event. The comprehensive nature of the topic necessitated an introductory chapter on its seventeenth century origins. Once the search for roots began, of course, it did not stop in the seventeenth century. While it would have been possible to find the origins of the colonists' English image in the Lollard movement of the fourteenth century, the English Reformation offered a more logical starting point. This was especially true since William Haller had just written a book which provided a good account of how sixteenth century English Protestants envisioned their nation. Haller's work helped to explain why eighteenth century colonists believed that England was the most glorious kingdom on earth, but it only hinted at why seventeenth century colonists in New England had a much darker picture of the mother country. Therefore the introductory chapter of the originally planned study had to explain why the colonists acquired a negative image of England in the seventeenth century and how that image was transformed into the positive one which predominated among colonists before 1764. As the materials for answering these questions accumulated, it became apparent that they contained a story within them-

selves. Since most of these materials pertained to New England, the present study emerged as an effort to trace the changes in the New England image of England during the first century of colonial existence.

I have tried to set the New England colonists' English image in the broadest possible context in order to account for all the influences which might account for its structure and intensity. I have treated an image as an idea which is connected in the mind with other ideas which influence it, and which it influences, as well as a concept which is dependent upon experience and outside information. A binary model incorporating positive and negative poles seemed to be the best instrument for explaining the internal structure of the colonists' English image because it accounted for the large amount of contradictory evidence at the same time it happily fit the Puritan penchant for consistent logic. The binary model also offered some help in measuring the intensity of the English image, since one element of the image often was dominant over the other. The problem of intensity was not solved by this device, however, since changes in structure of the image might or might not affect its intensity. The emotions which permeated the English image, moreover, were frequently confused and often dependent upon ideas and concepts which were difficult to focus around the topic. How intensely colonists felt about England thus appears far too infrequently in this study.

Ideas have been stressed as the most influential sources of the colonists' English image because primary sources and the relevant secondary works indicate their overwhelming importance. This is especially true of religious ideas, which formed the values through which most

seventeenth century New Englanders viewed England and everything else. The only comparable corpus of influential ideas was the common law, especially the Whig interpretation of it. Since there is a vast secondary literature on New England religious ideas, as well as plentiful source material, the influence of religious ideas has been elaborated in great detail. While I have tried to indicate the importance of the common law in the colonists' English image, this cannot be fully understood until there are histories of New England law equal to those which have been written about New England religion. Since political and social ideas were embedded in the religious and legal thought of most seventeenth century colonists, the influence of these ideas has been treated within their religious or social contexts.

I have emphasized the role of news from England in creating the colonists' English image because too often New England concepts have been treated as if they unfolded in an isolated context within the bounds of their own dialectic. Especially after the Restoration, New Englanders shared most of their ideas, values, and emotions with certain groups of English Dissenters. Thus two trans-Atlantic wings of Puritanism had a common viewpoint which encouraged similar images of England. Much of the colonists' information about English events came from their Dissenting brethren, so that it had already been filtered through the value system which was most congenial to the colonial intelligence. While colonists were critical of English reports, the informational link between the colonists and the Dissenters was important both in forming the colonists' English image and in confirming independently conceived colonial judgments.

The colonists' New England experience was an important element in the composition of their English image, yet it was difficult to determine the extent of its influence. The colonial experience was unique, yet this uniqueness had results which were hard to determine. It is clear, for instance, that the colonists felt alienated and isolated from England. Yet these feelings were not unique to New Englanders, but were felt by many Puritans and Dissenters who did not go to New England. The uniqueness of colonial alienation from England sprang from its greater intensity, an intensity inspired in part by distance and veneration for the holy superiority of New England institutions. How to measure this intensity and how to trace its effects have been recurring problems to which I have found only partial solutions.

It has been difficult to trace the roots of colonial Anglophilism, though the binary model of the colonists' English image provided a partial explanation after 1680, and especially after 1688. The problem of intensity is crucial here, however, since expedient utterance and true veneration for the mother country were invariably couched in the same rhetoric of adulation. To know whether or not a colonist was a true Anglophile required far more biographical information than was available in all but a handful of cases. In the absence of such information I have had to rely on evidence that it was the practical political situation, specifically the imposition of royal control and the Glorious Revolution, which gave the enormous impetus to Anglophilism among the colonists.

For both practical and theoretical reasons, I have foregone considering the problem of whether or not the colonists' English image coincided

with the English reality. Practically it seemed that the ambivalent English image solved the problem of reconciling contradictory impressions of English reality. From the standpoint of theory, it was (and is) impossible for the human mind to grasp entirely the reality of England. At the risk of being branded a neo-idealist, it seemed to me that the Puritans' perception lay more in the mind than in sensory perceptions. On the other hand I have tried to avoid treating the colonists' English image as purely a symbol subject to manipulation for literary or emotional effect, because the evidence indicates that England had concrete significance for the colonists even when dealt with in sermons, poetry, and other sources subject to literary analysis. My epistomological assumptions have been roughly those outlined in Kenneth Boulding's The Image, though I hope I have avoided the over-mechanical aspects of Boulding's model and the reductionist philosophy which informed much of his argument.

The shortcomings of this thesis are those of the author. Any merit it possesses owes much to several people whose help I deeply appreciate. The study was first conceived under the direction of Dr. Carl Bridenbaugh, without whose frequent encouragement it could not have been sustained. Dr. Robert Middlekauff's patience and criticism have been of invaluable assistance over an embarrassingly long gestation period. The John Carter Brown Library, Brown University, provided not only financial assistance but also a stimulating and friendly atmosphere for research. Librarian Thomas R. Adams offered fruitful suggestions, while his assistant, Glenn B. Skillin, and his secretary, Mrs. Dorothy Hardy, were never too busy to

search out material for me. I benefited greatly from the intelleotual qualities of Mrs. Joyce Ransome, former fellow of the John Carter Brown Library. To these individuals I extend sincere and hearty thanks.

David H. Corkran III
Portland, Oregon
Sept. 30, 1969

# CHAPTER I

## GOD'S ENGLISH NATION 1550-1620

"God is English"---Gerald Aylmer, 1560.

The story of the New England colonists' image of England most properly begins with an account of those ideas in sixteenth century English culture which shaped the Elizabethan Protestant's image of his nation. Along with much else, the men who lived under the Stuarts inherited their vision of England from the late sixteenth century. The New England colonists carried that image to America, where it continued to flourish despite alterations induced by time and events in both England and New England. Long after the first settlers had died out, the colonists' image of England continued to be the English Protestant's mental representation of England, distorted and displaced by peculiarly colonial values and needs, but English nevertheless. Among almost all Englishmen, colonial and domestic, the Elizabethan Protestant concept of England persisted through the seventeenth century and well into the eighteenth.

Four major ideas, and the impact of the Protestant Reformation on three of them, may be identified as important in the formation of the Elizabethan image of England. The first of these was a conviction that God had created a structured universe, and that nature and human existence reflected universal order and the will of God. The second notion, that Christian society was meant to be a unified whole composed of a hierarchy of separate parts, was intimately connected with the first, as was the third concept, which described the civil state and the church

as institutions for preserving order and Christianity in society. The fourth concept, more precisely a myth, adjusted the history of the English church and state to their ideal function as executors of God's will on earth. These ideas provided the mental lenses through which most Englishmen came to view England. Their theological cast made the nation's relationship to God the most pervasive single concern of several generations of statesmen, gentlemen, preachers and poets.

The belief that God had created an orderly world, which corresponded, or should correspond, to the coherent, hierarchically structured macrocosm was one of the more stable ideas of the era. Sixteenth century Englishmen were by and large convinced that the order of their world manifested the connection between worldly existence and divine omnipotence. The ideal Christian society fully partook of the temporal congruence with universal order. In theory its purpose was to glorify God and care for man according to the Lord's precepts. These ends were to be achieved by the division of society into hierarchical orders and the assignment to each rank of a specific function necessary to the welfare of the whole. The blessed society was marked by the harmonious working of its constituent parts.[1] Diversity and degree were supposed to be comprehended within an archetectonic structure whose temporal objective was the commonweal.

Traditionally the church universal had claimed transcendent authority over Christendom on the assumption that Christ's spiritual kingdom extended to all men. Theoretically Christian society was synonymous with the Catholic church. Marsiglio of Padua had long since questioned this

assumption by suggesting civil supremacy over the church, and by late medieval times the stronger dynasties had gained a great deal of control over the church within their jurisdictions. Yet the idea of a Christian society unified by the all embracing church persisted, as did the corollary assumption that temporal and spiritual authority came from God. It was a commonplace notion that the power of the magistrate was limited by the will of God, and that rulers transgressed at their peril God's laws for the welfare of the church and the whole society.

Most sixteenth century Englishmen thought that the historic English church had been uniquely successful in fulfilling its mission to propagate the faith. Legend taught that the ancient Britons had received the gospel from the successors to the apostles, and that the true church had flourished in England ever since. The skeptical expatriated Italian humanist Polydore Virgil repeated the story in 1516.[2] In 1554 Cardinal Pole told Parliament that God had made England first among Christian nations, and that she had been a major instrument in furthering the spread of Christianity.[3] John Foxe reproduced what he thought was a Lollard document of 1391 which supported the idea that the English had early received the gospel and never forsaken it.[4] The myth that the English church had survived and flourished for centuries was deeply rooted in the English consciousness.

The English Reformation made slight but important modifications in English concepts about society, state, and the Church, and created somewhat greater changes in Englishmen's interpretations of their church history. Englishmen still believed in an organic society, but the

crown's assumption of the headship of the church meant that society was to coincide with the dynastic state rather than with the church universal.[5] "Is not everye Chrysten common wealthe the folde of Christes shepe, the house of hys famylye?" asked Thomas Lever in 1550.[6] Lever and other "Commonwealthmen" envisioned a unified Protestant English society under the guidance of a temporal authority which would use its power for the spiritual ends of upholding order and promoting the welfare of the church.

When he assumed control over the English church Henry VIII invested the crown with the spiritual responsibilities hitherto held by the church. The magistrate thus became for practical reasons much more intimately involved in the promotion of the subject's spiritual welfare, an involvement which was reflected in the thought of the age by an increased emphasis on the godly qualifications necessary for effective civil rulers. Thomas Lever informed Edward VI and his council that they were to play the role of temporal and spiritual shepherds just as Christ had done when he fed the multitude with loaves and fishes. Lever insisted that it was incumbent upon civil rulers to uphold God's rule on earth by reforming the church and protecting the lower orders of society from harm by their betters.[7] Lever, like other "Commonwealthmen," also had much to say about the godly obligations of the lower orders to stay in place and do their duty. But it is clear that he laid the greatest stress on the ruler's obligation to govern in a moral fashion, and the divine grace or displeasure which would fall on the English state according to the merits of its rulers.[8]

Henry VIII's political reformation had furthered the tendency to redefine the church as coterminus with the state. But the denial of papal authority was shortly made on theological as well as political grounds. Out of that denial and a different interpretation of the sacraments all the Protestant versions of the church were then arising. The English reformers shared with their continental brethren the problem of meeting Catholic charges that they were heretics and that their churches were upstart usurpers of traditional Christianity. The Protestants' reply to Catholic aspersions was to reinterpret Christian history so that it validated the claims of their churches. English Protestants reexpressed the myth of the church in England in terms calculated to show that it was a Protestant rather than the Catholic Church which had been early established and nurtured through the years on English soil.

The main thrust of the English Protestant reinterpretation of church history followed the lines drawn by the continental reformers. To them papal authority and the mass were inventions of the devil who had established the pope, or Antichrist, to subvert the true church of Christ. This view of history was derived from the Bible, particularly the book of Revelation, which was thought to foretell the Reformation struggles in the symbolism of the Apocalypse.[9]

The English version of the apocalyptic image of history was expressed by the exiled John Bale in two books written at the end of Henry VIII's reign. Bale was sure that true Christianity had been early established in England, but in his pages English history became a story of the

struggle between Englishmen loyal to the pure faith and foreigners intent upon imposing papal supremacy and erecting the religion of Satan. For Bale the Lollards had been the defenders of the true English church against the machinations of the Pope, and he claimed for the English church the distinction of never having completely succumbed to the domination of Antichrist.[10] This turned the myth of the English church to Protestant ends, and implicitly furthered the identification of the English church as a separate institution. Thus partisan polemics modified the myth of the English church. The full development of the Protestant version of English church history had to await the confirmation of doctrinal changes, but its major outlines were in the process of formation long before adoption of the Thirty-Nine Articles.

Bale might celebrate the land as an ancient Protestant nation, but mid-sixteenth century England did not correspond with the ideals of those who took seriously the belief that God had ordained a unified, hierarchical, moral, and God-fearing society. To "Commonwealthmen" like Thomas Lever and John Bradford the social and political unrest and moral laxity of their age were manifestations of the sins of England. While they approved of Henry VIII's break with Rome and Edward VI's First Prayer Book, they were sure that God would punish if not destroy a corrupt and sinful nation for violating His rules for personal and national existence.[11]

To Thomas Lever, the sins of Englishmen were on the verge of destroying the ordered Christian society desired by God. The communism advocated by Ket's rebels threatened to eliminate the functional distinctions between those several parts without which social existence was in-

comprehensible.[12] But the leveling tendencies of the people had been provoked by their ruler's pursuit of private gain to the neglect of the common welfare. Plural officeholders who ignored their responsibilities taught "develyshe disorder."[13] Covetousness was the root sin, which caused all classes of men to look first to their own lusts rather than to their divinely appointed social tasks. Not until men forsook ambition for the doing of their social duty could God be expected to bless the land with harmony and prosperity.[14]

Lever laid great stress upon the sins of the rulers in failing to fulfill their divine obligations to provide for the people's welfare.[15] God's wrath would be visited upon the whole society for the ruler's transgressions, which in the England of 1550 included the allowing of enclosures, diverting benefices and monastic charity to private use, countenancing pluralism in the church, and failing to vigorously promote the spread of Protestant principles.[16] These corruptions were so abominable that Lever forecast that God would utterly destroy the land if they were not remedied.[17]

England had not received the Gospel to Lever's satisfaction, another evil sure to provoke the Lord's chastisement.[18] The way to achieve national happiness was to get rid of pluralists and Catholic priests, and to devote the spoils of the monasteries to education and charity.[19] But England was far from being blessed, because the occasion of "godly charitable reformation" had become an exercise in "worldly covetous corruption."[20]

The principle that a ruler brought wrath upon the land by violating his stewardship to rule according to divine precept was one of the most

important criteria of whether England was blessed or damned in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. If a ruler's performance did not approximate the religious and social ideals of his articulate subjects, they looked for divine displeasure not only upon him but upon his kingdom as well. Similar anger would be vented against a people who disobeyed their rulers, who failed in their appointed tasks, and who persisted in breaking the ten commandments. The list of provoking sins was long, and in part depended upon an individual's political position and his religious persuasion. Even though their nation seemed to be marching toward a more lively Protestantism, reformers like Lever had so deep a sense of social and national sin that England appeared to them corrupted to the point that God might be justified in leaving her to the horrors of social dissolution.

Bad as things might be, the prospects of returning the English church to apostolic purity through doctrinal and liturgical reform remained as long as Edward VI lived. But when it became apparent that the frail young king would not survive, and that Mary Tudor's claim to the throne had widespread support, the reformers had additional reasons for foreboding. During Lent, 1553, Lever preached at Court and "planelie spak the desolation of the comon weill, and the plagues which suld follow schortlie."[21] A few months later, after having supported the claims of the Warwick faction, he was himself fleeing the plague of a renascent Catholicism brought about by the accession of Mary.

Mary's attempt to reimpose Catholicism had both immediate and long range effects upon the Englishman's concept of his nation. For the nonce

it revived the credibility of the Catholic version of the myth of the English church, which Cardinal Pole repeated before Parliament when he arrived to reconcile the nation with Rome. To Pole the last twenty years had been an aberration in the nation's ecclesiastical history which he hoped to rectify so that the English church might once again assume its rightful position as a primary component of Catholic Christendom.[22]

The reformer's concept of English church history was also affected by the five years of Catholic supremacy. Martyrdom of their Protestant brethren at the hands of Mary's bishops made the vision of a struggle between the church of Christ and that of Antichrist much more vivid to the Marian exiles. The fate of the martyrs gave ample evidence to support the apocalyptic reinterpretation of English church history along the lines already set forth by John Bale. The exiles printed the martyr's stories to show that stout Englishmen were still opposing an apparently victorious Antichrist, evidence that the true faith remained in England, as it always had, despite persecution.[23]

The belief that two antagonistic churches were dueling for the possession of Christendom was only heightened by the exiles' contact with the advanced reform notions prevalent in Zurich, Basel, and Geneva. Though the various English exile congregations were torn by disputes over polity and doctrine, few individuals emerged from expatriation without some more radical ideas about liturgy, polity, or doctrine.[24] This meant that in later years some were far more disposed to condemn the church of England when it did not live up to the ideals they had imbibed on the continent. The reformers' more radical ideas, however, did

not affect their image of England until the Vesterian Controversy flared up and Elizabeth blocked their thrust toward Presbyterianism. In the meantime they gained a solid foothold in the English Church from which they created a Protestant interpretation of the myth of the English Church and Nation as God's special instruments on earth.

The apocalyptic vision of history embodied those yearnings for final union with God for which St. John had provided the archetype in Revelation. From Revelation the reformers learned that Christians responded to persecution with the conviction that Christ would soon return to earth to destroy their enemies and reward their faithfulness. Moreover, fire and blood were a part of the sixteenth century reformers' experience. Since Revelation foretold the persecution of the Saints in the course of the final judgment against Antichrist and the reprobate, Protestants concluded that their era could be understood by the correct interpretation of St. John's vision.[25]

English Protestant interpretations of Revelation bore marked similarities to continental versions, but events in England created a local variation on the common theme. Like continental reformers, John Bale and his protégé John Foxe thought that the Christian church had lived in peace and comparative purity after the Roman persecution, as St. John had foretold it would. That period had been succeeded by the release of Satan and the subversion of the Catholic church into the church of Antichrist. Peace had given way to conflict between the upholders of the true church such as Wycliffe, Huss, and Luther, and the minions of Antichrist. The war between the elect and Satan, the most important phase of history, was likely to end at any moment with the triumph of the true faith and the vanquishing of Antichrist.[26]

The accession of the Protestant Elizabeth to the throne appeared to the reformers as a miraculous deliverance by God similar if not identical to those forecast in Revelation. Elizabeth's religious views (even though her Protestantism was motivated by political considerations) and her need to encourage the reformers, were proof to them that the great moment for a new heaven and a new earth had arrived. The Marian exiles hastened back to take part in this new world by fastening a reformed church on England and convincing the English people that God's design for their nation was firm adherence to the true Protestant faith.[27]

"God is English," John Aylmer exulted in a tract celebrating Elizabeth's arrival on the throne. Aylmer's intent was to show that England's divinely ordained task under the new monarch was to pursue reformation and eliminate Catholicism. Bishop Jewel, even before the reformers had a chance to firmly entrench themselves in the church, was declaring that Protestantism was the true ancient faith of the realm and that it had remained so despite persecution and the intrusion of corrupt practices.[28]

It remained for John Foxe to crystallize the Elizabethan Protestant reformers' image of England by combining New Testament prophecy, Old Testament precedent, and current history. In the successive editions of his Acts and Monuments, Foxe incorporated the old legend of England's religious primacy into the apocalyptic vision of history. Foxe, like Bale before him, represented the English portion of the struggle against Antichrist as the "contention of the English rulers and people against the alien intruders for ever seeking to subvert the English state and corrupt the English church by open violence or by false doctrine and evil example."[29] Foxe repeated the story that the disciples of the Apostles

had brought Christianity to England, and that an English King had soon established the gospel throughout the land. Foxe believed with Pole that England had been instrumental in propagating the faith across Europe. Through persecution from foreign adversaries and corruption brought in from Rome, English Kings had fought tyranny and corruption and English religious figures had defended the pure faith. At that dark hour when the tide of Antichrist held almost universal sway over Christendom, Englishman John Wycliffe had arisen as the champion of the true church. His influence had spread to Huss and others on the continent, and in him Foxe saw the spiritual father of the Reformation.[30]

Foxe climaxed his history of the Protestant church in England with the story of the Antichristian persecutions under Mary, and the deliverance of the faithful and the church by the accession of Elizabeth. In the 1563 edition of Acts and Monuments Foxe claimed that with Elizabeth's elevation to the throne God had saved the English nation. In 1570 he warned against a reversion to popery, and reminded his readers that God had reformed the English church beyond all others. Elizabeth's queenship was the greatest example of that special mercy which God had always bestowed upon England, and marked the triumph of the reformed faith there. With this interpretation Foxe cast the legend of England's religious primacy into a Protestant mould.[31]

Foxe was sure that God had intervened continuously to save England, but he was equally convinced that English history demonstrated the validity of the Old Testament principles which governed a nation's relationship to God. Informed by the same social theory held by Thomas Lever,

Foxe's interpretation of English history undertook to show that when a ruler transgressed God's law and the people sinned, God inflicted suitable punishment with rebellion, war, plague, and a multitude of other afflictions.[32]

Like all other men of his era, Foxe thought that a godly monarch was necessary for the welfare of temporal and spiritual society. He and the other reformers wanted a vigorously Protestant sovereign. They could not afford to do without Elizabeth, however, for she was the only hedge between them and the Catholic Mary Queen of Scots. Elizabeth in her turn needed the reformers since they were the only available churchmen on whom she could even partially rely. Foxe accommodated his ideas to this situation by identifying Elizabeth as one of the godly sent by the Lord to rescue the nation. In the 1563 edition of Acts and Monuments he proclaimed her as a protomartyr, and invested her with the same sanctity that he was fashioning for those who had recently immolated themselves under her predecessor.[33]

However he may have regarded Elizabeth as a Deborah sent to save her people, Foxe assumed that it was his duty to inform her of her obligations as a godly ruler just as Lever had instructed Edward and his councillors.[34] The primary problem as Foxe saw it was the maintenance and development of a strong Protestant church. English history proved the axiom that the state could not survive if the church did not flourish: "...when the Church of Christ beggineth to be injured with violence and go to wrack through misorder and negligence, the state of the commonwealth cannot long endure without some alteration and strike of God's correction."[35] Foxe's intent was to forestall the possibility that the Reformation might be thwarted in England again, which he regarded as a po-

tential political and religious disaster.

The Protestant reinterpretation of the legend of England's religious primacy and Foxe's inclusion of Elizabeth within the folds of that myth found increasingly wide acceptance among Englishmen. In the Parliament of 1572 Speaker Bell told Elizabeth that God had made her as a shield for the afflicted church throughout Europe,[36] and Christopher Yelverton claimed that England was "the spectacle of religion throughout all Christendom;...."[37] Sir Walter Mildmay told the Commons in 1581 that Elizabeth had restored the realm to the pure and holy religion of the gospel.[38] When the papal bull excommunicating Elizabeth arrived in 1570, William Cecil composed a reply in which he recounted the same legend of the history of true religion in England which appeared in Foxe's pages.[39] Elizabethan expansionist literature was saturated with the idea that England had been specially chosen to extend the domain of the gospel.[40]

England might be God's elect nation, but even elect nations could sin grievously. Indeed, being specially favored by God laid a community under correspondingly heavy obligations to fulfill His will, making its iniquity all the greater. Thus the concept of the elect nation generated its obverse image of a degenerate people chastised, destroyed, or dispersed by the Lord's displeasure. The Bible was replete with examples of the heinous sins of the Chosen People, and the punishments inflicted therefor. As long as the Old Testament was thought to embody the principles by which God regulated the fortunes of nations, and as long as Englishmen insisted upon drawing a parallel between their nation and the ancient Israel, they could not avoid holding an ambivalent image of

England. English history revealed God's favor to the nation which justified celebration of its special status, but no one could ignore the prevalence of the same sins in England which had brought the Lord's vengeance upon Israel.

At the same time that Foxe's interpretation of England's religious primacy was gaining widespread popularity, many a sermon was preached against the provoking sins of the land. These sermons, in the tradition of Thomas Lever, were by preachers of all shades of Protestant opinion. The orthodox (as opposed to Puritan) prebend of Salisbury, Adam Hill, spent two hours at Paul's Cross in 1593 elaborating on the parallel between the sins of Sodom and those of London in a sermon subsequently published as The Crie Of England. Hill warned of the sure results of persistence in "the idolatry of papists, blasphemy, swearing, profanation of the Sabbath, murder, sodomy, whoredom, oppression of the poor, rebellion, atheism, pride in apparel, idleness, Martin Marprelate, sacrilege, drunkenness, corruption of the magistrate, seditious talk, simony, covetousness."[41] Just as Thomas Lever had warned against corruption while in the midst of the Edwardian Reformation, so Hill and many others testified against the iniquity of the land in the palmier days of Elizabeth. While the defeat of the Armada and the frustration of the Powder Plot enhanced the myth of England's favor with God, the preachers continued to bewail the sins of the land. On the one hand they expounded a messianic nationalism; on the other they called England to repentance under the threat of the Lord's displeasure.[42]

The concept of England as both blessed and threatened by God was

acute among the more radical Elizabethan Protestant reformers. From early in the reign there was a vocal minority of extremists who were convinced that England's transgressions against God's laws were far greater than her adherence to His rule. Like their more moderate comrades, these men accepted the concept of England's religious primacy. Rather than celebrating the English Reformation, however, they bewailed its shortcomings, and foretold the Lord's vengeance upon the nation for failing to adopt their version of the principles of national righteousness.

Presbyterian demands for a more reformed church were one source of the extreme reformers' ambivalent image of England as an elect nation. While they had to admit that God had favored England in the past, it was obvious to Presbyterians that the present national ecclesiastical polity did not coincide with what Cartwright and Beza taught was the true form of church organization. Judged by the standards of Geneva ("that best reformed and most blessed Church and Citie of God...as yet is in all the world..."),[43] England was reformed in doctrine but not in polity and liturgy, and now that doctrine had been settled matters of polity and liturgy were becoming more important. If England did not accept the Lord's best discipline, she was failing to uphold His kingdom on earth and risked the loss of status and destruction visited upon those chosen ones who rebelled against God.[44] When the Presbyterian ministerial meetings were suppressed Thomas Wood wrote Leicester and Burghley that the preachers who warned against God's wrath to come were ignored as in the time of Edward VI. Wood believed that the state of religion had been better in Edward's days, for then reformation had gone forward even with

little knowledge of the truth, while currently reformation regressed despite increasing knowledge. Wood warned the two councillors of the Lord's chastisement to come on the land because the government refused to institute Presbyterianism. God had delivered England from bondage and restored the gospel to her, and therefore she was in greater danger from His displeasure than when Edward had ruled.[45] Years later William Fuller expressed the same ambivalence when he warned Elizabeth against continuing to countenance Antichristianism and immorality. To the Queen herself he wrote that it was "plaine and evident by the same worde and otherwise that those kings, kingdomes, states and people (notwithstanding thei had bene never so well beloved, enriched and long borne with,) were yet at length, after manie admonitions, threateninges, sore strokes, and no repentance and amendement, either greatlye scourged and plagued, or utterlie destroied by God himself,...and the more and longer he had loved them, and done for them, and borne with them, the more terrible and horrible for example to posterities."[46]

Fuller also believed that God would destroy the land for its social sins. Besides the offensive compromises which Elizabeth practiced in religion, politics, and foreign affairs, she was failing to prevent murder, adultery, fornication, thievery, false witness bearing, and covetousness. If she did not repent, Fuller predicted that God would overthrow Queen, church, and state. Conversely repentance would bring God's blessings on the land.[47]

The roots of the zealous Puritans' ambiguous image of England grew out of their awareness of biblical precedent and their consciousness that reality did not coincide with what they regarded as God's will. Like

Foxe they were sure that England had been specially blessed because of the reforms which had been achieved and solidified, but like William Fuller they also feared that reform had not gone far enough and that God's displeasure would bring to England the same fate which ultimately overtook the Jews.[48] At times this ambivalence extended to the Queen herself. The six Norwich ministers who petitioned William Cecil in 1576 for relief from the enforcement of conformity lamented the sins of the land which had set "so godlie a prince" against "so godlie a cause" as that of Presbyterian reformation.[49] Whatever Foxe might write, it was much more difficult for the extreme reformers to continue to identify English political-religious life under Elizabeth with the triumph of his version of reformation, for the realities simply did not fit the ideal. But at the same time they had to admit that under Elizabeth England had been more blessed by God than "anie of our neighbours round us..." and acknowledge the benefits of her reign.[50]

The apocalyptic interpretation of history reinforced the reformers' ambivalent attitude toward their country at a crucial point. If history was the manifestation of the struggle between the church of Christ and that of Antichrist, it stood to reason that those who opposed the saints in their efforts at reformation were necessarily Satan's protagonists. The virulent anti-episcopal sentiment which arose under Elizabeth owed much to the fear and hatred of Antichrist. Such feelings were directed against the bishops who had to carry out Elizabeth's desires for uniformity, and who appeared to the reformers to be assuming the same role as persecutors of the saints which they had played under Mary. The reformers

believed that these remnants of Antichristianism were provoking evils on the land. They thought that eliminating bishops would bring an end to "persecution" and opposition to further reformation, actions which they could only regard as signs of God's favor.

By 1585 there were a few Separatists who were ready to declare that the Church of England retained so many Antichristian elements that it was not a true church. The logic of the Separatist position implied neither nation nor rulers which supported such a church could be termed Christian. Robert Browne flatly declared that any magistrate who opposed the ministers' desire for reformation was no Christian.[51] In a dispute with conforming Puritans early in the seventeenth century, John Robinson employed the most unbecoming biblical similes to describe England's corruptions. Holy days and episcopal government made the nation another apostate Israel. England was similar to Babylon because the bishops lorded their power over the elect, and was comparable to Egypt because she was plagued with spiritual ignorance. The nation was also another Sodom in Robinson's mind, since she abounded in "pride, fulness of bread, idleness, and want of mercy toward the poor...with contempt of heavenly admonition."[52] Browne declared that Elizabeth's reformation was no reformation,[53] and while Robinson was slightly more charitable he did not believe that Elizabeth's settlement was comparable to the biblical standards for correction.[54] The Separatists through their dependence upon the Word thus tended to cut themselves off from the myth of the English Reformation. But not even the Robinson wing of the Puritans could completely abandon the concept of England as the elect nation, as William Bradford later was to demonstrate.

The myth of a protestant England appears to have kept many Puritans from reaching the extreme position of Browne and Robinson that England was hopelessly corrupt. It appeared among Robinson's conforming sympathizers, with whom he conducted that internecine warfare characteristic of reformers whose extensive agreement only lends acrimony to their comparatively minor differences. Robert Parker, William Ames, and William Bradshaw virtually agreed with Robinson's definition of the true church as the faithful gathered together into a semi-autonomous, covenanted congregation, with the power to choose a minister. But where Robinson saw no correlation between this ideal and the English polity, Ames and Parker attempted to demonstrate that it yet survived from ancient Christian times beneath the admitted corruptions of the English hierarchy and the abuses of the parish system.[55] They claimed the same tradition of ecclesiastical continuity to which Foxe and Cecil had appealed in support of the Elizabethan settlement. Even with their modified Presbyterian polity (Perry Miller's "Non-Separating Congregationalism"), they were maintaining the earlier Elizabethan contention that the English Church, though corrupted, was still the true church of Christ. Such a claim expressed the conviction that the Protestant myth of the English Church was true and gave historical sanction to a system of polity otherwise derived almost completely from scripture and vulnerable to the charge that it was a creation of fallible human reason. It was the standard argument from history with which most Protestants answered Catholic charges that their church was a new invention.

The early seventeenth century Puritan's image of England oscillated

between the poles of national election and national reprobation. Which pole was emphasized depended upon current events and the viewer's social and religious ideals. The signs of God's favor to the land cheered Richard Sibbes who recalled that "God was home in '88,"[56] and who declared that England was more "glorious than any place beyond the seas..." because Christ was more fully revealed there and thousands were converted.[57] John Cotton believed that Christ still dwelt in the English Church.[58] On the other hand Robert Gray, contemplating the sins of the land, warned that "Though England be a Paradise for pleasure, a storehouse of wealth, and a rich Exchequer of all plenty and delights;...yet if God once visit this land and citie, for the sins of the inhabitants thereof neither this nor that, neither the largeness of their territories, nor their beauty, excellence, riches, or multitude of people shall excuse them, but he will make them as Sodom, and like unto Gomorrha."[59]

How the ambivalent image of England existed within the mind of a Puritan preacher and how opposite sides of the image were called forth by various events appears in the sermons of the great Ipswich preacher Samuel Ward. Some time before 1615, Ward preached on Revelation 3. 19. ("Bee Zealous") in an attempt to stir his parishioners to greater piety. Complaining about the nation's spiritual state, Ward compared England with the church at Laodocia--as being first and ablest in the blessings of God, and having the best laws and civility, but as also being lukewarm in its affection for Christ.[60] In this case it was the individual's temperate love of God which might provoke Him to "spue us out of his

mouth." Ward in this sermon depicted the Armada and the Powder Plot as near misses of the Lord's wrath against the nation.[61]

About 1618 Ward preached another sermon before the Suffolk Assizes, devoted to the duties of the godly magistrate. In the course of this explication he inveighed against a long list of civil and legal malpractices and corruptions. Anticipating the objection that his suggested reforms smacked of Utopia, Ward declared that the only way to repair the ruin of a dying world was to restore government to its original purity. It is clear that at this point he believed that there were very serious flaws in England's "laws and civility."[62]

When the Spanish Match failed in 1623, however, and Charles and Buckingham returned ready for revenge upon the False Don the image of England specially blessed sprang with great force to preacher Ward's mind: God had "lifted us up to heaven" and "severed this Island with the seas of his Mercies from all the world besides, and bordering Kingdomes round about, setting it as a Queen in the middest of them, to heare newes of warres, pestilence, bloodshed, and desolations, not to feele the least disturbance from within or without, scarce to here a dog bark against its long continued peace, unmatchable in present or past examples."[63] The Lord had also given England a lustrous church, with plenty of light, learning, preaching, and knowledge, as well as glorious salvations from invasion and treason, "such that Israel was never more honored."[64] Ward hoped that this event was a beginning for righting the wrongs of the land, for he knew that England was still corrupted. The normal thanks which Englishmen returned for their blessings

were idolatry, swearing, uncleanliness, drunkenness, lies, and a host of other familiar sins. Personal and national reformation were needed if God were not to destroy the English Church and nation.[65]

National and personal reformation were not forthcoming, however, in the later years of the reign of King James I, nor under his son Charles. Puritan efforts to reform the nation's morals and religious practices were not countenanced by the Court except temporarily under political pressure from Parliament. To the Puritans it seemed as if English society were collapsing around their heads, while their advice, which they equated with God's injunctions, was ignored. As the third decade of the seventeenth-century advanced, the widening gap between the reformers' ideals and the state of English society pushed the Puritans' image of England further toward the antithetical extreme of the elect nation. More moderate Puritans began to speak of the nation as corrupt and degenerate in the idiom which had found expression in Lever's sermons, the ultra-Presbyterian and Separatist polemics of Elizabeth's day, and John Robinson's strictures earlier in the seventeenth century.

Though the Presbyterian Classis movement had been crushed in the 1590's, an amorphous Puritan church reform movement persisted. Its major element appears to have been a widespread belief that reform of all sorts could be induced by an extended preaching of the Word. There were also a latent anti-episcopal sentiment, and several less uniformly held objections to the English liturgy. The idea of social and religious reform through placing a preacher in every benefice in England had been advocated for years, by Thomas Lever and Sir Francis Bacon among others.[60]

Samuel Ward brought the scheme up again in 1623,[67] and the Feoffees of Impropriations attempted to implement it. But the government rightly feared the political implications of Puritan ministers at local power points, and Laud suppressed the Feoffees in 1633.[68] Long before, Laud's efforts to impose liturgical uniformity on the Diocese of London had served to stir up anti-episcopal sentiment, and after 1633 Puritan church reform impulses appear to have been diverted more and more into the attacks on bishops which reached the apogee of expression in Prynne's writings.[69] Once again the bishops appeared to the Puritans as the minions of a persecuting Antichrist, and the Lord's displeasure with the corruptions of the English Church could be deduced from the fact that He allowed the godly to suffer at the hands of the hierarchy.

It was not only corruption of the church which excited the reformer's apprehensions. English law and its administration also appeared to have deteriorated from their original purity. Nathaniel Ward noted that in the law, "corruption has grown grosse,"[70] an observation hardly limited to Puritan circles as Sir Francis Bacon's legal reform proposals indicate.[71] But Puritans learned from Christopher St. Germain and John Foxe that English law had been derived from the word of God,[72] a proposition which lead to the conclusion that legal corruption was as offensive to the Lord as an impure church.

The reformers proposed to remedy the defects in the law by structural change and personal reformation of its administrators. Nathaniel Ward devised a project for reforming "officers and offices" of the law,

but suppressed it as too extreme.[73] His brother Samuel Ward preached an assize sermon which Nathaniel thought was more suited to the cause of legal renovation. Samuel denounced delays in justice, advocated settling petty cases out of court, and expressed provincial annoyance at the centralization of justice in London.[74] The implicit remedies suggested by this analysis of legal corruption were simplification and decentralization, steps which were to find many advocates in England and New England in ensuing years.[75]

The Puritan put most of his effort for legal improvement into reforming those who enforced the law. Samuel Ward devoted a good portion of his assize sermon to excoriating mercenary lawyers, justices who settled suits by favoritism or bribery, and constables who haled men into court on false charges in order to collect blackmail.[76] As an antidote he endeavoured to inculcate those godly attributes which were to enable magistrates to discern and act in accordance with God's law. Rulers, Ward told the assizes, should "heed the 'Holy Writ' for the venerable antiquity of it...in which respect it must needs be of sovereign use for discovering and reforming whatsoever error time has soiled governments withall."[77] Godly magistrates were to be honest and impartial, discipline corrupt minor officials, and encourage respect for justice by behaving justly. They were to promote virtue by their example and punish vice with their authority.[78] If they walked righteously before God, Ward assured his listeners, He would give them the moral power to rule justly.

Ward's characterization of the good magistrate was the concept of

the godly ruler particularized into the program of personal behaviour and public action to which Puritans believed all persons in authority should adhere. To this program the Stuarts did not adhere, as far as the Puritans were concerned. In fact, legal reform was beyond the power of any English government. Ecclesiastical reform could not have been left to the Puritan "Zeal o' the Land Busy's" without a dangerous weakening of Crown authority. In the struggle over whose version of the Sabbath should be observed, the Crown effectively asserted practices which were anathema to the Puritans.

In their attempts to implement various reforms the Puritans had the support of many men in the House of Commons. It was through that institution that respected Puritans like John Pym hoped to steer the nation back to true godliness. It seemed to them that the traditional rights of Englishmen were God-given, a simple extension of the idea expressed by Foxe and St. Germain that English law grew out of divine inspiration. On the grounds that Magna Charta embodied God's rule John Davenport told Lady Mary Vere that nobles and others had a right to keep chaplains.[80] An anonymous Puritan writer sought to clothe the common law case against the Crown with divine sanction by explicitly linking parliamentary claims to God's word. If the magistrate violated the customary rights of Englishmen, he was violating the rules which God had sent to the English nation.[81] Assertion of the prerogative thus became a sin against the Lord.

The personal lives of the monarchs and their courtiers were not such as to inspire any more confidence in their godliness than were their

domestic policies. James' favorites pandered to his perversion and engaged in large scale peculations, while Charles was suspect because of his Catholic wife. Roger Williams later remembered Charles as "a swearer from his youth, and an oppressor and persecutor of good men..." and charged both Charles and James with many "Blasphemous cruelties."[82]

Foreign affairs heightened Puritan pessimism about the domestic scene.[83] Disfavor at Court and harrassment from some bishops gave rise to feelings of persecution, which were reinforced by realization that Protestantism was being severely shaken in the maelstrom of the Thirty Years' War. It was all too easy to imagine that the fate of Bohemia would overtake England.[84] Apocalyptic expectations turned toward the prophecy that a time of troubles and persecution would precede the coming of the new heaven and the new earth, during which England would suffer greatly.[85] A pervasive tone of foreboding crept into Puritan sermons,[86] which were turned into "complaints and threateninges" of God's wrath shortly to fall upon the nation.[87]

Puritans who ultimately emigrated to New England were among those who were most convinced that England was deeply corrupted. As early as 1622 John Winthrop feared that the nation had seen its best days.[88] In 1626 Hugh Peter cried that there was "sin enough in the Court, city, country university to take away peace and prince."[89] John Wilson wrote a long poem on England's deliverances under God, in which he stressed the unthankfulness of the land for its blessings.[90] By 1629 Winthrop was sure that some judgment was imminent, for the Lord had "admonished, threatened, corrected and astonished us," and yet the land grew worse.[91] Winthrop's Suffolk neighbour Robert Reyce urged

him not to leave, but agreed that even though some "blynde lights" thought that everything was well, the land had degenerated. Reyce summed up the reformers' sense of the nation's failings in one breath. England was where "we mourn for justice, crying sins go unpunished, cruelty and blood are in the streets, the land abounds with murder, slaughter, incest, adultery, whoredome, drunkeness, oppression, pride; well doing is not maintained, or the godly cherished, but Idolatry and popery are countenanced."[92] To someone who attempted to dissuade him from leaving England, Winthrop replied that the land imitated Sodom in pride and intemperance, Laodocia in tepid piety, Ephesus and Sardis for the sins which resulted in the removal of their churches, the Turks in their sacrilege, and the synagogue of Antichrist. He asked "what good is there to save us," and indicated that the violent political controversies (the Parliament of 1628 had just been dissolved) were another sign of the Lord's impending displeasure.[93]

According to Cotton Mather, whose point of view may have been warped by hindsight of the English Civil War, many of the ministers who migrated to New England foresaw troublesome times and removed to avoid them. Mather related that Thomas Hooker, preaching an assize sermon, "declared freely the sins of England, and the Plagues that would come from such sins" and in his prayer paraphrased Malachi 2: 11., 12., "An abomination is committed, Judah has married the daughter of a strange God, the Lord will cut off the man that does this."[94] Francis Higginson foresaw that England's iniquity would warrant rebuke with a war.[95] One of Richard Mather's six reasons for leaving

England was (in his grandson's words) removal from a place "where there were fearful signs of Desolation" to a safer clime.[96] Jonathan Burr foresaw a "dismal Storm coming upon the Nation," and also came over.[97] Cotton Mather indicated that other ministers migrated to New England out of similar motives.[98]

The depth of the Puritan sense of the iniquity of England was expressed by Thomas Hooker sometime between 1629 and 1633 when he preached a farewell sermon before fleeing to Holland or New England. Later published under the title The Danger of Desertion, Hooker's sermon was a stinging accusation that England had violated God's laws by breaking the terms of His external covenant. The terms of the covenant were that the land practice the proper outward forms of worshipping God and sincere reformation of "things that be amisse."[99] England's rejection of the Puritan ministers who advocated "God's ordinances" made it clear that she was weary of God and fat for the slaughter.[100] Using a frequently repeated metaphor, Hooker portrayed magistrates and ministers as the hedges which protected society from sin and evil. One could tell that God was leaving England because the stakes of the hedge were becoming rotten, that is, preaching ministers and honest officials were being replaced by insincere priests and corrupt magistrates.[101] England's only hope of avoiding destruction was to lay aside "superstition and errors" and repent of the sins of Sodom and Gomorrha.

In Hooker the sense of frustration harbored by Puritans was tinged with a bitterness stemming probably from his being "harried out of the land." In a sentence revealing estrangement almost to the point of

alienation, he vehemently asserted that God had revealed to him personally that He "will destroy England, and lay it waste...."[102] The claim to direct revelation, later remembered by Anne Hutchinson, was that kind of heresy which had ominous political implications.[103] Though he immediately lapsed back into the familiar formula of asking for repentance to forestall God's departure, the words attributed to Hooker on his westward journey as the island of England sank below the horizon indicate that he had little hope for her reform: "Farewell England! I expect now no more to see that Religious zeal, and Power of Godliness, which I have seen among Proffessors in that Land."[104]

The ramifications of the Puritan fear that God was leaving England appear in a series of incidents which occurred around the years when Hooker and John Cotton departed for New England. Their emigration, along with that of many others, created more apprehension that England would soon see evil days. Thomas Shepard regarded their flight to New England as an omen that God was leaving England and he followed them.[105] William Twisse recorded that many divines thought the Gospel was fleeing westward, and Twisse himself wondered for a time if the English American plantations might not become the New Jerusalem.[106]

It is clear that the concept that England was corrupt was not unique among New England bound Puritans. The idea reappeared whenever men of reforming temper became disenchanted by the disparity between their ideals and the realities of English life, and when frustrated in their efforts to align the real with the ideal. Dissatisfaction with English church polity and worship had been one of the major grounds upon

which England had been declared corrupt, but Puritans hardly agreed upon the ideal standards by which they judged the English church. Presbyterians, Separatists, and proto-Congregationalists differed in their definitions of the true church, though their condemnation of the established church provided common ground as long as the bishops retained their power.

The most universal standard by which the land was adjudged to be mortally corrupted was social and moral. Men who had no quarrel with the established hierarchy were appalled by English personal and public mores. Thomas Lever, William Fuller, Adam Hill, John Robinson, and John Winthrop found the English nation corrupt because its rulers and people did not live up to the demands of the social and individual morality of Christianity. John Winthrop's "Modell of Christian Charity" reveals the ideals by which he judged England, and upon which he hoped to found New England. It was the same vision of a unified, hierarchical society with specialized and interdependent parts which had inspired Thomas Lever's strictures against the chaos and corruptions of English society in 1550.[107]

If the concept of the nation as degenerate and sinful was not novel, the widespread intensity with which it was held late in the 1620's was new. By that time the Puritan preachers had created an emotional attitude amongst their followers which made civil reformation a corollary to individual salvation.[108] At the same time, the personal and public actions of the Stuart monarchy forestalled public reformation, and the situation of the Protestant Churches in Europe became desperate.

Under these circumstances the rhetoric of national corruption took on a new relevance, a relevance reinforced by the apocalyptic speculation which had matured since early Elizabethan times.[109]

Yet the idea of England as a corrupt nation about to suffer for her sins remained only one pole of two differentiated concepts which formed the extremes of the Protestant image of England. The unifying principle which made the two ideas obverse sides of the same image was the faith that God punished national vice and rewarded national virtue. Most Puritans, even most Englishmen, subscribed to that proposition, which was writ large in the two most influential books of the age, the Geneva Bible and Foxe's Acts and Monuments.

Which is to say that, despite their emphasis upon the iniquity of England, many Puritans retained the notion that the land had been and still might be especially favored by God. Some were more disposed to place their sense of her election in their hopes for the future, upon which all calls for reformation were based. A few were so convinced that the land was corrupt that they never recanted that opinion, even under more optimistic circumstances. But the legend of England's primacy possessed great power over the English imagination. Samuel Ward told the Star Chamber judges that England had "the most flourishing national kingdom and church in the world...."[110] John Cotton retained his faith that God would eventually further reform the English Church.[111] In New England, where pressure arose to view the mother country in even more unfavorable a light, the concept of England's election persisted. It appeared in the colonists' claim that the English church was a true

church despite its corruptions.[112] In fact, John Winthrop rebutted Roger Williams' arguments for separation by appealing to the Foxian legend of the origin and persistence of the English church.[113] When the "Great Migration" of 1630 started flowing into Massachusetts Bay, William Bradford began his History of Plymouth. In recounting the Pilgrim experience, he began with an allusion to God's special favor to the English nation.[114] The ambivalent image of England as a nation blessed by God but as also plagued by mortal sin was transferred from the old world to the new.

## CHAPTER II

## THE ENGLISH ISRAEL CORRUPTED 1620-1660

"God Will Destroy England, and lay it waste..."--Thomas Hooker, ca. 1630.

The concept of England as a corrupt nation under threat of the Lord's chastisement was the dominant element in the New England colonists' English image during the era of the Great Migration. At the same time, New England's existence was partly based upon the assumption that England was not so depraved that she could not be reformed. Though the colonists condemned England severely throughout the decade preceding the Long Parliament, the events of 1641 brought a resurgence of the positive aspects of their English image. After an initial burst of optimism in which many New Englanders saw the beginnings of a full scale English reformation, the mixed character of English events provoked an ambivalent view which corresponded to the traditional ambivalence of the elect nation image. With the failure of the Puritan revolution the colonists felt forced once again to bewail the corruptions of England, though their strictures were less sharp than during the earlier period of colonial denunciations.

Colonial awareness of England's national perversions underwent strong intensification during the years between 1630 and 1640. This greater impression of the nation's sinfulness was partially inspired by reports from England, where the colonists' friends and relatives were increasingly appalled by the religious and political policies of the crown. "Laud prevails more and more with the King," James Downing

wrote to Winthrop during the public outcry against the treatment of Prynne, Burton, and Bastwick, "ther is noe signe of reformation atoll and what the end will be the lord he knows,...."[1] In church and commonwealth "the hed is scick and all the members out of frame," Brampton Gurdon reported a few months later, and Robert Stansby indicated that the situation deteriorated daily.[2] Such reports inspired Thomas Shepard to preach that England's "lamps and lights," meaning her ministry and churches, were being extinguished.[3] Richard Mather wrote in 1639 that the colonists heard of even greater corruptions in the English church than those existent when they had departed.[4]

The intensifying nature of colonial perception of English corruption was strongest in the settlers' concept of the English church. Traditional censures levelled at the English church since Elizabeth's day were at the root of New Englanders' awareness of English depravities. Time honored criticism that the English establishment retained elements of Antichristian worship were continued in New England, where William Bradford maintained that ceremonies, service books, and other "popish institutions" would bring divine wrath upon the nation.[5] John Cotton shared William Prynne's conviction that Episcopal bishops possessed an unlawful spiritual authority which had originated with the pope in Rome.[6] There was no doubt in Winthrop's mind that Antichrist had corrupted the English church down to the current moment.[7] Richard Mather repeated two generations of Presbyterian criticism when he declared that the English church was corrupted in its discipline, worship,

and ministry.[8] The indiscriminate membership of the English church was a subject for condemnation in New England as it had been in Old.[9]

Ideas about church polity advanced by a few early Stuart reformers formed another source of the colonists' mental representation of a debased English ecclesiastical government. Thomas Parker, Paul Baynes, William Perkins, and William Bradshaw had suggested that the true English church was really a group of individual covenanted congregations.[10] Parker's contention that the English church covenants were not explicit was taken by New England men as further evidence that the English church was corrupt.[11] The colonists also criticized the national church of England on the grounds that universal and national churches were non-scriptural and replicas of the Catholic church.[12] To buttress their scriptural arguments on the illegality of national churches they cited Baynes, Parker, and even the Presbyterian theorist Thomas Cartwright.[13]

The colonists' sense of English church corruptions was further stimulated by unique New England phenomena. They believed that they had achieved the scriptural church polity outlined by Baynes and others, and after 1636 some of them went further down the road toward perfectionism by limiting church membership to visible saints. Having created churches patterned after what they thought was New Testament precedent, they had a concrete norm by which to judge the English establishment. The faith that their churches were models of holiness gave the colonists feelings of superiority over the mother church, and made them more critical of it. As early as 1633 Winthrop answered admonitions to conformity with the

assertion that New England had "clearer Light and more Libertye" in church affairs than did the mother country.[14] After a few years in the rarefied ecclesiastical atmosphere of New England, John Cotton wrote to English acquaintances that he would not have taken the sacraments with them, warned against church fellowship with the unsanctified, and hinted that to remain in England was to become corrupted.[15] In 1640 Cotton stated that the English church was cast in the image of the beast of Rome and asked rhetorically if his parishioners wished to return to the bondage from which they had escaped.[16] Richard Mather indicated that some English parish churches were so corrupt that the New England men rejected communion with them.[17] Other colonists, returning to England, acted "somewhat highly and disdeignfully, as slighting us in comparison of you...," an English sympathizer informed Winthrop.[18] Cotton preached in 1640 that New England reformers were receiving increasing knowledge of the unlawfulness of Catholic and national churches because the Lord had enabled them to see that His true church was congregational.[19] Thomas Shepard prayed for the churches in New England rather than those in England, where "so much sin and evil was abounding...."[20]

Such statements suggest the widespread separatist impulse which existed in early Massachusetts despite colonial disclaimers.[21] Indeed the most extreme denunciations of the English church came from a small number of colonists who felt impelled to formally disassociate themselves from such a godless institution. After the fashion of Robert Browne these righteous souls stigmatized the English churches as Babels and harlots.[22] They were more outspoken than the Plymouth separatists, who

under Robinson's influence drifted back toward the Church of England,[23] or the body of Massachusetts men whose shift toward the moderate separatism of the Plymouth group did not include complete denial of the Anglican communion.[24] Most notable among them was Roger Williams, who rejected the English church as completely corrupt and called upon the rest of the colonists to follow his example.

Williams' allegorical exegisis of the Old Testament invalidated the assumption that the Jewish experience provided the rules guiding civil and ecclesiastical societies.[25] He thus implicitly repudiated the myth that England was the latter day counterpart of Israel. During the Civil War he declared that England was just one more among a number of countries which believed itself the replica of Jewish holiness and which persecuted the saints on the basis of that assumption.[26] His view not only robbed England of its uniqueness but also suggested that the English reformation had been a sham, a charge which Williams made explicit when he told Cotton that the changes in England's religion had been owing to the vagaries of Kings rather than to the will of God.[27] Williams' deviation from the majority of his brethren on this point underscores the importance of biblical literalism in forming and sustaining the idea of the elect nation among most reforming Englishmen at home and in the colonies.

In another context Williams' denial of England's election represented the ultimate extreme toward which the almost universal colonial disapprobation of the English church was pointing. Yet, despite their critical and at times hostile attitude toward the English church, New England men largely refused to follow the lead of Williams. Instead they continued

to assert that while corrupted the English churches were still true, an assertion not only valuable for political reasons, but virtually demanded by their objectives.

Influential New England migrants believed that the Reformation was still recovering the purity of Christian worship and polity from the corruptions of Antichristian Rome.[28] The myth of the true church in England was central to the colonists' reforming impulse, something they could not repudiate without relinquishing their own claim as heirs to the Reformation. When they instituted congregational churches the colonists believed that they were resurrecting the original form of the English churches which had been buried but never completely eradicated by Antichristian usurpation. Scripture proved that the apostolic churches had been congregational in form, and since Foxe, Gildas, Baronius, and others showed that the apostolic churches had been planted in England, it was clear to the colonists that the true English church was really the individual congregations in England. Winthrop invoked this concept when arguing with Williams,[29] and Richard Mather cited earlier expressions of the theme by Parker and Ames when replying to charges that the New England men were Separatists.[30] Cotton repeated that the ancient English churches were congregational in his pamphlets answering Williams and the Presbyterian attacks during the mid-sixteen forties.[31] That the concept was not only an invention arising out of polemical necessity was illustrated by Cotton's assumption that the New Englanders were the descendants of those who had maintained and fought for true religion in England. The spirit of the Marian martyrs sanctified the New England

Way; and the colonists were to "follow the steps of our blessed ancestors; we shall go on maintayning the same faith, and worship, and Government, wherein our Fathers were taught of God to walk, and whereby they did inherit promises both in life and death."[32]

It is clear that the colonial image of the English church as a corrupted body was still linked to the ambiguous image of the elect nation. At the same time that they stressed the church's corruption they assumed its validity. A similar combination of vivid disillusionment and tacit approval characterized their attitude toward many other English institutions. Toward these institutions they expressed the same strictures which they applied to the English church, seldom mentioning in the heat of their criticism that they approved of and copied the English foundations which made up their tradition.

The English state was so intertwined with the church that in colonial eyes the civil establishment had been corrupted by association with Antichrist. Royal supremacy had originated with the popish principle that there was a worldly head of the church, a theme which Cotton belabored while refuting the erastianism of the earlier reformers.[33] The various combinations of English civil and ecclesiastical administration were unpopular with the colonists, who failed to reproduce many of them in New England's early days. Many New England towns did away with Churchwardens and tithemen, those "humane inventions" which Cotton recommended be abolished in England also.[34] During the English Civil War John Eliot argued that the remnants of popery were so intertwined with the English state that the fall of Antichrist (meaning the hierarchical English church in this case) was bringing down English civil government as well. The mil-

lenial kingdom to come would find the state patterned after a Jewish model free from Antichristian perversions, a model which Eliot described in detail.[35]

Eliot was ultimately rebuked for his pains, for the revolutionary changes which he proposed might have been applied in New England as well as in Old. Most colonists did not believe that scripture prescribed a set form of civil government, even for the millenium. Having freed English institutions from association with a corrupt worship, they were not therefore going to exchange them for the product of some preacher's erudition, no matter how saintly he might be. When Winthrop had found he could not run the colony like an English trading company he told the Watertown settlers that the General Court was "in the nature of a Parliament."[36] Thenceforth the government of Massachusetts developed along parliamentary lines, guided in part by that effort to avoid the civil tampering with ecclesiastical affairs to which the colonists so strongly objected in England. Their success in adjusting the relationship between church and state confirmed the New Englanders in their belief that temporal rulers should claim no spiritual authority.[37]

A thoroughgoing application of the principle that it was unlawful for civil power to claim spiritual authority would have resulted in the conclusion that the English monarchy constitutionally embodied a perpetual breach of the second commandment. Roger Williams expressed this traditional separatist logic when he informed Winthrop that Charles I was an accomplice of the Antichristian beast described in the Book of Revelation.[38] The line of thought which saw English monarchy as tinged

with elements of popery persisted into Restoration days in New England, among men who disavowed Williams' ecclesiastical separatism. But many other colonists were not so eager to calumniate a civil authority which was both traditional and the basis of their own civil power. Cotton answered Williams by stating that the Stuarts had all the qualifications of legitimate monarchs, and emphasized that their major sins had come as a result of failure to fulfill the civil functions of godly rulers.[39] With his concern for legitimacy Cotton followed the traditional reformers pattern of castigating the shortcomings of kings while placing less emphasis upon the revolutionary implications of his reasoning. Williams also excoriated the personal sins of James and Charles, but in later years took pains to emphasize that his separatism did not deny the power of rulers in civil affairs.[40] In fact Williams was probably more ready to accept Charles II with his preference for toleration than were some of the Massachusetts men whom he had once schooled in separatism. That the tradition of monarchy in New England survived after the virulent criticism levelled at various kings by the New England reformers suggests once more the colonists' widespread respect for English institutions.

The image of a true institution overlaid with corruption reappeared in the colonists' concept of the English common law. There was a strong colonial tendency to see the law as founded upon the rules of God but departed from its pristine purity. It is not known if the colonists accepted Sir Edward Coke's version of common law history, which somewhat paralleled Foxe's account of the English church. Coke thought that the

law had passed through its age of primitive purity under the Angles and Saxons, had been corrupted by the Normans, and began a slow recovery to purity with Magna Charta.[41] The early legal history of Massachusetts suggests that the colonists were ready to stand for their rights on the basis of the common law at the same time they drastically modified it to fit their ideals.

The points at which the colonists believed that English law was deficient or corrupted may be discerned by the reforms which they inaugurated. Codification of the Massachusetts laws in 1641 and 1648 was in one sense the fulfillment, albeit imperfect, of the Baconian plan for legal reform.[42] The simplification of procedure and unification of English jurisdictions into a single hierarchical court structure eliminated many of the abuses of which Samuel Ward had once complained.[43] The inclusion of certain biblical laws, and the revamping of some English codes and practices in the light of scriptural injunction and equity, suggest where colonial legislators found English law incompatible with divine and natural precepts.[44] It was explicitly stated that Massachusetts law was in accordance with English law insofar as English law agreed with divine rule. Even William Pynchon, who believed English law the best in the world and who looked askance upon some of the Massachusetts innovations, admitted that English law not corresponding to God's principles was not to be accepted.[45]

Not all colonists believed that English law was so defective as to need revision at the hands of preachers and former country justices. Robert Child was more concerned with the development of colonial re-

sources than with establishing a beacon of holiness from which the rest of the world was to kindle its lamps. Child was one of the first to realize that English investors in colonial enterprise needed English law to protect their property from local authority. He saw English law as one of the cornerstones of English greatness, and thought that to depart from it created faction and endangered property,[46] conclusions not wholly inconsistent with Massachusetts' early history. Though a number of Boston merchants joined him in his remonstrance against the Massachusetts legal system, Child failed to raise the political power either in New England or England which would have forced the colony to resume traditional English legal customs.

Child later claimed that there were those in Massachusetts who declared that English law was foreign to the colony. Such claims coincided with, if they were not inspired by, the colonial rulers' determination to reform English institutions in their own way without that legally justifiable interference which the English government was bound to make at the first propitious moment. Because the Massachusetts charter was subject to action in the English courts, some colonial ministers thought they had to reject the entire concept of English authority. Winthrop did not identify these extremists, but John Eliot wrote a tract denying the legality of the English crown and Parliament on scriptural grounds, so it is likely that he was one of those who rejected these pillars of the common law. Ecclesiastical separatism thus found its political counterpart in the rejection of English authority, which in turn impugned the validity of English law in the colony.[47]

Uncertainty over legal authority explains in part why Massachusetts

saw a conflict between opposing concepts of the common law similar to that which raged in England. The struggle between the magistrates and deputies over the magistrates' discretion corresponded to the English constitutional conflict over how much the common law protected the subjects' rights on one hand or supported the crown's prerogative on the other.[48] In Massachusetts the deputies asked for written guarantees of their rights along the lines of Magna Charta,[49] while Winthrop argued that the customary and common law of England demonstrated the utility of judicial discretion in evolving legal precedent.[50] Both magistrates and deputies, however, contributed to the modification of Massachusetts law, and it is significant that they united in defending these modifications against the Remonstrants. Despite the presence of two differing concepts of the common law, it seems apparent that most colonists regarded the English legal tradition as needing the improvements they made. Winthrop justified the magistrates' discretion to the deputies by indicating that Massachusetts had "more positive and more wholesome laws" than England, despite the discrepancy in age between colony and mother country.[51] The supposed superiority of Massachusetts law provided one more vantage point from which colonials could look down upon England.

England's inferiority to New England was not confined to ecclesiastical and legal institutions in the New Englanders' minds but extended to the difference between English and colonial society. The ideal of a unified, hierarchical community in which men lived in brotherly love without faction and contention had served to stimulate criticism of English society among the reformers. The concept provided an ideological basis for

the New England settlements, as is shown by Winthrop's "Model of Christian Charity" and the various town covenants.[52] The town records of Massachusetts indicate that there was patriarchal leadership and "remarkable social harmony" in the early settlements.[53] Despite cleavages in Boston town and church, conflict between magistrates and deputies, and the sectionalism of Essex County, Winthrop in 1644 believed that "godly Massachusetts" had achieved the community he had envisioned in 1630. The realization of the ideal confirmed him in the conviction that, when compared with Massachusetts, England and other states were riddled by faction and "walk by politic principles only."[54]

The colonial saints were able to achieve and enforce a degree of Christian morality which England could not match. As early as 1633 Thomas Welde described the superior colonial moral climate which was bound to cast English morality in even darker hues than it had hitherto appeared. In New England, Welde wrote to his former parishioners, "our eares are not beaten nor the aire filled with Oathes. Swearers nor Railers, Nor our eyes and eares vexed with unclea(n) Conversation of the wicked...."[55] New England was "more free from temptations to lewdness, than ordinarily England hath been," observed Edward Johnson almost twenty years later.[56] About 1646 Giles Firmin told Parliament and the Westminster Assembly that during seven years in New England he had never seen beggars and drunks, and never heard an oath among the residents.[57]

Feelings of godly superiority did little to check the bitterness and estrangement toward England felt by some before they migrated. If anything, there was increased resentment against the home land among a large number

of colonists. Men like Dudley and Endicott displayed a self-righteous contempt for symbols of English authority.[58] Political and religious tensions between Massachusetts and the English authorities gave a combative twist to colonial feelings about England. Massachusetts magistrates armed the colony against any attempt by the home government to subdue her in 1634.[59] When it was rumored in 1637 that a governor and bishop were to be appointed for the colonies, colonial letters to England suggested the possibility of war.[60] Later in Maine, where Massachusetts backed enthusiasts led by Hansard Knollys squabbled with settlers led by the conforming minister Thomas Larkham, members of the Knollys faction compared themselves to the Scotch fighting for God's word against the bishops.[61]

The sanctimonious bitterness toward England which Thomas Hooker had expressed in his farewell sermon persisted among some New England men. William Hooke noted in 1641 that there were "strong temptations" in New England to gloat over the misfortunes of the mother country.[62] During the economic distress of the same year, Thomas Shepard blamed his English countrymen's cruelty and persecution for the colonists' exile and troubles.[63] One Samuel Norman inadvertently testified to the presence of hostile feeling toward England when he ran afoul the Massachusetts magistrates for saying that "if ministers which come will but raile against England, some would receive them."[64] Such statements indicated the deep estrangement from England felt by many colonists. By 1641 a large number of colonists rejected England in many respects, setting a theme which was to persist throughout New England's history. Among a

large number of New Englanders, the image of a corrupted nation, "fat for the slaughter," held the most reality.

The events of early 1640 did nothing to dispel the colonial impression that England continued to dwell in darkness and sin. Though they were heartened by Scotch resistance to the imposition of the Book of Common Prayer, the New England brethren did not share the optimism of some of their friends who were elected to the "Short Parliament." Most letters from England expressed fear that the Bishop's Wars boded no good for England.[65] The ship captains who were among Winthrop's most reliable informants wrote that the Short Parliament held out little prospect of reform.[66] Cotton was moderate in his views on English corruption when compared with some colonists, but he put into words what many New England men must have thought in the spring of 1640 when he preached that though England was a wise nation,

> yet such is the very frame of the State, and of the Sonnes of men, that if the Lord give free passage of a Parliament, you will find it a very difficult thing to have the State ruled by Apostolical judgment, to reject all the devices of men, to shut out the greatest part of a Kingdom from the Lord's Table, you would find rebellions multiplyed exceedingly, if they were of the spirit that they were of in Edward the sixths time.[67]

It was possible that popery might even grow in England, Cotton suggested.[68] Thus even moderate colonists held little hope for an English reformation.

No matter how alienated from England they might be, the colonists could be nothing other than Englishmen to the core. "Wee are distinguished from all the Nations in the World by the name of English," William Hooke reminded his Taunton congregation, and described England as being, except for sin, "that Garden of the Lord, that Paradise."[69] While

still in England, Lucy Winthrop Downing expressed the thoughts of many when she pronounced that those who knew London and Old England could not "deny the desireableness of them, as they are in them selves;...."[70] Thomas Shepard encouraged the New England saints' attendance at training days and their obedience to officers by appealing to their English martial pride.[71] "Our dere nativ country" was where God had sent the colonists salvation and his laws, Thomas Welde wrote home, and Hooke recalled that there the colonists had received thousands of blessings.[72]

The sense of English identity pervaded New England, though already it had to be adjusted to that sense of New England tribalism which was emerging with the creation of purified English institutions in the wilderness. New England might be superior to Old, but a large part of the terrestrial meaning of New England was to be found in her inspiration to Old England. It was New England's mission to set the example for England to follow, in matters of church government, civil government, and social organization, as Winthrop indicated before he ever set foot on America. Every domestic crisis, and most crises in the mother country during the twenty years after arrival of the Winthrop fleet provoked reiteration of that theme.[73] The assumption that England would some day resume her wonted course of Reformation underlay the expectations of many who embarked upon the errand into the wilderness.[74] In one respect New England was founded as an expression of the reformers' conviction that England would yet fulfill her destiny as God's elect nation.

Events in 1641 dramatically confirmed this faith, and gave it a new vitality among reformers both in England and her northern colonies. As

Laud was imprisoned, Strafford fell, and parliament extended its sway, euphoria swept the "preaching brotherhood." All the positive aspects of the myth of England's election sprang into currency. Antichrist was being vanquished, and the rule of the saints in England seemed imminent. If England would fulfill the terms of God's covenant, surely he would bless her beyond all previous favor. To those who had lived under the shadow of Laud's long arm for the previous thirteen years, the events succeeding the opening of the Long Parliament portended fulfillment of the prophecies.[75]

English and New English expectations of a continued reformation took place within a framework of apocalyptic interpretation markedly different from that current at the time of Bale and Foxe. While some commentators, such as Roger Williams, continued to see the struggle between Catholic and Protestant as that period during which the saints were to prophesy amidst persecution and death before the final denouement, an influential body of opinion now believed that the millenium of the church's peace lay in the future. These optimists were strongly affected by the work of Joseph Mede, whose Clavis Apocalyptica depicted the Reformation as a progressive movement by which Antichrist was being destroyed. Mede believed that the millenium would follow the overthrow of Antichrist, and assumed that the English church would be the first to enter into the millenial kingdom. Thus for many reformers millenial expectations came to occupy the role in the elect nation myth hitherto filled by more pessimistic apocalyptic theories. As the course of events was to show, pessimistic apocalyptic speculation was far from dead, but in the first burst of enthusiasm a variety of millenial expectations seemed most appropriate to the English situation.[76]

After ten years of an increasingly deeper sense of England's corruptions, the New Englanders were "like men who dreamed" when news of parliament's success in curbing the King's policy reached the colonies.[77] Though they still realized that England had a long way to travel before attaining New England's version of reformation, the colonists believed that the wheels of Providence were turning toward a new day for England. The mother country looked all the more appealing to some because of the economic depression which came with the good news. Out of mixed motives, many decided to return to England. Most of those who remained were sure that New England had a vital role to play in the English move toward a New Jerusalem.[78]

It was John Cotton who gave the clearest colonial expression to the newly revived positive aspect of the myth of England's election. In 1641 he embarked on an exposition of Revelation 16, that chapter of John's vision which foretells the pouring out of God's wrath upon the earth. Cotton, like Mede, regarded the seven vials of wrath as symbolic of the temporal means whereby God would destroy Antichrist and reform the church. The pouring out of each vial represented a stage in the downfall of Catholicism. In Cotton's interpretation English reformers, English martyrs, and their spiritual heirs (the Puritan preachers) were prominently represented among those who administered God's wrath to the minions of the papal Antichrist. The martyrs under Henry VIII, Edward VI, and Mary had poured out the first vial by disbanding the religious orders, dissolving the monasteries, and convincing the common people that Catholicism was a human invention. English and continental reformers applied the second vial when

they refuted the doctrines promulgated by the Council of Trent. Godly Queen Elizabeth, William Cecil, and the English Parliament had administered the third vial of God's wrath with their laws against the Jesuits and priests, laws which had spread to the Netherlands and Sweden.[79]

In Cotton's mind Elizabeth shared with Gustavus Adolphus the honor of having poured out the fourth vial upon the pope when she denied papal supremacy. Her actions had aroused the full power of Antichrist against her, but the outstretched arm of the Lord had preserved her and delivered England from the Armada.[80]

A year earlier Cotton had preached on Revelation 13, when he demonstrated that episcopacy was a church polity cast in the Roman mould.[81] The action of the Scots in opposing the bishops, the subsequent success of parliament, and the heightened anti-episcopal agitation of 1641 were clear indications that the next stage in the overthrow of Antichrist, or the pouring out of the fifth vial, was at hand in the imminent destruction of hierarchical churches. Cotton saw the writings of Parker, Beza, Cartwright, and Ames against prelatical authority as precursors of this phase of the Reformation, which had come into full flood with the Scots' opposition to the prelates. Even "civil minded" men were beginning to question rule by bishops.[82]

Though Cotton's interpretation of the seven vials stressed the role of England as leader in the Reformation, his concept of that all-engrossing manifestation of divine providence was far from parochial. Like Foxe he conceived of England as the epicenter from which successive waves of reformation washed across Europe. The third vial had spread from England

to northern Europe when the Dutch and Swedes imitated Elizabeth's statutes against the Jesuits. Cotton believed that the struggle against hierarchical churches would similarly flow out across Europe. English events had universal implications, a theme which Cotton more strongly emphasized when he turned to those parts of John's prophecy yet to be fulfilled.

The English reformers had maintained an international outlook throughout the third and fourth decades of the seventeenth century. It was they who had encouraged John Durie's efforts toward Protestant unification to counter the triumphant Catholicism rampant in central Europe during the Thirty Years' War. This concern may also have had roots in the preacher's inherent evangelical propensities; but it certainly owed something to the traditional aspiration toward a catholic Christianity. There was, moreover, ample precedent in Foxe's pages for that combination of national and international apocalyptic expectation which Cotton now developed in his interpretation of the pouring out of the sixth and seventh vials.

The sixth vial was to see the nations of Europe abandon Catholicism and unite in the destruction of the papal Antichrist at the Battle of Armageddon. Emission of the knowledge of God's saving grace upon the darkness and ignorance left from popery would constitute the outpouring of the seventh and final vial. Cotton envisioned a universal flow of God's saving grace which would make the distinction between the elect and the reprobate much clearer than heretofore. In the light of saving grace, the remnants of popish superstition would vanish, and Christ and

the true church would stand fully revealed to the entire world.[83]

For Cotton and many another colonist the term "true church" in 1641 meant the New England version of the English church, their own brand of congregationalism. The last stage in the fulfillment of the prophecies would see congregational polity revealed to men everywhere as the church of Christ's kingdom on earth. Cotton projected the New England version of the English Reformation into a universal norm, acceptance of which would effect the final overthrow of Antichrist:

> ...for when men once begin clearly to see which is the true Church of God, that is not Cathedrall, nor Provinciall, nor Diocesan, but congregationall only, the officers whereof are godly Pastors, and Teachers, and ruling Elders, and Deacons, And when they see that the Saints which they have embraced, and esteemed, are not the true Saints of God, nor these the Churches, nor those the officers of Christ wherewith they have been gulled; but they see now who are the Saints of the most High: and can put a difference now between precious and vile: In this way men will go on to raise such an earthquake (and that not besides the Law niether) that if any City rise up against them, fall it must, and stoop unto them, and at length Rome it selfe shall fall,....[84]

Such cosmic optimism sustained the colonists' hopes that England would become thoroughly reformed over the course of the next fifteen years. When Cotton, Davenport, and Hooker were invited to participate in the Westminster Assembly, the Massachusetts ministers and magistrates regarded the event as a call from God.[85] The outbreak of the civil war dampened their enthusiasm, but despite their vision of England "lying in blood, rent with divisions,...(and) filled with alarmes,"[86] their hopes remained keen that the nation was advancing to new heights of godliness. Revelation foretold that the elect would have to pass through fire and travail

before achieving the millenium. Anne Bradstreet exhorted the saints to victory in England and urged a subsequent advance upon those twin heads of Antichrist, the Turk and the Pope.[87] While puzzled over the lost opportunities of 1641, Nathaniel Rogers still hoped that "some of the great Acts in Revelation are now to be done."[88] In 1644 Peter Bulkeley told the English saints to hold fast to the covenant of grace in the certainty that God was about to shed collective grace upon the nation.[89] About the same time William Hooke asked the colonists to pray for England because God was coming closer to her.[90] Shepard was not so sure that England could achieve reformation by 1645, but still thought there was a possibility.[91] Nathaniel Ward's hortatory Simple Cobbler was intended as a spur to reformation after it became apparent that Parliament was ascendent over the king. As late as 1652, Captain Edward Johnson's History of New England reflected the conviction that English and colonial events of the previous ten years were the sure precursors of the establishment of the saints' rule on earth.[92]

The millenial hopes of the 1640's helped inspire a vigorous New England effort to convince their English brethren that congregationalism was God's appointed church polity, and one consonant with the maintenance of civil authority. Even Thomas Hooker suggested that congregationalism was the polity of the millenium.[93] Manuscripts describing the "New England Way" were circulated in England, though the lack of unity in New England on questions such as the relative powers of ministers and people prevented an official statement until 1648.[94] Some Englishmen did follow the New England model, especially after it became clear that no uniform church

polity could be enforced.[95] The real or fancied effects which New England had upon the English scene served to perpetuate colonial hopes that England might yet be converted to congregationalism.

Revival of the positive aspects of the elect nation image did not eliminate the colonists' conviction that the English church was still corrupted. It was recognized that an enormous job faced those who wished to renovate the Anglican establishment, especially along the lines envisioned by the New England plan. Hooker pointed this out when he indicated the futility of the presence of three colonial ministers at the Westminster Assembly.[96] Moreover, expectations of reformation continued to work in their traditional fashion, for in light of the coming church purity of the millenium the English church appeared as corrupt as ever.[97] Thus one of the strongest elements which helped create the ambivalent image of England was at work during the days of brightest optimism.

The outbreak of the war gave new relevance to the apostate nation pole of the elect nation myth among the colonists. That God rebuked national obstinacy with the sword of righteousness had been a key element in the forebodings which lead many colonists to New England. With all the admonitions which had been preached on both sides of the Atlantic, no one could have been surprised at the event. Hooke had seen the shadow of civil war over the land two years before, and had expressed the universal Puritan sense that such chastisement was merited,[98] a sense which Anne Bradstreet fully developed in her "Dialogue between Old England and New."[99] As the war continued, Davenport preached at New Haven that God still chastised England because her people "shaped their course too much

by Politike and national prudence, and held not strictly to the Rules of God's worde...."[100] Shepard quoted a letter from England to his congregation in which formal reformation of churches and worship were contrasted with less piety and increases in immorality and pride in apparel, all while "the ship is sinking."[101] England's suffering, when compared with New England's peace, justified the colonists' sense of the impurity of the mother country.[102]

Though they regarded the war as the righteous wrath of God upon England, most New Englanders were whole-heartedly for the Parliamentary forces during the conflict.[103] Colonial attention seems to have focused almost exclusively upon the "honest and godly part of the Kingdom,"[104] with whom there was common cause in the struggle against "Papists, Prelats, and Atheists."[105] Survival of the New England version of the English reformation as well as its propagation in England depended upon the English brethren who would control England's religious settlement if they overcame the king. The success or failure of Parliament and the condition of the "godly party" thus became the criteria by which colonials determined whether or not God favored the entire nation.

The first few months of the Civil War gave the colonists no clear evidence that their brethren would achieve that control over English society which was the prerequisite for implementing any form of reformation. December of 1643 found Winthrop in doubt about the English situation.[106] News of Edgehill fight and the Solemn League and Covenant with the Scots arrived shortly thereafter, giving the New Englanders more hope for a successful settlement with the King. But at the same time they discerned

that Scottish intrusion greatly enhanced the possibility of an English church settlement structured along Presbyterian lines. In an appeal to Parliament to adopt congregationalism, the Ipswich preacher Nathaniel Rogers reminded Englishmen that the Scotch were in their debt. Published within a month of the English congregationalists' Apologetical Narration, Rogers' appeal betrayed the same anxiety lest Presbyterianism should triumph which had provoked the plea for toleration of independent congregations.[107]

The New England men approved of the Apologetical Narration, but were appalled by the divisions within the godly party which were exposed and aggravated by the actions of their English sympathizers. The internecine political maneuvering and pamphlet warfare of the ensuing years was especially distressing to the colonial ministers. By 1645 Shepard was noting that sermon was preached against sermon in England, and that religious contention had become a cause of breaches of the peace.[108] Richard Mather bewailed the unseemly conduct of the English controversies, fearing that divisions among the godly would protract the war as well as displease the Lord.[109] Shepard foresaw that the opportunity for reformation would be lost unless the reformers united, and warned that England would suffer even worse disasters as a result of continued schisms.[110]

Much of the ministers' distress over the disunity among the preaching brotherhood in England was rooted in a deeper alarm engendered by the rise of sectarianism on the religious scene in both Old and New Englands. The Apologetical Narration unleashed a storm of controversy over the question of religious toleration. Sectaries embraced congregationalism as a means

of escaping from ecclesiastical control and urged toleration to make themselves safe from interference from the civil authorities. Heresies flourished so vigorously among the sects that by 1645 Nathaniel Ward described England as "the Aviary of Errors to the whole World."[111] Shepard lamented that "Such cracks and flaws in the new building of Reformation portend a fall; such hot fevers and inflammations of England's languishing body, call to the Physitians to let out more blood before it can recover."[112] When Peter Bulkeley refuted English enthusiasts he warned that the "new light" of heretical doctrine had almost extinguished the old zeal for the covenant of grace in England.[113] Shepard preached an entire sermon on the spiritual drunkenness of some English brethren, in which he enlarged upon the theme that "a spirit of rage and fierceness against each other, and contention," were forerunners of destruction.[114] Cotton was less outspoken, but thought that enforced uniformity would have been a better improvement of God's favor to England than the practical toleration which existed.[115] Even those English preachers closest to the New England ministers on matters of church polity aroused colonial distrust by advocating toleration and gathering churches on the basis of "worldly policy."[116] The colonial ministers feared the rigid Presbyterianism of the Scotch, distrusted most of the English independents, and hated the sectaries. Hooker gloomily wondered if the time of troubles to precede the apocalypse was approaching.[117] Even though Parliamentary forces had decisively defeated the King by 1646, the split between Parliament and the Army created continued colonial apprehensions.[118] After the Second Civil War opened in earnest, William Pynchon thought that England was

closer than ever to ruin, and even Roger Williams alluded to the "mournful state of England."[119]

New England leaders continued to express the belief that their experience in the wilderness was relevant to the problem of an English reformation. Edward Winslow urged strict congregational admission standards upon the English churches as means of achieving further reformation.[120] Edward Johnson's History of New England purported to show the relevance of the New England experience for the English situation.[121] Among some, the wish for a congregational reformation proved father to the belief that the English congregationalists were important if not the principle mainstays of the Revolution. Cotton told Robert Baillie that God's approval of congregationalism was demonstrated by the success of the Independent soldiery, whom he declared were congregationalists rather than sectaries.[122] Samuel Mather, a young Harvard graduate who migrated to England in 1651, believed that Pride's Purge and the defeat of the Scotch at Worcester were divine vindications of New England's polity.[123] Upon Cotton's death, John Norton declared that the colonies had demonstrated the true polity of God's worldly kingdom to many in Old England.[124]

Dissenters from the "New England Way" in the colonies shared the tendency of the orthodox to view England in light of their own interests and values. The New England Baptists expressed their tacit approval of the practical toleration which existed in England by agitating for formal toleration in New England.[125] They were joined by more secular minded merchants in Boston, who argued for freedom of conscience in a vein similar to that of the English merchant Henry Robinson. Robinson envisioned England

as a great commercial empire rather than the seat of the New Jerusalem, and advocated toleration in order to promote trade.[126] One suspects that a similar motive lay behind the support which many merchants gave to toleration and to the efforts Robert Child made toward jogging Massachusetts into compliance with English law.[127]

The colonial sectaries' approval of England waxed stronger as the Army and the English sectaries came to dominate the English scene. At virtually the same moment the orthodox Samuel Mather was proclaiming that Cromwell's success vindicated congregationalism, Roger Williams declared that parliament's army was blessed because it now fought for toleration. Viewing the swarming sectaries while on an English visit in 1652, Williams believed that England had more prophets than ever before. It was his turn to proclaim that England was on the verge of true godliness because she had seen fit to adopt his beliefs.[128]

Other dissenters from colonial political and religious orthodoxy refused to assume that colonial standards were valid norms by which to judge English institutions. Among the first of these was Thomas Lechford, whose colonial experience convinced him that bishops and kings were best suited to the English national temper.[129] Another was Robert Child, who was disturbed by the variations between English and colonial law. Child's Massachusetts career suggests that he was most concerned with entrepreneurial development of colonial resources under traditional property guarantees of the common law. He was not ready to agree that colonial law embodied more justice and equity than its English counterpart. Departure from English legal traditions seemed to him to breed faction and discontent, as well as

striking at colonial prosperity.[130] Rather than making godly colonial institutions their standards, Child and Lechford retained traditional English norms as the basis of their judgments.

Child and almost every sectary who ran afoul of Massachusetts threatened to invoke English power to modify New England orthodoxy. Colonial dissidents had a lively appreciation of the dependent legal status of Massachusetts in English law, which sprang from the same deeply ingrained legal tradition that the dominant colonial group was remodelling. Child and Samuel Gorton[131] were in favor of unmodified English law because it strengthened their hands against Massachusetts, but they showed the same concern for Englishmen's rights expressed by the deputies in the Massachusetts General Court. Their appeals were all the more dangerous on that account.

Appeals to England by Gorton and Child raised the problem of Massachusetts' relationship to England in an acute form, which was further aggravated by the civil war and dissentions in the parliamentary ranks. The issue became one of disagreement among the orthodox colonial leaders during the furor over Child's Remonstrance Petition, and continued to be a divisive subject far into the eighteenth century. Though the discussion was permeated by practical considerations, three distinct concepts of the relationship between Massachusetts and the mother country emerged, held by two or three different groups. Child noted that some of the colonists rejected English law as being foreign, and Winthrop recorded that these argued that the Massachusetts charter gave the colonial government complete and self-sufficient power independent of England.[132] Others maintained

that the charter made the colonies subordinate to Parliament, though this sanctioned the troublesome appeals by Gorton and Child.[133] The Massachusetts ministers advocated an analogous position, declaring that the colony stood in near relation and dependence to England. The preachers added so many practical qualifications to this proposition, however, that their view tended toward an ambiguous third position, which combined the colonists' desire for practical independence with the leaders' need for legitimacy.[134] This position was favored by Winthrop and others, who acknowledged allegiance and subjection to England after the manner of the Hanseatic towns' allegiance to the Empire and the obligations of the autonomous French provinces to the Crown of France. The same concept of a loose empire of semi-autonomous states lay behind Winthrop's reply to Child, in which he relied upon the classical model of colonization to justify Massachusetts' assumption of powers beyond those of an English corporation.[135]

Those who acknowledged the colony's "near relation and dependence" upon England realized that they might ultimately have to deal with an unfriendly Parliament. Yet there was good reason to hope that this would not be the case. A tempered colonial optimism was still possible as late as 1651, when Edward Johnson expressed the unity of colonial and English saints in the war against Antichrist. New England's settlement was an already partially successful strategic move in the struggle against popery in England.[136] Johnson thought that the previous seven years had seen an almost miraculous work of God in England in stopping the forces arrayed against the godly, and anticipated establishment of a government which

would support congregational churches.[137] His History of New England suggested that England had embarked upon a reformation not very different from that which had occurred in New England.

To many of the colonial ministers England remained as attractive as it had been to William Hooke in 1640. Older ministers received frequent tokens of esteem from English admirers. To young men such as Increase and Samuel Mather England offered career opportunities not to be had in New England.[138] Yet among those who remained in the colonies there was a growing sense of isolation from the homeland. Shepard wrote that the colonists were unfamiliar with most of the books published in England.[139] One of his own last works was prefaced by a poignant farewell to friends on the island.[140] By 1650 Cotton had given up hope that he might return.[141] Both men expressed affection for England in nostalgic terms which suggest that physical isolation had become an emotional burden to them.

Colonial ministers had strong practical reasons for seeking closer ties with England. The worst evils in the English church had been removed with the elimination of the bishops. The bar to further reformation seemed to be the sectaries, who denied the right of the state to interfere in matters of conscience.[142] In New England a combination of sectarian inspired crises and lay-domination of the churches caused the ministers to agitate for greater ministerial and synodical influence in New England's nearly autonomous congregations. Ministerial demands were embodied in the Cambridge Platform of 1648,[143] a scheme of church discipline which attempted to move the colonial churches closer to the moderate Presbyterianism adopted by Parliament in 1645-46. The Cambridge Platform offered a

basis for that unity between Presbyterian and Congregational saints for which colonial ministers had been pleading ever since 1643.[144] It was frequently mentioned that godly, moderate Presbyterians flourished in New England, and as early as 1645 Allin and Shepard indicated that the only irreconcilable difference between Congregationalists and Presbyterians, so far as New Englanders were concerned, was over the disciplinary power of synods.[145] In the later 1640's Giles Firmin, who returned to England, and John Cotton went even farther in attempting to accommodate Congregational and Presbyterian differences so that sectarianism might be quashed in both Englands.[146]

Despite emotional and practical reasons for seeking closer English ties, colonial ministers continued to be troubled deeply by the English scene, where the sects held effective power to enforce toleration. When former colonists such as Nathaniel Ward, Giles Firmin, and Samuel Mather returned to England they pleaded for unity among the moderate brethren and threatened the usual divine wrath upon the land for its heresies, toleration, and factions.[147] The thought that God had favored the true saints in the struggle with the rigidly Presbyterian Scots in 1650-51, and put power into the hands of their friends, increased the colonial ministers' bewilderment over internecine strife in England. That things were "as bad as ever" was ascribed to the English ministers who failed to unite against the heretics.[148] In such an atmosphere, the theme of England's corruption, and New England's alienation, continued to flourish. Samuel Danforth contrasted New England's peace and freedom with war and anarchy in England and elsewhere in 1648.[149] The next year he portrayed New England as an orphan exiled by its merciless stepmother (the Church of Eng-

land) which nevertheless enjoyed peace in detachment amidst universal chaos.[150]

Colonists recognized that the religious chaos in England threatened to undo even the minor reformation of the previous decade. By 1656 the Newbury Presbyterians Thomas Parker and Nicholas Noyes hoped for restoration of the monarchy as a means of putting down the sectaries. Noyes advocated return of the bishops, though he hoped to avoid reintroduction of the ceremonies.[151] Discerning this trend in English thought, John Norton sorrowfully noted that the fragmentation of the reform movement threatened the return of the "infallible chair."[152]

To the colonists Oliver Cromwell represented both security against the return of the bishops and the power of the sectaries. Unorthodox colonists such as Samuel Gorton were pleased by the toleration allowed under the Protectorate.[153] The orthodox were heartened by his preference for congregationalism, the favor he showed to the New England colonies, and by his anti-Spanish policy in the West Indies. Yet Cromwell's policy of toleration caused continuing anxiety in New England, where the threat to the reformation now came from Baptists and Quakers rather than from bishops and presbyters. John Hull eulogized Cromwell in his diary, but recalled that the Protector had not been strict enough with the English heretics.[154] The sixteen fifties, as before, saw divergent religious tendencies between colonies and mother country continuing to create ambivalence in colonial attitudes toward England.

The earlier optimism aroused by the initial success of the reformers was wearing thin even before Cromwell was installed as Lord Protector.

Surveying the English scene in 1652 after Cotton's death, John Norton accepted the possibility that the saints had been wrong in expecting the millenium. He saw clearly that constitutional uncertainty and religious turmoil were working to bring back the crown, which raised the spectre of the bishops. Reminding New England men that the disciples were disappointed at the failure of Christ's earthly kingdom to materialize, Norton decided that "the awful waiting for a calamity conduceth more to piety" than did millenial speculation.[155] Norton believed that "sadder vissectitudes" awaited the godly, reviving an earlier pessimism and setting the stage for the gloomy apocalyptic speculations of the Restoration era.

Colonial pessimism and anxiety were heightened by the increasingly confused English situation which followed Cromwell's death. William Hooke, back in England since 1656, wrote to John Winthrop, Jr. that many yearned for the old religious ceremonies and the House of Stuart. Hooke, writing with the inside knowledge he had as one of Cromwell's former chaplains, described the indecision and disunity of the godly party, and added that it neither knew the magnitude of its danger nor had the old spirit of prayer which had hitherto sustained it.[156] John Davenport ascribed the removal of Richard Cromwell from the Protectorate to the instigation of the Jesuits. Davenport indiscriminately lumped sectaries and papists together (a common New England practice) as the henchmen of Antichrist by suggesting that the English Quakers were fronts for Jesuit machinations. He even suspected it was possible that England would revert to Catholicism as a prelude to the slaying of the witnesses in the opening stages of the apocalypse.[157] William Davis of Boston told governor Thomas

Prince of Plymouth that English affairs were "in a dismall and formidable hue,...;" and repeated rumors that there was to be toleration of all blasphemous worship, even that of the devil. Davis saw English political instability as a judgment on the land because "God and Christ his institutions are of so vile esteeme, and the power of godliness so decayed in the nation...."[158]

By the time Davis made his pronouncement, "Christ his institutions" and "the power of godliness" as established in New England had served for more than twenty years as the standards by which orthodox colonists judged their homeland. By these standards England continued to be corrupt, as she had been for the reformers of the Great Migration. In 1659, however, the orthodox colonists' image of England was as deeply rooted in the differences between English practice and New England institutions as it had been based upon the gap between the reformers' ideals and English actuality. In the 1630's the ambivalent myth of England's religious primacy had supported differing attitudes toward England among orthodox colonists. The myth continued to fit English events neatly in the 1640's. But when internal affairs pre-empted the New Englanders' attention, the English reformation fell into the hands of the sectaries, and the resultant pessimistic apocalyptic expectations were intensified, the myth of England's religious primacy seemed less relevant. Among many orthodox New Englanders the ambivalent image persisted. Rather than being rooted in the myth of England's religious primacy, however, it now sprang from the radical disjunction between the colonists' old loyalty to England and their new allegiance to colonial institutions. It was no longer possible to view

colony and mother country as proceeding down the same path of reformation as had Edward Johnson in 1651. Faced with this dilemma, some orthodox colonists became extreme isolationists, repudiating the English Puritans and renouncing all allegiance to England, while others sought to remain loyal to their homeland without giving up New England's peculiar values.

While the Puritan revolution in England was grinding to a halt and New England orthodoxy searched for ways to suppress heresy and widen membership in the churches, New England became a diverse society. By 1659 the colonies contained many different groups of men who were disposed by interest or ideals to view England along lines which varied from the conventional New England perspective. The seventh decade of the seventeenth century was to find all the differing colonial images of England expressed as never before, as the colonists sought to understand their new situation in the world.

## CHAPTER III

## ANTICHRISTIAN ENGLAND 1660-1688

"Did ever God speake so loud,...as he hath done to England since the late change of government?"---John Davenport, 1665.

The myth of England's election continued to frame most New England colonists' English image. Since the Restoration marked a reversal of the saints' expectations, many negative aspects of the hitherto ambivalent colonial attitude toward England received greater emphasis than ever, while the positive aspects of England's election were rarely expressed. For a number of reasons, however, bitter criticism of England was usually muted among those colonists most convinced of England's corruptions. The English situation was a source of constant worry to pious colonists, who feared extension of the Restoration Settlement to New England. Some New Englanders reacted to the threat with a separatism which was partially based upon the assumption that England was irretrievably corrupted. Others maintained the ambivalent image, resisting the tendency to polarize their concept of England solely around its negative aspects. Still others, a definite minority, regarded England with unreserved enthusiasm.

Those who maintained the ambivalent image of England or an extreme enthusiasm for her developed a colonial Anglophilism out of old loyalties conditioned by the demands of a provincial existence. An indigenous New England tendency to draw nearer to England took form among some colonists, influenced by the English government's intensifying effort to regulate New England. These men clashed periodically with their isolationist brethren over Massachusetts' relationship with England, though

they too believed England was in a gloomy condition.

These divergent views of England were based in part upon divisions within colonial society. By 1660 there were many colonists, especially in Boston, who lived outside the ethos of the ruling oligarchy and the majority of the people. Many of these were economically and socially prominent people who were potential opponents of the orthodox establishment in New England. The Restoration gave them a focal point around which to rally. Though they were in the process of assimilation into colonial society, their attitude toward England set them a little apart, since it lacked the religious overtones characteristic of the older colonists' English image.

Religious and political divisions laced New England's homogeneous population. Most colonists were Congregationalists who adhered to the "New England Way," but within that orthodoxy there were bitter differences of opinion over the questions of baptism, church membership, and the communion of churches.[1] In Massachusetts Congregationalism was opposed by a few Baptists on the left and small Presbyterian and Anglican groups on the right. Plymouth was split between Baptists and Congregationalists, while Rhode Island's political complexion defied generalization. The five colonies bickered constantly over boundaries and jurisdictions, with Massachusetts and Connecticut acting aggressively expansionistic.[2] Rhode Island, New Haven, Plymouth, and Connecticut all lacked legal existence, placing them under the internal stresses and external insecurity characteristic of illegitimate seventeenth-century authority. The restoration of legitimate authority in England exacerbated these

weaknesses and divisions, and posed a serious threat to the autonomy of all New England colonies.

The different images of England held by men of differing religious views and living under different political jurisdictions was reflected in the variety of colonial responses to the Restoration. The most common reaction was one of dismay, expressed by the pious who had approved of the Puritan Revolution in England. Despite previous forebodings that all was not well with the godly party in England,[3] colonial leaders were shocked to learn that Charles II "was, by a strange turn of Providence, with all joy accepted...."[4] It was inconceivable that the saints, after "twenty years of conflicting, and a great part of them in bloody war, for reformation," should suddenly be robbed of the fruits of their efforts. Massachusetts failed to proclaim the king for almost a year in hopes of a counter-revolution. New Haven, where the influential John Davenport awaited the apocalyptic stroke which would finally free England from her resurgent Antichristian masters, did not admit that the king had returned until August of 1661.

The reaction of Rhode Island was exactly opposite that of New Haven.[5] As soon as news of the Restoration was confirmed she recognized the King, in October, 1660. Threatened by the Confederation of New England and the expansionist aims of Massachusetts, Rhode Island sought to curry the royal favor at every turn. She obtained a royal charter in 1662 and entertained the Royal Commission of 1664-65 with protestations of loyalty. Massachusetts' old enemy, Samuel Gorton, assured the commissioners of his respect and affection for England.[6] Several years later Roger Williams even dedicated his anti-Quaker polemic George Foxe Digged Out of

His Burrows to Charles II. Williams hoped that King Charles would be saved from both popery and Quakerism. Williams' tribute to Charles, so different from his condemnation of Charles' father and grandfather, were made while the English king was still trying to fulfill the policy of religious toleration he had enunciated in the Declaration of Breda.[7]

Like Rhode Island, though less quickly, Connecticut and Plymouth adopted an official royalism. The Restoration necessitated such a policy if these colonies were to legitimize their existence and preserve their autonomy. Connecticut's moderate governor, John Winthrop, Jr., was not unhappy to see the reimposition of royal authority.[8] England had been wracked with "hurries, hazards, and sufferings by civil warres" which had inspired colonial prayers that "settled peace and prosperity may return to our dear native country...," Winthrop wrote to an English friend.[9] Like many Englishmen, Winthrop was wearied by the protracted English strife. Termination of civil chaos in England offered Connecticut the opportunity to legalize her shadowy authority with a charter from the crown. Winthrop was soon in London negotiating for such an instrument. It was largely through his influence that the Connecticut and Rhode Island charters were obtained.

Royal sanctioning of Rhode Island and Connecticut helped insure the continuance of a lukewarm royalism in the small New England colonies.[10] Plymouth had always administered justice in the King's name in order to shore up the legal deficiencies which derived from her unchartered existence.[11] She continued to cultivate the crown, as when Governor Josiah Prince let Edward Randolph know that he favored a single New Eng-

land governor under the crown.[12] Plymouth and Connecticut received the 1664 Royal Commission hospitably, in hopes of avoiding onerous impositions. In later years, when the Crown became more insistent upon extending its authority to New England, their accommodating attitude persisted. In 1683 the Crown's move to revoke the colonial charters brought loyal addresses from Connecticut and Plymouth, while Massachusetts brayed about her chartered rights, "by which I suspect," wrote Nathaniel Mather in Ireland to his brother Increase in Boston, "you of Massachusetts are more whiggish, and your neighbors more Toryish, in the language of late in use."[13]

In the early 1660's the labels "Whig" and "Tory" lay in the future, but the differences in thought and attitude toward the crown which were to result in the distinction were taking shape in New England. At the same moment that pragmatic royalism was being perfected in the small colonies, a more vigorous loyalty was forming among some Massachusetts Presbyterians and a few Boston merchants. These men wished to see the power of the crown exerted to bring peace and stability to both Old England and New. They were tired of the political and religious struggles in England which destroyed order and disrupted trade. They looked to England as the source of power which would relieve them of sectarian government and assist them to prosper.

Thomas Parker, pastor of Newbury church, was the major religious figure in Massachusetts who welcomed the Restoration. Parker had reverted to Presbyterianism after a few years in New England. He remained

in the colony during the Civil War, when he agitated for the adoption of Presbyterianism and intrigued with the English Presbyterians against Independency. Like many English Presbyterians who assumed that they could make an alliance with the crown in the Restoration Church, Parker wanted to eliminate religious disorder and impose uniformity by quashing the Congregationalism which Presbyterians had long believed gave rise to sectarian error. He made these views known in London in 1661 by publishing a manuscript purportedly written by his deceased colleague James Noyes. Noyes attacked Congregationalism, advocated a national church with bishops, and espoused passive obedience and non-resistance to higher powers.[14] Parker's yearning for royal authority grew out of what he considered to be the chaos of sectarian rule, which had deprived the nation of "King, Parliament, Liberties, and orderly government, and had almost utterly overthrown the Church and State, Truth and Religion," leaving England "the reproach of the nations, the taile of the people...." Parker hoped that a Presbyterian liturgy, episcopacy, and crown control would restore order and harmony to the body politic.[15] Such a system would have aided Parker in controlling his own recalcitrant congregation during the disputes which arose in his church a few years later.

The most ardent Massachusetts "royalists" were non-Puritan settlers who had incurred the enmity of the government or who wished to see the colony regulated for the benefit of English economic interests which they represented. They looked to England for business contacts and for favor from the crown. Samuel Maverick and Thomas Breedon, both of whom had ample reason to avenge themselves upon the Bay Colony, parlayed their

schemes for colonial control and their knowledge of colonial divergence from English law into favor and office at the hands of the home government. Thomas Deane, Thomas Kellond, and Thomas Kirke, newly arrived in New England, were intimately connected with the London trading community. Kirke and Kellond sought royal favor by pursuing the regicides Whalley and Goffe when the two Cromwellians took refuge in New England. Such men were the colonial representatives of the emerging alliance between the crown and the London merchants which was aimed at achieving closer colonial control for the benefit of both.[16]

Most colonists, including those in the smaller colonies, were far less enthusiastic about the Restoration than were Parker and the Boston enemies of the Massachusetts regime. The image of England held by most colonists continued to be conditioned by information concerning the fortunes of the Puritans and the nation's morals. This information signaled a major declension. While the King's announced policy of toleration was cause for hope, before long Parliament was moving to smash the remnants of the Puritan movement.[17] The "godly party" in England was first disregarded and then placed under increasingly heavy penalties by the new government. Letters from English Puritans reported the return of the bishops, reimposition of the liturgy, and finally the deprivation of the non-conforming ministers.[18] Concomitant with these tidings came accounts of the increasingly immoral atmosphere of Restoration England. William Hooke wrote Davenport that the morality of the established clergy was worse than at any time since the Edwardian Reformation. Actors and

plays found favor from the nobility, Hooke complained, while lecturers and preachers languished from neglect.[19] Letters sent to New England by English Non-Conformists expressed their fears of the persecution which ultimately came. Garbled news and rumor at one point lead John Davenport to believe that the English situation was as bad as in Marian days.[20] Stories of miraculous occurrences accompanied fears of persecution, exciting apocalyptic speculations on both sides of the Atlantic.[21] By 1665 Davenport was sure that the English church had been usurped by "Brutish men" and that God's warnings to England were greater than ever before. He and other colonists shared the Non-Conformists' apocalyptic expectations, expectations given a new pessimism by the saints' late failure to institute God's Kingdom on earth in England.[22]

From the Restoration onwards it was perceived that the new English government posed a threat to the unique civil and religious polity of Massachusetts. Re-establishment of the Anglican church and attacks on the Dissenters created reasonable fear that the movement toward Anglican uniformity would be extended to that remnant of the saints' experiment which survived in Massachusetts. Once again England represented a threat to most pious New Englanders. Massachusetts' relationship with England became a matter of more urgent concern than at any time since 1646. How the colony was to meet the threat became a burning public question which broke Massachusetts into contending political factions. Neither faction wished to give up Massachusetts' chartered liberties, and both feared England's power. In developing different strategies for meeting the English threat, however, each side was influenced by that

aspect of the English image which was uppermost in its members' minds.

One large group of Massachusetts colonists thought that a conciliatory posture toward the crown would win the royal favor and secure the colony's chartered liberties. These "moderates" retained that loyalty and affection for England which were important components of the positive element in the colonial image.[23] Prominent among the moderates were John Norton, John Wilson, and Charles Chauncy, ministers; Simon Bradstreet and Daniel Denison, magistrates; deputies Edward Johnson and Thomas Clark, and merchants John Hull and Joshua Scottow. Their sense of English identity played a significant role in their desire to find an accommodation with the king. John Norton, who was sent as one of Massachusetts' agents to placate the home government in 1662, preached to the General Court that it was "neither Gospel nor English spirit for any of us to be against the government by King, Lords, and Commons."[24] Merchant John Hull reassured himself that the colonists' religion did not teach them to be disloyal to "our native land," the King, or Parliament.[25] "Fear God and honor the King" a large number of ministers enjoined when petitioning for a conciliatory policy toward the Royal Commission of 1664-65.[26] Exhortations to loyalty did not preclude strong objections to government by bishops or direct royal authority,[27] but a significant portion of the Massachusetts political community did not believe that the colonists' institutions and autonomy were incompatible with loyalty to the English crown. The liberal charter granted to Connecticut in 1662 probably helped to confirm their views.

An equally large number of Massachusetts men feared that the slight-

est accommodation with the English government would fatally jeopardize Massachusetts' godly polity. Its leaders included Jonathan Mitchell, John Endicott, John Leverett, Francis Willoughby, and Humphrey Davie. Endicott had lost none of his anti-English sentiment, having been forced to suspend persecution of the Massachusetts Quakers to avoid the crown's displeasure. Leverett was to defy Edward Randolph, the king's agent, in later years. The "commonwealth" faction continued to conceive of Massachusetts as "a little nation," the institutions of which were especially ordained by God. Jonathan Mitchell informed the General Court in 1660 that the colony's civil polity was a prototype of that government which would exist during the millenium, and exhorted the members to stand fast in its defense.[28] Commonwealthmen feared that their godly polity was threatened by the renascent Antichristian English church and state. In 1663 they circulated rumors that a royal governor and bishop had been appointed to rule Massachusetts, and that the king would seize the colony with the militia. Commonwealthmen even accused their more moderate opponents of wishing to extend the "mark of the beast and his image" to New England.[29] With this derogatory apocalyptic language the extremists perpetuated the negative aspects of the colonists' English image in time honored form.

The contraposition of their attitudes toward England did not prevent the two factions from uniting when the moderates became convinced that the Royal Commission of 1664 posed a severe threat to Massachusetts' autonomy. Factionalism virtually disappeared while the colony prepared to repel the Commission by force of arms if necessary. When tensions

eased, the moderates resumed their policy of conciliatory procrastination. They gained control of the General Court, and repelled the Commission with diplomacy.[30]

When faced with the unpopular assertion of royal authority in later years, the colonists invariably objected on grounds that their English rights were being invaded. In 1665 however, many colonists, especially but not exclusively commonwealthmen, were convinced that the laws of God and nature as embodied in Massachusetts were better bulwarks than the rights of Englishmen. They argued that when the colonists left England, they lost their allegiance to the English crown, their right to representation in Parliament, and the benefits of English law.[31] The charter, they declared, was a compact between King and colonists in which they had promised allegiance to the king, reserved one-fifth of the precious metals to be found for his use, and agreed to make no laws contrary to those of England. In return they had received the right to be governed by laws of their own choosing and officers of their own appointment.[32] Thus allegiance to the crown, and the crown's authority in Massachusetts, were dependent upon the charter.[33] Any attempt to exercise authority other than that granted by the charter was a violation of the king's government, in the eyes of many Massachusetts men. It was this tortured argument which was used to justify the colonists' denial of the Commission's authority.[34] This reasoning insulated the colonists from English law, but tended to isolate them from the safeguards of English Liberties as well. It was the political counterpart of the semi-separatism which characterized the colony's congregational church polity.

Separatism was strengthened by a new feeling of isolation. The first settlers' sense of their distinctiveness had been tinged with sorrow over the necessity of leaving the mother country. Some felt that they had been driven out by merciless persecutors, while others found their circumstances in the wilderness paralleled those of the Jews or the Apostles. Viewed either way, the result was that many came to see themselves as exiles from their homeland. The first generation assuaged its feeling of exile with the conviction that it was the spearhead of the Reformation. This idea survived in New England in a modified form, but it lost some force when the English Reformation took the path of sectarianism and toleration. As a result the colonial sense of alienation became more acute.[35] The Restoration greatly increased the colonists' sense of rejection by England, for it demonstrated that New England was becoming a backwater in the English mainstream. Colonists now shared in the contempt heaped upon the "godly party" in England, while the uprising of the Fifth Monarchy Men in London, lead by former colonist Thomas Venner, cast further odium upon New England.[36] Norton wailed that New Englanders were outcasts because they professed Congregationalism, which was no longer considered by men.[37] Sermons and polemical works in the years after 1660 were studded with allusions to the colonists as exiles in the wilderness.[38] The frequency with which this phrase was repeated suggests a deeper self-conscious distinctiveness was felt by many colonists.

The godly colonists' English identity took on a new aspect as a re-

sult of this heightened self-awareness. While referring to themselves as English when contrasting themselves with Indians, Frenchmen, or the Dutch, many colonists differentiated themselves slightly from England by conceiving of themselves as a part of the English nation. At the outbreak of the Third Dutch War the Massachusetts General Court acknowledged that Massachusetts citizens would share England's suffering because "wee are of the same nation, and many ways dependent thereon...."[39] Urian Oakes reminded the Court that they were "a part of that dear nation," while Samuel Torrey called the English "our people and nation."[40] Increase Mather referred to New England as the western portion of the English Israel.[41]

By even slightly differentiating themselves from Englishmen, the colonists were inviting self-comparison with their countrymen. Before King Phillip's War, colonial ministers occasionally identified the colonists as superior Englishmen. The oft-repeated assertion that the circumstances of removal had winnowed the English nation of its best elements suggested this conclusion, which was buttressed by the myth of New England's superior favors from God and her profession of Congregationalism.[42] John Oxenbridge and Urian Oakes conceived of the colonists as superior Englishmen because they had civil and religious privileges even beyond those of Englishmen.[43]

These expressions of colonial superiority came at the very moment that the colonists were losing the self-confidence of the first generation. In the years after the Restoration, the clergy increasingly emphasized that New England had declined from the piety, manners, and morals

of the founders. Though they maintained the belief that New England had enjoyed superior favor at the hands of the Almighty, the ministers portrayed New England as a corrupted land storing up God's wrath. This self-conception was couched in the familiar biblical similitudes and covenant theory which English preachers used to describe the state of the English Israel. Previous favors bestowed upon New England made her sins all the more grievous.[44] There was a strong tendency among pious colonists to regard New England with the same ambivalence which had marked their fathers' image of England. If they continued to believe in New England's superiority, it was with the recognition that she was subject to the same sins and chastisements as those which beset the mother country.

The virulent criticisms of England made by some of the early colonists were missing from the sermons and letters of most New England figures who were active during the Restoration era.[45] In part this was owing to the colonists' growing sense of their own declension. It was no longer possible to view England from the elevated rectitude the founders had achieved, if the colonists were as sinful as the preachers declared. But there were practical reasons for the decline in public criticism of the mother country as well. For logical and tactical reasons, a minister attempting to convince his people of their fall from virtue was not likely to lay undue stress upon their superior holiness as compared with that of other places. Moreover, the type of bitter criticism levelled at England by Thomas Hooker had been politically dangerous then, and was more so in an era when the British government

was rapidly extending its control over the colonies. There were many men in Restoration New England who, like Governor John Leverett, believed that New England was better than ever, and, as a corollary, that England was "a street of Rome."[46] But prudence demanded that such declarations be kept unofficial. Among commonwealth adherents in Massachusetts and their allies like Davenport at New Haven, the image of England as deeply if not fatally corrupted persisted.

By insisting upon New England's special holiness, the extremists differentiated themselves from England to a greater extent than their more moderate brethren. Moderates believed that New England was superior and that England was corrupt, but they were not so alienated from England as to abandon the myth of England's religious primacy. Increase Mather preached that "God hath culled out a people, even out of all parts of a nation, which he also had a great favor towards," when celebrating the New England migration.[47] The elect nation concept as applied to England continued to find expression among moderate colonists, though that element which dealt with national corruption was most strongly emphasized. Samuel Whiting, one of the survivors of the first generation, declared in 1666 that it was the colonists' duty to pray "for our own Country, and the Land of our Nativity," so that both Old England and New might be spared the fire of God's indignation.[48] Whiting had no doubt that England was being overwhelmed with wickedness, but he hoped that the saints there would constitute a saving remnant. He recalled the old belief that God had created more righteous persons in England "then (sic) does appear in the Christian world anywhere else," as

grounds for the speculation that there might still be many saints in the mother country.[49] Regicide William Goffe, living out his days on the Massachusetts frontier, hoped that the saving remnant would save England from God's retribution.

"Did ever God speake so loud,... as he hath done to England since the late change of government?" John Davenport challenged in a letter to William Goodwin late in 1665. To Davenport and other extremists, and to moderates also, it appeared that England's sins and God's vengeance had reached new heights in the mid-1660's. Barbaric men had scattered Christ's churches, silenced the preachers, corrupted the nation's worship, and killed some of the most prominent saints, for which God had smitten the land with the plague, London Fire, and Dutch War.[50] The cessation of such spectacular disasters did little to change their impression that England was drifting more deeply into corruption. English correspondents continued to harp on that theme. A Non-Conformist's description of the London epidemic, reprinted in New England where several churches had donated money for relief of the victims,[51] reported that "...pride, and envy, and flesh-pleasing, and the like God-displeasing and God-provoking sins, do abound in London, as if there were no signification in God's Judgments in the Plague."[52]

The colonists' English correspondents reported England's condition in terms little different from those which Winthrop had received thirty years previously. An English Dissenter wrote Reverend John Oxenbridge in 1670 that theatres, dancing schools, and the malapertness of the wicked was increasing the sin of the country and seducing its youth.

"Prophanes is gon through the land," he continued. "We are not the better either for judgments, which have been tremendous, nor for mercy's which have been oblidging to repentance."[53] In the same vein a year later Mrs. William Goffe wrote to her exiled husband that neither God's lenience nor His "many sore judgments" had awakened peoples' hearts in England.[54]

The plight of the English Non-Conformists was an essential element in the colonists' gloomy view of the mother country. Reports from England on the condition of Dissent were mixed, for persecution was sporadic and varied from locality to locality.[55] Colonists occasionally received news which indicated that their English brethren were unmolested, as in the spring of 1668 when Governor Bellingham was informed that they enjoyed a great deal of freedom.[56] In the same year, however, the Massachusetts General Court officially lamented the "present low Estate of the Churches of Christ... especially in our dear Native Country...," when proclaiming a fast day.[57] When Charles II issued the Declaration of Indulgence in 1672, William Hooke in England described the liberty enjoyed by Dissenters, but added that Catholics too enjoyed the fruits of toleration. Hooke's wife wrote to New England at the same time that Dissenters lived in daily expectation of the Lord's retribution upon England because of the contempt shown to the gospel by the Restoration Parliament "and highr powers." The nation's sins were so great that not even Noah, Job, Daniel, and Moses combined could have saved her.[58]

The pious colonists' mental picture of the Anglican Church buttressed their general image of England as a corrupt nation. Not only was the church dominated by an Antichristian hierarchy, but the hierarchy

seemed bent upon polluting the Church's reformed doctrine. Oxenbridge's English correspondent wrote that Anglican theorists were challenging the whole concept of regeneration and were insisting that grace was indistinguishable from virtue.[59] Such intelligence did nothing to allay the colonists' ever present fears that Anglican hegemony might be extended to New England,[60] fears exacerbated by the acrimonious conflicts over the Half-Way Covenant within the New England churches. Oxenbridge warned the colonists against "turning your churches into Parishes and your Ministry into Priests and Prelates."[61] At Newbury the struggle between the Presbyterian Thomas Parker and his congregation resulted in charges and counter-charges of episcopalianism between neighboring ministers, while rumors circulated that Parker had appealed to the Archbishop of Canterbury for aid in the dispute.[62]

"The news from England is such that it appears as black a day as the world has known," wrote Peter Tilton of Hadley, Massachusetts upon learning of the Stop of the Exchequer and the English Alliance with France against the Dutch in 1672.[63] The sentiment was a recurrent one among those Puritans on both sides of the Atlantic who were convinced that the recent failure of the saints and the increasingly dismal situation in England portended more violent upheavals antecedent to the Apocalypse. Pessimistic apocalyptic speculation revived among these men and women. In New England John Davenport had lead the way as early as 1665 when he interpreted plague, Dutch war, and rumors of Jewish conversions as harbingers of the greatest changes in the world "since

the 1st coming of Christ."[64] By 1669 Increase Mather had completed a lengthy work proving that the Jews would be converted to Christianity during the First Resurrection, which was to be preceded by great "shakings," "confusions," and "destruction all over the world."[65] The apocalyptic vision of history provided a convincing explanation for the failure of the Puritan Revolution and the subsequent trials of the saints, natural and man caused disasters in England, and a variety of other prodigious phenomena.[66]

Mather's outlook was cosmopolitan, but English events loomed large in the list of omens and judgments which he cited to prove that the First Resurrection was imminent. Not all signs were unpropitious, but most were of an ominous nature. Mounting wickedness among the unrighteous, as well as God's copious grace upon some peoples, indicated that the last days were already present. Another sign was the resurgence of Catholicism. "Have not some Lands received (if not the mark) the number of the beasts name, which once had almost wholly cast him off?"[67] Mather asked rhetorically, doubtless with English and Scotch experiences in mind. With worldliness gripping the professors of Christ and the wars, fires, and epidemics of the 1660's shaking the nations, it was clear to Mather that the "glorious salvation of Israel" was not far off.[68] He maintained the opinion that the First Resurrection was near with increasing conviction as affairs in England and New England became progressively worse.

Mather's treatment reflected the basic ambivalence of the apocalyptic vision of history, despite his emphasis upon the afflictive element

of God's Providence. Troublesome times would be succeeded by "glorious Promises," or, as John Davenport put it, the advent of God's political kingdom on earth.[69] When it was learned that the Third Dutch War was in progress, the Massachusetts General Court instructed colonists to pray that "the present tumults of the nations may tend to hasten the accomplishment of his glorious promises, for the deliverance of his church and people from the anti Christian yoake." As it had in the past, the optimistic component of apocalyptic speculation fostered faith in England's religious primacy. The General Court hoped that God would "save our nation, to be a hiding place to his people in the day of their distresse." Mather, probably thinking of the London fire, quoted an earlier apocalyptic treatise to the effect that a Protestant nation desolated by fire would suddenly and unexpectedly bring down Rome. Mather's correspondent William Goffe, the exiled regicide, believed that dark days heralded a greater glory for Protestantism in which England would play a leading role.[70]

The expressions of hope that England would yet lead the way in the Reformation represented the continued acceptance of English norms among the colonists. Distance and isolation could give a New England twist to these norms, as it did to the colonists' conception of themselves as different and unique Englishmen. Isolation from the mother country could also breed a new respect and veneration for its standards and culture. As early zeal for founding the godly community gave way to the necessity of preserving its essential features, some colonists came to realize that they lived on the periphery of a larger and more fascinat-

ing society.

Anglophilism was strongest among cosmopolitan elements of colonial society who realized the cultural inferiority of the colonies and their remoteness from the infinitely larger and more elegant scale of English life. To these provincials England became the metropolis to be emulated and venerated. Isolated from the world of Baconian experimentation and investigation which he loved, John Winthrop, Jr., yearned for the cultivated company of the Royal Society.[71] His less profound sons, Wait and Fitz-John Winthrop, were enthralled by their early English residence, when Fitz-John was a soldier and Wait aided his father in securing the Connecticut charter. Property and family ties forced the reluctant return of these worldly young provincials to New England, where they aped London fashions and Fitz-John fawned upon the royal governors of New York.[72] The brothers exemplified that lack of piety among second generation colonists bewailed by the clergy. Neither the warnings of the clergy nor their own inability to attain court splendour kept them from indulging in "fantastick Fashions, and attire" after the English mode. Such trappings were common among the merchants and many scions of the old Puritan oligarchy who framed their conduct "from their picture of life in Restoration England" rather than from the New England founders' ethos.[73]

Colonial approbation of the larger English culture was not confined to worldly merchants and backsliding young provincials. England held a fascination for godly New Englanders which the Clarendon Code could dim but not eradicate. Such New England worthies as Francis Hig-

ginson and Solomon Stoddard were dissuaded from trying their luck in England only at the last moment, while the Presbyterian Benjamin Woodbridge and young Peter Thatcher actually went over. Increase Mather was well established in New England and feared the persecution in England, but his desire to return to England increased with his age.[74] Like their more mundane contemporaries, Mather and other ministers were keenly aware of New England's isolation and the smaller scale of its culture.[75] Mather looked to England to provide models for colonial emulation, though he chose for imitation aspects of English culture far different from those which enamored his less saintly compatriots.

In the tradition of Thomas Lever, John Foxe, and Samuel Ward, Mather urged public reformation upon a declining New England. To prove the efficacy of his public reforms, which ranged all the way from a greater effort to convert the Indians to the suppression of ale-houses, Mather cited English precedents. King Phillip's War gave him the opportunity to recall that the gospel among the "ancient Brittains" had been rooted out by the heathen because of their failure to convert the Saxons.[76] The colonists faced a similar fate if they did not attempt conversion of the Indians. To spur flagging zeal for reform after the war was won, Mather cited Foxe's story of how God had rewarded the first phases of the Edwardian Reformation by giving the English victory over the Scotch.[77] Massachusetts' minor reforming efforts during the war had been similarly rewarded, and Mather was sure that greater reforming efforts would further return the Lord's blessings to New England.

Mather was ready to judge New England by an English norm, even if

it proved derogatory to the colonies. At the height of the war he delivered a Thursday lecture sermon in which he repeated the remarks of Englishmen "that they had seen more drunkeness in N. E. in halfe a year than in E. in all their lives." Governor Leverett was deeply offended, and declared such persons to be liars, while magistrate William Stoughton told Mather that he would have to "preach a recantation sermon," a suggestion which Mather self-righteously rejected.[78] Mather's willingness to accept the assessment of Englishmen that New England was morally inferior to England indicated that a truly provincial image of England was taking root among even the most pious colonists.

King Phillip's War delivered a serious blow to New England's pride. The colonies did not perform well militarily or administratively. When William Hubbard preached to the General Court of Massachusetts after a year of fighting, he told Massachusetts men that they retained English bravery, but hinted that colonial leadership had lacked wisdom and was overconfident.[79] Except for the brief Pequot struggle, Phillip's War was the first time that New England had experienced the desperate fighting which had occurred everywhere in Europe during the seventeenth century. The conflict showed that New England was not immune from the wrath which God showered upon apostate nations.

The Massachusetts experience was beginning to show that New England might share the corruptions of England, and undergo similar trials and tribulations. As early as 1662 the "commonwealth" fanatic Humphrey Davie declared the same decline in piety existed in New England as in Old.[80] His friend John Davenport, doubtless thinking of the Half-Way

Covenant, growled that New England was moving to comply with Old England in its corruptions.[81] Increase Mather believed that King Phillip's War had been God's chastisement for New England's backsliding, but he also saw it as a sign that New England was undergoing judgment visited upon the rest of the English nation. Indian war in New England, Bacon's Rebellion in Virginia, earthquake in Barbados, and fire in Northampton, England, presaged "dismal things... hastening upon the English Nation," and even upon the whole world.[82] Under Mather's influence the Synod of 1679 expressed belief that the affliction of the churches in New England and abroad stemmed from similar declensions.[83] The "crying sins of the Nation and want of reformation here (which you complaine of in N.E.) doth much threaten us with a storme of judgment," Samuel Petto wrote to Mather from England.[84] The younger Simon Bradstreet noted New England could no longer expect safety from the dreadful times "coming upon our Nation."[85] Thus in a negative way pious colonists found themselves back in the main current of English history.

King Phillip's War was hardly ended before the colonists were presented with another threat to their godly polity. The arrival of the King's agent in Massachusetts in 1676 represented the Crown's renewed determination to exert control over England's burgeoning empire. Massachusetts was required to send agents to England to defend the colony's claim to Maine, and to explain her violations of the Navigation Acts. Once in England, the agents had to face further charges that the colony's laws were contrary to the laws of England. The Crown demanded modification of Massachusetts' laws and institutions so as to align them with

English custom and practice.[86] In a practical and political sense, Massachusetts was being shoved out of her position of distinctive independence into the English orbit.

The English government badly frightened Massachusetts in 1677 when it seriously considered Edward Randolph's salvo of charges against the colony. News of the lenient response of the Committee on Trade and Plantations to Randolph's charges brought relief to the General Court, which had feared loss of the colony charter. It also gave the Court courage to ignore the Crown's directive to make changes in Massachusetts laws so as to make them consonant with English law. The result was a stern letter from the Crown which demanded enactment of the oath of allegiance. This was followed by a recommendation from the Committee on Trade and Plantations that a quo warranto be issued against the Massachusetts charter, and an order that an Anglican minister be appointed to reside in Boston. The latter events created new fears in New England, though these were temporarily relieved by advent of the Popish Plot.[87]

Pressure from the crown fanned the smouldering embers of commonwealth and moderate factionalism into new flames. Though the ministers prevailed upon the General Court to send agents to England in 1677, the commonwealth faction dominated Massachusetts' government throughout most of the period between 1676 and 1685. After the death of Governor John Leverett in 1679 it lost some force, but the moderates were never able to carry out their policy of limited concessions to the crown. Massachusetts' policy between 1676 and 1685 varied only in the degree of intransigence which she displayed toward the home government.

The commonwealth faction was strongest in the lower house of the General Court, and commanded the support of nearly half of the Council members.[88] Its major leader until his death in 1679 was John Leverett, when leadership devolved upon Thomas Danforth. The concept of England held by these men during the years of crisis may only be inferred from their actions. It appears to have been heavily weighted toward the negative aspect of the colonists' English image. Leverett showed his contempt for the crown's authority by refusing to uncover to the king's agent when Edward Randolph arrived.[89] That Leverett was ready to resist the king to the last extremity was suggested by Samuell Nowell when he wrote that Massachusetts would oppose a New England governor-general as long as Leverett held office.[90] A similar disregard for English authority was demonstrated by Reverend Thomas Shepard, Jr., who told John Hull and Samuel Sewall that Massachusetts ought to suppress Baptist and Quaker meetings and trust God to take care of England's reaction.[91] The old Cromwellian Daniel Gookin recalled to the General Court that Jonathan Mitchell and Thomas Shepard had said that those who worked to undermine government by the saints set themselves against Christ, and would have Christ for their enemy?[92] By that definition Edward Randolph and Charles II were Antichristian enemies of Massachusetts who would be consumed in the fall of Rome. Merchant John Saffin copied into his notebook an old prophecy which forecast a time of tribulation under cross, surplice, and crown until about 1685, when there would be no more kings in England and the pope would have a fatal fall.[93] On the basis of this scanty evidence it may be surmised that many commonwealth adherents continued to

view England with the self-righteous alienation and hostility which saw her as corrupted under the dominion of a tyrannical Antichristian rule.

Diametrically opposed to the commonwealth faction stood such "royalist" merchants as Richard Wharton. One of the wealthiest men in New England, Wharton's interests lay in the promotion of business and the economic development of the colonies. Wharton was typical of those who looked to England both as a source of power and profit and as providing models worthy of imitation. He used his influence with English officials, especially the omnicompetent colonial administrator William Blathwayt, in a vain effort to carve out an English manor for himself in Maine.[94] Concerned with trade as a means of personal profit, public good, and national greatness, Wharton saw England as the center of a potentially vast empire of which the colonies would be a subordinate part.[95] He encouraged the extension of royal authority to the colonies, in hopes of gaining a place in the royal colonial government. He accused the commonwealth faction of disloyalty to England during the Third Dutch War, and played upon the antagonism between commonwealth and moderate factions to defend himself against charges of piracy.[96]

The moderates were influential in the council, especially after Simon Bradstreet succeeded Leverett as governor in 1679. They received important support from some merchants and some prestigious clergymen. They wanted closer contacts with England, though they did not want the amount of royal control advocated by Wharton. Agent Peter Bulkeley bewailed Massachusetts' failure to mend her political fences in England,

and regarded the colonists' earlier rejection of a new charter as a blunder.[97] Increase Mather confided to his diary that one of New England's greatest sins was the cold shoulder she turned to England. He was convinced that Massachusetts stored up trouble for herself when the General Court disregarded his advice to send agents to England in 1680.[98] Mather was involved in the 1681 dispute between two trained bands, when one of them, probably dominated by moderates, wanted to return the cross of St. George to its ensign,[99] an incident which suggests that the moderates had considerable support in some towns.

Despite the commonwealthmen's resistance, pressure from the crown, declension of the will to maintain pristine colonial institutions, and a growing Anglophilism among key elements of the population combined to begin the transformation of Massachusetts' godly commonwealth into a political entity more resembling England. At the King's command in 1678 Massachusetts instituted the royal oath of allegiance, and passed a treason law.[100] Under renewed pressure in 1681, the General Court revised some colonial laws to bring them more in line with English practice. It repealed statutes against the observance of Christmas and for the death penalty to returning Quakers which contravened English law. Other laws were changed to bring them into greater compliance with English custom, most notably in that highway robbery was added to the list of capital crimes.[101]

Even those unique, independent, miniature commonwealths, the Massachusetts towns, were returning to "several deep seated English institutions and customs."[102] In Sudbury second generation farmers grew "Eng-

lish pasture," and the military company purchased a "flight of colors." One Captain Walley returned the cross to his local militia company's flag without authorization. The English common law was reintroduced in Sudbury in 1679.[103] Revival of English practices in rural areas like Sudbury suggests that some aspects of English culture ostensibly abandoned by the founding fathers were still well known to their progeny in the Boston hinterland.

Mounting pressure from the crown increased the Massachusetts colonists' solicitude for their rights as Englishmen. It is likely that the moderate faction was concerned with English Liberties for some time before the charter was annulled. During the 1680 dispute between the factions over sending agents to England, the old commonwealth adherent Daniel Gookin declared that sending agents would deprive the colonists of their English rights. Probably couched to appeal to moderates who valued English Liberties, Gookin's argument was that legally accredited representatives would justify the King in passing judgment (doubtless adverse) on Massachusetts, a violation of the colonist's Magna Charta right to be tried by twelve men of their neighborhood in the King's Courts rather than in his presence. Gookin added that removal to the wilderness had not deprived colonists of their countrymen's rights,[104] an admission which seriously weakened the commonwealthmen's contention that Massachusetts lay outside English law. In 1683 Increase Mather, temporarily joining the commonwealth faction in defiance of the crown, justified defiance partly on the grounds that the English monarchy was limited rather than absolute.[105] As Massachusetts moved reluctantly to embrace

more of English law, the Whig interpretation of the English Constitution became more influential in her citizens' thinking.

News of the crown's attack on New England was accompanied by other intelligence of equally grim import. Increase Mather heard in 1675 that a former friend had died at the hands of the bishops, which made him contemplate the possibility of his own martyrdom.[106] Throughout the next eighteen months he sprinkled his diary with notations about the sad state of English affairs and bewailed persecution of the Non-Conformists.[107] The slackening of persecution in 1677 did not bring more encouraging reports on the moral and religious condition of England. Mather's correspondents depicted the erosion of Dissent through the death of its ministers and the apostacy of saints who "for the most part, doe not adorn the Gospel."[108] The demise of so many Puritan preachers who stood in the way of God's wrath made it probable that His anger would break forth against England "wors then (sic) Sodom," wrote Elizabeth Moulder, a Bostonian visiting in London.[109]

The anti-Catholic tremors which rippled through English society were communicated to New England as rapidly as ships could carry them. Long before exposure of the "Popish Plot," the colonists had feared the spread of popery in England. In 1670 it was learned that Parliament was becoming increasingly concerned about the growth of Catholicism.[110] Four years later a gathering of ministers at John Hull's house "seemed to be sensible to the state of things and of the plots of papists, Atheists."[111] When New Englanders' emotions were inflamed by King Phillip's War, reports from London declared that the King and the Duke

of York had become Catholics. Edward Randolph arrived in Boston shortly thereafter to hear rumors that the Duke and some nobles had left court, attempted to raise London, and that "all was gone to confusion in England."[112]

Colonists were just as ready to accept Oates' lies as were the Privy Counsilors and the English Dissenters.[113] When persecution of the Dissenters ceased with the rise of anti-Catholic sentiment, it appeared as if God might once more begin to favor England. Revelation of the "Popish Plot" had saved the nation by "as great a miracle of the Providence of God" as Nathaniel Mather had ever known.[114] Peter Tilton thought that dissolution of Parliament in the fall of 1678 had foiled the plot. Tilton was heartened by the return of Shaftesbury to the Privy Council and the composition of the new parliament, which he hoped would espouse religion and bring an end to "Popish and prelatical tirranye..."[115]

Most colonists believed that their interests were identical with those of the Whig-Dissenter party in England. Pious souls judged England's welfare by the state of the "Protestant interest" there, which invariably hinged upon Whig fortunes and the amount of persecution undergone by Dissenters.[116] As the Whigs suffered reverses and popery was reported to flourish, colonial anxieties increased. Nathaniel Mather relayed information that the bishops had inspired dissolution of the First Exclusion Parliament in order to save Danby and the five other "Popish Lords." The Dublin-based Mather noted the strength of the Catholic "interest," which he believed had succeeded in discrediting the Plot. He described Whig hatred of the Court as so intense that it might result in civil war.[117] Four months later, in December, 1679, he portrayed Catholic

strength as increasing, and blamed papists for the delay in convening the Second Exclusion Parliament.[118] Reports originating in Bristol in the following summer informed the colonists of further delay in the summoning of Parliament. These were accompanied by accounts, probably originating in the alleged attack on John Arnold, of Catholic assaults upon Protestant magistrates in London and Monmouthshire.[119] A broadside describing Shaftesbury's indictment of the Duke of York as a popish recusant, and the quashing of the action under mysterious circumstances, circulated in New England.[120] Thus most indications were that an intensifying Catholic siege was being mounted against Protestant England.[121]

Throughout the seventeenth century English Non-Conformists provided much of the news from England which reached pious New Englanders. It was natural that the colonists and the Dissenters, who shared many preconceptions and problems and who were linked by family ties in many cases, should maintain close contact. Information supplied by the Dissenters was for this reason extremely influential in forming the colonists' English image into one which strongly resembled the English image held by Dissenters. At no time was this influence stronger than during the period between the Popish Plot and the death of Charles II, when both groups were more threatened by the English government than ever before. The similarity in viewpoint was so great that the Boston press printed a long poem on England's plight by the Baptist preacher and Whig pamphleteer Benjamin Keach which could have come from a New England pen. Entitled Sion in Distress and composed about the time of the Exclusion Crisis, Keach's poem depicted the woeful state of the nation. The land was sinking into debauchery and sinfulness while Rome plotted the overthrow of

the English bulwark against popery. Despite thousands of sermons, the preaching of the gospel in England was ineffective, which pointed to a further Catholic resurgence. Keach raised the spectre of persecution and property confiscation at the hands of "monkish Tories." While Keach painted an extremely gloomy picture, he held out cautious hope that persecution was the prelude to greater happiness. He expressed the apocalyptic hope that papal persecution would cease about 1689, and climaxed his work with a scenario of God's judgment raining down upon Antichrist.[122]

Apocalyptic speculations in New England also took on a more somber hue of pessimism during the Exclusion Crisis. The crown's renewed attack on the Massachusetts charter amplified colonial fears about English affairs. Increase Mather had already trumpeted that the New England churches could shortly expect a day of trial.[123] In 1681 he warned that "Roman eagles" were plotting to devour New England.[124] Samuel Willard believed that the day of fiery trials had come upon the lukewarm Protestant churches throughout the world.[125] A month after Willard delivered this pronouncement, the Massachusetts General Court expressed its sense that the "present state of the Protestant interest abroad, and more especially in the land of our Fathers Sepulchres, doth call for earnest Prayer."[126] In 1682 persecution of the French Protestants inspired Mather to encourage the New England saints to steel themselves to withstand persecution. Mather did not know if the final and presumably worst of Antichrist's oppression would reach England and New England, but he believed that New England's peace depended upon that of the

mother country. Mather was sure that all colonists were aware that there were "special designs against the Protestant Interest there."[127]

Despite news of renewed persecution of Dissenters, the failure of Exclusion, and the forebodings which accompanied the rise of Catholicism, it was still possible to hope that England would withstand papal machinations. Mather had hopes for the fall of Antichrist during the period between 1688 and 1696.[128] "Rome and Hell have not yet blown up the Protestant interest in England," Samuel Willard asserted somewhat grimly in 1682.[129] The next year Samuel Torrey reiterated that in "these latter ages" God had made the English nation the bulwark of Protestantism and more glorious than other nations.[130]

By the summer of 1683, however, it seemed that the Protestant interest was in desperate straits in England. Persecution was spreading to Non-Conformists all over the land. The crown was attacking the London charter while it used the Rye House Plot to destroy the Whig leaders. Increase Mather's English correspondents believed greater persecution was in the offing.[131] In New Hampshire newly appointed royal governor Lionel Cranfield was embarking upon systematic persecution of the Congregational clergy.[132] A sense of universal darkness pervaded the letters which Increase Mather received from Puritans all over the North Atlantic world.[133]

At this moment the crown launched its final attack on the Massachusetts charter. The colony was divided over the question of fighting the King's writ against the charter in the courts. Increase Mather, hitherto an advocate of reconciliation, went over to the commonwealth faction,

which refused to submit to the king's command that no public money be used in a legal fight against annulment.[134] Commonwealth arguments against submission to the crown, which have been attributed to Mather, suggest how most pious colonists must have viewed England at the moment. It was declared that the king's pleasure in religious matters was not likely to be compatible with New England's religious interest, an understatement which could hardly have done justice to most commonwealthmen's emotions on that subject, but which reflected Mather's greater moderation. It was maintained that the English corporations which had submitted to the crown had fared no better than those which fought in the courts. The logic of this double edged argument becomes clearer in light of another contention, which held that the king might well have demanded the colony's submission under the influence of popish counsel, under which circumstances it would be a sin for the colonists to comply. It was further urged that English Dissenters looked to New England not to set a bad example by caving in under pressure. Finally it was declared that such submission was not required because Englishmen lived under a limited rather than an absolute monarchy.[135] In short, Mather, or whoever enunciated these arguments, felt that the English situation had become so bad that Massachusetts saints must stand fast against a sinful course if they were to preserve their righteousness.

The moderates apparently counselled submission on the grounds that resistance was useless, as well as because the king's agent, Edward Randolph, offered liberal regulation of the charter if the colony would

submit itself to the crown's authority. Moderates had a preponderance in the Council, but since the deputies were controlled by the commonwealth group a deadlock ensued which persisted while the charter was annulled in late 1684.[136] News of annullment was expected, but when it was learned that Percy Kirke, the ruthless governor of Tangier, was to become governor of Massachusetts, colonists were stunned. "Our situation is awful," lamented Secretary Edward Rawson to Plymouth governor Hinkley in 1685.[137]

Dark as the situation appeared, a continuing thread of hope lurked in the minds of the pious, fostered by apocalyptic expectations and the ambiguous import of English events. That "monster" Charles II, as Cotton Mather called him,[138] died in 1685. The delay in crown assumption of Massachusetts' government consequent upon the accession of James II raised hopes that the colony might yet escape her fate.[139] In the previous year Increase Mather had declared that sudden revolutions in the wheel of God's Providence would crush Antichrist.[140] The possibility of a rebellion against James was known to exist. Earlier it had been argued that if the charter were annulled without their consent, the colonists were no longer the king's subjects.[141] Some colonists suggested a Massachusetts rebellion during the spring and summer of 1685. Six clergymen, lead by William Hubbard, opposed any colonial rebellion, though they admitted that an act of God might divert the English government.[142] A number of ministers believed just such an act was in the making with Monmouth's revolt, according to Edward Randolph, who wrote the home government that they preached the time of deliverance from popery

and monarchy had arrived.[143] Monmouth's Rebellion proved abortive, however, and moderate clergymen such as John Higginson seized the opportunity of Monmouth's defeat to declare that God was calling on His people to observe the principles of the good old Non-Conformists, "namely to yield subjection and obedience...to magistrates."[144] By September "the Calamities and Confusions of the English Nation" led Cotton Mather to spend an extra hour in prayer for the "distress'd Churches of God."[145]

That New England was to share in this distress seemed abundantly clear to many colonists when the Dominion of New England was established. Not only was an assembly omitted from the government, but the king commanded that Anglican worship be tolerated. An Episcopal minister arrived with Randolph, and commenced Anglican services in the Boston town house. His presence aroused fear and hatred among the Boston populace. Increase Mather issued a pamphlet attacking the English liturgy as Antichristian, with all the arguments used over the course of the previous century. He betrayed, however, the ambivalent attitude toward the English church which some New Englanders had held since the early days. Mather admitted that some men in the church of England adhered to the Thirty-Nine Articles, and that some were true Protestants who "would suffer with their Non-Conformable Brethren,...rather than Embrace Popery."[146] By recognizing the division of the English church into high and low branches, Mather perpetuated the old colonial contention that the English church was a true church overlaid with papal corruptions. Nevertheless, the impression conveyed by Mather's tract was that the Anglican intrusion posed a grave threat to New England's ancestral church

polity.[147]

The Dominion of New England laid the colonists under greater threats. Since their own situation was virtually identical to that in England, their image of England's plight and that of their own straits almost coincided. The news from England was that the land was being overwhelmed by a tide of "Atheism, irreligion, and profaness."[148] The colonists believed that the government under Sir Edmund Andros was inflicting the same upon them. The Dominion of New England was exactly what colonists had been led to expect in the way of Antichristian tyranny. Andros forced the Second Church of Boston to domicile the Anglicans.[149] His lieutenants denied that the colonists had the rights of Englishmen. He governed without an assembly, just as did the Catholic tyrant Louis XIV. Lack of an assembly deprived the colony of its traditional high court, the General Court. Andros took a long step toward completely dismantling Massachusetts' purified legal structure by establishing a Superior Court with wide powers, centralizing the registry of public records, and instituting the prerequisites and fees familiar in English legal transactions.[150] When Andros brought into question every land title in New England[151] (except those in Connecticut) he was doing exactly what New Englanders, and most Englishmen, expected "monkish Tories" to do. For years the colonists had been warned of just such a loss of their civil and religious privileges. In the eyes of godly colonists Andros and his favorites were the henchmen of Antichrist, though no one dared say it. Charles Morton, the Charlestown minister recently arrived from England, was tried for allegedly

saying "that persecution...was come amongst us and settled amongst us."[152] The worst fears of the godly over the previous dozen years had been confirmed.[153]

It was almost inevitable that the Rights of Englishmen assume a more prominent place in colonial thinking under Dudley's provisional government and the Dominion of New England. Annulment of the charter destroyed those arguments making the charter the main defense against the crown, though Gookin was ready to appeal to the laws of God and nature to resist authority which contravened divine precept. With the charter gone, the reasoning that English law did not extend to the colonies justified the Andros government in whatever actions it wished to take, as Dudley contended at John Wise's trial.[155] Moderates Saltonstall, Champernowne, and the two Bradstreets had refused to join Dudley's temporary government because it lacked an assembly, which they thought denied them liberty and was "against Magna Charta."[156] In June, 1688, Increase Mather petitioned the crown against Andros on the grounds that the Dominion governor had infringed upon the colonists' English Liberties.[157] Wise's protest against Dominion taxes was made on the familiar ground that taxation without representation was a denial of an Englishman's right.[158] From the dissolution of the charter onwards, the strongest legal defense against the crown available to the colonists was the time honored assertion of English Liberty.

The one reason for hope among pious colonists was the religious toleration afforded Dissenters in England and the lack of outright persecution in New England. James' religious policy enabled sanguine colonists to maintain a cautiously optimistic outlook. As early as January, 1686, Cotton Mather thought that James' actions worked "towards such a

Liberty for the Dissenters" as heralded the First Resurrection.[159] When his father, Increase, heard of the Declaration of Indulgence, he praised God "for the Liberty good People enjoy in England" and persuaded his congregation to convey its thanks to the crown. In this move he parted company with the commonwealth faction, who were not deceived. Thomas Danforth, who saw that toleration in England was intended to further Catholicism and who did not trust princes, vainly attempted to dissuade Mather from reconciliation with the crown. But Mather got his church's permission to plead New England's grievances before the king, thus fulfilling his long standing desire to return to England if the disabilities against Dissenters were removed.[160] He had already petitioned the king when John Wise led the Ipswich protest. Wise declared that the Ipswich men had "A good God, a good King, and should do well to stand by our privileges,"[161] an expression which suggests that he too might have hoped that King James would prove to be a fountain of justice.

Whatever illusions Increase Mather may have had about King James' intent to honor the Whig version of English Liberties were dispelled by the fair words and empty promises with which that monarch treated his representations against Andros. He was not the only colonial Anglophile disappointed by James' policy in New England. "Royalist" New England merchants and large landholders also found themselves denied what they considered their English Liberties by the Andros regime. They stood to lose as much by the Dominion's land policy as did Puritan townsmen. The lack of an assembly was as offensive to them as it was to moderates and commonwealthmen.[162] Worst of all, most of these

wealthy and cosmopolitan men were excluded from the profit and influence which they believed was rightfully theirs. Denied these advantages, they believed their rights of life and property to be threatened.[163] By the end of 1688 Richard Wharton had allied himself with Increase Mather in an intrigue to have Andros recalled. Thus when rumors of the Glorious Revolution reached New England, the "royalist" merchants were as ready to overthrow Andros as were other segments of the population. Momentarily, in early 1689, commonwealthmen, moderates, and royalists could agree, though out of differing motives, that government in Old England (and New) had been corrupted "by those worst of men, by whom English Liberties have been destroyed...."[164]

Opposition to the Dominion of New England united the divergent elements of colonial society against the strict exercise of English authority. Like most Englishmen in 1689, colonists were also united in regarding the late reign of James II as dangerous if not corrupt, and in welcoming the accession of William and Mary. Such unanimity of opinion about English affairs foreshadowed the consensus of loyalty to the Protestant Succession which was a conspicuous element in the colonists' English image during the eighteenth century. Michael G. Hall has suggested that the removal of a Catholic King and the granting of toleration made Massachusetts colonists loyal Englishmen,[165] an observation which seems generally accurate. Yet the thickening layers of that provincial Anglophilism which first arose during the Restoration did not eliminate colonial factionalism, nor the idea that England might be corrupt. The standards employed in passing judgment on England's state

of grace in the eighteenth century were somewhat different from those congenial to seventeenth century minds, but they did not eradicate the fundamental ambivalence of the colonists' many faceted English image.

## CHAPTER IV

## GLORIOUS ENGLAND 1689-1714

"Let us be Englishmen."---Joseph Dudley, 1703.

England appeared far more appealing to early eighteenth century New Englanders than she had to their Puritan forebears. The positive aspect of the colonists' ambivalent English image became dominant in the era between 1690 and 1715, to remain so for the succeeding fifty years. Glorious Revolution, Protestant Succession, and Marlborough's victories over France were interpreted as dramatic proof that once again God's favor was shining upon His elect nation. A wave of admiration for things English swept over New England, rooted in the new colonial political subordination to England as well as in colonial veneration of her religious distinction. The breakup of the Puritan orthodoxy, and the decline of New England moral rectitude dampened the colonial impulse to make invidious comparisons of England with New England. The New Englanders' self conceived superiority over England waned as they recognized their declensions or lost interest in New England's traditional religious values. Veneration for the mother country came to dominate public and private expressions of feeling about England, replacing the guarded loyalty of the old "moderate" faction and the hostility of the "commonwealth" group. While New Englanders rejoiced at the ascent of William and Mary and Queen Anne's victories, they were in the last stages of the transformation from being alienated Englishmen to provincials who venerated the metropolis.

The negative aspect of the colonists' English image did not die out, despite resurgence of its opposite. Fear of enforced conformity to Anglicanism remained as a lurking suspicion among most colonists, and was expressed in outbursts of apprehension which corresponded to periods of High Toryism in England. The last decade of the seventeenth century left in doubt the outcome of the struggle between England and France. English morality declined even further, and disunity was endemic among English Dissenters. Colonists frequently expressed traditional criticisms of High Church Anglicanism, noted England's growing moral corruption, and lapsed into the rhetoric of England's national degeneracy. Yet early eighteenth century colonists did not emphasize England's corruption as had some of their most influential predecessors. A Protestant monarch on the throne, toleration for Noncomformity, and English opposition to Catholic France offset "High Flying" Anglicanism and moral corruption in colonial eyes. With New England sharing in England's corruptions, moreover, the negative pole of the ambivalent English image lacked the sustenance of colonial self righteous moral superiority. The idea of England's corruption was to show renewed potency with time, but with Marlborough's victories it waned among New Englanders and became a muted theme. Colonists continued to see England as corrupt, but usually their view of her sins was overshadowed by their admiration for her virtues.

Belief that England was God's elect nation had always rested upon evidence of His favor to her. English Protestants had usually agreed that popery and foreign invasion were the two greatest evils which could

befall the nation. Avoidance of these disasters was the most widely held criterion of God's favor to England, and always provided an occasion for reaffirmation of the elect nation myth. The Glorious Revolution was just such an occasion, in Old England and in New. It took its place beside failure of the Armada and frustration of the Powder Plot as a pre-eminent example of God's special favor to the English nation. Whig churchman Gilbert Burnet, newly installed as King William's chaplain, told the House of Commons that the recent revolution was a pledge to Englishmen, and proof to all the world, that God was England's. Burnet recalled that Christianity had preceded Catholicism in England, and reasserted the traditional Protestant contention that the nation had resisted popish superstition even under bondage.[1] In New England as in Old, it was the Glorious Revolution which revitalized the myth of England's religious primacy. Cotton Mather preached a thanksgiving sermon in which he declared that the revolution was God's greatest deliverance to England, even outshining that of 1588. Mather believed that the event brought new hope for Protestantism throughout Europe and America. With England once more bearing the banner of Protestantism, he expected that arch-henchman of Antichrist, Louis XIV, to either die or grant toleration to French Protestants.[2]

Cotton Mather's hopes for France were an indicator of the quickening apocalyptic impulses which the revolution inspired. The deliverance of 1688 was the sudden stroke of God's power against Antichrist for which apocalyptically minded colonials had been waiting ever since the Exclusion Crisis. It confirmed the old belief that England would

play a prominent role in realizing the New Jerusalem. In 1689 Increase Mather was ready to invest the revolution with apocalyptic significance by interpreting the Whig sponsored Corporation Act (an abortive measure which would have revived Whig - Dissenter power in the municipalities and preserved the first Massachusetts charter) as the general resurrection of the witnesses foretold in Revelation. He speculated that the martyrs of 1682 (probably Algernon Sydney and Lord Russel) were the two witnesses slain in the eleventh chapter of Revelation.[3] While this interpretation proved incorrect, both Increase and Cotton Mather remained convinced that the millenium was at hand, and kept their eyes riveted upon England in expectation that she would be the focus of apocalyptic activity. In 1692 Cotton expressed faith that England would shortly receive the "Ancient Loving kindness of God" in the form of the New Jerusalem.[4] By 1696 he was declaring that "The Kingdom of God is at Hand!"[5] His hopes for the millenium reached one of several peaks in the late 1690's when he had assurances from God that a great reformation in England would usher in the chiliad.[6] At least for the Mathers, England's virtue sprang in part from her apocalyptic role.

Godly rulers were as important in the elect nation myth as were apocalyptic yearnings. Since the founding of New England none of the English kings had fitted colonial conceptions of the godly ruler, which contributed much to their conclusion that God's wrath lay heavily upon the nation. William's leadership of the international coalition against Louis XIV, regarded as Catholicism's most dangerous proponent by the colonists, gave him stature in the apocalyptic struggle against

Antichrist. Increase Mather told the Massachusetts General Court that England was blessed with a king in "whom the Fate of Europe and of the Church of God is more concerned then (sic) it has been in the life of any one Person for these thousand years" and added that William fought the battles of the Lord.[7] Cotton Mather echoed that William was God's instrument for saving the nation from Antichristian designs of the Catholic monarchs.[8] When the 1696 plot to assasinate William failed, Increase Mather regarded the event as both a deliverance for England and an apocalyptic stroke against Antichrist which promised greater wrath against him in the future.[9] Even those colonists who eschewed chiliastic pronouncements believed that William was "a great blessing to the threatened, endangered Protestant Interest" and "the Sanctuary of the Oppressed Nations" who had returned England to her rightful role as the bulwark of reformed religion.[10]

Most colonists were Whigs who valued English liberties, property, and Nonconformity in Religion. William was no friend of the English Whigs (though he was forced to get their support). This did not prevent New Englanders from depicting him as the saviour of Whig values. Cotton Mather observed that William and Mary were the only means whereby liberty and property as well as religion had been preserved.[11] Increase Mather listed restoration of the subjects' civil liberties among William's major achievements.[12] Benjamin Wadsworth recalled that William had rescued the nation when it was "almost quite depriv'd of Liberty and Property, having Religion, Laws, and Lives in utmost hazard; sinking under Arbitrary Power and Tyranny," as well as almost overwhelmed with

popery.[13] When even Connecticut Tory Gershom Bulkeley declared that William and Mary had restored government to its ancient integrity for all of England,[14] it is understandable how colonial Whigs could declare William one of their own.

New Englanders' adulation for William also rested upon his efforts to improve English manners and morals. The colonists' propensity for moral reformation was gratified by William and Mary's frequent proclamations against vice and immorality and their disapproval of the "immoralities" of the late reigns.[15] Cotton Mather hoped that the 1698 proclamation signaled beginning of a notable reformation.[16] The Connecticut General Court expressed its approval of William's proclamation by asking Governor Fitz-John Winthrop to draft legislation for fulfilling the King's wishes in Connecticut.[17] Not surprisingly, colonists tended to see publicly proclaimed morality as manifesting a virtuous character. The Connecticut General Court depicted William as "a prince for piety and virtue, magnanimity and fortitude, rarely to be paralleled,"[18] while Wadsworth saw him as "a great enemy to Vice and Wickedness" and "by Example, an Encourager of Vertue, and Discourager of vice."[19]

Queen Mary met New England preconceptions of the godly ruler even more satisfactorily than her consort. Her deeper interest in moral reform was appreciated by the Mathers, Cotton exclaiming that her greatest wish for good was to "Reform Her People of the Evil Manners that prevailed among them,"[20] while Increase celebrated her as a paragon of virtue, and told Joseph Dudley and the Massachusetts General Court that she would have attempted a thorough moral reformation had she lived.[21]

However, it was Mary's desire for comprehension of Dissent within the English Church and her intercession on Massachusetts' behalf during negotiations for the new charter which brought her colonial adulation. When he returned to New England after obtaining the new charter Increase informed the Massachusetts General Court that God had "blessed the Nation with a Queen...the like unto whom...never sat on the English throne."[22] Seven years after her death Benjamin Wadsworth was still recalling that she had done "much good for God's people."[23] When eulogizing Mary in 1695, Cotton Mather called her the "Greatest LADY that ever Europe saw," who had been God's instrument for saving His true religion, which she had embodied in her person, character, and conduct.[24] Mary's actual role in attempting the type of reformation colonists wished to see was minimal--neither she nor King William were so politically unwise as to try it. It was enough that she was pious and Protestant, since these attributes had not been combined in an English monarch within the memory of any living New Englander.[25]

King William's religious policy won him colonial loyalty, though it did not live up to the fondest hopes of the most pious colonists. The Toleration Act removed the immediate threat of persecution of Dissent, and William's appointees to influential bishoprics were low churchmen who favored comprehension of the Dissenters within the English Church. Gilbert Burnet, John Tillotson, and Thomas Tenison opposed the Test Act and advocated Comprehension, which raised the stature of the Anglican Church in colonial eyes. When these men aided Increase Mather in his quest for renewal of the old Massachusetts charter, they won real colonial

esteem.[26] Thereafter the Mathers frequently expressed approval of low church opinions and low church bishops. The Mathers saw low churchmen as reformers like themselves, Cotton once claiming that the Dissenters were the true church of England because they adhered most closely to the Calvinistic Thirty-Nine Articles and practiced reforms advocated by many low church writers.[27]

Comprehension failed in the Convocation of 1689, but for years after the Mathers and other colonial ministers hoped that it might be achieved. Their hopes gave rise to a more ecumenical frame of mind, wherein they were more willing to improve their image of the English Church. Unity of the faithful despite differences in discipline had a respectable tradition in New England, dating from John Norton's Reply to Appolonious (1648), which Wadsworth quoted in 1701 to prove that the colonists were not isolationist sectaries.[28] John Cotton had urged mutual tolerance upon the English Presbyterians and Congregationalists.[29] In the 1680's colonial ministers openly welcomed English Presbyterians within the fold of colonial orthodoxy.[30] Since before the revolution John Leverett and Thomas Brattle at Harvard had been recommending latitudinarian Anglican authors to their students, "to preserve us from...narrow principles" alumnus Henry Newman later recalled.[31] When Increase Mather helped engineer the ill-fated union of English Congregationalists and Presbyterians in 1692, Cotton Mather produced a supporting tract which claimed that pious members of all denominations, including Anglicans, were welcomed in the New England churches.[32] By 1699 Increase was writing that English Protestantism embraced those Anglicans, Presbyterians, Congregationalists, and Baptists who shared the same articles of faith and

whose churches each contained some of the godly and some of the unregenerate.[33] At this point it seemed to Increase Mather that the English Church was embarking on a New England style reformation, and his enthusiasm for low church Anglicanism reached its highest level.[34] In 1701 many ecumenically oriented colonial ministers welcomed the Anglican Society for Propagation of the Gospel as an ally in the attempt to convert the Indians, though they were shortly appraised of its intent to proselytize among the colonists.[35]

Glorious Revolution, Protestant monarch, and low church bishops were obviously God's blessings, but subsequent English events were more ambiguous in import. King William's reign did not inaugurate the millenium, nor did it result in victory over Antichristian France. Nonconformity did not win comprehension within the Anglican establishment, and the Anglican Church remained unreformed. Toleration of Dissent was grudging, with Dissenters still barred from public office. England continued to wallow in moral corruption despite the Glorious Revolution. Thus the image of England as a corrupt nation was still viable among colonists, and the negative aspect of the elect nation concept still played a role in maintaining the ambivalent image of England. Especially between 1695 and 1703 the import of English events dimmed England's luster in colonial eyes.

The most obvious blemish in England was High Church Anglicanism. Though they favored low churchmen, New Englanders were forced to condemn the English Church because the majority of its clergy were hostile to

Dissent and maintained the trappings and ceremonies of the church which were anathema to Nonconformists. Even more alarming was the growing Arminianism among the Anglican clergy, which aroused Cotton Mather to warn colonists against turning to the English "Will-Worship," and to remind English Dissenters of the danger from the "Pelagian Apostacy, of the Canonical Churches of England." Cotton charged the high churchmen with "exploding" the Calvinistic items in the Thirty-Nine Articles, and creating a "New Church of England" which desired reunion with Rome.[36] Many of Mather's criticisms were old complaints against the English ceremonies articulated by low church divines as well as by generations of Puritans, and reflected the traditional colonial bias against an Anglicanism which did not fit colonial notions of the true church. The decay of Calvinism in the English church, however, was a new and serious matter, especially since colonial hopes for a more ecumenical era were predicated upon the assumption that doctrinal agreement among the denominations was essential to Christian unity.

Calvinism was decaying elsewhere in England besides inside the state church. Nothing on the English religious scene in the 1690's appalled colonists as much as the furious polemical brawls which enveloped English Nonconformity. The Mathers especially were shocked, since Increase had helped to create a union of Congregationalists and Presbyterians while in England in 1692, which would have greatly strengthened Dissent had it been maintained. By late 1694 the union was in shreds, and in its stead the violent Crispian controversy widened the gap be-

tween Congregationalists and Presbyterians. Caught between the two doctrinal extremes of the controversy, the Mathers condemned the "Neonomian" heresy of the Presbyterians and the "Antinomianism" of their fellow Congregationalists.[37] The acrimony arising out of the dispute lead Increase Mather to bewail the great decay of piety among English Dissenters in 1699,[38] while Cotton stated that "the glorious Doctrines of Grace are depraved, and deserted, even in the Churches of the Reformation, and especially in the English Nation...," and mobilized his clerical brethren to prevent spread of the infection to New England.[39]

English immorality continued to dismay colonists, as it had for several generations. Even in 1689 Increase Mather's speculation on the resurrection of the witnesses included the interpretation that England was the sinful street of Babylon referred to in Revelation 11.[40] The Glorious Revolution did little to reform Englishmen, who continued to indulge in sins of the flesh and works of the devil. It did prick the consciences of pious low churchmen and Dissenters, however, who believed that Englishmen ought to reform their manners and morals as thanks to God for their late deliverance from popery, and who feared God's wrath if reformation did not take place. These people lamented England's moral corruption and warned of God's wrath to come, familiar words in New England ears.[41] Cotton Mather quoted none other than Queen Mary that the nation had enough visible sins which brought divine displeasure without worrying about invisible ones.[42] Cotton applauded formation of societies for reforming manners and morals, but continued to believe that God was provoked by the "Profanity, the Debauchery, the Superstri-

tion where with our Nation has been infected...."[43]

International events offered little indication that God was especially pleased with England at the turn of the eighteenth century. The uneasy European peace cast a pall of gloom over knowledgeable colonists who realized that the Treaty of Ryswick registered stalemate in the conflict between England and France. Cotton Mather, whose first reaction to rumors of the treaty was that it would inaugurate the millenium, was deeply disappointed by its terms, which did nothing to relieve French Huguenots and other European Protestants from persecution.[44] Dismay over the Treaty of Ryswick turned to pessimism in succeeding years. Louis XIV's claim to the Spanish throne stirred further foreboding among colonists, Cotton Mather composing an agitated pamphlet to arouse his compatriots to the new danger.[45] In June, 1702, Benjamin Colman declared that the entire Protestant cause was at a "lower ebb" than at any time in recent ages. A week later news of William's death arrived in New England, a further indication of the weakening of international Protestantism in colonial eyes.[46]

International and domestic English events both suggested that England was once again coming under the lash of the Lord's displeasure. Cotton Mather lamented England's sins and weaknesses. The nation was torn by divisions, and so overwhelmed with corruptions that reforming societies were ineffective. Dissenters were still barred from public office, and the nation had not repented for persecuting the Dissenters before the Glorious Revolution. Heresies flourished through the land, the state

church refused to be reformed, and the Dissenters quarreled among themselves.[47] Increase Mather believed England was ripe for God's judgment and recalled Thomas Hooker's prophecy that God would destroy England.[48] Increase thought that the jeremiads preached in England were so strong that they would have proved efficacious in the biblical model of iniquity, the city of Sodom. England had failed to repent despite ministerial warnings, fire, plague, and war which God had visited upon the nation since deprivation of the Nonconformist ministers in 1662.[49] In 1704 Increase added storm to the list of afflictive judgments when he heard about the hurricane which swept northwestern Europe and England. He found it appropriate of God's justice that the storm began on a day when a London audience was watching a play which profaned God's omnipotence by depicting thunder and lightning. Once again the elder Mather portrayed England as a modern Sodom, employing the catalogue of national iniquities which had been the preachers' standard fare for at least a century.[50]

Yet belief that God would eventually bless England persisted in New England. Even the judgment of the Great Storm did not shake Increase's affection for "the dear land of our Father's Sepulchres." He hoped that English saints would be the saving remnant for whose sake God would spare the nation, and took comfort from an estimate that there were more than fifty thousand regenerate souls in England.[51] Cotton Mather had hope for England's salvation because he believed that the English churches could be in a worse state, and because England, "above all the places upon Earth, has afforded rare Examples, and even Miracles of the

Divine Protection on the Protestant Interest."[52] Even during the darkest moments at the turn of the eighteenth century the Mathers were buoyed up by their conviction that the millenium was soon to bring blessings upon the Protestant Church and the English nation.[53] Despite her corruptions England continued to be God's elect nation, a concept as valid for the Mathers in 1702 as it had been for Samuel Ward in 1626.

The Mathers' faith in England's election seemed fully justified by events during the first years of Queen Anne's reign. In 1702 Increase hailed the new queen for her proclamation against immorality and in support of religion, and for her "tenderness" toward the Nonconformists. He also expressed hope that she would emulate Elizabeth's victory over Spain by defeating France.[54] Inherent in these statements were the criteria against which England's state of grace and Anne's performance as a godly monarch were measured by many colonists in the first decade of the eighteenth century. In almost all respects, England's performance came close to equalling Increase Mather's hopes, though Anne's attachment to Anglicanism and her distrust of the Whigs caused initial colonial apprehensions that she would enforce conformity. When the Occasional Conformity Bill failed to pass, the Tory ministry fell from power, and Marlborough's victories mounted, the colonists' fears declined and their veneration for queen and country increased.

A major element in the colonists' renewed belief in England's divine favor was the impressive English effort to combat impiety, vice, and immorality. When Archbishop Tenison sanctioned societies for encouraging piety in the Anglican Church, Increase Mather saw the move as the start

of a new reformation in England.[55] The societies for reforming manners and morals received new impetus from the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge and won wide support from Whigs, low church Anglicans, and Dissenters.[56] Cotton Mather published a pamphlet describing the English societies for reforming manners and morals in 1703. Mather reported that the London society had reduced public profanity and drunkenness and had closed down many brothels. Noting the spread of these organizations across England and on the continent, Mather urged their establishment in New England.[57] John Norton made a similar proposal to the gentlemen of the Massachusetts General Court in 1708.[58] The English charity school movement attracted colonial approval similar to that aroused by the societies for reforming morals and the Anglican associations for encouraging piety.[59]

New England preachers had no doubt that these efforts at reformation were bringing God's blessing upon England as well as being omens of His favor. Ebenezer Pemberton declared that the charity schools brought glory to the nation and advanced the cause of reformation.[60] John Rogers believed the reforming societies indicated that God was not going to leave the nation despite atheism, irreligion, and apostacy, proclaiming "That there is yet more of true Religion and Godliness (in that Land of our Fore-Fathers) than in any such spot of Earth on the Globe besides!" Doubtless thinking of England's victories over France, Rogers added that "God had appeared wonderfully" for Englishmen.[61] Benjamin Colman thought that the reformation of manners in England had brought "many Singular Smiles upon the Nation."[62] In 1708 and 1709 Increase Mather harked back

to the old legend of England's religious primacy by reminding colonists that England's leadership in the reformation of manners was parallel to her leadership in post-Apostolic days when she had produced the first Christian empress, the first Christian emperor, and the first Christian king. The current reformation with its effort to educate the young "in the Ways of Piety" made Mather sure that God "hath mercy in Store for the Isles afar off."[63] Increasingly the optimistic chiliast,[64] the elder Mather compared England in the age of Anne with England under Charles II and James II and found vast improvement in her morality and her religious life:

> "What an happy Change we have seen of late, in our own Land and Nation? What sad Times were there a few Years ago, when the vilest Debaucheries were openly practiced, when Prisons were filled with Good men; When faithful Ministers of God were not permitted to preach the Gospel. Things are much better there now...I am persuaded God has signal Mercy in Store for that Land."[65]

Marlborough's victories, low church Anglican reform effort, and the Whig ministry all reflected glory upon Queen Anne, who accordingly rose in the colonists' esteem. Colonial ministers hailed Anne's proclamations for suppressing vice with the same enthusiasm with which they had greeted William's. Anne was depicted as a protector of colonial liberties and as a nursing mother to her people. John Wise hoped that Anne's reign would be a model for all European monarchies, and proclaimed that Anne herself embodied all the "Heavenly, Princely and Heroick Virtues."[66]

Colonial euphoria over England's blessings abated in later years of Anne's reign, however. When the Whig ministry fell from power and Tory strength in parliament rose, Dissenters were once again faced with an un-

friendly administration. Tory power stifled low churchmen and crippled the reforming societies which had been dependent upon low church and Dissenting support. These events renewed the negative aspect of the elect nation concept in colonial minds. When Thomas Prince landed in London in the fall of 1709 he was suitably impressed by England, but thought of the "humorous factions" which sullied her glory.[67] Cotton Mather noted that the English moral reformation was dying out with the decline of the reforming societies, lamented renewed enforcement of the Test Act, and described the nation as "Depraved, Betray'd, unprosperous" because the royal proclamations against vice had not been executed against debauched government officials.[68] The Sacheverel Riots renewed fears of persecution of the English Dissenters which might extend to New England, and raised the spectre of civil war in England.[69] Many colonists regarded the Tory ministry with a distrust which seemed justified when the Tory commander of the abortive Quebec expedition, Sir Hovenden Walker, attempted to blame New England for his failure.[70] Thanks to Joseph Dudley's Tory connections and Jeremiah Dummer's lobbying New England escaped odium, but the temporary cheer on that occasion was soon dispelled by news that Marlborough had fallen and the Tory parliament had burned Dr. Fleetwood's defense of the Protestant Succession and the Duke. "Things look dark at home," Ebenezer Pemberton wrote in 1712, while other colonial ministers anxiously contemplated the effects of passage of the Occasional Conformity Bill.[71] The expatriate Henry Newman wrote to John Leverett a few months later that God was chastising England for its ingratitude with chaotic political conditions.[72] By early 1714 Cotton Mather was lamenting "the Impieties which

fill the English Nation at this day; from a vile Generation of men" and hoped that God would "put an End unto their Abominations, and mercifully deliver the nations once again from that which depraves them wonderfully."[73] Samuel Sewall summed up the gloom of many pious colonists when he wrote in respect to events in Europe and England that "a very dark night seems to approach, the Darkness wherof will be felt...."[74]

The oscillation of the colonists' English image between the poles of national blessedness and national sinfulness in the post-1689 era reflected the fluctuations in English political and religious life just as colonial estimates of England's grace had depended upon English events in the past. It is clear that the ambivalent myth of England's religious state continued to serve as a viable intellectual framework within which English events held meaning. Colonial emphasis throughout most of the era was on the positive aspects of the elect nation myth, reflecting the colonists' approval of the Glorious Revolution, the Protestant Succession, and victory over France. Colonial approbation of England had other roots besides England's fluctuating state of grace, however.

In the era after 1689 a strong wave of colonial Anglophilism arose, stimulated by the changing conditions of colonial culture as well as by the faith of the pious that God once again smiled upon the English nation. New Englanders were becoming more self-consciously provincial and were attempting to redefine their role in the universe. The Andros years had placed severe strains upon the self-confidence of many colonists, and the early years under King William imposed similar stresses

upon the old assumption that New England was the apple of God's eye. It was harder for colonists to believe that New England would crest on the wave of the millenium. Indian wars, witchcraft crisis, the break up of colonial uniformity, the decline of piety, and political centralization in England continued to suggest that New England was an area of secondary importance. In reaction to this trend important colonists continued to assert New England's importance, but with renewed stress upon the colonists' English identity. In religion and politics, as well as in dress and manners, New England's self importance was increasingly defined by the colonial relationship with England.

England (and Europe as well) seemed superior to New England in the troubled years following the Glorious Revolution when colonial apocalyptic anxieties focused on a series of domestic disasters. After the French and Indians destroyed Schenectedy in early 1690 Cotton Mather publicly stated his conviction that the colonists might well retire to Europe or ascend to heaven in the near future.[75] The witchcraft crisis provoked similar forebodings. Cotton Mather wrote Wonders of the Invisible World to assure English Dissenters that the devil was not destroying New England. His preoccupation with dissipating the notion that America was the devil's bailiwick suggests an uneasy feeling on Cotton Mather's part that the last days of the apocalypse might indeed see the triumph of Satan in New England. He was ready to believe that New England's connection with England might prove to be her salvation. England could expect establishment of a New Jerusalem within her borders, and New England would share in that blessed state.[76] The undertone of New England's religious inferiority in Wonders of the Invisible World complemented a sense of New England's secular inferiority which

also appeared in Cotton Mather's writings in the early 1690's. In 1689 he called for special efforts to preserve colonial youth from falling into that "Criolean Degeneracy, observed to deprave the Children of the most noble and worthy Europeans, when transplanted into America." Without culture, Christianity would expire in New England.[77] Mather later repeated the observation that animals transplanted from Europe to North America degenerated, and drew a tentative parallel between animals and men.[78] That America represented decaying nature when contrasted with Europe might have seemed reasonable in light of New England's declining holiness.

Increase Mather's image of England became brighter as his disillusionment with New England deepened. The witchcraft episode hurt his standing in Massachusetts, where the old commonwealth faction muttered against the charter he had obtained. After removal of governor Phips the elder Mather lost control of the Massachusetts Council. This was followed by a prolonged dispute with the Assembly over his role as Harvard president. Meanwhile Increase was failing to stop Solomon Stoddard's agitation for open communion in the New England churches, and watched while the Brattle Street Church implemented Stoddardianism in Boston itself. By the late 1690's Increase was prognosticating that New England would be "the wofullest place in all America" during the coming apocalypse.[79] His disillusionment with New England spurred his hopes that England was embarking on a new reformation in 1699. This notion was occasioned by news of the reforming societies then being established in the English churches. Mather thought the English Church

was adopting a New England style reformation, since the societies required relation of a conversion experience for membership, candidates were admitted or excluded with the consent of a majority of the members, and the societies' rules called for moral and pious living. It appeared to Increase Mather that England was in the midst of a Congregational type reformation at the very moment New England was abandoning the true church polity.[80]

The elder Mather's readiness to see a new reformation looming on the English horizon was as much a function of his desire to return to England as it was inspired by his millenial expectations or his disillusionment with New England. He had contemplated remaining in England before returning to Massachusetts in 1692, and once back in the colony he longed for England. His hopes became obsessive--for more than six months in 1693/94 he prayed daily about them. By 1696 Increase was sure that God intended to restore him to England. So strong was his "Bent of Spirit" to go to England that son Cotton received a "Particular Faith" that Increase would return to the mother country "to glorify the Lord Jesus Christ, before his Entrance into the heavenly Kingdome." Though the failure of that assurance caused the Mathers severe distress, Increase's desire to return to England continued for the rest of his life.[81]

Increase Mather's yearning for England was symbolic of the growing New England preoccupation with an English culture which was more and more widely recognized as worthy of imitation. There was a strong urge on the part of many colonists to replace at least some of the traditional colonial values with English values and custom, a tendency which had been

present before, but which circumstances magnified enormously after the Glorious Revolution. In no area was this more true than in the New English image of the English law, which underwent sweeping changes between 1685 and 1715. In this period the imposition of English law on the colonies helped to inspire a new respect and veneration for English law as the guarantee of the subject's liberties.

New Englanders had effected a legal revolution when they reformed the common law in Massachusetts and Connecticut. By colonial standards English law was corrupt, a sentiment which persisted for years after 1689, as the successful Massachusetts fight against adopting the Common law in toto suggested.[82] Creation of the Dominion of New England, however, had given the Massachusetts legal system a blow from which it never recovered, and for a while Connecticut also felt the full sway of the common law. The implications of the common law for New England society were profound, as Massachusetts colonists realized when Andros challenged the legality of the town grants in that colony.[83] As a reaction to absolute royal government, the Whig doctrines of a limited monarchy and the subjects' rights to enjoy liberty and property became much more prominent in the colonists' image of English law. Overnight English law, as interpreted by the Whigs, became a tool to be used in defense of colonial interests rather than a corrupted body of inferior customs and practices. In the post-1689 era, the constant need to defend what remained of colonial institutions reinforced the colonial tendency to view the common law through the lenses of Whig political theory.[84]

It was on the basis of Whig theory that Increase Mather justified

the colonists' revolt against Andros as one wherein New Englanders had common cause with Englishmen in the recovery of English Liberties. Increase and Cotton Mather continued to assure colonists throughout the 1690's that the new Massachusetts charter guaranteed Massachusetts citizens their rights as Englishmen.[85] Not content with such assurances, the Massachusetts General Court passed a law containing several clauses copied directly from Magna Charta providing that they could not be taxed without their consent.[86] The crown disallowed the law, but subsequently the Assembly quarreled with Governor Dudley on the grounds that its English liberty was violated unless it had the sole power to tax.[87] Determined to exercise local autonomy as far as possible and to maintain Congregationalism as intact as the circumstances of royal rule would allow, many New Englanders found in Whig theories which limited the sovereign's power an interpretation of English law suited to their objectives.

Royal authority in the colonies, however, also increased colonial respect for the prerogatives of the crown. When appointed to crown offices, men like William Stoughton and the Massachusetts council members during the interregnum between governors Phips and Bellomont became exponents of the crown's power and privilege because of their interest in place and profit.[88] Besides the impulse of material interest, it must be remembered that Whig political theory was still enmeshed with the common law tradition which provided for the king's prerogatives as well as the subject's liberties. When the English Whigs gained power in 1694, moreover, they switched from attempting to limit the Crown's au-

thority to expanding it for their own benefit.[89] New Englanders with English Whig connections also became enamoured with the prerogative. The Mathers were already supporters of a strong monarchy, partly because King William had made Increase Mather political czar of Massachusetts and partly because they looked to the crown for protection from the return of the Stuarts. With the advent of Whig councils in William's government colonials could count on further protection for Dissent. Matherian Royalism was demonstrated not only in repeated tributes to William and his ostensible Whig principles but also in the accolade with which Increase and Cotton received the Whig Lord Bellomont, the most powerful governor the crown had sent to New England since Andros. When Bellomont delivered a speech before the Massachusetts Assembly in which he "took William III as his model governor: a noble patron of religion, liberty, property, and strong central authority," Increase praised Bellomont's sentiments.[90]

New Englanders' espousal of the royal prerogative served as the matrix of an increasing veneration for English custom and social practice. The Toryism of Gershom Bulkeley best exemplifies how royalism could strengthen the colonial desire to emulate the English aristocracy. Bulkeley was a Connecticut gentleman who became more disillusioned with New England than did Increase Mather. Like Mather, Bulkeley espoused the prerogative, though in a more consistent fashion. Bulkeley's respect for the prerogative arose during the earlier period of crown centralization under Sir Edmund Andros, when the warring factions of Connecticut were stilled by the lack of an assembly and the monopoly of public office by

the governor's friends. In Bulkeley's eyes this peace was the direct result of crown rule, which created a social atmosphere of love and harmony rather than Connecticut's usual factional bickering.[91] From Andros' rule Bulkeley concluded that the further the colonists were from royal authority the closer they were to chaos and violence.[92] He visualized the king as law giver and protector of his subjects, and justified submission to the prerogative with the same "Tory" arguments used by parson James Noyes of Newbury some thirty-five years earlier; that active or passive obedience to kings was commanded by divine injunction.[93] While Bulkeley accepted the accession of William and Mary, he rejected the assumption that rebellion in the name of the subject's liberty was thereby justified.

Though Bulkeley's Tory political opinions were unique in New England, they sprang from the same increasing respect for English law felt by Increase Mather and John Wise. Bulkeley thought that it was the common law which upheld the prerogative, and argued vigorously that the common law ought to be adopted in the colonies. By common law standards, colonial laws and governments were sadly lacking. Bulkeley contemptuously dismissed Connecticut's reformed codes as "the forgeries of our own popular and rustical shop," and trumpeted that the Connecticut General Court engaged in activities which no English common law corporation was entitled to pursue.[94] By abolishing the common and statute law of England, the colonists had left themselves in ignorance of their proper rights and liberties and had forgotten their duty to the crown.[95] It was the crown which upheld the subject's liberties through exercise of the prerogative. Bulkeley cited the Ship Money decision that the king's right to tax for

protection of the realm was a function of his responsibility to uphold the subject's liberty.[96] In Bulkeley's view Whig principles stood for anarchy and oppression of the subjects by each other, while the crown embodied order, stability, and the majesty of the English law.

Bulkeley's thought, despite its uniqueness in New England, showed how colonial royalism served as part of the matrix from which grew the increasing New England respect for English custom and social practice. Bulkeley believed that English law buttressed the authority of the crown and insured the privileges of the aristocracy, both of which were necessary for the proper organization of society. How much the proper organization of society along hierarchical lines meant to Bulkeley may be gathered by his bitter characterization of the Connecticut leaders as being infected with a "levelling independent, democraticall principle, with a tang of the fifth monarchy."[97] It was clearly Bulkeley's desire to replace Connecticut's comparatively egalitarian society with the more structured English model. He attacked Connecticut's inheritance law which divided intestate estates equally among the heirs as being illegal in English law. Bulkeley sought to introduce primogeniture into Connecticut,[98] appropriate action for a legally minded gentleman who hoped to employ English forms and customs to achieve an imitation of England's aristocratically dominated society.

Bulkeley's effort to introduce primogeniture as a New England institution was one indication of how rapidly the desire to emulate the upper strata of English society was spreading among prominent colonists. Perhaps the best example of this effort to walk in English shoes was Joseph Dudley,

who did everything possible to transform himself into an English gentleman in a colonial setting. Son of a founding father, Dudley had been a member of the "moderate" faction, and then a vigorous supporter of Sir Edmund Andros, a move which committed him to the imperial service. After his expulsion from New England he worked his way into the English military bureaucracy, became governor of the Isle of Wight, all the while espousing the prerogative after the Tory fashion. He had ample opportunity to observe and practice the life of an English gentleman, and after wangling the governorship of Massachusetts from Queen Anne he returned to New England hoping to remodel Massachusetts into a place where English gentlemen might survive and flourish.

Dudley shared Bulkeley's Tory view of the prerogative. It was not his fault that Massachusetts failed to embrace English law and custom during his governorship. During a 1702 council discussion over the proper week day for a fast, the governor argued for Friday, cajoling those who wanted the colonists' traditional Thursday by saying, "Let us be Englishmen."[99] A few years later judge Samuel Sewall decreed public punishment for one Captain Lawson, a gentleman convicted of immoral behaviour. Dudley flew into one of his famous rages, shouting that he would die (presumably of mortification) if such punishment had ever occurred in England except in cases of felony or treason.[100] The governor was successful in his efforts to have the Queen's birthday properly celebrated, for in 1705 a party was held in Boston Town House, and the town house and several gentlemen's houses were illuminated in the evening.[101]

Dudley's aspiration to gentle status underlay his preoccupation with

creating an estate which would support the family name and his posterity. Among his keenest ambitions was the desire to pass on an intact inheritance to his eldest son, thus preserving the family position after the English custom.[102] When urging Connecticut governor Guerdon Saltonstall to protect a portion of the Winthrop estate, which Dudley claimed for his son-in-law John Winthrop, Dudley described Winthrops, Saltonstalls, and Dudleys as "English gentlemen," and declared that New England needed such families.[103] He advised Wait Winthrop of the old English saying "no wise man dyes without a will."[104] The governor and his son Paul contemplated establishing a court of chancery, Paul writing to an English correspondent that New England would be no fit place for gentlemen until a chancery court were established there.[105] The Dudleys no less than Bulkeley rejected New England's legal tradition in favor of the English system which promised greater support for exclusive privilege.

Even men whose politics were rooted in the old Massachusetts isolationism and who contested the crown's power in the General Court claimed English privilege as their right. When Dudley negated John Saffin's election to the Massachusetts Council in 1702, the former "Commonwealthman" reacted with bitter disappointment. Saffin believed that his English birthright had been denied him and cited the House of Lords' claim that the right to hold office was an Englishman's right equal to that of electing representatives.[106] Saffin's concept of English right in this instance was that of the Whig aristocrat intent upon upholding his privileges, significantly privileges which gained some of their meaning and luster from the crown. Like many another colonist of substantial means, Saffin was

almost insensibly adopting the English criteria of rank, place, power, and privilege.[107]

The colonial thrust to achieve the power and privilege of the English gentility was accompanied by a growing appetite for its manners and mores as well. Colonial moralists had no illusions about the saintliness of the average English gentleman. Cotton Mather implied that Sabbath breaking, swearing, whoring, and drunkenness defined the English gentleman, and Ebenezer Pemberton noted that irreligion was fashionable in England in 1705.[108] Colonists were aware of the English gentry's lust for office and the bribery employed to achieve advancement.[109] In 1714 an anonymous pamphleteer who opposed crown incorporation of Boston combined Harrington's definition of political corruption with colonial prejudices by asserting that incorporation would saddle Boston with English style "Placemen" who would rather be rich than good magistrates.[110] Yet aspiration to the refinements of an English gentleman grew among New England's leading families. Young colonials of Puritan stock increasingly valued the polished manners, proper deportment, and learning associated with gentility. When London residents refused to believe that Thomas Prince was a provincial because of his bearing, proper manners, and correct accent, the young Harvard graduate proudly recorded their reaction in his journal.[111] Young John Winthrop valued the "accomplishments" and the "Pollishing aires of Europe" denied rude provincials like himself.[112] Cotton Mather sought to turn the desire for gentility to the service of religion and culture by exhorting colonial gentlemen to do good. In Bonifacius (1710) Mather urged composition of religious essays, mastery of languages and science, and acquisition of libraries as the proper pre-

occupations of gentlemen, and suggested that the best English model should be followed by exclaiming that "an English gentleman has been sometimes the most Accomplished thing in the whole world."[113] The cult of the English gentleman was one of the most pervasive elements of the rising New England Anglophilism at the turn of the eighteenth century.

The radical Whiggery espoused by John Wise also revealed how thoroughly the colonial conversion to English norms had proceeded by the second decade of the eighteenth century. To protect the congregational autonomy of the Massachusetts churches from centralization proposed by the Mathers, Wise sought to link New England's unique church polity to English Rights by depicting congregational churches as manifestations of the true spirit of English Liberty and as examples of Englishmen's God given privileges. In Wise's The Churches Quarrel Espoused and A Vindication of the Government of New England Churches the rhetoric of colonial ecclesiastical particularism became an expression of another brand of English political theory.

Wise's version of English Liberties was rooted in the Whig pamphlet literature of the Exclusion Crisis and the later 1680's. His image of the English Constitution was derived from William Penn and other Whig polemicists, many of them minor figures, who were progenitors of the "Eighteenth Century Commonwealthmen." Like them, Wise believed that English kings were limited by God and the law. In A Vindication of the Government of New England Churches Wise quoted The Secret History of Charles II and James II to the effect that English law provided for both the subject's rights and the prerogative and protected each from

the other.[114] Wise was a colonial example of the growing English disposition to see the English government as a mixed and limited monarchy which combined the advantages of monarchy, aristocracy, and democracy without their respective defects. Especially important for preserving Englishmen's Liberties from encroaching power were parliaments and juries which Wise, under the influence of Pama's polemics, believed were checks against tyranny and usurpation.[115] The birthright of Englishmen to be free from arbitrary violence and oppression was secured by Parliament, where the subject had the right to share in the legislative power, and in the jury system, whereby the subject was judged solely by his peers.[116] Wise was convinced that this happy constitution was inspired by God, and quoted another English writer that the English empire was "a kingdom that of all the kingdoms of the world, is most like to the kingdom of Jesus Christ, whose yoke is easy, and burden light."[117]

Wise specifically linked New England's God given congregational church polity with the divinely ordained political rights of Englishmen.[118] New England's church government granted the congregation judgment in all church affairs, which was perfectly consonant with the "Constitution, Nature, and Practice" of civil government in the English empire.[119] The provision in the Cambridge Platform of Church Discipline which called for representation of the laity at consultative synods was analogous, in Wise's view, with the rights and duties of the House of Commons in the English government. The congregations' power to judge the spiritual state of the brethren corresponded to the juries' right to determine mundane matters extending to life, limb, and property. On

the strength of these parallels Wise baldly asserted "that there is in the Constitution of our Church Government more of the English Civil Government in it, and it has a better Complexion to suit the true English Spirit, than is in the English Church, or any other."[120] In his determination to undercut the Mathers' proposals Wise insisted that the colonial churches were established in English law and that an effort to alter their composition was an assault upon English Liberties. Like the Mathers, though from different premises, Wise could assert that the New England churches were a part of the colonists' English identity, an assertion which seemed more applicable to the colonial scene than at any time since the early 1640's when Philip Nye and Thomas Goodwin had prefaced one of John Cotton's tracts with the claim that congregationalism embodied the same principles as the English jury system.[121] By the time Wise wrote, the colonists' self conception was becoming integrated with their image of England to create a colonial sense that they were part of a far flung English empire united by traditions of Protestantism, nationality, and English Liberties.

It was Cotton Mather who most clearly expressed New Englanders' new sense of imperial English nationalism. The younger Mather managed to combine the colonists' faith in New England's religious primacy with the myth of England's election. If God's special people existed anywhere on earth it was "in the English Nation," Mather told Lord Bellomont and the Massachusetts General Court in 1700.[122] God had dealt with England and New England as he had with no other nation.[123] Mather stressed New England's resemblance to England and claimed that

God had made England and especially New England His Israel.[124] Mather attempted to strike a balance between the idea of England's election and New England's sense of superior holiness by noting that England had many more pious souls while claiming greater doctrinal purity for New England.[125] He tipped the scales somewhat in New England's favor when describing her "matchless" church polity, and by adding that colonial ministers still preached salvation rather than moral virtue devoid of Christ.[126] Mather actually announced his preference for New England, but hastened to emphasize that it was no little blessing that New England was a part of England: "Our Dependence on, and Relation to, that brave Nation, that man deserves not the Name of an English man, who despises it."[127] The English nation was the most glorious under heaven, and so was its King.[128]

Cotton Mather's great work, Magnalia Christi Americana, was another assertion of the colonist's sense that they were New England Englishmen. Despite his doubts in the early 1690's, his father's disillusionment with New England, and the gloomy events following the Treaty of Ryswick, Cotton's main concern in the Magnalia was to show that God blessed that part of the English nation settled in New England with as much grace as He had bestowed upon England, if not more. Book V of the Magnalia was titled "Acts and Monuments. The Fifth Book of the New English History:...Containing the Faith and Order in the Churches of New England," a title which suggests that Mather saw his history of New England as a sequel to Foxe's history of the English Reformation. He repeated the claim that New England might have fulfilled Brightman's prophecy that some saints in the wilderness would discover the full

corruptions of the Antichristian churches, citing the Cambridge Platform as the instrument which made this discovery possible. New England had a "singular share" in receiving and transmitting that portion of God's will revealed to the English nation.[129] As when speaking before Lord Bellomont, Mather glorified England and stressed New England's close connection with the mother country.[130]

The union of Scotland with England helped to solidify the colonists' English nationalism. Establishment of the Scotch Presbyterian Church in English law seemed a step toward greater security for all Dissenters. Benjamin Colman expressed the colonists' favorable reaction to the event and in the process summarized the sources of their imperial nationalism. Colman saw love of country as an instinctual response originating partly from past and future associations with the nation. Colonial veneration for England was deeply rooted in a feeling of filial piety for the mother country and feelings of loyalty to its sovereign. Love for England was also an expression of the colonists' love for Christ, since God had made the "British Dominions" an eminent part of His visible Kingdom. Colman expressed the link between ecumenical piety and colonial English nationalism when he declared that the colonists had a "Piety and Duty" to pray for their nation similar to their duty te pray for the "Universal Kingdom and Church of Christ."[131] As the bulwark of Protestantism and the home of the most pure reformed religion, England deserved colonial prayers simply because colonists were members of the universal church and England was God's chosen nation.[132]

Implied in Colman's description of the colonists' veneration for England was the assumption that the colonists were in fact Englishmen..

That assumption had been made throughout New England's history, though it was stressed anew by colonists in the era after the Glorious Revolution.[133] By the second decade of the eighteenth century the colonists' image of England played a larger role in their self conception than it had at any time since the early days of the English Civil War, eighty years earlier. Joseph Dudley had urged the colonists to become Englishmen, and by 1715 colonists as disparate in their interests as John Saffin, Gershom Bulkeley, and John Wise had demonstrated that the English model had a magnetic attraction for all kinds of colonists. In that sense at least the colonists' image of England had come full circle to resemble the image of England held by their English ancestors before King Charles I ascended the throne. When the Protestant monarch George I acceded to the English throne the outpourings of New England loyalty to the English crown were sincere manifestations of colonial Anglophilism as well as expressions of relief that Toryism and the Jacobites had gone down to defeat.[134]

Yet the colonists' English image was deeper in its ambivalence than the Englishman's English image. It reflected the uncertainty of provincials whose love of their own region vied with their respect and loyalty to a larger and more impressive culture. Samuel Sewall hoped that England and New England together would convert the heathen, but also found himself "a Stranger in this Land" when he returned to England in 1689.[135] Thomas Prince thought that England was the most glorious nation in the world, but mused aloud to an English friend that in a hundred years New England would be strong enough for independence.[136]

Fitz-John Winthrop, torn between his reverence for the English crown and his identity as an important personage in the provincial society of Connecticut, "epitomized the ambivalence of post revolutionary New England."[137] Joseph Dudley himself retired to Roxbury rather than to an English estate, while Increase Mather, the most ardent Anglophile of his generation, lived out the last thirty years of his life in Boston yearning to return to England. Even those colonial Anglophiles who took up residence in England had trouble creating an English identity. When he first landed at Falmouth, England, Henry Newman kissed the trees along the road in his joy at reaching the mother country. Yet twenty-five years of English residence still found him referring to New England as "my country."[138] Jeremiah Dummer, another New England expatriate, met with disdain in England and was appalled by the corruption and atheism in the English court. Though he ultimately settled into the life of an English squire he continued to defend his homeland against political charges years after he had been snubbed by the colonial churches.[139] Circumstances of ideology, tradition, and isolation had subtly alienated even the most Anglophile New Englanders, and made the deeply ambivalent image of England a distinctive trait in colonial culture.

# CHAPTER V

## CONCLUSION

Ambivalence was the outstanding structural characteristic of the New England colonists' image of England in the seventeenth century. New Englanders saw England as a nation to be loved and hated, respected and feared, venerated and scorned. They inherited their feelings from several generations of Puritan reformers who had developed the values which inspired these conflicting emotions. Like all Englishmen, the Puritan reformers were conscious of England as an independent nation with a history of national greatness, a distinct monarchical dynasty, and a long tradition of Christianity. Unlike most Englishmen, the Puritans wished to institute sweeping changes in the English Church and hoped to reform the morals of the entire populace. To attempt such reforms was to fly in the face of English law and custom, as well as to confront certain deeply rooted instincts; to repudiate, in short, some of the English values which Puritans held in common with other Englishmen. On the one hand, Puritans were loyal Englishmen--on the other, they were participants in a movement which saw the nation permeated with corruption. Puritans had the normal Englishman's affection for England, but they hated her sins and corruption; they had traditional loyalty to the English crown, but scorned the men who sat on the throne; and they respected the preaching of the Word in England while fearing the bishops whose power might silence

them. The Puritans' peculiar values conflicted with numerous elements of English culture, with the result that their view of that culture was dominated by contradictory impressions and emotions.

Loyalty to England as a nation and to English sovereigns as divinely appointed rulers was the glue which kept fissionable emotions together. The original myth of England's religious primacy attracted loyalty to the English state beyond that demanded by the church universal. In its Protestant guise the myth of England's election became the religious sanction for loyalty to Queen Elizabeth. Early Puritan reformers further adapted the myth to explain a paradoxical situation: England's apostacy to a Catholicism which was contrary to God's will and which she was just then rejecting. Under the half Catholic, half Protestant religious practices which Elizabeth solidified into the English Church, the paradox remained. Thus the myth of a corrupt but elected nation continued to describe English reality as Puritans saw it in the early seventeenth century. The myth of England's religious primacy, moreover, kept the Puritans' image of England from polarizing around the concept that the nation was so corrupt that it ought to be abandoned, or around the idea that the nation was so blessed that no further efforts were needed to forward her reformation. Ambivalent feelings about England thus became consistent in the larger context of God's will. Feelings of alienation inspired by moral disapproval of the evils in English life were reconciled with natural loyalties to king and country.

In the myth of England as an elect nation ambivalent feelings about

England were translated into opposite sides of the same image. If England were a special nation, her corruptions were far graver in their offense to God. This principle gave the myth the flexibility necessary for its continued relevance. When the Puritan reformers found themselves frustrated by English events, they interpreted those events as England's sins. When events favored their cause, or they were successful in their reforming efforts, these were seen as manifestations of England's special relationship to God. Thus the opposite poles of the elect nation myth fluctuated in intensity and relative position depending upon the course of English events.

The two poles of the elect nation image varied further in intensity and relative position as a result of values held by the reformers. The English Church might appear more corrupt when judged by Congregational standards than by Presbyterian ones; an English king might appear less godly to Puritan Sabbatarians than to moderate Anglicans. Intensity and relative position of the opposite sides of the myth also depended upon the Puritans' personal and collective experience. Those Puritans who were allowed to practice non-conformity in their parishes were less likely to view the nation as corrupted than were those who were harried out of the land. When the personal experiences of a large group of Puritans were significantly altered, or when their values shifted in similar directions, the result was an alteration in the internal arrangement of their concept of England's election, so that one of the two opposing poles became more prominent or intense than the other.

Puritan values were becoming both more rigid and more widely dis-

persed within the English population after 1620. At the same time the crown found it increasingly necessary to assert the prerogative, which clashed with Puritan notions about godly rulers, the proper form of church polity, and the proper administration of justice. The interaction of political events with Puritan ideals created an imbalance within the ambivalent English image held by many Puritans. When the colonists left for New England, England's corruption had become the dominant aspect of the English image among many Puritans. The trend of English events and the Puritans' personal experiences both had contributed to development of a deeply rooted disillusionment with England. The disparity between England's performance and the Puritans' reforming ideals became so great that some Puritans could not contain their sense of England's corruptions within the elect nation myth. Especially among those who left for New England, there was a strong tendency for the English image to become polarized around England's corruptions.

The colonists' image of a corrupt and degenerated England was further amplified by the first ten years of their experience in Massachusetts and Connecticut. Isolation from English culture made possible the rejection of many features of English life which had conflicted with reforming values. England itself was rejected as hopelessly corrupt. Thoughts and acts condemning England, suppressed before by inhibition or prudence, were now possible. The image of a sinful England was intensified further by establishment of a purified church and state in the New England colonies, beside which England's polity and laws

seemed defective indeed. With New England now carrying the banner of reformation, it was tempting to regard her as God's elect nation in contradistinction to England, a temptation to which some colonists succumbed. Thus the myth of England as an elect nation was weakened in the minds of some by application of the concept to a competing entity which fulfilled their ideals. The negative aspect of the English image was enormously strengthened by the colonial experience.

Polarization of the English image around England's corruptions was dominant in the minds of many colonists from the founding of Massachusetts until after the Glorious Revolution. Especially in the early years of settlement, colonists saw England as deeply corrupted by the persistence of Antichristianism. When the Civil War wracked England, there was a strong impulse among the colonists to see the war as God's chastisement upon a worldly and sinful nation. When the English reformation was thwarted by the sectaries, colonists were sure that these heretics had seduced England as badly as had the pope. The Restoration reaffirmed the image of papal and Antichristian corruption, a view which lead many colonists to reject reconciliation with the English government. By 1689 the idea that England was a corrupt and sinful nation was indelibly engraved on the New England consciousness.

England's corruptions did not dominate the English image of all New Englanders. Loyalty to England was too strong to die out. Since it was one aspect of an Englishman's loyalty, the myth of England's election could not be easily discarded, especially by men whose English identity was being subjected to the trying experiences of a new world. For men

who had invested a lifetime in reform and whose view of history was fraught with millenial expectations, the probability was great that England would embark on a thorough reformation. Throughout the seventeenth century some New England Puritans were convinced that the New England reformation was part of the larger English reformation. They saw little contradiction between the concept of England's election and New England's holy superiority. English events caused their image of England to fluctuate between the opposite poles of the elect nation concept, but the influence of the positive element was greater upon these men. Many of them were members of the Massachusetts "moderates" who wished reconciliation with England after the Restoration. The positive aspect of the elect nation concept was one of the basic ingredients of the Anglophilism which arose in the early eighteenth century.

A strong tendency to polarize their English image around the concept of England as a blessed, desirable, and superior nation was the long term result of the colonists' New England experience. That the tendency existed from the first was demonstrated by Thomas Lechford, who left New England with a renewed respect for the English crown and the bishops, and by James Noyes, whose longer stay resulted in identical conclusions. Gershom Bulkeley's disillusionment with New England and his consequent turn to unqualified English values was the most spectacular manifestation of a trend which occurred in many other individuals. As the propensity to claim superior holiness for New England declined, the deficiencies of New England culture and its isolation from England became as apparent to orthodox colonists as it had been to such skeptics of New England as Robert Child. The Glorious Revolution de-emphasized

England's corruptions and confirmed that God blessed the nation. With a Protestant monarch on the English throne, toleration for Dissent, and England's growing international prestige, there was every reason for the colonists to respect and venerate England. The more ecumenical spirit of the age helped to foster an imperial English nationalism in New England.

By 1715 the positive image of England had become dominant in New England minds, though the colonists still held that England had numerous sins. Eighty years earlier the two aspects of the colonists' English image had been reversed--England had seemed corrupted with but few redeeming features. In the intervening years the opposite sides of the ambivalent image had alternated in dominance several times, though the long term trend had been for the positive image of England to become stronger than its opposite. Having virtually polarized their image of England around the nation's corruptions in the 1630's, colonists almost went to the opposite extreme in the early eighteenth century. The dominance of the positive English image owed much to English events and the colonists' identity as Englishmen, but it was also rooted in the conditions of colonial existence. Colonists aspired to the metropolitan sophistication denied provincials, and could not but be impressed by the superior power and wealth of England. These were constant colonial conditions which inspired colonial awe and veneration of the mother country.

England's negative aspects dropped into the background of the colonists' English image during the early eighteenth century, but many of

the conditions which had given the negative aspects their earlier prominence persisted. England was still morally corrupt, and a new vocabulary of political corruption was coming into use which would one day excite further colonial criticism. Colonists continued to hold reforming values which might be applied to England, to her detriment in colonial eyes. From the 1670's onwards colonial ministers assured New Englanders that they possessed unique civil and religious liberties, a refrain which became common in the eighteenth century. Thus colonial society continued to be a criterion against which England might be measured and found deficient. While the image of a corrupt England was de-emphasized in the early eighteenth century, survival of the conditions from which it had derived much strength presaged its revival in the future.

In the early eighteenth century the colonists' English image was characterized by a less acute but more subtle and deeply rooted ambivalence than before. The tradition that England was corrupt was waning while the colonists' veneration for a Protestant England of superior power, wealth, and culture was intensifying. The era saw the most extensive colonial expositions of the elect nation concept applied to England which ever appeared in print. Mather's Magnalia and Wise's Churches Quarrel Espoused were in one sense efforts to demonstrate that New England participated in the glories of the English nation at the same time that she enjoyed superior advantages. This was to affirm the colonists' English identity, their veneration for England, and their sense that she was blessed by God. When Wise and Mather claimed that distinctly colonial institutions were more English than comparable Eng-

lish institutions, they were explicitly injecting colonial values into their English image just as had their forebears, though they avoided the invidious distinctions which colonists had often made between New England and England. The contrast between England and New England thus became implicit rather than overt, an arrangement which was characteristic of the colonists' English image in the mid-eighteenth century. Yet the basic source of the colonists' negative English image remained: if New England's institutions represented true English values, then Old England's different institutions were imperfect or corrupted. Despite their intense Anglophilism, the colonists were fundamentally alienated from England.

# FOOTNOTES

## FOOTNOTES

## CHAPTER I

1. E. M. W. Tillyard, The Elizabethan World Picture (New York, 1959), 94-99.

2. William Haller, Foxe's Book of Martyrs & the Elect Nation (London, 1963), 143.

3. Haller, Foxe's Book, 19.

4. John Foxe, The Acts and Monuments of John Foxe... Rev. Stephen Reed Cattley, ed. (8 vols., London, 1837-41), III, 142-143.

5. Sir Maurice Powicke, The Reformation in England (London, 1961), 57, 63.

6. Thomas Lever, Sermons. 1550 (English Reprints...No. 25, Edward Arber, ed.) (London, 1870), 110,146.

7. Lever, Sermons, 55-64, passim.

8. Lever, Sermons, 62.

9. Ernest Lee Tuveson, Millenium and Utopia (New York, 1964), 28, 32, 36-39; Haller, Foxe's Book, 63-64.

10. Haller, Foxe's Book, 63-64.

11. Foxe, Acts and Monuments, VII, 207.

12. Lever, Sermons, 27-28.

13. Lever, Sermons, 116.

14. Lever, Sermons, 27-28.

15. Lever, Sermons, 62.

16. Lever, Sermons, 28-32, 40, 67.

17. Lever, Sermons, 31, 55.

18. Lever, Sermons, 55-56.

19. Lever, Sermons, 89, 32, 80-82.

20. Lever, Sermons, 58, 61.

21. Lever, Sermons, 4.

22. Haller, Foxe's Book, 19.

23. Haller, Foxe's Book, 54-55, 71-72.

24. Marshall M. Knappen, Tudor Puritanism (Chicago, 1939), 164.

25. Haller, Foxe's Book, 67-68.

26. Haller, Foxe's Book, 68-69, 160-162, 164.

27. Haller, Foxe's Book, 85-88.

28. Haller, Foxe's Book, 87; 94.

29. Haller, Foxe's Book, 135-136.

30. Haller, Foxe's Book, 150-151, 165-169.

31. Haller, Foxe's Book, 136-137, 165-167.

32. Foxe, Acts and Monuments, III, 57.

33. Haller, Foxe's Book, 121-139.

34. Haller, Foxe's Book, 136-140.

35. Haller, Foxe's Book, 170.

36. Sir John Neale, Elizabeth I and Her Parliaments, 1559-1581 (London, 1953), 245.

37. Neale, Elizabeth's Parliaments, 283-284.

38. Neale, Elizabeth's Parliaments, 382.

39. Conyers Read, Lord Burghley and Queen Elizabeth (New York, 1960), 23-24.

40. Louis B. Wright, Religion and Empire (Chapel Hill, 1943), passim, especially 40, 90-91.

41. Millar Maclure, The Paul's Cross Sermons, 1534-1642 (Toronto, 1958), 121.

42. Maclure, Paul's Cross Sermons, 118-120.

43. Albert Peel, ed., The Seconde Parte of a Register (2 Vols., Cambridge, 1915), II, 61.

44. Peel, ed., Seconde Parte of a Register, I, 157-158.

45. Patrick Collinson, ed., "Letters of Thomas Wood, Puritan, 1566-1577," Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research. Special Supplement No. 5 (Nov., 1960), 22-24.

46. Peel, ed., Seconde Parte of a Register, II, 51.

47. Peel, ed., Seconde Parte of a Register, II, 52-57.

48. For example see Peel, ed., Seconde Parte of a Register, I, 157-158.

49. Peel, ed., Seconde Parte of a Register, I, 143.

50. Peel, ed., Seconde Parte of a Register, I, 76, 143, 251.

51. Robert Browne, "Reformation Without Tarrying for Any," Old South Leaflets, Vol. IV, No. 100 (Boston, n.d.), 5.

52. John Ashton, ed., The Works of John Robinson... (3 vols., London, 1851), III, 172.

53. Browne, "Reformation Without Tarrying," 6.

54. Ashton, ed., Works of Robinson, III, 309.

55. Perry Miller, Orthodoxy in Massachusetts (Boston, 1959), 74-84, passim. See Haller, Foxe's Book, 130-131.

56. Frank E. Farrel, "Richard Sibbes: A Study in Early Seventeenth Century Puritanism," (Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Faculty of Divinity, University of Edinburgh, 1955), 270.

57. Farrel, "Richard Sibbes," 235.

58. John Cotton, A Brief Exposition of the Whole Book of Canticles... (London, 1642), 126-127.

59. Quoted in Edmund S. Morgan, The Puritan Dilemma (Boston, 1958), 21.

60. Samuel Ward, A Coale From The Altar To Kindle The Holy Fire of Zeale (Fifth ed., London, 1627), "Introduction."

61. Ward, A Coale, 83-84.

62. Samuel Ward, Iethro's Justice of the Peace (London, 1627), 62-63.

63. Samuel Ward, A Peace Offering to God For the blessings we enjoy under his Majesties reigne, with a Thanksgiving for the Princes safe returne... (London, 1627), 38-39.

64. Ward, Peace Offering, 40.

65. Ward, Peace Offering, 42-44.

66. Lever, Sermons, 136.

67. Ward, Peace Offering, 44.

68. William Haller, The Rise of Puritanism (New York, 1957), 80-81.

69. Haller, Rise of Puritanism, 218-219.

70. Ward, Iethro's Justice, 71.

71. Fulton H. Anderson, Francis Bacon. His Career and Thought (Montpelier, 1962), 179-183; George Lee Haskins, Law and Authority in Early Massachusetts (New York, 1960), 192-193.

72. Haskins, Law and Authority, 144; Haller, Foxe's Book, 151.

73. Ward, Iethro's Justice, 71-72.

74. Ward, Iethro's Justice, 64-66; 68.

75. Haskins, Law and Authority, 191, 212-213.

76. Ward, Iethro's Justice, 53-54.

77. Ward, Iethro's Justice, 2-3; also quoted in Sumner Chilton Powell, Puritan Village (New York, 1965), 140.

78. Ward, Iethro's Justice, 35-39.

79. Christopher Hill, Society and Puritanism (New York, 1964), Chapter V, "The Uses of Sabbitarianism," especially 193-196; Knappen, Tudor Puritanism, 442-450; Thomas Shepard, Theses Sabbaticae (London, 1655), "The Preface to the Reader."

80. John Dykstra Eusden, Puritans, Lawyers, and Politics in Early Seventeenth Century England (New Haven, 1958), 121-122; Margaret Judson, The Crisis of the Constitution (New Brunswick, 1949), 335; Isabel M. Calder, ed., Letters of John Davenport (New Haven, 1937), 40; Perry Miller, The New England Mind. The Seventeenth Century (Boston, 1961), 412.

81. Louis B. Wright, "Propaganda against James I's 'Appeasment' of Spain," Huntingdon Library Quarterly, VI (1943), 156-157.

82. Perry Miller, et. al., eds., The Complete Writings of Roger Williams (7 vols., New York, 1963), VI, 247.

83. Wright, "Propaganda," Hunt. Lib. Quart. VI, 152, 156, 171.

84. Raymond Phineas Stearns, The Strenuous Puritan. Hugh Peter 1598-1660. (Urbana, 1954), 35; Stewart Mitchell, ed., Winthrop Papers (5 vols., Boston, 1929-1947), II, 91, 111; Perry Miller, Seventeenth Century, 469.

85. William Twisse to Joseph Mede in Joseph Mede, The Works of the Pious and Profoundly-Learned Joseph Mede, B.D. (London, 1664), 936.

86. Hugh R. Trevor-Roper, "Three Foreigners and the Philosophy of the English Revolution," Encounter, XIV (Feb., 1960), 7.

87. Winthrop Papers, II, 121.

88. Winthrop Papers, I, 268.

89. Stearns, Hugh Peter, 35.

90. John Wilson, "A Song of Deliverance for the Lasting Rememberance of God's Wonderful Works..." (London, 1626) in Kenneth B. Murdock, ed., Handkerchiefs from Paul (Cambridge, 1927), 42.

91. Winthrop Papers, II, 91.

92. Winthrop Papers, II, 129-130.

93. Winthrop Papers, II, 122.

94. Cotton Mather, Magnalia Christi Americana (London, 1702), Bk. III, 64.

95. Mather, Magnalia, Bk. III, 74.

96. Mather, Magnalia, Bk. III, 125.

97. Mather, Magnalia, Bk. III, 80.

98. Mather, Magnalia, Bk. III, 102.

99. Thomas Hooker, The Danger of Desertion (London, 1641), 8.

100. Hooker, Danger of Desertion, 9.

101. Hooker, Danger of Desertion, 3-4.

102. Hooker, Danger of Desertion, 14.

103. Larzer Ziff, The Career of John Cotton: Puritanism and the American Experience (Princeton, 1962), 140.

104. Mather, Magnalia, Bk. III, 63.

105. Thomas Shepard, The Autobiography of Thomas Shepard, Nehiamiah Adams, ed., (Boston, 1832), 42; John Winthrop, The History of New England from 1630 to 1649, James Savage, ed., (2 vols., Boston, 1825-26), I, 135.

106. William Twisse to Joseph Mede, Works of Joseph Mede, 979.

107. Winthrop Papers, II, 292-297.

108. Haller, Rise of Puritanism, 192, 221-222.

109. Tuveson, Millenium and Utopia, 35-55, 75-85.

110. John Ward Deane, A Memoir of the Rev. Nathaniel Ward A.M. (Albany, 1868), 144.

111. Ziff, John Cotton, 66, 156-157.

112. Miller, Orthodoxy in Mass., 74-84.

113. Winthrop Papers, III, 14.

114. William Bradford, History of Plymouth Plantation, 1620-1647 (2 vols., Boston, 1912), I, 3.

## CHAPTER II

1. Stewart Mitchell, ed., Winthrop Papers (5 vols., Boston, 1929-47), III, 376.

2. Winthrop Papers, III, 386; 391.

3. Thomas Shepard, The Parable of the Ten Virgins Opened and Applied:... (London, 1660), 55.

4. Richard Mather, An Apologie of the Churches in New England for Church Covenant (London, 1643), 26-27.

5. William Bradford, History of Plymouth Plantation, 1620-1647 (2 vols., Boston, 1912), I, 7.

6. John Cotton, An Exposition on the Thirteenth Chapter of the Revelation (London, 1656), 16, 40, 237.

7. Winthrop Papers, III, 10-13.

8. Edmund S. Morgan, Visible Saints. The History of a Puritan Idea (New York, 1963), 6; Mather, An Apologie for Church Covenant, 41.

9. Morgan, Visible Saints, 7-11; Mather, An Apologie for Church Covenant, 41.

10. Perry Miller, Orthodoxy in Massachusetts (Boston, 1959), 77, 87.

11. Winthrop Papers, III, 399-400; Mather, An Apologie for Church Covenant, 36-37.

12. Cotton, Thirteenth Chapter of Revelation, 16; John Davenport, An Answer of the Several Churches in New England unto Nine Positions,... (London, 1643), 66; Richard Mather, "A plea for the churches of Christ in New England," R. Mather M.S. 61.2.5, 43, Massachusetts Historical Society; Thomas Shepard and Thomas Allin, A Treatise of Liturgies, Power of the Keyes, and of matter of the Visible Church (London, 1653), 77.

13. Shepard and Allin, A Treatise of Liturgies, 73.

14. Richard S. Dunn, Puritans and Yankees (Princeton, 1962), 29.

15. Larzer Ziff, The Career of John Cotton: Puritanism and the American Experience (Princeton, 1962), 95.

16. Cotton, Thirteenth Chapter of Revelation, 12, 16, 20-21.

17. Richard Mather, An Apologie for Church Covenant, 28-29, 32.

18. Winthrop Papers, III, 399; Edmund S. Morgan, The Puritan Dilemma (Boston, 1958), 75.

19. Cotton, Thirteenth Chapter of Revelation, 96.

20. Thomas Shepard, Three Valuble Pieces, Viz. Select Cases Resolved; First Principles of the Oracles of God, or, Sum of Christian Religion; and a private Diary;... (Boston, 1747), 49.

21. Morgan, Puritan Dilemma, 74-76; Ziff, Cotton, 83.

22. (William Rathband), A Brief Narration of Some Church Courses Held in Opinion and Practice in the Churches lately erected in New England (London, 1644), "The Postscript."

23. Miller, Orthodoxy in Massachusetts, 82; Richard Mather, "A plea for the churches in New England," 8-9, 13-15.

24. Richard Mather, An Apologie for Church Covenant, 27-28.

25. Perry Miller, Roger Williams. His Contribution to the American Tradition (New York, 1962), 39-48.

26. Perry Miller, et. al., eds., The Complete Writings of Roger Williams (7 vols., New York, 1963), III, 325, 342-345.

27. Ibid., III, 136-137, 173-177; VII, 35.

28. Perry Miller, The New England Mind. The Seventeenth Century (Boston, 1961), 469-470; Davenport, An Answer of the Several Churches, 53; Richard Mather, An Apologie for Church Covenant, 45.

29. Winthrop Papers, III, 14.

30. Richard Mather, "A plea for the churches in New England," 43.

31. Perry Miller, et. al., eds., Writings of Williams, II, 131-132; John Cotton, The Way of the Churches of Christ in New England (London, 1645), 111.

32. Cotton, Thirteenth Chapter of Revelation, 222.

33. Ibid., 237, 260-261.

34. Cotton, Way of the Churches, 114.

35. John Eliot, The Christian Commonwealth: or the Civil Policy of the Rising Kingdom of Jesus Christ (London, 1659), "Preface."

36. John Winthrop, The History of New England from 1630 to 1649, James Savage, ed. (2 vols., Boston, 1825-1826), I, 70.

37. Morgan, Puritan Dilemma, 163; Ziff, Cotton, 103-104.

38. Richard S. Dunn, Puritans and Yankees (Princeton, 1962), 29-30.

39. John Cotton, The Bloudy Tenent, Washed, And made white in the bloud of the Lambe:... (London, 1647), 137; John Cotton, A Brief Exposition with Practical Observations Upon the Whole Book of Ecclesiastes (London, 1654), 218, 227-229, 233.

40. Miller, et al., eds., Writings of Williams, VI, 247, 248-249; Miller, Roger Williams, 138, 255-256.

41. William Haller, Liberty and Reformation in the Puritan Revolution (New York, 1963), 70.

42. George Lee Haskins, Law and Authority in Early Massachusetts (New York, 1960), 36-37, 117-118, 130, 192.

43. Thomas Lechford, Plain Dealing: or, News from New England (London, 1642), 26; Haskins, Law and Authority, 182, 194.

44. Haskins, Law and Authority, 145, 158-160, 211-212.

45. Massachusetts Historical Society Collections, 4th Series, VI, 381.

46. Thomas Hutchinson, ed., A Collection of Original Papers Relative to the History of the Colony of Massachusetts-Bay (2 vols., Albany, 1865), I, 217-218.

47. Hutchinson, Papers Relative to Massachusetts-Bay, I, 219; Winthrop, History, II, 182-183.

48. Haskins, Law and Authority, 37, 47.

49. Ibid., 56, 129, 131-132, 203-204.

50. Winthrop Papers, III, 487.

51. Ibid., 474.

52. Winthrop Papers, II, 292-294; Dan Gleason Hill, ed., Dedham Town Records: 1636-1659 (Dedham, 1892), 2.

53. Kenneth A. Lockridge and Alan Kreider, "The Evolution of New England Town Government, 1640 to 1740," William and Mary Quarterly, 3rd Series, XXIII (Oct., 1966), 569; Sumner Chilton Powell, Puritan Village; The Formation of a New England Town (Middletown, Conn., 1963), 98-99.

54. Dunn, Puritans and Yankees, 45; Winthrop, History, II, 209-210.

55. Thomas Welde, "Letter to Terling, Essex," Publications of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts, XIII (1912), 130-131.

56. Edward Johnson, A History of New England. From the English planting in the Yeere 1628. Untill the Yeere 1652 (London, 1654), 166; John Gorham Palfrey, History of New England (Boston, 1899), II, 35-36; Collections of the Maine Historical Society, 2nd Series, III, 73-74.

57. Israel Loring, The Duty of an Apostatizing People to remember from whence they are fallen, and repent,... (Boston, 1737), 26-27.

58. Morgan, Puritan Dilemma, 103.

59. Ibid., 196.

60. Winthrop Papers, III, 397-398.

61. Lechford, Plain Dealing, 44.

62. William Hooke, New Englands Teares, for old England's Feares (London, 1641), 6-7.

63. Shepard, Three Valuble Pieces, 63.

64. Nathaniel B. Shurtleff, ed., Records of the Governor and Company of the Massachusetts Bay in New England (Boston, 1853), I, 265.

65. Winthrop Papers, IV, 207, 218, 221, 224-225, 235-236; Miller, et al., eds., Writings of Williams, VI, 141.

66. Winthrop Papers, IV, 205, 213-214, 237-238.

67. Ibid., 243-244, 248; Cotton, Thirteenth Chapter of Revelation, 259.

68. Cotton, Thirteenth Chapter of Revelation, 262.

69. Hooke, New Englands Teares, 15-16.

70. Winthrop Papers, III, 278.

71. Thomas Shepard, Subjection to Christ in all his Ordinances, and Appointments, the best means to preserve our Liberty (London, 1657), 69.

72. Hooke, New Englands Teares, 10.

73. Charles Francis Adams, ed., Antinomianism in the Colony of Massachusetts Bay (Boston, 1894), 308; Ziff, Cotton, 177-178; Winthrop Papers, V, 125-127.

74. Perry Miller, Errand into the Wilderness (New York, 1963), 11.

75. Haller, Liberty and Reformation, 17-20.

76. Ernest Lee Tuveson, Millenium and Utopia (New York, 1964), 76-79, 81-92; Haller, Liberty and Reformation, 29, 46-50, 101. See also William Haller, The Rise of Puritanism (New York, 1957), 270-272.

77. Nathaniel Rogers, Letter discovering the Cause of Gods continuing Wrath against the Nation... (London, 1644), 1.

78. Morgan, Puritan Dilemma, 180; William Hooke, New Englands Sence of Old England and Irelands Sorrowes (London, 1645), 24-25.

79. John Cotton, The Powring out of the Seven Vials: or an Exposition of the 16. Chapter of the Revelation, with an Application of it to our Times (London, 1645), "The first Vial," 4, 14; "The second Vial," 18, 24; "The third Vial," 34-36, 48-49.

80. Cotton, Seven Vials, "The fourth Vial," 59-61.

81. Cotton, Thirteenth Chapter of Revelation, passim.

82. Cotton, Seven Vials, "The fifth Vial," 77-80.

83. Ibid., "The sixth Vial," 92, 95-96; "The seventh Vial," 151-154.

84. Ibid., "The seventh Vial," 155. See also Jesper Rosenmeier, "The Teacher and the Witness: John Cotton and Roger Williams," William and Mary Quarterly, 3rd Series, XXV (July, 1968), 422.

85. Winthrop, History, II, 76.

86. Nathaniel Rogers, Cause of Gods continuing Wrath, 1.

87. Anne Bradstreet, The Tenth Muse Lately sprung up in America (London, 1650), 189-190.

88. Nathaniel Rogers, Cause of Gods continuing Wrath, 3, 6.

89. Peter Bulkeley, The Gospel Covenant, or the Covenant of Grace opened... (London, 1651), 14-15.

90. Hooke, New Englands Sence, 24-25.

91. Thomas Shepard, Wine for Gospel Wantons: or Cautions against Spiritual Drunkeness (Cambridge, 1668), 12-13.

92. Nathaniel Ward, The Simple Cobler of Aggwam in America (London, 1647), 69; Edward Johnson, History of New England, 230-233.

93. Thomas Hooker, A Survey of the Summe of Church Discipline,... (London, 1648), "The Preface."

94. Thomas Hooker to (Thomas Shepard), n.d., "Copies of unprinted material in the Collection of M.S.S. made by Thomas Hutchinson for His History," Massachusetts Historical Society; Winthrop, History, II, 137.

95. Rathband, Narration, "Preface"; Geoffrey Nuttal, Visible Saints. The Congregational Way 1640-1660 (Oxford, 1957), 15-17, 41.

96. Winthrop, History, II, 76-77.

97. John Cotton, The Churches Resurrection, or the Opening of the Fift and sixte verses of the 20th Chap. of the Revelation (London, 1642), 19.

98. Hooke, New Englands Teares, 10-15.

99. Anne Bradstreet, The Tenth Muse, 183-187.

100. Winthrop Papers, IV, 472 fn.

101. Shepard, Wine for Gospel Wantons, 11-12.

102. Thomas Shepard, The Autobiography of Thomas Shepard, Nehiamiah Adams, ed. (Boston, 1832), 67; Winthrop Papers, III, 357, 366.

103. Nathaniel Rogers, Cause of Gods continuing Wrath, 1-2.

104. Winthrop, History, II, 176.

105. Hooke, New Englands Sence, 16-19.

106. Winthrop, History, II, 150.

107. Giles Firmin, Separation Examined: or, A Treatise Wherein the grounds for Separation from the Ministry and Churches of England are weighed, and found too light (London, 1652), 12-13; Nathaniel Rogers, Cause of Gods continuing Wrath, 8.

108. Shepard, Wine for Gospel Wantons, 11.

109. Richard Mather, "A plea for the churches in New England," "Preface."

110. Shepard and Allin, A Treatise of Liturgies, 15-22.

111. Ward, Simple Cobler of Aggwam, 8.

112. Thomas Shepard, New Englands Lamentation For Old Englands present errours, and divisions, and their feared future desolations if not timely prevented (London, 1647), 2.

113. Bulkeley, Gospel Covenant, 15.

114. Shepard, Wine for Gospel Wantons, 1-7.

115. Hutchinson, Papers Relative to Massachusetts-Bay, II, 129-133.

116. Thomas Hooker to Thomas Shepard, Sept. 17, 1646, "Unprinted material in the Collection by Thomas Hutchinson," Massachusetts Historical Society; Winthrop Papers, V, 91.

117. Hooker to Shepard, Sept. 17, 1646, "Unprinted material in the Collection by Thomas Hutchinson," Massachusetts Historical Society; "Thomas Dudley's Will," New England Historical and Genealogical Register, V, 117; Winthrop Papers, V, 70, 142, 156.

118. Winthrop Papers, V, 90.

119. Miller, et al., eds., Writings of Williams, IV, 149; Winthrop Papers, V, 169.

120. Edward Winslow, Hypocrisie Unmasked: By A True Relation of the Proceedings of the Governour and Company of the Massachusetts against Samuel Gorton (London, 1646), 94.

121. Johnson, History of New England, passim, especially 200-203.

122. John Cotton, The Way of the Congregational Churches Cleared In two Treatises (London, 1648), Part I, 21-22, 102-104.

123. Samuel Stone, A Congregational Church is a Catholic Visible Church (London, 1652), "To the Reader."

124. John Norton, Abel being Dead yet speaketh; or, the Life and Death of that deservedly Famous Man of God, Mr. John Cotton,... (London, 1658), 19.

125. Winthrop, History, II, 250-251; Publications of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts, XXXVIII (1959), 50-52.

126. Haller, Liberty and Reformation, 159-163.

127. Darret B. Ruttman, Winthrop's Boston (Chapel Hill, 1965), 253-254.

128. Miller, et al., eds., Writings of Williams, IV, 5, 407; VII, 204-206.

129. Thomas Lechford, "Note-Book Kept by Thomas Lechford, Esq., Lawyer,...," Transactions and Collections of the American Antiquarian Society, VII (1885), 274, 287, 312.

130. Hutchinson, Papers Relative to Massachusetts-Bay, I, 217-218.

131. Alan Simpson, Puritanism in Old and New England (Toronto, 1966), 58-59.

132. Winthrop, History, II, 279.

133. Ibid., II, 279.

134. Ibid., II, 282-283.

135. Ibid., II, 182-183, 279; 282-283.

136. Johnson, History of New England, 26; 29, 58, 103-104, 232-233.

137. Ibid., 217, 224.

138. Winthrop, History, II, 240-243; Massachusetts Historical Society Collections, 4th Series, VIII, 3.

139. Thomas Shepard, Theses Sabbaticae. Or, The Doctrine of the Sabbath (London, 1655), "The Preface to the Reader."

140. Thomas Shepard, The Sound Beleever... (London, 1652), "To his deare Friend Mr. W. Greenhill."

141. John Cotton, Of the Holiness of Church Members (London, 1650), "Dedicatory Letter," Sig A2.

142. Shepard, Subjection to Christ, 11-13; Shepard, Wine for Gospel Wantons, 11; Winthrop Papers, V, 90-91.

143. Winthrop, History, II, 250-251, 269-271.

144. Williston Walker, Creeds and Platforms of Congregationalism (Boston, 1960), 191, 194-195; Ziff, Cotton, 207-208; 222-229.

145. Winslow, Hypocrisie Unmasked, 99-101; Johnson, History of New England, 68; Shepard and Allin, A Treatise of Liturgies, 22.

146. Firmin, Separation Examined, "The Epistle Dedicatory," 5, 95-96, 106; John Cotton, Certain Queries Tending to Accomodation and Communion of Presbyterian and Congregational Churches (London, 1654), 7-8.

147. Nathaniel Ward, Discolliminium. Or, A most obedient Reply to a late Book,... (London, 1650), 50-52 (misnumbered 50, 52, 53); Firmin, Separation Examined, 99.

148. Firmin, Separation Examined, "To the Reader."

149. Samuel Danforth, "An Almanack for the Year of Our Lord 1648" in Kenneth B. Murdock, ed., Handkerchiefs from Paul (Cambridge, 1927), 104-105.

150. Ibid., 108-111.

151. James Noyes, Moses and Aaron: Or the Rights of Church and State (London, 1661), 62-68 (misnumbered 53-59), "Subordinate Power may not offensively resist Supreme Power..." (separately paged), 1-22 passim.

152. Norton, Abel being Dead, 48.

153. K. W. Porter, "Samuel Gorton, New England Firebrand," New England Quarterly, VII (1934), 440.

154. John Hull, "Some Observable Passages Toward the Country...," Transactions and Collections of the American Antiquarian Society, III (1857), 186-187; Dunn, Puritans and Yankees, 112.

155. Norton, Abel being Dead, 48-50.

156. Massachusetts Historical Society Collections, 4th Series, VII, 590-593.

157. Isabel MacBeath Calder, ed., Letters of John Davenport, Puritan Divine (New Haven, 1937), 139-140; Johnson, History of New England, 99.

158. William Davis to Governor Thomas Prence, Jan. 25, 1659/60, Winslow M.S.S., Massachusetts Historical Society.

## CHAPTER III

1. Perry Miller, The New England Mind. From Colony to Province (Boston, 1961), 93; 105-110.

2. James Truslow Adams, The Founding of New England (Boston, n.d.), 249-251; 320-321.

3. Isabel MacBeath Calder, ed., Letters of John Davenport, Puritan Divine (New Haven, 1937), 157; 159-160; John Hull, "Some Observable Passages Toward the Country...," Transactions and Collections of the American Antiquarian Society, III (1857), 190-191; 194. (Hereafter cited as Hull, "Passages.")

4. Hull, "Passages," 195; Richard S. Dunn, Puritans and Yankees (Princeton, 1962), 114-115.

5. Dunn, Puritans and Yankees, 119.

6. K. W. Porter, "Samuel Gorton, New England Firebrand," New England Quarterly, VII (1934), 440-441.

7. Roger Williams, G. Fox Digg'd Out of His Burrowes,... (Boston, 1676), "The Epistle Dedicatory"; Adams, Founding of New England, 320.

8. Massachusetts Historical Society Collections, 4th Series, VIII, 233.

9. M. H. S. Coll., 5th Series, VIII, 65; Dunn, Puritans and Yankees, 115-116.

10. John Gorham Palfrey, History of New England (Boston, 1899), III, 72.

11. Thomas W. Perry, "New Plymouth and Old England: A Suggestion," William and Mary Quarterly, 3rd Series, XVIII (1961), 257.

12. Robert N. Toppan and Thomas S. Goodrick, eds., Edward Randolph (Boston, 1898-1909), II, 222-223. (Hereafter cited as Toppan, Randolph.)

13. M. H. S. Coll., 4th Series, VIII, 55.

14. James Noyes, Moses and Aaron: Or the Rights of Church and State,... (London, 1661), passim, especially 7, 53-59 (misnumbered 62-68); "Subordinate Power may not offensively resist Supreme Power..." (separately paged), 1-7.

15. Thomas Parker, "The Epistle Dedicatory" in Noyes, Moses and Aaron.

16. Bernard Bailyn, The New England Merchants in the Seventeenth Century (New York, 1964), 114-122.

17. M. H. S. Coll., 4th Series, VIII, 183; 207; 124-125.

18. Thomas Hutchinson, ed., A Collection of Original Papers Relative to the History of the Colony of Massachusetts-Bay (Albany, 1865), II, 42; Hull, "Passages," 195; M. H. S. Coll., 4th Series, VIII, 201; Calder, ed., Davenport Letters, 204.

19. M. H. S. Coll., 4th Series, VIII, 195-197; 177-178.

20. Calder, ed., Davenport Letters, 207; M. H. S. Coll., 4th Series, VIII, 181.

21. M. H. S. Coll., 4th Series, VIII, 173, 185; 175-176.

22. Calder, ed., Davenport Letters, 256-257.

23. Paul R. Lucas, "Colony or Commonwealth: Massachusetts Bay, 1661-1666," William and Mary Quarterly, 3rd Series, XXIV (Jan., 1967), 90-92. (Hereafter cited as Lucas, "Colony or Commonwealth.")

24. John Norton, "Sion the Out-cast healed of her Wounds," 11, in Three Choice and Profitable Sermons Upon Several Texts of Scripture;... (Cambridge, 1664).

25. Hull, "Passages," 199.

26. Lucas, "Colony or Commonwealth," 103.

27. Hull, "Passages," 217; Lucas, "Colony or Commonwealth," 101; John Higginson, The Cause of God and His People in New England... (Cambridge, 1663), 14.

28. New England Historical and Genealogical Register, II, 170.

29. Lucas, "Colony or Commonwealth," 96; 100; N. E. H. G. R., V, 393; M. H. S. Coll., 4th Series, VIII, 204.

30. Lucas, "Colony or Commonwealth," 98-106.

31. E. B. O'Callaghan, ed., Documents Relative to the Colonial History of the State of New York (Albany, 1853), III, 140.

32. Thomas Hutchinson, The History of the Colony and Province of Massachusetts Bay, ed. Lawrence Shaw Mayo (Cambridge, 1936), I, 215-217.

33. Michael G. Hall, Edward Randolph and the American Colonies (Chapel Hill, 1960), 34-35. (Hereafter cited as Hall, Randolph.); Lucas, "Colony or Commonwealth," 90-91.

34. Palfrey, History of New England, II, 216.

35. John Norton, The Heart of New England Rent... (London, 1660), 57; "An Appendix," 82, 84-85.

36. Hull, "Passages," 200-201; Charles E. Banks, "Thomas Venner, the Boston Wine-Cooper and Fifth Monarchy Man," New England Historical and Genealogical Register, XLVII, 442.

37. Norton, "Sion the Out-cast...," 12-13, in Three Choice Sermons.

38. Norton, "Sion the Out-cast...," 14-15, "Reply to Dury," 1-2, in Three Choice Sermons; (Increase Mather), "An Apologetical Preface to the Reader," in John Davenport, Another Essay for Investigating... (Cambridge, 1663); Richard Mather, A Defense of the Answer and Arguments of the Synod... (Boston, 1664), 1; Samuel Whiting, Abraham's Humble Intercession for Sodom (Cambridge, 1666), 31; Urian Oakes, New England Pleaded with... (Cambridge, 1673), 22.

39. Nathaniel B. Shurtleff, ed., Records of the Governor and Company of the Massachusetts Bay in New England (Boston, 1853), IV, pt. II, 508. (Hereafter cited as Mass. Records.)

40. Oakes, New England Pleaded with..., 20; Samuel Torrey, A Plea for the Life of Dying Religion from the Word of the Lord (Boston, 1683), 10.

41. Increase Mather, A Brief History of the Warr With the Indians in New England,... (Boston, 1676), 1.

42. William Stoughton, New England's True Interest, Not to Lie... (Cambridge, 1668), 18-19; Oakes, New England Pleaded with..., 23; Thomas Shepard, Eye Salve, or A Watch Word From our Lord Jesus Christ unto his Church... (Cambridge, 1673), 12-13. For a different interpretation of this evidence, see Miller, Colony to Province, 135.

43. John Oxenbridge, New England Freemen Warned... (Cambridge, 1673), 28; Oakes, New England Pleaded with..., 50.

44. Miller, Colony to Province, 27-39.

45. John Davenport's remains are the outstanding exception to this statement. See Calder, ed., Davenport Letters, 256-257; Dunn, Puritans and Yankees, 167.

46. Increase Mather, "Diary," Massachusetts Historical Society Proceedings, 2nd Series, XIII, 358. (Hereafter cited as Increase Mather, "Diary"); Oakes, New England Pleaded with..., 19.

47. Increase Mather, The Day of Trouble is near (Cambridge, 1674), 27.

48. Whiting, Abraham's Intercession, 84.

49. Ibid., 39, 86; 66-67; M. H. S. Coll., 4th Series, VIII, 136-137.

50. Calder, ed., Davenport Letters, 256-257.

51. Boston Registry Department, Report of the Record Commissioners (Boston, 1884), VI, 203.

52. Thomas Vincent, Gods Terrible Voice in the City of London Wherein you have the Narration of the Two late Dreadful Judgments of Plague and Fire,... (Cambridge, 1668), 19.

53. M. H. S. Coll., 4th Series, VII, 221.

54. Ibid., 132-133.

55. Ibid., 219-221.

56. N. E. H. G. R., VII, 274.

57. Massachusetts Bay Colony, At a Council...March 10, 1668 (N.S.) (Cambridge, 1669), Broadside.

58. M. H. S. Coll., 4th Series, VIII, 144; 260-261.

59. Ibid., 222.

60. Bailyn, New England Merchants, 141-142.

61. Oxenbridge, New England Freemen Warned..., 19.

62. Joshua Coffin, A Sketch of the History of Newbury, Newburyport, and West Newbury, From 1635 to 1845 (Boston, 1845), 108-109.

63. Hutchinson, ed., Papers, II, 172.

64. Calder, ed., Davenport Letters, 256-257.

65. Increase Mather, The Mystery of Israel's Salvation Explained and Applyed:... (Boston, 1669), 1-36, passim.

66. For a differing view, see Perry Miller, From Colony to Province, 125; Errand into the Wilderness (New York, 1964), 217-239.

67. Increase Mather, Mystery of Israel's Salvation, 40.

68. Ibid., 156-160.

69. Increase Mather, Day of Trouble, 12; John Davenport, "An Epistle to the Reader," in Mather, Mystery of Israel's Salvation.

70. Mass. Records, IV, pt. II, 508; Mather, Mystery of Israel's Salvation, 164; M. H. S. Coll., 4th Series, VIII, 158.

71. M. H. S. Coll., 5th Series, VIII, 90, 131.

72. Dunn, Puritans and Yankees, 191-192; 199-200; 205-206.

73. Samuel Danforth, A Brief Recognition of New England's Errand into the Wilderness;... (Cambridge, 1671), 17; Joshua Scottow, Old Men's Tears for their own Declensions,... (Boston, 1691), 5; Bailyn, New England Merchants, 139.

74. N. E. H. G. R., XIV, 196; Hull, "Passages," 195; Miller, From Colony to Province, 228; Frederick Lewis Weis, The Colonial Clergy and the Colonial Churches of New England (Lancaster, Mass., 1936), 153; M. H. S. Proceedings, LXXI, 52; Increase Mather, "The Autobiography of Increase Mather," M. G. Hall, ed., Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society, LXXXI, pt. 2, 287. (Hereafter cited as Increase Mather, "Autobiography."); Kenneth B. Murdock, Increase Mather, The Foremost American Puritan (Cambridge, 1926), 59, 70.

75. Increase Mather, A Brief History of the Warr, 37; Samuel Nowell, Abraham in Arms (Boston, 1678), 11.

76. Increase Mather, An Earnest Exhortation to the Inhabitants of New England,... (Boston, 1676), 19.

77. Increase Mather, A Brief History of the Warr, 18.

78. Increase Mather, "Diary," 358.

79. William Hubbard, The Happiness of a People in the Wisdom of their Rulers... (Boston, 1676), 47.

80. M. H. S. Coll., 4th Series, VIII, 202.

81. Calder, ed., Davenport Letters, 257.

82. Mather, An Earnest Exhortation, "To the Reader," 25-26.

83. Synod of 1679, The Necessity of Reformation With the Expedients subservient thereunto, asserted;... (Boston, 1679), "The Epistle Dedicatory."

84. M. H. S. Coll., 4th Series, VII, 347.

85. Ibid., 477.

86. Adams, Founding of New England, 364-389.

87. Hall, Randolph, 21-52, passim.

88. Palfrey, History, III, 361; Hall, Randolph, 73.

89. Adams, Founding of New England, 378.

90. M. H. S. Coll., 4th Series, VIII, 573.

91. Samuel Sewall, The Diary of Samuel Sewall, M. H. S. Coll., 5th Series, V, 30. (Hereafter cited as Sewall, Diary.)

92. N. E. H. G. R., II, 170.

93. Caroline Hazard, ed., The Notebook of John Saffin, 1665-1708 (New York, 1928), 25-27.

94. Viola F. Barnes, "Richard Wharton. A Seventeenth Century New England Colonial," Publications of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts, XXVI, 248-249.

95. Ibid., 251, 257.

96. Ibid., 257.

97. M. H. S. Proceedings, 2nd Series, XIV, 215.

98. Increase Mather, "Diary," 359; 408.

99. Palfrey, History of New England, III, 348 fn.

100. Adams, Founding of New England, 387.

101. Palfrey, History of New England, III, 348.

102. Sumner Chilton Powell, Puritan Village; The Formation of a New England Town (Middletown, Conn., 1963), 185-186.

103. Palfrey, History of New England, III, 348 fn.; Powell, Puritan Village, 185.

104. N. E. H. G. R., II, 168-169.

105. Palfrey, History of New England, III, 381.

106. M. H. S. Proceedings, 2nd Series, XIII, 345.

107. Ibid., 353, 364, 366, 371-372.

108. M. H. S. Coll., 4th Series, VIII, 11, 352, 335.

109. Ibid., 588.

110. Ibid., 219-221.

111. Sewall, Diary, 8.

112. Jerome Batty to John Balye, May 29, 1676, Cotton MSS., Pt. VII, no. 8, Boston Public Library; Toppan, Randolph, II, 218.

113. David Ogg, England in the Reign of Charles II (2nd Edition, Oxford, 1963), II, 559.

114. M. H. S. Coll., 4th Series, VIII, 15; 16.

115. Ibid., 225.

116. Palfrey, History of New England, III, 368; Bailyn, New England Merchants, 190; Toppan, Randolph, III, 215.

117. M. H. S. Coll., 4th Series, VIII, 19-21.

118. Ibid., 24-25, 27.

119. Extract of a letter from Bristol, dated May 1, 1680, in the handwriting of Thomas Prince, Cotton MSS., Pt. VIII, no. 19, Boston Public Library.

120. Reasons for the Indictment of the Duke of York... (London, 1680), Broadside; Ogg, England in the Reign of Charles II, 598.

121. John Wilson, Jr., Introduction to John Wilson, "A Song of Deliverance for the Lasting Remembrance of God's Wonderful Works..." (London, 1626) (Boston, 1680), reprinted in Kenneth B. Murdock, ed., Handkerchiefs from Paul (Cambridge, 1927), 25-26.

122. (Benjamin Keach), Sion in Distress (Third Revised Edition, Boston, 1683), passim. For the quotation on "monkish Tories," 40.

123. Increase Mather, Returning unto God the great concernment of a Covenant People (Boston, 1680), 15.

124. Increase Mather, Heavens Alarm to the World (Second Impression, Boston, 1682), 38.

125. Samuel Willard, The Fiery Tryal no strange thing;... (Boston, 1681), 13-16.

126. Massachusetts Bay Colony, At a General Court...16th of March, 1680/1681. (Boston, 1681), Broadside.

127. Increase Mather, A Sermon Wherein is Shewed that the Church of God is sometimes a Subject of Great Persecutions;... (Boston, 1682), 19.

128. Increase Mather, KOMHTOTPAΦIA. or a Discourse Concerning Comets:... (Boston, 1683), 137-139.

129. Samuel Willard, The Child's Portion:...Together with several other Sermons Occaisionally Preached... (Boston, 1684), 225.

130. Samuel Torrey, A Plea for the Life of Dying Religion, 10.

131. M. H. S. Coll., 4th Series, VIII, 42; 45; 47-49; 489-490; 619-620.

132. Hall, Randolph, 82.

133. M. H. S. Coll., 4th Series, VIII, 492, 619, 625.

134. Hall, Randolph, 82; Viola F. Barnes, The Dominion of New England (New Haven, 1923), 22.

135. Palfrey, History of New England, III, 381.

136. Ibid., 385.

137. Hutchinson, History of Massachusetts Bay, ed. Mayo, I, 199.

138. Cotton Mather, Diary of Cotton Mather, M. H. S. Coll., 7th Series, VIII, Pt. 1, 113. (Hereafter cited as Cotton Mather, Diary.)

139. Barnes, Dominion of New England, 53.

140. Increase Mather, The Doctrine of Divine Providence Opened and Applyed: Also Sundry Sermons on Several Other Subjects,... (Boston, 1684), 49-57.

141. Palfrey, History, III, 386 fn.

142. M. H. S. Proceedings, 2nd Series, XIII, 335.

143. Toppan, Randolph, IV, 103, 105.

144. John Higginson, Our Dying Saviour's Legacy of Peace to His Disciples in a troublesome World,... (Boston, 1686), 174-175.

145. Cotton Mather, Diary, Pt. 1, 104.

146. Increase Mather, A Brief Discourse Concerning the unlawfulness of the Common Prayer Worship... (Cambridge, 1686), 4, 17.

147. Ibid., passim.

148. M. H. S. Coll., 4th Series, VIII, 67, 669.

149. Palfrey, History of New England, III, 521-522.

150. Ibid., 522-523, 531.

151. Ibid., 529-530, 551-554.

152. Ibid., 547 fn.

153. "Declaration of the Gentlemen, Merchants, and Inhabitants of Boston," in W. H. Whitemore, ed., The Andros Tracts (Boston, 1868), I, 11-12. (Hereafter cited as Andros Tracts.)

154. N. E. H. G. R., II, 169.

155. Miller, From Colony to Province, 156-157.

156. Barnes, Dominion of New England, 54.

157. M. H. S. Coll., 4th Series, VIII, 115.

158. Adams, Founding of New England, 425.

159. Cotton Mather, Diary, Pt. 1, 113.

160. Sewall, Diary, 186; Hall, Randolph, 117-118.

161. Miller, From Colony to Province, 156.

162. Barnes, "Wharton," 263.

163. Bailyn, New England Merchants, 181, 190-192.

164. Andros Tracts, I, 18.

165. Hall, Randolph, 126-127.

CHAPTER IV

1. Gilbert Burnet, A Sermon Preached before the House of Commons On the 31st of January 1688. Being the Thanksgiving-day For the Deliverance of this Kingdom from Popery and Arbitrary Power... (Boston, 1689), 7, 18, 20.

2. Cotton Mather, The Wonderful Works of God Commemorated. Praises Bespoke for the God of Heaven, In a Thanksgiving Sermon... (Boston, 1690), 32-38.

3. John Gorham Palfrey, History of New England (Boston, 1899), IV, 16; J. H. Plumb, The Origins of Political Stability. England 1675-1725 (Boston, 1967), 66-67; Samuel Craddock to Increase Mather, March 21, 1689, Massachusetts Historical Society Collections, 4th Series, VIII, 644.

4. Cotton Mather, The Wonders of the Invisible World. Observations As well Historical as Theological, upon the Nature, the Number, and the Operations of the DEVIL (Boston, 1693), 46.

5. Cotton Mather, Things for a Distress'd People to think upon. Offered in the Sermon to the General Assembly of... Massachusetts Bay... (Boston, 1696), 33.

6. Cotton Mather, Diary of Cotton Mather, Massachusetts Historical Society Collections, 7th Series, VIII, Pt. I, 184, 187-188, 199-200, 207, 222, 224-225, 233, 234, 241, 262-263. (Hereafter cited as Cotton Mather, Diary.)

7. Increase Mather, The Great Blessing of Primitive Counsellours. Discoursed in a Sermon,... (Boston, 1693), 22.

8. Cotton Mather, Observanda. The Life and Death of the Late Q. Mary (Boston, 1695), 33.

9. Cotton Mather, Things for a Distress'd People, 69-76.

10. Benjamin Wadsworth, Good Soldiers a Great Blessing (Boston, 1700), 20; Benjamin Colman, Faith Victorious (Boston, 1702), 34.

11. Cotton Mather, Observanda, 35.

12. Increase Mather, The Excellency of a Public Spirit Discovered: In a Sermon... (Boston, 1702), 34.

13. Benjamin Wadsworth, King William Lamented in America:... (Boston, 1702), 9.

14. Gershom Bulkeley, "Will and Doom: or The Miseries of Connecticut by and under an usurped and arbitrary power;...," Connecticut Historical Society Collections, III, 191; Gershom Bulkeley, Some Seasonable Considerations For the good People of Connecticut (New York, 1694), 33.

15. Dudley W. R. Bahlman, The Moral Revolution of 1688 (New Haven, 1957), 15-22; Increase Mather, The Surest Way to the Greatest Honour:... (Boston, 1699), 38.

16. Cotton Mather, Diary, I, 261-262; 265-266.

17. Massachusetts Historical Society Collections, 6th Series, VIII, 43.

18. Ibid.

19. Wadsworth, Good Soldiers a Great Blessing, 23, 6.

20. Cotton Mather, Observanda, 43.

21. Increase Mather, Excellency of a Public Spirit, 23.

22. Increase Mather, Primitive Counsellours, 22.

23. Wadsworth, King William Lamented in America, 26.

24. Cotton Mather, Observanda, 38.

25. Ibid., 36.

26. Cotton Mather, Wonderful Works of God Commemorated, 93; Palfrey, History of New England, IV, 9, 71; Perry Miller, The New England Mind: From Colony to Province (Boston, 1961), 391, 417.

27. Increase Mather, "Introduction" in Cotton Mather, Johannes in Eremo (Boston, 1695), 12; Cotton Mather, A Letter of Advice to the Churches of the Non-Conformists in the English Nation: Endeavoring their Satisfaction in that Point, Who are the True Church of England? (London, 1700), passim. See also John Quick, The Young Man's claim unto the Sacrament of the Lords Supper (Boston, 1700), 2.

28. Benjamin Wadsworth, Mutual Love and Peace Among Christians (Boston, 1701), 29.

29. John Cotton, Certain Queries Tending to Accomodation and Communion of Presbyterian and Congregational Churches (London, 1654), 8.

30. Samuel Mather, An Apologie for the Liberties of the Churches in New England:... (Boston, 1738), 149.

31. Henry Newman to Mr. Taylor, March 29, 1714, M. S. Henry Newman Typed Letters, Massachusetts Historical Society; Miller, From Colony to Province, 238.

32. Cotton Mather, Blessed Unions. An Union With the Son of God by Faith, And an Union In the Church of God by Love, Importunately Pressed;... (Boston, 1692), "The Dedication."

33. Increase Mather, "To the Reader" in Samuel Willard, The Peril of the Times Displayed (Boston, 1700), 3.

34. Ibid., 10-11.

35. Carl Bridenbaugh, Mitre and Sceptre; Transatlantic Faiths, Ideas, Personalities, and Politics, 1689-1775 (New York, 1962), 58.

36. Cotton Mather, Diary, I, 205, 312; Cotton Mather, Advice to the Churches of the Non-Conformists, 6, 20.

37. Miller, From Colony to Province, 222.

38. Increase Mather, "To the Reader" in Willard, Peril of the Times, 4.

39. Cotton Mather, Diary, I, 429-430; Cotton Mather, A Seasonable Testimony to the Glorious Doctrines of Grace, At this Day many ways undermined in the World (Boston, 1702), 1-12, 14.

40. Samuel Craddock to Increase Mather, March 21, 1689, M. H. S. C., 4th Series, VIII, 644.

41. Bahlman, Moral Revolution of 1688, 1-14.

42. Cotton Mather, Things for a Distress'd People, 45.

43. Cotton Mather, Wonders of the Invisible World, 64; Cotton Mather, The Day, and the Work of the Day (Boston, 1693), 57.

44. Cotton Mather, Diary, I, 256; Cotton Mather, An Advice To the Churches of the Faithful: Briefly Reporting, The Present State of the Church, Throughout the World:... (Boston, 1702), 11.

45. Cotton Mather, Diary, I, 397-399.

46. Colman, Faith Victorious, 29; "To the Reader"; M. H. S. C., 6th Series, III, 113; Increase Mather, Excellency of a Public Spirit, "To the General Assembly" (Preface).

47. Cotton Mather, Advice to the Churches of the Faithful, 11-13.

48. Increase Mather, Ichabod. or A Discourse Shewing what Cause there is to Fear that the Glory of the Lord is Departing from New England (Boston, 1702), 9-11.

49. Increase Mather, The Righteous Man a Blessing: Or, Seasonable Truths Encouraging unto Faith and Prayer In this Day of Doubtful Expectation (Boston, 1702), 61-62.

50. Increase Mather, The Voice of God in Stormy Winds (Boston, 1704), 52-56.

51. Ibid., 56; Samuel Sewall, The Diary of Samuel Sewall, I, M. H. S. C., 5th Series, VI, 50. (Hereafter cited as Sewall, Diary); Increase Mather, The Righteous Man a Blessing, 62-63.

52. Cotton Mather, Advice to the Churches of the Faithful, 15.

53. Ibid., 13-14; Increase Mather, Morning Star Blessed with Righteousness, published with Excellency of a Public Spirit (Boston, 1702); Cotton Mather, "Problema Theologicum. An Essay Concerning the Happy State Expected for the Church upon Earth; Endeavoring to Demonstrate that the Second Coming of the Lord Jesus Christ will be att the Beginning of that Happy State..." (1703), Cotton Mather M. S. S., American Antiquarian Society, passim.

54. Increase Mather, Excellency of a Public Spirit, "To the General Assembly" (Preface).

55. Increase Mather, "To the Reader" in Willard, Peril of the Times, 11.

56. Bahlman, Moral Revolution of 1688, 70-82.

57. Cotton Mather, Methods and Motives for Societies to Suppress Disorders (Boston, 1703), 5-6.

58. John Norton (1651-1716), An Essay Tending to Promote Reformation (Boston, 1708), 17.

59. Ebenezer Pemberton, Advice to a Son. A Discourse At the Request of a Gentleman in New England, Upon his Son's going to Europe (London, 1705), 24.

60. Ibid.

61. John Rogers, A Sermon. Preached...May 29, 1706... (Boston, 1706), 35.

62. Benjamin Colman, A Sermon Preached before His Excellency the Governour, and Her Majesties Council, At Boston in New England, On July 22d. 1708. Being the Day of the Proclamation of the Happy Union of the Two Kingdoms of England and Scotland (Boston, 1708), 25.

63. Increase Mather, A Dissertation, wherein the Strange Doctrine Lately Published in a Sermon, The Tendency of which, is, to Encourage Unsanctified Persons (while such) to Approach the Holy Table of the Lord, is Examined and Confuted (Boston, 1708), "Appendix," 105; Increase Mather, A Sermon Shewing That the present Dispensations of Providence declare that wonderful Revolutions in the World are near at Hand,... (Edinburgh, 1710), 29.

64. Increase Mather, Strange Doctrine Examined and Confuted, "The Preface," 101-105; 109; Dispensations declare Revolutions are near, 14-28.

65. Increase Mather, Dispensations declare Revolutions are near, 13.

66. Rogers, A Sermon, 35; Norton, Essay Tending to Promote Reformation, 21; Colman, Sermon on the Happy Union of the Two Kingdoms, 31; Thomas Bridge, Jethro's Advice Recommended to the Inhabitants of Boston,... (Second Edition, Boston, 1733), 20; Ebenezer Pemberton, The Divine Original Dignity of Government Asserted;... (Boston, 1710), 79-80; John Wise, The Churches Quarrel Espoused;... (Second Edition, Boston, 1713), 32-33.

67. Thomas Hutchinson, The History of the Colony and Province of Massachusetts Bay, ed. Lawrence Shaw Mayo (Cambridge, 1936), II, 139-140; Clifford K. Shipton, Sibley's Harvard Graduates. Biographical Sketches of those who attended Harvard College, V (Cambridge, 1936), 344.

68. Cotton Mather, Bonifacius. An Essay Upon the Good... (Boston, 1710), 167, 123.

69. Cotton Mather, Diary, II, 36.

70. Hutchinson, History, II, 146; Increase Mather, Burnings Bewailed: in a Sermon, Occasioned by the Lamentable Fire... (Boston, 1711), 31; Jeremiah Dummer, A Letter to A Noble Lord; Concerning the Late Expedition to Canada (London, 1712), 11.

71. Cotton Mather to Wait Winthrop, Feb. 19, 1712, M. H. S. C., 4th Series, VIII, 414; Cotton Mather to Samuel Penhallow, April 17, 1712, Cotton Mather, Diary, II, 172; Ebenezer Pemberton to John Winthrop, Oct. 5, 1712, M. H. S. C., 6th Series, V, 261; Bridenbaugh, Mitre and Sceptre, 62.

72. Henry Newman to John Leverett, Jan. 22, 1713, M. S. Henry Newman, Massachusetts Historical Society.

73. Cotton Mather, Diary, II, 281.

74. Samuel Sewall to Eliphalet Williams, Aug. 10, 1714, M. H. S. C., 6th Series, II, 31-32. (Hereafter cited as Sewall, Letterbook.)

75. Cotton Mather, The Present State of New England. Considered in a Discourse on the Necessities and Advantages of a Public Spirit in every Man:... (Boston, 1690), 35; Cotton Mather, The Day, and the Work of the Day, 58-59.

76. Cotton Mather, Wonders of the Invisible World, "The Authors Defense," 57-58; 43, 55; 45.

77. Cotton Mather, The Way to Prosperity (Boston, 1689), 34.

78. Cotton Mather, Things for a Distress'd People, 14.

79. Miller, From Colony to Province, 174, 237, 241; Increase Mather, Ichabod, 64.

80. Increase Mather, "To the Reader" in Willard, Peril of the Times, 4-7, 11.

81. Kenneth B. Murdock, Increase Mather, The Foremost American Puritan (Cambridge, 1926), 283; Increase Mather, "The Autobiography of Increase Mather," M. G. Hall, ed., Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society, LXXXI, pt. 2, 344-346; 349. (Hereafter cited as Increase Mather, "Autobiography."); Sewall, Diary, I, 494; Cotton Mather, Diary, I, 305, 353; Increase Mather, "Autobiography," 352, 360; Murdock, Increase Mather, 387.

82. Hutchinson, History, II, 47-50.

83. Richard L. Bushman, From Puritan to Yankee (Cambridge, 1967), 46-47.

84. Miller, From Colony to Province, 158-159, 168-169; Hutchinson, History, II, 142; Increase Mather, Surest Way to Greatest Honour, 33.

85. Miller, From Colony to Province, 169.

86. Hutchinson, History, II, 48.

87. Palfrey, History of New England, IV, 297; Miller, From Colony to Province, 370.

88. Richard S. Dunn, Puritans and Yankees (Princeton, 1962), 270-271.

89. Plumb, Origins of Political Stability, 133-134, 138.

90. Murdock, Increase Mather, 356; Increase Mather, Surest Way to Greatest Honour, "The Epistle Dedicatory!"; Dunn, Puritans and Yankees, 273.

91. Bulkeley, "Will and Doom," 144.

92. Ibid., 97.

93. Ibid., 194; 93-95.

94. Ibid., 90, 94, 102-112; Gershom Bulkeley, The People's Right to Election Or Alteration of Government Argued in a Letter;... (Philadelphia, 1689), 3-9.

95. Bulkeley, "Will and Doom," 130-131.

96. Bulkeley, Some Seasonable Considerations, 26-29.

97. Bulkeley, "Will and Doom," 90.

98. Ibid., 228; Connecticut Historical Society Collections, XXI, 340-346.

99. Sewall, Diary, II, 65.

100. Ibid., 124.

101. Boston News-Letter, Feb. 12, 1705.

102. Everett Kimball, The Public Life of Joseph Dudley (New York, 1911), 201, 209.

103. Joseph Dudley to Guerdon Saltonstall, May, 1708, M. H. S. C., 6th Series, V, 169-170.

104. Joseph Dudley to Wait Winthrop, June 8, 1713, Ibid., 267.

105. Cotton Mather, The Deplorable State of New England (London, 1708), 8-9; 21.

106. Caroline Hazard, ed., The Notebook of John Saffin (New York, 1928), 75-76.

107. Dunn, Puritans and Yankees, 192.

108. Cotton Mather, Wonders of the Invisible World, "The Authors Defense"; Pemberton, Advice to a Son, 20.

109. Palfrey, History of New England, IV, 306 fn.

110. Anonymous, "My son, fear thou the Lord, and the King...," Folio Broadside, Publications of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts, X (April, 1906), 351.

111. J. M. Manning, "Thomas Prince," The Congregational Quarterly, I (Jan., 1859), 9.

112. John Winthrop to Fitz-John Winthrop, ca. 1707, M. H. S. C., 6th Series, III, 402.

113. Cotton Mather, Bonifacius, 149.

114. John Wise, A Vindication of the Government of New England Churches (Boston, 1717), 52.

115. Henry Care, English Liberties, or the Freeborn Subjects Inheritance (Fifth Edition, Boston, 1721), 4, 22; Wise, The Churches Quarrel Espoused, 55-56, 58. Apparently William Penn was the author of most of English Liberties. See Winthrop S. Hudson, "William Penn's English Liberties: Tract for Several Times," William and Mary Quarterly, 3rd Series, XXVI (Oct., 1969), 578-585.

116. Wise, Vindication of New England Churches, 95-96.

117. Ibid., 51.

118. Wise, Churches Quarrel Espoused, 118.

119. Ibid., 43.

120. Ibid., 55.

121. Thomas Goodwin and Phillip Nye, "To the Reader" in John Cotton, The Keyes Of the Kingdom of Heaven, and Power thereof, according to the Word of God (London, 1644).

122. Cotton Mather, A Pillar of Gratitude (Boston, 1700), 3.

123. Ibid., 8.

124. Ibid., 13.

125. Ibid., 21-22.

126. Ibid., 24-25.

127. Ibid., 11; 32-33.

128. Ibid., 34.

129. Cotton Mather, Magnalia Christi Americana (London, 1702), Book V, 1, 39, 62.

130. Ibid., "General Introduction," Book III, 157-158; Book I, 3, 4, 29.

131. Colman, Sermon on the Happy Union of the Two Kingdoms, 15-16.

132. Ibid., 16.

133. Increase Mather, A Brief Relation of the State of New England... In a Letter to a Person of Quality (London, 1689), 9; Anonymous, Revolution in New England Justified, And the People there Vindicated From the Aspersions cast upon them By Mr. John Palmer... (Boston, 1691), 7-8; Cotton Mather, The Christian Thank-Offering. A Brief Discourse on the Returns of Gratitude and Obedience (Boston, 1696), 23.

134. Samuel Sewall to Sir William Ashurst, Nov. 8, 1714, Sewall, Letter-book, II, 35-36; Cotton Mather, Diary, II, 292; Cotton Mather, The Glorious Throne. A Short View of Our Great Lord-Redeemer On His Throne... (Boston, 1714), 34, 35; Palfrey, History of New England, IV, 325.

135. Samuel Sewall, Phaenomena quaedam Apocalyptica Ad Aspectum Novi Orbis configurata (Boston, 1697), "Dedication to Sir William Ashurst"; Sewall, Diary, I, 263.

136. J. M. Manning, "Thomas Prince," 10.

137. Dunn, Puritans and Yankees, 318-319.

138. Henry Newman to Thomas Prince, July 16, 1729; Newman to Cotton Mather, Aug. 31, 1722; Newman to Paul Dudley, Sept. 13, 1723; Newman to Bishop of Peterborough, Mar. 16, 1724; Newman to Jonathan Belcher, Jr., May 11, 1730, M. S. Henry Newman, Massachusetts Historical Society.

139. Sheldon S. Cohen, "The Diary of Jeremiah Dummer," William and Mary Quarterly, 3rd Series, XXIV (July, 1967), 405, 407.

# SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

## PRIMARY SOURCES

### Books and Pamphlets


Anonymous, M. S. to A. S. With a Plea for Libertie of Conscience in a Church Way,..., London, 1644.

_____, Reasons for the Indictment of the Duke of York..., London, 1680. Broadside.

_____, Revolution in New England Justified, And the People there Vindicated From the Aspersions cast upon them By Mr. John Palmer,..., Boston, 1691.

Bradstreet, Anne, The Tenth Muse Lately sprung up in America, London, 1650.

Bridge, Thomas, Jethro's Advice Recommended to the Inhabitants of Boston,..., Second Edition, Boston, 1733.

Bulkeley, Gershom, The Peoples Right to Election or Alteration of Government in Connecticut Argued in a Letter;..., Philadelphia, 1689.

_____, Some Seasonable Considerations For the good People of Connecticut, New York, 1694.

Bulkeley, Peter, The Gospel Covenant, or the Covenant of Grace opened,..., Second Edition, London, 1651.

Burnet, Gilbert, A Sermon Preached before the House of Commons On the 31st of January 1688. Being the Thanksgiving-day For the Deliverance of this Kingdom from Popery and Arbitrary Power..., Boston, 1689.

Care, Henry, English Liberties, or the Free-born Subjects Inheritance,..., Fifth Edition, Boston, 1721.

Chauncy, Charles, Gods Mercy, Shewed to His People in Giving them a Faithful Ministry and Schooles of Learning for the Continual Supplyes Thereof, Cambridge, 1655.

Child, John, New Englands Jonas Cast up at London:..., London, 1647,

Clap, Roger, Memoirs of Capt. Roger Clap, Boston, 1731

Colman, Benjamin, Faith Victorious, Boston, 1702.

_____, A Sermon Preached before His Excellency the Governour, and Her Majesties Council, At Boston, in New England, On July 22d, 1708. Being the Day of the Proclamation of the Happy Union of the Two Kingdoms of England and Scotland, Boston, 1708.

Cotton, John, Certain Queries Tending to Accomodation and Communion of Presbyterian and Congregational Churches, London, 1654.

_____, The Churches Resurrection, or the Opening of the Fift and sixt verses of the 20th Chap. of the Revelation, London, 1642.

_____, An Exposition upon the Thirteenth Chapter of the Revelation, London, 1656.

_____, Gods Promise To His Plantation, London, 1630.

_____, Of the Holiness of Church Members, London, 1650.

_____, The Keyes Of the Kingdom of Heaven, and Power thereof, according to the Word of God, London, 1644.

_____, The Powring out of the Seven Vials: or an Exposition of the 16. Chapter of the Revelation, with an Application of it to our Times, Second Edition, London, 1645.

_____, The Way of Congregational Churches Cleared: in two Treatises, London, 1648.

_____, The Way of the Churches of Christ in New England, London, 1645.

Danforth, Samuel, A Brief Recognition of New-Englands Errand into the Wilderness;..., Cambridge, 1671.

Davenport, John, An Answer of the Elders of the Several Churches in New England unto Nine Positions, Sent Over to Them (By divers Reverend and godly Ministers in England) to declare their Judgements therein..., London, 1643.

Dummer, Jeremiah, Letter to a Noble Lord, Concerning the Late Expedition to Canada, London, 1712.

Edwards, Thomas, Antapologia: Or, A Full Answer to the Apologetical Narration..., London, 1644.

Eliot, John, The Christian Commonwealth: or The Civil Policy of the Rising Kingdom of Jesus Christ, London, N. d. (1659).

Firmin, Giles, Of Schism. Parochial Congregations in England, and Ordination by Imposition of Hands, London, 1658.

_____, Separation Examined: Or, A Treatise Wherein the grounds for Separation from the Ministry and Churches of England are weighed, and found too light, London, 1652.

Higginson, John, The Cause of God and His People in New England as it was Stated and Discussed in A Sermon..., Cambridge, 1663.

_____, Our Dying Saviour's Legacy of Peace To His Disciples in a troublesome World, Boston, 1686.

Hooke, William, New Englands Sence, of Old England and Irelands Sorrowes, London, 1645.

_____, New Englands Teares, for old Englands Feares, London, 1641.

Hooker, Thomas, The Danger of Desertion: or A Farewell Sermon of Mr. Thomas Hooker,..., London, 1641.

_____, A Survey of the Summe of Church Discipline,..., London, 1648.

Hubbard, William, A Narrative of the Troubles with the Indians of New England, Boston, 1677.

Johnson, Edward, A History of New England, London, 1654.

Keach, Benjamin, Sion in Distress. or the Groans of the Protestant Church, Boston, 1683.

Lechford, Thomas, Plain Dealing: or, Newes from New England, London, 1642.

Mather, Cotton, An Advice to the Churches of the Faithful: Briefly Reporting, The Present State of the Church, Throughout the World, Boston, 1702.

_____, Blessed Unions, An Union With the Son of God by Faith And an Union In the Church of God by Love, Importunately Pressed, Boston, 1692.

_____, Bonifacius. An Essay Upon the Good..., Boston, 1710.

_____, The Christian Thank-Offering. A Brief Discourse on the Returns of Gratitude and Obedience..., Boston, 1696.

_____, The Day, & the Work of the Day, Boston, 1692.

_____, Fair Weather. Or Considerations to Dispel the Clouds & Allay the Storms of Discontent..., Boston, 1692.

_____, The Glorious Throne. A Short View of Our Great Lord Redeemer on His Throne:..., Boston, 1714.

_____, A Letter of Advice to the Churches of the Non-Conformists in the English Nation:..., London, 1700.

_____, Magnalia Christi Americana, London, 1702.

_____, Methods and Motives for Societies To Suppress Disorders, Boston, 1703.

_____, Observanda. The Life and Death of the Late Q. Mary, Boston, 1695.

_____, A Pillar of Gratitude, Boston, 1700.

_____, The Pourtraiture of a Good Man, Boston, 1702.

_____, The Present State of New England. Considered in a Discourse On the Necessities and Advantages of a Public Spirit In every Man;..., Boston, 1690.

_____, A Seasonable Testimony to the Glorious Doctrines of Grace, At this Day many ways undermined in the World, Boston, 1702.

_____, The Serviceable Man. A Discourse Made unto the General Court of...Massachusetts..., Boston, 1690.

_____, The Short History of New England. A Recapitulation of Wonderful Passages..., Boston, 1694.

_____, Theopolis Americana. An Essay on the Golden Street Of the Holy City:..., Boston, 1710.

_____, Things for a Distress'd People to think upon, Boston, 1696.

_____, The Way to Prosperity. A Sermon. Preached to the Honourable Convention, Boston, 1689.

_____, The Wonders of the Invisible World. Observations As well Historical as Theological, upon the Nature, the Number, and the Operations of the DEVILS, Boston, 1693.

_____, The Wonderful Works of God Commemorated. Praises Bespoke for the God of Heaven, In a Thanksgiving Sermon..., Boston, 1690.

Mather, Increase, A Brief Discourse Concerning the unlawfulness of the Common Prayer Worship..., Cambridge, 1686.

_____, A Brief History of the Warr With the Indians in New England,...Together with a serious Exhortation to the Inhabitants of the Land, Boston, 1676.

_____, A Brief Relation of the State of New England...In a Letter to a Person of Quality, London, 1689.

_____, A Call from Heaven To the Present and Succeeding Generations..., Boston, 1679.

_____, The Day of Trouble is near. Two Sermons Wherein is shewed, What are the Signs of a Day of Trouble being near..., Cambridge, 1674.

_____, A Discourse Concerning the Danger of Apostacy, Especially as to those that are the Children and Posterity of such as have been emminent for God in their Generation, Boston, 1679.

_____, A Dissertation, wherein the Strange Doctrine Lately Published in a Sermon, The Tendency of which, is, to Encourage Unsanctified Persons (while such) to Approach the Holy Table of the Lord, is Examined and Confuted, Boston, 1708.

_____, An Earnest Exhortation to the Inhabitants of New England,..., Boston, 1676.

_____, The Excellency of a Public Spirit Discovered:..., Boston, 1702.

_____, The Great Blessing of Primitive Counsellours, Boston, 1693.

_____, Ichabod. or A Discourse Shewing what Cause there is to Fear that the Glory of the Lord, is Departing from New England, Boston, 1702.

_____, The Mystery of Israel's Salvation, Explained and Applyed: A Discourse Concerning the General Conversion of the Israelitish Nation..., Boston, 1669.

_____, New England Vindicated..., London, 1689.

_____, A Relation of the Troubles which have hapened in New England, By reason of the Indians there..., Boston, 1677.

_____, Returning unto God the great concernment of a Covenant People, Boston, 1680.

_____, The Righteous Man a Blessing: Or, Seasonable Truths Encouraging unto Faith and Prayer In this Day of Doubtful Expectation, Boston, 1702.

_____, A Sermon Shewing That the present Dispensations of Providence declare that wonderful Revolutions in the World are near at Hand;..., Edinburgh, 1710.

_____, A Sermon Wherein is shewed that the Church of God is sometimes a Subject of Great Persecution;..., Boston, 1682.

_____, The Surest Way to the Greatest Honour:..., Boston, 1699.

_____, The Voice of God in Stormy Winds..., Boston, 1704.

Mather, Richard, An Apologie of the Churches in New England for Church-Covenant, London, 1643.

Mede, Joseph, The Works of the Pious and Profoundly-Learned Joseph Mede, B. D., London, 1664.

Norton, John, Abel being Dead yet speaketh; or, the Life and Death of that deservedly Famous Man of God, Mr. John Cotton,..., London, 1658.

_____, A Discussion of that Great Point in Divinity, the Sufferings of Christ;..., London, 1653.

_____, The Heart of New England Rent at the Blasphemies of the Present Generation, Cambridge, 1659.

_____, An Appendix to The heart of New England Rent by the Blasphemies of the Present Generation, London, 1660.

_____, The Orthodox Evangelist..., London, 1657.

_____, Three Choice and Profitable Sermons Upon Severall Texts Of Scripture;..., Cambridge, 1664.

Norton, John (1651-1716), An Essay Tending to Promote Reformation..., Boston, 1708.

Noyes, James, Moses and Aaron: Or, The Rights of Church and State;..., London, 1661.

Oakes, Urian, New England Pleaded with, And pressed to consider the things which concern her Peace at least in this her Day:..., Cambridge, 1673.

Oxenbridge, John, New England Freemen Warned..., Cambridge, 1673.

Pemberton, Ebenezer, Advice to a Son. A Discourse At the Request of a Gentleman in New England, Upon his Son's going to Europe, London, 1705.

_____, The Divine Original Dignity of Government Asserted;..., Boston, 1710.

Rogers, John, A Sermon,..., Boston, 1706.

Rogers, Nathaniel, Letter discovering the Cause of Gods continuing Wrath against the Nation..., London, 1644.

Scottow, Joshua, A Narrative Of the Planting of the Massachusetts Colony..., Boston, 1694.

_____, Old Mens Tears For their own Declensions, Mixed with Fear of their Posteritie's further falling off from New England's Primitive Constitutions, Boston, 1691.

Sewall, Samuel, Phaenomena quaedam Apocalyptica Ad Aspectum Novi Orbis configurata, Boston, 1697.

Shepard, Thomas, New Englands Lamentation for Old Englands present errours, and divisions, and their feared future desolations if not timely prevented..., London, 1645.

_____, The Sound Beleever. A Treatise of Evangelical Conversion, London, 1652.

_____, Subjection to Christ in all his Ordinances and Appointments, The best means to preserve our Liberty..., London, 1657.

_____, Theses Sabbaticae. Or, The Doctrine of the Sabbath, London, 1655.

_____, Three Valuble Pieces. Viz. Select Cases Resolved; First Principles Of the Oracles of God, or, Sum of Christian Religion; and a private Diary;..., Boston, 1747.

_____, Wine for Gospel Wantons: or Cautions against Spirituall Drunkeness..., Cambridge, 1668.

Shepard, Thomas, and Allin, Thomas, A Treatise of Liturgies, Power of the Keys, And of matter of the Visible Church. In Answer To the Reverend Servant of Christ, Mr. John Ball, London, 1653.

Shepard, Thomas Jr., Eye Salve, Or A Watch-word From our Lord Jesus Christ unto his Church Especially those within the Colony of the Massachusetts in New England, To take heed of Apostacy:..., Cambridge, 1673.

Stone, Samuel, A Congregational Church Is a Catholicke Visible Church..., London, 1652.

Stoughton, William, New England's True Interest, Not to Lie..., Boston, 1668.

Synod, 1679, The Necessity of Reformation With the Expedients subservient thereunto, asserted;... Agreed upon by the Elders and Messengers Of the Churches assembled in the Synod At Boston in New-England, Sept. 10, 1679, Boston, 1679.

Torrey, Samuel, An Exhortation unto Reformation, amplified, By a Discourse concerning the Parts and Progress of that Work, according to the Word of God, Cambridge, 1674.

Vincent, Thomas, Gods Terrible Voice in the City of London Wherein you have the Narration of the Two late Dreadful Judgements of Plague and Fire,..., Cambridge, 1668.

Wadsworth, Benjamin, Good Soldiers a Great Blessing, Boston, 1700.

_____, King William Lamented in America:..., Boston, 1702.

_____, Mutual Love and Peace Among Christians, Boston, 1701.

Ward, Nathaniel, Discolliminium. Or, A most obedient Reply to a late Book, Called Bounds and Bonds,..., London, 1650.

_____, The Simple Cobler of Aggwam in America. Willing To help 'mend his Native Country,..., London, 1647.

Ward, Samuel, All in All, London, 1627.

_____, A Coale From The Altar To Kindle The Holy fire of Zeale, Fifth Edition, London, 1627.

_____, Iethro's Justice of the Peace, London, 1627.

_____, A Peace Offering to God For the blessing we enjoy under his Maiesties reigne, with a Thanksgiving for the Princes safe returne,..., London, 1624.

Whiting, Samuel, Abraham's Humble Intercession for Sodom, and the Lord's gracious Concessions in Answer thereunto:..., Cambridge, 1666.

Willard, Samuel, The Checkered State of the Gospel Church..., Boston, 1701.

_____, The Fiery Tryal no strange thing;..., Boston, 1681.

_____, The Peril of the Times Displayed..., Boston, 1700.

Williams, Roger, G. Fox Digg'd Out of His Burrowes,..., Boston, 1676.

Winslow, Edward, Hypocrisie Unmasked: By A true Relation of the Governour and Company of the Massachusetts against Samuel Gorton..., London, 1646.

_____, New Englands Salamander, Discovered..., London, 1647.

Wise, John, The Churches Quarrel Espoused:..., Boston, 1713.

_____, A Vindication of the Government of New England Churches, Boston, 1717.

Printed Manuscripts, Letters, and Documents.

Anonymous, "My son, fear thou the Lord, and the King...," Folio Broadside, Publications of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts, X (April, 1906), 348-352.

Adams, Charles Francis, ed., Antinomianism in the Colony of Massachusetts Bay, Boston, 1694.

Ashton, John, ed., The Works of John Robinson, Pastor of the Pilgrim Fathers, 3 vols., London, 1851.

Boston, Registry Department, Report of the Record Commissioners containing the Roxbury Land and Church Records, Boston, 1884.

Bradford, William, History of Plymouth Plantation 1620-1647, Worthington C. Ford, ed., 2 vols., Boston, 1912.

Bulkeley, Gershom, "Will and Doom: or The Miseries of Connecticut by and under an usurped and arbitrary power;...," Connecticut Historical Society Collections, III (1895), 81-269.

Calder, Isabel MacBeath, ed., Letters of John Davenport, Puritan Divine, New Haven, 1937.

Collinson, Patrick, ed., Letters of Thomas Wood, Puritan, 1566-1577, Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research. Special Supplement No. 5 (Nov., 1960).

Foxe, John, The Acts and Monuments of John Foxe..., ed. Rev. Stephen Reed Cattley, 8 vols., London, 1837-1841.

Hull, John, "Some Observable Passages Toward the Country...," Transactions and Collections of the American Antiquarian Society, III (1857), 167-250.

Hutchinson, Thomas, ed., A Collection of Original Papers Relative to the History of the Colony of Massachusetts-Bay, Publications of the Prince Society, Hutchinson Papers, 2 vols., Albany, 1865.

Lechford, Thomas, "Note-Book Kept by Thomas Lechford, Esq., Lawyer,...," Transactions and Collections of the American Antiquarian Society, VII (1885).

Lever, Thomas, Sermons, 1550, ed. Edward Arber (English Reprints, no. 25), London, 1870.

Mather, Cotton, Diary of Cotton Mather, Massachusetts Historical Society Collections, 7th Series, VIII, Parts I and II.

Mather, Increase, "The Autobiography of Increase Mather," ed. M. G. Hall, Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society, LXXI, Part II (Oct., 1961), 271-360.

Miller, Perry, et al., eds., The Complete Writings of Roger Williams, 7 vols., New York, 1963.

Mitchell, Stewart, ed., Winthrop Papers, 5 vols., Boston, 1929-1947.

Murdock, Kenneth B., ed., Handkerchiefs from Paul, Cambridge, 1927.

Norton, John, The Answer To the Whole Set of Questions of the Celebrated Mr. William Appolonius,..., trans. by Douglas Horton, Cambridge, 1958.

O'Callaghan, E. B., ed., Documents Relative to the Colonial History of the State of New York, III, Albany, 1853.

Peel, Albert, ed., The Seconde Parte of a Register, 2 vols., Cambridge, 1915.

Saffin, John, The Notebook of John Saffin, 1665-1708, ed. Caroline Hazard, New York, 1928.

Sewall, Samuel, The Diary of Samuel Sewall. Massachusetts Historical Society Collections, 5th Series, VI, VII, Boston, 1879.

_____, The Letter Book of Samuel Sewall. Massachusetts Historical Society Collections, 6th Series, I, II, Boston, 1886.

Shepard, Thomas, The Autobiography of Thomas Shepard, ed. Nehiamiah Adams, Boston, 1832.

Shurtleff, Nathaniel B., ed., Records of the Governour and Company of the Massachusetts Bay in New England, 5 vols., Boston, 1853.

Toppan, Robert N., ed., Edward Randolph; Including His Letters and Official Papers..., 5 vols., Boston, 1899.

Whitemore, W. H., ed., The Andros Tracts, Boston, 1868.

Winthrop, John, The History of New England from 1630 to 1649, ed. James Savage, 2 vols., Boston, 1826.

Young, Alexander, ed., Chronicles of the First Settlers of Massachusetts Bay, Boston, 1846.

## Unprinted Manuscripts

Cotton Manuscript, Boston Public Library.

Newman, Henry, Henry Newman Typed Letters, Massachusetts Historical Society.

Mather, Cotton, "Problema Theologicum. An Essay Concerning the Happy State Expected for the Church upon Earth; Endeavouring to Demonstrate that the Second Coming of the Lord Jesus Christ, will be att the Beginning of that Happy State. With some Thoughts upon the Characters and Approaches of it," Cotton Mather Manuscript, American Antiquarian Society.

Mather, Richard, "A plea for the churches of christ in New England. Divided into two parts. The former conteyning A survey of Mr. W.R. his booke intitled, A Narration of church courses in New England... The other conteyning Possible grounds from scripture and reason for justification of the way of the said Churches," R. Mather Manuscript 61.2.5, Massachusetts Historical Society.

Winslow Manuscript, Massachusetts Historical Society.

## SECONDARY SOURCES

### Books

Adams, James Truslow, The Founding of New England, Boston, 1949.

Bahlman, Dudley W. R., The Moral Revolution of 1688, New Haven, 1957.

Bailyn, Bernard, The New England Merchants in the Seventeenth Century, Boston, 1964.

Barnes, Viola F., The Dominion of New England, New Haven, 1923.

Bushman, Richard L., From Puritan to Yankee. Character and the Social Order in Connecticut, 1690-1765, Cambridge, 1967.

Coffin, Joshua, A Sketch of the History of Newbury, Newburyport, and West Newbury, From 1635 to 1845, Boston, 1845.

Davies, Godfrey, The Restoration of Charles II, 1658-1660, Los Angeles, 1955.

Dean, John Ward, A Memoir of the Rev. Nathaniel Ward, A. M., Albany, 1868.

Dunn, Richard S., Puritans and Yankees, Princeton, 1962.

Eusden, John Dykstra, Puritans, Lawyers, and Politics in Early Seventeenth-Century England, New Haven, 1958.

Gardinier, Samuel Rawson, The Fall of the Monarchy of Charles II, 2 vols., London, 1882.

Hall, Michael Garibaldi, Edward Randolph and the American Colonies, Chapel Hill, 1960.

Haller, William, Foxe's Book of Martyrs and the Elect Nation, London, 1963.

_____, Liberty and Reformation in the Puritan Revolution, New York, 1955.

_____, The Rise of Puritanism, New York, 1957.

Haskins, George Lee, Law and Authority in Early Massachusetts, New York, 1960.

Hutchinson, Thomas, The History of the Colony and Province of Massachusetts Bay, ed. Lawrence Shaw Mayo, Cambridge, 1936.

Judson, Margaret, The Crisis of the Constitution. An Essay in Constitutional and Political Thought in England 1603-1645, New Brunswick, 1949.

Kimball, Everett, The Public Life of Joseph Dudley, New York, 1911.

Knappen, Marshall M., Tudor Puritanism. A Chapter in the History of Idealism, Chicago, 1939.

Maclure, Millar, The Paul's Cross Sermons, 1534-1642, Toronto, 1958.

Miller, Perry, Errand into the Wilderness, New York, 1964.

_____, The New England Mind: From Colony to Province, Boston, 1961.

_____, The New England Mind: The Seventeenth Century, Boston, 1961.

_____, Orthodoxy in Massachusetts, 1630-1650, Boston, 1959.

_____, Roger Williams. His Contribution to the American Tradition, New York, 1962.

Morgan, Edmund S., The Puritan Dilemma: The Story of John Winthrop, Boston, 1958.

_____, Visible Saints. The History of a Puritan Idea, New York, 1963.

Murdock, Kenneth Ballard, Increase Mather, The Foremost American Puritan, Cambridge, 1926.

Neale, John E., Elizabeth I and Her Parliaments 1559-1581, London, 1953.

Nuttal, Geoffrey F., Visible Saints. The Congregational Way 1640-1660, Oxford, 1957.

Ogg, David, England in the Reign of Charles II, 2 vols., Second Edition, Oxford, 1963.

Palfrey, John Gorham, History of New England, 5 vols., Boston, 1899.

Plumb, J. H., The Origins of Political Stability. England 1675-1725, Boston, 1967.

Pocock, J. G. A., The Ancient Constitution and the Feudal Law. A Study of English Historical Thought in the Seventeenth Century, Cambridge, 1957.

Powell, Sumner Chilton, Puritan Village; The Formation of a New England Town, Middletown, 1963.

Read, Conyers, Lord Burghley and Queen Elizabeth, New York, 1960.

Sachse, William L., The Colonial American in Britain, Madison, 1956.

Simpson, Alan, Puritanism in Old and New England, Toronto, 1966.

Stearns, Raymond Phineas, The Strenuous Puritan. Hugh Peter 1598-1660, Urbana, 1954.

Tillyard, E. M. W., The Elizabethan World Picture, New York, 1959.

Tuveson, Ernest Lee, Millenium and Utopia, New York, 1964.

Weis, Frederick Lewis, The Colonial Clergy and the Colonial Churches of New England, Lancaster, 1936.

Wright, Louis B., Religion and Empire: The Alliance between Piety and Commerce in English Expansion 1558-1625, Chapel Hill, 1943.

Ziff, Larzer, The Career of John Cotton: Puritanism and the American Experience, Princeton, 1962.

## Articles and Unpublished Studies

Banks, Charles E., "Thomas Venner, the Boston Wine-Cooper and Fifth Monarchy Man," New England Historical and Genealogical Register, XLVII (1893), 437-444.

Barnes, Viola F., "Richard Wharton. A Seventeenth Century New England Colonial," Publications of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts, XXVI (1927), 238-270.

Buffinton, Arthur H., "Sir Thomas Temple of Boston, A Case of Benevolent Assimilation," Publications of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts, XXVII (1932), 308-319.

Clive, John, and Bernard Bailyn, "England's Cultural Provinces: Scotland and America," William and Mary Quarterly, 3rd Series, XI (April, 1954), 200-213.

Farrel, Frank E., "Richard Sibbes: A Study in Early Seventeenth Century English Puritanism," Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Faculty of Divinity, University of Edinburgh, 1955.

Kitteridge, George Lyman, "Dr. Robert Child the Remonstrant," Publications of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts, XXI (1919), 1-146.

Lockridge, Kenneth A., and Alan Kreider, "The Evolution of Massachusetts Town Government, 1640 to 1740," William and Mary Quarterly, 3rd Series, XXXIII (Oct., 1966), 549-574.

Lucas, Paul R., "Colony or Commonwealth: Massachusetts Bay, 1661-1666," William and Mary Quarterly, 3rd Series, XXIV (Jan., 1967), 88-107.

Maclear, James Fulton, "The Heart of New England Rent: The Mystical Element in Early Puritan History," Mississippi Valley Historical Review, XLII (March, 1954), 621-652.

Manning, J. M., "Thomas Prince," The Congregational Quarterly, I, (Jan., 1859), 1-16.

Perry, Thomas W., "New Plymouth and Old England: A Suggestion," William and Mary Quarterly, 3rd Series, XVIII (April, 1961), 251-265.

Porter, Kenneth W., "Samuel Gorton, New England Firebrand," New England Quarterly, VII (Dec., 1934), 405-444.

Rosenmeier, Jesper, "The Teacher and the Witness: John Cotton and Roger Williams," William and Mary Quarterly, 3rd Series, XXV (July, 1968), 411-433.

Trevor-Roper, Hugh R., "Three Foreigners and the Philosophy of the English Revolution," Encounter, XIV (Feb., 1960), 3-20.

Wright, Louis B., "Propaganda against James I's 'Appeasement' of Spain," Huntingdon Library Quarterly, VI (1943), 149-173.

Reproduced with permission of copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.