Spring 2015

NEW ENGLAND'S GOD: ANTI-CATHOLICISM AND COLONIAL NEW ENGLAND

Matthew J. Nowak
John Carroll University, mnowak12@jcu.edu

NEW ENGLAND'S GOD: ANTI-CATHOLICISM AND COLONIAL NEW ENGLAND

An Essay Submitted to the
Office of Graduate Studies
College of Arts & Sciences of
John Carroll University
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of
Master of Arts

By
Matthew J. Nowak
2015

The essay of Matthew J. Nowak is hereby accepted:

Reader – Dr. Anne Kugler — Date: 4/28/15

Reader – Dr. Marcus Gallo — Date: 4/28/15

Advisor – Dr. Daniel Kilbride — Date: 4/28/15

I certify that this is a copy of the original document

Author – Matthew J. Nowak — Date: 4/28/15

Introduction

The Puritans left England because of Roman Catholicism. Either because of perceived threats by Catholics or Pseudo-Catholics or their detestation of the continued presence of Catholic influence in church, government, and society, Puritans believed there existed a better way of life outside the sway of Catholicism. The people who left England during the seventeenth century and founded the colonies of New England – Massachusetts, Connecticut, Plymouth, Rhode Island, and New Haven – did so in the spirit of religion and reform. Born from the turmoil of religious persecution and political experimentalism, New England Puritanism – which is the primary focus of this discussion – created a unique overarching society that focused on godliness, Biblical law, substantive justice, participation, and cohesion. Within this reform orientated culture, however, the specter of religious dissent and especially Catholicism hung over the heads of its inhabitants, like a thunder cloud ready to strike a drought afflicted prairie.

Catholicism influenced New England Puritanism throughout the seventeen and early eighteenth centuries in ways often taken for granted and in ways not necessarily examined in depth before. Not many Catholics set up their homes in New England and for good reason. New England was dominated by Puritan Congregationalism, influenced by the years of Protestant rule in England. English Catholics had become a minority beginning with the reign of Henry VIII, and with the notable exception of Mary and the Stuart line, continued to be so thereafter. For "other" religious people, to journey across the Atlantic and settle in an increasingly intolerant region such as New England, which frequently persecuted Quakers, Baptists, and Anabaptists, among others, was near suicidal. In fact, these groups were oftentimes banned outright. Likewise, the surrounding

colonies, such as Pennsylvania, Virginia, and especially the Catholic-friendly Maryland were better alternatives. Despite its lack of physical representation in the region, Catholicism continued to influence (and horrify) New England Puritans in more unexpected ways than historians have noted in the past.

For English Protestants, especially New England Puritans, Catholicism represented a danger to both body and soul. In regards to the soul, Catholicism prevented reunification with God in heaven; it allowed sin to flourish; it trapped souls for the Antichrist; and it was not a true Christian religion but rather treacherous heresy. It also represented physical threats as well. Not only did it anger God and excite Satan, who acted in the physical as well as spiritual worlds, Catholicism was the core religion of England's chief rivals – the French, Spanish, and Portuguese. Take the words of John Flavel, an English Puritan, who wrote "It was Queen Elizabeth's Motto; *No peace with Spain* and it should be ours; No peace with *Rome*."[1] To make matters worse, the pope was the head of his own empire, the Papal States. Invasion from these armies permeated English fears over their own physical safety regardless of the likelihood of such an invasion occurring; they could never be safe in a world filled with potential invading armies, especially when those armies were physically nearby.

New Englanders were not all Puritans, and all Puritans were not conservative or radical. However, as we shall see, New Englanders overwhelmingly favored experimentation with participation, rights, and responsibilities in ways that their contemporaries – fellow colonies and European countries – did not. They were not proto-democrats in the modern sense, but they emphasized and experimented with institutions

[1] Flavel, John. "Tydings from Rome or England's Alarm." Cambridge, Mass.: 1668. Microform. *Early American Imprints*: first series; no. 131. p. 17-18.

and ideas that made them highly unique for their period. Because of this, there seems to be more concrete evidence to suggest that the laws passed by their assemblies, and the attitudes and beliefs espoused by their leaders, are more representative of the region's population than in most other cases. This makes New England an excellent study in the examination of anti-Catholicism. Anti-Catholicism (or the fear and distaste of Catholicism) was at the root of many of the reforms of New England Puritanism. Catholicism had a constant presence in the hearts and minds of Puritans, especially Puritan ministers for whom we have a plethora of writings to choose from. As we shall see, the unique aspects stressed in New England society - participation, uniformity, and religion – allowed the laity to influence religion and officials in ways unseen in England or elsewhere. This makes the words of ministers, like Cotton Mather and Samuel Willard, much more representative of the general population.

Early modern anti-Catholicism came in many fashions. The following is a list of several types of stereotypes often associated with anti-Catholic fears or beliefs. Throughout the following pages these stereotypes will reappear time and again:

(1) Types of Anti-Catholicism: The Antichrist:

Most, if not all, Protestants called the pope, the leader of the Catholic Church, the antichrist. Whether they actually believed it or not, the call for the defeat of the antichrist, meaning the pope, was so common that, for historians, the term antichrist almost always refers to the Catholic pope. As the antichrist, the pope was bringing the End of Times and the great war between Christ's followers and Satan's armies. The pope and the Catholic Church was thus an organization allied with Satan that provided for his evil armies. For example, Increase Mather did not hesitate to employ the use of the antichrist stereotype in

his discussion of the Israel metaphor, arguing that "Before this salvation of *Israel* be accomplished, the Pope [Catholicism] and Turk [Islam] shall be overthrown and destroyed" and that, explicitly, "The Pope (Anti-Christ) shall be destroyed before all *Israel* be saved."[2] Likewise, John Flavel used Reformist reasoning to reach his conclusion: "That which is the *Religion* of *Antichrist*, is a false *Religion*; but the *Popish Religion* is the *Religion* of *Antichrist*."[3]

Like a rival king or leader, the pope was an easy target for Protestants due to his position and reputation. Protestants could vent their frustrations, fears, and differences towards the pope in order to demonstrate objections for the entire Catholic Church. By equating the pope with the antichrist, Protestants easily identified their target to showcase their opposition to an idea, belief, or action. Hand in hand, followers of the pope – Catholics – were equated with followers of the antichrist, creating an *us-vs-them* dichotomy ("the Other") that would replicate itself in many forms.

(2) Types of Anti-Catholicism: The Prostitute:

One common slur slung at Roman Catholicism was that of the prostitute, or the whore. Puritan preachers often invoked the image of God and mankind as a marriage covenant. Within this image, they fashioned Catholicism as the role of the prostitute, impinging upon the true marriage of faith. With Revelations in mind, Protestants echoed the Biblical "Whore of Babylon" in their denunciations of simony, the practice of selling church offices, and indulgences, which usually involved paying for the forgiveness of sins. One Protestant minister wrote "The power which have obeyed the Roman Harlot,

[2] Mather, Increase. *The Mystery of Israel's Salvation, Explained and Applyed: Or, A Discourse Concerning the General Conversion of the Israelitish Nation*. 1669. Microform. *Early American Imprints*: first series; no. 143. p. 21-2.
[3] Flavel, John. "Tydings from Rome or England's Alarm." Cambridge, Mass.: 1668. Microform. *Early American Imprints*: first series; no. 131. p. 19-20.

shall hate her, make her naked, and burn her with fire."[4] The equation of the pope as the Biblical prostitute dates before the Protestant Reformation. In the first canticle, "Inferno," of his epic *The Divine Comedy*, Dante compares previous popes with the image of the prostitute. In Canto XIX, Dante writes:

> You shepherds it was the Evangelist had in mind
> when the vision came to him of her who sits
> upon the waters playing whore with kings:
> that one who with the seven heads was born
> and from her ten horns managed to draw strength
> so long as virtue was her bridegroom's joy.[5]

The one who "sits upon the waters" is the Catholic Church, defiling itself with its own practices, like simony, and the political nature of its affiliations with other governments and kings.

For Protestants, especially Puritans, the prostitute represented something more than just an image. As Edmund Morgan puts it, "In like fashion idolatry was called adultery, the Roman Church a whore, and the casting off of backsliders a divorce."[6] Here Catholicism took on another role in Puritan life. It was the interloper that interfered between the marriage with God; the seducer that fed upon the lusts of the Puritan. This too harkens back to Dante. In the same canto, Dante writes:

> O Simon Magus! O scum that followed him!

---

[4] Dury, John. *A Copy of the Letter Returned by the Ministers of New-England to Mr. John Dury About His Pacification*. 1664. Microform. *Early American Imprints*: first series; no. 91. p. 10.
[5] Alighieri, Dante. *The Divine Comedy: Volume 1: Inferno*. Trans. Mark Musa. New York: Penguin, 2003. Print. p. 111.
[6] Morgan, Edmund S. *The Puritan Family: Religion & Domestic Relations in Seventeenth-Century New England*. New York: Harper & Row, 1966. Print. p. 164.

Those things of God that rightly should be wed

to holiness, you, rapacious creatures,

for the price of gold and silver, prostitute.[7]

A prostitute is someone who has been corrupted, to the extent of having corrupted itself through its own desires and actions, especially for material and earthly gain. Any original purity the Catholic Church may have had from early Christianity has now been corrupted, Protestants believed, due to the corruptions of its leaders (i.e. the pope), its practices (i.e. simony and indulgences), and its heretical beliefs (i.e. those not found in scripture).

(3) Types of Anti-Catholicism: The Saboteur:

Brendan McConville begins the introduction of his work, *The King's Three Faces*, with an episode from Boston, on November 5, 1764. November 5th was the annual celebration known as Guy Fawkes Night, where the English burned effigies of the pope and other detested cultural, religious, and national figures. It served as a reminder of the 1605 incident, known commonly as the Gunpowder Plot, where Guy Fawkes and a group of English Catholics failed to assassinate the English king James I. In the colonies, the day was also known as "Pope's Day."[8]

Sedition against the colonial government was, in the eyes of the Puritans, sedition against the English government, as was treason against the English government treason against the colonial one.[9] Those individuals convicted of colonial sedition were often given the same punishment as Jesuits and other Catholic priests who resided in New

[7] Alighieri, *Inferno*, p. 239.
[8] McConville, Brendan. *The King's Three Faces: The Rise & Fall of Royal America, 1688-1776*. Chapel Hill: Published for the Omohundro Institute of Early American History and Culture, Williamsburg, Virginia, by the U of North Carolina, 2006. Print. p. 1-2.
[9] Hermes, Katherine A. *Religion and Law in Colonial New England, 1620-1730*. Ann Arbor: UMI Dissertation Services, 1995. Print. p. 93.

England territories. As Katherine Hermes outlines, an alleged pirate by the name of Captain Stone was banned from entering a New England colony. If he did enter it without permission from the governor, he would be killed.[10] Likewise, Jesuits and priests were banned from the colonies in similar manners. This was because of the belief that Jesuits and other members of the clergy were saboteurs and schemers, plotting the downfall of England and the death of all Protestants; they were just as treasonous, treacherous, and detested as pirates and other nefarious individuals.

The image of the Catholic as the saboteur, especially priests, would haunt English life for generations. John Flavel epitomized the saboteur stereotype in his 1667 work *Tydings from Rome, or England's Alarm*. In it, Flavel wrote:

> …and hearing round about me the noise of bloody *Papists* rallying together, and preparing themselves to make a slaughter; and finding the fears and jealousies of the Nation (lately awakened by the flames of *London*; and the instrument of cruelty there discovered) beginning to abate, though their dangers are still [i]ncreasing upon them…[11]

Real life events like the Gunpowder Plot of 1605 and the Great Fire of London in 1666, and fabricated conspiracy theories like the "Popish Plot" of the late seventeenth century, melded together to form a fear of Catholics as real life threats to Protestants' physical bodies.

(4) Types of Anti-Catholicism: The Unchristian:

Puritans and Protestants alike often believed that Catholics were not real Christians at all, a common assertion used by both sides of the religious debate for

[10] Hermes, p. 95-6.
[11] Flavel, John. "Tydings from Rome or England's Alarm." Cambridge, Mass.: 1668. Microform. *Early American Imprints*: first series; no. 131. p. 1.

centuries. In his discussion on infant baptism, Puritan minister Increase Mather stated that "I know there are that arrogate to themselves the Name of Christians who are manifest Anti-Christians, as Papists, Atheists, etc."[12] For Mather and others, Catholics were just Christian pretenders, having more in common with non-believing atheists than themselves.

The belief that Catholics were not true Christians rests primarily on two foundations: Catholic dogmas and practices. As mentioned previously, practices like indulgences and simony were seen as "buying into heaven" and thus unchristian. Equally, as we shall discuss later, certain religious beliefs were seen as incompatible with Christianity, like the role of clergy and the nature of divine revelation. Michael Carter summarizes this type quite well, stating that "For these Protestants, Catholicism was not even a religion at all, but a form of spiritual and intellectual "slavery" that was the antithesis of their [Protestant] free, rational, and pure religion."[13]

(5) Types of Anti-Catholicism: The Divisor:

As the British Empire blossomed, fears of disunion naturally grew. Similar to their fear of the saboteur, colonists and Englishmen alike were afraid of another civil war brought on by minority and radical groups. When William of Orange invaded England and dethroned the (perceived Catholic) James II during the Glorious Revolution, it cemented Protestantism as the de facto religious identity of the Crown and Empire. Catholicism took on the image of the divisor: something that can divide another; more

[12] Mather, Increase. *The First Principles of New-England Concerning the Subject of Batpisme and Communion of Churches*. Cambridge: Printed by Samuel Green, 1675. Postscript p. 5. Microform. *Early American Imprints*: first series; no. 208.
[13] Carter, Michael S. "A "Traiterous Religion": Indulgences and the Anti-Catholic Imagination in Eighteenth-Century New England." *Catholic Historical Review* 99.1 (2013): 52-77. Print. p. 53.

specifically, something that could divide and destroy the English state, religion, culture, and Empire.

The Empire, as we shall discuss later, was built on fear of Catholicism. It needed to maintain a fear of Catholicism in order to survive. Likewise, colonists and their Atlantic brothers feared that Catholicism would divide the Empire if given the chance. Brendan McConville writes that "In this worldview, all destructive or antisocial behavior could be construed as either coming from Catholics, having Catholic characteristics, or threatening to bring Catholicism somehow back to Britain."[14] Groups identified as possible divisors include Jacobites, those who advocated for the restoration of the Catholic Stuart line, as well as minority English Catholics themselves.

The image of the divisor fit well in the boogeyman-like nature of most types of anti-Catholicism. It acted as a representation to redefine and unite English culture. Rather than a concrete figure, the divisor was a physiological shape-shifter. As France and Spain grew, so did their status as hegemonies in the Atlantic world. English citizens looked upon their rival enemies as Catholic conquerors ready to divide and conquer them. From within English society, fears of conversion to Catholicism and treason provided a perfect two-pronged fear over division.

(6) Types of Anti-Catholicism: The Tyrant:

Protestants often looked at Catholic leaders as tyrants with more powers than their own monarchies. The pope and the monarchies of France and Spain were seen as holders of arbitrary power; slave masters who conquered populations and bounded them to Catholic slavery. David Hall makes a succinct observation when he states that the word

[14] McConville, p. 115.

"popery" was merely "a code word for arbitrary governance."[15] For Protestants, perhaps the epitome of arbitrary power was Louis XIV, the French "Sun King." Louis XIV expanded royal power in France, revoked the Edict of Nantes which provided limited protection for France's Protestant population (the Huguenots), and advocated absolutism, which challenged the Congregationalism espoused by Puritans.

Louis reigned for more than seventy-two years, from 1643 to 1715, making him the longest reigning monarch in European history. He was ever-present in the fears of English Protestants. As Brendan McConville argues, "Before the Revolution, no political figure was more hated by the [English] colonists than France's Sun King, Louis XIV. He stood in life and death as the feared embodiment of the type of Catholic, arbitrary power the colonists never ceased to denounce."[16] Louis was the incarnation of the "Catholic tyrant," a leader that challenged Protestant hegemony, discriminated against Protestant minorities, wielded absolute power, and violently enforced Catholicism upon the population by his wars and conquests.

These six stereotypes of anti-Catholicism would reverberate throughout the generations of English Protestants and colonial Puritans during the early modern period. Writers tended to employ one or multiple types in their works, arguments, and words. Depending on their audience, or their own fears, one stereotype or many might suffice. The ever-quotable Increase Mather merged both the antichrist and unchristian (heathen) stereotypes in his discussion on the conversion of the Jews. Mather writes that:

> The truth of this likewise manifest, because the fifth vial shaketh *Rome* in pieces; whereas the *Jews* are not converted till the sixth vial…Now what is the seat of the

[15] Hall, David D. *A Reforming People: Puritanism and the Transformation of Public Life in New England.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2011. Print. p. 7.
[16] McConville, p. 136.

> beast, but *Rome*? That which was the seat of the Dragon, is the seat of the beast, so saith the spirit…But the City of *Rome* is that which was the seat (or throne) of the Dragons, i.e. the Heathen Emperours [sic] as acted by Satan, therefore it is a vain thing for [us?] to expect any *general conversion of the* Jews, until such time as we hear that *Rome* is burnt…[17]

Working within the imagery of Revelations, Mather, like so many other Puritan writers, utilizes Catholic stereotypes in order to convey his message. In this instance, Mather discusses the subject of conversion while employing anti-Catholic language. Hall remarks that the utilization of stereotypes was common in the period, attesting that "the rhetoric of politics revolved around satire, sarcasm, and stereotypes – the Puritans as rabble-rouser, the Jesuit as relentless plotter, the bishops of the church as greedy parasites."[18] With this in mind, the anti-Catholic stereotypes exploited by Protestants (and Puritans) had several layers of meanings and uses.

Catholics soon became an "Other," or an opposite of English Protestant ideology. Discussing English Protestants in the eighteenth century, Linda Colley describes this truth, stating that "In time[s] of danger or insecurity, Catholics – like witches – became scapegoats, easy targets on which their neighbors could vent fear and anger. The slang adjective most commonly applied to Catholics was 'outlandish', and this was meant quite literally. Catholics were not just strange, they were out of bounds. They did not belong, and were therefore suspect."[19] Of course, during the early modern period, Catholics did not treat Protestants any better. However, the unique self-fashioning that Protestantism

---

[17] Mather, Increase. *The Mystery of Israel's Salvation, Explained and Applyed: Or, A Discourse Concerning the General Conversion of the Israelitish Nation*. 1669. Microform. *Early American Imprints*: first series; no. 143. p. 23.
[18] Hall, p. 14.
[19] Colley, Linda. *Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707-1837*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1992. Print. p. 23.

exhibited, joined with the timing of the creation of British self-identity, makes the study of English anti-Catholicism, especially Puritan anti-Catholicism, exceptionally important.

Hostility to Catholicism amalgamated different sections of English and colonial society. In the words of Michael Carter, "opposition to Roman Catholicism…united the vast majority of the era's English speaking Protestants."[20] Carter's discussion is limited to the seventeenth century, but his words could describe the preceding century as well. Anti-Catholicism in this context, or "anti-popery," was the antagonism to both real and imagined beliefs, actions, and practices. Most opposition tended to be towards fanciful conjectures, but Protestants and Puritans also discussed and often rejected very real realities like doctrines and practices, including the Catholic Church's hierarchy, the authority of the pope, and the origin of divine salvation.

There might not be anything particularly groundbreaking in my analysis of anti-Catholicism in colonial New England. Rather, I refocus long held assumptions, facts, and arguments into an overarching context – anti-Catholicism – that historians have often taken for granted. I have done so in four distinct chapters, each focusing on a separate cogwheel in the Puritan anti-Catholic machine.

Chapter One sets the groundwork for our discussion. It explores the backgrounds of Protestantism and English Puritanism, tracing the dynastic lines of the Tudors and Stuarts prior to the Puritan expedition to New England. While generalized for the sake of our conversation, many of the actions these monarchs undertook alienated and angered English Protestants, chiefly among them the English Puritans. When they migrated to New England, these Puritans retained a collective memory of past horrors from the homeland, helping to form and mold their attitudes against Catholics both at home and

[20] Carter, p. 52.

abroad. Many of these implications would have profound effects in the fight for empire, discussed in Chapter Four.

Chapter Two explores New England congregationalism, especially in regards to church membership and societal exclusion of "Others." Catholics, scoundrels, sinners, Indians, foreigners, "civil men," the ungodly, and "strangers," among others, were all excluded from the definition of godly, Puritan society. The purpose of this chapter is to discover the reasons for Puritan exclusion, especially in the context of anti-Catholicism, and the means by which they excluded "others." Bounded by religious covenants with God that could spell success or doom for their people, Puritans sought to create a righteous community where each member regulated the other for the sake of their souls, and those of the public and their family.

Chapter Three builds upon many of the themes discussed in Chapter Two. Experiments in participation in church and government allowed Puritans to form a godly society more in tuned with their aspirations, beliefs, and goals. The laity had extensive control over their ministers and government officials, making sure the ministers' words and deeds aligned with the laity. With power in their hands, Puritans established laws that relied heavily upon Scripture. Biblical law, they believed, pleased God and formed the basis for godly society. Continuing with the theme of exclusion seen in the previous chapter, I dive into the Puritan stress on uniformity. Biblical law, anti-Catholicism, and God's covenants all fused into a defensive desire to control society by insisting on conformity, uniformity, and consensus. Dissent was tolerated to an extent, but too much or in certain areas could translate to sedition, heresy, and challenges to the established

authority. Reformed theology and acceptance of the New England Way must be taught to children at a young age, or else they could be let astray by ignorance and Catholicism.

Chapter Four explores, in mostly narrative fashion, the fight for empire between the English and the Spanish and French that extended well into the New World. The nearby Catholic armies of Spain and France presented several challenges to the Puritans, none more so than the collective fear of invasion. The fight for empire was also a time of building empire. The British Empire, contrasting itself to its Catholic counterparts, began to form a uniform anti-Catholic definition of "Britishness." The British nation, and subsequently its empire, was, by its very nature, anti-Catholic.

Chapter One: Roots - Protestantism and English Background

While it would take several multivolume works to fully address the theological differences between (and their consequences for) Protestantism and Roman Catholicism, a quick discussion on the important contexts is appropriate considering our subject. In fact, Linda Colley believes that "Protestantism was the foundation that made the invention of Great Britain possible," highlighting the importance of understanding the religious differences.[21] From the very start, Protestantism defined itself by contrasting itself with Roman Catholicism.

Catholicism became Protestant's greatest enemy. In her discussion on the role of gender in the prosecution of witches during the early modern period, Allison Coudert identifies an important distinction between Catholicism and Protestantism. According to Coudert, the "breakdown of social, political, and religious consensus" in the aftermath of the Reformation and Counter-Reformation "was paralleled by the collapse of traditional intellectual and scientific systems."[22] While Coudert's point is to highlight a new focus on the natural vs. unnatural, it raises the fact that new institutions, systems, and identities were forced to be shaped in the aftershock of the religious upheaval. Quoting Stephen J. Greenblatt, Coudert repeats that "Self-fashioning is achieved in relation to something perceived as alien, strange, or hostile. This threatening other – heretic, savage, witch, adulteresses, traitor, Antichrist – must be discovered or invented in order to be attacked and destroyed."[23] By using this logic, it is understandable that in the wake of the

[21] Colley, p. 54.
[22] Coudert, Allison. "The Myth of the Improved Status of Protestant Women: The Case of the Witchcraze." *The Politics of Gender in Early Modern Europe*. Kirksville, MO: Sixteenth Century Journal, 1989. Print. p. 65.
[23] Ibid., p. 66.

Reformation, Protestantism needed an enemy to define itself by, and that enemy was Roman Catholicism.

This reality, however, presented problems for Protestantism. Coudert argues that Protestants were affected by problems of order and disorder more so than Catholics because of that fashioning of self-identity the Reformation created. As she writes, "Protestants were instrumental in the dissolution of the old order…They had rejected one authority, that of the Church, and one father, the Pope."[24] This rejection created the need for a new power. "They were therefore constrained," Coudert continues, "to establish a new order and authority and to construct a new identity that would justify their rebellion."[25]

Protestants rejected the Catholic Church, describing it as "the embodiment of all that was corrupt, evil, and sinful" while creating a "new order based on rigid notions of patriarchal authority and obedience."[26] The action of rebellion, however, would continue to reverberate throughout Protestant history as more and more communities spiritually rebelled from the majority, creating splinter groups like the Quakers, which, like Catholics, were held in contempt by New England Puritans. In the case of the Puritans, they essentially rejected the result of the English Reformation, which was a compromise of Catholic and Protestant values and practices. Michael Carter succinctly summarizes this understanding by stating that "the Puritans, the largest population in British America, sprang from a rejection of the dominant vision of church and state in England (itself a

[24] Coudert, p. 66.
[25] Ibid., p. 66.
[26] Ibid., p. 66.

rejection of the English Catholic past that Puritans believed had not gone nearly far enough)."[27]

Early modern religion is in many ways different from today's versions. Protestantism, which throughout its history has never been a unified and specific religion, was at its formation during this period. For ease of understanding some of the major differences between Catholicism and Protestantism during the early modern period, the following is a chart taken from Robert Bucholz and Newton Key's *Early Modern England: 1485-1714*. It demonstrates the noticeable differences between the two core religions, which will play important roles throughout the proceeding generations:

	Catholic	Protestant
Source of divine truth	Scripture + tradition + authority	Scripture alone
Structure	Hierarchical	Limited or no hierarchy
Clergy	Semi-sacred priest	Minister
Ritual	Sacramental and efficacious	Few sacraments; symbolic
Salvation	Faith + good works (free will)	Faith alone (some predestinarian)

Table 1: Tenets of Catholicism and Protestantism.[28]

As seen in the table above, Catholicism and Protestantism differentiated themselves on a number of religious issues, including (but not limited to) their structure, their sources, the nature of their clergy, rituals and sacraments, and in their beliefs on the attainment of eternal salvation.

One of the major differences between Catholicism and most forms of Protestantism is the doctrine of *Sola fide*, or "justification by faith alone." For Protestants – Calvinist Puritans among them – justification (or the forgiving of sins) is done only through faith in God and Christ, and not through good works or God's natural Grace

[27] Carter, p. 55.
[28] Bucholz, Robert O., and Newton Key. *Early Modern England, 1485-1714: A Narrative History*. Second ed. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2009. Print. p. 93.

given in Baptism as believed in Catholicism. In his "brief" catechism, Puritan minister John Norton wrote that justification is a "gracious act of God the Father upon a believer, whereby he doth freely discharge him from sin, and accept him as righteous, for the righteousness [sake of] Christ imputed to him."[29] In New England, Richard Mather compared the typical Protestant view of their difference (and understanding) of Catholic justification, stating that:

> Therefore a man cannot justifie himself. Papists teach that a man by his works may justifie himself with that which they call the second justification, and wherin they place the merit of eternal life. But the Scripture makes man passive in his justification, and that this work is wrought by God himself, and by him only. So that what Christ spake of honouring of himself…may well be applyed to the matter in hand, that if a man *justifie himself, his justification is nothing*.[30]

For men like Norton and Mather, deep doctrinal differences divided Protestants and Catholics in irreversible and uncooperative ways. As we shall see, Protestants (and in our case, Puritans) constantly defined and iterated their beliefs by contrasting them with those of Catholicism.

The Bible, composed of Greek, Aramaic, and Hebrew languages, had for centuries been translated only in Latin. The Catholic Church believed that this translation, read and studied by individuals educated sufficiently in its context was the only reasonable way to extract divine revelation from its words. The Church believed that it, then, had the sole designation to interpret it. The Bible was not the only source for divine

---

[29] Norton, John. *A Brief Catechisme Containing the Doctrine of Godlines, Or of Living Unto God*. Cambridge: 1660. p. 12. Microform. *Early American Imprines*: first series; no. 63.
[30] Mather, Richard. *The Summe of Certain Sermons Upon Genes: 15.6*. Cambridge, 1652. Microform. *Early American Imprints*: first series; no. 60. p. 7-8.

truth, however. Actions and decisions by the Church, as well as traditions that went back hundreds and even thousands of years had equal weight in interpretation. This is in stark difference to most followers of Protestantism, which rejected most (if not all) traditions and practices not found in or sanctioned by Scripture. Protestantism, especially English Puritanism, placed a great emphasis on a literate laity, especially with the rise of the printing press. A literate laity would then have a larger role in religious discourse, since they could read and discuss the written Bible and its scriptures, translated in the native tongues, and published sermons, books, catechisms, and other works.

When the Protestant Reformation occurred throughout England and the Continent, one of the major changes occurred in regards to the formalism of the Christian church. Protestants argued that the rituals, traditions, and hierarchical nature (especially the pope) of the Catholic Church convoluted the worship of God, opening up the doors for superstition, the workings of Satan, and idol worship. Protestants thus sought less hierarchical institutions, especially groups like the Puritans who chose the less-hierarchical form of congregationalism. In fact, as time went on, groups like the Puritans and Separatists sought to continue the shedding of Catholic influences within the Church of England, which they believed had stalled. The Separatists, a group which believed the Church of England was too far corrupted by Catholicism to reform and subsequently split from it, argued that the English Church ceased to be a true church after the rise of the papacy.

When it came to the clergy, Protestants used ministers instead of priests. Unlike Catholic priests, Protestant ministers could marry and have families. They were also usually situated on an even playing field in relation to other men, the so-called

"priesthood of all believers." These ministers were less likely to be elevated to a higher spiritual level in society over the non-laity like Catholic priests traditionally were. The Puritan congregations, for example, also elected their own ministers and administered their pay and position, limiting their power and autonomy. Inspiration from God, faith, the congregation, and the emphasis on the literal words of Scripture were all the sources of a preacher's authority.

Puritans themselves detested what they perceived was the Catholic Church's placement of celibacy over marriage. These types of attitudes spread with the Reformation. Martin Luther, who rejected monasticism, argued that virtually every other occupation was better than, as Edmund Morgan writes, the "sterile seclusion" of a monk or nun.[31] The Puritans agreed with Luther; ministers married and had families of their own. According to Morgan, Puritans "condemned monasticism because monks served no purpose useful to society."[32] Prayer and fasting were not reserved for monastics because they were the duties of each and every Christian.

In addition to their aversion to monasticism and the celibacy of the Catholic clergy, Puritans, like their Protestant counterparts, believed that Catholic priests were the agents of subterfuge and ruin, supported by the Catholic hierarchy, which was already corrupted. Jesuits were especially seen as mediators of moral and physical destruction. Equally, as we shall see, one of the reasons for colonizing the New World was to convert natives. Franciscans in New Spain and the Jesuits in New France were so successful (in the minds of Protestants) at converting natives that England needed to step in before all the natives fell to Catholic heresy. Those Catholic priests who converted natives were

[31] Morgan, *Puritan Family*, p. 70.
[32] Ibid., p. 71.

seen by Protestants as schemers and tricksters, convincing natives to convert through confusion, diversion, and falsehoods.

England:

Before one can discuss the implications of religion in colonial New England, it is necessary to understand the events that occurred within England herself that impacted Puritan (and Protestant) thoughts on Catholicism and of their own religious identity. While the following is a short and general summary of the English reigns, remember that Puritans were impacted and motivated by one, many, or all of the following actions and encounters. In the sixteenth century, practically every member of the English population adhered to Christianity, and their belief in God played a major role in everyday life. As in every place and time, and with every religion, there were "thinking" and "unthinking" Christians, those who regularly meditated on religion and those who simply went about their daily business, attended mass and participated in religious life without contemplating on the great mysteries of their faith.[33]

Christopher Haigh, in his study of the English Reformations under the Tudor dynasty, discusses "thinking" and "unthinking" Christians and their relationships with Catholicism and Protestantism. Prior to Henry VIII's break with Rome, England was a decidedly Catholic country. Even Henry, who ushered in the era of Protestant Reformations, died believing himself to be a good Catholic.[34] English "thinking" Catholics sought to help those who were "unthinking" by reforms and better instruction, but they still considered them Catholic:

[33] Haigh, Christopher. *English Reformations: Religion, Politics, and Society under the Tudors*. New York: Oxford UP, 1993. Print. p. 285.
[34] Ibid., p. 167; Bucholz, p. 92.

> …Catholic reformers did not doubt that the unthinking could be Christians: less informed Christians, perhaps less secure Christians, but Christians none the less, seeking their way to heaven as best they could. Justification by works incorporated all in an achievable salvation system: the same sacraments could save Thomas More, Roger Martyn, and the people of Morebath.[35]

In other words, Catholic "thinkers," those who treated religion with continuous meditation and serious faith, still believed that the "unthinkers" could find salvation.

On the other hand, as the Protestant Reformation spread throughout the Continent during the sixteenth century, and Henry ushered in the several English versions of it, English "thinking" Protestants, which had continued to grow in the country, viewed "unthinking" Christians in a different vein. Rejecting justification by works, these "thinkers" argued essentially that "If the Christian would be saved, he or she must be a thinker: a sermon-goer, a catechism-learner, a Bible-student, an earnest prayer, a singer of psalms…"[36] For "true" Protestants, one had to be actively engaged in their religion. If not, you were not only an untrue Christian but were condemned without God's grace. This dynamic would shape the exclusivity seen in later generations, especially in Puritan New England.

Just as the French monarchy viewed itself as having a unique relationship with God and Catholicism (the French king, for example, was called the "Most Christian King"), the English monarchy too felt a special relationship to Protestantism after Henry's break. After all, the English monarch was the head of the Anglican Church. "England's monarchs," Edmund Morgan writes, "had broken from what they considered

[35] Haigh, p. 286.
[36] Ibid., p. 286-7.

the tyranny of the Roman church and had established what they liked to think of as the true church of Christ on earth."[37] Likewise, the English Protestants saw themselves as having a major part in the success of the Reformation.

Not many English monarchs are as infamous or divisive as Mary Tudor. Succeeding both her father Henry VIII and brother Edward VI in 1553, Mary reigned for only five years. Within those five years, however, many Protestants were killed, creating martyrs for the Protestant cause and giving Mary her unflattering nickname of "Bloody Mary." Mary was fervently Catholic and while in power she sought to reverse the trend toward Protestantism that her father started. She began a process to revert the monarchy back to Roman Catholicism; a process which her sister Elizabeth would end upon the latter's ascension.

Overall, Mary defrocked some 2,000 priests for sympathies towards Protestantism, about one-quarter of the clergy. Many sympathizers or true believers fled abroad. For those that stayed, many faced heavy punishments, including executions. Burning at the stake was a popular choice for Restoration officials; prominent Protestant clergymen were publically executed in this way which horrified and vexed English Protestants. About 237 men and 52 women were burned at the stake as heretics during Mary's five year reign.[38] Mary's reasoning is similar (or the same) as others in their actions towards religious separation; as one historian writes, Mary "had to cut out the cancer of Protestantism before it spread."[39] This is an appropriate analogy for our discussion, as Puritans in New England viewed Catholics as a physical danger to their

[37] Morgan, Edmund S. *American Slavery, American Freedom: The Ordeal of Colonial Virginia*. New York: Norton, 1975. Print. p. 61.
[38] Bucholz, p. 111.
[39] Ibid., p. 112.

own bodies as well. That was the nature of religious "tolerance" in the early modern period.

Some Englishmen had uneasy feelings regarding Mary's Spanish lineage as well. In 1554, Mary married the Spanish (and Catholic) king Philip II. While Mary's five year reign did not last long, it helped to flame English fears of Spanish authority, which they believed was trying to orchestrate a takeover of the crown. This fear combined with Mary's hardened Catholicism solidified her as the epitome of Protestant suspicions. Additionally, due to Mary's marriage, England was dragged into a war between the French and Spanish. England was ill equipped for such involvement, and it resulted in the loss of Calais, the last remaining English territory in France. Mary's short reign embodied tragedy; her legacy impacted by religious dissension, marriage to an unloving husband, failures in domestic and international policy, and her lack of an heir. These failures would help to provide stereotypes of Catholic rulers for centuries.

Protestants immediately detested Mary during and after her reign. In his *Actes and Monuments* (also known as *Foxe's Book of Martyrs*), first published in 1563 and the second most popular work in English for a century behind only the Bible, John Foxe wrote "We earnestly pray that the annals of no country, Catholic or pagan, may ever be stained with such a repetition of human sacrifices to papal power, and that the detestation in which the character of Mary is holden, may be a beacon to succeeding monarchs to avoid the rocks of fanaticism!"[40] A decade later, still in the euphoria of Elizabeth's coronation in 1559, Raphael Holinshed clamored:

[40] Foxe, John. "Chapter XVI" *Actes and Monuments*. Ed. William Byron Forbush. *Foxe's Book of Martyrs*. Christian Classic Ethereal Library. Web; Bucholz, p. 112.

> After all the stormy, tempestuous and blustery windy weather of Queen Mary was overblown, the darksome clouds of discomfort dispersed, the palpable fogs and mists of most intolerable misery consumed, and the dashing showers of persecution overpast, it pleased God to send England a calm and quiet season, a clear and lovely sunshine, a quietus from former broils, and a world of blessings by good Queen Elizabeth.[41]

During and after Mary's reign, the writings of men like Foxe and Holinshed greatly influenced Protestants for generations afterwards, especially the Puritans of New England. They linked religious persecution, tyranny, corruption, foreign intervention, and Roman Catholicism together in chains that many were hard-pressed to break.[42] The Puritans took these chains to the New World, utilizing the stereotypes and conclusions of these authors in their everyday instructions and conversations.

Elizabeth ascended to the throne after Mary's death in 1558. Proving to be more practical and flexible than her sister, coupled with her rule for almost fifty years, Elizabeth was (and still is) considered to be one of the most successful monarchs in history. Overall, Elizabeth, while Protestant, worked for religious peace within her realm. In love with both Protestant theology and Catholic hierarchy and ritual, Elizabeth sought a compromise that focused on obedience and loyalty to the monarch.[43] The new queen did undertake Catholic persecutions, however. One such action was the Treason Act, which made it a capital crime to support papal jurisdiction. Executions of Catholics were also performed, to the extent that they resulted in about the same number of Catholic deaths that Mary did to Protestants (albeit in over a much longer time period). However,

---

[41] Weir, Alison. *The Children of Henry VIII*. New York: Ballantine, 1996. Print. p. 366.
[42] Colley, p. 27.
[43] Bucholz, p. 122.

Elizabeth structured the English Church in a Catholic way, with the same titles of clergymen, colorful vestments, and hierarchy seen in the Catholic Church. The liturgy too was "far more traditional – Catholic – than that of any other Protestant faith."[44] It was, therefore, a church of "compromise."[45]

Mary Tudor's legacy is hampered both by her own failures and the dramatic successes of her sister Elizabeth. Elizabeth reversed Mary's Catholic Restoration and laid strong foundations for the prosperity of Protestantism within the realm. Like her sister, the queen also clamped down on religious dissension. For example, during the second year of her reign, she promulgated the Commission for Ecclesiastical Causes in an attempt to silence Roman Catholics. She also made it a capital crime for Catholic clergy to step foot on English soil. For reasons such as these and others, Catholicism never recovered to the level it was prior to Henry's split with Rome.

Elizabeth undertook a vehemently anti-Catholic foreign policy. She continuously exasperated Spanish designs, even so far as defeating Philip's famous Armada. The queen also supported the revolt in the Netherlands. Because of these and others, Protestants called Elizabeth the "Protestant Deborah," a champion and defender of Protestantism from evil Catholic rivals and the antichrist (the pope).[46] As we shall see later on in our discussion over empire, this ideology would return in significant ways. Throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, English Protestants on both sides of the Atlantic would identify their monarchs with the defense of Protestantism.

---

[44] Bremer, Francis J. *The Puritan Experiment: New England Society from Bradford to Edwards*. Revised ed. Lebanon: U of New England, 1995. Print. p. 6.
[45] Bucholz, p. 122.
[46] Bremer, p. 13.

As the decades wore on, Catholics continued to be separated from the dominant culture: "Separated from their neighbors by feasts and fasts, addicted to popish priests and mass, as their hostile countrymen saw it, English Catholics grew distinctly apart in a realm where Protestant identity came to signify nationhood."[47] Likewise, anti-Catholicism became a unifying mechanism for differing strains of Protestant Englishmen; as Francis Bremer argues, "despite some fissures in Elizabeth's church, most of the nation's Protestants were held together by a shared theological stance as well as a shared anti-Catholicism."[48] Yet, Elizabeth proved to be both more practical and pragmatic in her dealings with religious difference. While this gained her legitimacy and support with conservatives and even some Catholics, it proved to be a sticking point for English Puritans.

English Puritanism:

The English "Puritans" – a general term used for the growing number of Protestant advocates for religious reform and experimentation – often caused contention within the homeland as they increasingly grew sickened by the lingering Catholic elements within the Church of England. They argued that a return to the ways of the early Christians, a focus on primitive piety and participation, would root out the perceived corruptions of the English Church.[49] Many of these men and women were exiles during Mary's reign and believed that their mission of reform was chosen from God. On their return to England, they wished to reform society into a more godly state and to remove

[47] Hsia, R. Po-chia. *The World of Catholic Renewal, 1540-1770*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge UP, 1998. Print. p. 85.
[48] Bremer, p. 10.
[49] Hermes, p. 17-22.

lingering deposits of Catholic residue. Their plight would eventually travel with them to the New World.

These Puritans, according to Bucholz, "sought to "purify" [the Church of England], to make it less Catholic and more Protestant, less of "a mingle-mangle" of the two faiths."[50] After all, Elizabeth's religious compromise created an English Church that "thinks Protestant, but looks Catholic."[51] They did not wish to separate from the English Church, however. They wanted to return to scriptural evidence for laws, doctrines and practices as well as an overhaul in education and preaching. One English Puritan charged Anglican preachers as "Dumme Doggs, Unskilful sacrificing priestes, Destroying Drones, or rather Caterpillars of the Word."[52] Biblical law, much of which would be later implemented in New England, was a constant subject in debates and treatises. Puritans also protested the use of ornately decorated vestments during services, as it echoed the ones used by Catholic priests at mass. For them, these types of vestments "suggested distance between the ordained priesthood and the congregation," which most Protestants sought to avoid.[53] Other aspects seen as too Catholic included organ music at services, the use of rings during marriage celebrations, tithes, the occupation of bishops and the word "priest," the sacrament of confirmation, the use of the Apocrypha, the remembrance of holy days, reliance on canon law, and the use of the sign of the cross, among many others.

Not every member of the English society agreed with these tenets of Puritanism. Those in positions with the government and the English Church were usually more

---

[50] Bucholz, p. 124.
[51] Ibid., p. 122-3.
[52] Morgan, Edmund. *Visible Saints: The History of a Puritan Idea*. New York: New York UP, 1963. Print. p. 7.
[53] Bucholz, p. 124. Also discussed in Bremer, *The Puritan Experiment*, p. 7.

inclined to conservatism. Elizabeth insisted on certain practices, like the use of colorful vestments, and defrocked many clergymen who refused to use them. Likewise, Puritans, who aggressively argued for a restructuring of the English Church's hierarchy as well as the discussion of Scripture without any supervision, were threats to the state's hierarchy and legitimacy. Robert Bucholz and Newton Key summarize the fears of those in power quite well: "If the people can make up their minds about Scripture without supervision, why could they not make up their minds about the Magna Charta and all of the other proclamations and laws which governed the secular world?"[54] The answer was simple: it was a slippery slope and surrendering too much to Puritanism (and even Protestantism), even from a Protestant government and monarch, could result in the de-legitimation of that government and the English Church.

Queen Elizabeth followed the "Puritanism as a threat" line of logic when, in 1576, she ordered the suppression of unofficial meetings, favored by Puritans, between clergymen called "prophesyings." Edmund Grindal, the Archbishop of Canterbury, was sympathetic to these meetings. When he died in 1583, Elizabeth appointed John Whitgift, a known anti-Puritan, to the seat. Whitgift then set out to expel some three to four hundred clergymen from their positions because they had "refused to conform to the practices of the Church of England."[55] Subsequently, many of the ecclesiastical and political positions were filled by those "more inclined to please Elizabeth" than nonconformists, like Puritans.[56] Puritans became alienated even under a Protestant monarch.

---

[54] Bucholz, p. 125.
[55] Ibid., p. 125. "Prophesyings" are also shortly discussed by Bremer, p. 8.
[56] Bremer, p. 8.

James I ascended to the English throne in 1603 with the death of Elizabeth. The first of the Stuart monarchs, James protected his authority in civil and religious matters with fervent enthusiasm. However, Puritans applauded James' Calvinist leanings and his relaxation on ceremonial issues that Elizabeth enforced. During James' reign, a strong "Anti-Calvinism" movement emerged that sought to "temper Calvinism" while redirecting "the faith of Englishmen away from a focus on preaching and toward devotional practices" like the deliverance of grace by priests in church.[57] While not a Catholic movement, it certainly had Catholic overtones which only added to Puritan irritation and frustration. James was relatively fine with religious differences as long as his authority went unchallenged.

Unlike his predecessor, James did not enthusiastically uphold the mantle of Protestant defender. For example, the king did not aid Protestants during the Thirty Years' War. Likewise, James had no problems arranging marriages, such as that of Prince Charles, to French and Spanish nobles. For James, "statecraft replaced religion."[58] Puritans openly refuted the king's policies. Prolonged attacks on James's authority resulted in its reassertion, and his reliance on the Anti-Calvinists. James's successor, Charles I, proved to be more authoritarian, focusing on uniformity. Whether or not Charles leaned Catholic, the king was certainly not Calvinist. He enforced Catholic-like doctrines in the church, like sacramental grace and the use of the sign of the cross and operated often, in the minds of Puritans, as a tyrant with actions like dissolving

[57] Bremer, p. 12.
[58] Ibid., p. 13.

Parliament. To top it all off, Charles did even less than his father in expanding the international Protestant movement.[59] Understandably, the Puritans were not amused.

Many Puritans left England for either the Continent or the New World as a direct consequence of the actions of the English monarchies and their Church. Some Englishmen, called Separatists, decided that reforming the English Church was impossible and that the only way to live a godly life was to completely separate themselves from it. Countless others still agreed with the Puritan idea of reforming the Church of England from within. Both groups set out for America, founding the New England colonies. As David Hall concludes, "The great lesson their English years taught the colonists was the mistake of allowing the state to assert its authority over doctrine, the selection of ministers, and the disciplining of church members."[60] Participation would become a hallmark of New England Puritan society. One more perceived "mistake" needs to be added to Hall's list: allowing Catholicism to continue to influence Protestant church and society.

[59] Bremer, p. 29, 37.
[60] Hall, p. 110.

Chapter Two: New England Puritanism and "Differences"

Historians and students alike might find themselves asking questions along the lines of "why was it not possible for Puritans and Catholics to live in harmony?" and "did the Puritans really believe the things they said?" Avoiding anachronisms, the answers to both questions are bounded together. Yes, Puritans truly believed in the things they did and said. Likewise, Puritans (and Protestants) and Catholics could not live together in a period before the modern conception of "toleration" existed. The pre-modern world was violent, dirty, and dangerous. As we shall see, Puritans were bounded by religious covenants and beliefs that dictated their homogeneity, as well as their desires for uniformity and stability in such a world. They were honest in their convictions, reinforced by God's will, and their attempts at establishing an exclusive haven for the godly.

New England offered a unique opportunity for English Puritans: it was a potentially new beginning free from the entanglements of the Old World. It was, according to John Winthrop, a place where the establishment of a godly community could be like "a citty upon a hill." Writing during his journey across the Atlantic in 1630, Winthrop argued that the success of New England, where "the eies of all people are uppon us," will result in God's "prayse and glory." Its failure, on the other hand, would have catastrophic effects:

> …wee shall be made a story and a by-word through the world. Wee shall open the mouthes of enemies to speake evill of the wayes of God, and all professors for God's sake. Wee shall shame the faces of many of God's worthy servants, and

cause theire prayers to be turned into curses upon us till wee be consumed out of the good land whither wee are a goeing.[61]

New England provided the opportunity to create a community estranged from the English Church and legal institutions. It helped that it also attracted a willing population for experimentation. In order to succeed and be free from those entanglements and failures, the Puritan community needed to separate itself from those who did not think, act, or believe in the ways Puritans did.

New England was unique in relation to its sister colonies. Unlike Virginia and the Carolinas, for example, New England's population consisted mostly of families instead of male laborers. Similarly, while it had cooler weather, New England enjoyed a healthier atmosphere, far from the mosquito-filled swamplands and backbreaking plantations, which helped in the reproduction and longevity of its peoples. As mentioned above, its goal was different too. New England was founded as a religious – Puritan – haven, to experiment and reshape religious, civil, and state systems to then export back to England. The other English colonies were founded mainly for economic, martial, and imperial reasons. That is not to say that New England's founders did not have those reasons as well, but they singularly emphasized one – religion – over any other. As Katherine Hermes argues, New World Anglicans wanted to replicate English law but Puritans wanted to experiment with it.[62]

Puritan New England was a land of legal and religious experimentation. Their goal was to create a more godly community. Puritan minister Thomas Shepard's 1672 plea demonstrates the region's desire for alignment with God: "…hath the Lord known

[61] Winthrop, John. "A Modell of Christian Charity." *Hanover Historical Texts Collection*. Hanover College. Web. 17 July 2014. (Boston, 1838), 3rd series 7:31-48.
[62] Hermes, p. 62.

and blest his people in this great Wilderness…O let him *never leave us, nor forsake us, but be with us as he was with our fathers*…and that the shining brightness of the favour of the glorious God of *Israel*…may be still the Vision of the God of New England; not dark and cloudy, but light and glorious."[63] New England's God was one that had always favored the godly and reformed. Puritans believed that they were the chosen ones, which separated themselves from everyone else. Puritan minister Samuel Danforth reflected on this special relationship, pondering the question, "What is it that *distinguisheth New-England* from other Colonies and Plantations in *America*?" He answered to himself, "Not our transportation over the *Atlantick* Ocean, but the *Ministry* of Gods faithful Prophets, and the fruition of his holy *Ordinances*."[64]

The New England Puritans inherited the militant Protestantism that exploded after the reign of Mary Tudor. As time wore on, the Puritans themselves believed in an origin myth of religious persecution and godly Providence. While there is certainly truth to the tale, it was a "selective recreation of the founders' enterprise."[65] It served two roles: it allowed settlers to be both refugees for conscience and loyalists to England.[66] In fact, New England (and the rest of the English colonies) was connected to the motherland in several ways. While it did not attract colonists like many of the other colonies, "New England in the 1630s was a society connected to England by kin, communication, and social characteristics."[67] One more should be added to that list: religion.

---

[63] Shepard, Thomas. *Eye-Salve, Or, A Watch-Word From Our Lord Jesus Christ onto His Church Especially Those within the Colony of the Massachusets In New-England, To Take Heed of Apostacy*. Cambridge, 1673. Microform. *Early American Imprints*: first series; no. 182. p. 49.
[64] Danforth, Samuel. *A Brief Recognition of New-Englands Errand Into the Wilderness*. Cambridge, 1671. Microform. *Early American Imprints*: first series; no. 160. p. 18.
[65] Hermes, p. 268.
[66] Ibid., p. 268.
[67] Ibid., p. 211.

Each colony within New England had its differences, of course. Massachusetts and New Haven were the most exclusive, discriminating the most against non-Puritans. New Haven's laws were closely modeled after the Old Testament and limited trial by jury, whereas most other colonies experimented greatly with participation. While not exactly Maryland, Rhode Island was perhaps the most tolerant colony of them all when it came to toleration of dissenting Protestants. Connecticut accepted Presbyterians and Plymouth was separated entirely from the Church of England.[68] However, one conviction did unite these colonies: a fervent strain of anti-Catholicism.

The English Scoundrel & Tribal Puritanism:

One of the major reasons why the New England Puritans left England was not only to establish religious, political, and social peace "in the absence of their antagonists in England," but also to escape the profanity and corruptness they had witnessed there. [69] The Catholic Church was too indiscriminate; it allowed sinners to be members and preachers. Joshua Moodey epitomized the ongoing struggle with sin, writing "To be ever at variance and in actual contest with Sin is our work, and therefore this of a Christian with Sin is rightly called, *The Holy Warr*."[70] All Puritans agreed on the necessity to "exclude and expel the wicked" for, in the words of Puritan minister Thomas Shepard, "one man or woman secretly vile, which the Church hath not used all means to discover, may defile a whole Church."[71]

---

[68] McConville, p. 26.
[69] Hall, p. 130.
[70] Moodey, Joshua. *Souldiery Spiritualized, or the Christian Souldier Orderly, and Strenuously Engaged in the Spiritual Warre, And so Fighting the Good Fight*. Cambridge, 1674. Microform. *Early American Imprints*: first series; no. 193. p. 8.
[71] Morgan, *Visible Saints*, p. 12, 114.

These vices were not only committed by the English Church or Catholicism, but also by the average person. Unfortunately for Puritans, these average, sinful settlers immigrated anyways. According to Edmund Morgan, the Puritans "did not imagine that the emigration would bring to the shores of Massachusetts Bay such a horde of average, lusty Elizabethan Englishmen."[72] In fact, several Puritans believed that New England was too tainted for recovery, and that another move was needed. John Humfrey admonished "to remove our choice people thither and to leave the mixt multitude (that will ever bee as thornes and prickes unto us) behind us."[73] Likewise, Nathaniel Ward believed "we and many others must not only say, with greif, we have made an ill change, even from the snare to the pitt, but must mediate some safer refuge, if God will afford it…"[74]

No second journey was undertaken and New England was never free from the average English scoundrel and sinner. Their fear, distaste, and apprehension over the arrival and settlement of average, ungodly men (and certainly women too) demonstrates their undying desire to separate themselves from any opposing minority, or at the very least, any and all who are inherently different from themselves. John Norton exemplified the disdain many Puritans had for non-Puritans. Writing on the Quakers, Norton, comparing them to the "pernicious waters of old heresyes," argues that "the doctrine of the Quakers…is but the opening of that vast and horrid stinke: (such as makes the land to stink in the nostrils both of God and man, more then [sic] the Frogs that sometime annoyed Egypt)."[75] The difference with the non-Puritan English, or even sinful Puritan settlers, and the Catholics, however, is simply the sheer numbers of the former and the

[72] Morgan, *Puritan Family*, p. 170.
[73] Ibid., p. 170.
[74] Ibid., p. 171.
[75] Norton, John. *The Heart of N-England Rent at the Blasphemies of the Present Generation*. Cambridge, 1659. Microform. *Early American Imprints*: first series; no. 56. p. 1-4.

inherent unacceptableness of the latter. Sin can be punished, rules enforced, sinners offered as examples. But Catholics were more dangerous than just simple sinners or scoundrels. They were agents of Rome, of the antichrist, and the minions of France and Spain; managers of corruptness, of sabotage, and of blasphemy.

Morgan attests that the defensive nature of Puritanism against the sinful English commoner signified a rising "tribalism." Examples, like those mentioned above, "indicate a defensive, tribal attitude, growing at the heart of New England Puritanism."[76] They grew more and more inward, looking after family more so than others. In a larger sense, this tribalism can be applied to the nature of Puritanism as a whole: looking after the salvation of the holy and separating the godly from the heathen. "The church," Morgan concludes, "was thus turned into an exclusive society for the saints and their children. Instead of an agency for bringing Christ to fallen man it became the means of perpetuating the gospel among a hereditary religious aristocracy."[77] From the very beginning, Catholicism could not prosper in such a setting, where Puritans continued to look inward and separated themselves from "others."

The Puritans rebuffed the ungodly by reproving marriages to unregenerate persons and denying jobs to sinful servants. The ungodly were both damned on earth and in the afterlife: "All the odds, therefore, were against the unregenerate. They were brought to church, but they were not preached to. They were told to get into a godly family, but the doors to such families were closed wherever the ministers could close them."[78] In other words, Puritan tribalism closed the ungodly from heaven and family,

[76] Morgan, *Puritan Family*, p. 173.
[77] Ibid., p. 174.
[78] Ibid., p. 182.

condemning them to a lifetime of exclusion. Puritans separated themselves, then, from the sinful and ungodly, which took many shapes and creeds.

Order & Church Membership:

Before we can discuss the Puritans' reforms, we must first look at who constituted the Puritan Church. Like most Christians, New England Puritans believed in an order in the universe dictated by God. Summarizing what he calls the Puritans' "order of creation," Edmund Morgan writes that "The world was created by man, but man was created for God."[79] In other words, all creatures were subordinate to mankind, but mankind was subordinate to God, the ultimate creator. Likewise, in the "social order," there were men who were subordinate to other men. These types of hierarchies are certainly not unique to Puritanism, as they harken back to such concepts like the Medieval "Great Chain of Being." There were also biblical references to such relationships: the authority of one's parents is outlined in the fifth commandment and God is referred to as a king throughout Scripture.

Social class, office, and rank were part of a larger celestial plan. According to Morgan, "The Puritans indeed honored every kind of superiority among men as part of the divine order: old men were superior to young, educated to uneducated, rich to poor, craftsmen to common laborers, highborn to lowborn, clever to stupid."[80] The godly were high on the mountaintop, superior to Catholics (who were considered by Puritans to be heretics) and all "others" in His order. Similarly, Robert Gross argues that New Englanders believed that "The upper orders were to rule, the lower to follow," and that even into the eighteenth century, leaders, like magistrates, were "raised up to rule as

[79] Morgan, *Puritan Family*, p. 17.
[80] Ibid., p. 18.

another Moses, a model of wisdom and righteousness, a lover of justice and champion of the people's rights."[81] This translated throughout all levels in the community: the patriarchal family, the congregational church, and the civil state. Leaders, looked upon as the modern Moses, could not allow heretics and heathens, like Catholics, to prosper within their lands and jurisdictions.

New England Congregationalism centered around the idea that, until Christ's Second Coming occurred, the best way for man to communicate to God was through congregations, or groups "of individuals joined together by voluntary agreement for the purpose of worship."[82] Like their ideas on order, Puritans believed in selective incorporation. Church membership belonged only to the "visible saints," those individuals who were selected by God and the Holy Spirit. In order to become a member, one had to go through – and later explain in front of the church's congregation – a conversion experience. The churchgoers decided if the individual was sincere and, if he or she was found to be, accepted them into the fold. The conversion experience test originated in Massachusetts and spread throughout the other New England colonies and across the Atlantic to Holland and England.[83]

By its very nature, Congregationalism was both inclusive and exclusive. It was open to all Puritan individuals, but was determined by sincerity, zeal, and agreement. It stressed participation, consent and voluntarism. One of the reasons the Catholic Church (and, as some argued, the English Church) were impure churches was because it accepted sinners as full members. For Puritans, one had to volunteer his or her heart up to God and

[81] Gross, Robert A. *The Minutemen and Their World*. New York: Hill and Wang, 1976. Print. p. 11-2.
[82] Morgan, *Puritan Family*, p. 134.
[83] For more information on the origin of the conversion experience, see Edmund Morgan's third chapter "The New England System" in *Visible Saints*, especially p. 64-66.

be fully dedicated to the lifestyle dictated by Scripture and the congregation in order to be a member (in essence, to be "thinking" Christians). This system was much different when contrasted with Roman Catholicism, which stressed its "catholic" (i.e. "universal") approach, sinners and all. Instead of focusing on expanding membership through conversion, like French and Spanish Catholics, Puritans focused primarily on their own community and especially their children. One aspect of Puritan membership still derived itself from Catholicism, however. The subject of child membership proved controversial in New England (as did infant baptism). Yet children of church members were still automatically entered into the church.

Edmund Morgan argues that the acceptance of children harkens back to the Puritan church's "domestic origin."[84] Puritans believed that in between mankind's fall and the birth of Christ, the church existed within the chosen family of Abraham. It was thus a "domestic institution." Theoretically, this comforted the hearts of those Puritan theologians. Despite being accepted literally by Morgan, this viewpoint is anachronistic at best. The acceptance of church members' children, and later the Half-Way Covenant, is derived from Anglicanism and, more directly, from the Catholic Church as a practical means to ensure the continuation of the church and its membership. The Puritans utilized this at times when church membership was considered to be in jeopardy as a means to continue the influence of Puritanism within New England. In fact, as surprising as it is, Puritans recognized the baptism of other Christian dominations, including Roman Catholicism, as valid.[85]

[84] Morgan, *Puritan Family*, p. 135.
[85] Morgan, *Visible Saints*, p. 133,

In 1662, The Half-Way Covenant was introduced in order to sustain church membership. Unfortunately for the Puritans, children were not converting after becoming adults. In order to alleviate the situation, the Half-Way Covenant was instituted; it allowed for the continuance of incomplete church membership for those adults that had been accepted as children into the church. The Half-Way Covenant, implemented at a time of increasing public piety and ritual in the form of fast and thanksgiving days, allowed a further compromise and amalgamation of the godly and selected ungodly. By the eighteenth century, as unthinkable as it was, Baptists would join Congregationalists in days of worship and repentance.[86]

How widespread was the acceptance of children within the church during each colonial period? Morgan concludes that "all orthodox New England churches acknowledged that children should partake in their parents' membership."[87] Consider the words of Increase Mather who said that "I know the bare having of Baptisme does not always keep true Religion but sure it is, that the want of it will quickly lose Religion among a people."[88] Thomas Shepard added "and shall the experience of thousands respecting the Lords blessing their Baptisme which they received in Infancy, and the thoughts of their Covenant interest sealed in Baptisme, preventing many a sin that else they would have run into…"[89] Although uneasy over the theology of baptism, especially infant or child baptism, Puritan leaders understood the importance of numbers within a congregation. In doing so, they accepted child baptism on religious grounds. Since all

---

[86] Hermes, p. 176.
[87] Morgan, *Puritan Family*, p. 136.
[88] Mather, Increase. *The First Principles of New-England Concerning the Subject of Batpisme and Communion of Churches*. Cambridge: 1675. Postscript p. 5. Microform. *Early American Imprints*: first series; no. 208.
[89] Shepard, Thomas. *Eye-Salve, Or, A Watch-Word From Our Lord Jesus Christ onto His Church Especially Those within the Colony of the Massachusets In New-England, To Take Heed of Apostacy*. Cambridge, 1673. Microform. *Early American Imprints*: first series; no. 182. p. 25.

traditional churches participated in this action, it demonstrates the significance (and indebtedness) Puritans had to Roman Catholicism and Anglicanism.

Interestingly enough, Edmund Morgan attributes the downfall of New England Puritanism to its placement of future stability upon their children. Church and state were connected by the Church, and full church membership kept falling. Instead of implementing a wider net, or as Morgan puts it, "take the obvious step of looking for material elsewhere," Puritans tried even harder to convert their children, and failed to do so.[90] Having alienated practically every other minority in their sphere, the Puritans' paradox of inclusion and exclusion, and alienation of "the other," would finally catch up to them, but not just yet.

The "Civil Man" & the Covenants:

To devout New England Puritans, a life committed to Christ came before anything else. In the opening pages of his classic *The Puritan Family*, Morgan discusses the "civil man." The "civil man," Morgan writes, "…was a good citizen, a man who obeyed the laws, carried out his social obligations, never injured others" and yet this "paragon of social virtue," was, in the eyes of Puritans, "on his way to Hell."[91] The reason for this is based within Protestant theology. The Puritans were influenced greatly by John Calvin, especially his view on predestination. Calvin argued that the fate of every person was decided before they were born. One could not change fate and that, in the words of Morgan, his or her "progress in this world ether toward salvation or toward damnation was simply the unfolding of a decree made before he was born."[92] In stark

[90] Morgan, *Puritan Family*, p. 185. Morgan also discusses the Half-Way Covenant and child membership extensively in his chapter "The Halfway Covenant" in *Visible Saints*, p. 113-138.
[91] Ibid., p. 1.
[92] Morgan, *Visible Saints*, p. 67.

contrast to Roman Catholicism, where God's Grace is given for both faith and good works, Protestantism, especially Puritanism, argues that God's forgiveness can only be given solely on the basis of one's true faith in Christ (the doctrine of justification discussed previously). In other words, as Morgan puts it, "Only faith in Christ could bring redemption from the sin of Adam, and faith was the free gift of God, not to be won by human efforts."[93]

The distinction between these theological arguments has divided Catholics and Protestants for centuries. More importantly, they rank among the major tenets of their individual theologies, creating direct chasms between the two faiths that were felt especially during this period. For Puritans, civic duty was important, but secondary to service to Christ. While this is not distinctive to Puritanism, the fact that Puritans placed such emphasis on the understanding that the good works of men (who, for example, might identify themselves as Catholics or Jews) are inferior to true faith (which would be, in the case of Puritanism, the highly selective Puritan strain of Protestantism) creates massive theological barriers between Puritans and non-Puritans that carried over into society. In other words, no matter how pious and civic a Catholic farmer may be, he was still inherently separate from the dominant Puritan community: he was forever an "other." This is evidenced by the words of Cotton Mather, who called Catholics "Merit-Mongers" and were thus excluded from divine salvation.[94] While only God knew if an individual was truly saved (as He had determined it before anyone was born), Puritans still looked at one's sanctification and faith, and not good works, as indicators or clues for that person's salvation.

[93] Morgan, *Puritan Family*, p. 2.
[94] Ibid., p. 4.

This is not to say, however, that Puritans detested a strong civil life. The opposite, in fact, is the truth. In both law and religion, New England Puritans sought to create a "purer form of Christianity" than the one in England (and elsewhere) by stripping away distracting formalism and applying justice in a more consistent way.[95] In order to do so, they positioned "themselves intellectually in that period of transition before the rise of Roman Christianity" and looked upon the works available to the Early Christians: the scriptures.[96] In doing this, they hoped to create a *new* England, an inspiration and model for the old. In other words, they hoped to create institutions and practices that were, at least indirectly if not directly, different from those influenced by Catholicism and Anglicanism. They would get back to basics, in a sense, by eliminating over a thousand years' worth of Catholic history, tradition, and influence. The means by which to accomplish this feat were through church and state reforms: expediting justice, choosing substance over formality, encouraging participation, and establishing godly rule. The fear of God's wrath played its part as well.

Morgan asks the questions, "why did the Puritans wish to be socially virtuous themselves" and "why did they wish to force social virtue on others?"[97] The answer to the first, according to the author, is that the Puritans believed that "good social conduct was the result of salvation rather than the cause of it."[98] In other words, social virtue was a sign of being saved. This "visible saint" differs from the "civil man" because of motive: the "civil man" acts out of education and restraint, while the "visible saint" has the spur

[95] Hermes, p. 28.
[96] Ibid., p. 37.
[97] Morgan, *Puritan Family*, p. 3.
[98] Ibid., p. 3.

of the Holy Spirit. This is the same dynamic, through the lens of Protestantism, seen earlier in England between the "thinking" and "unthinking" Christians.

The answer to the second question, "why did they wish to force social virtue on others," is the covenant. Apart from the monitoring of the goodness of others as a means of showcasing one's own faith, the covenant of grace provided another layer to the spiritual fabric of community interactions.[99] Puritans believed that they inherited the original covenant between God and Abraham. Abraham promised that his "seed" would faithfully adhere to God's commands; his "seed" meaning both the "figurative sense" of fellow followers of faith, as well as "his physical descendants." [100] This interpretation meant that a believer, who accepts the covenant of grace, bears the responsibility of guiding his family in faith and behavior. With the addition of inheriting the Hebrew Israel's covenant with God, representing another added theological layer, Christians saw themselves as the new chosen people. Protestants, like the Puritans, "regarded every Christian state and every Christian church as a successor to the tribe of Israel. All the members of such bodies, they thought, were bound by covenant to God."[101] The covenants with God, inherited from the Old Testament, pushed Puritans to monitor the morality of themselves and their fellow neighbors.

Morgan goes on to describe a major contradiction within the belief of covenant, and describes the Puritans' answer to it. Every family, church, and state had non-believers and evil-doers. If sanctification meant salvation, and association with the ungodly hindered the "visible saints," then was all lost? According to Morgan, the Puritans argued that the covenant had "different terms and a different name" when

[99] Morgan, *Puritan Family*, p. 6.
[100] Ibid., p. 6.
[101] Ibid., p. 9.

applied to certain groups, like the family, church, or state.[102] Covenant concerns for entire groups were focused on the present instead of the future afterlife. Salvation was not possible for an entire group, but by following God's commands prosperity on earth might follow; if ignored, communities were flirting with God's wrath.

While an individual's faith was inherently private, the community could do its best to govern the behavior of its people in order to uphold the covenant with God and avoid his anger. In a pre-modern world where life hinged on successful harvests and the avoidance of epidemics, communities placed great emphasis on pleasing God. The covenant(s) "were like a wall that God erected to protect His people from the dangers of the world."[103] The enforcement of a "smooth, honest, civil life" on the part of Puritans reflected their belief, in the words of Morgan, that:

> The Christian's family, church, and state had each promised to give outward obedience to God in every respect. Consequently every Christian was bound to obey God not merely as a sanctified man (in order to prove to himself that he was saved) but as a member of each group to which he belonged. If he failed, he not only demonstrated his own damnation, but he brought the temporal wrath of God upon his family, upon his church, and upon his state.[104]

The stakes were high; too high to risk relying on the faith that each citizen, each individual in a community and family would act in accordance to God's will in order to appease him, without the addition of social, religious, and civil motivations and punishments. Punishment was important because it demonstrated to God that the

[102] Morgan, *Puritan Family*, p. 9.
[103] Hall, p. 133.
[104] Morgan, *Puritan Family*, p. 10.

community recognized and disapproved of such action. Likewise, constant monitoring was required to ensure that no sin went unpunished.[105]

Puritans felt God's wrath whenever poor harvests were reaped, misfortunes transpired, controversy erupted, and war was forged. The national covenant, between the Puritans and God, religiously bounded individuals and communities together in order to preserve their present and future. For example, the English Puritan Thomas Vincent recounted the recent destruction in London in the 1660s as having been an act of God. "God was the Author of this evil" recalls Vincent, and that:

> The hand of God was in it. The Decree was come forth: *London* must now fall; and who could prevent it? No wonder, when so many Pillars are removed, if the Building tumbles; the prayers, tears, and faith which [sometimes?] London hath had, might have quenched the violence of the Fire, might have opened Heaven for rain, and driven back the wind…[106]

According to Vincent, God ordered that London burn. As Katherine Hermes argues, "Their belief in the national covenant, that God would covenant with a godly society to protect it from harm but would punish one which had forsaken Him, complemented their ideas about the personal covenant God made with the regenerate."[107] The national covenant bound the godly and ungodly alike. Samuel Willard, in 1673, admonished that:

> God takes not the Rod in his hand till he be enforced to it…he useth all other means first, Convictions, Reproofs, Warnings, Threatenings, and waits to see if

[105] Morgan, *Puritan Family*, p. 10.
[106] Vincent, Thomas. *Gods Terrible Voice in the City of London*. Cambridge, Mass.: 1668. 22-23. Microform. *Early American Imprints*: first series; no. 132.
[107] Hermes, p. 143.

> these will not reach his ends, and work repentance; when all these fail, then he begins to afflict a people…[108]

The Puritan belief in covenants with a personal and active God, on many levels, increased the monitoring of actions of all individuals, communities, congregations, and the state. It also necessitated the need to separate the godly from the ungodly, including sinners and Catholics.

God was not the only one that could interact with the physical world, however. Protestants, especially Puritans, feared the work of the devil. As Separatist William Bradford wrote in his famous rendition of the history of Plymouth Colony, Satan had persecuted the visible saints:

> Some times by bloody death and cruell torments; other whiles imprisonments, banishments, and other hard usages; as being loath his kingdom should goe downe, the trueth prevaile, and the churches of God reverte to their anciente puritie, and recover their primative order, libertie, and bewtie.[109]

"The devil," according to Allison Coudert, "assumed a centrality in Protestant thought that he never achieved in Catholic dogma."[110] This is especially demonstrated by the rise of "devil books," which highlighted specific evil vices and the ways in which one could combat Satan and his servants, throughout Europe among Protestant communities in the Post-Reformation world. Puritans themselves believed that Satan influenced ignorant children to sin, gave false callings to men, and pushed physical lust over thought and prayer in the coupling of marriage. As described earlier, Catholicism was thought to be a

---

[108] Willard, Samuel. *Useful Instructions for Aprofessing Peope in Times of Great Security and Degeneracy*. Cambridge: 1673. Microform. *Early American Imprints*: first series; no. 184.
[109] Bradford, William. "Of Plymouth Plantation." *Early Americas Digital Archive*. Maryland Institute for Technology in the Humanities, 2003. Web. 28 Oct. 2014. Chapter 1.
[110] Coudert, p. 67.

conduit of Satan by Puritans and Protestants, acting out his wishes and ruining the souls of all those who fell into his "Catholic" heresy.

For Puritans, New England, like England before it, had taken the place of Israel in God's divine plan. The covenants were significant in the survival of the new chosen people. They were a means to satisfy God, become visible saints, and defeat Satan and the antichrist. Similarly, in order to bring about God's desires, kingdom, and favor, his instructions must be followed diligently and faithfully. To deviate, even a little, risked body and soul.

Native Americans & Strangers:

Differences often overcame similarities, whether it was ethnic or religious. Separatist minister Thomas Shepard argued that religion was best when it was homogeneous, exclaiming that "Mixtures in Religion cherished by a spirit of Libertinism, and spiritual licentiousness: It is dangerous to Religion, and to Israels state…"[111] The Reformation allowed newly-established Protestants to leave a church that they felt was, in many ways, too indiscriminate. The visible church was corrupted with sinful members. Protestants felt that previous reforms were too "insufficient" and subsequently "left the established church to build new ones of their own." [112] English Puritan divine John Greenwood argued that the church should expel any and all "Atheists, men without the knowledge or feare of God, together with the papists, hereticks, and all other infidels."[113] Puritan discrimination regarding church membership was paralleled with their attitudes toward societal association. We have talked extensively over differences in religion, and

[111] Shepard, Thomas. *Eye-Salve, Or, A Watch-Word From Our Lord Jesus Christ onto His Church Especially Those within the Colony of the Massachusets In New-England, To Take Heed of Apostacy*. Cambridge, 1673. Microform. *Early American Imprints*: first series; no. 182. p. 32.
[112] Morgan, *Visible Saints*, p. 3.
[113] Ibid., p. 36.

will continue to do so in the pages that follow. The subject of difference, however, took on more meaning in relation to natives and strangers. Both of these types mixed with anti-Catholicism, "the Other," and fear of the unknown in New England culture.

In the beginning of colonization, most Englishmen knew nothing of natives except from what they read about in the accounts of the interactions with the Spanish. According to these tales, two types of natives existed: the friendly "good" kind that might help Europeans and adopt their civilization, and the hostile cannibals who tried to kill every foreigner they saw.[114] As the English began their attempts at colonization, they soon realized the truth about natives: they were far more independent, clever, and diverse than originally thought. Yet, conversion, or at the very least protection from Catholic alteration, still remained one of the English's primary goals. In fact, King James, on the topic of New World natives, wrote that "all just, kind and charitable courses shall be holden with such of them, as shall conforme themselves to any good and sociable traffique and dealing with the subjects of us, … *whereby they may be the sooner drawne to the true knowledge of God, and the Obedience of us*."[115] From the top down, official policy, if the occasion arose, was to convert the natives to Protestantism.

In fact, the Puritans that founded the Massachusetts Bay Colony had natives in mind. In the opening chapter of his work *The Unredeemed Captive*, John Demos richly describes how the official seal of the colony, created by these men, features a single native, almost naked, standing in a 'wild' landscape, and holding a bow and arrow in his hands. Out of his mouth emerges the words "Come over and help us."[116] Of course, the

---

[114] Morgan, *American Slavery, American Freedom*, p. 18-9.
[115] Ibid., p. 20. Also discussed by Katherine Hermes, *Religion and Law*, p. 69. Emphasis added.
[116] Demos, John. *The Unredeemed Captive: A Family Story from Early America*. New York: Vintage, 1994. Print. p. 2-3.

seal referred to the formal objective of the colony – to convert, elevate, and civilize the natives of the New World, while protecting them from the heathen Catholics of France and Spain. In doing so, they would "[tame] the wilderness and [remake] America in the image of their motherland," England.[117]

Although willing to convert the natives, the colonists were fearful of being converted themselves. Life in such a wild place could be dangerous to the body and mind. Instead of converting the natives, the natives might convert the colonists. However, similarly to the fashioning of Protestant identity, the natives – a collective term for countless numbers of differing tribes, groups, and cultures – began to see Europeans as an analogous group. As Europeans called natives "Indians," natives called Europeans "Christians." Likewise, natives began using "Indian" as means to distinguish themselves from Europeans, like the English. According to Katherine Hermes, "In general, Europeans became identified by their military alliances and their religion, while Indians became evermore amorphous to the colonizers."[118]

Puritans believed that conversion occurred through meditation and inner-examination and not from outward external ritual or force. According to Increase Mather, the founders of New England arrived in order to convert the natives. They could not do so, however, until the defeat of the Antichrist. Summing up Mather's position, Katherine Hermes writes that "The sons [the successive generations of Puritans in New England] had neglected the noble missions of the fathers, and it was time that New England resumed its place in the divine scheme of the defeat of the Antichrist."[119] It was time,

[117] Demos, p, 3.
[118] Hermes, p. 193-4.
[119] Ibid., p. 167-8.

according to Mather and others, to recommit themselves to the great war against Catholicism, including "freeing" the natives.

While Puritans and their fellow Protestants waited for the destruction of Rome and the antichrist, they looked with horror upon the natives' indigenous religion. From the horrendous accounts of ritualistic cannibalism in the south to the torture, mourning wars, and seemingly endless conflict in the north, the English (and all Europeans) viewed native religion and culture as propagated by ignorance and Satan. As Edmund Morgan writes, "According to the English, Indian religion was focused on an evil deity, whom the English identified at once as the devil."[120] Take, for example, the equation of native religion and devil worship as seen in the Massachusetts's 1660 law book: "And it is Ordered that no Indians shall at any time *Powaw* or performe outward worship to their *False Gods*, or to the *Devil*, in any part of our Jurisdiction, whether they be such as shall dwel here, or shall come hither…"[121] The association with the native religion and the devil is, in a sense, comparable to the belief that Catholics worshiped the Antichrist. In other words, as typical of the period, any service or practice dissimilar to their own was seen as heathen and devil worship.

The English also viewed natives as being deceived and misled by rival empires, especially Spain and France. Owen Stanwood quotes a portion from Richard Janeway's *Impartial Protestant Mercury*, which outlined the reason why some natives were unwilling to grow corn for the English colonists: "some Ill Neighbours, especially some that are Papists not far off, which supposition is increased for that the said *Indians* already take the Boldness to Kill the Cattle of the Protestant Planters before their faces,

---

[120] Morgan, *American Slavery, American Freedom*, p. 56.
[121] *The Book of the General Lavves and Libertyes concerning the Inhabitants of the Massachusets*. Cambridge, Mass., 1660. Microform. *Early American Imprints*: first series; no. 60. p. 43.

and threaten every day to fall upon their persons, whereas they offer no such outrages to any Plantations of the Papists."[122] The natives were not acting out of self-determination or self-resistance; they were being agitated by the Catholics, particularly the French. It was, therefore, always an *us-vs-them* scenario, the Papists Planters vs. the Protestant ones. They abhorred the conversions of natives to Catholicism as well. Urian Oakes, pastor of Church of Christ in Cambridge, exclaimed:

> Or as the *Popish Priests in the* Indies *drive scores of* Indians *to the Water*, *and baptize them*, and set down so many for Christian Converts they have made, and then let them run wild into the Woods again to their old *Pagan courses*.[123]

Either deceived by priests to attack the English or convert to Catholicism (or even worse, to do both) was a primary fear Puritans and other Protestants encountered on a yearly basis. As we shall see, this fear would play a major role in the struggles over empire.

One particular menacing group of natives, "the French Indians," was a collection of individuals who left their respective tribes and traveled north to French Canada. Seeking relief from a variety of ills and misfortunes, partly brought on by Europeans themselves, these natives often helped the French in struggles over empire. In one particular case, during the War of Spanish Succession, hundreds of "French Indian" fighters fought with French soldiers in attacks on English settlements, including New England.[124] These natives, and others, were seen as having been allied with and corrupted by Catholic powers, making them particularly frightening and potent.

---

[122] Stanwood, p. 319.
[123] Oakes, Urian. "New-England Pleaded With, and Pressed to Consider the Things Which Concern Her Peace, at Least in This Her Day." Cambridge, Mass.: 1673. 55. Microform. *Early American Imprints*: first series; no. 180.
[124] Demos, p. 9.

As a result of conversion to Catholicism and attacks on English settlements, jurisdictions raised funds to provide defense from both natives and Catholics. One such decree from the Massachusetts General Court stated that "It is Ordered by this Court, that a Thousand Fire Arms be accordingly procured with all convenient expedition for the use of the Country, Payment whereof to be made out of the publick Treasury…"[125] The meaning of this statement, of course, is that colonies, communities, and towns armed themselves out of fear of attack; the fear of natives and Catholic rivals forced all English colonists to devote resources and time for the defense of their persons, properties, religion, and colony. Catholics were a physical danger, not just a theoretical or spiritual one.

One particular threat that horrified Puritans is the theme of John Demos's *The Unredeemed Captive*. In Demos's factual account, the family of a local Puritan minister, John Williams, is captured by natives and French forces during a raid expedition. The town, Deerfield, was plundered and burned and many residents, including some of Williams's family, were killed. Williams's capture was political in nature, as he was considered a bargain chip for the release of a French captain held by the British. The group of over one-hundred captives was forced to migrate over some several hundred miles to French Canada; along the way many of Williams's children were given off to native tribes. Eventually, Williams was released and found his children. All but one, Eunice, returned; Eunice's captors had refused to let her go.

Williams would eventually die, horrified in knowing that his daughter had "gone wild." She forgot English, was baptized by a French Jesuit into the Catholic faith

[125] *Several Laws & Orders Made at the Sessions of the General Court Held at Boston the 13th of October 1675*. Cambridge: 1675. Microform. *Early American Imprints*: first series; no. 202. p. 27.

(perhaps an action even worse than death for a Puritan), and even married a native. Sexual intermixtures between Europeans and natives, especially in the case of European women, were hallmarks of European ethnic ideological fears. Joane Nagel argues that, in the "minds of Europeans" the "New World was an exotic and erotic landscape, an imaginary land of milk and honey."[126] But to indulge in that landscape was taboo, even more so for women. As Nagel concludes, "Racial, ethnic, or nationalist defense and enforcement of in-group sexual honor and purity strengthens ethnic boundaries and subjugates members enclosed inside ethnic borders."[127] It was yet another means to differentiate themselves from the "Other," whether it was Catholic, native, or a mixture of both. This fact, combined with the baptism of Eunice into Roman Catholicism, represented the ultimate fear of colonial, and especially Puritan, officials.

The focus on difference was pushed even farther with the restoration of Charles II in 1660, because it began the process towards re-anglicization within the colonies. As Hermes argues, "The push to re-anglicize from some quarters of the society was a powerful factor in the desire to eliminate cultural difference."[128] In other words, as the decades wore on, cultural differences continued to be examined and emphasized, playing an important part in the attitudes and relationships the English had with their fellow indigenous neighbors, not just among their own more homogeneous communities.

This is not to say, however, that the English or the Puritans did not try to convert the surrounding natives. Praying towns were founded, albeit not nearly to the frequency of the Spanish or French. Puritans Thomas Mayhew and John Eliot, the so-called

---

[126] Nagel, Joane. *Race, Ethnicity, and Sexuality: Intimate Intersections, Forbidden Frontiers*. New York: Oxford UP, 2003. Print. p. 83.
[127] Ibid., p. 55.
[128] Hermes, p. 208.

"Apostle to the Indians," founded some fourteen praying towns. These Puritans were honest in their attempts at converting their neighboring natives. For example, such enthusiasm can be seen in the title of Eliot's "Indian Dialogues," which reads: "For Their Instruction in that great Service of Christ in calling home their Country-men to the Knowledge of God, and of Themselves, and of Jesus Christ."[129] Formal legal rules and proceedings were created in dealing with natives, including from within the colony. Over time on a large scale, however, natives continued to practice their own cultural and religious rituals, and efforts to convert them failed. This led the English to recognize their "retention of difference" and forced the English to require "their separateness" from them.[130] This practice is on par with the Puritans process of exclusion seen elsewhere.

The fear of cultural difference and the exclusivity of Puritanism fused with another issue for New England towns: strangers. A stranger was someone new to the town that had no connection to it. They could be a religious minority, like a Quaker or Catholic. Often they were poor or otherwise undesirable. In a 1675 decree by the Massachusetts General Court, Indians, like "strangers," were banned from the town of Boston. The order declared that:

> Whereas not withstanding the COUNCILS former Prohibition of all Indians coming to, or remaining in the Town of Boston, we finde that still there remains ground of *Fear*, that unless more effectual Care be taken, we may be exposed to

[129] Eliot, John. *Indian Dialogues, For Their Instruction in That Great Service of Christ, in Calling Home Their Country-men to the Knowledge of God, And of Themselves, and of Jesus Christ*. Cambridge: 1671. Microform. *Early American Imprints*: first series; no. 161.
[130] Hermes, p. 178.

> *mischief* by some of that *Barbarous Crew*, or any *Strangers* not of our Nation by their coming into, or residing in the Town of Boston.[131]

This decree reveals much about New England fears. First, strangers, foreigners, and natives were equated together as potential dangers to Boston's inhabitants. Secondly, they were considered to be "mischievous," much like Catholic Jesuits who planned powder plots and deceptively converted natives. In fact, the phrase "Barbarous Crew" probably refers to both natives and Catholic priests alike.

The early modern period was, without a doubt, a period of violence and death. Dynastic, religious, and cultural warfare was not uncommon. Disease was poorly understood and knowledge of its prevention nonexistent. Communities were often responsible for the care of their own sick and homeless as well, especially of their "own." The targeting of "strangers," much like natives and Catholics, most likely promulgated from a prejudiced desire to isolate and identify common dangers they encountered every day. In general, colonial communities were suspicious of unknown "strangers." This weariness was not unfounded, for reasons mentioned above. As David Hall admits, colonists were "uneasy" because "they tied their hopes for social peace to a policy of controlling who came into their communities," especially after the growth of a land market that resulted in migrating populations.[132] An incoming straggler represented many potential problems: they could be a drain on the community's resources if they were to become homeless or sick, and they could also be a bringer of death, due to violence or disease. On a rare but much imagined occasion, a stranger might be an enemy of the state.

---

[131] *Several Laws & Orders Made at the Sessions of the General Court Held at Boston the 13th of October 1675*. Cambridge: 1675. Microform. *Early American Imprints*: first series; no. 202. p. 25. Emphasis added.
[132] Hall, p. 58.

New England colonies passed laws, and later reiterated them, that banned "strangers" and went so far as to exile them to their community of origin. As early as 1660, the Massachusetts General Court declared that:

> [H]enceforth all Strangers of what quality soever, above the age of *sixteen years*, arriving in any *Ports* or parts of this Jurisdiction, in any ship or vessel, shall immediately be brought before the Governour, Deputy Governour, or two other Magistrates, by the Master or Mate of the said ship or vessel, upon penalty of *twenty pound* for default thereof, there to give an account of their occasions, and busines[s] in this Country, whereby satisfaction may be given, and order taken, with such strangers...[133]

Similar laws continued to be echoed throughout the century. For example, a broadside from 1676 reiterated the same desires to regulate strangers, calling on "Select Men" to interview all "Incomers" and commanding that they "take a particular account of all Persons and Families so coming unto them, requiring them if need be to appear before them that they may be fully informed of their state and way of living, and how they dispose of themselves."[134]

Whether it was the ungodly, Catholics, natives, strangers, scoundrels, or "civil men," Puritans sought to create a society devoid of human outliers. For those groups, Puritans closed off avenues of amalgamation and incorporation. This was true for other groups not mentioned. Quakers and Baptists too were considered to be "Others" by Puritans. The significance of these facts, of course, is that Puritans sought homogeneity

---

[133] *The Book of the General Lavves and Libertyes concerning the Inhabitants of the Massachusets*. Cambridge, Mass., 1660. Microform. *Early American Imprints*: first series; no. 60. p. 73.
[134] *At a Council Held at Boston April the 4th. 1676*. Boston: 1676. Microform. *Early American Imprints*: first series; no. 215. p. 1.

within their society and religion. To not do so risked breaking the sacred covenants that could bring about God's wrath. At the very least, it invited foreign intervention, conspiracy, degeneracy, and subterfuge.

Chapter Three: New England Experimentalism:

From the very beginning, New England churches and states were separated but united in their values and desires for their members. Puritanism, according to Katherine Hermes, is intertwined with both religious and legalistic elements, those of which cannot be separated.[135] Backed by the covenants with God, many believed that religion and politics were integrated, arguing that "civil authority in a Christian commonwealth was always and everywhere secondary to the sovereignty of Christ" and that "rulers and people were alike in being servants of Christ and subordinate to the moral principles he had established."[136] Similarly, Edmund Morgan argues that while the church had modes of enforcing its faith, like admonishment and excommunication, it had no bite for the ungodly. This is in part due to the elimination of ecclesiastical courts. Therefore, it relied upon the state to enforce godly authority, especially at home.[137]

Puritans mixed religion and law in both theory and practice. Excluding Rhode Island, which had a more diverse religious makeup, the New England colonies looked upon biblical laws as a basis for their own. For them, God was the "ultimate source of all law."[138] Thankfully he had endowed His people with laws recorded in the Scriptures. "The Puritans," according to Morgan, "made no attempt to read while they ran. They studied minutely every phrase of the Scriptures and extracted from it the last ounce of meaning, so that each one of the Ten Commandments meant volumes of prohibitions and injunctions to them."[139] Sacred law was bound to all members of the Christian

[135] Hermes, p. 17.
[136] Hall, p. 30-1.
[137] Morgan, *Puritan Family*, p. 142-3.
[138] Hermes, p. 35.
[139] Morgan, *Puritan Family*, p. 11.

community. By adhering to Biblical law and morality, Puritans might even bring about the Second Coming of Christ.

The 1660 edition of "The Book of the General Lavves and Libertyes" of Massachusetts outlined several capital laws inspired by biblical law. Capital laws, of course, were those that could result in the death penalty. Offenses included idolatry, witchcraft, blasphemy, murder, poisoning, bestiality, sodomy, adultery, man-stealing, bearing false witness, and conspiracy. An example of the wording of such a law, like in the case of idolatry, went like this: "For any man after legal conviction shall HAVE OR WORSHIP any other God, but the LORD GOD he shall be put to death."[140] Puritans considered Catholics to be blasphemers and idolaters, so it is safe to assume, legally speaking, that New England was not the most hospitable place for Catholics to live. In fact, the same publication had entire sections dedicated to Quakers, another religious minority detested by Puritans, banning them and punishing any co-conspirators with either fines or banishment. For example, it declared that "And if any such *Quaker* or *Quakers* or other *Blasphemous hereticks* (knowing them to be such) every such person shall forfeit to the Countrey, Fourty shillings for every houres entertainement and concealment of any *Quaker* or *Quakers*…"[141] While the decree does not mention Catholicism specifically, the phrase "other blasphemous heretics" refers specifically to non-Puritan Christian denominations.

The hanging of Quakers in Massachusetts ceased after 1660, but they continued to explicitly banish Quakers and Anabaptists. In fact, in 1661 the Cart and Whip Act replaced the death penalty for Quakers, allowing authorities "to drive foreign Quakers out

[140] *The Book of the General Lavves and Libertyes concerning the Inhabitants of the Massachusets*. Cambridge, Mass., 1660. Microform. *Early American Imprints*: first series; no. 60. p. 8.
[141] Ibid., p. 35.

of the colony."[142] In 1662, England passed the Act of Uniformity which established the Church of England as the official church over the kingdom, replacing many of the Puritan-implemented laws that had been in effect since the English Civil War. While New England was not bound by the act, the king declared specifically that toleration should be promulgated within the colonies.[143] That declaration was widely ignored. The example of the Quakers exhibits not only the extent of religious toleration in the region but also the responsibilities of the state: enforce moral law and protect Puritanism from heretics and other threats.

Capital laws give insight on the thoughts and beliefs of the region's population. Both Katherine Hermes and David Hall have demonstrated that New England's capital laws were seldom prosecuted to their fullest extent (executions for such offenses were quite rare), especially after the 1660s.[144] However, the promulgation and keeping of such laws tells us that Puritans took Biblical law seriously. They used capital laws as a means to demonstrate to others that New England was mostly, if not only, for Puritans: founded by Puritans and for Puritans. Everyone else was simply a guest of the community and colony. It was also just as easy for a dissenting congregation or individual, who might have committed a capital offense, to leave for another colony than for the magistrates to execute a ghastly punishment.[145]

Law and religion mingled in more than one way. Religious actions often had legal tones; as Hermes explains, "Ministers had to be lawfully ordained. Sacraments had to be

[142] Hermes, p. 220.
[143] Ibid., p. 219.
[144] Hall, p. 87.
[145] Ibid., p. 126.

lawfully administered."[146] Additionally, the subject of lawful baptisms proved to be a decisive issue between Congregationalists and Anabaptists as well. Regardless of the issue or law, the early courts sifted through civil laws searching for either their outright endorsement from the Bible or at least competent reasoning derived from Scripture. Of course, interpretation was needed for both and interpretations often varied from individual to individual.

Puritan marriage too had both legal and religious touches. Adam and Eve represented the first marriage, and its rules were established by God. But in separation from Catholics, Puritans refused to elevate marriage to the level of a sacrament, despite rejecting celibacy as an inherently superior state. Quoting the New England minister Samuel Willard, Edmund Morgan argues that "the Puritans said, with an eye on the Catholics, those who 'speak reproachfully of it do both impeach God's Wisdom and Truth.'"[147] In other words, Puritans believed that Catholics disavowed God's rules regarding marriage, because they argued that Catholicism treated marriage improperly: Catholicism held celibacy higher than matrimony, and complicated it by imposing arbitrary sacramental traditions and rituals. This belief, coupled with the stereotype of the prostitute, positioned the Catholic Church as the enemy of true marriage.

When the Church of England split from the Catholic Church, marriage laws were steeped in antiquated and even slack regulations. The Council of Trent, which overhauled Catholic marriage law, occurred after this separation. Therefore, English marriages continued to be often "bigamous and clandestine" under the conservative Anglican

[146] Hermes, p. 35.
[147] Morgan, *Puritan Family*, p. 28.

umbrella.[148] Puritans sought to inflict change in the New World, replacing ceremonial proceedings with formal, civil, and very public ones. Marriages were presided over by a magistrate and not a minister. Even after 1686, when ministers were given officiating power from royal governments, magistrates continued to govern matrimonial proceedings.[149]

The churches themselves held immense influence over their communities especially the ministers who had significant clout in affecting law, but they did not hold actual legal power over non-members. Congregations concerned themselves with only visible saints, and it was the duty of the state to regulate the ungodly. Checks did exist, however. For many New Englanders, especially those who held an office, the perceived role of the government acted as a bulwark order, of stability, and Puritan godliness. While colonies like Plymouth did not limit enfranchisement to church members, possibly due to larger numbers of non-Separatists, other colonies like Massachusetts and New Haven did.[150]

Church membership held benefits that non-membership simply did not have. According to Hermes, "Freemanship was for males analogous to, and in Massachusetts and New Haven dependent upon, church membership."[151] These freemen, whom in certain colonies were only church members, elected the legislatures and courts, served as juries, and "shaped ideas about criminality and social deviance, morality, and human relations."[152] To hold the office of governor in Connecticut, for example, one must be a

[148] Morgan, *Puritan Family*, p. 31.
[149] Ibid., p. 29-32.
[150] Hermes, p. 84.
[151] Ibid., p. 86.
[152] Hermes, p. 86.

freeman and church member.[153] In 1636, Massachusetts took one step further by establishing a test for church membership – narration of the conversion experience – which directly limited the franchise.[154] It is no wonder that colonial New England was a "jurisdiction that never allowed Catholics to become naturalized subjects."[155]

Puritan Experimentation:

The English were always prideful of certain aspects of their government and laws. The Magna Carta was held up as one of the major distinguishing characteristics of English government that disassociated itself from other European powers. Likewise, certain rules and customs elevated the superiority, in their eyes, of England. For example, trial by jury was "one of the emblems of English freedom," Morgan states, "which Englishmen took pride in contrasting with the more authoritarian legal procedures of other countries."[156] This type of exceptionalism traveled over with the Puritan founders of the New England colonies.

David Hall argues effectively that Puritanism fostered a type of experimentalism that was unique to its area and time period. He attributes this experimentalism to the Puritans' "unhappiness with the Church of England, the monarchy, and certain features of English society."[157] What is surprisingly missing from Hall's account is anti-Catholicism. What was the root of the Puritans' unhappiness with the Church of England, even aspects of the English monarchy? Owen Stanwood gives the answer, despite describing the struggle for empire in the late seventeenth century. In discussing how Protestants

---

[153] Hall, p. 118.
[154] Hermes, p. 101.
[155] Stanwood, Owen. "The Protestant Moment: Antipopery, the Revolution of 1688-89, and the Making of an Anglo-American Empire." Ed. Stanley N. Katz and John M. Murrin. *Colonial America: Essays in Politics and Social Development*. 6th ed. New York: Routledge, 2011. Print. p. 321.
[156] Morgan, *American Slavery, American Freedom*, p. 61.
[157] Hall, p. 4.

believed that they needed to act as differently from Catholics as possible, the author states that "Emulating the enemy was not an option; rather, true Protestants had to strive to be as unlike their popish rivals as possible, whether in forms of worship or politics."[158] Stanwood limits his discussion to the imperial struggle that occurred later on in the seventeenth century, but his argument holds true to the centuries following the Reformation.

Protestants and Puritans alike tried to shed any Catholic influence that had once been attached to them and their everyday life. Puritans and Separatists were even more radical in this instance, believing that the Anglican Church and English government was still too Catholic. In regards to government and civil society, the Puritans were great experimenters in the New World. While anti-Catholicism did not play as a front issue in these civil reforms, it is easy to sense subtle motivations. They emphasized participation, representation, and uniformity.

The first example is the Puritans' congregationalism. While the minister led the church, it was the congregation that invited the minister, paid his salary, and made important decisions. Ministers were very important, but not necessarily essential. For example, between 1625 and 1629, the Pilgrim's home church in Holland was without a minister. There was little worry among its members, however. "[T]he members," Edmund Morgan attests, "could comfort themselves with [former Pastor] Robinson's previously declared insistence that churches made ministers, not vice versa, and that a church could exist and could both admit and expel members without a minister."[159] Likewise, while governors existed, general assemblies or courts held great swaths of

[158] Stanwood, p. 322.
[159] Morgan, *Visible Saints*, p. 58-9.

power. This was a major difference when compared to contemporary kings and the pope. In France, the French king held power over his government and the French church, albeit in line with Rome. In England, the monarch was head of both the English government and the Church of England. Equally, the pope, essentially another monarch, was the supreme leader of the Catholic Church and of the Papal States. As John Flavel warned, "Abhor Popery and be eminent in your zeal against it. Rome is that [enemy] with whom God will never make peace; neither should we."[160] For Puritans, liberty never meant personal freedom. Rather, liberty was a series of protections from an absolutist or unjust state, king, or tyrant, and perhaps a minister.[161]

Participation proved to be a unique keystone in Puritan and New England civil society, and was built in practically every level of governance: congregations, courtrooms, town meetings, and the General Court.[162] Individuals made petitions, argued and debated, expressed their grievances, sought personal favors, joined in gossip, and wrote, printed, and published their ideas. In congregations, members selected ministers and voted on membership. Participation was a means to enact change and ensure stability. For example, Plymouth Colony's "Oath of a Free-Man," a loyalty oath said by colonists, demonstrates the commitment to God and the emphasis on honest participation that was expected by its colonists. It reads that:

> Moreover I doe solemnly bind myself in the sight of God, that when I shall be called to give my voice touching any such matter of this State in which FREEMEN are to deale I will give my vote and suffrage as I shall judge in mine

[160] Flavel, John. "Tydings from Rome or England's Alarm." Cambridge, Mass., 1668. Microform. *Early American Imprints*: first series; no. 131. p. 17-18.
[161] Hall, p. xi.
[162] Ibid., p. 19, 54, 70.

> own conscience may best conduce and tend to the publicke weale of the body without respect of person or favour of any man. So help me GOD in the LORD JESUS CHRIST.[163]

While certainly not proto-republicans in any sense, it is without a doubt that Puritans looked at the circulation of power among elites in London, Versailles, and Rome and deemed it too exclusive. In the Catholic Church, they saw power centered on the pope and drawn downward from him to administrators in the Church and Papal States. Likewise, Catholic mass, to Puritans, seemed to be the antithesis of participation. The priest stood in front of the church, facing the altar, and spoke in Latin. Congregations did not select their priests or bishops, nor did they have any influence on the selection of the pope.

It is precisely this participation, which allowed citizens and the laity to hold extensive power over ministers and governors, which enables historians to better use the words of men like Cotton Mather. Congregations were the ones that extended invitations to ministers, the laity paid the minister's pension, and exercised, as they often did, their right to expunge ministers which they did not like or disagreed with. This means that the sermons and writings of Puritan ministers hold more weight than other writings by intellectuals or officials in other regions and periods. New England's emphasis on participation allowed its people to do things not seen in places like England or Europe. It is logical then, that church members must have agreed with, approved of, or at the very least leaned towards, most of the words and actions of their ministers. Additionally, albeit discussing the eighteenth century (specifically Concord), Robert Gross effectively

---

[163] *The Oath of a Free-Man*. Microform. *Early American Imprints*: first series. "Printed at Cambridge in New England: by Order of the Generall Courte. Moneth the First - 1639."

demonstrates the importance churches and ministers had in the hearts of the regions' inhabitants.[164] Often, tensions within towns and congregations arose when travel to churches was too great, splintering communities and creating whole new municipalities. Likewise, congregations were serious about the selection of their ministers and what those ministers said and believed, highlighted especially during times like the Antinomian Controversy and the divide between the "Old Lights" and "New Lights."

By 1647, about fifty-percent of adult males could vote in Massachusetts.[165] These same colonists believed that the "most important business of state-making was to prevent arbitrary rule."[166] In fact, later during the Dominion of New England, Protestants, including Puritans, believed that the "lack of representative institutions screamed popish absolutism."[167] As we have discussed earlier, Catholicism merged with arbitrary tyranny to form a common stereotype. When colonists advocated against arbitrary rule, they had both men like Charles I and the pope in mind. Considering this, the system of Rome became a political, not just religious, threat to the government and peoples of New England. Ponder both the religious and political tensions in Thomas Hooker's "Survey of the Summe of Church-discipline." Hooker, looking into the past, states that:

> King Henry the eighth, *he further clipped* [the Pope's] *wings in temporalls, shook off and renounced* that supremacy *that* [the Pope] *had arrogated and erected over kings and kingdoms in former ages: only that is storied of him as his mistake, he* cut off the head of Popery, but left the body of it (*in* Arch-bishops, Primates,

[164] For more information, see Gross's first chapter "Do Not Be Divided for So Small Matters."
[165] Hall, p. 92.
[166] Ibid., p. 24.
[167] McConville, p. 33.

Metropolitans, Archdeacons,) *yet within his realm, and the Churches there established*.[168]

In many places, like Plymouth, Connecticut, and Rhode Island, political authority was placed in the hands of freemen. The franchise, however, was based mostly on religious affiliation. As a result, this new political culture could never accept something similar to the structure of power in the Catholic Church, or in England of old.

In their great experimentalist reforms, the Puritans created a "fundamental reworking of authority."[169] David Hall asserts that the system of church governance implemented by the New England colonists was unlike anything seen in England. Hall identifies five improvements. First, Puritans eliminated tithes and ecclesiastical courts. Secondly, they prohibited the clergy from holding office. Thirdly, the distinction between church and state was codified in written law. Congregations were allowed to discipline their members regardless of their class or status. Finally, with their legal reform, civil and criminal laws were closely united with Scripture.[170]

Participation reached new levels in the colonies. According to Hall, "Sanctioned, encouraged, and seized upon in unpredictable ways; participation became an integral aspect of civil and religious life in early New England."[171] Some of the common innovations and implementations in law and government seen in the region include: the requirement that assembles and general courts meet at least two times a year; powers of the general court to legislate and identify specific duties of government officers, while town meetings limited local officials; annual or semi-annual elections for governors,

---

[168] Hooker, Thomas. *A Survey of the Summe of Church-discipline*. 1648. TS, Princeton Theological Seminary Library. Princeton University, London. *Internet Archive.org*. Web. 23 Oct. 2014. Preface.
[169] Hall, p. 115.
[170] Ibid., p. 115.
[171] Ibid., p. 54.

magistrates, and deputies; and the mandatory (or, at least encouraged) rotation of the office of governor, among others.[172] Notice how radically different these powers and reforms are in comparison to absolute kingship and the role of pope. For example, unlike New England governors, popes and kings served for life. Or in the case of the laity, Puritans believed that Catholics had a passive role in their worship at mass. The Puritan reforms outdid the compromises made in the wake of the Long Parliament and Charles II's Restoration, creating in practice the closest thing to Puritan ideals ever seen at that point in history.

Rejecting the Catholic influences of the English Church, while at the same time combating the Catholic Church, was seen as continuing the Protestant dream, or in the words of Puritan Samuel Willard, "carrying on of the Work of Reformation."[173] It was the logical step towards continuing the Reformation that began in the early sixteenth century. Fighting for body and soul against Catholicism, Puritanism can be seen through a larger viewpoint of the continuing existence of the Protestant Reformation, as well as a fight for Empire and personal safety. Puritans, especially "thinking" Puritans, sought to continue to reform. Willard epitomized this idea when he urged Protestants to "Give a spirit of Reformation to all his people, that such a work may be universally consented to, that we may all set our hearts and shoulders to the Work; doubtless there is no greater good we can beg for at the hands of God at this time."[174]

In 1624, Reverend John Lyford, an ally to the Church of England, arrived in Plymouth only four years after the colony's founding. William Bradford, a Separatist,

---

[172] Hall, p. 47-8, 70.
[173] Willard, Samuel. *Useful Instructions for Aprofessing Peope in Times of Great Security and Degeneracy*. Cambridge: 1673. Microform. *Early American Imprints*: first series; no. 184. p. 70.
[174] Ibid.

detested Lyford, as all the Separatists did. Separatists argued that a complete break with the Church of England was needed in order to shed the last vestiges of Catholic influence, especially in regards to traditions and rites. For Separatists, the English Church was, like the Catholic Church, not a true church at all.[175] Puritans believed in reforming the English Church, but not necessarily breaking from it. Within Puritanism, there existed a radical Separatist wing, but not all Separatists spoke for all Puritans. However, Separatists did speak out against the continued influence of Roman Catholicism within the Church of England, and virtually every Puritan agreed with them in this regard.

As mentioned above, Bradford detested Lyford because he performed rites in communion with the Church of England. Opposition to the newcomer mounted as he baptized children and performed other sacraments, as well as working on the Sabbath. A general court was called by the governor and Lyford was sentenced to banishment from the colony.[176] While this particular story contains threads of both Puritanism and Separatism, it does highlight the volatile environment that existed in Plymouth, and in other parts of New England, which sought to shed itself from Catholic influence. Consider a quote from Cotton Mather, who said that "tho [New England] be in the same Latitude with *Italy*, [it] is yet amongst the sincerest of its *Antipodes*."[177] In other words, New England was the antithesis of Italy, the location of Rome and the pope. Similarly, these two groups believed that the English Church relied too much on old, antiquated, and even superstitious Catholic tendencies.

[175] Morgan, *Visible Saints*, p. 20-1.
[176] Hermes, p. 79-83. This account of John Lyford is taken from Katherine Hermes's discussion in her second chapter "Foundation and Fundamentals."
[177] Stanwood, p. 322.

Catholic influences within the Anglican Church included sacramental rights and its strict hierarchy. Genuflecting or bowing in front of statues or images of saints or crucifixions were considered idolatry by Puritans; the same sin as worshiping a golden calf. Likewise, swearing an oath – an act accepted in Catholic countries and even in Anglican England – in a civil ceremony, either by touching or kissing a Bible, was also idolatry.[178] The Anglican Church was too formal, like the Catholic Church, and these groups sought to change that. They required no universally fixed tithes and many went further to argue that the episcopacy of the Church of England, especially the office of bishop, was arbitrary and unchristian. The heavy use of Latin, which for Catholicism was a unifying language, became by the seventeenth century outdated. Puritans and Protestants in general believed that prayer and church should be done in the native language of the community. Likewise, Scripture should be read in one's native language as well. The Latin Vulgate was rejected in favor of English translations like the King James Bible, first published in 1611.

Certain Catholic practices, which Puritans believed could not be traced back to Scripture, were seen as superstitious. These included certain sacraments like confession and the transubstantiation of the Eucharist; the use of holy water; saints' days; the prohibition of the consumption of meat on Fridays; the use of crosses or other symbols (especially the Cross of Saint George); the practice of indulgences; and the celibacy of the clergy, among many others. Anglicanism retained several traditions that Puritans and Separatists disapproved of. For example, Anglicanism integrated ritual and ceremony much like Catholicism. Certain holidays, like Shrovetide, the English carnival that welcomed the arrival of Lent, were deeply Catholic and still endorsed by the Church of

[178] McConville, p. 33.

England. Shrovetide was banned in Massachusetts because, in the words of Brendan McConville, "the open practice of this Catholic-tainted ritual threatened to rupture the covenant between God and Massachusetts that had existed since 1630."[179]

Indulgences were a major issue for Puritans. In the Catholic Church, indulgences were ways in which individuals could shed temporal punishments (the results of sins and not the sin itself) by performing good works, in line with their justification for divine salvation as discussed earlier. Examples of indulgences included certain prayers, pilgrimages to holy sites, fasting, and the ever-misunderstood act of monetary donations. During the late Middle Ages, monetary indulgences were abused, as officials demanded larger amounts of money while even reassuring the forgiveness of sins; this resulted in the widespread infamy known today and, most importantly in our discussion, to Puritans. Indulgences became one of – if not the most – detested Catholic doctrines for Puritans. According to Michael Carter, "The Protestant hostility to indulgences came to encompass all the other practices perceived as the fruits of popish priestcraft."[180] In this light, the idea of indulgences, for Puritans, often overshadowed and corrupted the other tenets and practices of Catholicism.

For anti-Catholic opponents, indulgencies seemed to be a "license to sin," allowing individuals to procure an indulgence for future sins. Likewise, it seemed as if the pope and other clergymen had authority to define sins, changing their positions whenever it benefitted themselves and their pockets. Of course, this perspective was part ignorance and part legacy from the Middle Ages. Martin Luther, in his *Ninety-Five Theses* (1517), loudly criticized the connection of indulgences with monetary

[179] McConville, p. 29.
[180] Carter, p. 54-5.

contributions, despite not opposing the idea of indulgences itself in theory. However, indulgences were seen by most of the post-Reformation Protestant generations as the epitome of Church corruption.

Indulgences took on a political tinge too. For Puritans, indulgences represented not only corruption but power as well. In this perspective, the pope had power over the "consciences and loyalties of men," as Carter argues, and the "dispensation over the entire moral law;" this resulted in the raising of "the specter of priestcraft and its perceived dangers from mere superstition and backwardness to a terrifying "arbitrary" tyranny that would, if allowed to infiltrate the monarchy or other positions of power, destroy all British liberties and even true Christianity itself."[181] Dispensations worked the same way; the pope could withdraw obligation to certain laws for individuals. This power was seen as a political threat as well. One minister wrote: "Dispensations with Gods commands are many times *Anti-Christian*, and very dangerous: To dispense with Christs commands practically…is unlawful, much more doctrinally, most of all authoritatively, as the Pope takes on himself to do."[182]

The pope, Protestants believed, could arbitrarily forgive sins, release men of their loyalties to law and kings, and endorse or support specific sins. Take John Flavel's words, as he merges the stereotype of Catholics as saboteurs, Catholic imagery, and the supposed corruptness (and dangers) of indulgences:

> [Rudolf] *Hospinian* shows us how the *Jesuits* animate him, whom they employ for the murdering of Kings; they bring him into a Chappel, where the Knife lies

[181] Carter, p. 55.
[182] Shepard, Thomas. *Eye-Salve, Or, A Watch-Word From Our Lord]esus Christ onto His Church Especially Those within the Colony of the Massachusets In New-England, To Take Heed of Apostacy*. Cambridge, 1673. Microform. *Early American Imprints*: first series; no. 182. p. 32.

> wrapt upon a Cloath with *agnus Dei* engraven upon it; then they open the Knife and sprinkle it with Holy Water, fastning to the Halt some consecrated Beads, with this Indulgence, That so many Stabs as he gives the King, so many Souls he saves out of *Purgatory*.[183]

Remember that the Puritans mixed politics and religion into their laws, using Biblical law for many of its institutional foundations. For them, Catholicism and the pope represented both a spiritual and political threat, especially with their armies and conspirators. The word priestcraft came to embody arbitrary power, centered on the clergy, over religious and political institutions. Shedding its influences in law, politics, and religion would prevent Catholicism (and the pope) from infiltrating their society and government.

In regards to music, Congregationalists favored singing by "ear" as opposed to by "rule" or "note" as heard in Anglican and Catholic masses.[184] Demonstrating the fear of Anglicanism, and its relation to Catholicism, a citizen of Massachusetts wrote that "once we begin to sing by rule, the next thing will be to pray by Rule; we must have the Common Prayer, Forsooth, and then comes Popery."[185] Even singing in a certain way could invite corruption and Catholicism into prayer. The hierarchical structure of both churches is also starkly contrasted with the congregational nature of Puritan churches as well. Furthermore, unlike the two sacraments accepted by dissenters, the Anglican

---

[183] Flavel, John. "Tydings from Rome or England's Alarm." Cambridge, Mass.: 1668. Microform. *Early American Imprints*: first series; no. 131. p. 22-23. Michael Carter also discusses this specific passage in relation to indulgences in his work "A "Traiterous Religion": Indulgences and the Anti-Catholic Imagination in Eighteenth-Century New England." *Catholic Historical Review* 99.1 (2013): 52-77. Print. p. 62.
[184] Hermes, p. 251-2.
[185] Ibid., p. 253.

Church recognized seven – the same number as Rome. In their eyes, the "hand of popery as represented by the Church of England grasped at the men of New England."[186]

Like most Protestants before them, Puritans rejected the physical Catholic *church* template; that is to say, they built their churches quite differently from Catholics. They viewed grand cathedrals, with their large stained glass windows, statues of saints, and crucifixions, as blasphemous and idolatrous. Protestants looked upon Catholic churches with judgmental eyes, viewing them as too large, with their high ceilings, and grand spectacle; Protestants saw them as unreceptive and perhaps impersonal. Even today it is easy to feel small inside a large Gothic church that took centuries to construct. Instead, Puritans tried to build simple, idol-less structures that represented their religious tenets. They did so because they viewed the Catholic template as idolatry, or idol worship. As Edmund Morgan writes, "Though man delights to create God in his own image, the Puritans strove hard to avoid doing so and whitewashed churches and smashed idols wherever they recognized them."[187] All of these aspects and more put Puritans at odds with the Churches of England and Rome.

What Queen Elizabeth had feared in 1576 regarding the slippery slope of legitimacy began to bear fruit. In Massachusetts in 1634, colonist Richard Brown filed a complaint that Richard Davenport, the ensign-bearer, had caused sedition by removing the red cross from the king's colors. Puritans espoused a strong iconoclasm, attacking any images, representations, or symbols that, for them, bordered on idol worship. As Katherine Hermes states, "The Court was rather sympathetic to the ensign's position; the

[186] McConville, p. 35.
[187] Morgan, *Puritan Family*, p. 161.

cross was, after all, a sign of superstition and "a relique of anti-christ."[188] While they favored Davenport's actions, they ruled against him out of a fear of retribution from the Crown. While ultimately deciding against Davenport, Puritan leaders' shedding of Catholic influences, or "relics of the antichrist," began to creep towards politics and the monarchy, as it did the English Church.

Puritanism in New England took on even greater importance with the rise of the euphoria surrounding millennialism that took place during the seventeenth century.[189] Many Puritans and other Protestants believed that the coming of Christ was close at hand. By the end of the century, Rome would fall, the antichrist would be destroyed, and Christ would establish his kingdom. Anti-Catholic sentiment took on another dimension as Catholics were seen as an impediment to the swift action of the Second Coming. At the same time Puritans were establishing a godly state in America, they were focusing on combating Catholicism to bring about the final judgment.

In all, Puritans sought simplicity, activity, and liberty from arbitrary tyranny. They tried to accomplish these feats through congregationalism and participation. A decentralized structure would eliminate abuses like indulgences and simony. Puritan congregationalism, in combination with militant Protestantism, rejected large Gothic churches, church hierarchy, and doctrines considered idolatrous. It was a step towards the primitive church prior to its corruption by Catholicism. Participation, which filtered through every level of life, was an act of war upon those practices, associated with the Catholic Church, deemed unchristian and oppressive. They tried to establish a Puritan utopia of godly, visible saints in accordance with the laws of Christ.

---

[188] Hermes, p. 99. Hall cites the same example in his chapter "Godly Rule," p. 100.
[189] Hall, p. 104.

Dissent in New England Congregationalism:

The nature of dissent in New England, prior to the Antinomian Controversy, did not differentiate much between Puritans and non-Puritans. According to Katherine Hermes, "Dissent from within was as common as dissent from without" and "Both challenged the legal, political, and religious order."[190] When it came to heresy, however, communities felt the need to suppress such dissonance. Ironically, the region that espoused participation in various forms in law and religion also denounced division as a physical and spiritual threat. Also ironically, for an area that emphasized voluntarism and sincerity, several New England colonies, including Massachusetts, New Haven, and Connecticut passed laws that required every citizen to attend church services.[191]

Dissent was disruptive as ever. As Hermes argues, "The leaders seem to have valued differences of opinion, but only to a point."[192] Looking through records of the Massachusetts General Court, she discovered a pattern: "The people who were before the court appear in other records as members of particular groups who stood in varying degrees of opposition to the majority of the colony's leaders."[193] Most of arguments tended to be politically centered, like questioning the legitimacy of the courts and governor, and not minority groups asking for religious or ethnic toleration or enfranchisement. It demonstrates the level of patience (or lack thereof) that leaders and majority groups had for dissenting opinion, even if in this case it was limited to the realm

[190] Hermes, p. 34.
[191] Morgan, *Visible Saints*, p. 123.
[192] Hermes, p. 97.
[193] Ibid., p. 96-7.

of politics. Criticizing certain officials, for example, could result in public apologies, whippings, fines, and brandings, just to name a few.[194]

Hermes identifies inherent key experiences in the shaping of law and religion: consensus, inclusion, and exclusion. When the settlers left England in 1620, reaching consensuses became a chief goal in matters of policy. Inclusion and exclusion were methods at reaching that objective. The removal of people and relocation of congregations impacted New England identity, helping to restrict dissent and increase an emphasis on unity in places like Massachusetts. Banishment and excommunication took on highly symbolic roles, as "many of the godly saw it as a way of mitigating divisiveness and ensuring harmony."[195]

Puritans, for a number of reasons (religious, economical, martial, social, etc.) feared division. Katherine Hermes tells a story (and the controversy) that erupted in a Watertown church. In 1631, some members of the church, including the pastor George Phillips and elder Richard Brown, declared the Catholic Church a true church. The storm that ensued grew to such a clamor that John Winthrop and members of Boston's First Church went to investigate. The real issue at heart, according to Hermes, was the division that the pastor was making within the church, rather than his views.[196] Surely the pastor's pro-Catholic views were not ignored, however. Despite this overlook, Hermes's story echoes the fear Puritans had over division. The "code of conduct" of a New Englander was to preserve harmony; "When he joined in a town meeting," Robert Gross explains, "[the New Englander] would set the needs of the group before his own and strive to think

[194] Hall, p. 84.
[195] Hermes, p. 103-5.
[196] Ibid., p. 90-1.

as his neighbors thought. In the course of discussion, he might properly disagree with another speaker, but always reluctantly, with a spirit of accommodation in his heart."[197]

Banishment, exile, and excommunication were tools that were utilized to create a consensus. It allowed policies to be implemented that favored the majority over the minority, as well as universal church discipline. If people were unsatisfied, they could relocate, as Thomas Hooker and his congregation did, or they could protest and risk banishment. Puritans tended to favor reconciliation, but only if the individual was prepared to recount and preserve the established harmony. This is the type of atmosphere that allowed anti-Catholicism to thrive during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. "At the heart of legal ritual in New England," Hermes declares, "was insistence on upon submission to authority, be it parental, religious, or secular."[198]

Hermes argues that these types of banishments – like those of Roger Williams and Anne Hutchinson – were less about religion and more about authority. The Watertown congregation that argued that the Catholic Church was a true church was not banished, for example. She is right in identifying authority as a particular sticking point in the goal of consensus. However, in the Watertown example the congregation was Protestant derived; it was not a Catholic congregation by any means. English Protestants may be reasoned with, but non-English Catholics would be at the receiving end of any exile or violence had they disrupted any thread of harmony.

Instead of banishment, relocation, leaders believed, was the best alternative for dissenters. "Divisions of people who disagreed about the relationship between religion and law," Hermes contends, "moved to places which enabled them to experiment in their

[197] Gross, p. 14.
[198] Hermes, p. 158.

preferred direction."[199] This relocation had its limits, of course. Puritans who disagreed with legal doctrine or Protestants who argued over religion were much more likely given the choice to set up camp elsewhere and experiment than religious dissenters of Catholic or non-Protestant origin. Likewise, those protesting legal or political customs were likely given relatively lenient punishments compared to those opposing religious ones.

One of the greatest threats to consensus and harmony in Massachusetts arose in the late 1630s: the Antinomian Controversy. Antinomians believed that "faith alone, not obedience to the moral law, was necessary for salvation," and used the same rhetoric of anti-Catholicism that Puritans used against Catholics.[200] They were followers of the tenets of "Free Grace" which rebuffed orthodox preaching. Anne Hutchinson was accused of being an antinomian and she presented major problems for leaders: she was an outspoken woman and a believer in her own personal revelations. Hermes focuses primarily on the factionalism that Hutchinson caused with the Massachusetts community. This, according to the author, was the reason why she was investigated and eventually banished. However, she ignores the larger theological war going on in regards to the Reformation. Protestant churches, Puritans among them, argued that revelations outside of Scripture had stopped after the period of Christ. Only Scripture was to be trusted. The Catholic Church, of course, believed differently; Scripture and ongoing revelations, which were revealed to the Church over time, provided the template for ultimate salvation.

In repudiating moral law as fundamental, Antinomians denied the authority and clout magistrates and churches had on civil law. Regardless of the beliefs of the

[199] Hermes, p. 120.
[200] Ibid., p. 124; Hall, p. 122.

Antinomians themselves, their existence within New England highlights several key points. First, the Protestant legacy of reshaping identity, experimentalism, and rebelling continued even in the American colonies. Secondly, the participation feature of the Congregational Way allowed individuals to discuss aspects of theology away from ministers. It also gave them access to evaluate ministers and their beliefs; when ministers were deemed unacceptable, the congregation could go out and seek a replacement. They could also relocate to another colony or town.

The impact of the Antinomian Controversy was felt well after the flames dissipated. According to Hermes it forced officials and communities to decide on the appropriate level of debate and dissension.[201] Different opinions and personal faith were restricted and individual liberty was officially superseded by communal harmony. Excommunication had previously been more symbolic in gesture prior to the controversy, but afterwards it took on a more permanent role. "New Englanders," Hermes concludes, "had come to accept removal and separation as the inevitable consequence of difference."[202]

David Hall attests that, unlike in places like England and France where a close alliance of church and state sought uniformity (through the uses of punishments like executions, fines, and imprisonments), New England avoided such pitfalls by creating checks in power, particularly through the participation of ordinary people.[203] However, Hall fails to recognize the use of exclusion, through banishments, excommunications, and intimidations (even among their own church members), that Puritans exercised to sustain uniformity in decisions and populations. Likewise, unlike in England, New England

[201] Hermes, p. 122.
[202] Ibid., p. 134.
[203] Hall, p. 124.

generally housed a more uniform populace, especially those who adhered to Puritanism but also other likeminded militant Protestants. In other words, besides the occasional Quaker, Baptist, or Irish Catholic slave, Puritans did not have to confront large populations of minorities like England did with English or Irish Catholics.

Spiritual Education & Piety:

Puritan parents were obliged to provide spiritually for their children, just as much as any physical or material requirements. Massachusetts, in the 1640s, passed laws that required parents to teach their children to read, demonstrating their commitment to a tenet of Protestantism, as well as requiring that "all masters of families doe once a week (at the least) catechize their children and servants in the grounds and principles of Religion."[204] In 1673, Puritan minister Samuel Willard reiterated the importance of instructing children and servants in religion, framing it in the spirit of the Reformation: "Reform others that are under thy charge, as far as thou canst do thy best; say to thy Children, as *Jacob* to his sons, *Put away every one from among you his strange gods*."[205] Of course, the "strange gods" line is an indirect reference to Catholicism, especially a reference to the many charges Puritans had against Catholicism for idolatry.

Literacy, as well as knowledge of laws (which were derived from God, especially the capital laws), enabled children to learn about God. A literate laity, as we have discussed earlier, was a hallmark of early modern Protestantism. Likewise, knowledge, Puritans believed, was a powerful tool against Satan and the obliviousness pushed by the Catholic Church. Edmund Morgan argues:

---

[204] *Massachusetts Laws of 1648*. Morgan, *Puritan Family*, p. 88.
[205] Willard, Samuel. *Useful Instructions for Aprofessing Peope in Times of Great Security and Degeneracy*. Cambridge: 1673. Microform. *Early American Imprints*: first series; no. 184.

> [The Puritans] retained throughout the seventeenth century a sublime confidence that man's chief enemy was ignorance, especially ignorance of the Scriptures. By keeping the world in ignorance, they thought, the Roman Church had stifled true religion. When the people finally recovered knowledge of the Scriptures, the light of the gospel broke out in the Reformation, and as long as the people had this knowledge, the light would continue to shine.[206]

In other words, literacy, spiritual education, and knowledge of the laws gave children – who would grow up to become citizens and church members – the tools necessary to combat the evil and errors of the Catholic Church.

Increase Mather held the same belief, exclaiming that "Ignorance is the Mother (not of Devotion but) of HERESY."[207] Children were born in ignorance. The heresy Cotton referred to, at least partly, was Catholicism. This is more evident when taken in context with other texts. Thomas Shepard warned:

> yea, and mischief (perhaps) shall be laid in, in the very primmers for children whereby they may even suck in poison in their tender years: & also in the pictures and images of Christ, of the *Virgin Mary*, and other canonized popish Saints, &. Sold in some shops, or brought over among us: things that will take with children, but though they may seem *minute*, yet will surely prove of dangerous consequence at length to those tender years, and may become an Introduction to Popery it self.[208]

---

[206] Morgan, *Puritan Family*, p. 89.
[207] Ibid., p. 89.
[208] Shepard, Thomas. *Eye-Salve, Or, A Watch-Word From Our Lord]esus Christ onto His Church Especially Those within the Colony of the Massachusets In New-England, To Take Heed of Apostacy*. Cambridge, 1673. Microform. *Early American Imprints*: first series; no. 182. p. 31.

When taught appropriate catechism, they would stop performing evils out of ignorance and become closer to God. Shepard's work also hints at the presence of "popish" items sold in New England shops, demonstrating the likely truth that society was still tied to Catholicism. Early education was thus a step towards salvation; to skip or delay this step periled individuals to act out of ignorance, potentially committing heresy in the process.

Morgan discusses the instruction of children through catechism books. As mentioned previously, Massachusetts passed a law that required all fathers to teach their children from a catechism at least once a week. This catechism was a book, written in question and answer format, which outlined tenets of Puritanism. The father would ask the child a question, and the child answered from memorization. Morgan argues that this system was designed specifically to prevent things like heresy, stating that "This method of instruction was not designed to give play to the development of individual initiative, because individual initiative in religion usually meant heresy."[209] While the catechism books were not written with Catholicism in mind per se, it is important to acknowledge another example that the threat of heresy – or religious beliefs contrary to Puritanism – troubled these communities.

One of the major themes of the migration to New England, according to Puritans themselves, was the future of their children. According to this narrative, the Puritans traversed the Atlantic in order to secure a godlier place for their children. In 1682, Samuel Willard famously preached that "the main errand which brought your Fathers into this Wilderness, was not only that they might themselves enjoy, but that they might settle for their Children, and leave them in full possession of the free, pure, and uncorrupted

[209] Morgan, *Puritan Family*, p. 98.

libertyes of the Covenant of Grace."[210] One of those origins of corruption was undoubtedly the Catholic Church.

While Puritans abhorred certain types of rituals – especially ones that were overly Catholic, or "sacramental rituals," – they emphasized piety. Piety for Puritans was, according to Hermes, "rigorous self-analysis."[211] Self-meditation replaced outward ritual. This meditation has its origins in Catholicism; even Hermes agrees that "There was, of course, a tradition within Roman Catholicism which was a predecessor to the psychology of conversion that became identified with Puritans."[212] Similarly, Francis Bremer acknowledges that "Puritans, like other English Protestants, drew on the writings of the fathers of the Catholic church, including Augustine and Aquinas" as much as the writers of the Reformation.[213] Examination and transformation of the inner self was where and when true conversion to Christ occurred, according to Puritans, and not the external and sacramental rituals used by Catholics. But meditation was also a hallmark of Catholicism, especially the types found in monasteries and promulgated by men like St. Augustine. It was, after all, Augustine that wrote "Without you [God] I am my own guide to the brink of perdition."[214] Even in self mediation and piety Puritans were both intellectually and theologically indebted to Catholic writers just as much, and even more so, than Protestant ones.

[210] Morgan, *Puritan Family*, p. 168.
[211] Hermes, p. 138.
[212] Ibid., p. 138.
[213] Bremer, p. 15.
[214] Saint Augustine. *Confessions*. Trans. R. S. Pine-Coffin. London: Penguin, 1961. Print. p. 71.

Chapter Four: The Fight for Empire:

The origins of English hatred for the Spanish and French began well before the colonizing of the New World. However, certain events that occurred during and after the discovery of the Americas greatly impacted Puritan thought towards those empires and Catholicism in general. Many English entrepreneurs saw the New World as a dream-like place where great things could occur. Pollution was occurring, however. The Spanish, Portuguese, and French, all Catholic powers, had already occupied large swaths of land. They were converting natives, in the eyes of the English, at an astonishing rate, corrupting their souls and defiling the land. Englishmen were flustered at the idea of England's chief rivals converting thousands of natives for their Catholic army, claiming and occupying lands rich in resources and beauty, all the while expanding their influence, power, and physical boundaries.

The English settlement at Roanoke, established in 1585 (the same year as Elizabeth's ascension to the throne), was the first attempt to capture the English dream, a dream that in and of itself had several threads, including "a dream," Edmund Morgan writes, "in which Protestant Britons liberated the oppressed people of the New World from the slavery that the papist Spaniard had imposed on them."[215] The Spanish were particularly menacing for the English, especially in the early years of colonization. When Christopher Columbus "founded" the New World, he was funded by the Catholic Spanish monarchy. Soon afterwards, much of South America, Central America, and parts of North America came under the influence of the Spanish. It was an empire that was unparalleled for its time, growing larger than even the limits of ancient Rome; "During the sixteenth century," Alan Taylor writes, "the Spanish created the most formidable

[215] Morgan, *American Slavery, American Freedom*, p. 6.

empire in European history by conquering and colonizing vast stretches of the Americas."[216]

The English were obviously jealous of the Spanish, especially of the gold and silver the Spaniards were importing. As a result, the English constantly authorized the raiding of Spanish galleons, some of which were wildly successful. The English had been suspicious of the Spanish since Mary's marriage with Philip that occurred decades before. Fear continued to grow as well, and in more ways than one. Of course, they feared like all other European countries that the Spanish were growing too large and were wary of an increasing military and economic threat. English Protestants were not afraid of war, whether it was against one's own sins, the antichrist or rival empires. One Puritan minister embodied this truth, writing that "A Christian must be a [Soldier]" and that "It is the Duty of every Christian to look at and carry himself as a [Soldier] in the Fight…"[217] In the same document, the minister concluded "[The] Anti-Christ must Fall, and the Enemies of the [Puritan] Church shall be overcome by a material Sword, as well as by a Spiritual one."[218]

The Protestant English were also afraid of the horrors that they believed were happening under Spanish watch. The so-called "Black Legend," exaggerations and myths born out of real Spanish atrocities, spread throughout Europe, especially in places like Protestant England. According to the "Black Legend," the Spanish were cruel and sadistic in their dealings with the natives, employing torture, rape, and pure evil in the construction of their empire. The English colonized the New World with such legends in

---

[216] Taylor, Alan. *American Colonies: The Settling of North America*. London: Penguin, 2002. Print. p. 51-2.
[217] Moodey, Joshua. *Souldiery Spiritualized, or the Christian Souldier Orderly, and Strenuously Engaged in the Spiritual Warre, And so Fighting the Good Fight*. Cambridge, 1674.. Microform. *Early American Imprints*: first series; no. 193. p. 5.
[218] Ibid., p. 39.

mind, although all European empires committed similar atrocities in the Americas, including the English. But in the minds of English Protestants, who were reminded of persecutions during the reign of Bloody Mary, it was deja vu as natives were being slaughtered by another Catholic tyrant, this time in the New World.[219]

Spain was one of the first colonizers to devote abundant resources to the conversion of the natives to Christianity. Of course, that particular strain of Christianity was Catholicism, and, when compared to the English, the Spanish were quite successful in their attempts. Obviously, this drove the English crazy. Consider the envious, yet horrified tone of Increase Mather's account of Spanish conversion:

> [Jesuit Cardinal Robert] *Bellarmine* and others of the Popish Faction, have taught that Baptism doth sanctifie the unclean, and therefore that it is not prophaned, though it be Administred [sic] to unclean persons. Histories tell us what wild werk the men of that Religion have made of it, when they have pretended to *Christianize* the poor miserable *Indians* in some places of *America*, It is reported that in the Kingdome of *Mexico* sundry of their Preachers did in a few years time baptize each one of them above one hundred thousand.[220]

While many Protestants may have opposed the conversion of natives, especially since most converts perhaps could not be counted on as "thinking" Protestants, they were still greatly irked by the conversion of large numbers of natives to their Catholic rivals. For Mather, and others like him, such conversions were "Anti-Apostolical and Anti-Christian."[221]

---

[219] Morgan, *American Slavery, American Freedom*, p. 6-8.
[220] Mather, Increase. "A Discourse concerning the Subject of Baptisme." Cambridge, Mass.: 1675. Microform. *Early American Imprints*: first series; no. 207. p. 73.
[221] Ibid., p. 73.

With Elizabeth's crowning, the Protestant fear of martyrdom at the hands of the English government subsided within the motherland, but their distaste and distrust for the Spanish only grew. Spain continued to grow richer and more powerful. Mercantilism was the philosophy of the day, and it promulgated that the success of one empire was always at the expense of another. There were only so many resources, minerals, lands, and precious metals (gold and silver) in the world, and the empire or state that obtained the most of these things was at the best position over its rivals. Therefore, in the minds of the English, as the Spanish economy and reserves grew, the English counterparts declined. Defeat of the Spanish on the battlefield would thus weaken her might, and "Any blow struck against her in the New World could be viewed as a blow for truth as well as freedom" due to "Spain's aggressive Catholicism."[222]

As the decades wore on, the French became the biggest threat to English interests in the colonies. Spain encountered one of its greatest defeats in the disastrous failed invasion of England in 1588, known as the Spanish Armada. That is not to say the Spanish did not continue to threaten the English or Protestantism afterwards, however. While the Spanish eventually lost power to the English and French, it continued to carry the banner of Catholicism. Philip II and his immediate ancestors continued the Spanish monarchy's "close alliance with the Catholic cause."[223]

Anti-Catholicism as a Unifying Mechanism:

Despite the simple fact that very few Catholics lived in New England, Catholicism impacted Puritan society in one other way: it helped to unify different congregations, communities, and individuals. As Katherine Hermes states, "If there was

[222] Morgan, *American Slavery, American Freedom*, p. 9.
[223] Hsia, p. 49.

one common element in the religious beliefs of the first New England settlers, it was that Roman Catholicism was anathema to true Christianity."[224] Additionally, Brendan McConville argues that this truth extended well into the eighteenth century British Empire. On the subject of conversion from within, McConville writes:

> It was not the actual number of Catholics that in the end frightened imperial officials. The fear of internal subversion, of Britons turning to Catholicism and Catholic ways, expressed a starkly Calvinist view of the human soul. In that worldview, Protestantism and British Protestant liberty demanded much….There was always a danger that that which was asked was too much, that the individual soul might be seduced by Catholic spectacle and the range of emotions it could create.[225]

As we have seen already, Protestantism developed in part as an opposition to the established Catholic Church; fashioning its identify by comparing itself to Catholicism. That resistance continued centuries after the initial Reformation and permeated every English colony.

Owen Stanwood asserts that the Glorious Revolution (1688-89), which witnessed the overthrow of the Catholic King James II by the Protestant William of Orange, was a watershed moment in the amalgamation of Protestantism, anti-Catholicism, and the Anglo-American Empire. Prior to this event, the English Empire in the New World was comprised merely of trading posts and dispersed colonies with very little government intervention (until the Dominion) and even less synchronization. As the new century crept on, however, the Empire was shaping up: "By the eighteenth century," Stanwood

[224] Hermes, p. 138.
[225] McConville, p. 118.

writes, "…Britons on both sides of the Atlantic considered themselves to be subjects of a global polity, ruled by a single monarch and united by common religious, political, and economic beliefs."[226] For Stanwood, this period saw the emergence of a rather unified English Empire. However, one aspect remained consistent throughout the entire colonial process: most English, especially the Puritans, remained virulently anti-Catholic.

In Stanwood's account, two contrasting visions of the British Empire exploded during the late seventeenth-century. The first, espoused by men like Sir Edmund Andros (the royal governor of the Dominion of New England), saw a future where the New World was the center; a place where the king's power could be propelled the world over. The second, according to Stanwood, was a group who "advocated another kind of empire centered on religious ideology: a loose combination of territories defined by their common Protestantism and allegiance to an English, Protestant monarch and united in their opposition to Catholic France – a diabolical enemy whom they believed to be plotting against them."[227] Men like Cotton Mather supported this view, believing the empire was a means for defeating Catholicism and promoting global Protestantism.

The Spanish fear had fallen since the defeat of the Spanish Armada in 1588, although it was always present, like in the case of the War of Jenkin's Ear in the eighteenth century. During the French Wars of Religion, the French and Spanish often allied themselves with each other. Political lines would also blur, as they often did, with the intermarriage of royal bloodlines. By the beginning of the eighteenth century, great wars would be undertaken over successions. One particular one, the War of the Spanish Succession, was sparked with the death of Spanish king Charles II. Having no heirs, the

[226] Stanwood, p. 318.
[227] Ibid., p. 318.

king willed succession to Philippe of Anjou, a young French duke. Anjou was the grandson and protégé of Louis XIV, and began the Spanish line of the Bourbon dynasty.[228] War would break out between the alliance of France and Spain and their hated rivals England and the Holy Roman Empire, highlighting the ever present threat of the Spanish state.

Meanwhile, fears of the French continued to grow, hitting the high mark during the seventy-two year long reign of Louis XIV, also known as the "Sun King." Under the French king's management, Catholicism continued to progress, irritating Protestants, especially those who believed Catholicism was both a physical and spiritual threat like the Puritans. The Sun King reformed the French bureaucracy and government, building an absolutist state in the process, and began to inch his influence upon the other European powers by the 1670s.[229] Historians have debated for decades whether Louis was truly an absolutist monarch, but the important thing to understand is that it was true in the minds of English Protestants who viewed the Sun King as an arbitrary and Catholic tyrant.

Other monarchies sought to emulate the Sun King's actions in order to check his power and increase their own influence. The English Stuarts were examples of such monarchies: an absolutist, centralized state would surely consolidate the Empire under the king's will, cut down on corruption, expand royalist rights, and check local power, these men thought. However, many Englishmen, especially Puritans, viewed emulating the Catholic French king as treasonous and – even worse – blasphemous. For them, Louis was not a "secular ruler" but "an agent of the Antichrist who needed to be resisted at all

[228] Demos, p. 9.
[229] Stanwood, p. 318.

costs."[230] This is why, as detailed by Stanwood, so many upheavals occurred during the period between communities and the colonial governments. British writers on both sides of the Atlantic attacked absolutism as an indicator of Catholicism.[231]

Placed in the sphere of "Atlantic history," Stanwood acknowledges that historians have often overlooked the religious network that connected the colonies and England. However, Stanwood traces the English anti-Catholicism of 1689 to the 1678 "Popish Plot," a fake conspiracy that many English believed was an attempt at religious massacre and the assassination of Charles II by an underground network of Catholics. As we know, the origins of English anti-Catholicism stretch back much farther than a decade – back to the beginning of Reformation, in fact (and perhaps even longer than that). Nevertheless, Stanwood provides insight into the context of the anti-Catholic hysteria: Protestants acted out because they were afraid of Louis' influence, especially at the English Court, and his growing political, economic, and religious power.

This fear was not limited to the English mainland. Stanwood quotes a newspaper entry by the Englishman Benjamin Harris, prior to his migration to Boston in 1686. Harris reported on a massive fire in Boston, in the heart of New England, in 1679. According to Harris, the fire, which destroyed hundreds of houses, "was done by Treachery and Design, and there is a *Frenchman* in Prison upon the same account."[232] Preying on the old anti-Catholic stereotype of the saboteur, Harris molds the French and Catholic identities into one. Catholicism was always a specter of danger, and it united English Protestants and Puritans alike.

---

[230] Stanwood, p. 318.
[231] McConville, p. 20.
[232] Stanwood, p. 319.

The Dominion, Re-Anglicization, Royalism, and Aftermath:

The period prior to the Dominion of New England laid the foundations for re-anglicization, or a move towards more mainstream English customs. According to Katherine Hermes, "Re-anglicization was a necessary incorporation of current English cultural and institutional practices and not a return to the English ways of the founders."[233] It was the result of the growing English empire; increasing royal oversight and attendance, and the valuable trade network. Piety and ritual, according to Hermes, became more public. The Puritans were already changing, slowly becoming – in law and culture – more synched with the current English Empire. They did not give up their religious uniqueness quite yet, but they would soon suffer a blow to their political hegemony.

The establishment of the Dominion of New England brought with it royal government, causing a gradual conformity to common English standards of procedure in law in the region and an upheaval of the previous order. Began by Charles II and instituted by his brother James II, the monarchy underwent a campaign to clamp down on the American colonies. Men like Edward Randolph and Edmund Andros implemented the consolidation of a governmental territory running from Maine to New Jersey under the scope of a single governor and council, which was personally chosen by the king. Prior to the Dominion, New England society grew increasingly filiopietistic towards the region's Puritan founders. The re-anglicization of New England, or the so-called climbing back "into the imperial fold," after the ascension of James I focused on accepting contemporary instead of Puritan practices.[234] The English government sent

[233] Hermes, p. 137.
[234] Ibid., p. 61.

over more advisors, officers, and military men to inforce both the king's and Parliament's will. By the time of the Dominion, the Puritans found themselves right in the midst of this transformation.

In utilizing their origin myth as both exiles and loyalists, the Puritans argued that any action performed contrary to the King's wishes was only done so out of their own duty to the colonial royal charters, which indirectly was correct service to the government. Stanwood argues that the close proximity of the French (New France) caused the colonists under the Dominion, including the Puritans, to look at the new English protectorate as another step in the takeover of the French Catholics. In fact, the English officials were emulating the French; those who developed the Dominion "hoped to build a similar system [like New France] across the woods in New England."[235] Of course, they were not handing the government over to the French. Rather, the English officials believed building a similar, efficient system was the best method at combating their Catholic rivals.

According to Stanwood, the "push for empire came specifically out of a fear of the French, a fear that many colonists shared with their brethren in England."[236] In truth, the French acted as the new scapegoat and boogeyman that populations and governments use to rally their people. Some English, like the Tories, looked at the struggle for empire through secular eyes: the French are our enemy because they are powerful, not necessarily because they are Catholic. Others, however, "interpreted the French threat as

[235] Stanwood, p. 321.
[236] Ibid., p. 321.

a new manifestation of the popish Antichrist that had been battling the true church for centuries."[237]

Just as the current civil and political customs of the royal English began to supersede those of native New England and Puritanism, as described by Hermes, the Puritans increasingly accepted their role as a part of a global struggle between Catholicism and Protestantism, as described by Stanwood. "By claiming a special role for their homeland," Stanwood argues, "Reformed leaders in Massachusetts and other plantations attempted to become full partners in an imperial struggle for true religion against the forces of global Catholicism."[238]

They were particularly horrified by the ascension of James II, a Catholic, to the English throne. Stanwood quotes Cotton Mather in order to emphasize the Protestant fear and depression that set in with the new king's crowning. Mather spent his day "in Humiliations, and Supplications…to deprecate the Confusions with which the Protestant Religion and Interest, were threatened by the Accession of that Prince unto the Throne."[239] In addition to James's ascension, Stanwood identifies one other post-1685 event that shook English Protestants: Louis XIV's repeal of the Edict of Nantes, which had previously guaranteed certain rights and religious toleration to French Huguenots.

The wording of Louis's 1685 revocation emphasizes France's renewed war on the Huguenots, simply stating that "we decided that there was nothing better we could do to erase from memory the troubles, the confusion, and the evils that the growth of this false religion [Protestantism] had caused in our [French] kingdom…than to revoke entirely the

[237] Stanwood, p. 322.
[238] Ibid., p. 322.
[239] Ibid., p. 322.

said Edict of Nantes."[240] With this action, French Protestants began to flee the Continent, often migrating and forming settlements in places like Massachusetts, where they recalled their negative experiences with French Catholicism to all those willing to lend an ear to listen.

With the arrival of the Dominion and more English customs came the arrival of Anglicanism, the religion of English officials. Anglican services and churches were increasing in frequency, often by order. This no doubt disturbed, or at the very least annoyed, Puritans and Separatists who, after all, aimed to reform or separate from the English Church. Even worse, Anglican religion began rubbing off. "After 1685," Hermes concludes, "Congregationalism's move toward ceremonialism and ritual, in order to accommodate a creeping Anglicanism was an abdication of its position as a reforming institution."[241] Even congregational clerics were ministering marriages and performing eulogies at funerals that were more Anglican in custom.[242]

Most native New Englanders rarely interacted with the Anglican Church prior to the Dominion, only possessing a "historical distrust of Anglicanism," in some ways comparable to Catholicism.[243] Puritans had previously tried to extend the Reformation to the English Church. During and after the Dominion, however, hatred for Anglicans grew rapidly for native born New Englanders, as they had for other more prominent minority religions. Many times Congregationalists waged a "silent war" on Anglicanism, using indirect and sometimes direct actions like refusing to grant land for services.[244] As quoted

---

[240] "Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, Fontainebleau, October 25, 1685." *Louis XIV and Absolutism: A Brief Study with Documents*. Ed. William Beik. Boston: Bedform / St. Martin's, 2000. 193-95. Print.
[241] Hermes, p. 211.
[242] Ibid., p. 236.
[243] Ibid., p. 238.
[244] Ibid., p. 247.

by Hermes, the ever-opinionated Cotton Mather wrote that the work of the "high-Flying Church of England" was "to poison and seduce and divide…"[245] Once again, the fears over division, seduction, corruption, and death well up from beneath.

It was not just Anglicanism that had been arriving for some time: "Of the recent immigrants, a vocal and insistent minority who opposed Congregationalism – Baptists, Quakers, and Anglicans – were gaining a foothold in places other than Rhode Island."[246] The increase in Anglican activity, the creation of the Dominion, the ascension of an English Catholic king, the success of the Sun King's absolutism, and the perceived ongoing war with the Antichrist in Rome culminated in renewed fears of physical invasion and distrust. The French were to the north, the Spanish to the south and in between them stood the English. Natives, meanwhile, surrounded the colonies and acted, they believed, as the tools of Catholic-native conspiracies.

Utilizing the old stereotype of Catholics, especially priests like the Jesuits, as saboteurs and schemers, English colonists, including those in New England, viewed increasing native raids as the work of Catholicism. The Jesuits were, after all, the primary missionary order for the French in the New World. With the colonists' fears of a Catholic invasion mounting, Andros and the Dominion underwent a foreign policy campaign aimed at winning the favor of surrounding natives and tradesmen instead of war, which won over little of the colonists' support.

When Andros finally did go to war against the natives, he "impressed hundreds of young men from Massachusetts towns and sent them to Maine, where they endured a tough winter under the command of strangers with foreign ideas about military

[245] Hermes, p. 242.
[246] Ibid., p. 212-3.

discipline."[247] Impressment, as always, proved unpopular and rumors circulated that the war was a conspiracy to "drain New England."[248] The atmosphere was charged: "In the political-cultural conflict that developed between colonists and kings," McConville writes, "seemingly minor things like kissing a book as part of an oath could be understood as a tyrannical act designed by a popish ruler to covertly bring on arbitrary government."[249]

All of this coincided with the Glorious Revolution, which saw William of Orange, a prominent advocate of Protestantism, invade England (under Protestant invitation) and dethrone the apparently-Catholic James II, who was progressively more disliked in the motherland. News traveled slowly over the Atlantic and Andros and other Dominion officials were stuck between a rock and a hard place. Unsure if the reports were true, they kept quiet and suppressed Orangist propaganda. These actions promulgated distrust and hatred amongst the Protestant colonists who were growing more excited with each unofficial report and rumor. Protestants, including the radical Puritans, believed their fears were confirmed when James finally fled England to live in rival France.

Andros himself came under attack. He was either an arbitrary ruler working on behalf of a king that defected to the enemy or an ineffectual leader that could not protect his people.[250] Beginning in Boston, rebellion spread to other colonies in 1689. Here was an opportunity to reshape the scope of the British Empire, forged under anti-Catholicism. Utilizing secular reasoning and phrasing, the colonists tried to bill "their rebellion as a mirror to the English one" in order to try and restore the old charters that were replaced

[247] Stanwood, p. 325.
[248] Ibid., p. 325.
[249] McConville, p. 15.
[250] Stanwood, p. 326.

by the Dominion.[251] But, harkening back on the millennialism mentioned earlier, some believed that the "transatlantic revolution was part of a cosmic drama that would end with Christ's return;" for, after all of the turmoil, persecutions, and violence, the End of Times was surely near.[252]

Apocalyptical writings flourished. The Reformed leaders could now look upon William and Mary as leaders against Catholicism and the antichrist. In the new Protestant Empire, rights and liberties would be preserved and guaranteed. This is why, argues Stanwood, these colonists wrote about the guarantees of the old charters and a more decentralized empire. Stanwood effectively applies the Puritan religious experimentalism to their political views:

> These radicals favored a decentralized empire because they felt that local control would best preserve the true church, while still understanding the necessity of unity in the face of such danger. Essentially they attempted to translate their approach to church governance to the state, calling for godly people to adopt the role that lay leaders played in the Reformed churches, with the king as a distant figurehead.[253]

As mentioned previously, the Puritans' experimentalism was rooted not just in their political motivations but their religious ones too, especially their desire to become as un-Catholic as possible. Even at the end of the seventeenth century, they continued to emphasize a congregational, decentralized political view that acted as a bulwark against the ideals of the centralized, highly hierarchical Roman Catholic Church, prior Catholic Stuart monarchies, and Catholic French absolutism.

---

[251] Stanwood, p. 328.
[252] Ibid., p. 328-9.
[253] Ibid., p. 329.

Finally, in 1689, war broke out between France and England. The French utilized their alliances with natives to attack settlements, something that the English colonists had often feared. In reaction, and in an attempt to demonstrate the validity of their decentralized theories, colonists from several colonies, including those in New England, invaded New France. After some modest gains, the invasion was ultimately unsuccessful and the English retreated back home. This setback was the nail in the decentralized coffin; the colonial leaders could neither defend their communities, nor organize effective military strategies. For Stanwood, the nature of anti-Catholicism had changed over the period of rebellion; they failed "because they espoused an outdated brand of anti-Catholicism that viewed the world in terms of the ongoing, apocalyptic struggle between papists and Protestants."[254] No longer could Protestant leaders divide people into two groups – the godly who battled the papists and those in league with them.

With the euphoria of William and Mary's ascension and the failures of the decentralized colonial leadership, the gap between the average English colonist and the Puritan and other radical Protestant's view of the godly individual widened. The apocalyptic fear of the final showdown between Christ and the antichrist resided increasingly with the educated classes. The flavor of anti-Catholicism among the average colonist, including those in New England, continued to echo the saboteur: "a violent enemy that endeavored to burn towns and butcher children."[255] These fears tended to be associated with more likely dangers: encounters with New France, relations with the natives, and the memory of religious persecution in England. Instead of promoting Protestantism the world over, as men like Mather echoed, the state's true duty was to

[254] Stanwood, p. 331.
[255] Ibid., p. 332.

defend its citizens and communities. When the Dominion could not defend its colonists against Catholic France, Stanwood concludes, the people rebelled. This is somewhat similar to Edmund Morgan's discussion on Puritan covenants, where larger group covenants often focused on the present instead of the afterlife.

This is not to say, however, that apocalyptic anti-Catholicism died, or that the English stopped viewing their government as a bastion for defending and promoting Protestantism. Rather, the two anti-French views, mentioned earlier, formed an amalgamated empire on both sides of the Atlantic. Colonists continued to read about Protestant causes on the Continent and believed that "the British monarch was the primary defender of global Protestantism."[256] In the end, the origins of the Empire under William and Mary were forged by several strains of anti-Catholicism. When the Protestant Stuarts failed to produce an heir, the Act of Settlement (1701) was passed. It outlawed Catholics, or those married to Catholics, from ascending to the crown (a rule that Linda Colley points out is still in effect today).[257] Once again, Protestants defined themselves and their empire by contrasting it to Catholicism.

Stanwood's discussion is not narrowed to only New England or to Puritanism. However, his well-articulated argument demonstrates a new trend in colonial history – Atlantic History. Atlantic History focuses on bigger picture-type threads. Instead of looking at a colony or region – say New England – as an isolated territory, it looks deeper at the ties that bind said colony with others, stretching across the Atlantic to England and elsewhere. In this same vein, my discussions of New England and Puritanism are Atlantic-like. New England was not isolated politically and economically. Likewise, it

[256] Stanwood, p. 332.
[257] Colley, p. 47.

was not isolated religiously. It was a cog in a greater English colonial anti-Catholic machine that began with the Reformation and "ended" presumably with the American Revolution, although the legacy of anti-Catholicism would continue to live on even after American independence.

As the eighteenth century began, "Anglicanism had become a force in New England life both religious and political."[258] While Congregationalism remained the single largest religious group in the region, it lost power as more prominent citizens became members of the English Church. Despite their loathing, Congregationalists never persecuted Anglicans like the French did Huguenots. But they did not embrace them as brothers, nor did they even truly tolerate them. Likewise, anti-Catholicism continued to flourish, finding homes in both Congregationalists' and Anglicans' hearts. As Brendan McConville writes, "In the royal America that existed between the Glorious Revolution and 1776, that which we call political culture, the milieu in which politics takes place, was decidedly monarchical and imperial, Protestant and virulently anti-Catholic, almost to the moment of American independence."[259]

The changes brought on by the Dominion and the growth of the English Empire in many ways unified the colonies. As mentioned above, Stanwood identifies that the Dominion brought English colonists united under the umbrella of Protestantism and Empire. Equally, McConville, with an eye towards political culture, recognizes the post Dominion period as a time of further unification: "Shaped by what [the colonists] saw, heard, and read, an ever-growing number of provincials identified themselves as Britons and referenced versions of British and English history as their own," situated in the

[258] Hermes, p. 248.
[259] McConville, p. 7.

"ongoing struggle between pan-European Protestantism and Catholicism, absolutism, and popery."[260]

It was also during this post-Glorious Revolution period when the king became a personal figure for colonists. With its Protestant dedication and military successes, the English king became the embodiment of the Empire and the figurehead for colonial affections. Royalism became a primary "force of change."[261] In the Act of Settlement (also known as the Act of Succession), Roman Catholics were banned from ascending the throne. This fact demonstrates the period's religious commitment. Not only did Protestants hold their belief so strongly as to inhibit royal bloodlines, but the Catholic Stuarts were just as adamant in their faith; they clung to their religion even though giving it up would lead to the English crown. The king was linked to the colonists through his commitment to protect Protestantism (much like Elizabeth's Deborah personage) and the colonists' outward portrayal of deference: "The key imperial tie became the emotional one between the individual and the ruler created in part by the spectacles that celebrated the monarch's life and the defeat of Catholicism in England."[262] Across the Atlantic, a similar development had been occurring for decades in France. Under the leadership of Cardinal Richelieu, French royalism became identified with Catholicism, increasing antagonism for the French in the English world.[263]

There was opposition to the increasing royalism. Puritans fought tooth-and-nail to preserve its oligarchy and the New England Way. Samuel Sewall recorded and bemoaned every royalist encroachment on Puritanism, like celebrating the queen's birthday on the

[260] McConville, p. 7.
[261] Ibid., p. 10.
[262] Ibid., p. 50.
[263] Hsia, p. 70.

Sabbath and placing the monarchy and government ahead of God and his ministers in the processional order; common complaints against Catholicism and absolutism. But even Sewall and his Puritan contemporaries recognized that the alternatives to Empire and the Hanoverian dynasty were even worse than the status quo: "regicide and republicanism, absolutism and popery, those riders from the home islands that had tortured the empire in the seventeenth century – were even worse."[264] A similar adjudication took place in England itself, when Protestants accepted the Hanoverian George I as king, a distant cousin of Queen Anne (who was childless). George I's claim was at least fifty places removed from the nearest Stuart, but all the remaining Stuarts were Catholic. It was more acceptable to English Protestants to crown a distant German Protestant, although it was widely believed that he did not even speak English at the time, than an English Catholic with a much better claim to the throne; religion conquered over nationality, Protestantism over English bloodlines.[265]

One major implementation that helped ease royalism and direct Empire was Pope's Day: "As difficult as it may seem to believe, hideous effigies of the pope and other Catholics carted and burned on November 5 each year helped seal the imperial contract and make the first British empire real."[266] Once again, Catholicism played a central role in shaping British and colonial identity, and anti-Catholicism remained as fervent as ever. Pope's Day helped colonists remember the effects of the Glorious Revolution, God's intervention on behalf of the Protestant monarchy, the divisive and murderous nature of Catholicism, and the successes of the Empire.

[264] McConville, p. 55.
[265] Carter, p. 65.
[266] McConville, p. 56.

Pope's Day had been a holiday in England and the American colonies since the 1660s. Massachusetts declared it a special day of thanksgiving in 1667, and while it was opposed by Puritans for decades, it became a recognized holiday in New England after 1688. Ministers spent the day delivering sermons damning Catholics, while nights were spent around bonfires, burning effigies like the devil, the pope, and anti-Catholic figures like "Pope Joan." The towns, cities, and individuals who participated in the celebrations demonstrated their commitment to both destroying popery (to which McConville calls "a Protestant political culture") and upholding the Empire.[267] Additionally, during times of increasing friction with Catholic France, effigies of French sympathizers were used as well.[268] Additionally, other holidays had anti-Catholic touches also: January 30th was Charles I's execution, while August 1st was the fastening of Protestant Succession with the establishment of the Hanoverian dynasty.

Imperial holidays – like Pope's Day and the king's birthday – helped to form cohesion within the sprawling British Empire. Colonial officials used such celebrations as a tool to unite their colonies and form affections for the Empire's identity. McConville determines that "By the eighteenth century's first decades, a political marching culture like that in modern Northern Ireland, militantly Protestant and anti-Catholic, was in place in every major provincial American town and village."[269] Anti-Catholic political cultures had already existed in the English colonies prior to the Glorious Revolution, as we have seen already. However, as Puritan power declined in New England, imperial power all throughout the colonies grew.

[267] McConville, p. 62.
[268] Ibid., p. 59-61.
[269] Ibid., p. 79.

Hand-in-hand, as imperial power grew, so did anti-Catholicism. Even compared with England, "the colonies," McConville writes, "were ultra-Protestant."[270] Similarly, histories were studied through an imperial lens, forming causation lines "of particular dynasties to God's holy Protestant design."[271] Some made comparisons between the defense of Briton from Caesar, and defense of the British Empire from Roman Catholicism. Print culture that espoused anti-Catholicism prospered; "Lurid antipopery, for lack of a better term, flooded the empire's print culture" after the Glorious Revolution.[272] The defeat of the Dominion and of the Stuarts' supposed tyranny led to an increase in anti-Catholicism throughout the English colonies.

In the colonial sphere of the burgeoning empire, anti-Catholicism also shaped historical interpretation of not just dynastic lines but of Oliver Cromwell's protectorate. Those who approved and disapproved of Cromwell's dictatorship after the English Civil War now viewed their perspectives through the lens of anti-Catholicism. Those who disapproved looked at certain Protestant groups, like the Puritans, as *Cromwellian* due to their association with "radical sectarians." But others rehabilitated Cromwell's image in an effort to "justify a more assertive use of royal prerogative to fight [Catholic] France."[273] The latter feeling was particularly strong in New England, especially in Connecticut, where Cromwell was viewed as a defender of the faith.

The end result of these types of royalist implementations was the acceptance of (and the belief that English citizens needed) the Protestant-yet-foreign Hanoverian dynasty. In essence, anti-Catholicism was the primary tool used in the colonies, including

[270] McConville. p. 79.
[271] Ibid., p. 83.
[272] Ibid., p. 113.
[273] Ibid., p. 96-7.

New England, to create support for a bloodline that, in any other period, might have been considered treasonous. Likewise, British history itself was revised and reviewed with anti-Catholicism and Empire in mind and spirit. Colonists also benefitted from the wars for empire against France, Spain, and Native Americans. According to Brendan McConville, "Imperial wars…led to vigorous economic growth funded by an unstable paper money supply."[274] In other words, not only did anti-Catholicism shore up support for the bloodline, it also helped to grow the colonial economies.

Like Protestant identity itself, which emerged from the murky waters of the European Reformation, the British Empire in the colonies, including New England, was built on shaping an identity that was in opposition to Catholicism. The identity of the Hanoverian monarchy – as Germans – had to be remade to the sensibilities of the English. According to McConville, "The two, love [of king and empire] and fear [of Catholicism], held the empire together."[275] Catholicism, of course, entailed many things. To eighteenth century colonists, especially Puritans, Catholicism took on more roles. It represented the usual: the antichrist, Rome, France, Spain, and their native allies. It added newer dimensions as well: "the Pretender" to the throne (the Catholic Stuarts, who were deposed during the Glorious Revolution) and disunion (and destruction) of the Empire.

Invasion from within was a constant fear for the English, especially for those living in the mainland. The Stuart "Pretenders" made several attempts at seizing the crown, often with French and Spanish aid. In fact, in the eighteenth century, expeditionary armies arrived in Scotland in 1708, 1715, and 1745 in support of the dethroned Stuarts. Even more so, scares, either factual or fictitious, continuously

[274] McConville, p. 170.
[275] Ibid., p. 113.

peppered the period and the peaceful minds of English Protestants. A successful overthrow would mean several things. Of course, it would place a Catholic at the head of government and church. That had ramifications on both sides of the Atlantic, as Puritans had experienced during the Dominion. Likewise, the overthrow attempts tended to have international Catholic support, and any successful attempt most likely meant the potential for foreign occupation by the French or Spanish.[276] Additionally, although Scotland had been allied with France in prior times, the new opposition to Catholicism cultivated in the mainland allowed Protestant Scots to oppose French intervention and, as a whole, the French government.

Like Stanwood and McConville, Linda Colley isolates the era as a period of considerable identity-fashioning for Britons. The author argues specifically that this molding took place after the 1707 Act of Union, which merged England and Wales with Scotland. It was during this period such an identity was "forged above all by war."[277] For Colley, war, especially against the French, proved to be the foundational concrete needed for creating and transforming the British identity. According to the author:

> Time and time again, war with France brought Britons, whether they hailed from Wales or Scotland or England, into confrontation with an obviously hostile Other and encouraged them to define themselves collectively against it. They defined themselves as Protestants struggling for survival against the world's foremost Catholic power. They defined themselves against the French as they imagined them to be, superstitious, militarist, decadent, and unfree…[278]

[276] Colley, p. 24.
[277] Ibid., p. 6.
[278] Ibid., p. 6.

While Colley argues that anti-Catholicism represents one, albeit important, factor in the shaping of British identity, it is interesting that the words she elects to use, "superstitious," "militarist," and "unfree," can refer to the many stereotypes used against Catholics, as absolutists, enslavers, and heretics. Even non-religious qualms had anti-Catholic tinges. Additionally, as we have seen, focusing on the Catholic "Other" had been occurring within both mainland England and the colonies for centuries before the Act of Union.

Admitting that historians often forget to acknowledge the obvious, Colley bluntly hits home the fact that Protestantism was at the core of the unification of the three territories of England, Wales, and Scotland (although she concedes that the three were united in their dedication to Protestantism before the union). Colley forcefully argues that "Protestantism was the dominant component of British religious life. Protestantism coloured the way that Britons approached and interpreted their material life. Protestantism determined how most Britons viewed their politics. And an uncompromising Protestantism was the foundation on which their state was explicitly and unapologetically based."[279] It is no wonder then, regardless of the precise years of origin, how anti-Catholicism became the central and unifying aspect of British identity.

Despite the fact that various divisions separated Protestant denominations, like Puritans, Quakers, and Baptists, the "gulf" between Catholicism and Protestantism "was still the most striking feature in the religious landscape" of the British Empire.[280] In other words, while divisions were real among Protestant groups, their dissimilarities with each other paled in comparison to their differences with Catholicism. In the mother country

[279] Colley, p. 18.
[280] Ibid., p. 19.

throughout the eighteenth century, Catholics were barred from holding civil offices, including membership in both houses of Parliament, were subjected to heavy taxes, and disfavored in regards to opportunities in education, religious worship, and property rights. They were also prohibited from owning weapons and were considered "un-British" and "potential traitors."[281] The British state was "pluralist yet aggressively Protestant."[282] This element carried over into the colonies.

McConville argues that the Protestant political culture, which "rested on love for the king, fear of Catholics, and the desire to consume in emulation of the British gentry," grew exponentially in the colonies after the Glorious Revolution and only ended with the American Revolution.[283] He is certainly right. As we have seen, fear of Catholicism had always been present within the colonies, especially in New England, and anti-Catholicism flourished in every period. It took on newer dimensions, as both McConville and Stanwood discuss, with the rise of the imperial (and Protestant) British Empire. In fact, this so-called "troika of love, fear, and desire" proved to be the foundation of the empire in the New World, as more people identified their king as "a loving Protestant ruler" where "loyalty to the king was loyalty to Protestantism and reformation."[284] Colonists in every colony began to hang portraits in their homes and carry medals on their persons of the Protestant monarchs as the material culture began to grow, creating more outlets for showcasing their religious and political opposition to Catholicism.[285]

---

[281] Colley, p. 19.
[282] Ibid., p. 19.
[283] McConville, p. 105-6.
[284] Ibid., p. 106, 172, 209.
[285] Ibid., p. 119-137. For more information, see McConville's section "Envy, Desire, and the Commodification of the Monarchy."

The First Great Awakening, which swept colonial American between the 1730s and the 1750s, had profound consequences for New England. Conservative Puritans, who were already losing power to royalism and the encroaching Empire, held tight on their traditional roles of authority, while revivalists saw more individuality as the means for greater attunement with God. Yet, while schisms were occurring within New England congregations, anti-Catholicism remained a key link between the two opposing sides. Like the traditionalists who always opposed Catholicism, revivalists argued that Protestantism and Catholicism were still at war for the souls of Christ's people on earth, that the king protected the empire from the antichrist, and that those who disagreed, were ignorant of, or, at the very least, seemed not to care, were dangerous.[286] In 1739, George Whitefield wrote that "there needs no other argument against popery, than to see the Pageantry, Superstition, and Idolatry of their Worship."[287] In this particular quote, Whitefield adds nothing new to anti-Catholicism; he, like countless other contemporaries, simply rehashed the old stereotypes and objections against Catholicism that had been used for generations.

Ironically, the English colonies soon absorbed many of the aspects they detested of the French and of other Catholic monarchies. The Hanoverians, in an effort to connect their legitimacy and bloodline back to the ancient English kings, began the rehabilitation of the Stuarts' images in the mid-eighteenth century, although most continued to view the monarchs as Catholic tyrants.[288] A portion of colonists began using absolutist language – like the solar imagery, "the sun," – to describe their beloved monarchs. Not in the same

[286] McConville, p. 167.
[287] Ibid., p. 167.
[288] Ibid., p. 192-202. For more information, see McConville's chapter "Neoabsolutism," especially the section "Time Amended: History, Aesthetics, and the Stuart Rehabilitation."

vein as the Sun King, Louis XIV, these comparisons flowed from the scientific laws of Newton and a well geared universe.[289] Equally, the colonists borrowed heavily from French absolutism for defense of their colonies, in terms of hierarchy, design, and standardization. As McConville argues, "There could be no greater irony than these efforts to save British liberties by making British colonies over on the model provided by the hated French and their New France colony."[290] Following closely after the death of George I, divine right monarchy, a government philosophy usually reserved for Catholic kings, came back in vogue among the English.

As the cult of monarchy continued to grow, especially in the colonies, a rehabilitation of the divine right political philosophy – that is, the belief that the monarch divinely derives his legitimacy and power directly from God – occurred. In the midst of the ages-old war of words (and swords) between Protestantism and Catholicism, the colonists, like Boston minister Benjamin Colman, reapplied divine right to the Hanoverian monarchy. Colman argued that "Our faithful zeal for and adherence to the Protestant Succession in the House of Hannover, is our fidelity to CHRIST and his holy Religion."[291] The monarchy went from a defender of Protestantism to a divinely sanctioned régime guided by Providence, owing greatly to the Catholic divine right philosophers and kings of the past.

Anti-Catholicism continued to be strong during the post-Dominion period. The region's political and social cultures shifted as the decades wore on, but leaders and commoners alike continued to utilize anti-Catholicism in their personal ambitions, whether for religious or political authority. It was only until the tides of political upheaval

[289] McConville, p. 203-09. For more information, see McConville's section "A Newtonian Sun King."
[290] Ibid., p. 223. For more information, see McConville's section "Designs Shaped by Defense."
[291] Ibid., p. 209.

became too strong with the unraveling of empire that anti-Catholicism fell from the forefront, although it continued to calmly lay beneath the surfaces like a deadly undertow.

Conclusion:

Socially, as the eighteenth century wore on, the population in the colonies grew to outpace land, royal offices and titles. Coupled with a mounting material economy, which allowed colonists to obtain materials traditionally associated with Britain's aristocracy, anti-Catholicism began to take a backseat to more direct and pressing needs leading up to the American Revolution.[292] Land in older towns became scarce and depleted for growing generations. As Robert Gross states, "The impending shortage of land posed a fundamental threat to traditional family life," forcing younger generations to either move west or live with less material wealth and property than their parents.[293]

Politically, the colonists, in New England and beyond, believed that the king was a protector from tyrannical sources, like Parliament. Provincial sentiment changed when their beloved protector failed to safeguard their interests against their enemies, this time within the Empire, such as in the case of regional finances and the controversy over currency. This failure and the collapse of the façade, grown in the colonies, that the king was the source of sovereignty led to the shattering of monarchical legitimacy throughout the colonies. This is not to say, however, that anti-Catholicism died with it.

In the years mounting to revolution, many believed the acts of London, which alienated so many colonists, were really conspiracies from Rome.[294] One such action was the Quebec Act (1774), which allowed religious toleration of Catholics in the Province of Quebec. Many saw the passing of the Quebec Act as an attempt to establish institutional

[292] McConville, p. 145-159. For more information, see McConville's chapter "The Problem with Patriarchy: Institutions, Events, and Empire Rethought."
[293] Gross, p. 76-83. For more information, see Gross's chapter "A World of Scarcity."
[294] McConville, p. 261-266. For more information, see McConville's section "Dynastic Conflict, Anti-Catholicism, and the Contours of Conspiracy Theory."

popery as well as the kowtowing of the English monarchy to French Catholicism.[295] These frustrations and fears are especially evident when one takes into account the growing struggles for Empire that spilled over into the colonies, like the War of Jenkins' Ear and the Seven Years' War (the French and Indian War). Even anti-Catholic actions, like Pope's Day, took on new meaning. As early as 1765, colonists in Boston used Pope's Day as a means to demonstrate their dissatisfaction with the empire and king, adding effigies of tax collectors and British officials to those of the popes.[296] When war finally broke out between London and the American colonies, even home support for the Continental Army, which had been increasingly filled with those of "lower-class origins" like the poor, homeless, and immigrant (especially from Catholic countries), was a struggle.[297] Anti-Catholicism continued to permeate colonial culture.

The legacy of anti-Catholicism, brought forth from the English colonies' Protestant founders and shaped greatly by the Puritans of New England, continued well into and after the American Revolution. By the signing of the Constitution, seven of the fourteen U.S. states had prohibited Catholics from holding office.[298] From then on, events and movements like the opposition to France during the Quasi-War and the French Revolution during the early republic period, the rise of nativism before and after the American Civil War, the resurgence of anti-Catholicism during the twentieth century, and the religious hostility towards the election of John F. Kennedy are all part of a larger

---

[295] McConville, p. 288-90.
[296] Ibid., p. 301-2.
[297] Martin, James Kirby, and Mark Edward Lender. *A Respectable Army: The Military Origins of the Republic, 1763-1789*. Second ed. Arlington Heights, IL: H. Davidson, 1982. Print. p. 128. While the authors do not look at the foreign breakdown of the army in depth, anti-Catholicism without a doubt would have played a major role in opposition to Irish Catholic, Spanish, and perhaps even French Catholic migrants within an army already discriminated against by a majority of Protestant colonists.
[298] Carter, p. 58.

legacy that was fashioned in the hilly and rocky landscapes of New England and England proper.

New England Puritans agreed with English Puritan John Flavel, as I have demonstrated, when he wrote that "…and what cause you have to abhor Popery…it is a FALSE; BLOODY; BLASHPEHEMOUS; UNCOMFORTABLE; AND DAMNABLE RELIGION."[299] Like Flavel, New England ministers echoed (and reechoed) the several stereotypes of anti-Catholic sentiment, believing that Catholicism corrupted religion and society; it was a threat to both body and soul. Later generations, during the American Revolution and thereafter, would continue to subscribe to that assumption, albeit in diminishing numbers. Catholicism continued to be almost un-American, with its high arch ceilings, seemingly passive role, and authoritarian style that clashed with the supposed egalitarian and liberty-loving American ideology.

Despite exploring nativism between 1860 and 1925, John Higham agrees that "By far the oldest and – in early America – the most powerful of the anti-foreign traditions came out of the shock of the Reformation" (i.e. anti-Catholicism).[300] Higham argues that the American anti-Catholic sentiment, which is most widely attributed to the nativism that appeared prior to and after the American Civil War, was not truly nativistic during the colonial period. For Higham, writing in the mid-1950s, "Anti-Catholicism has become truly nativistic, however, and has reached maximum intensity, only when the Church's adherents seemed dangerously foreign agents in the national life."[301] As we have seen, Puritans (and other Protestants) took the threat of Catholicism, whether in the

[299] Flavel, John. "Tydings from Rome or England's Alarm." Cambridge, Mass., 1668. 1. Microform. *Early American Imprints*: first series; no. 131. P. 18-19.
[300] Higham, John. *Strangers in the Land: Patterns of American Nativism, 1860-1925*. New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 2011. Print. Ninth printing. p. 5.
[301] Ibid., p. 5.

form of internal saboteur or international army, very seriously. Whether the anti-Catholicism of the colonial period, specifically in New England, was nativistic matters little to this discussion; rather, the question demonstrates the legacy of the subject viewed in this dialogue: anti-Catholicism greatly impacted colonial Puritan life, and would continue to impact their ancestors, physically and figuratively, throughout every corner of the United States and in every period of the nation's history.

It is my hope that the roots of Puritanism's experimentalism and beliefs are more exposed than ever before. One cannot discuss New England Puritanism and their opposition to the Anglican Church without mentioning and exploring Catholicism and anti-Catholicism. Puritans were not just reforming their religion and politics because of their views on the Church of England; rather, they were straining to remove themselves from under the shadows of the Roman Church. Likewise, their views on religion, politics, and culture were heavily tainted with anti-Catholicism to such an extent that it is strenuous to try and separate the two, if at all possible.

It is therefore true that Puritan and Protestant culture – both home in the colonies and back in the motherland of England – was steeped with anti-Catholicism. It permeated every level of government, society, and religion for centuries. It played major roles in the experimentation with participation, reform, and decentralization. It was a significant factor in relations with natives, foreign powers, and "Others." It helped to grow royalism and the image of the king, while helping to unite a diverse Empire under the banner of Protestant rule. It legitimized one dynasty and dethroned another. It sparked emotions of fear, love, excitement, and dread; visons of life, death, and the afterlife.

As John Higham indicated at the close of his extraordinary work on American nativism, "History may move partly in cycles but never in circles."[302] The anti-Catholicism displayed by the early settlers of New England, the Puritans, would evolve in the centuries that came after them. It would take on newer meanings, different shades, and altered senses, but it would nonetheless reverberate and live on for centuries to come.

[302] Higham, p. 330.

Works Cited

Alighieri, Dante. *The Divine Comedy: Volume 1: Inferno*. Trans. Mark Musa. New York: Penguin, 2003. Print.

At a Council Held at Boston April the 4th. 1676. Boston, 1676. 1. Microform. *Early American Imprints*: first series; no. 215.

The Book of the General Lavves and Libertyes concerning the Inhabitants of the Massachusets. Cambridge, Mass., 1660. Microform. *Early American Imprints*: first series; no. 60.

Bradford, William. "Of Plymouth Plantation." *Early Americas Digital Archive*. Maryland Institute for Technology in the Humanities, 2003. Web. 28 Oct. 2014.

Bremer, Francis J. *The Puritan Experiment: New England Society from Bradford to Edwards*. Revised ed. Lebanon: U of New England, 1995. Print.

Bucholz, Robert O., and Newton Key. *Early Modern England, 1485-1714: A Narrative History*. Second ed. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2009. Print.

Carter, Michael S. "A "Traiterous Religion": Indulgences and the Anti-Catholic Imagination in Eighteenth-Century New England." *Catholic Historical Review* 99.1 (2013): 52-77. Print.

Chauncy, Charles. "Gods Mercy, Shewed to His People in Giving Them a Faithful Ministry and Schooles of Learning for the Continual Supplyes Therof." Cambridge, Mass., 1655. 54. Microform. *Early American Imprints*: first series; no. 40.

Colley, Linda. *Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707-1837*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1992. Print.

Coudert, Allison. "The Myth of the Improved Status of Protestant Women: The Case of the Witchcraze." *The Politics of Gender in Early Modern Europe*. Kirksville, MO: Sixteenth Century Journal, 1989. 60-89. Print.

Danforth, Samuel. *A Brief Recognition of New-Englands Errand Into the Wilderness*. Cambridge, 1671. Microform. *Early American Imprints*: first series; no. 160.

Demos, John. *The Unredeemed Captive: A Family Story from Early America*. New York: Vintage, 1994. Print.

Dury, John. *A Copy of the Letter Returned by the Ministers of New-England to Mr. John Dury About His Pacification*. 1664. Microform. *Early American Imprints*: first series; no. 91.

Eliot, John. *Indian Dialogues, For Their Instruction in That Great Service of Christ, in Calling Home Their Country-men to the Knowledge of God, And of Themselves, and of Jesus Christ*. Cambridge, 1671. Microform. *Early American Imprints*: first series; no. 161.

Flavel, John. "Tydings from Rome or England's Alarm." Cambridge, Mass., 1668. Microform. *Early American Imprints*: first series; no. 131.

Foxe, John. “Chapter XVI” *Actes and Monuments*. Ed. William Byron Forbush. *Foxe's Book of Martyrs*. Christian Classic Ethereal Library. Web.

Gross, Robert A. *The Minutemen and Their World*. New York: Hill and Wang, 1976. Print.

Haigh, Christopher. *English Reformations: Religion, Politics, and Society under the Tudors*. New York: Oxford UP, 1993. Print.

Hall, David D. *A Reforming People: Puritanism and the Transformation of Public Life in New England*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2011. Print.

Hermes, Katherine A. *Religion and Law in Colonial New England, 1620-1730*. Ann Arbor: UMI Dissertation Services, 1995. Print.

Higham, John. *Strangers in the Land: Patterns of American Nativism, 1860-1925*. New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 2011. Print. Ninth printing.

Hooker, Thomas. *A Survey of the Summe of Church-discipline*. 1648. TS, Princeton Theological Seminary Library. Princeton University, London. *Internet Archive.org*. Web. 23 Oct. 2014. <https://archive.org/details/surveyofsummeofc00hook>.

Hsia, R. Po-chia. *The World of Catholic Renewal, 1540-1770*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge UP, 1998. Print.

Hubbard, William. "The Happiness of a People in the Wisdome of Their Rulers Directing and in the Obedience of Their Brethren Attending Unto What Israel Ougho [sic] to Do." Boston, 1676. 40. Microform. *Early American Imprints*: first series; no. 214.

Martin, James Kirby, and Mark Edward Lender. *A Respectable Army: The Military Origins of the Republic, 1763-1789*. Second ed. Arlington Heights, IL: H. Davidson, 1982. Print.

Mather, Increase. "The Day of Trouble Is near." Cambridge, Mass., 1674. 5. Microform. *Early American Imprints*: first series; no. 192.

Mather, Increase. "A Discourse concerning the Subject of Baptisme." Cambridge, Mass., 11675. 73. Microform. *Early American Imprints*: first series; no. 207.

Mather, Increase. *The First Principles of New-England Concerning the Subject of Batpisme and Communion of Churches*. Cambridge: 1675. Postscript P. 5. Microform. *Early American Imprints*: first series; no. 208.

Mather, Increase. *The Mystery of Israel's Salvation, Explained and Applyed: Or, A Discourse Concerning the General Conversion of the Israelitish Nation*. 1669. Microform. *Early American Imprints*: first series; no. 143.

Mather, Richard. "The Summe of Certain Sermons upon Genes: 15. 6." Cambridge, Mass., 1652. 7. Microform. *Early American Imprints*: first series; no. 35.

Mather, Richard. *The Summe of Certain Sermons Upon Genes: 15.6*. Cambridge, 1652. Microform. *Early American Imprints*: first series; no. 60.

McConville, Brendan. *The King's Three Faces: The Rise & Fall of Royal America, 1688-1776*. Chapel Hill: Published for the Omohundro Institute of Early American History and Culture, Williamsburg, Virginia, by the U of North Carolina, 2006. Print.

Middlekauff, Robert. *The Mathers: Three Generations of Puritan Intellectuals, 1596-1728*. New York: Oxford UP, 1971. Print.

Miller, Perry. *Errand Into the Wilderness*. 11th printing. Cambridge: Belknap of Harvard UP, 1993. Print.

Moodey, Joshua. *Souldiery Spiritualized, or the Christian Souldier Orderly, and Strenuously Engaged in the Spiritual Warre, And so Fighting the Good Fight*. Cambridge, 1674. Microform. *Early American Imprints*: first series; no. 193.

Morgan, Edmund S. *American Slavery, American Freedom: The Ordeal of Colonial Virginia*. New York: Norton, 1975. Print.

Morgan, Edmund S. *The Puritan Family: Religion & Domestic Relations in Seventeenth-Century New England*. New York: Harper & Row, 1966. Print.

Morgan, Edmund S. *Visible Saints: The History of a Puritan Idea*. New York: New York UP, 1963. Print.

Nagel, Joane. *Race, Ethnicity, and Sexuality: Intimate Intersections, Forbidden Frontiers*. New York: Oxford UP, 2003. Print.

Norton, John. *A Brief Catechisme Containing the Doctrine of Godlines, Or of Living Unto God*. Cambridge, 1660. 12-13. Microform. *Early American Imprines*: first series; no. 63.

Norton, John. *The Heart of N-England Rent at the Blasphemies of the Present Generation*. Cambridge, 1659. Microform. *Early American Imprints*: first series; no. 56.

Oakes, Urian. *New-England Pleaded With, and Pressed to Consider the Things Which Concern Her Peace, at Least in This Her Day*. Cambridge, Mass., 1673. 55. Microform. *Early American Imprints*: first series; no. 180.

The Oath of a Free-Man. Microform. *Early American Imprints*: first series. Printed at Cambridge in New England: by Order of the Generall Courte. Moneth the First - 1639.

"Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, Fontainebleau, October 25, 1685." *Louis XIV and Absolutism: A Brief Study with Documents*. Ed. William Beik. Boston: Bedform / St. Martin's, 2000. 193-95. Print.

Saint Augustine. *Confessions*. Trans. R. S. Pine-Coffin. London: Penguin, 1961. Print.

Several Laws & Orders Made at the Sessions of the General Court Held at Boston the 13th of October 1675. Cambridge, 1675. Microform. *Early American Imprints*: first series; no. 202.

Shepard, Thomas. *Eye-Salve, Or, A Watch-Word From Our Lord]esus Christ onto His Church Especially Those within the Colony of the Massachusets In New-England, To Take Heed of Apostacy*. Cambridge, 1673. Microform. *Early American Imprints*: first series; no. 182.

Stanwood, Owen. "The Protestant Moment: Antipopery, the Revolution of 1688-89, and the Making of an Anglo-American Empire." Ed. Stanley N. Katz and John M. Murrin. *Colonial America: Essays in Politics and Social Development*. 6th ed. New York: Routledge, 2011. 317-38. Print.

Taylor, Alan. *American Colonies: The Settling of North America*. London: Penguin, 2002. Print.

Vincent, Thomas. "Gods Terrible Voice in the City of London." Cambridge, Mass., 1668. 22-23. Microform. *Early American Imprints*: first series; no. 132.

Weir, Alison. *The Children of Henry VIII*. New York: Ballantine, 1996. Print.

Willard, Samuel. *Useful Instructions for Aprofessing Peope in Times of Great Security and Degeneracy*. Cambridge: 1673. Microform. *Early American Imprints*: first series; no. 184.

Winthrop, John. "A Modell of Christian Charity." *Hanover Historical Texts Collection*. Hanover College. Web. 17 July 2014. Scanned from the Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society (Boston, 1838), 3rd series 7:31-48.