The History of the Church in America, From 1492 To the American Revolution

THE PROLOGUE

As far as anyone knows, the first Christians to set foot in the Western Hemisphere were the Vikings, under the leadership of Leif Erickson. Leif Erickson was the son of Eric the Red. Eric the Red was a pagan who resisted the aggressive evangelism of Olaf Tryggvason, the Norse king. In 986, Eric led a group of Vikings from Iceland to Greenland and established a settlement there. Eric's son, Leif was converted to Christianity while spending time in Olaf Tryggvason's court. According to some accounts, Leif was commissioned by the king to take Christianity to Greenland.[1] Eric expressed disgust when Leif brought a priest to Greenland. Even though the Norse population of Greenland never was more than 2000, churches and a cathedral were erected and in the early years of the 12th Century, a bishop was consecrated.

In 995 AD, Leif led an expedition to America. Historian, K. S. Latourette, tersely summarizes the venture,

> "It was by the Norse that Christianity reached America. How many Norse came in succeeding years we do not know. Nor do we know where they went, how many of them were Christians, or whether they made any converts among the Eskimos and Indians."[2]

Since Latourette wrote these words in 1952, a number of Rune Stone discoveries indicate that Norsemen explored the interior of the American continent, traveling the waterways at least as far as Oklahoma. Rune Stones have been found along the Missouri River and the Arkansas River, the most notable being the large Rune Stone at Heavener, Oklahoma.

---

[1] The sequence of events varies in the different ancient accounts. Exactly when Leif became a Christian and exactly how the voyage to America took place also differs. In one account, fifteen year old Leif heard stories from a Viking who had accidentally been blown off course and saw Newfoundland. Eric then carefully planned and executed the journey to America. Another account says that he was visiting the Norwegian King, converted to Christianity, sent by the king back to Greenland, and on the way blown off course, ending up in North America. Other variations also exist.

[2] K. S. Latourette, *A History of Christianity* (New York, Harper & Brothers Publishers) 1953, page 390

Be that as it may, whatever Christianity touched North America in the person of the Vikings, there is no known lasting evidence of their faith.[3] Their visit to America cannot be classed as a part of the history of the Church in America.

THE BEGINNING

American Church History began on Thursday, October 11, 1492. Christopher Columbus, "Admiral of the Ocean Sea, Viceroy and Governor of whatever territory he might discover," placed the following record in his journal:

> "Thursday, 11 October.
>
> Steered west-southwest; and encountered a heavier sea than they had met with before in the whole voyage. Saw pardelas and a green rush near the vessel. The crew of the Pinta saw a cane and a log; they also picked up a stick which appeared to have been carved with an iron tool, a piece of cane, a plant which grows on land, and a board. The crew of the Nina saw other signs of land, and a stalk loaded with rose berries. These signs encouraged them, and they all grew cheerful. Sailed this day till sunset, twenty-seven leagues.
>
> After sunset steered their original course west and sailed twelve miles an hour till two hours after midnight, going ninety miles, which are twenty-two leagues and a half; and as the Pinta was the swiftest sailer, and kept ahead of the Admiral, she discovered land and made the signals which had been ordered. The land was first seen by a sailor called Rodrigo de Triana, although the Admiral at ten o'clock that evening standing on the quarter-deck saw a light, but so small a body that he could not affirm it to be land; calling to Pero Gutierrez, groom of the King's wardrobe, he told him he saw a light, and bid him look that way, which he did and saw it; he did the same to Rodrigo Sanchez of Segovia, whom the King and Queen had sent with the squadron as comptroller, but he was unable to see it from his situation.
>
> The Admiral again perceived it once or twice, appearing like the light of a wax candle moving up and down, which some thought an indication of land. But the Admiral held it for certain that land was near; for which reason, after they had said the

[3] It could be argued that the method of calculating dates, as displayed on the Heavener Rune Stone do indicate a Christian influence.

> Salve [a Marian hymn – "Hail, Holy Queen, Mother of Mercy…."] which the seamen are accustomed to repeat and chant after their fashion, the Admiral directed them to keep a strict watch upon the forecastle and look out diligently for land…At two o'clock in the morning the land was discovered, at two leagues' distance."[4]

The religious motivation for Columbus' undertaking is described in an earlier journal entry, wherein he recounts the events that led to the initiation of his trans-Atlantic voyage.

> "…in the present month [January], in consequence of the information which I had given your Highnesses respecting the countries of India and of a Prince, called Great Can, which in our language signifies King of Kings, how, at many times he, and his predecessors had sent to Rome soliciting instructors who might teach him our holy faith, and the holy Father had never granted his request, whereby great numbers of people were lost, believing in idolatry and doctrines of perdition. Your Highnesses, as Catholic Christians, and princes who love and promote the holy Christian faith, and are enemies of the doctrine of Mahomet, and of all idolatry and heresy, determined to send me, Christopher Columbus, to the above-mentioned countries of India, to see the said princes, people, and territories, and to learn their disposition and the proper method of converting them to our holy faith; and furthermore directed that I should not proceed by land to the East, as is customary, but by a Westerly route, in which direction we have hitherto no certain evidence that any one has gone…. and ennobled me that thenceforth I might call myself Don,[5] and be High Admiral of the Sea, and perpetual Viceroy and Governor in all the islands and continents which I might discover and acquire, or which may hereafter be discovered and acquired in the ocean; and that this dignity should be inherited by my eldest son, and thus descend from degree to degree forever."[6]

From these and other statements, it is clear that the motive for Columbus' venture was to bring the inhabitants of India into the Christian faith (since Columbus thought that he was sailing to India, he called the inhabitants of the region that he discovered, "Indians").

---

[4] Medieval Sourcebook: Christopher Columbus: Extracts from Journal, www. Fordham. Edu,, page 6.
[5] *Don* is a Spanish title similar to Mister (originally, *Master*), i.e. *Don Pedro*. Usually, the term is reserved for a Spanish gentleman or a nobleman
[6] Ibid, page 1

Immediately after landing and encountering the inhabitants of the region, Columbus wrote,

> "As I saw that they were very friendly to us, and perceived that they could be much more easily converted to our holy faith by gentle means than by force, I presented them with some red caps, and strings of beads to wear upon the neck, and many other trifles…"[7]

Later in the journal he wrote,

> "I believe that they would easily be made Christians, as it appeared that they had no religion."[8]

On March 15, 1493, after his return to Spain, Columbus made one final entry in his journal,

> "I know respecting this voyage that God has miraculously shown His will, as may be seen from this journal, setting forth the numerous miracles that have been displayed on the voyage, and in me who was so long at the court of your Highnesses, working in opposition to and against the opinions of so many chief persons of your household, who were all against me, looking upon this enterprise as folly. But I hope, in our Lord that it will be a great benefit to Christianity, for so it has ever appeared."[9]

Of course, in addition to the religious motive, there was the hope of commercial profit. After Columbus and his associates had explored several islands and the passages between the islands, Columbus wrote,

> "I shall examine on the passage, and according as I find gold or spices in abundance, I shall determine what to do; at all events I am determined to proceed on to the continent and visit the city of Guisay, where I shall deliver the letters of your Highnesses to the Great Can, and demand an answer, with which I shall return."[10]

---

[7] Ibid page 6
[8] Ibid page 7
[9] Sydney E. Ahlstrom, *A Religious History of the American People* (New York, Yale University Press) 1972, page 37
[10] Medieval Sourcebook page 12

To grasp the significance of the endeavor to bring the inhabitants of India into the Christian faith, we must begin by making ourselves aware of the culture and civilization that produced Columbus and his daring venture.

Western Europe had undergone major changes in the centuries immediately preceding Columbus' fateful voyage. Three significant things that brought about these changes were:

1. The introduction of scientific theory and method.
2. The changing role of the Church
3. The rise of strong nation states

THE INFLUENCE OF SCIENTIFIC THEORY, METHOD, AND KNOWLEDGE

After Magellan circumvented the earth in 1522, no one could argue for a flat earth. However, even before Magellan, many learned people considered the earth to be a globe. In the centuries prior to the birth of Christ, various individuals had proven that the earth was an orb. For example, after detailed studies of astronomical data, especially the earth's relationship to the sun, Eratosthenes of Alexandria calculated the earth's circumference (circa 240 BC). His calculations are surprisingly accurate. A younger contemporary of Columbus, the Polish canon lawyer and physician, Koppernigk (better known by his Latin name, Copernicus),[11] demonstrated that the earth is not the center of the universe, but along with other planets, rotates around the sun. These changing views of the earth, along with improved navigational instruments, gave life to Columbus' obsession with sailing west, rather than east, in order to bring India into the Church.

THE CHANGING ROLE OF THE CHURCH IN A CHANGING CULTURE

In the Fourth Century, Emperor Constantine moved the capital of the Roman Empire from Rome to Constantinople, where it remained in succeeding centuries.[12] The eastern wing of the Church also had its base at Constantinople, where it erected St. Sophia, the marvelous cathedral that became a symbol of Byzantine Christianity. Quite naturally, the Roman Emperor identified with the Byzantine Church.

---

[11] Koppernigk (1473-1543) did most of his writing after 1492, but the questions that he pondered, and for which he produced many answers, were a part of the culture during the final years of the 15th Century.
[12] Constantinople finally fell to the Turks (the Ottomans) under the leadership of Mehmed II, in 1453.

Religious pictures, from earliest times, had been produced by devout Christians. The appropriateness of such portrayals always was a controversial subject. Some churchmen argued that the masses tended toward venerating these representations and as a result, they became idols. This objection was heightened by the accusations of Muslims and Jews that because of these icons, Christians were idolaters. The controversy became quite heated in Byzantine Christianity and ultimately the Emperor, Leo III, sided with the iconoclasts. An edict was issued by the Emperor in 725 or 726 forbidding the use of icons. With the issuance of the iconoclastic edict, problems erupted.

Gregory III, the Roman Bishop, reacted to Leo's edict by convening a council that pronounced excommunication upon the iconoclasts. From the Fourth Century onward, the Bishop of Rome had been confirmed by the Emperor. The action of Leo and Gregory's reaction permanently severed the relationship between the Byzantine Emperor and the Bishop of Rome.

During Gregory's tenure as Bishop, the Arian Lombards began subduing Italy and steadily expanded their territory toward Rome. Since he no longer could appeal to the Emperor for help, Gregory appealed to the strongest ruler in the West, Charles Martel, the ruler of the Franks. Charles Martel had saved the Roman Catholic Empire when he defeated the Muslims at the Battle of Poitiers. For reasons that are not clear, Martel refused to help the Pope repel the Lombards.

Martel's son and successor, Pepin the Short, was of a different mind. He succeeded his father in 741. In the meantime, Pope Zacharias had succeeded Gregory. When Pepin found himself the heir to his father's realm, he asked Pope Zacharias to approve his taking of the royal title. Zacharias did confirm him and thus began the tradition that the Pope had the right to both depose monarchs and to grant crowns.

Pope Zacharias' successor was Stephen II. When the Lombards succeeded in taking Ravenna, Stephen realized that the situation was desperate. He traveled to Paris where he anointed and crowned Pepin, thus confirming Zacharias' action. He also anointed Pepin's queen and his sons, one of which was the future Charlemagne. In return, Pepin waged two successful campaigns against the Lombards in Italy. Not only did he repel them, but he also

captured some cities and regions that belonged to the Byzantine Emperor. These lands were given to the Pope. Thus, Pepin's actions[13] inaugurated the temporal power of the Papacy and the Estates of the Church.

Pepin's son, and successor, Charlemagne, became the Holy Roman Emperor, who along with the Pope ruled western civilization. Charlemagne used Augustine's, *City of God,* as his guide for ruling the empire. During the Middle Ages, the Holy Roman Empire, ruled by the Pope and the Holy Roman Emperor, was the glue that held western civilization together.

As the Middle Ages drew to a close, city states and diverse ethnic groups in specific geographical regions began coalescing into nations and their rulers began to assert their independence from Papal authority. Notable among these was the Iberian Peninsula (present- day Spain and Portugal; the Roman Empire knew the region as *Hispania*). This region and its history are of primary importance to our current narrative.

In 711 AD, under the leadership of Tariq ibn-Ziyad, the North African Arab Muslims (called, *Moors*) launched an eight-year campaign against Iberian Peninsula (the Arabs called the peninsula, *Al Andalus*). At the time, Iberia was the home of the Arian Visigoth Christians, which were divided into several tribal groups. After successfully conquering and occupying Iberia, the Moors pressed north across the Pyrenees, intending to over-run Europe. As noted earlier, they were halted by the forces of the Frankish ruler, Charles Martel, at the battle of Poitiers in 732 AD. Following this defeat, the Moors gave themselves to occupying and ruling *Al Andalus.* Many Iberian Christians converted to Islam during the almost 800 years of Moorish occupation.

The unity of the Moorish state was short lived. In the 750's various Moorish sects and tribal leaders wrestled with one another for control of the region. In the same decade the Christians of Asturias (a northeastern section of Iberia) launched the Reconquista – the crusade to expel the Moors from Iberia. Simultaneously, the Basques in the Pyrenees region (the border between France and Spain) began to resist their conquerors. The result of this turmoil was the formation of a number if Islamic-ruled fiefdoms (*taifas*). For a season, the *taifas* were consolidated under the Caliphate of Cordoba.

[13] Seeking and receiving Papal confirmation of his kingship, and granting real estate to the Pope.

As the decades progressed, other Christian states in the northern and western portions of Iberia joined in the Reconquista. Navarre, Galicia, Leon, Portugal, Aragon, Catalonia (*Marca Hispanica*) and Castile began a process of internal consolidation and expulsion of the Moors. Even though the Reconquista was relentless, the Moor's were tenacious. Finally, in 1212 AD, a coalition of kings under the leadership of Alphonso VIII of Castile drove the Muslims out of central Iberia. In 1249 AD, the Portuguese, led by Alphonso III, succeeded in defeating the Moors in southwestern Iberia. Alphonso III became the first monarch to claim the title, *King of Portugal*.

By 1492, the Moors held only the most southern state, which by that time had become, *Andalusia.* Granada, the site of the famous Alhambra citadel, was the Andalusian capital.

On October 14, 1469, Isabella, Queen of Castile and Leon, married Ferdinand II of Aragon. Their marriage brought together three of the major Iberian states and thus laid the foundation for the unification of Iberia. Isabella was a very devout woman. She criticized Pope Alexander VI, for his profligacy and worldly behavior. She was fervent in her desire to bring all people into the Kingdom of God. She and Ferdinand vigorously pushed the Reconquista against the Muslims in Andalusia. Although Ferdinand was king, Isabella seems to have been the one pushing the Reconquista. Because of her evangelistic zeal and her determination to make all in her realm, Christian, she has been labeled, "the last Crusader." In 1482, a ten-year war was launched against Granada and in 1492 the Moslems conceded defeat.

Another significant event of 1492 was Isabella's successful expulsion of Jews from Iberia. From Roman times, there had been a significant Jewish population in the region. Sephardic Judaism is a product of Iberia. The Jews had been both persecuted and welcomed during the ebb and flow of various Muslim rulers. Isabella, the fervent Catholic Christian, was determined to rid Iberia of unbelievers, or to bring them into the Church. Both Muslims and Jews were pressed to convert and the Jews were given the option to convert or leave the country. Later, under the Spanish Inquisition more severe measures were instituted.

When Columbus had first proposed (1486) that the new Spanish Monarchs send him on a westerly journey to India, Isabella told him to wait until the war with the Moors had ended. Six

years later, she summoned him and funded his mission. Her driving reason was to expand the Kingdom of God, the Catholic Church, by converting the people of India.

Thus, as a result of a devout queen's passion to enlarge the Kingdom of God and a sea captain's dual motive – to bring India into the Kingdom and to prove that one could sail west to India – Christianity was brought to the Western Hemisphere.

CHRISTIANITY IN NEW SPAIN

Ferdinand and Isabella responded with vigor to the discovery of the "New World." With the authority obtained by having created a Catholic nation in Iberia, the nation of Spain – which had become the most powerful force in Europe - the Spanish monarchs were in a position to demand certain things of the Pope. At the Spanish monarchs' insistence, in May 1493, Pope Alexander VI issued two bulls, *Inter Caetera I* and *II,* which granted to Spain all lands not under Christian rule. The bulls set a line at 100 leagues (263 miles) west of the Azores and Cape Verde Islands, and declared that all lands west of this line, which on December 25, 1492 were not held by a Christian ruler, would belong to Spain.

Immediately after the issuance of the bulls, Columbus set sail again, this time he had an imposing armada of seventeen ships, bearing over 1200 men (no women), at least 5 priests, livestock, seeds, and building materials. The colony was planted on Hispaniola (Haiti). Very little flourished in the colony, except discontent and disease, but Spain had made a serious effort which over the next three-hundred years would produce significant results.

Of major importance for their future endeavors was the fact that the Spanish monarchs were able to obtain several concessions from the Pope, giving them the authority of *Real Patronato.* With this authority, the Spanish monarchy had achieved major ecclesiastical power. In the New World, the Spanish monarch, functioned as a vice-Pope. Ferdinand had the authority to:

- collect all tithes
- present candidates for all churchly offices, from the lowest curate to the archbishop
- the right to review decrees of all councils and synods held in the Indies
- the right to approve or disapprove papal decrees, bulls and ordinations before they could become official.

With this vast grant of authority, Spain assumed the responsibility to promote the Church throughout her growing empire. Conquest and conversion were assumed to go together, and every ship that brought soldiers and settlers also had a contingent of priests. The churchmen were backed by the same royal authority as were the captains and viceroys. In New Spain, Church and State partook of the same spirit, sought the same goals, and to an extent, employed the same methods. The religious zeal of Isabella and her descendents, Charles V and Phillip II, made certain that the Great Commission to baptize all nations was taken seriously.

The efforts to conquer and convert were hugely successful in Mexico, and to a lesser degree, in Central and South America. Many of the priests and lay missionaries were very devoted to their task of saving souls. Many of the early missionaries learned the languages of the Indians and were protective of the indigenous people (in contrast to the military and local government authorities). Unfortunately, as the decades progressed, corruption in local government and in some church situations displayed the inherent human failures in both Church and State.

We are tempted to devote considerable space to the history of the Church in Mexico and Central and South America, but we must avoid that temptation in order to proceed to the missionary efforts in what was to become the United States of America. Before leaving the account of the Church in Mexico, Central and South America, we need to note those things that contributed to the success, which were not present in the evangelization of North America.

First is the nature of the indigenous population. The tribes that inhabited Mexico and regions south were a structured society in which individuals were accustomed to being under authority. Thus, the Spanish authority and church hierarchy were not difficult for them to accept. Neither were these tribes war-like. There were battles, but they were not incessant and soon were over.

A second factor is the manner in which Spanish Roman Catholicism in Mexico practiced a pragmatic syncretism. One of the most obvious examples is the creation of the great shrine of Our Lady of Guadalupe, one of the richest and most elaborately decorated Mexican church buildings. The building was erected on the site that was sacred to the goddess Teotenantzin, "the mother of the gods." Among all of the figures in the ancient Mexican pantheon, Teotenantzin most closely resembles the Holy Virgin. Here is Charles S. Braden's account of the event,

> "Our Lady of Guadalupe is the name of a picture, transferred to a church, and thence to a town. The events connected with its origins are among the most remarkable in the church history of sixteenth-century New Spain. On 9 December 1531, just a century before the settlement of Boston, a fifty-five-year-old Indian, a Franciscan neophyte, beheld a vision of the Virgin, who, [in the vision] bade him ask the bishop to build a church on that spot. On the next day, fulfilling the demand for a sign, she [the Virgin] instructed [the Indian] to pick roses in a certain place, though they were out of season. He did, and brought [the roses] to the bishop. As the Indian opened his tilma [cloak] to exhibit the roses, he discovered upon [the tilma] the now famous picture of the Virgin. The church was built and, upon becoming New Spain's most popular shrine, has been repeatedly enlarged. In 1754 Pope Benedict XIV decreed Our Lady of Guadalupe to be the national patron of Mexico and made 12 December a holy day of obligation."[14]

In every feature, Our Lady of Guadalupe is an Indian. Thus, what had been the site of the Mexican Mother of the Gods, became a site of Catholic adoration. It was an easy step for the Indians to accept Our Lady of Guadalupe in the manner that they had worshipped Teotenantzin.

INITIAL SPANISH MISSIONARY VENTURES INTO NORTH AMERICA

In 1523, Charles V granted to Vasques de Ayllon the right to plant settlements on the North American east coast, "eight hundred leagues up" from San Domingo. The *credula* which authorized this enterprise is an explicit example of the Spanish emperor's religious commitment.

> "Our principal intent on the discovery of new lands is that the inhabitants and natives thereof who are without the light of the knowledge of faith may be brought to understand the truths of our holy Catholic faith and that they may come to the knowledge thereof and become Christians and be saved, and this is the chief motive you are to bear and hold in this affair, and to this end it is proper that religious persons should accompany you…and I command that whatever you shall thus expend in transporting the said religious, as well as in maintaining them and giving them what is needful… and for the vestments and other articles required for the divine worship, shall

[14] Ahlstrom, FN page 51

be paid entirely from the rents and profits which in any manner shall belong to us in the said land."[15]

In 1526, the colony of San Miguel was founded near the site of the later Jamestown (the first successful English settlement in the Virginia Colony).[16] San Miguel benefitted from the ministry of Antonio de Montesinos, the Dominican friar who was an outspoken advocate of Indian rights. Shortly after founding, Allyon died, winter set in and with it came a mutiny, a slave revolt, and Indian attacks. Six hundred men were in the original company that planted the colony. By the end of the winter only 150 remained and they returned to Hispaniola. Yet, a chapel had been built and the Mass, for the first time, had been celebrated on the North American continent.

After a half-dozen other failures, a permanent settlement was established at St. Augustine (Florida) in 1565. The colony was established to protect the sea route of treasure ships. Shortly thereafter, a group of French Huguenot Protestants sailed to the New World and established a colony at the mouth of the St. John's River.[17] The Spaniards massacred the Huguenots – Spain was exceedingly jealous of her exclusive rights in her new domain.

Church and State were inseparable in St. Augustine. A chapel and governor's palace were erected opposite one another on the town square. Two hospitals and a convent later were built and missions to the Indians were begun. Major efforts to evangelize the Indians were undertaken with mixed success. When the War of Spanish Succession[18] broke out in 1701, the fragile

---

[15] Ahlstrom page 40

[16] Jamestown was founded May 14, 1607

[17] Near present day Jacksonville, Duval County, Florida

[18] The war of the Spanish Succession (1701-1714), known as Queen Anne's War in North America, was the result of the death of Charles II, King of Spain. Charles died without leaving an heir. Thus, the decision as to who would become the heir of the Spanish kingdoms (Spain, a portion of Italy, the Low Countries [Belgium, Netherlands, Luxemburg], the Philippines, and the Americas) became contentious. In the absence of a direct heir, candidates had to be sought among the descendents of the king's sisters. Two dynasties claimed the Spanish throne: the French Bourbons and the Austrian Hapsburgs, both closely related to Charles and his father, Philip IV. If Philip V (a Bourbon and second cousin to the deceased king) were chosen, then France and Spain would have been united under one king. The other choice was Leopold I (a Hapsburg and also a cousin to the deceased king). Most of the European nations became engaged in the war, because the outcome would determine the future of Europe. dynasty. When the war ended, Philip was recognized as King of Spain, but he was required to renounce any claim to the French crown and to cede much of the Spanish Crown's possessions to the Holy Roman Empire, the

Spanish life in Florida began to crumble. By 1751, only 136 Indian believers remained in four Indian missions; the missionary mandate had not succeeded. The only significant Catholic presence in Florida consisted of Spaniards living in the city of St. Augustine and Florida never became a vital part of the Spanish empire.

SPANISH MISSIONARY VENTURES INTO THE AMERICAN SOUTHWEST

In 1540, enticed by reports of the fabulous Seven Cities of Cibola, The Viceroy of Mexico commissioned Francisco Vasquez de Coronado to lead a major expedition, which resulted in the Spanish discovery of the Grand Canyon and what later became Kansas, Oklahoma, the Texas panhandle, and some pueblo villages of the Zuni in western present day, New Mexico – a vast mission field but no Seven Cities and no gold. After this expedition, interest in the northern country faded until 1598.

It is important to remember that the Spanish domains which later became a part of the United States of America were frontier borderlands. The frontier was different from the Anglo-American frontier that has become familiar to contemporary Americans. The Spanish North American frontier never did achieve the complex cultural development that characterized the Spanish Empire in Mexico. The most important institutions peculiar to these borderlands were the *presidio* and the mission. The *presidio* usually consisted of a group of usually idle, unruly soldiers. The mission padres did all that they could to keep the soldiers as far from the Indians as possible.

New Mexico

In 1598 Don Juan de Onate led a mission north and founded San Juan de Caballeros in what is now New Mexico. Onate traveled at the head of a significant company, consisting of more than 100 soldiers, 400 settlers, seven Franciscan fathers, and two lay brothers, many slaves, 83 wagons, and 7000 head of stock. The group came to stay and stay they did. In 1609 Onate was replaced as governor by Pedro de Peralta, who moved the capital of the colony to Santa Fe,

---

Dutch Republic, Savoy, and Great Britain. He also had to agree to partition the Spanish Empire in Europe.

which became the permanent center of Spanish dominion in New Mexico. By 1630, there were 50 priests working in 25 missions that embraced 60,000 converts living in 90 pueblos.

A fierce revolt by the Indians in 1680 resulted in a terrible massacre and the remaining Spaniards were forced back to El Paso. For more than twenty years, no missionaries ventured into New Mexico. In time, the area was reconquered and the old Spanish pattern of life was restored for another approximately 150 years. The Indians, sullen but subdued, provided most of the labor for the mines, the mills, and the fields. In time, the Indians became virtual vassals of *metizo*[19] merchants and Spanish landlords. The friars, who sought to care for the spiritual condition of the Indians, considered these conditions obnoxious and were in constant conflict with the civil authorities.

A number problems, including economic and merchandising regulations,[20] and the constant attacks by the Apaches, caused the colony to lose strength. By 1800 the number of Indians in the missions had fallen to about 10,000.

Arizona

The region that we know as Arizona was called, *Primeri Alta*. The region had a character and history of its own. Few Spanish settlers attempted to enter the region. A few intrepid Jesuits and Franciscans did venture into the area, but with little results. Even so, the story of their efforts is inspiring. Most notable is Eusebio Kino, who entered the region in 1687. Before his death 24 years later, he had baptized 4000 Indians, covered thousands of miles, and explored and mapped the area. He introduced stock raising in five or six valleys. However, all of his missions were on a precarious footing because of the Indian's hostility, the shortage of priests, and continual quarrels with civil authorities. The small gains made by Kino were decimated in 1783, when Charles III expelled all Jesuits from New Spain. The Franciscans tried to continue the work, but apart from erecting the beautiful church building at San Xavier del Bac, little remained of the Arizona mission by 1821.

---

[19] The term, *metizo,* refers to an individual of mixed European and indigenous blood. In this instance, a person of Spanish and Indian (Mexican) heritage.

[20] Being under royal rule, there were merchandizing rules that required all business to be the business and in some way, profit the throne. Thus, private business was controlled and less profitable.

Texas

Texas also was a passing and temporary mission endeavor of the Spanish. A few Spanish missionaries had ventured east and north from El Paso, during the mid years of the 17th Century. Late in the 17th Century, the growing French presence in Louisiana caused the Spanish to feel threatened and so they did attempt to establish themselves in the region (more about this in the section on New France). Late in the 17th Century, the governor of Coahuila sent out a series of expeditions and in 1690 he claimed the area for Spain. San Francisco de los Tejas (Texas) was founded as a Spanish mission in that year by a Franciscan father but it was abandoned three years later.[21] In 1718 renewed efforts produced some lasting missions, the most famous of which is San Antonio (the Alamo mission). By 1722, there were ten missions, four *presidios* (military posts), and four centers of settlement in Tejas territory. A governor resided at Los Adaes (now Robeline, Louisiana)[22].

Because of the hostility and intractability of the Comanches and Apaches, few settlers were willing to move into the region and so the Spanish influence in Tejas remained very weak. From 1762 to 1800, even the military occupants were withdrawn from the territory. In 1810, the total Spanish population of Tejas was not more than 3000. The United States purchased Louisiana in 1803, Mexico broke away from Spain in 1821, and Texas won independence from Mexico in 1836, at which time there were only two priests of Mexican origin in the region and both of these were an embarrassing scandal to the Church.

The religious history of old Texas is a record of fifty missions and much heroism, but the end result was barely discernable. In later years, major Mexican immigration has given to Texas a considerable population of Spanish Catholic heritage.

California

The early story of New Spain in the far west is similar to that of Texas. In the period of Spain's great expansion in the New World, California was given little attention. In the 1540's, Juan Rodriguez Cabrillo, Bartolome Ferrelo, and a few others pushed up the western coast. In 1602,

[21] The mission was located on San Pedro Creek, a few miles west of the Neches River, in present day Houston County

[22] Approximately 100 miles south of Shreveport and 10 miles east of the Mississippi River.

Jan Vizcaino bestowed names on many of the bays and islands that he discovered along the coasts of California and Oregon. In 1702, Father Eusebio Kino traveled west from his work in southern Arizona and determined that Lower California was a peninsula and not an island, as had been previously thought by those who had accessed it by boat from Mexico.

Spanish interest in California came alive in 1741. Russian captain Vitus Bering, in 1728, sailed through the straits that bear his name. In1741 he reached Alaska and claimed for Russia that vast slice of North America which is as large as Western Europe. As had been true with Texas, the presence of an alien power spurred Spain into action. In 1769, Jose de Galvez, the vigorous visitor general of Spain's new energetic King Charles III, organized an exploratory expedition into California. Six Franciscans, under the able leadership of Father Junipero Serra, were assigned the task of spiritual development. In July 1769, the mission of San Diego de Alcala was founded and a *presidio* was established nearby. The expedition continued to trek northward and in November these Spaniards were the first non-Indians to view the Golden Gate and its magnificent bay. A year later, at Monterrey, the San Carlos mission was established and by 1772 three others had been established.

At the same time that this northern migration was taking place, Juan Batista de Anza, the commander of the military in Arizona, led a company of soldiers westward out of Arizona and established the first Spanish post on San Francisco Bay.

In the next decade, a number of missions were established, including Santa Barbara, San Jose, and Los Angeles. These missions were the most important institution of old California – both economically and socially. Life was meager apart from the missions.

The mission system prospered in California as it had nowhere else. Chiefly, this was because the Indians were not warlike, olive trees flourished, grain grew bountifully, and sheep and cattle multiplied so rapidly that whole herds had to be slaughtered for lack of an adequate market. Equally important is the fact that Spaniards and other Europeans did not swarm in to disrupt the situation (the number of Spaniards in the area was quite small; in 1800, only 1200 Spaniards lived in California). Father Serra, who led the Franciscans in establishing and overseeing the California missions was a man of deep ascetic piety and exceptional administrative ability. In every way, he fulfilled the Spanish ideal of the missionary as a saint.

Evangelism was at the heart of the mission system. Each of California's twenty-one missions was adjacent to an Indian village, where from one to three thousand Indians lived. Between 1769 and 1845, approximately 100,000 Indians had been baptized by the Franciscans. In the Spanish sense of the term, they were civilized and Christianized. The Indians tilled the land, herded livestock, tanned hides, built roads and bridges, and built chapels. Government was at a minimum, the viceroy was far away in Mexico, the king was even farther away. Life was slow, graceful, and easy, and the Church prospered.

THE CHURCH IN NEW FRANCE

Even though Frenchmen on fishing expeditions to the Grand Banks had touched the North American shore late in the 15th Century, France did not make any attempt to establish a presence in the New World until the Spanish occupation had gone on for more than a century. Why France was so dilatory in attempting to establish a colonial presence in America is not easily explained, but some factors do present themselves.

The European territorial wars fully occupied the attention and resources of France during the early decades of the 16th Century. Under Francis I (1515-47), France began to experience a new prosperity and strength, along with a determination to establish national autonomy. As a result, the Pope realized that negotiations with the King of France were necessary. In 1516, Francis and the Pope agreed upon a compromise over certain taxes and control of clergy (The Concordat of Bologna). This came to be known as Gallicanism which consisted of three basic ideas: (1) the independence of the French King in temporal power, (2) the superiority of an ecumenical council over the pope, (3) the king's right to limit the intervention of the Pope within France.

As France increasingly became a force to be reckoned with, the nation found itself in fierce competition with Italy and Spain. For a time, King Francis himself was a hostage of his bitter rival, Charles V of Spain (The Holy Roman Emperor). An uneasy truce was obtained at the Peace of Cambrai (1529).

Another shadow fell across the French realm shortly after the Peace of Cambrai – the Protestant Reformation shattered the unity of Roman Catholic Christendom and with it, the unity of France.

In 1534, the year that Jacques Cartier sailed into the Saint Lawrence Gulf for the first time,[23] the brilliant young French lawyer, John Calvin, was converted to evangelical views. Calvin was

---

[23] Jacques Cartier made three voyages for France to the North American continent between 1534 and 1542. He explored the St. Lawrence River and gave Canada its name. In 1534 he was appointed by Francis I to explore North America, in an attempt to find a passage to the Pacific Ocean. He reached Newfoundland in 20 days, sighted the Magdalen Islands and Prince Edward Island (which he thought was the mainland) and found the St. Lawrence River. He made a second voyage in 1535 and explored the St. Lawrence up to what is now Montreal. On his third voyage (1541), Cartier was under the command of Jean-Francois de la Rocque de Roberval.

born July 10, 1509 in Noyon, about sixty miles northeast of Paris. At fourteen years of age, Calvin began matriculating at the University of Paris. When he was nineteen, he left Paris and began the study of law. Four years later, back in Paris, he published his first book, a commentary on Seneca's *De Clementia.* In was in this period that he came under the influence of a very earnest religious group that produced some of the early leaders of the Protestant movement. The writings of the humanist, Erasmus, and the publications of Luther were being discussed in intellectual and literary circles at the time; it is a natural assumption that Calvin read and pondered the views propounded by these authors. At some point during this period, he had a sudden and unexpected conversion experience (generally assumed to have been in 1533), but we have no details either about the nature of the event, nor of its exact timing. [24] In 1534, because of rising persecution to the free-thinking embryonic Protestants, he fled the region to settle in Basel, Switzerland. From Basel, at the age of twenty-six, he published what was/is the most influential book of the Protestant Reformation, *The Institutes of the Christian Religion* (*Institutio Christianae Religionis*). This publication had great influence in French Protestant circles. Calvin dedicated this book to the French King and in an immortal preface, assured the monarch that he had nothing to fear from a revival of evangelical Christianity. Calvin's assurance was premature.

For a time, King Francis vacillated in his attitude toward the reformers. Francis and his family were very pious and several family members were given to theological humanism. In 1533, for pragmatic reasons, he did adopt a policy of vigorous opposition to the Protestants and this policy was continued by his successors. Because the strength of the Protestant party continued to grow, the conflict was inevitable. Between 1562 and 1598, France was ravaged by the Wars of Religion. It had become a nation divided against itself.

The Huguenot Protestants became quite strong in France to the point that the Huguenot Admiral, Coligny, was able to sponsor small colonies in the New World. As already noted, the Huguenot colony on the Saint John's River in Florida was annihilated by the Saint Augustine Spaniards. In

---

[24] Calvin mentions this in his introduction to his *Commentary on the Psalms,* but does not give details.

1572, Coligny himself was murdered in bed and his body thrown into the street during the massacre of Saint Bartholomew's Eve.[25]

In 1589, Henry of Navarre, a Huguenot hero who had led Huguenot forces in the religious wars, became the legal King of France and continued as monarch until his death in 1610. Realizing that as a Protestant he could not rule France, he renounced his "heresies" and was received into the Roman Catholic Church (cynics stated, "He decided that Paris was worth a Mass").[26] Henry of Navarre became Henry IV, founder of the Bourbon dynasty. He promulgated the Edict of Nantes in 1598, thus assuring Protestant liberties and ending the French War of Religions. France then entered into an era of peace, prosperity and power.

Neither King Henry nor his great Administrator of State, Sully, had any serious interest in an overseas empire. They had the attitude that still characterizes Frenchmen, "there is no place like France, why should anyone have much interest in an overseas empire?" They did not have the missionary heart that had driven the Spanish monarchs.

Even so, Henry did authorize tentative thrusts into the New World. The De Monts colony set forth in 1604. In the fierce winter of 1604-05, the colony lay freezing and half-dead with scurvy on the little island of Saint Croix in Passamaquoddy Bay (a small bay, off of the larger, Bay of Fundy).[27] Only eight men survived the winter. One of the survivors was Samuel Champlain, the royal geographer and a man of extraordinary vision and determination. Upon his return to France, Champlain was able to arouse interest in a French colonial venture and in 1608, on the third of his eleven voyages to Canada, he founded Quebec.[28] Other Frenchmen returned to the Bay of Fundy and began to make Port Royal (southwestern shore of present day Nova Scotia)[29] a center of French influence.

With the end of the Wars of Religion, a significant revival took place in the French Roman Catholic Church, reaching its peak during the reign of Louis XIV (1643-1715). A major presence in the revival was the Society of Jesus (the Jesuits) who also played a very major role in

---

[25] Addendum A
[26] He was greatly influenced in this decision by the love of his life, his mistress, Gabrielle d´Estrees
[27] On the border between Maine and New Brunswick, Canada in the larger Bay of Fundy. MAP I
[28] MAP II
[29] MAP III

the French activity in the New World. Even though the Jesuits were opposed by the influential Sorbonne (the Catholic stronghold in the University of Paris), the Society spread rapidly and widely. The return to a purified religion gave new life to all of the existing major French Catholic orders: Capuchins, Recollects, reformed Cistercians, and Benedictines.

The intense spiritual drive of the era also produced a number of newer orders. One of the most influential reform movements was an order of secular priests[30] known as the French Oratory. The new order was founded by the pioneer of modern French mysticism, Father Pierre de Berulle. He was succeeded by Father Charles de Condren, who not only continued to work to revitalize the clergy, but also became the leading champion of the mystical devotion to the Sacred Heart of Jesus. This form of piety, promoted by the Jesuits, became quite popular in France. The devotion to the Sacred Heart produced a sentimental ardor in the 16th and 17th Centuries that characterized much of Catholicism in New France.

The Oratory had a great influence on Jean-Jacques Olier (1608-1657) who founded several seminaries and the Society of Saint Sulpice. The society was named after the church in the Paris slums where Olier ministered. Other significant orders that were birthed as a result of the Oratory were the Congregation of the Priests of the Mission (1625) and the Sisters (or Daughters) of Charity (1633), both founded by Saint Vincent de Paul.

In 1627, Cardinal Richelieu became the most powerful leader in France. Even though Richelieu was more concerned with advancing France's fortunes in the European power struggle, he did give New France a semblance of support. He organized the Company of One Hundred Associates to control and sustain the colonists in New France. This was more impressive in theory than in substance. French outposts in Canada continued to rest on a shaky foundation.

When Louis XIV came to the throne in 1661, he assumed personal responsibility for foreign policy.[31] Two years later, he made Canada a royal domain. He upbraided the Company of One

[30] Secular priests (also called, "diocesan priests") are those that do not belong to any of the orders (Franciscan, Benedictine, Jesuit, etc.) and are not under monastic rule. Regular Priests take monastic vows, whereas Secular Priests do not. Secular Clergy live in the world, not in a monastery. They are clergy in the full sense of the term and have the same diocesan duties as Regular Clergy.

[31] Louis had succeeded his father, Louis XIII at the age of four (1643). In 1648, a fierce internecine battle for control of France took place between parliament and Cardinal Mazarin (Richelieu's) successor. When Mazarin died in 1661, Louis astonished his ministers by informing them that he intended to take the

Hundred for its pitiful performance and dissolved it. In its place, he established a sovereign council over which he had full control. His Minister of Finance, Jean Baptiste Colbert, was deeply involved in the financial aspects of New France and under his influence France became a serious competitor in the race for an empire in the New World. Even so, France never did give to these enterprises the support that Spain and given to New Spain.

During Louis XIV's reign, Catholicism gained a centrality and importance in New France that exceeded even that which it held in New Spain. Louis was determined to make his empire Catholic and in 1685 he revoked the Edict of Toleration (Edict of Nantes). What was transplanted to New France was not simply French Catholicism, but it was the militant religion of the Society of Jesus. One historian has written,

> "The history of missionary labors is connected with the origin of every celebrated town in the annals of French Canada; not a cape was turned or a river entered but a Jesuit led the way."[32]

Yet, even before the Jesuit team of Pierre Biard and Ennemond Masse had arrived at Port Royal, two secular priests had been there and baptized more than 100 Indians.

Other Catholic orders also came into the region, but because of many problems with the trading companies, they had to turn to the intractable Jesuits for help. In 1625, five Jesuits arrived in Quebec and assumed responsibility for French missions originating from that center. They faced a difficult challenge. There were only 51 winter residents in all of New France. Also, the first news that they received upon arriving in Quebec was that Father Viel, a member of the Recollect Franciscan order, had been drowned or murdered while returning from an effort to evangelize Hurons. Champlain, the chief promoter of New France, died in 1635. Even so, under the leadership of Paul LeJeune, the Jesuits began to write a magnificent chapter in the history of Christian missions. These French missionaries exemplified fervent personal piety combined with a passionate desire to Christianize Canada's Indians. By 1649, eight Jesuits had been martyred.

---

responsibility for ruling the kingdom. Believing in succession by Divine right, he viewed himself as God's representative.

[32] George Bancroft, *History of the United States*, as quoted in Ahlstrom, page 61

The story of any of these missionaries would be inspiring, but we are fortunate to have the record of Jean de Brebeuf.[33] Brebeuf was born into a prosperous upper-class family in Normandy. He entered the Society of Jesus in 1617 and served as a college administrator. He applied for an assignment in Quebec and was accepted. From that time onward, with but one brief return to France, his lifetime obsession was the conversion of the Hurons. He lived with this harassed and plague-ridden tribe. He learned their tribal ways, their language, and prepared both a lexicon and grammar of the language. He labored tirelessly to win converts, baptizing the dying and the newborn. His journals record a personal religious life of personal self-disciple and even ecstasy. Here is an entry:

> "on the 9th of May [1640] when I was in the village of Saint Joseph, I was, as it were, carried out of myself and to God by powerful acts of love, and I was transported to God as if to embrace Him."[34]

On May 27, he recorded his experience before the Blessed Sacrament on the Feast of Pentecost.

> "Saw myself in a moment invested in a great fire which burned everything which was there around me, without consuming aught. While these flames lasted, I felt myself inwardly on fire with the love of God, more ardently than I had ever been."[35]

Nine years later, as great numbers of Hurons were coming to faith, the western Iroquois[36] attacked the tribe and Brebeuf was captured. After brutal preparatory torture, he was scalded and burned to death on March 16, 1649. With the backing of the Dutch and English, the Iroquois drove the Hurons west to Wisconsin. The Dutch and English wanted to curb the French control of the fur trade. The Jesuits, undaunted, followed the Hurons westward.

After 1680, the Jesuits also worked among the Abenakis of present-day Maine and New Hampshire. Success was minimal until Father Sebastian Rale (sometimes spelled, Rasle) assumed leadership of the mission in 1694. Under Rale's leadership, the entire Abenaki tribe came to a lasting commitment to the Christian faith.

---

[33] Summarized by Ahlstrom, page 62
[34] Francis X. Talbot, *Saint among the Hurons: The life of Jean de Brebeuf* as quoted by Ahlstrom page 2
[35] *ibid*
[36] The Iroquois were not a single tribe, but a confederation of tribes (initially five, but from 1722 onward, six) See Addendum xxx

The European conflicts, reflected in the New World, began to impact the missionary efforts of the region. In 1704, the Indian allies of the French perpetrated the infamous massacre at Deerfield, Massachusetts. In 1713, the Treaty of Utrecht conveyed Hudson's Bay, Newfoundland, and Nova Scotia to England. In 1722, England declared war.[37] In 1724, Rale was shot and scalped. In spite of all of these troubles, the Abenaki remnant remained true to their faith. After the American Revolution, the Abenaki of Maine (who had supported the colonists against the British[38]) were allowed to receive the ministry of a Roman Catholic priest.

A significant non-Jesuit achievement was the founding of Montreal. A group associated with the Sulpician Order obtained a grant of land on the Island of Montreal. In 1641 they convinced a pious military officer, Paul Chomedy, Sier de Maisonneuve, to lead a company of Frenchmen to the island and found the colony of Montreal. Included in the group that traveled with him was Mademoiselle Jeanne Mance, who established Montreal's Hospital of Saint Joseph. Maisonneuve spent 24 years at this dangerous outpost in support of Catholic missions in the area. Reinforcements arrived in 1653, including four Sulpician priests and Sister Marguerite Bourgeous, who along with Mademoiselle Mance, established the Congregation de Notre Dame and its school for Indian girls. A similar work among Indian women of Quebec was carried on by courageous French women. The Ursuline Sisters (an order of nuns closely associated with the Jesuits) were deeply involved with these endeavors.

The French Catholic missionaries began to lose their early optimism when the Indians hostility increased and the Dutch and English incessantly attacked them in every possible form (not only were the Dutch and English competing for the fur trade, but they also vehemently opposed Catholicism). With evangelism becoming very difficult, the Jesuits' emphasis began to shift from evangelism to exploration. Missionary activity always was present, but careful charting of unknown territory and reporting on the geography and the peoples of the various regions took on increased importance.

An outstanding example of the new Jesuit was Father Jacques Marquette. For four years he labored among the Indians in the upper Great Lakes. Then, in 1673, he joined the trader and

---

[37] The war has been given many names: *The Three Years War, The Drummer's War,* Lovewell's *War, Father Rale's War, Greylock's War, The Fourth Indian War,* and *The Wabanaki-New England War of 1722-1725.*

[38] www.snowwowl.com/peopleabenaki.html

explorer, Louis Joliet in a search for the fabled Mississippi River. Together, they traveled twenty-five hundred miles, either paddling a birch bark canoe or portaging from one body of water to the next. After paddling from the Mackinac Straits through Green Bay and thence up the Fox River, they portaged overland to the Wisconsin River. They followed the Wisconsin River south until it emptied into the Mississippi.[39] They proceeded down the Mississippi until they came to the mouth of the Arkansas River.[40] By that time, they had become convinced that the Mississippi did not flow west to the Pacific Ocean, but rather, emptied in the Gulf of Mexico. They realized that if the continued on they might fall into hands of the Spanish, so they returned north by paddling up the Illinois River.[41]

On the return leg, Marquette conceived the idea of planting missions in Illinois country. In 1674, the vision began to be fulfilled when he established the mission of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin at Kaskaskia (about 80 miles south of St. Louis). While on this trip, Marquette contracted dysentery and died the following spring on the eastern shore of Lake Michigan.

The Kaskaskia mission is important because it was the first church planted in what later became the central United States. Kaskaskia became a significant French colony and a mission center. At its peak, Kaskaskia had a population of approximately 7000 residents.[42] When the United States created the Illinois Territory in 1809, Kaskaskia was the capitol. When Illinois became a state, in 1818, Kaskaskia was the state capitol for one year (Vandalia became the capitol in 1819 and continued as the capitol for twenty years).

The greatest of the French explorers was Robert Cavalier de la Salle, who immigrated to Montreal at the age of twenty-three. He quickly learned the languages of the various Indian

---

[39] Near the town of Prairie du Chien, Wisconsin

[40] About 115 miles south of Memphis, Tennessee

[41] This is the Illinois River that begins at Joliet, Illinois, and empties into the Mississippi River a few miles upstream from St. Louis.

[42] Kaskaskia was on a well-situated peninsula. The Mississippi River flowed on the west side of the peninsula. Kaskaskia became a major steamboat refueling site and as a result the land around the peninsula was deforested, due to the need for firewood for the steamboats. This deforestation resulted in a major flood in April,1881, in which the Mississippi covered the peninsula, and when the flood receded, the Mississippi channel changed to east of Kaskaskia. The peninsula had become an island. The lower ten miles of the Kaskaskia River had become a part of the Mississippi. Although the village still exists, in the 2000 census, only 9 residents were listed.

tribes of the region and traveled throughout the Great Lakes, exploring and establishing forts. The story of his exploits has been told many times, but the one that is relevant to our subject is his December 1681 adventure. La Salle assembled a group of 23 Frenchmen and 31 Indians and stuck out for the Mississippi. The rivers were frozen and so the party made sleds on which they dragged their canoes across "the divine river" (*Checagou* to the Indians – "Chicago" to English speakers), thence down the Illinois River. On February 6, 1682, they arrived at the Illinois junction with the Mississippi (upstream from present day, Alton, IL). They paddled down the Mississippi, past the mouths of the Missouri River (South of Alton, Illinois) and the Ohio River (Cairo, Illinois) and the Chickasaw bluffs. La Salle was determined to discover the mouth of the Mississippi. Along the way he demonstrated his uncanny ability to relate to the Indians. He placated the fierce Quapaw, the culture Taensa, the Natchez, and every other Indian nation he encountered. On April 6, after passing the site of New Orleans, the company reached the point where the Mississippi divides into three channels. The troupe divided into three groups and explored each channel and in three days reached The Passes. They assembled on a spot of dry ground in the Gulf of Mexico and La Salle unfurled the white banner of the Bourbon King and took possession of "this country of Louisiana . . . in the name of the most high, mighty, invincible and victorious Louis the Great, by the Grace of God King of France and of Navarre." He defined Louisiana as the valley of the Mississippi, including all of its tributaries. No claim so stupendous had been made by any European monarch since the voyages of Columbus.

Later, as a result of La Salle's pressure, Louis IV decided to seize and hold Louisiana, chiefly to annoy the king of Spain, who at the time was his chief rival. Louis XIV provided La Salle four ships, a company of solders, and male and female immigrants. His orders were to build a fort on the lower Mississippi whereby "we may control the continent." The fleet departed in 1684.

Unfortunately, when La Salle had discovered the mouth of the Mississippi, he had not been able to determine its longitude. So, the fleet overshot The Passes and landed on the shores of Matagorda Bay, Texas. They marched inland and built a fort on the banks of the Garcitas River. They found plenty of buffalo for food and the Indians were friendly, but they had no idea where they were. La Salle, with a few men set out to find the Mississippi. On March 18, 1687, near the site of Navasota, Texas, the group mutinied and murdered its leader. The body of the man who

had staked out an empire for France was stripped, dishonored, and left for the wolves and the vultures.

La Salle's discovery of the mouth of the Mississippi, and his final misadventure had an impact on the future of Christianity in Louisiana. His building of the fort on the banks of the Garcitas River stirred the Spanish to plant their first mission in Texas, near the Neches River, in 1690. A few years later, Spain planted a colony at Pensacola, east of Louisiana. The Spanish intention was to put the pincers on French Louisiana, and force the French to retreat. This effort failed and not only did the French enlarge the mission at Kaskaskia, but they also founded trading posts at Cahokia (northeast of St. Louis) and Vincennes (present day Indiana, but at that time a part of the Illinois country). Le Moyne d'Iberville and a group of French pioneers built Biloxi, in the present state of Mississippi. Le Moyne d'Iberville hoped to make Louisiana a southern French Catholic Canada, but Louis XIV refused to cooperate, beyond deciding to send some of the Canadian *coureurs de bois* (Frenchmen who traveled in birch bark canoes trapping and fur trading with the Indians) to help populate Louisiana. These men refused to become farmers and so they had to be put on the garrison payroll. Although there were only 27 French families in Louisiana (in addition to the garrisoned *coureurs de bois*), the feeble French presence did preserve the area for France.

In 1718, Le Moyne d'Bienville (the brother of Le Moyne d'Iberville) founded New Orleans at a strategic location in order to control the Mississippi River traffic.

After a number of wars, involving France, England, and Spain, the New World was divided up among the contenders. The resulting Peace of Paris, in 1763, marked the end of France as a North American power. Of significance to our study is England's receiving most of Canada and Spain's receiving the vast territory of Louisiana. The Mississippi River became the boundary between the English and Spanish empires.

As noted earlier, the 1713 treaty of Utrecht had ceded Nova Scotia to Britain. However, the only white inhabitants of the region were several thousand French Acadians living on the Bay of Fundy (estimates range from 12,000 to 18,000 Frenchmen living on the bay). The British made no attempt to interfere with their Catholic religion, their language, or their local government. However, they were Frenchmen and were actively hostile or sullenly neutral toward the British

during the ensuing wars. In the spring of 1749, England sent 1400 colonists (most of these were charity cases and the act was considered one of generosity – giving those on charity an opportunity to obtain land and develop a productive life) to populate the unsettled areas of Nova Scotia. Edward Cornwallis, the governor of the colony, founded Halifax.

The British concluded that they could not allow the hostile Acadians to live near strategic centers, because if another war broke out in the region, the Acadians would be an enemy on their exposed flank. Therefore, they decided to deport all Frenchmen living in the region. The Acadian deportation was carried out with unnecessary hardship. Families and neighbors were separated (Longfellow, in the novel, *Evangeline,* based on a real episode, describes this tragic event). The most fortunate of these refugees ended up in French Louisiana, where they retained their French Catholic faith, their language and their customs (the present day "Cajuns" are descendents of the transplanted Acadians).

Later, when Louisiana became the possession of Spain, Spanish Catholicism began to have a strong presence in the region. Thus the Christianity of lower Louisiana became a mix of French and Spanish Catholicism, and in some demographics, a bit of Caribbean spiritualism.

The Acadian presence in Louisiana is the only significant lasting impact that New France Catholicism has had on the United States. As Ahlstrom wrote,

> "The lasting impact of New France on American religious life has been slight. In that part of La Salle's imagined empire which became United States territory, very little that was French or Roman Catholic endured except, as in New Spain, a treasure of melodious bur soon hopelessly mispronounced place-names. A few small communities remained along the Mississippi and its tributaries, but these were soon enveloped by America's westward expansion. Only in New Orleans and the Louisiana bayou country, where the transplanted Acadians settled, did anything like French culture [and religion] leave a lasting deposit; and even here three decades of Spanish rule left traces of yet another culture In this area, however, religious affairs were radically different from those in Quebec. Disorder and laxity were the rule; and not until 1785, under Spanish rule, did New Orleans receive a resident bishop. Only after the purchase of

> Louisiana by the United States was ecclesiastical anarchy gradually ended and a reunion of church and people attempted."

After the establishment of the United States, large numbers of French Catholics emigrated into the northern tier of states along the Canadian border. In each of these states sizeable French Catholic communities were created. However, these were not a part of New France, nor of the French Catholic Church that was so important in New France. As stated above, only in New Orleans is there a surviving representation of New France dating from the era of that empire.

THE REFORMATION BACKGROUND OF THE ATLANTIC COLONIES

New Spain had become firmly established before the Reformation had shaken the structures of Europe. Spain brought to the New World a Medieval structure and a Medieval Catholic faith.[43] As noted earlier, when New France came into existence, France had been racked with religious wars, but the work of the Church in New France was undertaken by those who were committed to rejuvenate and reform the ancient Catholic faith, not by those who were promoting a Protestant Reformation. Therefore, the Protestant Reformation had little impact on the religious institutions of either New Spain or New France.

The story was dramatically different in the primarily British "intermediate empire," which forced its way between these two Roman Catholic giants. The influence of the Protestant Reformation on the Atlantic coast colonies was so significant that it is almost impossible to exaggerate. Therefore, we will undertake a brief overview of the four expressions of the Reformation:

- The Lutheran Reformation
- The Reformed Tradition
- The Radical Reformation
- The Anglican Reformation

[43] The Middle Ages refers to the period between 476 AD (when the western Roman Empire fell) and roughly, 1500, when the Renaissance had impacted Europe. The Late Middle Ages refers to the 14th and 15th Centuries, the centuries in which towns became increasingly important and the feudal system began to fall into decline.

Because the Anglican Reformation had such an impact on the colonies, we will treat it as a separate study.

First, we examine the forces that propelled the Reformation. The causes of the Reformation are important to our study because echoes of these forces are later found to resonante throughout the colonies and the churches contained therein. Many of the mind-sets that were springboards for the Reformation are ingrained in American Christians today, but they were new to the western world when the Reformation was launched.

Causes of the Reformation

1. The political factor was one of the more important indirect causes for the Reformation. During the Middle Ages, the Roman Catholic Church was the universal (the term, *catholic*, means, "universal") church which exercised authority over the Christian world. The new nation states in northwestern Europe were opposed to the concept that a universal church could have authority over the nation state and its powerful ruler. The rulers of the new nations resented the Roman Church's owning great tracts of land within their territory; the Pope, rather than the king, had authority over these papal estates. Appointments to important positions were made by the Pope, who was a foreigner; clerics could not be tried in civil or royal courts, but only in church courts.

   It is noteworthy that the nations that accepted Protestantism during the Reformation were outside of the orbit of the old Roman Empire. The developing powerful middle classes in these countries had a different mind-set from that of the Latin nations.

2. Economic factors played a large role in acceptance of the Reformation. The rulers of the new nations resented the amount of money that went into the Papal treasury at Rome. The clergy were exempt from the national taxes in the new nations. The abuse of the indulgence as a means of getting more money out of Germany is one of the things that angered Luther.

3. The changing intellectual climate was a major cause of the Reformation. One of the characteristics of the humanism[44] that was birthed in the late 15th Century was an eagerness to become acquainted with the sources of man's intellectual past. As they studied the writings of ancient Greek philosophers, they began to look at classical Greece as an ideal. The intellectual freedom they saw in Greek society and the principle of the freedom of the individual as seen in Scripture, made the humanists skeptical of the claims of authority made by the Roman Church.

   Through the work of the humanist scholar, Erasmus, the Greek text of the New Testament became increasingly available. The scholars who studied Erasmus' Greek New Testament clearly saw discrepancies between the Roman Catholic Church and the church described in the New Testament.

4. The moral factor also was a strong force in the launching of the Reformation. Corruption was present throughout the hierarchy of the Roman Church. Offices in the church were bought and sold. Many clerics enjoyed positions in which they received a salary, but did not do the work associated with the office. Although it was against Catholic law, some held more than one office, and received the resultant income. One could buy a dispensation that would allow him to marry a close relative, even though canon law forbade it. Many priests lived in open sin, some even keeping concubines. Many parish clergy did not put forth the effort to preach, but contented themselves with conducting a Mass, which they proclaimed as a magic rite that would bring grace to a congregant. Collections of relics[45] became a vogue – a single viewing of the 5,005 relics of Frederick of Saxony was supposed to reduce one's time in purgatory by nearly two million years.

5. Changes in the social structure accelerated the disillusionment with the Medieval social order associated with the church. The rise of towns with a prosperous middle class within the towns created a new spirit of individualism. The new money economy freed

[44] Humanism, during this era, was an emphasis on the study of the Latin and Greek classics, especially the writings of the philosophers. Many became enamored with Plato. Rather than following the teaching of Catholicism, there was an emphasis on thinking for one's self and critical examination of propositions. Roman Catholicism did not fare well in many quarters, where humanism flourished. However, some of the greatest humanists remained loyal to Catholicism – Erasmus being a primary example.

[45] Usually, supposed pieces of the cross and the bones of saints.

people from dependence on the soil as a main means of making a living. Middle class "burghers" replaced the feudal lords, employing artisans and laborers needed in the new economy.

6. The theological and philosophical factor was central to the Reformation. Two competing theologies had representatives in the Catholic Church: Augustine and Thomas Aquinas.
   - Augustine contended that man is totally depraved and that he could do nothing toward his salvation. God had to extend to each person a grace that would energize his will so that he could by faith take the salvation offered in Christ.
   - Thomas argued that man's will is not totally corrupted and that by faith and by using the grace offered in the sacraments dispensed by the Church hierarchy, man could achieve salvation (This view was labeled the *theologia gloria,* which viewed the visible Church as a safe ark of salvation if only one would climb aboard and obey the captain's rules).

   Roman Catholicism had accepted Aquinas' theology. The Reformers, on the other hand, leaned toward Augustine. It is important to note that the Reformers did not obtain their theology from Augustine, but they did go from the Bible to Augustine as an ancient authority who agreed with their perspective (this especially was true of Luther and Calvin).

7. If discontent is to become more than discontent, there must be a great leader to express the ideas contained in the discontent – who also has the courage to take a stand on the essential issues. Martin Luther, Calvin, Zwingli, and other men of note came on the scene just at this time.

The Lutheran Reformation

The Bohemian priest, John Huss (Jan Hus), had raised many of the questions that Luther later raised. Although Huss had followers, who became the Moravians, he did not succeed in producing a significant reformation. Without a popular outcry, Huss was burned at the stake on July 6, 1415. A century later, when Luther posted the Ninety-five Theses on the Wittenberg chapel door in 1517, the popular climate had changed. This change was evident when Luther

arrived in Worms. In 1521 Charles V summoned Luther to appear at Worms before the Imperial Diet. When Luther arrived, the population of Worms greeted Luther in the streets as a liberating hero.

German Catholics in the 16th Century were very earnest in their faith, as contrasted with much of the Catholic world of the early 16th Century. When Luther visited Rome in 1510, he was appalled that while celebrating the Mass, an Italian priest at an adjacent altar had said his last amen before Luther had gone no further in the order of service than the reading of the Gospel lesson. Later, at San Sabastiano, he saw seven Masses completed in an hour and he encountered priests who did not know how to hear confession. Only in the German Church on the Piazza Navona did he find the liturgical reverence that he had expected to find in Rome. Both Catholic and Protestant historians are agreed that this religious earnestness on the part of the Germans and the prevalence of ecclesiastical abuse, clerical ignorance, and theological decadence, produced the religious climate in Germany that provided the seedbed for the Lutheran Reformation.

The event that motivated Luther to write the Ninety-five Theses was Archbishop Albert's abuse of the indulgence system. Archbishop Albert, only twenty-three years old, was a prince of the House of Hohenzollern. He already was in control of two provinces of the Roman Church, in spite of the canon law that forbade one man to hold more than one office. He had to pay Pope Leo X a substantial sum for the dispensations necessary that would allow him to occupy the two offices. Even though he already held two archbishoprics, Albert began to covet the vacant archbishopric of Mainz in 1514. Leo needed money to build the present-day St. Peter's Cathedral in Rome and Albert's ambition gave Pope Leo an opportunity to meet that financial need. The Pope agreed that Albert could take over the archbishopric of Mainz if he would pay the Pope a large sum of money, in addition to the fees normally charged for being granted such an office.

The sum that the Pope required of Albert was so large that it became a matter of high finance. The Pope suggested that Albert might borrow the money from the wealthy Fugger banking family in Augsburg. The loan was arranged, with the Pope issuing a papal bull, authorizing the sale of indulgences in Saxony as a guarantee that Albert would repay the loan to the Fuggers.

Indulgences were associated with the sacrament of penance. After one had repented of sin and had confessed it, the sinner was assured of absolution by the priest. Yet, even though the guilt of sin and the punishment for sin were forgiven, a temporal satisfaction must be fulfilled, either in this life or by time spent in purgatory (ultimately a forgiven sinner would get to heaven but he had to spend some time in purgatory). The earthly satisfaction that would exempt someone from spending time in purgatory could be a pilgrimage to a shrine, or a payment of money to a church, or some other meritorious deed.

Indulgences were documents that could be bought for a sum of money. When an indulgence was obtained, one was freed from the temporal penalty for sin (purgatory). The concept of the indulgence was built upon the belief that Christ and the saints had achieved so much merit in their earthly existence that their excess merit was stored in a heavenly treasury upon which the Church could draw and deposit into the account of the living faithful. This idea was first formulated by Alexander of Hales in the Thirteenth Century. Pope Clement VI declared it to be dogma in 1343 and Pope Sixtus, in 1476, extended the privilege to souls in purgatory, providing their living relatives purchased indulgences for them (for an extended Roman Catholic presentation on this topic, see ADDENDUM C).

Albert's main agent for promoting the sale of indulgences was a Dominican monk named, John Tetzel. Tetzel used high pressure techniques to sell the indulgences and he was paid handsomely for his efforts. An agent of the Fuggers traveled with Tetzel to make certain that one-half of the money paid for each indulgence went into the Fugger bank as payment for the loan. The amount Tetzel charged for an indulgence was determined by the sinner's wealth and social position. Luther's protest in the Ninety-five Theses against the abuse of indulgences was the main event that precipitated the chain of events that produced the Reformation.

The Reformation that grew out of Luther's posting of the Ninety-five Thesis was not radical. Though the doctrine of Christian Freedom which Luther espoused was radical, he sought a conservative path. "Evangelical principle, Catholic substance," very aptly describes not only Luther's intention but also the Lutheran Church which gradually came into existence. Evidence of Luther's conservative stance is seen in his view of the Eucharist. In 1529, Luther and his associate, Melanchthon, met with the two leading reformers of Strasbourg and Zurich, Martin Butzer and Huldreich Zwingli. Luther wrote on the table, "*Hoc est corpus meum*, this is my

body." No amount of argument could shake his conviction that Christ's Real Presence existed in the sacrament of communion. "Better the Roman Mass," he declared, than to understand the Lord's supper as a mere memorial, or in spiritually symbolic terms. He concluded the meeting by stating, *Vos habetis alium Spiritum quam nos,* "You are of another spirit." Luther also had doubts about using arms to advance the Reformation. His conservative stance caused him to become estranged from other expressions of the Reformation.

Luther's major emphasis has been summarized under three headings:

1. **Christian freedom,** expounded in his treatise, *On Christian Liberty*, left no ground for salvation by law or legalism. It presented man's faith, love, and hope in God's unbounded mercy and defined the Christian life as a free response to God's self-giving love.
2. A second emphasis was Luther's understanding of man as, **"at once justified and a sinner"** (*simul justus et peccator*) which stood squarely opposed to perfectionism and spiritual arrogance – it also turned man to acts of love in this world.
3. Luther greatly emphasized **the Creator.** All orders of creation, including the institutional structures of the secular world (family, government, marketplace, etc.) were divinely ordained as a means of serving one's neighbor in a Christ glorifying vocation. Every human calling was an opportunity for "faith active in love." This being true, the proper response to God's love was not to withdraw from society and live in a monastery, nor to become an ascetic (denying man's essential nature), nor to isolate one's self from normal life by becoming a servant of the Church. This was in stark contrast to the 1000 year-old tradition of the Catholic Church.

Luther's writings and knowledge of his deeds soon reached all across Europe, causing a spiritual and intellectual ferment. Lutheran Churches formed in every European nation and by 1580, when the Formula of Concord[46] was agreed upon Lutheranism had achieved many of its classical positions that remain today.

[46] The Formula of Concord appeared in 1580, after protracted conferences, and was approved by 86 of the German states. It contains articles on the following theological issues: original sin, free will, the Eucharist, predestination, the rule of faith and the creed, justification, good works, the Law and the Gospel, the third use of the law, the person of Christ, the descent of Christ into hell, and the customs of

The Reformed Tradition

At about the same time that Luther was busy with the Reformation in Germany, a totally independent series of Reformation events took place in Switzerland. Discontent with the Church was rife. A scandalous incident of indulgence selling, parallel to what Luther had encountered in the actions of Tetzel, had received much publicity and reaction among the Swiss. The Swiss Confederation and the cities within it had achieved an independence that the Church refused to recognize. The bishops not only were corrupt, they also were foreigners. Many Swiss resented the use of Swiss mercenaries as a part of the Pope's entourage.

By 1523, the magistrates of Zurich, led by the preacher-theologian Huldreich Zwingli, had instituted a full-fledged purge and reform of the Church. Catholicism was on the way out in Switzerland. On some points, Zwingli echoed the concerns of Luther, but he went much further. He abolished the Mass, denounced its liturgy, and in an effort to remove any hints of Catholicism, he discouraged frequent observance of the Lord's Supper.

The Swiss Reformation had an impact far beyond its borders, especially in France. The Reformed tradition was a firmly established reality by the time John Calvin converted to evangelical views. For this reason, it is best to speak of the movement as "Reformed tradition," rather than as "Calvinistic." Certainly, after Calvin became a part of the Reformation, he became the chief source of energy, inspiration, and theological influence.

Off and on, John Knox, the Scottish reformer, spent considerable time in Geneva. Calvin had a great influence on Knox. Calvin even installed Knox as the minister of an expatriate church of English speakers in Geneva. In 1558/1559 Knox returned to Scotland and laid the groundwork for a system of presbyterian church government. Knox's Reformed church was ratified by law in Scotland in 1560 and it became the state church of Scotland. Knox's Presbyterian Church had great influence in the later American colonies.

---

the church, as well as an appendix concerning heresies and sectaries. The publication of the *Book of Concord* was an attempt to heal the divisiveness characteristic of the Lutheran movement since the death of Martin Luther 30 years earlier. Although it was not accepted everywhere as binding, it came to serve as the source book for Lutheran orthodoxy.

The Reformed tradition infiltrated most of Europe, especially, as we will see later, England. The following tenets are the defining characteristics of the Reformed tradition:

1. The first, and underlying truism of the Reformed tradition is God's awful and absolute sovereignty. The majesty, power, and "otherness," (utter transcendence, and unknowableness) of God, were themes upon which Reformed thinking and meditation constantly dwelled. This led Reformed Christians away from sentimentalism, triviality, and all efforts to cajole the Almighty.
2. The doctrine of human total depravity stood in the fore of Reformed teaching. This was expressed in the doctrine of "double predestination," stating that God in His almighty wisdom had elected some to eternal salvation and others to eternal reprobation. For both strict and moderate Reformed adherents, the doctrine of assurance (how to know if one is among the Elect) became increasingly important. This contributed to the future history of revivals in which some considered religious "enthusiasm" as a sign of that election.
3. A third characteristic was the intense concern for God's revealed Law. The Reformed tradition declared that the Scriptures provide an authoritative direction for the Church in doctrine, discipline, church order, and worship. The desire was to reconstitute the visible Church according to biblical prescription. All of the rites, offices, and ceremonies that were not explicitly prescribed in the Bible were prohibited, including "profane" hymnody, instrumental music, harmony (only singing in unison was acceptable), and festivals, such as Christmas. The Sabbath (Sunday) on the other hand came to be observed with legalistic austerity and rigor. The Law also was an explicit guide to human morality (in this they differed from the Lutherans). The civil government was to make its laws in conformity with the Scripturally revealed Law.
4. A fourth feature was the view that culture could be shaped and regulated by the revealed Law. Thus, Reformed leaders were very optimistic in their plans for reorganizing society according to their understanding of God's Law. They viewed themselves as being God's instruments for reordering human society. The Reformed tradition enlivened an Old Testament world view. This was expressed in the American colonies when the Puritans were determined to make God's Law and the historical example of Israel the explicit basis for life in "Christian commonwealths."

THE RADICAL REFORMATION

Several enduring radical movements emerged in Europe, and at least three of these were perpetuated in the colonies.

1. One expression of the Radical Reformation consisted of the "free spirits" who wandered about in Spain, France, and Germany. These rejected the world and its demands, but also any formal worship or church organization. They emphasized the primacy of the Spirit and, for the most part, they rejected the authority of the Scriptures; when the Scriptures were looked into, they rejected objective scriptural exegesis. They often were persecuted. One of the most influential of those who exemplified this view was Kaspar Schwenkfeld. Some of his followers, "the confessors of the Glory of Christ," later sought refuge in Pennsylvania.

2. More rationalistic were the antitrinitarians, who were organized in the Sconian movements of Poland and Transylvania. The best known of this group was Michael Servetus who was executed by the authorities in Geneva for his antitrinitarian views, his denial of original sin, and his opposition to infant baptism.[47] The opposition and persecution of their members caused the antitrinitarians to organize Unitarian churches in Poland.
3. The Anabaptists were the most widespread and lasting radicals. Their goal was to gather a visible church that conformed to the primitive church of the New Testament. Noting that only believers were baptized in Scripture, they insisted on baptizing only adults who made a profession of faith. They rebaptized those who had been baptized as infants. Because of this practice they were given their name (*Anabaptist* – "baptize again") which in time came to be accepted by both those in the movement and their critics. Even though their motive was to recreate the church of the New Testament, they were not able to come to an agreement as to what this church would look like. Gradually, more or less distinct groups formed and defined themselves. The main Anabaptist groups were and are:

[47] Calvin pled with the authorities to grant Servetus a merciful death by beheading. However, the council insisted that he be burned at the stake.

- The Swiss Brethren, who were influenced by the teachings of Conrad Grebel and Balthasar Hubmaier; many of these later settled in Pennsylvania.
- The Hutterites¸ whom Jacob Hutter molded into an enduring communal church. Many of these settled along the American/Canadian border.
- Mennonites, the followers of Menno Simons (a native German) of the Netherlands is the largest body to survive; the Mennonites settled throughout the American Midwest. Many migrated to Kansas and Indiana.

We will encounter each of these groups in future chapters of our story.

THE RELIGIOUS BACKGROUND OF THE BRITISH COLONIES

For thirty years (1455-1485), England had been torn apart by the Wars of the Roses,[48] the feud between the House of York and the House of Lancaster, both contending for the crown of England. On August 21, 1485, at Bosworth's Field, the army of the House of Lancaster, led by Henry Tudor, Earl of Richmond, defeated the army of the House of York and their leader, King Richard III. Richard III was killed in the battle. After the victory, Henry Tudor, had Richard's crown placed on his own head, and declared himself as king. All of England, tired of war, hoped for peace. Parliament authenticated Henry's claim to the throne and he was crowned, officially, in November 1485. Henry Tudor became King Henry VII and thus began the Tudor royal family. Four months later, the Archbishop of Canterbury died and England had a completely new ruling elite.

The Church and Henry VIII (1509-1547)

When Henry VII died in 1509, his brilliant and energetic son, Henry VIII, inherited a consolidated nation. Governmental authority had been centralized, there were no serious

[48] The Wars of the Roses were a series of civil wars fought in medieval England from 1455 to 1485 between the House of Lancaster and the House of York. Because Lancaster's heraldic badge was a red rose and York's was a white rose, the long conflict came to be known as the **Wars of the Roses** Major causes of the conflict include: 1) both houses were direct descendents of King Edward III; 2) the ruling Lancastrian king, Henry VI, surrounded himself with unpopular nobles; 3) the civil unrest of much of the population; 4) the availability of many powerful lords with their own private armies; and 5) the untimely episodes of mental illness by king Henry VI.

contenders for the throne, and an era of peace and prosperity beckoned. At Henry's side was Thomas Wolsey, who in time became Thomas Cardinal Wolsey, Lord Chancellor (the most powerful position in the kingdom, other than the king), Archbishop of York, and the papal legate who had authority over all of England's clergy. Wolsey was a man of great ambition and enormous pride. Because Henry was more interested in amorous adventure, hunting, and other sporting events, than he was in ruling, Wolsey quickly became the true ruler of England. Among other things, Wolsey taught Henry how to manipulate the Church and Henry learned the lesson well (later to Wolsey's regret).

Henry saw the Lutherans as a dangerous group and wrote an anti-Lutheran diatribe for which the Pope awarded him the title, "Defender of the Faith." For a season, he and the Pope seemed to be quite close. In 1509, Henry received a papal dispensation (with Wolsey's help) allowing him to marry his brother Arthur's widow, Catherine of Aragon. Because their union only produced one daughter, Mary, and no sons, Henry instructed Wolsey to obtain a papal dispensation that would allow him to divorce Catherine. Wolsey tried time and again, but failed to obtain permission for the divorce. At the time, Pope Clement VII was a prisoner of Charles V, the Holy Roman Emperor. Charles was Catherine's nephew and he would not allow the Pope to extend the dispensation allowing Henry to divorce his aunt.

Henry decided to take matters into his own hands and in a swift series of royal and parliamentary acts, England's ties to the papacy were cut. By 1531, the English clergy had been cowed into accepting the king as "Singular Protector, only Supreme Lord, and as far as the law of Christ allows, even Supreme Head of the church of England." In 1533, Henry divorced Catherine and married Anne Boleyn the same year.[49] In 1534, the famous Act of Supremacy was passed, stating the same thing, as the declaration of 1531, only the act did not contain the phrase, "as far as the law of Christ allows." By 1539, Henry had liquidated England's entire monastic

[49] Henry married the pregnant Anne Boleyn in 1533; she gave him another daughter, Elizabeth, but was executed for infidelity (a treasonous charge in the king's consort) in May 1536 (it appears that the charges of infidelity were contrived). He married Jane Seymour by the end of the same month, who died giving birth to Henry's lone male heir, Edward, in October 1536. Early in 1540, Henry arranged a marriage with Anne of Cleves, after viewing Hans Holbein's beautiful portrait of the German princess. In person, alas, Henry found her homely and the marriage was never consummated. In July 1540, he married the adulterous Catherine Howard - she was executed for infidelity in March 1542. Catherine Parr became his wife in 1543, providing for the needs of both Henry and his children until his death in 1547.

establishment, transferring its vast lands to various owners – the crown claiming one half of all of the real estate.

In spite of Henry's activities, and his severing the English Church from papal authority, doctrine and practice in the English parishes remained unchanged. The traditional faith and order of medieval Catholicism were perpetuated by the Six Articles of 1539 and the Kings Book of 1543. Even so, England had not been insulated from the Reformation. At Cambridge, Luther's writings became increasingly influential. Vernacular versions of the Bible became available.[50] Thomas Cranmer, who became the Archbishop of Canterbury in 1533, succeeded in translating the liturgy into English before Henry's death. Furthermore, Henry had put his son, Edward, under Protestant tutelage.

The Church and Edward VI (1547-1553)

Edward VI was the only male heir that Henry produced in his many marriages. Edward was the son of Henry and Jane Seymour. He was a frail lad, only nine years-old when he came to the throne. Because he had been reared as a Protestant, the Protestants of England hailed him as the

[50] The first English effort to render the Scriptures in the vernacular was that of John Wycliffe (1380), a translation of the Latin Vulgate. William Tyndale's translation from Erasmus's Greek text was printed surreptitiously in Antwerp and distributed in England after 1526. The first complete Bible in English was done by Miles Coverdale in 1535 with considerable indebtedness to Tyndale and Luther; it included the "apocryphal" books. John Rogers issued in 1537 a translation based on the work of Tyndale and Coverdale which was printed under the pseudonym, "Matthew." A recension of this by Richard Tavener appeared in 1539. The Great Bible of 1539 was the first Bible specifically prescribed for use in the churches of England. It too, was virtually a reissue of Matthew's Bible, edited by Coverdale. The second and later editions bore a preface by Archbishop Cranmer commending its use. This is the version of Scripture quoted in the traditional Book of Common Prayer.

The Geneva Bible (1560) was the work of several exiles who fled England with the coronation of Queen Mary. One of the most notable men to work on this translation was Miles Coverdale. Its numbered verses, lucid prose, improved scholarship, extensive prologues, and marginal notes gave it wide popularity. It was authorized for use in Scotland, and until superseded by the King James Version, it was the most widely distributed English Bible (this is the version carried by the Pilgrims who landed on Plymouth Rock). The "Bishop's Bible," a revision of he Great Bible supervised by Archbishop Parker and carried out by him, his fellow bishops, and a few other scholars who later became bishops, appeared in 1568. It never was widely accepted. The Douai-Rheims Bible (New Testament1582¸then the Old Testament 1609-1610) was translated by exiled Roman Catholics for use in England. As revised from time to time it has remained a standard Roman Catholic Bible in England.

The version which captured the hearts and minds of English speaking non-Catholics for at least three centuries is the Bible authorized by King James I in 1604. The translation was accomplished by 47 scholars. It was first issued in 1611.

English Josiah,[51] who had come to the throne to purify the Temple of its Romish idolatries. Because he was not yet an adult, two successive protector/regents had the real responsibility of ruling England. The first protector was Edward's uncle, Edward Seymour, Duke of Somerset. During Edward Seymour's tenure as protector (1547-1549) moderate reforms were enacted in the Anglican Church. The second protector (in that role from 1549 until Edward's death in 1553), John Dudley, Earl of Warwick and Duke of Northumberland, encouraged more radical changes in the Church.

During Edward VI's brief reign, the nation took major strides down the Reformation road. Most of the changes were done by legislation rather that in response to popular sentiment or the concern of churchmen. However, a number of societal changes also were influential. Protestant influence became more pervasive in the halls of learning as brilliant Reformed theologians from Austria, Switzerland, and Poland, began teaching at Oxford and Cambridge. Lutheran refugees were welcomed into England in 1548. Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop at the time, leaned toward the Reformed view of the Eucharist, rather than the Lutheran position (the theology of the Eucharist was the primary issue that separated Lutheran and Reformed Christians). Two significant documents were produced:

- The new Book of Common prayer (first issued in 1549 and revised in 1552) along with the Acts of Uniformity, enforcing their use in the churches.
- The Forty-two Articles of Religion, reflecting Reformed theology, was issued.

Although some Lutheran influence did remain, the major trend was toward Reformed theology. This was the period in which the groundwork was laid for the future Puritan Movement, via the emphasis on the covenant, the forbidding of "popish" vestments, ornamentation, and church furnishings.

Even though churchmen and government were involved in these matters, the public seemed to care little, one way or the other. The average Englishman was apathetic toward such issues.

[51] II Kings 22:1ff

The Church and Queen Mary Tudor (1553-1558)

Three weeks after signing the Forty-two Articles of Religion, Edward died. He was succeeded by his half-sister Mary Tudor, the daughter of Henry VIII and Catherine of Aragon (his first wife). The new Queen was a fervent Catholic and she was determined to return England to the Catholic fold. She also wanted someone to pay for the illegal divorce of her mother and father.

Evidence of the shallowness of the reforms that took place under Edward is seen in the great enthusiasm with which the population greeted Mary's coronation, and how quickly she was able to persuade Parliament to reverse most of the religious legislation enacted during the reigns of her father and half-brother.

In 1555 and 1556, four Protestant bishops were burned at the stake: John Hooper, February 1555; Nicholas Ridley and Hugh Latimer, October 1555; and Thomas Cranmer, March 1556. While the flames rose around Ridley and Latimer (tied together back to back on the same post), Latimer said, "Be of good comfort, Master Ridley and play the man; we shall this day light such a candle by God's grace in England as I trust shall never be put out."

Cranmer believed that all in the kingdom should obey the monarch. For this reason, he signed a document recanting his Protestant beliefs. However, when he read this recantation before the Royal Tribunal, he followed the script past the point of urging people to obey the monarch, then he departed from the script and recanted his recantation. He said that when he was burned, he would make certain that the hand that had signed the recantation would be the first of his members to be burned. It was so; he thrust his hand into the flames as they rose about his body. The day after Cranmer's execution Mary appointed Catholic Cardinal Reginald Pole as Archbishop of Canterbury.

Three hundred others were immolated by Mary and their stories are preserved in Foxe's *Book of Martyrs*. Among those executed was John Rogers, the pseudonymous editor of Matthew's Bible.

Popular displeasure mounted against the once popular Queen. Many began to question a religion that had to be promoted and protected by execution and torture. Her marriage to Philip of Spain, in 1554, sealed her loss of trust among the people. She also involved England in continental

wars, in which England seemed always to choose the losing side. The simultaneous deaths of Mary and her Archbishop in November 1558 were seen by many as Divine providence.

The Church and Elizabeth (1558-1603)

Mary was followed on the throne by her half-sister, Elizabeth, the daughter of Henry and Anne Boleyn. Everyone expected Elizabeth to be decidedly Protestant. However, the new Queen was not interested in reforming the Church as much as she was in ruling it. Her main concern was how to be Queen of England and how to survive. She knew that the English people would permit her to do this if they were able to go about their business and live their lives with little interference from the government and the Church.

The result of Elizabeth's approach was the Elizabethan Settlement, which was a policy of accommodation – a trait that still marks the Anglican Church. Elizabeth appointed Matthew Parker to the post of Archbishop. Parker had been ordained to the priesthood before Henry's break with Rome. The Act of Supremacy designated Elizabeth as "The Supreme Governor" of England's Church and an oath of loyalty to the Queen was required of all clergy. A revised and moderate Book of Common Prayer was produced and the Act of Uniformity required that it be used in the worship services of all churches.

The Pope excommunicated Elizabeth because she pulled the nation away from Catholicism. After her excommunication, a doctrinal statement was prepared for the Church, the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion. The Thirty-nine Articles never has been revised, substantially. Both the Articles and the Book of Common Prayer were aimed at maximum inclusiveness and important points were purposely vague.

The Puritans

The Puritan movement became stronger during Elizabeth's reign. Although not in full agreement with all of her actions, the Puritans were grateful to have a Protestant on the throne, especially one who seemed to guarantee them the freedom to practice their religion. The so called, "Puritan Century," is considered to have begun with Elizabeth's coronation.

Puritanism can be defined negatively as the religion of those who wanted to purify the Church by removing all taints of the papacy and to worship by those purified forms. Positively, Puritanism

can be defined as being concerned about those (1) who were living without the benefit of religion, and (2) those who had embraced the wrong religion. They sought both to purify England's Church and to revive it. They tenaciously adhered to Reformed theology.

All forms of Puritanism emphasized the concept of covenant. According to Puritans, each individual must make a personal covenant with God. Beyond that, a covenant must be made with the Church.

Some Puritans were *Conformists*, who were determined to purify the established church. They opposed separation from the church and considered such separation to be a deadly sin. They objected to many of the ceremonies, such as the ring in marriage, the sign of the cross in baptism, kneeling, showy vestments, and receiving immoral people at the communion table. They preached their views in their respective parishes. However, when James I took the throne (King of England 1603-1625), royal opposition to the Puritans became overt. James I of England had been James VI of Scotland and in that role had developed a negative view of Presbyterianism and the Puritans. The Puritan clergy in the Church of England were oppressed and ruined by excessive fines. As a result of James' attitude, the Puritans became less inclined to "tarry for the Magistrate."[52]

Division among the *Non-conformist* Puritans developed over the issue of how the Church, apart from the established Church of England, should be constituted.

- On one side were the *Presbyterian* Puritans who looked to the model of the established church in Geneva, and its English manifestation in the Presbyterian Church of Scotland. They accepted the notion that the Church should be organized nationally. They replaced Anglican prelacy[53] with a system of ascending church ruling bodies: local sessions, presbyteries, synods, and a general assembly. The general assembly was a body of clergy

[52] Interestingly, James I authorized the translation and publication of the famous version that bears his name – in the opinion of many, the only thing that he did to promote the well-being of the Reformation.
[53] A church government similar to the Roman Catholic structure with an ascending order of bishops, archbishops, etc.

and laity that functioned as an individual bishop would function in the Anglican Church. Many Anglican/Catholic practices were continued, such as sprinkling of infants.[54]

- On the other side of the issue were the congregational Puritans – *the Separatists,* also called, *Congregationalists*. This group believed that the Church should consist of local congregations of "visible saints" who had covenanted with God and with one another within the congregation. Each congregation was to be complete and autonomous. The local church would determine who were the saints, discipline and excommunicate members, ordain its ministers who would administer the sacraments only to those who were participants in the local church covenant. Other congregations, even those who shared the same faith, might not offer advice, unless it was asked for.

The original Baptist congregation sprang from a Separatist congregation that formed in Gainsborough, Lincolnshire, around 1606. John Smyth became its leader. Smyth and his congregation believed:

- the Bible and not creeds or church tradition should be the guide for faith and practice,
- the church should be comprised only of believers,
- the church should be governed by its members and not by bishops.

These embryonic Baptists pushed the covenant concept even further than most Puritans. They abandoned infant baptism, and redefined adult baptism as a mere outward seal of the Spirit's inner work; they diminished the importance of ordination; they considered the Lord's Supper to be of little importance; and they also insisted on the complete separation of Church and State.

Things worsened for the Puritans as James became more domineering and also began to favor those who led the Arminian[55] and more liturgical movements. Even so, the Puritans believed that England was an "elect nation," destined by God to be the savior of the Reformation.

---

[54] The views on pedo-baptism have drifted somewhat in recent decades. Original sin was the motive for infant baptism in its earliest days. However, today, in some branches of Presbyterianism a different view is held. See Addendum E for an article on Infant Baptism from a Presbyterian website presenting the view of one of the three branches of Presbyterianism represented in the US, PresbyFax, Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.), Louisville, KY.

[55] Arminius Jacobus (aka Jacob Arminius, James Arminius, and his Dutch name Jacob Harmenszoon) was a Dutch theologian, best known as the founder of the anti-Calvinistic school in Reformed Protestant theology, thereby lending his name to a movement which resisted some of the tenets of Calvinism. The

The Puritans' hopes took another serious downturn when Charles I took the throne in 1625. He married a Roman Catholic, and thereafter favored the Arminians and those who wanted a dogmatic hierarchy in the English Church. He appointed the leader of the Arminians, William Laud, as Archbishop. Charles had Laud prepare for him a list of all of the clergy and beside each name to put an "O" or a "P," i.e., Orthodox or Puritan. An effort was made to purge the English Church of clergy with Puritan leanings.

Charles sought to overrule the authority of Parliament and as a result he was involved in two civil wars, in which his royal army fought the forces of both the English and Scottish Parliaments. He lost the first war (1642-1645). After Charles' defeat, in 1645, Parliament executed Archbishop, William Laud, who was deemed to be a part of Charles' conspiracy. Parliament expected Charles to accept its demands for a constitutional monarchy. Charles would have none of it. He escaped from England and launched a second civil war (1648-1649) which he also lost. He was captured, tried, convicted and executed for high treason, January 30, 1649.

After winning the second war, Parliament abolished the monarchy and established a republic called, *the Commonwealth of England*, (also called, *the Interregnum*, referring to the period between two monarchies, when the throne is empty).[56] The Parliament at this time consisted almost exclusively of Presbyterians – both Scottish and English.

Oliver Cromwell was the military leader who had led the Parliament's army to victory over the royalists. Cromwell also was a member of Parliament and a congregational Puritan. The Presbyterians in Parliament had not given enough attention to paying the army its wages and so after the war, Cromwell ousted the Presbyterians from Parliament. In time, Cromwell ruled the country as a dictator.

---

doctrine of free will was an important element in Arminius' theology and the point that contradicted most strongly the views of Calvin. The theology of Arminianism was not fully developed during Arminius' lifetime but was formalized after his death. After 1610, the Dutch followers of Arminius' teaching were called the *Remonstrants*; it was in that year that they issued a document containing points of disagreement with classic Calvinism, entitled *The Five Articles of Remonstrance*, which they defended before the Council of Dort (the Synod of Dordrecht, held 1618-1619). In response, the Council published the five points of Calvinism (later known as TULIP) as a point-by-point response to the five points of the Arminian *Remonstrants.* (see Addendum F for the five points of TULIP)

[56] Charles' son, Charles II, theoretically became king when his father was executed, but he did not take up the throne until the restoration of the monarchy in 1660.

His congregationalism caused Cromwell to be tolerant toward the various expressions of church. Baptists grew in number during this period and other new groups came into existence, the most prominent of the new groups being the Society of Friends (the Quakers[57]). The Society of Friends emphasized being led by the Spirit; they rejected both the concept of an ordained ministry and all objective sacraments.

In December,1658, shortly after Cromwell's death, the Savoy Declaration[58] was issued affirming congregational autonomy. Things really were looking up for Puritans – but not for long.

When Cromwell died in September,1658, his son Richard succeeded him, but he did not have the power base that supported his father. He was forced to resign in May 1659. The Presbyterians and the Anglicans joined forces to restore the Stuart monarchy and they installed Charles II as king (ruled 1660-1685). The reconstituted Church of England was absolute authority and no compromise was allowed. Persecution became severe for Puritans of every type. Presbyterians, Congregationalists, Baptists, Quakers, Roman Catholics, and Unitarians were imprisoned and harassed. During this period, some of the finest devotional literature was produced by the oppressed Puritans: John Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress,* Richard Baxter's *Saint's Everlasting Rest*, Philip Doddridge's *The Rise and Progress of Religion in the Soul* – and the excellent hymns of Isaac Watts.

Out of these centuries of turmoil and theological pendulum swings came the Church of England – clearly defined and clearly established. The Anglican Church maintained its continuity with England's past – retaining the traditional forms of ministry and diocesan government, in many ways continuing to reflect its Roman Catholic background. Another characteristic was and is the liturgy in the Book of Common Prayer, essentially as it was edited during the reign of Elizabeth. The Thirty-nine Articles were reaffirmed. The Anglican Church was reconstituted as decidedly Arminian and rationalistic. In future years, there would be a recognition of other communions

[57] The origin of the name, "Quaker," is disputed but George Fox's journal seems to be the accurate source for the origin of the name. George Fox was brought to trial for blasphemy before Justice Bennet of Derby. According to George Fox's journal, when he was brought before Justice Beennet of Derby, on the charge of blasphemy, Bennet "called us Quakers because we bid them tremble at the Word of God." (referring to Isaiah 66:2 and Ezra 9:4). Thereafter, the group accepted the title.

[58] A modification of the Westminster Confession, allowing congregational government in the church.

and denominationalism would be given official recognition, but it took many decades for such plural denominationalism to become a reality.

Every component of the diverse English church scene would become a part of the religious life of colonial America.

British Colonial Failure and Tragedy

In 1585, during the reign of the iron-willed Elizabeth, Sir Walter Raleigh, a nobleman with a zest for adventure, dispatched a small fleet of ships to the New World. His plan was to settle Roanoke Island, off the coast of what is now North Carolina. This was the second attempt to settle a colony at this location. The first had ended with the starving would-be settlers abandoning their effort.

Many English and other European fishing vessels plied the North American coast and they often put ashore for wood and water. They brought back fabulous tales of Indians who used chamber pots of gold, encrusted with rubies and diamonds. So, when Raleigh sought to recruit Englishmen to join him in a second effort to settle the island, he had little difficulty in obtaining candidates for his venture.

There was no religious fervor that spurred Raleigh and his colonists. It was purely a case of greed. John White was appointed governor of the colonists. After the colonists had been attacked by hostile Indians and their supplies were diminishing rapidly, they prevailed on John White to sail back to England for emergency relief. White left behind his family, including his granddaughter, Virginia Dare, the first white child to be born in America. By the time that he arrived in England, Raleigh and others were consumed in preparing to repel an invasion by the Spanish. Two years would pass before White was able to head back to Roanoke with the needed supplies. When he arrived he found nothing but a deserted village. The main gate was off its hinges, the houses were falling apart, and no one was to be found. There were no bones to indicate a massacre and no hint as to what had happened. One of the ship's crew found four large letters carved in the trunk of a sizeable tree: C R O A. What did it mean? Some speculated that the settlers had gone off to join friendly Indians on "Croatan Island," (present day, Hatteras Island) but no hint of the settlers ever was found. To this day, no one knows the fate of those first Americans. For the second time, efforts to establish an English colony had failed.

Jamestown – a Tragic Colonial Success

A generation later, one of Raleigh's captains, Bartholomew Gosnold, was able to stir up interest in giving it another try. The Virginia Company was formed and all sorts of slick sales techniques were used to get investors to put money into the venture. One ploy was manipulating clergyman to proclaim from the pulpit that the venture was a great opportunity to share in a great work of God which would play a key role in the salvation of countless Indians. However, the sermons were just hype and there was no real interest in religious matters motivating the venture; the only motive was a desire for profit. From the first, the venture had one problem after another.

Finally, a colony was established on a small peninsula attached to the mainland by a narrow neck of sand. For the next several years, just about everything that could go wrong did go wrong. The venture was beset by disease, lazy aristocratic gentlemen who would not do common labor because it was beneath them; hunger was a constant companion and had it not been for the gracious Indian chief, Powhatan, all would have died of starvation.

There was but one clergyman among them, Robert Hunt and after his death, he was not replaced for many years. The noblemen were sarcastic toward Hunt's preaching in a makeshift arbor. They made it a point to arrive late for the Sunday meeting, and to have conversations among themselves while he was preaching. No church was established.

Many decades later, when the settlement had come to some permanency, the colonists started to grow tobacco. This became the chief source of profit for those who had invested in the colony. Even then, the authorities in England had little concern for the religious well-being of the colonists. "Damn your souls, make tobacco," was the reply of England's Attorney General, when James Blair made an appeal for funds to establish a school to train ministers because the colonists in Virginia had souls that needed to be saved. So, even though the tragic story of Jamestown is intriguing, historically, it is not a part of the History of the Church in America. The settlement was undertaken without even a nod toward Christ.

Plymouth – the First English Church in America

Because the "Old Colony" of New Plymouth is so significant in both the political and religious history of America, we will give significant space in the telling of its story. The story begins in the village of Austerfield in Yorkshire, England.

A puny fifteen-year old boy named, William Bradford, lived in Austerfield in 1604. His father, a wealthy farmer died when William was but a baby. His mother, the daughter of a shopkeeper remarried and moved away with her new husband. William lived sometimes with his paternal grandfather and sometimes with various uncles. All of these men were farmers and so Will was being reared to become a farmer. There were no schools available for Will, but somehow he learned to read and at the age of twelve he began to read the Geneva Bible. He thought that it was the most wonderful book in the world. Shortly thereafter, he began to play hookey from the little Anglican Church where his family worshipped. Will found little in the service to hold him. The minister muttered through the reading of the prayer book and never read from the Bible or brought a sermon. On the other hand, Will never missed an opportunity to steal away to hear a Puritan preacher, Mr. Richard Clyfton, preach in the open air or in people's houses. Mr. Clyfton preached from the Bible. He declared that the Anglican Church was completely off the beam and Will believed it because the only Anglican clergyman that he knew was the dumb parson in Austerfield. So, at the age of fifteen, in 1604, young Will began attending meetings held by Mr. Clyfton in the manor house in nearby Scrooby.

The manor house was the inn for passengers on the Great Northern Railroad between London and Edinburg. The manor house was kept by the leading man of the region, Mr. William Brewster, who in 1604 was twice William Bradford's age. These two Williams were destined to make a major mark on the future colony in America and on the religious climate of the new nation. Brewster was an educated gentleman. He was a graduate of Cambridge and a former secretary in Queen Elizabeth's diplomatic service. He had friends in high places. He knew both Latin and Greek and much experience in the wider world. Young Will Bradford looked up to Brewster and so when Brewster said that the Scrooby group should separate from the Church of England, Bradford went along.

Reverend John Robinson, who had been Clyfton's assistant, became the Scrooby congregation's preacher when Clyfton emigrated to the Netherlands.[59] Robinson was an Anglican priest, a graduate of Cambridge, a fellow of the college, and a true scholar. After accepting the Separatist view he renounced his Anglican orders, choosing poverty and hardship in order to minister to the Scrooby congregation.

To separate from the Church of England was a dangerous thing to do at that time. Such an act was viewed as treason and some separatists already had been executed. To become a part of the Scrooby congregation meant that one would endure the wrath of his family, as well as the wrath of the citizens of the area. It was not unusual for Separatists to have to fight their way to their Sunday meeting and to dodge brickbats when they exited. The girls of the community were ordered to not speak to them; merchants would not buy their farm products and shopkeepers refused to sell them supplies.

The situation become so intolerable in Scrooby that the congregation decided in 1607 to emigrate to the "Low Countries," the Netherlands. The Dutch were not very tolerant with their fellow Dutchmen, but they did welcome foreigners and let them worship as they pleased. Two other English Separatist congregations had gone to the Netherlands and reported that they had not been troubled by the authorities and that they had found work. Making the move was not easy. It was illegal for an Englishman to leave the country unless he had a passport and such documents were not granted to Separatist "traitors." Also, the sea passage from England to Netherland cost money, and only Mr. Brewster had any great sum of money. Brewster sold most of his property and paid the cost of passage for any who could not afford the fee.

The first group to leave walked to the seaport of Boston in Lincolnshire, carrying all that they could carry. They chartered a ship, but the captain betrayed them. They were arrested and jailed for a season, then sent home. A second smaller party, in 1608, contracted with a Dutch captain to take them to the Netherlands. They rendezvoused with him off a lonely spot on the coast, but before half of them could board the ship the sheriff arrived with a posse and arrested those still on shore, including Brewster and Bradford. Finally, the two Williams, along with other parishioners, did succeed in sailing from England on a Dutch vessel. On the way, they

[59] Later, Clyfton disavowed his Separatist views and wrote many documents opposing the Separatist movement.

encountered a frightful storm and even the sailors began to cry out, "we sink, we sink," but the Pilgrims knelt and prayed and their prayers were answered. This immediate turning to prayer became an oft repeated event in their future experiences, always with striking results. Thus, by late summer, 1608, about 125 members of the Scrooby congregation including the Reverend Mr. Robinson, "gat over" to Holland, taking up residence in Amsterdam. After a year, the group relocated to the university town of Leyden.

The Dutch were decent to the Pilgrims, allowing a number of them to become naturalized citizens. They were able to find work in humble occupations, but were not allowed to join the trade guilds, which monopolized the best paying jobs. Brewster was able to buy a printing press and began printing Puritan books, authored by English Puritans. An English Ambassador discovered that a Puritan book prohibited in England was being printed in Leyden. He sent an Anglican clergyman to Leyden to confiscate and burn all of the books.[60] The authors, Henry Barrow and John Greenwood were arrested in England, tried as traitors and executed. The English tried to have Brewster arrested and taken to England for trial, but the Dutch protected him.

The Pilgrims remained in Leyden for more than a decade, then they began to sense that they needed to move on. Several things motivated them. One was the fact that there really was no future for them in Holland. The only jobs available were hard indoor labor. They could not afford the boat or the equipment to become fishermen, like the Dutch, nor could they afford the expensive, limited farmland in the Netherlands. They longed for open fields and flocks and growing things. The older people worried because their children were becoming little Dutchmen, forgetting their native language and showing no respect for the Sabbath. Furthermore, war was about to break out between the Dutch and the Spanish and they had heard tales of the cruelty of Spanish soldiers.

Last and not least, they dreamt of a place where they could have their own Christian community, a place where the Gospel could be advanced and to which likeminded people would be attracted.

---

[60] Bradford in "First Dialogue," pp 7,10 states that the Anglican book burner kept a single copy for himself, intending to write a refutation. However, after reading the book he was converted by the arguments and became a Separatist (see Elliot Morison, *The Old Colony of New Plymouth*,[New York, Alfred Knopf]) 1956, page 12

Gradually, the vision began to grow - of having a colony overseas where they could worship as they felt proper, make a decent living, and lead a New Testament life.

Then arose the great question, where to go? Many options were considered, and for various reasons, rejected. After prayer, they decided to try to arrange something with the Virginia Company and go to the New World under that organization's auspices. The Virginia Company had begun to give large tracts of land, "Particular Plantations," to individuals who would emigrate at their own expense., They would be given the freedom of self-government and other privileges. An obvious challenge was the identity of the Virginia Company's board – all of them were loyal Anglican churchmen and probably would not give a patent to Separatists. Mr. Brewster had a personal relationship with the head of the Virginia Company, Mr. Edwin Sandys. Brewster dispatched two leading men of the Leyden group to visit with Sandys. Sandys assured them that his organization would be delighted to grant Brewster and his friends a plantation, but that he could not guarantee them religious freedom without the King's approval. Sandys asked his friend, Robert Naunton, a Secretary of State who sympathized with the Puritan cause, to approach the King (King James I). When Naunton gave his presentation, the King asked how the Pilgrims expected to support themselves, and Naunton replied that they intended to do this by fishing. "So God have my soul," the King replied, "'tis an honest trade, 'twas the apostle's own calling." However, the King said that he could not promise them religious liberty without first approaching the Archbishop. The Archbishop wanted definite assurance that the Pilgrims would acknowledge his and the King's supremacy over the church, and agree to other things that were against their principles. Sandys urged them to accept, stating that once they arrived in Virginia, having a patent for a plantation, they would be an ocean away from England that they could do just about whatever they pleased. Most of the Pilgrims felt that this would be hypocritical and that they had better try to get a grant in New England.[61] However, the Northern Virginia Company that had control over that area was being reorganized and no patents could be given until it had a charter from the King. So, a resolute minority decided to accept the Virginia Company's offer in lieu of something better. As Robinson and Brewster wrote to Sandys,

[61] At this time, New England was considered to be Northern Virginia

> "It is not with us as with other men, who small things can discourage, or small discontentments cause to wish themselves at home again. . . We verily believe and trust that the Lord is with us. . . and that He will graciously prosper our endeavors."[62]

On February 2, 1620, the Virginia Company issued a patent to them in the name of John Peirce, one of Brewster's London friends. The location of the Plantation was not specified; that was not done until people reached Virginia, and where they chose to settle is where the Plantation was authorized. It was assumed that they would settle somewhere near the mouth of the Hudson River, a location that would be handy for fishing and trading with the Indians.

The next big question was how to raise the money. The agreement was that they would cover all of their own expenses. As they wrestled with this, their agents were approached by a London iron salesman, Thomas Weston. He was a small capitalist who preferred to "chisel in" on some big enterprise that others were undertaking, rather than look for more legitimate sources of trade. His ethics were questionable and he had barely avoided being jailed for a previous venture. He saw a chance to make good money by exploiting the Pilgrims' plight. The Adventurers (the name of the investors) would pay all expenses of the ship, supplies, and transportation. The colonists must work for the Adventurers at fishing, fur-trading, lumbering, or whatever means of profit they found – for seven years. All profits above bare substance would go to the Adventurers. At the end of seven years, each colonist over sixteen years old who had labored for that space of time would get one share worth 10 pounds and each Adventurer would get one share for every 10 pounds that he had invested. All property in the colony then would be divided on that basis. Thus, a family of husband and wife, plus three children, who had worked for seven years would get exactly the same dividend as the capitalist who had invested about $250.00. In vain the Pilgrims asked to be allowed two days each week to work for themselves and that the houses that they built and the gardens they planted be regarded as their private property. Weston and his Company of Adventurers were adamant, the Pilgrims could take it or leave it.

Most Pilgrims decided to leave it. The prospect of working for seven years in the wilderness and getting nothing more than 10 pounds worth of real estate did not appeal to them. So, the

---

[62] Morison, *The Old Colony of New Plymouth*, page 16

Reverend John Robinson had to remain in Leyden with them, much to the grief of those who chose to make the trip to the New World.

A minority decided to make the trip. Brewster, Bradford, Carver, Cushman, Winslow and Allerton became the leaders of the venture. They hoped to leave in time to plant a crop for the autumn harvest, but with one thing after another interfering, they did not leave Holland until July 1620 and their final departure to America was postponed until September.

When the time came for the Leyden Pilgrims – fifty or sixty in number – to depart, the entire congregation accompanied them to Delftshaven, where the *Speedwell* lay ready.[63] The entire congregation fell to its knees and with teary cheeks commended them to the Lord with the most fervent of prayers. Many of them never saw one another again, in this life.

The *Speedwell* transported them from Holland to Southhampton where the *Mayflower* was anchored waiting for them. The Adventurers declared that not enough Pilgrims had volunteered to form a colony (which was true), and so they had recruited others to join the Pilgrims. Most of these had no interest in religious matters but only wanted to get to the New World and make their fortunes. A number of these recruits proved to be honorable men who became pillars of the colony but others did not, such as John Billington who was hanged for murder. Further problems developed – debts had been incurred which the Adventurers wouldn't cover and so the Pilgrims sold some of their provisions, including several thousand pounds of butter.

The two ships departed with the Pilgrims, but the *Speedwell* began leaking so badly that they had to put in at Dartmouth to have her repaired – consuming more time and money. Again they put out to sea, but after they had sailed about 300 miles, the captain of the *Speedwell* complained that the ship was leaking so badly that he refused to go on. So, once again they turned back, this time to Plymouth. The Pilgrims decided that it was too late in the year to delay longer and so they sold the *Speedwell* at a loss and all who could do so crowded onto the *Mayflower.* Those who had to stay behind waited for another ship that would sail the next year.

No more desperate colonial venture ever was launched from English shores. The season was too late for a fair voyage; the passengers had no knowledge of the New World; simple farmers and

[63] They had purchased the *Speedwell.*

artisans knew nothing of fur trading or fishing; and they were not trained to cope with the pioneer conditions in a savage continent. Yet, they had something better – stout courage and a firm faith. They believed that God was for them, even as they were for God, and that all of their troubles were planned by the Almighty to test them and to weed out the weak and timid even as had been done with Gideon's army. Ten years later, Bradford wrote,

> "Our fathers were Englishmen which came over the great ocean, and were ready to perish in this wilderness; but they relied unto the Lord and He heard their voice… Let them therefore praise the Lord, because He is good; and His mercies endure forever." [64]

The voyage took sixty-six days. It would have taken less time if the early plans had been carried out and they had left in May, when they would have enjoyed fair winds. However, leaving in September was the worst time to sail west. In September the opposing gales had begun and the *Mayflower* encountered many.

The journey also could have been completed in half the time if they had chosen to follow Columbus' route, dropping down to the Canaries and sailing past the West Indies and Florida, then up the coast to their destination. That route, however, would have put them in danger of being captured by the Spanish.

The trip was miserable, but they maintained a Christian spirit through it all. More than once the ship was in grave danger, but the prayers and the helpful ingenuity of the Pilgrims got them through one crisis after another.

On November 9, 1620 (by our present day calendar, the Gregorian – they used the Julian Calendar and so they dated things differently than we), they saw Cape Cod. The ship's Master, Mr. Jones, recognized the area, because he had made the trip before, bringing fishermen to the region. Since the Pilgrims were supposed to settle near the mouth of the Hudson River, Master Jones turned the ship south.

By evening the *Mayflower* was offshore from the elbow of the Cape and being drawn into the shoals of Pollock Rip[65]. The current was against her and the wind was failing. Night was

[64] Morrison, *The Old Colony of New Plymouth*, page 25
[65] Sometime spelled Pollack

rapidly coming upon them. It appeared that the ship was going to become the victim of the roaring breakers and dashed on the shoals.

Master Jones held a quick council with the leading men of the Pilgrims and all agreed that they should attempt to turn about and abandon their plans to settle at the mouth of the Hudson River, many miles to the south. It was a sound decision. By the next evening, November 10, they were off the coast, just east of Peaked Hill Bar – on the northeast shoulder of the Cape. The sea was calm, the weather was clear and cold. The Pilgrims had a prayer meeting to express thanksgiving to God for their narrow escape from the dangerous shoals of Pollock Rip. It was at this point that one of the most famous documents in history was composed. Some of the "strangers" who had been recruited for the voyage, began to boast that since they were going to land outside of the area controlled by the Virginia Company, that no one could tell them what to do, and as soon as they were ashore it would be "Hey, Ho! And everyman for himself." The Pilgrim leaders realized that something had to be done and some genius among them – no one knows who – suggested that they draw up a compact, similar to their church compact, but that this one would be for civil government and every man would be asked to sign it. How the bad actors were persuaded to sign on the dotted line is a matter of speculation, but most of them did. Here is the text of the *Mayflower Compact.*

> "In ye name of God, Amen. We whose names are underwriten, the loyall subjects of our dread soveraigne Lord, King James, by ye grace of God, of Geat Britaine, France and Ireland king, defender of ye faith, &c., having undertaken, for ye glorie of God, and advancement of ye Christian faith, and honour of our king & countrie, a voyage to plant ye first colonie in ye Northerne parts of Virginia, doe by these presents solemnly & mutually in ye presence of God, and one of another, covenant and combine our selves together into a civill body politick, for our better ordering & preservation, & furtherance of ye ends aforesaid; and by virtue hereof to enacte constitute, and frame such just & equall laws, ordinances, acts, constitutions, & offices, from time to time, as shall be thought most meete & convenient for ye generall good of ye Colonie, unto which we promise all due submission and obedience. In witness whereof we have hereunder subscribed our names at Cap-Codd ye 11. Of November, in ye year of ye raigne of our soveraigne lord, King James of England, France, & Ireland ye eighteenth, and of Scotland ye fiftie fourth. Ano. Dom. 1620"[66]

[66] Ahlstrom page 136-137

This document eliminated any independent behavior and united all signers in a covenant of submission to the welfare of the whole.

About a mile off the tip of Long Point, the Master directed the ship southward toward the landlocked part of the harbor and before long the ship was anchored in one of the best anchorages in New England – offshore from present day Provincetown, Mass. The ship's longboat was lowered and an armed party of fifteen or sixteen men rowed ashore, landing at the southern end of present day Provincetown. In his later journal, Bradford wrote, "They promptly fell on their knees and blessed the God of Heaven who had brought them over the vast and furious ocean, and delivered them from all the perils and miseries thereof, again to set their feet on the firm and stable earth, their proper element."[67]

For the next several weeks, the Pilgrims explored the region, occasionally encountering Indians, finding a buried cache of corn (which was important to them since their supplies were running low), discovering springs, ponds, and other important details that might help in their decision to set up their colony.

Quite by accident, one of the sailors took them to the site of the "Plymouth Rock." He thought that he was taking them to the site of a river that he had seen on a previous visit to the area. Many things made Plymouth the perfect site and that is where they chose to stay. The exploring party returned to the *Mayflower* and reported their findings. Bradford received tragic news at that time. While he had been away with the exploring party, his wife had fallen overboard and drowned.

On December 16, the *Mayflower*, weighed anchor and that night she anchored in Plymouth Harbor. Since it was against Puritan principles to work on the Sabbath, everyone stayed on board, December 17, and Elder Brewster conducted "Divine Service." Advance parties began going ashore on December 18. The pictures of the Pilgrims arriving enmasse are inaccurate portrayals. The significant dates of the arrival in the New World are:

- The first landing took place at future Provincetown on November 11
- The exploring party landed at or near the present town of Plymouth on December 11
- The *Mayflower* anchored in Plymouth Harbor on December 16

[67] Morison, *The Old Colony of New Plymouth*, page 42

- The first people, other than the exploring party, went ashore on December 18

After two or three days of exploring and discussing, the group decided to plant the center of their town where Town Brook flows into the harbor. On either side were cleared Indian cornfields ready for planting; just behind the shore, overlooking the brook, was a high hill from which they could look out to sea, view the country all around, and place cannons for defense if they needed to do so. The flow of the brook made a boat channel, even a low tide, through the mud flats to Plymouth Rock.

On December 21 & 22 there was a cold heavy rain and so all stayed on board the *Mayflower,* but on the 23rd most of the men landed and with their tools began to chop down trees for building. By the end of December 25, they had the sills laid for a storehouse, twenty feet square. From that day onward, they built their town.

The story of the colony is one of the most interesting stories in all of history. Most Americans are familiar with the first hard winter, the many deaths during the Great Sickness of 1621, the time of starvation, and the providential arrival of two Indians who spoke English and befriended them. We must pass by that intriguing tale and move on to the story of the Pilgrim's church.

Early on, the colonists built a stockade on the hill above the town and the lower floor was the meeting place for their church services. Isaack de Rasieres, the Dutch official who visited Plymouth in 1627, described their situation.

> "Upon the Hill they have a large square building with a flat roof, built of thick sawn planks stayed with oak beams, upon the top of which they have six cannon. Which shoot iron balls of four and five pounds, and command the surrounding country. The lower part they use for their church where they preach on Sundays and the usual holidays. They assemble by the beat of drum, each with his musket or firelock, in front of the captain's door; they have their cloaks on, and place themselves in order, three abreast, and are led by a sergeant without beat of drum. Behind comes the Governor in a long robe; beside him, on the right hand, comes the Preacher with his cloak on, and on the left hand the Captain with his sidearms and cloak on, and with a small cane in his hand; and so they march in good order, and each sets his arms down near him. Thus they are constantly on their guard night and day."

Because of this detailed description by an on-sight observer, we know that the various paintings of this event are correct. The armed Pilgrims did march up the hill to church, attired in their best clothes.

One of the things that bothered the Pilgrims more than anything else, was the lack of a clergyman. Elder Brewster was a good preacher, and true to the Word, but, being unordained, he was not qualified to baptize babies or to administer Holy Communion. The Reverend John Robinson whom they had hoped to bring over from Leyden had died in 1625.

A friend of one of the Adventurers, the Reverend John Lyford was sent to Plymouth, in the hope that he would do as the Plymouth minister. Lyford had been the minister in an Anglican parish in Ireland, but he had been expelled for "playing wolf" with the girls of his congregation. When he arrived in Plymouth, he seemed to be very sweet and humble, telling the group that even though he was an ordained Anglican, he really was a Puritan at heart. Delighted at last to have a "Reverend," the colony provided him with a house and double rations for him and his family of five. In due time, they would have elected him their pastor, but he quickly got in cahoots with a troublesome man named, Oldham, and with him began to develop a secret faction planning to overthrow the government of the colony. Bradford noticed secret meetings and whispering going on among some malcontents and became suspicious. Lyford had written a number of letters to be sent to England aboard the ship, *Charity*. Bradford and some others boarded the *Charity* opened the mail box and read Lyford's letters and kept some of the more damaging. The letters revealed that the conspirators were sending lying reports about the current leadership of the colony to the Adventurers and the conspirators were planning to take over the colony. Bradford decided to let the conspiracy cook for awhile to see who was in on it. Oldham displayed himself in such a way that the colonists began calling him, "Mad Jack." He refused to perform military duty, pulled a knife on Miles Standish, the captain of the militia, and roared and cursed at the obedient citizens. Lyford went so far as to set up a separate church meeting for his cronies. After it became evident who the culprits were, Bradford called a meeting of the Freemen of the Colony and preferred charges. They denied everything, and so Bradford pulled out Lyford's letters and read them out loud. Lyford broke down and confessed. Oldham and Lyford were ordered to leave the colony within six months. Lyford then put on an act, weeping and wailing, confessing his sins and promising to be loyal – he was forgiven and the sentence

revoked. However he wrote another slanderous letter which was intercepted. Mrs. Lyford was so ashamed of her husband that she made a full confession to the leaders of all of her husband's misdeeds. The Adventurers were advised of all of this, and they had learned of Lyford's previous behavior in Ireland. They agreed with his removal. Lyford wandered north along the coast, preaching to fishermen, and finally ended up an Anglican minister in Virginia where he died.

Next on the scene, in 1628, was a hopeful young parson named, Rogers, but he turned out to be "crazed in his brain," and had to be sent home. The next year the Reverend Ralph Smith, a scholar of Christ's Church, Cambridge, was induced to come to Plymouth. He was the first ordained regular pastor of the Plymouth Church. However, he was physically weak and had to be relieved after six years. Edward Winslow then engaged "a godly and worthy man" who promptly died, before he could travel to Plymouth. Next came the Reverend John Norton, but after a year he left to join another colony. The Reverend John Rayner, formerly of Magdalene College, came next and remained for quite some time. Yet, he had some unhappy rows with the Plymouth Church that resulted in his departure after twenty years.

During Rayner's tenure, the Reverend Charles Chauncy was obtained as Rayner's collegue. Being a Greek scholar, he insisted that baptism be by immersion, and intended to baptize infants by immersion. Bradford objected because "in this cold country that is not convenient." Chauncy moved to Scituate, where he followed the baptismal practice that he believed was correct – but he constantly had trouble over this issue. Finally he was elected President of Harvard College where he had to do no baptizing .

Plymouth Church services were held in the block house until 1648, at which time the first meeting-house was constructed – a simple square structure on the corner of Leyden and Main. A larger church building was erected on the same site in 1683.

Meanwhile, the Reverend John Robinson, still leading the congregation at Leyden, had decided that rigid separation from other Protestant churches was wrong and he converted his congregation to that point of view. As a result of Robinson's stand, the Plymouth Church chose to no longer be Separatists, but just Congregational Puritans. Thus, the Plymouth Puritans were in complete sympathy with the Puritans who shortly came to Massachusetts Bay and became a

great help to that colony. The Plymouth Congregational Church has the distinction of being the oldest congregation in the United States.

Massachusetts Bay- The Second Puritan Church in America

In 1620, a branch of the old Virginia Company was reorganized as the Council for New England. The group of aristocrats who accomplished this feat incorporated a land company with a grant to all territory north of the 40th parallel (just north of Philadelphia) and extending to the 48th parallel (which included New Brunswick and Nova Scotia) "from sea to sea." The stockholders were landed gentry who intended to establish in New England a monolithic Anglican domain with fiefdoms and manors for themselves. In 1623 there were at least forty authorized sailings to areas held by the Council for New England and by 1625 at least fifty ships were fishing in New England waters. By that time, there would have been several hundred semi- permanent "settlers" at various points along the coast, not including the settlement at Plymouth.

The only one of these settlements that has a place in Church History is the colony at Cape Ann (Gloucester). The Cape Ann Colony was founded by a company organized by John White, the minister of Holy Trinity Church in the seaport of Dorchester, Wessex. White was an Anglican of Puritan leanings who had a concern for the spiritual condition for the New England fishermen. Fourteen men were sent out in 1623 and thirty-two more the year following. When, after three years, they had not turned any profit and had not provided significant pastoral care to the wandering fishermen, the company called on Roger Conant to take over the company's New England affairs. Conant was a merchant who had spent a year in Plymouth. Not long after Conant began to work toward accomplishing his mission, the company collapsed, having discovered that,

> "no fishing place in the Land is fit for planting, nor any good place for planting found fit for fishing, at least neere the Shoare, And secondly, rarely any Fisher-men will worke at Land neither are Husband-men fit Fisher-men but with long use and experience."[68]

Conant was left to pick up the debris, which he did well, by moving the colony's twenty souls to Naumkeg (later Salem) where a viable agricultural colony could be maintained.

---

[68] Clifford K., Shipton, *Roger Conant, A Founder of Massachusetts* (Cambridge, MS, Harvard University Press) 1945, as quoted in Ahlstrom, page 141.

In England, the efforts of White and some of his associates converged with the interests of "some Gentlemen of London" and the earnest desires of a group of Puritans in East Anglia. In 1628 the group attained legal status as the New England Company with title to lands "from the Atlantic Ocean to the South Sea" between a point three miles north of the Merrimac River to a point three miles south of the Charles River.[69] With John Endicott as chief-in-command (Endicott was a brash, independent-minded soldier), a party of about forty sailed from Waymouth on the *Abigail,* on June 20, 1628. They reached Naumkeag on September 6. Endicott ruled with an iron hand giving little respect for the old settlers of Naumkeag. The older settlers rose up in resentment and trouble brewed. However, a peace of some sort was worked out and so Endicott renamed the settlement, *Salem,* meaning, "peace." Endicott's role was redefined in 1629, when word was received that the New England Company had been reconstituted on a radically different model as the Massachusetts Bay Company.

The birth of the Massachusetts Bay Company largely was the result of the desire of non-separatist Puritans to live in a Bible Commonwealth. It was they who pushed forward the reconstitution of the New England Company. A new enlarged charter was routinely processed through Parliament and presented for His Majesty's signature. The King, Charles I, failed to notice that there was no mention of where the Company's meetings were to be held. He signed it and forgot about it. The timing of God can be seen in the fact that less than a week later, the King dissolved Parliament and took the reins of the country entirely into his own hands (see page 47). After that, he scrupulously scrutinized every document to make certain that his authority was in no way diminished.

The Bay Company's partners were jubilant. There was nothing holding them to England, nothing that kept them from moving to New England themselves and taking the charter with them. Headquarters would be in Salem, not in London. The company could become a self-governing commonwealth with the charter as its *carte blanche.* Rather than the laws of England, they could be governed by the laws of God.

---

[69] Endicott Rock, which the surveyors placed to mark the northern boundary is in New Hampshire, on the eastern shore of Lake Winnipesauke, at the Weirs; the Charles River empties into the bay on the south side of Boston.

On August 26, 1629, John Winthrop met with the other principles at Cambridge (most were alumni of Cambridge). They put their lives where they already had put their money and their mouths (in contrast to the Virginia financers). Winthrop wrote,

> "It is fully and faithfully agreed amongst us…we will be ready in our persons…to embark for the said plantation by the first of March next…to pass the seas (under God's protection) to inhabit and continue in New England"[70]

The Bay company was not a group of battered Separatists thrown upon a rocky shore. It was an aristocratically led, well planned, and well financed flank attack on the corruptions of the Church. Winthrop and his colleagues believed that their venture was an essential maneuver in the drama of Christendom. As Perry Miller wrote, "They did not flee to America; they went in order to work out that complete reformation which was not yet accomplished in England and Europe."[71] Furthermore, unlike the colonists who founded Plymouth, the Bay Company founders and colonists were Puritan Anglicans. The Reverend Francis Higginson, exclaimed to the passengers as they departed,

> "We will not say, as the Separatists were wont to say at their leaving of England, 'Farewell Rome!' or 'Farewell Babylon!' But we will say, 'Farewell dear England! Farewell the Church of God in England, and all the Christian friends there! We do not go to New England as Separatists from the Church of England, though we cannot but separate from the corruptions in it, but we go to practice the positive part of church reformation and propagate the Gospel in America."[72]

Three days after the Cambridge agreement, the decision was approved by the general membership of the company and Winthrop was elected Governor. When the group was ready to sail, Winthrop was on one of the first ships to depart, the *Arabella.* The traditional farewell sermon was delivered by a young Puritan minister, John Cotton, who later would play a prominent role in New England. His text was II Samuel 7:10,

> *Moreover I will appoint a place for my people Israel, and will plant them, that they may dwell in a place of their own, and move no more; neither shall the children of wickedness afflict them any more, as beforetime,*(appropriately – KJV)

---

[70] Peter Marshall & David Manuel , *The Light and the Glory,* (Old Tappen, New Jersey, Fleming H. Revell Company) 1977, page 156-157
[71] Perry Miller, *Errand into the Wilderness,* as quoted in Marshall & , page 157
[72] Marshall & Manuel , page 155

> "Go forth," he exhorted them, "with a public spirit, with that care of universal helpfulness. . . Have tender care. . . to your children, that they do not degenerate as the Israelites did…" [73]

Cotton concluded his sermon,

> "What He hath planted, He will maintain. Every plantation His right hand hath not planted shall be rooted up, but His own plantation shall prosper and flourish. When He promiseth peace and safety, what enemies shall be able to make the promise of God of none effect? Neglect not walls and bulwarks and fortifications for your own defense, but ever let the name of the Lord be your strong tower, and the word of His promise, the rock of your refuge. His word that made heaven and earth will not fail, till heaven and earth be no more."[74]

After seventy-two days of sailing the *Arabella* arrived at Salem. To Winthrop's shock, the town consisted of a few huts and canvas shelters. The people who came down to the shore to meet him were gaunt and ragged. More serious to Winthrop was their obvious spiritual state; they were listless, slow of movement, apathetic; life had gone out of their faces.

As soon as possible, Winthrop had a private meeting with Endicott, who had been acting as provisional Governor – the man that Winthrop would replace. Excellent ministers had arrived several months before Winthrop. Winthrop demanded of Endicott what had gone wrong – "you had ministers here, good ones, is there no teaching here?" Endicott stated that they had service on Thursdays and two services on Sundays, but the people just hear the sermons and nod their heads, but nothing changes.

Winthrop spent that night upon the *Arabella.* After hours of prayer and meditation, he took out a quill and writing paper and composed what would rank in importance with the *Mayflower Compact.* He took the *Mayflower* concept one step further. They had stated that they were beginning to do something as a body politic of equal members, gathered under God, and to be governed by their mutual consent. Winthrop, in his document, spelled out why this would work. His definition of covenant-love seldom has been equaled.

---

[73] Marshall & Manuel, page 157
[74] *Ibid* in loco

Across the top of the page he wrote the words, A MODEL OF CHRISTIAN CHARITY. Then, he went right to the heart of the matter,

> "The love among Christians is a real thing, not imaginary. . . as absolutely necessary to the well being of the Body of Christ as the sinews and other ligaments of a natural body are to the well being of that body. . . We are a company, professing ourselves fellow members of Christ, and thus we ought to account ourselves knit together by this bond of love…

Then he wrote the heart of his vision for the colony,

> "Thus stands the cause between God and us: we are entered into covenant with Him for this work. We have taken out a Commission; the Lord hath given us leave to draw our own articles. . . If the Lord shall please to hear us, and bring us in peace to the place we desire, then hath He ratified this Covenant and sealed our Commission, and will expect a strict performance of the Articles contained in it. But if we shall neglect the observance of these Articles. . . the Lord will surely break out in wrath against us.
>
> Now the only way to avoid this shipwreck and to provide for our posterity is to follow the counsel of Micah, to do justly, to love mercy, to walk humbly with our God. For this end, we must be knit together in this work as one man. . . We must hold a familiar commerce together in all meekness, gentleness, patience, and liberality. We must delight in each other, make one another's condition our own, rejoice together, mourn together, labor and suffer together, always having before our eyes our Commission and Community in this work, as members of the same body. So shall we keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. . .
>
> We shall find that the God of Israel is among us, when ten of us shall be able to resist a thousand of our enemies, when He shall make us a praise and glory, that men of succeeding plantations shall say, 'The Lord make it like that of New England' For we must consider that we shall be as a City upon a Hill…[75]

The next day, the new Governor went ashore and began to implement and bring into reality the document that he had prepared the night before. Although Manuel and Marshall use a lot of imagination in their narrative, their creation is worth reading because it does present an accurate picture of what happened the day that Winthrop took up the role of Governor at Salem. He instructed Endicott to assemble the colonists for their first meeting with the new Governor. He instructed all residents to be present for a meeting at 1 o'clock in the afternoon.

---

[75] *The Winthrop Papers,* Boston: Massachusetts Historical Society, Volume II pages 292-295

Promptly at one o'clock, he came to the opening in the center of the huts and shelters that was "town." A number of people were already there, staring at their Governor in amazement. Dressed in worn boots and breeches and an old frayed shirt, he looked more like an indentured servant than a Gentleman.

When most of the people had gathered, he addressed them: "The situation here is not exactly what we in England were led to expect." There was some cynical laughter, but mostly silence; they were waiting to hear what would come next. "But I think it can be rectified without too much trouble, although it's going to require hard work. By the end of the summer, every one of you is going to be in a proper dwelling. Until then, more than one family will have to live together, at least for the first winter." There was now a noticeable current of unbelief. "How are we going to do it?" Winthrop asked for them. "By God's grace, we are going to do it, and by helping one another."

At that moment he was interrupted by Richard Saltonstall and a friend, who were just then arriving and carrying on a conversation of their own. Saltonstall was wearing a white shirt with a ruff at the neck. Winthrop's lips compressed, then he turned back to the rest.

"First of all, who among you has had any experience fishing?" Eight men raised their hands, and Winthrop conferred with Endecott at his side. "All right, Packham and Kenworthy, each of you take three men, and on alternate days you will take turns using the shallop for fishing."

"Now the women," he said, looking up from his lists. "Those of you who are able, will do field work in the mornings. The rest will be under Mr. Skelton on nursing detail. Mr. Skelton, as of this moment you are officially responsible for what you and Mr. Higginson have been unofficially doing all along: tending the sick. Only now you are going to have more help."

"Mr. Higginson," and there he turned to the pastor who had lowered himself to a stump because he was not able to stand any longer, "considering your condition, sir, you can help us most with your prayers – and a strong word on Sunday about what it means to serve God and one another."

He turned his attention to the other minister. "Mr. Skelton, you will also be in charge of the food stores. I want an inventory taken daily, and I would appreciate your alerting me of any projected shortfalls, as far in advance as possible. Also, by the guidance of the Holy Spirit, you are to decide what the daily ration will be. And those of you who have your own stocks will be expected to forego your ration.

> He folded the lists and handed them to Endecott. "The rest of you will form into two work parties: those under forty, with Mr. Endecott, those over forty, with me. Are there any questions?
>
> "Yes" It was Richard Saltonstall. 'John, you do not really expect me to—"
>
> "Yes, Richard, I really do."
>
> "But common labor, John! I brought nine men with me to look after that sort of thing! And you brought more than I!"
>
> Winthrop hesitated, before replying. "Last August, at Cambridge, you put your name to an agreement which bound you as a Christian to be ready *in your person* to further this work. So did I. This work will not succeed unless every man is willing to give his all. We are all laborers in God's vineyard, and that does not mean that, just because we can afford to, we pay someone else to do our work for us."
>
> Saltonstall shook his head, almost too angry to speak. "This is—"
>
> "This is the way that it's going to be. I'm afraid. And I will tell you something else," he looked around. "This is for all of you who were late. I want you to know that I do not consider lateness to be merely impolite; as far as I am concerned, it is a sin against God! This is His work, and He has called us to it. To steal His time is to blaspheme against what He is trying to accomplish here!
>
> Starting tomorrow morning, we will meet promptly at two hours past sunrise for daily work assignments. And bring something with you to eat at the noon hour. We will work until four hours past noon, and the rest of the day is entirely your own." There was more laughter now.
>
> "Are there any questions?" There were none.[76]

Without a doubt, what was almost miraculous took place with Winthrop's arrival. A nearly dead colony was resurrected and from all reports, God's single instrument was John Winthrop. The great New England Puritan, Cotton Mather, referred to Winthrop as the American Nehemiah. Another seventeenth-century report said,

> "As soon as Mr. Winthrop landed, perceiving what misery was like to ensue through their idleness, he presently fell to work with his own hands, and thereby so encouraged the rest that there was not an idle person then to be found in the whole plantation. And whereas the Indians said that they [the newcomers] would shortly return as fast as they

[76] Marshall & Manuel, pages 164-166

> came, now they admired to see in what short time they had housed themselves and planted corn sufficient for their subsistence."[77]

Throughout the years that he led the colony, Winthrop was admired, respected, and loved. He was very generous, displaying a godly humility, and never taking advantage of his position for personal gain. When there were hungry people and Winthrop had anything in his personal store, he gave it to the hungry. Out of his own wealth, to a large degree, he subsidized the colony in its earliest days. The settlers, observing his example, followed it. Most students of the colonies rank him second only to Washington in terms of stature among the founding fathers.

Sunday in the Massachusetts Bay Colony

After the Puritan movement began to flourish, one of the distinctives that marked the movement was the commitment to the Decalogue as God's express will for their lives, their communities, and their churches. That being true, they had to commit to the principle of Sabbath-keeping and they declared Sunday, the first day of the week, to be the Christian Sabbath. The idea of a strictly observed Christian Sabbath was the creation of English Puritanism. The earliest Puritan theorists who produced this view were Lancelot Andrewes, Nicholas Brownde, and Thomas Greenahm – they were theorists. Later, John Trask (1573-1636?), a very literal and legalistic thinker, demanded a Seventh Day observance and his view continued to find favor with the early Puritans. Finally, Sunday was accepted as the Pilgrim's Sabbath - their absolute standard. So, what happened during a Puritan Sabbath?

The first event was a morning service which lasted three to four hours. After taking a recess for a light lunch they reconvened for the afternoon service which could run for another three hours. During the morning and afternoon service, there was lengthy teaching, singing, and praying. Then came Sunday dinner, which was the heartiest meal of the week. A nap usually followed.

The Puritans were so hungry for the Word of God and for sound teaching to assist them in their struggle against sin and self, that they welcomed sermons lasting two hours or more. When in top form the Puritan pastor could be counted on to require a minimum of two turns of the large hourglass that stood in plain view near the pulpit. After the sermon, they expected at least a turn

---

[77] Edmond S. Morgan, *The Puritan Dilemma,* (Boston, Little, Brown & Co) 1958 page 58, as quoted by Manuel and Marshall page 167

and a half of prayers. If a visiting preacher gave out after only three-quarters of an hour, they spoke of him in the same language that they used for a spavined horse.

The man who was responsible for turning the hourglass was the "tithingman." He had many responsibilities in the church and in the community. He had the responsibility of visiting the inns on Sunday (before, after, and in-between the time that the service was in session) to make certain that they remained closed on the Sabbath. Also, enroute to the service, he stopped by the houses of known truants to make certain that they were up and about and getting ready to occupy their appointed pews.

Most importantly, he was responsible for keeping the saints alert during the service, "as the pastor went from his 'Thirteenthly' to his 'Fourteenthly,' (or heaven forfend, from his 'Twenty-seventhly' to his 'Twenty-eighthly,' which was known to happen.")[78] The tithingman was on the alert for a saint who was "only resting his eyes." He was equal to the task, having a staff with a foxtail or a pheasant feather on one end (for the ladies) and a brass knob on the other (for the men). Some had a sharp thorn on the end of the staff for those who were soundly asleep. The congregation desired to hear every word of the sermon and so they appreciated the work of the tithingman, and willingly paid his salary. Jesus said, "the spirit is willing but the flesh is weak," and the Puritans agreed. The journal of Obadiah Turner, describing the service on the first Sunday in June 1646, gives an interesting account of the tithingman's work.

> "As he strutted around the meetinghouse, he did spy Mr. Tomlins sleeping with much comfort, his head kept steady by being in the corner, and his hand grasping the rail. And so spying, Allen (the tithing man) did quickly thrust his staff behind Dame Ballard and give him a grievous prick upon the hand. Whereupon Mr. Tomlins did spring up much above the floor, and with terrible force did strike his hand against the wall, and also, to the great wonder of all, did profanely exclaim, "*Curse ye, woodchuck!"* he dreaming, so it seemed, that a woodchuck had seized and bit his hand. But on coming to know where he was, and the great scandal he had committed, he seemed much abashed, but did not speak. And I think he will not soon again go to sleep in the meeting."[79]

[78] Marshall & Manuel, page 186
[79] Alice Morse Earle, *The Sabbath in New England* (New York, Scribners) 1891, as quoted in Manuel and Marshall, pages186-187

Of great importance to the Puritans was the choir. The choir was essential because all singing was *acapella* and many in the congregation could not remember the tunes. Even the few melodies that were well known, were sung differently by individuals and so no two parishioners sang them exactly alike. Hence, as one person described the singing, it sounded like five hundred different tunes being roared out at the same time.

Traditionally, the singing consisted of singing the Psalms, with an elder or deacon leading a line and the choir dutifully repeating it.[80] This sort of singing (called "spelling") continued in many parts of the United States until well into the 20th Century. Interestingly, the first printing press in America was set up at Cambridge in 1639 and in 1640 it published its first book, *THE VVHOLE BOOKE OF PSALMES Faithfully TRANSLATED into ENGLSH Metre, Whereunto is prefixed a discourse declaring not only the lawfulness, but also the necessity of the heavnly Ordinance of singing Scripture Psalmes in the Churches of God.*

Distinctives of Bay Colony Puritans

1. They were Reformed in doctrine.
2. The magistrate and the Church should cooperate in establishing both civil and ecclesiastical order.
3. They were a self-conscious tightly knit group within the larger Puritan movement.
4. They had progressed beyond the Presbyterian conception of a national church to one that fully was congregational.
5. They rejected the idea that pure preaching of the Gospel and correct administration of the Lord's Table were sufficient marks of a true church.
6. The church should consist only of "visible saints" and their children.
7. A knowledgeable confession of faith and consistent God-fearing behavior were the test of visibility.
8. They were not Separatists, in that they did not consider the Church of England to be the Great Whore of Babylon, but a church that needed correction.
9. Particular churches should be formed only by men and women who could give credible evidence that they had experienced God's effectual call – in order to do this they must narrate the experience of the Regenerating Grace, thus qualifying for membership.

[80] The story (whether aprocryphal or true - who can say) is told of one deacon, who upon rising to lead the singing found that his failing eyesight made it difficult for him to read the Psalm. As he faltered, he apologized and said, "My eyes, indeed, are very blind." The choir, assuming that he was reading the first line of a Psalm, repeated the line in the same tone and inflection that he had spoken. The deacon, trying to explain, said, "I cannot see at all!" and the choir repeated that line. Frustrated, the deacon cried out, "I really believe you are bewitched," and the choir then sang that line. The deacon added, "The mischief's in you all," and sat down in disgust. (see Marshall & Manuel, page 187)

For the first time in the history of the Church, a state church not only was enforcing uniformity, but also was requiring an internal, experiential test of church membership.

The Move to Boston

Other ships arrived and Salem was not situated to accommodate the growing population. So, Winthrop moved the center of the colony to the landlocked harbor at the mouth of the Charles River. The new town of Boston became the seat of government. A cluster of towns quickly developed in the bay area.

A dramatic move was made in the form of the Bay Colony government. On August 30, 1630, just two and one half months after Winthrop's arrival, Governor Winthrop, Deputy Governor Thomas Dudley, and seven "Assistants" began their governmental tasks. On October 29, they called a meeting of "the whole body of settlers," and carried out a minor political revolution. It was decided "by the generall vote of the people, and an erecion of hands" that the freemen (landholders) of the colony, not the stockholders of the company, should have the power of choosing Assistants, and "the Assistants from amongst themselves to chuse a Governor and Deputy Governor, whoe with the Assistants should have the power of makeing lawes and chuseing officers to execute the same." At the next meeting, 116 newcomers were added to the original twelve freemen (probably almost all of the adult males). In 1632, the freemen were empowered to elect directly the Governor and the Deputy Governor. Thus, the trading company had become a self-governing commonwealth.

Although not a democracy in the modern sense, this was a step in that direction. The Governor and his Assistants still were the ones who enacted laws required by God's Word, the Bible, especially the Decalogue. Some laws had to be established apart from the biblical paradigm but biblical principles were sought as the measure of such laws.

It also should be stated that the Bay Colony was not a theocracy. For that matter, of all of the governments in the western world at that time, early Massachusetts gave the clergy the least authority. The government of the Church and the government of the State were not the same, even though the same men might function in both roles. Yet, the clergyman's influence was important because only church members could vote and the minister determined who was admitted to the church.

The way that towns were laid out also emphasized the central role of the local church. At the center of the town was the village and at the center of the village was the meeting house[81] and the commons.[82] From this center radiated all else.[83]

Even as the church building, the *meeting house*, was the geographical center of the community, the church itself was the spiritual center. The Puritans considered the New World, especially New England, to be the New Land of Israel, and they were the New Israelites. Therefore, the church was formed at the earliest possible moment by the covenanting of the town's visible saints. Immediately thereafter, lay officers were elected and a minister was called who usually spent the rest of his life as the minister of that particular congregation.

Originally, town meetings were concerned with both civic issues and ecclesiastical matters. The agenda of a meeting might include both the repair of roads and how to meet the needs of the minister and the repair of the meeting house. However, as time went by, an increasing number of townspeople failed to meet the experiential requirement for church membership. That being the case, the tenor of town meetings changed. After this change, the town meetings might be concerned with supporting public worship, but the ecclesiastical elections and church discipline were reserved for the church itself.

The General Court of community made support for clergy and the church an obligation of all who lived in the colony, whether one was a church member or not. The court also upheld the "first table of the Decalogue," punishing citizens for blasphemy, heresy, vain swearing and violation of the Sabbath.

Urian Oakes, minister at Cambridge, wrote in 1678,

---

[81] The church building was plain. It did not have an altar, but only a serviceable communion table and a central pulpit (as contrasted with some church buildings in which there are two pulpits, one on either side of the podium – one pulpit for reading Scripture and the other for preaching the sermon). Originally, Puritan church buildings did not have a "popish" tower; later New England church buildings came to have the appearance by which they now are known: a tall white, one story building, with narrow tall windows, and an impressive bell-tower and steeple.

[82] The *commons* was a common protected pasture. Later, and only rarely, it was used as the site for the assembling of the militia.

[83] In order to guard against the dispersion and isolation of families, something that unlimited space permitted, each town was incorporated with responsible "proprietors" in charge. When a family wanted to move further from the center, the proprietor had to grant the privilege.(for discussion, see Marshall & Manuel, page 216)

> "According to the design of our founders and the frame of things laid by them the interest of righteousness in the commonwealth and holiness in the Churches are inseparable. . . To divide what God had conjoined. . . is folly in its exaltation. I look upon this as a little model of the glorious Kingdom of Christ on earth. Christ reigns among us in the commonwealth as well as in the Church and hath His glorious interest involved and wrapt up in the good of both societies respectively."[84]

The colonists did not want "dumb preachers" in their pulpits and so early-on steps were taken to insure a learned ministry. A document from 1640, *New England's First Fruits,* describes the founding of Harvard.

> "After God had carried us safe to New England, and we had built our houses, provided necessaries for our livelihood, reared convenient places for God's worship, and led the civil government, one of the next things we longed for and looked after was to advance learning and perpetuate it to posterity; dreading to leave an illiterate ministry to the churches, when our present ministers shall lie in the dust."[85]

To this end, the General Court in 1636 voted to give 400 pounds toward a school or college for the education of future ministers. They chose a plot in Newton (later Cambridge) where Thomas Shephard was minister and appointed Nathaniel Eaton (brother of the founder of New Haven) as headmaster. The first classes were held in 1638 and in that same year, John Harvard, a young minister and graduate of Cambridge in England, died, leaving his property and library to the new college. The decision was made to name the school after John Harvard. Eaton was unsatisfactory in the role and he was replaced by Henry Dunster, who brought many improvements and placed the college on a firm footing. Before Dunster was required to resign in 1654 because he had come to accept Baptist views, the college had received a new charter (which still is in effect), was granting degrees, and had self-consciously committed itself to education in the old university of tradition. In 1674 the college was able to publish the names of 200 Harvard graduates.

---

[84] As quoted in Ahlstrom, page 149

[85] For the entire text of the document, see Addendum G

The Puritan Westward Expansion into the Connecticut River Valley

The Bay Colony was blessed with outstanding ministers.[86] One of the finest men to fill that role was the Reverend Thomas Hooker. Hooker was Cambridge trained and was an extremely gifted and compassionate minister. Hooker and his congregation of English Puritans emigrated from Holland to New England in 1633. Interestingly, John Cotton and Thomas Hooker sailed to New England on the same ship. John Cotton became the minister of Boston's church and Hooker took the post at Newton (later Cambridge).

The colony at Newton became known as "Mr. Hooker's Company." In his writings before coming to New England, and in his writings throughout the rest of his life, Hooker emphasized over and over again, the place of the cross in the Christian's life. His teaching emphasis on self-denial and his personal humble example of this concept, made Hooker the man that he was – loved, respected, and listened to. John Cotton, John Winthrop, and Thomas Hooker were trusted friends, but they were not in total agreement on some issues. Hooker, for example, trusted the Law and the Holy Spirit to transform the individual in a manner that was somewhat different from that held by Cotton and Winthrop. This led to a difference of opinion on how government should be structured. As friends they were able to engage in dispassionate argument. Again, we turn to Manuel and Marshall for an imagined interchange between Winthrop and Hooker (edited).

> As they sat by the hearth, Winthrop said, "Can you really be serious about extending the vote? Government by the consent of the governed is one thing, but every man with a vote? And all the magistrates elected? You're inviting anarchy you know, or worse. Just because an idea happens to be momentarily popular with 51 percent of the people does not make it necessarily right. How often are God's strong dealings that popular? If the Kingdom of God were a democracy, how long do you think God would remain in office? That's why we have set up the Bay's Government so that responsible leadership will not be encumbered by irresponsible legislation."
>
> Hooker sipped his mulled wine and looked into the fire. "I have no quarrel with government by responsible and caring men, but tell me something: where are the checks and balances on the Massachusetts Bay system, to ensure against the corruption in leadership which so often accompanies absolute power? Don't you see that the

[86] For an article on the Mathers, a family that provided several generations of some of the most influential ministers in American History, see Addendum H

> people themselves must be allowed to help create the laws which govern them? Mind you, nothing could make me happier John, than to have you continue in office until the Lord returns, but you're not going to, and we both know that. What if your successor turns out to be a bad apple? What if the magistrates start creating laws which line their own pockets or subvert the common good? How do we pluck them out before they ruin the barrel? You know that can happen and just how quickly it can happen."
>
> Winthrop thought a minute then said, "But I say that you cannot trust most men to have the necessary wisdom to elect governors and assistants and magistrates. You'll have them putting their cronies in for favors, or putting in golden-tongued charmers who will promise everything but deliver nothing. Government is best off in the hands of a few men who are totally dedicated to the work of God. You know that I am not advocating an aristocracy – I don't care what man's background is as long as he is totally surrendered to God and means to serve his fellowmen and has the brains and courage to do the job."
>
> Hooker replied, "But it is not a question of trusting the voters, it is a question of trusting the Holy Spirit to work through them." [87]

Hooker and Winthrop never did come to an agreement on this matter.

In 1636, Hooker and his church requested permission to leave the Bay Colony and settle on the Connecticut River. Winthrop did not want to let him go because Hooker had provided more leadership to the colony that all of the other ministers. Also, Hooker had been a valuable peacemaker – taking two men with seemingly irreconcilable differences and gently reminding them who was the most important – God and one's brother.

Yet, Hooker was not taking off as an independent – he was asking permission to leave. Winthrop came to see that if this were God's will, it somehow would strengthen the colonies and God's Kingdom in New England. So permission was given.

In 1638 Hooker framed the *Fundamental Orders of Connecticut,* which quite naturally developed out of Hooker's beliefs, some of which had progressed to new concepts not even thought about earlier in his dialogues with Winthrop and Cotton. This constitution differed from the Bay Colony's system in four respects.

1. There was no religious qualification for one to be able to vote
2. Definite restrictions were placed on the authority of magistrates

[87] Manuel & Marshall pages 205-206

3. Though the "inhabitants" (servants, etc.) could not vote for governor and other officers, as could the freemen, nonetheless they had the legal right to vote on deputies to the court
4. The governor was sharply limited in power and could not succeed himself.

In his *Sum of Church Discipline,* Hooker expressed his conviction that it was impossible to overemphasize the horizontal aspect of the Puritan covenant.

Hooker and the Newton congregation planted Hartford and shortly thereafter, Windsor and Wethersfield. They were outside of the Bay Colony's grant. Several things motivated the move, including, as always was the case, a desire on the part of some to have more land. For Hooker, however, the motivation seemed to be of a spiritual nature – by moving from the Bay Colony, he avoided a possible future conflict with Cotton over their differences, which seemed to be growing.

In 1635, a company of London Puritans led by Theophilus Eaton and the Reverend John Davenport, settled New Haven as a likely site for a trading city. The New Haven Colony was quite large, spreading along and across Long Island Sound. In 1639, the two colonies, Hartford and New Haven, joined their constitutions which provided for a representative government which served them well until 1662, when King Charles II combined them under a corporate charter as the Colony of Connecticut.

So, the Puritan form of the Church continued to expand and gain strength in New England.

The New England Halfway Covenant

A number of problems beset the New England colonial church. To address some of the problems, the Cambridge Synod of 1648 was convened. The colonial establishment was facing some of the same problems that the Church of England had faced in its parish system. The population, including many baptized children of "the saints" were becoming a mere cross-section of English types – the pious and the impious, the fervent and the "stolid." Many were not seeking to be qualified as church members, even though that was necessary in order to have access to the weekly Lord's Supper and the baptism of their children. The churches attempted to fulfill their responsibility for the spiritual welfare of individual lives and the community, but lacking an influx of "visible saints," there was a question as to whether or not some churches would survive. Baptists kept alive the doctrinal conflict on the meaning of baptism, and others

raised theological objections to the restrictions on the Lord's Supper. The church establishment was sailing through difficult waters.

The theological position held by the New England Puritans concerning church membership began to give them problems by the mid-Seventeenth Century. The founders of the New England, "Church-way" had from the earliest days found themselves between two "fires." On the one hand, the Presbyterians applauded them for not yielding to the doctrine of believer's baptism. The Puritans continued to practice infant baptism, which both they and the Presbyterians had inherited from the Anglican Church which in turn had inherited it from the Roman Catholic Church. However, the Presbyterians denounced the New England Puritans for demanding a personal religious experience as a prerequisite to being a full communicant in the church. The Presbyterians argued that such a position reduced infant baptism to no more than a meaningless ceremony , totally irrelevant to one's salvation – either infant baptism made one a citizen in the Kingdom and thus a full communicant in the church, or it did not. The growing Baptist movement applauded the New England Puritans for their demand that congregations consist of regenerate saints, but criticized them for hanging on to the practice of infant baptism.

Some congregations were more of a Presbyterian mindset on the issue and did not "quibble too much" over evidences of a conversion experience. More radical individuals, such as Roger Williams and Harvard's President, Henry Dunster, advocates of the experiential aspects of salvation, became Baptists.

Among second and third generation New England Puritans, as well as immigrants who continued to arrive, there were many to whom the experience of saving grace never came. Even though they had been duly baptized as infants, were professing Christians and living admirable lives, because they had not a salvation experience, they were only in "external covenant," and thus they could not present their children for baptism.

The clamor increased and in response, an unofficial Connecticut-Massachusetts ministerial council met in 1657 and approved certain "half-way" measures. The Massachusetts General Court went further and summoned a formal synod in 1662. As a result of its historical deliberations (which forever changed the New England church scene), baptism was declared to be sufficient for a certain level of church membership which would allow baptized parents to

bring their children into the baptismal covenant, although a regenerating experience still was required for one to be a full communicant member. This so-called "Half-Way" covenant gained wide acceptance throughout New England. As one would expect, this concept met strong opposition in some quarters. In Connecticut several churches split in a dispute over its adoption, including the major churches located in Hartford, Windsor, and Stratford. The Reverend Abraham Pierson of Branford, led a majority of his congregation out of Connecticut and settled in New Ark, New Jersey, where they perpetuated the old New Haven Constitution[88]. John Davenport, the respected father-figure pastor of the First Church of New Haven, bitterly opposed the Half-Way measure as well as the New Haven Colony's being absorbed into the Connecticut Colony. He was called by the First Church in Boston in 1668 to become its pastor and to lead the church in resisting the innovation. There was a strong minority in the Boston church that favored the Half-Way Covenant. The Half-Way Covenant opponents sought permission to withdraw from the church and begin a new church in Boston. A council of local clergy met to hear their plea and they endorsed their request. The group left Boston's First Church and formed the Third, or "Old South" Church of that city.

The Half-Way Covenant solved some problems, but not all – even creating some new problems. New Englanders no longer were required to be "visible" saints in order to have their children baptized. Personal piety flagged and the Half-Way Covenant often was seen as the cause. The ministers preached strong sermons, condemning the decline, frequently using texts from Jeremiah, such as Jeremiah 8:5, *Why then has this people, Jerusalem, Turned away in continual apostasy? They hold fast to deceit, They refuse to return.* [89] Because Jeremiah provided the text for so many of these sermons, the term "jeremiad," now exists in the English language, referring to a lamentation, especially one designed to bring about change or repentance.

Not only ministers, but government leaders became concerned with the changing climate. Several things caused the change. One was success in the material world. Cotton Mather, in his survey of the Plymouth colony repeated an old aphorism, *Religio peperit Divitias, Filia devoravit Matrem* – "Religion brought forth prosperity, and the daughter devoured the mother." The children of the New Englanders were born into town situations, instead of having to carve

[88] This congregation gradually was absorbed into Presbyterianism, but they did bring some of the Puritan thinking into the Scottish tradition
[89] NAS

out a place in the wilderness. They never knew desperate need. They did not know what it was to be starving and crawling about on one's hands and knees trying to find one last nut or wearily digging for mussels, just trying to survive. They did not know what it was like to be beaten or jailed for their faith. They did not know what it was like to have no land, no job, and no say in how they were governed. They did not know what it was to live in tents, or holes in the ground, and to see one half of the population die from cold and sickness. These were what their parents had endured because of their faith and the hope that they could have freedom to worship in a promised land. Because the succeeding generations had not experienced these things, and had been born into security, freedom, and relative affluence, they could not be expected to have the gratitude and the sense of dependency on God that characterized the early New Englanders.

Another social condition that resulted from the security and prosperity was the loss of community and in its place, an independency and unhealthy self-reliance. Originally, no one was allowed to live more than one-half mile from the meeting house. However, with the second and third generations, that was an ignored concept. A homestead of three acres became thirty and then three hundred. Thus, they increasingly began to live apart from one another and the sense of community and mutual dependency, gave way to individualism and self-reliance.

Each generation became less inclined to pray before an undertaking and to express gratitude thereafter. The first generation learned how to live close to the land; they could tell by the mere touch when a cow was ready to calve, how to shoe a horse, how to use an adze and an axe, how to plow, how to card wool, how to know when a crop was ready to harvest. They passed these things on to their children who becoming self-reliant not only needed God less, but needed one another less. Today, the fruit of these independent Yankees is seen in story and song, the frontiersman, the lone pioneer, the non-conformist rebel. Even though self-reliance is a healthy thing, it also feeds pride and that is what happened throughout New England.

A series of events took place that brought many to repentance – droughts, a caterpillar plague, major Indian uprisings, serious epidemics. At one point, in 1670, so many things had gone wrong that the government of Massachusetts appointed a council to determine why God had such a controversy with New England, but nothing came of it. There were times of repentance and fasting, but the trend toward spiritual apathy continued.

Roger Williams & Rhode Island

Roger Williams was a brilliant man with a gift for lyrical and inspiring preaching. After graduating from Pembroke College at Cambridge University, he became the chaplain for a wealthy family. While in that role, he became a controversial figure because of his unconventional ideas concerning freedom of worship. In 1630, ten years after the Pilgrims landed at Plymouth, Roger left England and sailed to Boston. He and his wife, Mary, arrived on February 5, 1631.

Roger Williams was a purist, "charming, sweet-tempered, winning, courageous, selfless, God-intoxicated, and stubborn."[90] At the same time, he was so obsessed with being pure, doctrinally and ecclesiastically, that not even the Puritans were pure enough for him.

At the time that he arrived in Boston, the Puritan minister, John Wilson, had gone back to England to fetch his wife and bring her to Boston. So, for a season, the Boston pulpit was empty and John Winthrop asked Roger Williams to become the Boston church's teacher. Williams refused the invitation because, even though the Boston church had removed all of the Anglican trappings, the church had not repented publically for ever having taken Holy Communion within the framework of the Church of England. When he confronted the Boston Puritans, they felt no need to do what he asked.

For Williams, Christianity had become so spiritualized that it was removed from all contact with the sinful realities of life. He was not able to consider that God might be building His Kingdom on earth through imperfect human beings. Many of the finest men in the colony tried to plead with him concerning his views, including Thomas Hooker, John Cotton, William Bradford, Edward Wilson, and John Winthrop. John Winthrop seems to have been the one who got closest to Williams' heart and the compassionate governor probably was Williams' closest friend for the remainder of his life. However, when it came to a matter of principle, Williams was impregnable and would not back down or change his mind.

To Williams, the dearest principle of all was, *liberty of conscience* ("Nobody is going to tell me what to do or believe"). Liberty of conscience, pressed to its extreme (and that is where

[90] Manuel & Marshall, page 192

Williams kept it) brought Williams to the place where he felt free from any commitment to corporate unity; he was not going to hear from God through anyone, including Winthrop.

So, after a short time, he left Boston and took his family to Plymouth, where he expected to find truly separated Separatists. For about two years he remained at Plymouth, became a member of the church and functioned as a teacher. Then, he discovered that the Pilgrims' agent in London had attended Anglican services there and so he took off again. Bradford, describing Williams' time at Plymouth wrote,

> "Mr. Roger Williams, a man godly and zealous, having many precious parts but very unsettled in judgment, came over first to Massachusetts, but upon some discontent left that place and came hither, where he was friendly entertained, according to their poor ability and exercised his gifts among them and after some time was admitted a member of the church. And his teaching [was] well approved, for the benefit thereof I still bless God, and am thankful to him even for his sharpest admonitions and reproofs, so far as they agreed with the truth. He this year [1633] began to fall into some strange opinions and from opinion to practice which caused some controversy between the church and him and in the end some discontent on his part, by occasion whereof he left them something abruptly…[when they refused his demand that they excommunicate their agents, he had no choice but to separate himself from them as a matter of principle]. He is to be pitied, and prayed for, and so I….desire the Lord to show him his errors and reduce him to the way of truth, and give him a settled judgment and constancy in the same…."[91]

Winthrop, Bradford, and the others who encountered him and tried to help him see the problems with his perspective, all had great personal fondness for the man and experienced considerable anguish over the tragic course that he was obsessed with pursuing.

No sooner had he broken with Plymouth, than the church at Salem offered him the Salem pulpit. He readily accepted the offer and with this church behind him, he began to push forward in earnest. He began preaching that the King had no right to issue a charter to the Bay Colony because the Indians, not the King, owned the land. He also charged the King with blasphemy for referring to Europe as, "Christendom."

John Cotton had asked the magistrates permission to entreat Williams privately on behalf of the Bay Colony, and here, as always was true, Williams was shown nothing but grace and love. The

[91] Manuel & Marshall page 194

attitude of the leaders of the Bay Colony had been, “Let him believe what he wants as long as he is quiet about it and God will mellow him, in due time, and after breaking him will use him.”

Williams just could not keep his opinions to himself. In print, he carried on long and tedious debates with John Cotton. He wrote a treatise in which he denounced the King as a liar and recommended that the Bay Colony either send the charter back to England as a fraudulent document, or return to England themselves.

Since Salem was within the commonwealth, and Williams was dispensing his views as the pastor of a Congregational Church within the commonwealth, Winthrop had no choice but to publically admonish him in open court. For a while Williams seemed to have had a change of heart, but within six months he was back at it again. However, since Salem was a Congregational Church and each Congregational Church was autonomous, the other churches could not dismiss him.

The civil authorities were not bound by church polity and he was again hailed before the General Court of the colony. He was accused of willful and persistent heresy and troublemaking. Williams countered with the charge that since the churches had given up the principle of congregational independence and had called upon the government to suppress him, they no longer were pure churches. Therefore, he and his congregation had no option other than to renounce all of the other churches in Massachusetts.

He expected the Salem Congregational Church to follow him in this action, but it was not to be. He was sick in bed with a bad cold, and not able to speak before the church, so he sent his appeal in writing. Had he been able to speak to them, because of his natural eloquence, they may have followed him, but his written appeal fell flat. So, he had no choice but to renounce the Salem congregation.

He still refused to desist from his anti-King diatribes and this put the entire commonwealth in jeopardy with the English government. The civil authorities were about to arrest him and so in the middle of January, 1636, he fled Salem and made his way southward. After grueling exposure to “winter miseries in a howling wilderness,” he found refuge among the Narrangansett Indians.

During his Plymouth years, Williams had spent considerable time with the Indians. He had learned their language and always was an advocate for their rights. Thus, the Narrangansetts were ready to receive him. He retained friendly relations with this particular tribe throughout his life. He later published (1643) *A Key into the Language …of the Natives in that part of America, called New England.* In this volume he wrote that the vocabulary begins with *cowammaunsh,* meaning, "I love you." Interspersed among his rules of grammar were little rhymes, such as,

Sometimes God gives them fish or flesh,
Yet they're content without,
And what comes in, they part to friends,
And strangers round about.
If Nature's sons both wild and tame
Humane and courteous be,
How ill becomes it sons of God
To want humanity.!

In the eyes of most Englishmen, this volume made Williams the outstanding authority on American Indians.

After purchasing land from the Narrangansetts, he and five other "refugees" settled on the east bank of the Seekonk River. When he learned that this settlement was within the boundaries of Plymouth, he once again purchased land from the Narranganssett chiefs, Canonicus and Miantonomi and relocated his settlement which he named, "Providence".[92] He went to England to obtain a charter for his colony (a strange action since his initial problems in Massachusetts had been over the issue of their obtaining a charter from the King). As a result of Williams' relationship with the Indians, Rhode Island was the only colony that was spared from all of the Indian uprisings, but one. Williams never pushed the Gospel on the Indians, but because of his relationship with them, he did bring many to Christ.

The Providence Colony (which soon became the Rhode Island colony, when several communities were formed in the colony's borders) quickly became the destination for almost every rebel, misfit, and crackpot in New England. As president of the colony, Williams was responsible for keeping order and his work became a nightmare. On the basis of liberty of conscience, one man refused to obey any government order. Another, Samuel Gorton, a man

[92] The original deed is in the Archives of the City of Providence.

with a golden tongue, had followers who were not able to describe clearly what they believed, they just didn't believe what everyone else believed. They had been ceremoniously removed from Plymouth and Aquidnick, before they descended upon Providence.

The Quakers were Williams' greatest problem. Although the image of Quakers today is one of a gentle quiet folk, in their early years in the Seventeenth Century, the Quakers were the wildest and most fanatical believers in Christendom. To their way of thinking, Puritanism was compromised and polluted, an institution which needed to be brought down by violent activism. They found every opportunity possible to display this attitude in Massachusetts.

One Sunday, in Boston, just after the Puritan minister was moving into the second hour of his sermon, in came a fire-breathing Quaker with two bottles in his hands. He strode up the aisle, then bellowed, "God will shatter you for your hypocrisy, just like this!" He then hurled the bottles on the floor, smashing them. He immediately turned on his heel and strode out. On another occasion, in the middle of the service, a Quaker lass walked into the Puritan meeting, totally naked, and went up to the communion table, turned around and walked out without saying a word.

Needless to say, Puritans were stirred to the point of having a seizure when one spoke of a Quaker and the Quakers loved every minute of it. They seemed to feel fulfilled when they were objects of persecution. The persecution of Quakers in Massachusetts became quite severe. They were tethered behind carts and as they were drawn from village to village they were whipped. According to some sources, they were branded with an "H" for heretic, holes were drilled in their tongues and their ears were cut off.[93] Finally, they were banished from the Bay Colony with a sentence of death upon them if they returned. Four Quakers, seemingly seeking martyrdom, received it by returning to the Commonwealth and they were hanged on Boston Common.[94]

Being banished from Massachusetts, Quakers by the droves began showing up in Providence and took pernicious delight in bedeviling Williams by reading back to him his most famous quotations. Everything that Williams had inflicted upon the Bay Colony was being inflicted on

---

[93] John C. Thorne, *Early Quaker History*, http://thorn.pair.com/earlyq.htm;

[94] William Robinson, Marmaduke Stephenson, William Leddra, and Mary Dyer. Mary Dyer had become a follower of Anne Hutchinson, and then a Quaker. She was the first woman to be executed in America for religious convictions; a statue of her stands on Boston Common.

him (later, the Quakers changed their mood and some of the greatest leaders in Rhode Island were Quakers – including Rhode Island Governors).

Another person who spent a brief time in Providence and presented a challenge to Williams, was Anne Hutchinson, a Puritan woman who became totally infatuated with experiential supernaturalism. Anne had been an admirer of John Cotton when he was the preacher at St. Botolph's in England, so when she and her husband arrived in Boston, in 1636, they became members of Cotton's church. Mrs. Hutchinson had an extremely quick mind and a vivacious charming personality. She praised Cotton effusively for his illumination of every subject upon which he spoke. He, on the other hand, had never seen anyone so enthusiastic about the Gospel and had such a quick grasp of the deep things of the Spirit. Not only was she able to grasp the deep things about which Cotton spoke, but she also received insights of her own which were compatible with what he was teaching. He began to look forward to meetings with her after preaching.

She began inviting women to her home after church to discuss the sermon. The meetings became very popular and attendance grew rapidly – even some men began attending. Gradually, she began to present some of her own beliefs, which were not always in line with what Cotton taught, nor anyone else's teaching, for that matter. Subtly, she began to put down every one of the Puritan ministers in the colony, except Cotton (although she always denied doing so, if anyone asked her).

Hutchinson's heresy was one of those aberrations that takes a basic truth and pushes it to the extreme, usually to the ignoring of other truths. She taught that Christians are saved by faith alone, then she went on to say that no amount of sanctification or good works could be taken as signs of salvation; neither were the absence of sanctification or good works evidence that a person was not saved. According to her, the Holy Spirit enters a person when he is saved and one who has the Spirit can tell whether or not someone else has the Holy Spirit, and thus such Spirit-filled individuals can tell who is and who isn't saved.

There was no theology of the cross in her teaching. In time, she began to claim that the direct revelation that she received was superior to the "ministry of the Word." Thus, when her revelation was in conflict with the minister's interpretation of the Bible, the minister was wrong.

Because she had direct communication with the Holy Spirit, she didn't need to submit to the rest of the Body of Christ.

The ministers of the colony became disturbed, not only about Mrs. Hutchinson, but also by John Cotton's attitude toward the woman. He seemed to be under her spell. Members of almost every congregation were attending her Sunday meetings. She began to declare that none of the ministers, except Cotton, was fit to preach the Gospel.

Finally the inevitable day came when she was summoned before the magistrate for promoting heresy. When she was challenged she declared, "Take heed what you go about to do to me…for I know that for this you go about to do to me, God will ruin you! And your posterity! And this whole state!" After her tirade, the court asked her how she knew that it was God and not Satan who was revealing things to her. This resulted in another exchange and another threat concerning what God would do to them.

The court needed only a short while to decide to banish her and all who followed her teaching – they were declared, "unfit for society." She decided to go to Rhode Island, but by the time that she and her husband left for Providence, her following had diminished greatly. The next year her husband died and shortly thereafter she gave birth to a badly deformed child who died at birth. Rhode Island did provide the freedom to promote her views, and she did promote them in that colony, but after the death of her child, she decided to leave Rhode Island. She took her family to a lonely settlement in the Dutch Colony of New Netherlands near a place called Hell's Gate (now Pelham). She and her children were slain on their doorstep, the first victims of a local Indian uprising.

There is a macabre footnote to the Anne Hutchinson story which convinced the Puritans that she was a mouthpiece for Satan. Winthrop, the balanced and somewhat staid Governor, felt that a record of the event merited a detailed account in his history of New England. The same year that Anne Hutchinson gave birth to her deformed child, her protégée, Mary Dyer, also gave birth to a grotesquely deformed child. Both mothers tried to bury their babies without entering them into the town records and no record remains of a description of Hutchinson's baby. However, word got out about Dyer's baby and Winthrop and another magistrate, along with a church elder, did

question the midwife who had been present at that birth. Winthrop's description of the child is quite revolting. After describing the child, Winthrop described what they did next:

> "The Governor, with advice of some of the magistrates and of the elders of Boston, caused the said monster to be taken up, and though it were much corrupted, yet most of the things were to be seen, as the horns and claws, the scales, etc. When it died in the mother's body (which was about two hours before birth), the bed whereon the mother lay did shake, and withal there was such a noisome savor, as most of the women were taken with extreme vomiting and purging and were forced to depart. And others of them, their children were taken with convulsions (which they never had before or after), and so were sent home, so as by these occasions, it came to be concealed."

This description is significant because of its source. Winthrop was a mature witness and in all of his writings there is no hint of distortion or exaggeration – if anything, he always seems to be conservative. Be that as it may, the Puritans viewed these two births as evidence that Mrs. Hutchinson's and Mrs. Dyer's revelations and teachings originated in Satan.

The fact that Anne Hutchinson was received in Rhode Island and allowed to propagate her views, the Puritans considered to be validation of their judgment that Rhode Island was the "latrine of New England."

Williams obsession with purity finally caused him to separate himself from almost everyone until the only person with whom he was willing to take communion was his wife. Then, a striking thing happened. He abruptly concluded that true purity was an unobtainable goal and he decided to embrace everyone! He even stated that as far as anyone knew, the Indians' religion might be as acceptable to God as was Christianity.

New England Baptists

The Baptist story is very complex. Although one might think that the Baptists grew out of the continental Anabaptist movement – because of the emphasis on believer's baptism – that is an incorrect conclusion. The Baptists were the product of the Separatist wing of the Puritans..

Two strands of Baptists developed:

- An Arminian group, known as General Baptists, because they believed in unlimited atonement i.e., Christ died for all;

- A Reformed group, known as Particular Baptists, because of their belief in a particular election and limited atonement (the TULIP acronym)

As noted earlier (page 46) The history of the General Baptists begins with John Smyth, a Cambridge graduate who was serving as the City Preacher in the Church of England in Gainsborough, Lincolnshire. Around 1600, he became a strongly convinced Separatist and assumed the leadership of a Separatist congregation in Gainsborough. Because James I was increasing his persecution of Separatists, the group fled to Amsterdam in 1607 or 1608 After a time, they reasoned that if the Church of England were a false church, then its baptism also was bogus. Their study of Scripture and their ongoing discussions led them to the same conclusion that the Anabaptists had reached – baptism should be reserved for those who profess faith in Christ. In 1609, they dissolved their covenant, and by so doing dissolved their church – they were going to start over. Smyth baptized himself by "affusion," (poured water on his head),[95] then he repeated the act with every member of his congregation.

When Smyth began considering the possibility of merging with the Dutch Mennonites, part of his congregation broke away and Thomas Helwys became the leader of his group. Helwys and his followers came to the conclusion that it had been a mistake to flee England and persecution. They returned to England in 1612 and founded at Spitalfields (a London suburb) the first known General Baptist Church in England (the first English church to identify itself as "Baptist").

The origin of the Particular Baptists is traced to the 1616 formation of a non-separatist Puritan independent congregation in Southwark, near London. The leader of this group was Henry Jacob, who described himself as "the rigidest sort of those that are called Puritanes." In 1622, the group emigrated to Jamestown, Virginia. Shortly thereafter, Jacob was replaced by John Lathrop. Because of the severe persecution that the group experienced in Jamestown, Lathrop and about 30 members migrated first to Scituate, in the Plymouth Colony in 1634. They finally settled at Barnstable on Cape Cod.

- [95] It took the Baptists a few years to move from affusion (they never did sprinkle) to immersion. One of the earliest Baptist writings displaying immersion language was penned in 1614 Leonard Busher, in which he stated that to be baptized is to be "dipped for dead in the water." See G.R. Beasley-Murray, *Baptism in the New Testament* (Grand Rapids, William B. Eerdmans Publihsing Co.) 1973, page 133

Meanwhile, back in England, the Southwark congregation continued to grow – and divide. In 1633, one group broke off from the church because they felt that their church should have openly broken fellowship with the Church of England. In 1638, their numbers increased when another group of "seceeders" joined. Two years later, these Separatists decided that baptism ought to be "by dipping ye Body into ye water, resembling Burial and rising again." In 1641, the church conducted a service in which every member of the congregation was immersed.

This event marked the culmination of a journey in which first was defined the identity of the administrator (no priest is needed); then the identity of the recipient was defined (no infants, but only believers), and finally the method (immersion, rather than sprinkling or effusion). In time, in the minds of most people, immersion became a hallmark of Baptist identity.

Both General Baptists and Particular Baptists continued to multiply. Outside of London their main strength was in Wales. One of the earliest Baptist churches established in Massachusetts was a Welsh congregation led by John Miles, at Swansea, in the Plymouth Colony. This congregation was established in 1663.

General Baptists migrated to America, mainly in Rhode Island (an obvious choice, given its religious liberty), Virginia, and North Carolina. The church which Roger Williams and his fellow refugees formed at Providence was one of the earliest Baptist Churches in America. In March 1639, Ezekiel Holliman, who had been a member of Williams' church in Salem, baptized Williams, by immersion, and Williams then immersed Holliman and ten others. Williams at the time, like most Puritans, placed great emphasis on the conversion experience. Now he also became concerned with the strong New Testament testimony concerning the importance of believer's immersion. However, as was typical of the man, Williams journeyed on from this phase of his journey. Richard Scott, who later became a Quaker, in a letter to George Fox, wrote this of Williams,

> "I walked with him in the Baptists' way about three or four months in which he brake from the society, and declared at large the ground and reasons of it; that their baptism could not be right because it was not administered by an apostle. After that he set upon a way of seeking (with two or three of them that had dissented with him) by way of

> preaching and praying; and there he continued a year or two, till two of the three left him."[96]

After Williams withdrew from the Rhode Island Baptists, Thomas Olney became the leader of the group. He was one of the original freemen of the Providence Plantation and he was a convinced Calvinist, a Particular Baptist. This was a bit of a problem, since the leading laymen in the church were English General Baptists. These General Baptists came to believe that the laying on of hands was an apostolic practice required for the reception of the Holy Spirit and was a necessary requirement for interchurch fellowship. Roger Williams held to this view, while among them. They based their belief on Hebrews 6:1-2, which they considered to contain the "six foundational principles" of Christianity: repentance, faith, immersion, laying on of hands, resurrection of the dead, and eternal judgment. Hence, they came to be known as *Six Principle General Baptists.*

In 1652 the Baptist Church in Providence divided over this issue. It is not surprising that Thomas Olney was the leader of *Five-principle Particular Baptist* group (these adhered to the Calvinist, TULIP formula). The Five Principle Baptists were the smallest of the two groups. Since their losses through death were not replaced by immigrants or by converts, they passed out of existence in about 1720.

Even though the Six Principle General Baptists were the largest group, they never really went forward. They didn't even have a meeting house until 1700. When Rhode Island College was moved to Providence in 1770, the President of the college, James Manning, became the minister of this small group and led them out of their Arminian beliefs back into Calvinism. Through Manning's influence, this church merged with the other churches of the Warren Association – the association was formed by Manning in an effort to get Baptists to cooperate with one another and support one another in their endeavors.

The first effort to form a Baptist Church in Massachusetts (rather than one transplanted from another locale) was at Reheboth, where several people withdrew from the Congregational Church and were immersed in 1649 by John Clarke. Next year, they were cited by the court in Plymouth and so they moved to Newport. In 1651, Clarke and two other men were invited to

---

[96] Ahlstrom, page 170

visit Lynn, Massachusetts, and conduct meetings. They promptly were arrested for holding an unauthorized religious meeting.

In 1653, Henry Dunster, the first President of Harvard College, withheld his fourth child from baptism and the result was his forced resignation next year. He briefly associated himself with Thomas Gould, the future leader of the Boston Baptists, who formed a church in that city in 1665. Dunster moved to Scituate, which was a more tolerant town.

When Gould's group did establish a church in Boston, they promptly were arrested and sentenced to banishment. They withdrew to Noddle's Island for a time, but then courageously returned in 1680 to erect a meeting house in the heart of Boston. By this time other Baptist churches had been formed in Newbury and Kittery, two Indian Baptist churches were being gathered on Nantucket and Martha's Vineyard, and John Myle's Welsh church was well established at Swansea, and there also was a growing number of Baptist churches along the Plymouth-Rhode Island border.

An indicator of the willingness to tolerate Baptists in Massachusetts was demonstrated in 1717, when both Increase Mather and Cotton Mather participated in a Baptist ordination in Boston.

Baptist beginnings in Connecticut were the result of Baptists from Rhode Island who began to infiltrate the area. The first permanent congregation was planted in 1705 at Groton by the Reverend Valentine Wightman of Rhode Island. He remained the pastor of that church until his death in 1741, then was succeeded by his son and grandson until 1841. The Wightmans became the patriarchs of Baptists in Connecticut. A second church was formed at New London in 1726 by another Rhode Islander, Stephen Gorton. From these two centers, New London and Groton, Baptist principles spread slowly into other areas of Connecticut.

Early on, the Six Principle Baptists (General Baptists) began holding an annual meeting of churches, the *Rhode Island Yearly Meeting of the General Baptists*. In its early years, the Rhode Island Yearly Meeting included nearly all of the Baptist churches of New England, with the exception of the Five Principle Particular Baptist churches of Newport, Swansea, and Boston. Although the body began to decline after the Great Awakening, which revived the Puritan concepts, it counted seventeen churches in its fold in 1764 and remained fairly strong throughout the Eighteenth Century. It changed its name to the Rhode Island Association in later years and

continued to eke out a meager existence. By 1965, the numbers had decreased to three churches with 96 members. These New England General Baptists would have little sustained or organic relationship with the future vast expansion of the Baptist Churches.

In 1707, the Particular Baptists (Five-point Calvinists) held their first annual meeting in Philadelphia, which became known as *The Philadelphia Association*. By this time, the Particular Baptists were becoming known as American Baptists. This group had a major influence on the future expansion of the Baptists in the South.

Roman Catholicism in Maryland

During the years of American exploration, Roman Catholicism made its appearance everywhere. The earliest Roman Catholics to touch the New World were Leif Erickson and his Norsemen who spent a season in "Vineland." Spanish and French Catholics explored the Atlantic coastline during the 16th Century. New York's harbor and river had been named, St. Christobel and the Saint Antonio River, eighty years before Henry Hudson visited the area. Yet, none of these ventures produced a Catholic Church in what would become the eastern portion of the United States of America. Maryland is correctly understood to be the first place in America where Roman Catholicism was able to establish a significant and lasting presence.

Maryland originally was a part of the crown colony of Virginia.[97] Virginians attempted to keep it that way, at one point even sending troops to reclaim a portion of the region after the colony of Maryland had been established.

The story of Maryland is unique in many ways. Prior to the establishment of Maryland, more than one colony had been launched with the proprietor's hope of establishing feudal baronies, with fiefdoms, serfs, and the whole lot of Medieval domains. All had failed, until the establishment of Maryland.

Another unusual element is to whom and by whom the charter was granted. The generous grant was made by a Protestant king, Charles I, to a Roman Catholic who desired to create a haven

[97] Two categories of colonies existed: proprietary colonies and royal colonies. In a proprietary colony, an individual or a company was given a charter for a designated region. In essence, the charter made those who held the charter, proprietors. A royal colony was one in which the colony was the property of the monarchy and was ruled directly by the king, without any intermediary proprietors.

where his fellow Roman Catholics would be free from the legal restraints put upon them in England.

George Calvert, the first Lord Baltimore, was Secretary of State of England from 1619 until 1625. He was forced to resign in 1625 because he had converted to Catholicism. Even so, he continued to be one of the king's favorite friends. Several conditions suggest themselves as being among the reasons why Charles granted the charter to George Calvert. First, of course was the friendship. It also is speculated that the King owed a debt to Calvert and the granting of the charter was a repayment of the debt. Another strong reason was King Charles' opposition to the Puritans in England; he wanted to give the Puritans in the New World a bit of a tussle. Another reason, was the fact that the granting of the charter to a Catholic was a domestic corollary to the crown's international aims during that period; the Stuart dynasty (James I and Charles I) were not on good terms with the Protestant nations. Neither James I nor Charles I had given wholehearted support to the Protestant forces in the Thirty-Years war.

Charles also had married Henrietta Maria, the sister of the French King, Louis XIII (Catholic). Incidentally, the new colony was named after the Queen (*Terra Mariae*) "Maria's Land" – which to Catholics was a *double entrendre,* referring as well to Mary, the Mother of Christ. So, even though it might seem strange for a Protestant king to give a charter to someone who wanted to establish a Roman Catholic domain, there were many reasons that influenced Charles I to give Calvert the charter.

Not long after the charter was granted, George Calvert died and the King delivered the Maryland charter to George Calvert's son, Cecilius Calvert who succeeded his father as the second Lord Baltimore. Cecilius appointed his brother, Leonard Calvert, as Governor of the Colony.

Two ships, the *Ark* and the *Dove*, discharged their passengers on the Potomac in the spring of 1634. The company consisted of between sixteen to twenty gentlemen (all or nearly all Roman Catholic) and at least two hundred, possibly three hundred, servants and laborers (mostly Protestant). Thus, the town of St. Mary's was founded on the Potomac. The settlement took shape exactly as Calvert had intended. It was a manorial system with aristocratic nobles and lords in their seigniorial life, on the one hand, and serfs and fiefs on the other. It was a land of "actual manors, demesne lands, free-hold tenements, rent rolls, and quitrents…Socially there was

a great gulf fixed between the upper and lower classes."[98] The story of Maryland in the next several decades is the story of this system's gradually breaking down, often through violent means.

Overall, the story of Maryland is a story of a prosperous colony. Several things contributed to the success, especially the nature of the location: it was a healthy pleasant site, its farm lands were lush and fertile. Leonard Calvert's wisdom in leading the colony was a major reason for its success. He was farsighted and firm in his governing and he avoided the mistakes made in Virginia. Diversified agriculture was practiced at first, but it was not long before tobacco became the colony's main base of economy. The baronial plantation system that developed fit well into the Calverts' hopes for creating a medieval barony in America.

Maryland's first problems arose over Virginia's claim for a portion of the territory. This came to a head when a quarrel erupted over the possession of the Isle of Kent (in Chesapeake Bay, near present day Annapolis). The island had been an active Virginia parish and had sent delegates to the Virginia House of Burgesses. Moreover, William Claiborne, one the most influential politicians in Virginia had a trading post on the Island. Claiborne launched a naval attack in an effort to keep possession of the island for Virginia, but ultimately Virginia yielded the island to Maryland.

A significant event took place in 1645. Richard Ingle was a trader and ship captain who transported to the colony goods from England and then Maryland's products back to England. Because tobacco was the Maryland cash crop, Ingle soon became a prominent tobacco trader. When the English Civil War broke out, Ingle sided with the Puritans. Since the Maryland barons were royalists and Catholic, Ingle began to express his opposition to their authority in the colony. Because he was inciting rebellion, Leonard Calvert seized Ingle's ship in 1642. Ingle escaped and made his way back to London. When he arrived in London, the first war between Charles I and Parliament was at its peak (see page 47).

Because the Calverts were royalists and Roman Catholics, it was not difficult for Ingle to secure a commission from Parliament to cruise the waters of the Chesapeake looking for "malignants."

[98] C. M. Andrews *The Colonial Period in American History*, Vol. 2 (New Haven, Yale University Press) 1938 , p 297, as quoted in Ahlstrom, page 333

He appeared off the Maryland shore in 1645, in a ship aptly named, *Reformation.* Although Claiborne had lost the Isle of Kent, he had not given up and many credit him with promoting an insurrection in Maryland that was in progress when Ingle arrived on the scene.[99] Ingle attacked the Maryland colony in the name of Parliament, gained the victory, and for two years he ruled the colony as a dictator.

Leonard Calvert was able to escape to Virginia, but Ingle imprisoned many other leaders of the colony. He also put the two resident Jesuit priests in chains then transported them back to England. Under Ingle's leadership, his men looted the property of wealthy Roman Catholic settlers and Marylanders came to regard Ingle as a pirate. They labeled the two years of his reign, "the plundering time."

Governor Calvert returned in August 1646 and regained command of the colony. Though most of Ingle's men were granted amnesty, Ingle specifically was excepted from the amnesty and consequently he was executed.

Leonard Calvert died in 1648. His brother, Cecilius Calvert (Lord Baltimore), the proprietor, realized that given the changing social elements in the colony, the best way to preserve the colony was to appoint a protestant Governor. He chose William Stone to fill that role.

Lord Baltimore was deeply committed to the principle of religious liberty – for various brands of Christians. He bound the new Governor by a very specific oath not to

> "trouble, molest, or discountenance any person . . . professing to believe in Jesus Christ, and in particular no Roman Catholick, for or in respect of his or her religion, nor in his or her free exercise thereof. . . and to relieve and protect any person molested or troubled."[100]

In the same vein the Maryland Assembly on April 21, 1649, passed its celebrated Act Concerning Religion, putting the practice of toleration into precise and legal terms. Even though

---

[99] The insurrection that coincided with Ingle's arrival often is labeled, "Claiborne and Ingle's rebellion."
[100] Ahlstrom page 334

Catholics by this time were a minority in the colony, they did dominate the legislature. The concluding article contained the following stipulations,

> "And whereas the inforceing of the conscience in matters of Religion hath frequently fallen out to be of dangerous Consequence in those commonwealths where it hath been practised . . . Be it Therefore . . . enacted . . . that noe person or persons whatsoever within this Province . . . professing to believe in Jesus Christ, shall from henceforth bee any waies troubled, Molested or discountenanced for or in respect of his or her religion nor in the free exercise thereof . . . nor any way compelled to the beliefe or exercise of any other Religion against his or her consent."[101]

That these idealistic provisions applied to Christians is made clear, not only by the language of the article above, the articles preceding this section of the Act spelled it out clearly:

1. Deniers of the Trinity receive the death penalty
2. The Virgin, Apostles, and Evangelists be not spoken of reproachfully
3. Reproachful names for religious groups (papist, heretick, puritan, etc.) be not used
4. The "Sabbath" or Lord's Day called, "Sunday," be not profaned.

Most of the delegates, Catholic and Protestants, supported this policy. Some of the narrower Puritans opposed it altogether, wanting to impose their own stringent principles. The Puritans kept trying to put their stringency on the colony.

In 1651, Stone, for personal reasons, took a leave of absence from the colony and appointed as his deputy a Roman Catholic, Thomas Greene – who also was a royalist. By this time, the Puritans had gained a majority in the Maryland Parliament and so in Stone's absence they temporarily deposed Stone as Governor and asserted Parliament's authority over the colony. Lord Baltimore retrieved the situation, but soon faced other difficulties. The Puritans, fired by social and economic grievances against the Catholic manorial lords, called an assembly in 1654 and repudiated the proprietor's authority and abrogated the Act of Toleration. Aided by Roundheads (followers of Cromwell) from Virginia, they captured Stone in 1655 and imprisoned him. The Puritans then outlawed Roman Catholicism, plundered the estates of the Jesuits, forced

[101] Ahlstrom page 334

all priests into exile, and executed at least four Roman Catholics. The Puritans had a friend in Cromwell, who at the time was ruling England.

Lord Baltimore was able to regain his proprietary privileges in 1657 (a year before Cromwell's death) with the stipulation that he will appoint Josias Fendall, a Protestant as Governor in Stone's place.

After the death of Cromwell and the restoration of the Stuart monarchy, one would expect Maryland's affairs to settle down, but such was not the case. After repeated uprisings, and one party after another gaining control, King William III, in 1691, vacated the Baltimore charter and made Maryland a royal colony. In 1692 the Church of England was established formally, though a formal law making it the religion of the colony was not passed until 1702. In 1695, the capitol was moved from St. Mary's to the Protestant town of Annapolis.

Maryland continued to be the Roman Catholic stronghold among the English colonies, although the establishment of the Church of England and the enforcement of English law put Maryland Roman Catholics under severe disabilities.

The experience of Catholics in the New York colony had an experience similar to their fellow Catholics in Maryland. Initially, they were well represented and had important posts. However, in time all proprietary rights were suspended and New York became a royal colony. Under the new rule, Roman Catholic liberties were categorically denied. Mass had to be celebrated in homes in secret – if a priest could be found to conduct the rite.

William Penn and the Pennsylvania Quakers

As the years progressed the Quakers, by and large, did become more settled and ordered in their lives. Pennsylvania is an example of a settled, responsible Quaker colony. The Quaker sect was founded by George Fox (1624-1691). George Fox was a weaver's son, born in Leicestershire and apprenticed as a shoemaker. As a young man he began to experience deep spiritual anguish and he could find no solace in the existing churches. In his despair, he wandered from place to place trying to find help, all to no avail. In his journal, he later wrote, "And when all my hopes in them and in all men were gone, so that I had nothing outwardly to help me, nor could tell what

to do, then, oh then, I heard a voice which said, 'there is one, even Christ Jesus, that can speak to thy condition.'"[102] This experience offered him direct access to God, apart from all human mediation, through the gracious activity of the Holy Spirit.

In 1648, Fox began to speak in various places, often in parish churches after the minister had finished the service. His message was a declaration of the availability of an inward spiritual faith. His talks stirred much resistance. Despite being jailed, beaten, and enduring scoffing mobs, he persevered. His powerful witness, his homely eloquence, and wonderful tenderness began to win people to his position. Fox considered the founding of the Society of Friends to have taken place in 1652, when he brought "convincement" to a group of seekers in the home of Judge Fell and his wife, Margaret, of Swarthmore Hall, in Lancashire.

Fox, and those who followed him, gave testimony to the direct revelation of Christ to the soul, but this was not understood to be contradictory to, or even to be apart from, Scriptural revelation. It does mean, however that true revelation must be an experiential reality. In his journal Fox wrote,

> "Now I was sent to turn people from darkness to the light, that they might receive Christ Jesus, for to as many as should receive him in his light, I saw that he would give power to become the sons of God, which I had obtained by receiving Christ. And I was to direct people to the Spirit that gave forth the Scriptures, by which they might be led into all truth, and so up to Christ and God, as they had been who gave them forth. . . I saw that the grace of God, which brings salvation, had appeared to all men, and that the manifestation of the Spirit of God was given to every man to profit withal."[103]

Fox's message fit within the Puritan tradition, with its intensely Christocentric emphasis, its experientialism, its total reliance on the Grace of God and its emphasis on salvation. However, his speaking of "revelation" was dangerous in a century in which the Bible was understood to be a closed and static body of doctrine and predestination was the view of the man on the street. Quaker teaching also was feared because it undermined the clergy and abandoned the idea of the

---

[102] *The Journal of George Fox,* Christian Classics Ethereal Library, Chapter one "A Boyhood and Seeker," page 11
[103] *The Journal of George Fox* page 34

objective sacraments of the Lord's Supper and baptism. Disruptive and strange behavior sometimes was attributed to the prompting of an inner voice (as was seen in New England). Most ominous was the Quaker conviction that the work of the Holy Spirit was universal, rather than something reserved for the elect.

A major difference between the Puritans and the Quakers was their view of mankind. The Puritans and the Reformed tradition from which they sprang emphasized the total depravity of man. The Quakers, on the other hand, believed that man was essentially good.

George Fox visited the New World in 1672, landing at Newport, Rhode Island. He was accompanied by some of the most eminent Quakers in England and was entertained by Governor Nicholas Easton. Roger Williams, ever eager to debate someone, drew up fourteen propositions for debate, and although he was seventy years old, he rowed alone thirty miles to Newport, only to find that Fox had departed.

Fox's visit spurred Quakerism in the colonies. Barbados became a Quaker stronghold. Most of the Quakers who sought to propagate Quakerism in the English colonies came from Barbados.

The founding of the Pennsylvania colony is an impressive story of Quaker success. William Penn, born in 1644, was the indulged son of Admiral Sir William Penn, who was the conqueror of Jamaica, under Cromwell. Admiral Penn also was a friend of King Charles II and his brother, the Duke of York, under whom Penn also served. These contradictory relationships speak well of a man who was respected by all.

Young William at an early age showed an interest in religion, something which puzzled his parents. While attending Christ Church, Oxford, he displayed his contempt for Anglicanism by perpetrating a prank which resulted in his expulsion. He was first well thrashed by the Admiral, then sent on a grand tour of the European capitals. When he returned to London, he studied law, and then went to Ireland to look after some estates that Charles II had confiscated and given to Admiral Penn. On a visit to Cork, he listened to a discourse by a Quaker preacher, discoursing on the text from I John 5:4, "There is a faith that overcometh the world," and as a result of that meeting, he became a Quaker.

William Penn inherited all of the privileges that would come from having such a famous and prominent father. He also inherited a small fortune. Penn was an extraordinary man in his own right. He was almost, "all things."

- He was the pacifist son of a naval hero;
- He was a favorite of kings (Charles II and James II)
- He was the friend of the philosophers John Locke and Algernon Sidney
- He attended school at Christ's Church (Oxford), Saumur, and Lincoln's Inn;
- he was a Quaker convert, a friend of George Fox, and author of a popular devotional classic, *No Cross, No Crown;*
- He was a devout adherent of a radical Protestant sect
- He was a democratic theorist, and champion of religious freedom
- He was an aristocrat, accused of Jesuitry and suspected of being a Jacobite;[104]
- He was the visionary idealist who was the founder and longtime proprietor of the most successful colony in the British empire.

In 1676, in the company of George Fox, Penn traveled through northern Europe. While traveling with Fox, Penn realized that thousands of Quakers and other persecuted Protestant sects were eager to emigrate to America if they could have a colony of their own where they could practice their religion unhindered. Earlier, Penn had been involved with others in the colonization of New Jersey. Out of that experience, Penn was convinced that a colony offering religious freedom, representative government, cheap land, and strictly proprietary arrangements could furnish a haven for poor and oppressed people.

Charles II and his brother, the Duke of York, owed the Penn family 16,000 pounds. William offered to cancel the debt if the monarch would make him owner and governor of a tract of land west of Delaware, between 40 degrees North and 43 degrees North. This designation left the status of lower Delaware in doubt, but the next year the Duke of York deeded to Penn the western shore of Delaware Bay. In July 1681, Penn's Deputy Governor took possession of the tract. In 1682, Penn issued a recruiting tract that was distributed in several European nations; it was translated into German, French, and Dutch. In the tract, he offered complete religious freedom and easy terms for land. As a result of this tract, the population of Pennsylvania quickly became very cosmopolitan.

[104] A Jacobite was one who supported the return of James II or his descendents to the throne of England.

In the fall of 1682. after a harrowing passage during which a third of the passengers died of smallpox, Penn arrived at Newcastle on the Ship, *Welcome.*

The neighborhood around the future Philadelphia was not a wilderness. Several hundred Swiss and Finns were there, already, remnants of a short-lived Swedish colony. They were tilling the land and producing food, so food was available to the emigrants that arrived with Penn. Pennsylvania did not pass through many of the hardships that other colonies had experienced.

After his arrival, Penn moved quickly to establish a sound footing for the colony. Before, the year was out, the Assembly had been called and Penn's *Frame of Government* was adopted. In the first year, Penn laid out Philadelphia in a geometric criss-cross, which became the pattern for cities all across America. Nine months after Penn's arrival, the town had 80 houses, surrounded by 300 farms. In 1684, Penn returned to England, leaving the colony in the care of a Deputy Governor. There were political challenges to the colony, back in England and for the next fifteen years, Penn did not return to the colony. When he returned to Pennsylvania in 1699, his debts were vast (the quitrents had produced little income), but his colony was thriving. Philadelphia no longer was a town, it had become a city. With the exception of the Puritans in New England, The Society of Friends had become the greatest religious force in the colonies.

One notable thing about Penn was his treatment of the Indians. He learned several dialects so that he did not have to use a translator in negotiations with the tribes. He paid them a fair price for their land and passed a law that if an European did an Indian wrong, there would be a fair trial before juries consisting of both Europeans and Indians.

Before Penn left the colony for the second time, again to deal with matters in England, the colony had installed its constitution, totally of its own making. The only thing that could cloud the future would be incompetent deputy governors, constant harassment from royal officials, the decline of Quaker piety, and the threat of French and Indian wars.

Quakers flocked to the colony. By 1700 there were more than forty meetings, some very large and flourishing. Other groups also came in large numbers to the colony and established communities that still reflect their heritage. A variety of German groups found a home in Pennsylvania: Lutherans, Catholics, Dutch and French Huguenots, Moravians, Mennonites,

Amish, Schwenkfelders, Dunkers, and Rosicrucians. Several English groups, including Anglicans found their way into the colony. Welsh Quakers founded Radnor and Haverford. A corporation of English Quakers, called the Free Society of Traders, stocked a general store in Philadelphia, organized whale fishing in Delaware Bay, established brick kilns, tanners, glass works, and trade with the West Indies. German Mennonites, mostly linen weavers from Crefeld settled Germantown in 1683. The group was led by Daniel Pastorius, a learned minister whom Penn had met on his European tour. Moravians settled Bethlehem and Litiz.

Thus, in the atmosphere of religious freedom, the colony flourished. William Penn's "Holy Experiment" was to become the true "Keystone State" of American religious history. The colony would remain a world center of influence for Quakerism. The Presbyterians organized the first Presbytery in the New World in Philadelphia and a later influx of Scotch-Irish would keep Pennsylvania a Presbyterian stronghold. The Philadelphia Association was a dominat force in the organization and expansion of the Baptists, and the American Baptist Convention still has its headquarters in that city. The Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States was constituted in Philadelphia. The tolerant attitude allowed Roman Catholics to lay deep roots in the state. The Pennsylvania Ministerium would become a key force in the growth of American Lutheranism. The German Reformed Church had its chief strength in this state, as well as its intellectual center, Mercersburg Seminary. From the western edge of the state, Thomas and Alexander Campbell launched their Restoration movement that produced Christian Churches, Churches of Christ, and Disciples of Christ Churches. The first independent African/American denomination, the African American Episcopal Church, had its origins. Philadelphia also was the birthplace of both the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. In Pennsylvania, all of these diverse groups found that it was possible to have a fruitful coexistence, which was a model for the future United States of America.

Even though the colony flourished, William Penn did not. Penn was too busy to pay attention to business affairs – he left these to a fellow Quaker, Philip Ford whom he fully trusted. Unfortunately, Ford was untrustworthy. He embezzled significant sums from Penn's account. Without reading them, Penn signed whatever papers Ford put in front of him, one of which was a paper authorizing the transfer of the deed to Pennsylvania from Penn to Ford. Ford, claiming that he now owned Pennsylvania, began to charge Penn great sums of money as rent for the

colony's use of his property. Of course, Penn could not pay. After Ford died, his widow had Penn put into debtors prison because he "owed her rent money." The Lord Chancellor, fully aware of the situation, declared that Bridget Ford was morally unfit for the role of proprietor of a colony and the proprietorship was returned to Penn and his heirs. Even so, Penn was penniless.

In October, 1712, Penn suffered a stroke while writing a letter about the future of Pennsylvania. Four months later he had a second stroke. For the next six years he lived as an invalid, dying July 30, 1718.

Witchcraft in the Colonies

At the same time that the colonies were being established in America, a witch-hunting crusade was taking place in much of Europe. The general belief was that one could become a witch by making a pact with the devil, and from that time onward one would have supernatural power and be able to bring good upon their friends and curses upon their enemies. Furthermore, a witch was not fully responsible for his or her behavior (75 percent of those accused of witchcraft were women).

From the fist settling of the colonies, there had been accusations of witchcraft – in Virginia as well as New England. Prior to 1692, there had been 44 trials for witchcraft and four hangings of convicted witches in New England. Many convicted witches were punished but not executed. In Virginia, the custom was to punish by whipping – no witches were executed in Virginia.

During the months of May through October of 1692, a five-month anti-witchcraft furor exploded in Massachusetts. Most students of the period discount the reality of these accusations. American historian, Samuel Elliot Morison is representative of this point of view.

> "To the already vast literature on witchcraft the Reverend Cotton Mather …contributed a book on *Memorable Providences,* describing a case of alleged witchcraft in Boston for which a poor old woman was executed, and telling how he handled the accusing children to prevent a witch-hunting epidemic. The second edition of this "how to do it" book, filled with data on how the "possessed" were expected to behave, got into the hands of a group of young girls in a poor settlement near Salem. More or less as a prank, they accused a half-Indian, half-Negro, family slave of being a witch. She, flogged by her master into a false confession to save her skin, accused two

> respectable goodwives[105] of being her confederates. The "afflicted children" finding themselves the objects of attention, with the exhibitionism natural to young wenches, persisted in their charges for fear of being found out, and started a chain reaction. Governor Phip's appointment of a special court to try the witches only made matters worse, for the chief justice (William Stoughton) and his colleagues were not trained in the use of evidence and became panic-stricken themselves. Innocent people whom the girls accused implicated others [in order] to escape the gallows. They confessed broomstick rides, flying saucers, witch's Sabbaths, sexual relations with the devil, and everything which, according to [Mather's] book, witches were supposed to do. Honest folk who declared the whole thing nonsense were cried out upon for witches. … in 1692, if you accused the witch court or tried to help an accused kinsman, you were in league with the devil.
>
> "This vicious business continued through the summer of 1692 until fourteen women and five men had been hanged, and one man, Giles Corey, pressed to death for refusing to plead guilty or not guilty. At least four died in jail of the fever that swept through it and one poor child, jailed with her mother who was hanged, went out of her mind. Some 55 others saved their skins by pleading guilty and accusing others. The frenzy was not halted until the witch-finders began to go after prominent people such as the Boston clergy, wealthy merchants, and [the Governor's wife] Lady Phips. On the sound if tardy advice of Increase Mather and other clergymen, the assembly dissolved the special court on October 12, 1692 and released some 150 prisoners who were awaiting trial."[106]

A totally different point of view is expressed by Marshall and Manuel. They argue that since the colonists had become prosperous, their spiritual life had become weak. Therefore, God allowed Satan to bring about an intense harassment of the colony. They argue that the witchcraft was real.

> "As the seventeenth century drew to a close, so enfeebled had the affluent Christianity of the Puritans again become, that the supernatural manifestations of Satan's power – occultism, witchcraft, poltergeist phenomena (demons at mischief) et al – were coming out into the open. Witches began hanging out their shingles, as it were, letting it quietly be known that they could cure warts and straighten toes and mix love potions (all white magic, for the 'come-ons'; the black magic – the hexing, the cursing, the spellbinding – would come later). And the gullible, the unwary, the

[105] A "goodwife" is a woman who is in charge of a household.

[106] Samuel Eliot Morison, *The Oxford History of the American People,* (New York, Oxford University Press) 1965, page 124

hopeless turned to this source of power, and more and more people began to come to 'the knowing ones' for advice and counsel.

"As their influence grew, they became bolder, until there was almost an unacknowledged competition between them and the local pastors. And all the while, demonic activity increased to the point where scarcely a village existed which did not have at least one house that was bedeviled by 'haunts.'

"Of the several contemporary accounts of this sudden holocaust of satanic activity, Cotton Mather's was the most comprehensive. This was not because he was obsessed with the occult (as modern anti-Puritans would have us believe), but simply because he was one of the few ministers strong enough in the faith to come against Satan and remain supremely confident of victory. And because of this, everyone came to him with his supernatural problems – as if he were the only fireman in a town of straw houses.

". . . Typical were the goings-on in the house of William Morse at Newberry described here by Cotton Mather: 'In the night, he [Morse] was pulled by the hair and pinched and scratched. . . and blows that fetched blood were sometimes given him. . . A little boy belonging to the family was the principal sufferer of the molestations, for he was flung about at such a rate, they feared his brains would have been beaten out. . . all the knives which belonged to the house were one after another stuck into his back, which the spectators pulled out. . . The poor boy was divers times thrown into the fire, and preserved from scorching there, with much ado. . . once the fist beating the man was discernable, but they could not catch hold of it. . . and another time, a drumming on the boards was heard, which was followed with a voice that sang, 'Revenge! Revenge! Sweet is Revenge!' At this, the people being terrified, called upon God, whereupon there followed a mournful note, 'Alas, alas, we knock no more, we knock no more!' and there was an end to it all.

"One of the most diabolical things about this onslaught of demons and hell's angels was that apparently they often assumed the form of innocent good people in the town as they went about their foul practices, 'framing' them, as it were, giving rise to accusations against these innocents and fomenting all manner of jealousies and hatred. This became a great problem that Increase Mather and a conclave of ministers warned civil judges throughout the Bay Colony not to accept such testimony as the basis for conviction of witchcraft.

". . .For there was certainly no doubt in any Puritan's mind that a massive frontal attack of witches and wizards, in league with one another, was indeed afoot. Mather

> reports that more than 120 then in custody freely confessed that the Devil had appeared to them with a book in his hand for them to sign. [107]

The witchcraft trials were stopped when the clergy prevailed upon Governor Phips to curtail them. The ministers were convinced that these trials by secular judges were not in God's will and that the entire colony had become gripped by a spirit of fear and vengeance.

Four years after the October cessation of the trials, Samuel Sewall who had been one of the judges at the Salem trials, experienced tragedy. His daughter died and his wife gave birth to a stillborn son. He became convinced that these events were an expression of God's displeasure with him and the role that he had played in the trials. He became fearful that he might have condemned some innocent people to death and he presented a petition for public distribution, repenting for his role.

PETITION UP BY MR. SEWALL ON THE FAST DAY
January 14, 1697

> "Samuel Sewall, sensible of the reiterated stroke of God upon himself and family, and being sensible that as to the guilt contracted upon the opening of the late Commission of Oyer and Terminer at Salem, he is, upon many accounts, more concerned than any that he knows of, desires to take the blame and shame of it, asking pardon of men, and especially desiring prayers that God, who has unlimited authority, would pardon that sin and all his other sins, personal and relative. And according to his infinite benignity and sovereignty, not visit the sin of him or of any other, upon himself or any of his nor upon the land. But that He would powerfully defend against all temptations to sin for the future and vouchsafe him the efficacious saving conduct of his Word and Spirit."[108]

Who is right, is it Morison - or is it Marshall and Manuel? Was there an explosion of Satanically inspired witchcraft, or was it all superstition fired by teenaged girls and carried on by superstitious judges? From this vantage point, it is difficult to say and one must decide for himself which perspective is true – or is it possible that both are true? Could it not be possible that Satan did produce witches (a few) and in the hysteria, things got out of control and a scenario painted by Morison consequently ensued. Regardless of which position one takes, Satan had a heyday.

---

[107] Marshall and Manuel pages 236-238, edited.
[108] Marshall and Manuel, page 238

The Church in Virginia

If there were any place in the colonies where culture programmed the Church, it was Virginia. From the initial motivation to settle the colony – monetary gain with little sense of expanding the Kingdom of God – to the emerging tobacco industry, the culture and the geography of the colony determined the character of the Virginia Church of England.

Earlier (page 50) we briefly touched on the ministry of the Reverend Robert Hunt, the Anglican minister who accompanied the Jamestown settlers. Even though it seems that everyone else involved in that venture was concerned with getting rich, Hunt's singular passion was advancing the Kingdom of God. When the colonists first arrived on shore, he immediately led them in setting up a cross and kneeling in the sand around it. While they knelt, he reminded them of the admonition of the Royal Council, "Every plantation which My Heavenly Father hath not planted shall be rooted up" (Matthew 15:13), then raising his hands to heaven he claimed the land for country and king and consecrated the continent to the glory of God.

Hunt sought to bring a Christlike presence and reverence into a situation where all sorts of circumstances and attitudes stirred up opposition to his efforts. As noted in an earlier section, when he conducted services (he conducted morning and evening prayers and regular Sunday meetings), the aristocrats arrived late and had conversations among themselves while he was speaking – showing shameful disrespect for the ministry of a man who was trying to look after their souls.[109]

It is generally believed that Hunt died in the spring of 1608 (his will was probated in October 1608). Thus, the colony had the benefit of his ministry for about one year (the colonists had first landed in May 1607). After his death, the colony's leaders lamented the loss of Hunt because in his humble way, he was gifted with the ability to reconcile combatants and bring peace among those who passionately disliked one another.

For the next two years, there was no clergy in the colony and no one to conduct religious services. When the new Governor, De La Warr[110] arrived in 1610, the first thing that he did was

[109] For a more extended treatment of Hunt's ministry, see ADDENDA I
[110] Delaware was named after Governor De La Warr.

to lead the entire colony to a service where they heard from a clergyman that he had brought with him. The topic of the sermon was vanity and idleness. De La Warr was a compassionate and gifted Governor. Tragically, half of the colony died of the pestilence, during his first year, and he almost died when he contracted the disease. As a result of his poor health, he returned to England.

In 1611, Thomas Dale and Thomas Gates arrived with the commission to be joint Governors of the colony. They functioned in that role until 1616. Dale brought another Anglican clergyman with him, Alexander Whitaker who would make a significant contribution to the spiritual life of Virginia.

Governor Dale had a strict concern for *The Lawes Divine, Morall and Martiall,* which he and the secretary of the company, William Strachey had drawn up. In this plan, there was "Divine Law" for civil conduct and "Martiall Law" for the church – in essence, a design for a Holy Commonwealth. Dale was a tough-minded veteran of the Dutch wars and he commissioned army officers to see "that the almightie God bee duly and daily served" and that those who absented themselves from morning and evening prayers were punished. It further was ordered that "everie man and woman duly twice a day, upon the first towling the Bell, shall upon the working daies repaire unto the Church to hear divine service," and that the Lord's day be given to public and private religious exercises. Ministers were urged to discipline their flocks as well as to perform diligently a wide range of church duties. Clearly, for these Anglicans, a period was entered upon that is very close to what the Puritans required. God was going to be in charge.

Dale founded a second settlement fifty miles up the river from Jamestown. The settlement, Henrico, was more easily protected and not prone to the diseases from mosquitoes and other illness related to the marshes that surrounded Jamestown. In this town they formed a second parish and a " fair-framed Parsonage impaled for Master Whitaker." It was from this site that Whitaker, for a season, functioned as the "Apostle of Virginia." Most familiar of his many significant deeds was the conversion and baptism of Pocahontas.

After Dale returned to England, Deputy Governor Samuel Argall oversaw the colony. Argall was incompetent as a Governor and the colony once again began to suffer. In London opposing

factions tried to take over the company, but finally, Sir Edwin Sandys became the leader of the Virginia Company and under his leadership things moved forward. He ordered the establishment of a House of Burgesses in the colony and the repeal of Dale's Lawes." When the first House of Burgesses met in the choir loft of the Jamestown church (this was the first elective assembly in America), none of them wished for more than a slight modification of the "morall lawes." The Governor set aside "glebes," which were lands whose produce was used to support the church. The colony was divided into four parishes and ministers were sought to fill the role in each parish. To promote evangelism among the Indians, each town was to educate a certain number of "natives" and prepare them for college.

Controversy between the Virginia Company and the King became serious after 1619 and once again the colony entered into a season of uncertainty. King James, angry over several issues tried to destroy the Virginia Company and in June 1624 he made Virginia a royal province.

Another serious event that damaged the colony was an Indian uprising in 1622 that brought death to 347 colonists and reduced the population to 1,800 and the number of tobacco plantations was reduced from eighty to a dozen. In 1644 there was another Indian massacre, killing more than 500 people in the outlying communities.

After twenty years of the colony's shaky existence, William Berkley was appointed Governor in 1642 and he began to turn the colony around. Berkley was a royalist and a champion of the established Anglican Church. He took stringent measures to halt any Nonconformist inroads into Virginia. The wealthy and powerful planters of Virginia supported Berkley in these measures which were designed to keep all Englishmen loyal to the Church of England and loyal to the crown. After Parliament had executed Charles I and Cromwell became the ruler of England, Cromwell was determined to turn the Virginia colony into a non-conformist Puritan colony. In 1652 Cromwell sent a Commonwealth Armada to Virginia and forced Berkley to resign. Berkley resigned, but he did not leave Virginia.

After Cromwell died and his son had resigned, the Virginia House of Burgesses elected Berkley to the office of Governor (as contrasted to his being appointed, by the King, during his first

tenure of office). When the Stuart monarchy had been restored, Charles II confirmed the election, making Berkley Governor by royal appointment.

The Stuart restoration meant a return to royal control in Virginia, and quite naturally, the establishing of the Church of England as the recognized church in Virginia. The resulting church culture in Virginia from this time forward changed very little prior to the Revolutionary War. The church settlement in Virginia had been reached in three stages:

- From 1607-1619 the colony's religious affairs were guided by the Virginia Company, which framed the colony's laws and sent out ministers to serve as chaplains.
- The establishment of a House of Burgesses in Virginia in 1619, marked a change. The House of Burgesses was a representative body that included ecclesiastical legislation as one of its responsibilities.
- The third stage began in 1624, when James I made Virginia a royal colony and appointed the first Governor. It was at this time that the Anglican Church became established in Virginia as an institution. Even so, no resident bishop was provided for the colony and so the Church of England in America was under the authority of an ecclesiastical hierarchy in London, and no clear ecclesiastical oversight was given to the Virginia church.

Even though Anglicanism was considered to be established in the colony, it was a vague establishment. The organization of the clergy was informal and unorganized; canon law was not enforced; Non-conformity was widespread, even though government measures were taken to squelch it. However, since Anglicanism was established, its support was guaranteed by law, parishes were created and divided by the House of Burgesses, and the Governor personally exercised formal jurisdiction over many phases of church life. One of the ecclesiastical responsibilities that fell on the Governor was to induct a minister into any parish whose vestry presented the minister for such induction.

Vestries were small trustee groups, elected in each parish, with the responsibility for managing the affairs of the parish. Their two most important responsibilities were managing the property and arranging for the recruitment and maintenance of a minister. This system was officially put in place in Virginia in 1643. By 1662, they were made self-perpetuating (selecting their successors). They had the authority to "present" a living to a rector priest (a commitment to provide a perpetual income) or to withhold such a presentation and keep the priest on a temporary basis. Thus, in Virginia, the local vestry had more authority than it had in England.

Because the vestry had the authority to withhold a minister's income, and sometimes did when they were displeased with him, ministers had little authority in discipline, etc.; the vestry could control him. This allowed church members to be routine in their commitment to spiritual matters and the religious life of Virginia suffered.

In 1685, the Bishop of London appointed James Blair as the Commissary for Virginia, which gave him authority similar to that of a resident bishop. Blair served in Virginia from 1685 until his death in 1743. He was very concerned about the low tenor of religion in Virginia and often without tact, but with much zeal, he sought to elevate the character of the Anglican priesthood in Virginia. Because of the interlocking interests of the House of Burgesses and the vestries, he had little substantial results. One thing he did accomplish was securing a charter in 1693 for the college which he named after England's sovereigns at the time, William and Mary. He served as the college president during the last years of his life.[111]

One thing that made the Southern attitudes toward work and leisure different from these attitudes in New England was the difference in religion. The Puritans never encouraged idleness nor the propensity to live by the sweat of another man's brow; to them, such an attitude was sin. However, from the first settling of Jamestown, this attitude had been present in the Virginia colony. The aristocratic concept that ran strong in Virginia was compatible with the transplanted Church of England. This was decisively effected by the rise of the tobacco culture after it was introduced in the years following 1612.

The Influence of Tobacco on the Church in Virginia

Tobacco first was introduced to France and England by the English sea captain, John Hawkins. Hawkins briefly visited the short-lived Huguenot colony of St. Caroline in Florida, not long before the Spanish destroyed the settlement and slaughtered all of the inhabitants. Hawkins took back to England a packet of tobacco, which he described, "The Floridians have a kind of herb

[111] Although William and Mary College became an important institution, during Blair's lifetime it was little more than an institution struggling for existence. It rarely had more than twenty students at one time, and a contemporary described it as "a college without a chapel, without a scholarship, without a statue' having a library without books, a president without a fixed salary, a burgess (a representative in the House of Burgesses was included in the school charter) without certainty of electors." Ahlstrom page 190

dried, which with a cane and an earthen cup on the end with fire – doe suck through the cane the smoke therof, which smoke satisfieth their hunger."[112]

In the years following Hawkins' trip, tobacco began arriving in Europe from various regions of the New World. Europe quickly became addicted. James I wrote a diatribe against tobacco and tried to prohibit its growth in Virginia, but his efforts fell on deaf ears – too much money was at stake. Tobacco users either smoked pipes or used snuff. Cigars were not used outside the Spanish Empire and cigarettes were not yet in use in Europe.[113] Tobacco was grown in several of the southern colonies of England and Spain, and the tobacco from one region differed somewhat from the tobacco of another region. In time, the Europeans began to dislike the Indian tobacco grown in Virginia and showed a preference for the tobacco grown among the settlements in New Spain. All of this changed when John Rolfe came on the scene.

John Rolfe and his wife and daughter left England in May, 1609, on a ship bound for Jamestown. The ship and two others were carrying supplies to the colony. Enroute the fleet encountered a three-day hurricane and the ships became separated from one another. The ship on which the Rolfes were sailing, began to leak so badly that the captain deliberately grounded the vessel on the reefs of Bermuda. All on board survived – for a while. A pestilence swept through the region and Rolfe's wife and daughter died of the disease. The survivors were able to rebuild their ship and construct a second, and they resumed their journey to Jamestown in May 1610.

---

[112] Samuel Eliot Morision, *The Oxford History of the American People* (New York, Oxford University Press) 1965, page 41

[113] The term, *cigarette*, is a French term, meaning, "little cigar." The earliest forms of cigarettes were largely indistinguishable from their predecessor, the cigar. Cigarettes have been attested in Central America around the 9th century in the form of reeds and smoking tubes. The South and Central American cigarette used various plant wrappers; when it was brought back to Spain, maize wrappers were introduced, and by the 17th century, fine paper. The resulting product was called *papelate* and is documented in Goya's paintings *La Cometa*, *La Merienda en el Manzanares*, and *El juego de la pelota a pala* (18th century). By 1830, the cigarette had crossed into France, where it received the name *cigarette*; and in 1845, the French state tobacco monopoly began manufacturing them.

In the English-speaking world, the use of tobacco in cigarette form became increasingly popular during and after the Crimean War (1853-1856), when British soldiers began emulating their Ottoman Turkish comrades and Russian enemies, who had begun rolling and smoking tobacco in strips of old newspaper for lack of proper cigar-rolling leaf. This was helped by the development of tobaccos that are suitable for cigarette use, and by the development of the Egyptian cigarette export industry.

Rolfe had in his possession some tobacco seeds from Trinidad. After being granted some Virginia land, he planted the Trinidad tobacco, and in the first season he cross-cultivated the Trinidad tobacco with the Virginia Indian tobacco. He named his new tobacco, Oronoko. In 1612, the first Oronoko tobacco was sent to England and it quickly captured the English market and became the preferred tobacco throughout most of Europe.

As a result of the exploding market for Virginia tobacco, the colony went "tobacco mad." They even grew Oronoko in the streets of Jamestown. Men who came to the colony with very little of this world's goods, became wealthy through their production of tobacco. Hosts of immigrants flocked to the colony, hoping to get rich. Maryland quickly began planting Oronoko and experienced the same phenomena as Virginia.

Associated with the tobacco industry was Virginia's head-right system. When a prospective planter arrived at Jamestown, he obtained from the Colonial Secretary a warrant, entitling him to 50 acres of wild, ungranted land for himself and 50 acres for each person that he brought with him whose expense the planter had paid. He also received 50 acres for every person whom he brought over later, at his own expense. The warrant didn't have to be converted to land, immediately. For that matter he could keep the warrant all of his life, and when he died his heirs inherited the warrant, still not acted upon.

When the planter did start his plantation, he had to find a site that had not been claimed, have it surveyed by a government certified surveyor, record the location with the court, and then "seat" the claim – i.e., build something on the site, even if it were only a shack. After the claim was seated, he received a deed and annually was assessed 2 shillings per acre, as the king's quit-rent.

The head-right system, combined with the tobacco industry, forever changed Virginia. Those who managed well became wealthy planters and they became the aristocratic Virginians who were leading players in the American Revolution.

The first effect of the head-right/tobacco institution was the change in the constituency of the upper crust of Virginian society. The original settlers (1607-1624) for the most part were Oxford graduates, the sons of knights, barons, and others aristocratic origin. They were accustomed to having wealth in England and expected to be treated like gentlemen in the New World. Few of

these survived into the next era. They were not going to perform physical labor; many lost heart and returned to England. Others died of the fever or were killed during Indian uprisings.

Most of the next generation (1625-1645) consisted of middle-class Englishmen who came with little wealth, but rose to wealth in the colony – and tobacco was the means.

The head-right system and the tobacco culture required a supply of cheap labor. Therefore, indentured servants began to have a growing presence in the colony. This accentuated the separation between Virginia aristocracy and other colonists. An indentured servant was a person who could not afford passage to the New World, and so he signed a contract to be the possession of someone else who would pay his passage and cover his living expenses in the colony. The contract stipulated how many years the person would be indentured. Historians estimate that:

- About 70% of immigrants from England 1630-1660 were indentured servants;
- Most indentured servants were young, 15-25, and single;
- Males servants outnumbered female servants;
- Indentures were typically 4-7 years in duration;
- Trade in indentured servants peaked about 1620-1680, but lasted until the 1770s. [114]

Indentured servants included both the desperately poor (the majority) and the middle class. Prior to the introduction of African slaves, most indentured servants were farmers or unskilled laborers.[115] Men, women, and sometimes children signed a contract with a "master" to serve a term of 4 to 7 years. When the contract had expired, the servant was paid "freedom dues" and allowed to leave the plantation. Freedom dues usually consisted of corn, tools and clothing.

During the time of his/her indenture, a servant was considered his master's personal property and the servant's contract could be bartered, inherited or assigned. While a servant, a person could neither marry nor have children (if the indentured female servant became pregnant, her term was lengthened, to compensate for the time she lost during pregnancy and caring for her child). A master's permission was needed to leave the plantation, to perform work for someone else, or to receive money for personal use. An "unruly" servant was punished by whipping for improper behavior.

---

[114] http://homepages.rootsweb.ancestry.com/~crosslin/records/va/immigrants3.html
[115] After the introduction of African slaves, many of the indentured servants were English craftsmen.

Labor was hard and living conditions were generally harsh for indentured servants. Many servants had difficulty adjusting to the climate and native diseases of Tidewater Virginia, and many servants did not live to receive their freedom. Runaway servants, of which there were many, were punished by increasing their time of service if they were captured.

Slavery did not become rooted in Virginia until after 1681. In that year, the Royal Governor estimated the population of the colony to be between 70,000 and 80,000 people. Within the population there were 3000 "blacks" and 15,000 white indentured servants. The blacks included a considerable number of free blacks, many of them had become quite wealthy through the head-right system and tobacco production. One very prosperous black community, in Northampton County, began importing significant numbers of slaves from Africa and white indentured servants from England. Because so many whites in this community were indentured to blacks, the House of Burgesses passed a bill in 1670 making it illegal for a black to own a white indentured servant.

Another effect of the head-right/tobacco complex was the dispersion of the population so that community life was next to impossible. In the towns of Jamestown, Williamsburg, and Henrico, some semblance of community life could have taken place, but Virginia was not defined by life in the towns; Virginia was defined by life on the plantations.

Increasingly, the House of Burgesses sought to enforce morals and the practice of religion. The form of religion was a Puritan influenced Anglican Church. Laws were passed that prohibited the playing of cards or the rolling of dice. A fine of 50 pounds of tobacco (one week's wage) was imposed upon those found guilty of missing church services. Each vestry had two Church Wardens, as a part of the vestry. The responsibility of the wardens was to act as moral policemen in the parish. They were to present to the county court cases involving bastardy, adultery, blasphemy, Sabbath breaking, slander, backbiting, and other "scandalous offenses." Violators were punished by whipping, being placed in stocks, being pilloried,[116] and dunked while tied to a dunking stool. Although violators were jailed from time to time, the courts did

[116] When one was placed in a stock, his ankles and sometimes his wrists were locked into the stock and the one being punished had to sit in the awkward position for as long as he was in the stocks. When one was pilloried, his head and usually, his hands, were placed in the apparatus, and he stood while in the pillory.

their best to inflict other punishment. Jailing someone cost money, and also removed that person from the labor force.

Because in the rural regions, a man who did not have slaves depended on the labor of his children, no man wanted to marry a woman who would prove to be barren. Thus, "five month" babies became common. If it were determined that a couple had engaged in pre-marital sex (a baby being born five months after the wedding did raise suspicion), they would appear before the church on a Sunday morning, dressed in the white sheet of repentance, and confess their sin to the church. After that, all was forgiven.

The Church and the state cooperated in vain in trying to clean up the unholy speech of Virginians. Morison describes the situation,

> "English men and women of that day, whether at home on the colonies and of whatever class, expressed anger or vexation in explosive, picturesque, and bawdy language that shames the four-lettered profanity of today. Against this practice the church and state struggled in vain. In a crusade to clean up Henrico County, 122 persons were indicted for uttering 'wicked oaths.' A woman was found guilty of swearing no fewer than 65 times, and John Huddlesey was imprisoned for 'oaths innumerable.'"[117]

One of the greatest influences that the head-right/tobacco culture had on the church was the dispersion of the population. When a planter received a head-right, he headed out into the unoccupied area and staked his claim. Because he hoped to make his fortune in tobacco, he would locate an area along one of Virginia's rivers, so that his product could be taken to market by boat – often by a small ship that sailed up and down the rivers picking up tobacco.

> "Jamestown, where every arriving and departing ship had to call, had a goodly brick church… and a brick State House where the assembly met, but not more than thirty other houses by mid-century. When the courts and assembly were not sitting, the town was almost deserted. A traveler of 1650, sailing up the James, the York, or any other tidal tributary of Chesapeake Bay, found every few miles a clearing with a wharf, a modest mansion, a clutch of wooden cottages for servants, an orchard, kitchen garden

[117] Morison, *History*, page 91

> and corn patch, and fields green with the tobacco plant. Beyond and between these plantations there was only the primeval forest in which cattle browsed and pigs rooted…this gave every plantation a place on the tobacco pipeline to England….The Reverend John Clayton observed in a letter of 1688, 'The country is thinly inhabited; the Living solitary and unsociable; Trading confused and dispersed; beside other Inconveniences.'"[118]

The result of this arrangement meant that some parishes were 50 miles long, following the banks of a river. Under this arrangement, neither vestry, Church Warden, or minister could exercise much oversight of the spiritual lives of church members. This was far different from the early society of the Plymouth and Massachusetts Bay colonies.

> "In the New England colonies Puritanism was a pervasive and positive way of life. Most people in New England lived around a village green under the supervision of a parson and the constable. If Elnathan Danforth was observed entering the house of Nathaniel Cotton (who recently married a young and pretty wife) when Nate was out mowing, the whole village watched developments with keen interest. But in Virginia the parson wore out his horse, his boatmen, and his legs, merely trying get around, and much went on that he never could know about"[119]

The Anglican Church in Virginia suffered from a lack of ministers. The colony did not have a Harvard where ministers could be educated and so young Virginians who might be inclined to enter the ministry could not qualify. As a result the colony had to depend on a supply of ministers from England and young newly ordained Englishmen naturally preferred a parish in England rather than roughing it in Virginia. By 1672, four out of five parishes did not have a minister and two out of three of those who had some sort of ministry had lay leaders, rather than ordained ministers.

Almost all Englishmen in the seventeenth century were interested in religion. Anyone who read anything read books on divinity. Inventories of Virginian private libraries include a surprising number of volumes on Puritan theology, which were favorite reading material in England. The

---

[118] Morison, *ibid* page 87
[119] Morison, *History*, page 92

Bible was quite well known among the population. Although Virginians honored the king and preferred to worship according to the Book of Common Prayer, their churches were conducted in a manner that would have shocked Archbishop Laud – or perhaps some bishops today. Parts of the liturgy were omitted, the surplice seldom was worn by the minister, holy communion was administered to the congregation sitting around a table (Puritan fashion), and there was no altar with candles and a cross, which Virginia Anglicans of that era considered to be slightly idolatrous.

Church doctrine declared that only pagans could be enslaved. This rationale allowed even pious slavers to ply their trade because the Africans whom they enslaved were not Christians. Therefore, for a period of time, when a black slave was baptized, he no longer would be considered to be a slave. When great numbers of slaves were becoming Christians, some even preachers, a series of laws passed from 1667 – 1682 declared that slavery depended on race not religion.

We close this section with the statement with which we began, "If there were any place in the colonies where culture programmed the Church, it was Virginia." The head-right/tobacco culture created a society in which religion was tepid and most of the clergy had little influence in spite of legislation that attempted to force participation in the Anglican Church. It is significant that one of the social conditions that contributed to the second and third generations' lessening of piety in New England (it could be argued that it was the main thing that brought about the lessening of piety) – the larger farms and Christians living farther and farther apart – was present in Virginia quite early. The sense of community and being in covenant with fellow believers never was present in Virginia and as a result, Virginia never did have the vibrant faith that characterized the early days of New England.

New England's Evangelization of the Indians and King Philip's War

In 1631, John Eliot was the minister and "teaching elder" at Roxbury, a suburb of Boston. In that role, he became concerned about the need to convert the Indians that surrounded the community. Many Christians thought that the Indians were the lost Tribes of Israel and so they had a special responsibility to bring them to faith. To help achieve this, Eliot translated the Bible

into the Algonquian language. The "Eliot Bible" was published in Cambridge, Massachusetts, in 1663 under the title,

The Holy Bible
Containing the Old Testament and the New.
Translated into the Indian Language.
by John Eliot, "Apostle to the Indians,"
to support his missionary efforts among Native Americans.

The Eliot Bible appeared some 120 years before the first complete English edition of the Bible was published in what is now the United States. In 1666, his grammar of *Massachusett*, called "The Indian Grammar Begun", was published as well. As a cross-cultural missionary Eliot was best known for attempting to preserve the culture of the Native Americans by putting them in planned towns where they could continue by their own rule as a Christian society. At one point in time, there were 14 of these towns of so-called "Praying Indians"

As a result of the work of John Eliot among the Indians in Massachusetts, the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in New England was founded in London and chartered by Parliament in 1649. This was a true missions organization aimed at converting the Indians of New England and significant results were achieved until King Philip's War.

In January, 1675, some men were passing a frozen pond near Middleborough, Massachusetts (fifteen miles south of Plymouth), and they noticed something that looked like a man's hat sitting on the surface of the frozen pond. Upon pausing to look at the object, they also could see something else that looked like a musket. Since these were items that no one would leave behind, and since the ice was strong enough for them to walk upon, they ventured out to take a closer look. Suddenly, one of the men let out a cry; beneath the clear ice was the face of a man, eyes wide open and dark hair billowed out around it. The men ran to get an axe and they chopped out of the ice the body of John Sassamon, a Christian Indian from the nearby settlement of Nemasket.

At first they speculated that the man foolhardily had been trying to cross the pond before it was frozen solidly and had fallen through the thin ice and drowned. However, upon further thorough examination of the body they realized that something was wrong. Sassamon was an Indian and he would have known better than to try something that foolish. As they examined the body, they

noted a swelling on the side of his head, probably caused by a blow. Furthermore, no water had come out of his lungs, so he had not drowned. On further examination they discovered that his neck was broken. It began to look as if Sassamon had been murdered and his death made to appear as an accident.

Sassamon had been reared in one of Eliot's community of Christian Indians at Natick and even had studied at Harvard. During an identity crisis, he left the Christian community and joined the Indians living in the wilderness. He became an aide to the sachem[120] Philip.[121] John Sassamon was as fluent in English as he was in his native tongue and was very valuable to Philip, as a translator and negotiator. God's Spirit began convicting Sassamon about his forsaking the church and his Christian community. He left Philip and returned to Natick, where he was readmitted and even became the minister of the local church. Naturally, this infuriated Philip, who was well known for his hatred of Christianity. To Philip, Sassamon was a turncoat of the vilest sort.

Shortly before his death, Sassamon had visited Plymouth Governor Winslow and secretly told him that Philip and the Wampanoags were organizing a general conspiracy against the settlers. The Governor seemed to have discounted the warning, even though John Sassamon emphasized that he was risking his life to bring the report.

Incredibly, a friendly Indian from the top of a nearby hill had observed the murder and was able to identify the culprits – one of which was Philip's lieutenant. The accused murderers were apprehended and a trial was set for June. To ensure the utmost fairness, there would be two juries: one composed of settlers and the other of the wisest Indians in the colony. Although the three defendants insisted that they were innocent, both juries found them guilty as charged.

Philip was furious – he declared that the witness was lying and was in league with the settlers in an effort to besmirch his honor. Any question of the witnesses' truthfulness was removed at the execution. As the trap door swung open beneath the last of the three Indians to be hung, the rope

---

[120] A primary chief among the Algonquin Indians is called a *sachem* or *sagamore*. The terms are synonymous.

[121] The settlers had given the Christian name, Philip, to Metacomet, the son of Massasoit, sachem of the Wampanoags. Philip noted that the English monarch was called, "king," and so he took the title for himself, thus becoming, "King Philip."

broke. The Indian fell to the ground and in the terror of the moment confessed that all three of them had done exactly what the witness had said. He argued that he had only watched what the other two had done. His confession did not save him; he was re-hung and this time the rope did not break.

Philip was out for revenge. Settlers began to see large bands of Indians roaming through the fields and woods. Sensing danger, the settlers living in remote places began abandoning their homes and moving into towns that were guarded by "strong houses." Bands of Indians began looting and burning the abandoned homes. Armed militia went into the woods seeking the culprits but always returned empty handed. During the first three weeks of June, the settlers held their breath and waited for what they sensed was coming.

On June 21, the war began. Philip and his Indians who lived at Mount Hope burned all of the houses at Swansea, and slaughtered and mutilated all of the inhabitants. When the colonial troops finally arrived, they were sickened by the sight; the main street of the village was strewn with the dismembered corpses of men, women, and children.

The next day, Dartmouth fell under the tomahawk, and then Taunton, Middlebury, and Sudbury. Fifty men were massacred in Lancaster and forty homes burned in Groton. Next, King Philip and 1500 braves prepared to move on Marlborough. This was a larger army than any colony ever had been able to muster. New England was unprepared, strategically, mentally, and spiritually. Any time a company of militia would be sent out, they would be cut to pieces by a well planned ambush and when a second column would be sent out to assist the first, the same fate awaited the second troop. Morale sank to the lowest possible point. Survivors arriving in towns that as yet had not been attacked were in hysterics, others could not speak because of the atrocities that they had seen.

The colony began to sense that they were dealing with Satan, not just Indians and that God had removed his protecting hand from the colony. A fast day was declared in Massachusetts, but no sooner had the service ended than reports of fresh disasters came in. For years the preachers had been pleading with the people to renew their covenant and revive their devotion to God. With the Indian uprising, they realized that it was going to take more than one day of repentance to

turn away God's wrath. Increase Mather and his son, Cotton, sounded the note that other clergymen would pick up. They preached the most powerful sermons of their lives, based on Scriptures such as,

> "*Behold, I am bringing a nation against you from afar, O house of Israel," declares the LORD. "It is an enduring nation, It is an ancient nation, A nation whose language you do not know, Nor can you understand what they say.* [16] *"Their quiver is like an open grave, All of them are mighty men.* [17] *"And they will devour your harvest and your food; They will devour your sons and your daughters; They will devour your flocks and your herds; They will devour your vines and your fig trees; They will demolish with the sword your fortified cities in which you trust.. . . "They seize bow and spear; They are cruel and have no mercy; Their voice roars like the sea, And they ride on horses, Arrayed as a man for the battle Against you, O daughter of Zion!"*
> (Jeremiah 5:15-17; 6:23)

In Mathers' view, God was not going to be satisfied with superficial or temporary change; He was demanding nothing less than a complete rooting out of sin and dealing with it in a manner that had not been seen since the early days of the colony. At first, the people did not take the preachers seriously, because they had been hearing this message from their pulpits for years. Yet, the war got worse, and indeed, it had become a war. Every Indian tribe in New England had donned the warbonnet and was collecting scalps.

Finally, the people began to heed the ministers and the Bay Colony's churches began to be filled. People who had not attended church in years stood in the aisles and joined in the prayers. Proud, independent men, Yankee farmers and backwoodsmen who never had known fear, tasted it for the first time, and also for the first time, bowed the knee in prayer and repentance. Years later, describing this period, Samuel Cooke preached, "Satan, whom the Indians worshipped… [raised] armies of fierce, devouring beasts. . . . "[122]

That the Indians understood this as a spiritual battle is shown by the Indians' later report as to why they attacked Sudbury and not Concord. They said that they were afraid of the influence that Edward Bulkely, the Concord preacher, had with the Great Spirit. One old Indian chronicle stated, "We no prosper if we burn Concord. The Great Spirit love that people. He tell us not to go there. They have a great man there. He great pray."[123] Story after story could be told of

[122] Marshall and Manuel page 228
[123] Marhsall and Manuel page 228

God's response to the genuine repentance that was taking place in various parts of the colony – even in remote areas.

By April of 1676, there scarcely was a man or woman in all of New England who was not diligently searching his or her soul for unconfessed or unrepented sin. It became unpatriotic not to do so. Benjamin Franklin's grandfather, Peter Folger, a poet, wrote,

If we then truly turn to God,
He will remove His ire.
And will forthwith take this His rod
And cast it in the fire.
Let us then search that is the sin
That God doth punish for;
And when found out, cast it away.
And ever it abhor.

Modern historians tend to explain the colonists' deliverance, totally apart from God. The colonists had the greatest numbers; they had the weapons and they had the supplies. All that was needed was for them to regain their nerve and take the offensive. The Puritans themselves disagree with this assessment. They knew from whom the courage finally came; they knew whom to thank and they did so profusely.

God's instrument for turning the matter around was the Praying Indians. Badly frightened settlers had decided that a good Indian was a dead Indian. Had the Praying Indians not been protected by the Reverend John Eliot, Daniel Gookin, Daniel Henchman, and William Danforth, there would have been wholesale atrocities committed against these Christian Indians. As it was, many were interred on Deer Island in Boston's harbor and for the duration of hostilities, with almost no shelter, they were wholly dependent on charity for their food. After a time, the colony's leaders began to trust the Praying Indians and they were given weapons and combat assignments. The Christian Indians taught the colonists how to fight, Indian style (which years later helped them defeat the British). The Christian Indians also became scouts and by the summer of 1676, the tide turned in favor of the colonists.

The colonists began renewing their church covenants and their covenants with one another. There was a sense of freshness, cleanness, and new hope. The tide began turning against the

Indians to the point that they began giving themselves up in small bands and then in droves. On August 26, 1676, King Philip was killed at his base at Mount Hope, on the peninsula of Bristol Neck, Rhode Island – the place where it had all begun.

Most students of the era estimate that King Philip's war cost more lives, proportionately, than any other war in American history. For certain, it did interrupt Eliot's evangelism among the Indians.

Efforts to Produce a Greater Anglican Presence in the Colonies

The Anglican Church had not obtained a significant presence in any of the colonies during most of the Seventeenth Century. There were Anglicans in all of the colonies, but they were scattered and not well provided for by the Church of England hierarchy. Only in the southern colonies (Maryland, Virginia, the Carolinas, and Georgia) did they achieve anything that might be labeled a success.

At the close of the century, there were an estimated 43,000 Anglicans in all of the colonies. Of this number, 20,000 were in Virginia, 20,000 in Maryland, and 1,000 in New York. A survey in 1701 determined that there were 50 Anglican clergymen in the colonies: 25 in Virginia; 17 in Maryland, and 2 or less in each of the other colonies.

Shortly before the close of the Seventeenth Century, England experienced an "imperial awakening." Both statesmen and merchants realized that the colonies were not just a string of feeble outposts, but rather the beginnings of an empire. The Anglican Church had the same "awakening."

John Eliot's success in evangelizing the Indians in Massachusetts caught the attention of several prominent Anglicans. In response, the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in New England was formed and chartered in 1649. The purpose of the organization was to send missionaries to evangelize the American Indians. King Philip's War greatly curtailed the society's work, but the society did struggle on, trying to fulfill its purpose.

In 1696, the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in New England , in cooperation with the Bishop of London, sent a very capable Anglican priest, the Reverend Thomas Bray, as commissary in Maryland. Bray was an energetic man, whose main interest always had been the

equipping of clergy. When he arrived in Maryland, he became more concerned with the state of the leadership of the Anglican Church in the colonies, than he did with evangelizing Indians. Less than six months after his arrival (1700), he returned to England, believing that he had more chance of attaining his goals in London than he did by living in Maryland. In 1701, he was able to obtain the charter for a second society, the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts (usually referred to as the SPG). Bray's new society had significant support from powerful government leaders as well as the church. For the next eighty years, the SPG focused on establishing and extending the Anglican Church in the colonies. Its primary task was the recruiting and supporting of qualified missionaries to oversee the parishes in the New World. The SPG wanted to do all that it could to prevent the "dissolute dregs of English clergy"[124] from obtaining posts in the colonies.

The SPG did achieve many of its goals. For example in Virginia in 1701, where Anglicans were the recognized church, more than one half of the parishes were without clergy. By 1743, the SPG and commissary Blair[125] had been able to fill all but two of the posts. Even so, during the colonial period the story of the Anglican Church in the colonies was not one of great success. Anglicans experienced great difficulty when the colonies began to move toward independence, since many Anglicans supported the British, and some left the colonies and returned to England.

The Church of England in the Carolinas

Unlike the men who formed the Massachusetts Bay Company, or even the Virginia Company, the men who set their eyes on the vast territory south of Virginia had almost no interest in religion. Through several complicated actions, a group of court favorites and London adventurers became proprietors of this vast feudal barony in 1663. The French had named the region, "Carolina," and that is the name by which the region continued to be called. Once again, as had been true in other colonies, the proprietors hoped to establish some sort of a Middle Ages fiefdom.

At one time, the northern portion of Carolina had been claimed by Virginia and named, Albemarle County Colony, in honor of the Duke of Albemarle, one of the leading proprietors of

[124] Ahlstrom, page 220
[125] Pages 48 and 105 in these notes

the Virginia Colony. After the establishment of the Carolina Colony, Albemarle continued to be used as a designation for the northern part of the colony. Because the colony was quite large, the northern and southern portions began to take on two separate lives. In time, they began to have two separate governments, South Carolina and Albemarle, which ultimately became North Carolina.

Although the proprietors were strongly Anglican, they guaranteed all settlers religious freedom, thinking that this might draw people to the colony. That was not sufficient inducement to attract settlers to a region that to most Englishmen was unattractive. One group of New England Puritans briefly attempted a settlement near Cape Fear in 1663, but they quickly departed. Two years later, a group from Barbados made a similar attempt at the same site, but shortly thereafter they abandoned the area. Finally, in 1669, a group of 140 immigrants, under the leadership of Joseph West landed at Port Royal Sound, then quickly moved north to the Ashley River where they established Charles Town in 1670. It was not long before they began growing tobacco and thus had some semblance of a commercial success. This drew other settlers and by 1700 the colony had a population of 4000 – widely scattered throughout the colony.

From the very first the colony had problems. On the south, they faced pressures from the Spanish in Florida. In the south and west they faced pressure from the French in and around Louisiana. At one time, the Carolina militia launched a campaign against the French on the gulf. The government that the proprietors put into place was totally incompetent and frequent adjustments to the configuration and personnel had to be made. Finally, because the colony was so badly managed, King George, in 1721, revoked the charter and made Carolina a Royal Colony.

Major problems were caused by two disastrous Indian wars.

The Tuscaroras, related to the Iroquois, lived in the northern portion of Carolina, where they maintained friendly relations with the colonists. Trouble began when the white settlers began to take advantage of the Tuscaroras, encroaching on their farmland, cheating them in trades, and in some cases kidnapping and selling their children into slavery. In retaliation, Tuscarora warriors, under Chief Hancock, raided white villages in 1711. The war quickly escalated. In the southern part of the colony, the colonists had developed a strong relationship with the Yamassee Indians,

who were the natural enemies of the Tuscarora. According to some sources, few of the southern colonists actually fought the Tuscarora, but rather, they employed the Yamassee to do their fighting. Whether or not that is true, it is clear that the colonial army consisted of Englishmen and Yamassee Indians, as well as other tribes that joined the colonists in the conflict. In a final standoff, Colonel James Moore led the colonists and their Indian allies in an attack on the major Tuscarora village of Neoheroka in 1713, killing and capturing one thousand inhabitants. Many were then sold into slavery to finance the war effort. The surviving Tuscaroras migrated to New York, where in 1722 they became the sixth nation in the Iroquois League, occupying the region around Niagara Falls. The Tuscarora War cost many lives and greatly disrupted the colony.

The Tuscarora War and its lengthy aftermath played a major role in the outbreak of the Yamassee War. Other Indians from diverse tribes, many of whom had been traditional enemies of one another, had joined the colonists and the Yamassee in fighting the Tuscarora. Tribes that sent warriors to South Carolina's armies included the Yamassee, Catawba (who in the first portion of the war had fought on the side of the Tuscarora), Yuchi, Apalachee, Cusabo, Wateree, Sugaree, Waxhaw, Congraree, Pee Dee, Cape Fear, Cheraw, Saxapahaw, Cherokee (originally allies of the Tuscrora), and various proto-Creek groups.

This military collaboration brought Indians of the entire region into closer contact with one another. The Indians were exposed to the disagreements and weaknesses of the British colonies, as South Carolina, North Carolina, and Virginia bickered over various aspects of the Tuscarora War. This weakness, compared to the historic unity among the tribes, emboldened the Indians. Two or three years after the Tuscarora War, all of the tribes that helped the whites against the Tuscarora, joined together and began to wage war on the settlers. Because the Yamassee were the dominant tribe, the war is known as the Yamassee War.

There seems to have been several things that contributed to the Yamassee War. For years, the Yamassee profited from their relation with the British. However, by 1715 the Indians found it difficult to obtain the two trade items most desired by the British— deerskins and Indian slaves. With the deerskin trade booming, the deer population became depleted in Yamassee territory. After the Tuscarora War, slave-raiding opportunities were limited because the Yamassee did not

have any enemies from whom they could capture future slaves. The Yamassee became increasingly indebted to the British traders, who supplied them with trade goods on credit.

By 1715 rice plantations had begun to thrive in South Carolina, and much of the accessible land good for rice had been taken up. The Yamasee had been granted a large land reserve on the southern borders of South Carolina, and settlers began to covet their land, which they deemed ideal for rice plantations.

When the war broke out, the tribes were determined to wipe out the English colony. Hundreds of colonists were killed and many settlements were destroyed. They killed hundreds of colonists and destroyed many settlements. Traders "in the field" were killed throughout the American southeast. Abandoning settled frontiers, people fled to Charles Town, where starvation set in as supplies ran low. The survival of the South Carolina colony was in question during 1715. About 7% of South Carolina's white citizenry was killed, making the war bloodier than King Philip's War. The tide turned in early 1716 when the Cherokee sided with the colonists against the Creek, their traditional enemy. The last of South Carolina's major Native American foes withdrew from the conflict in 1717, bringing a fragile peace to the colony. The defeated Yamassee emigrated to Florida where they became a part of the milieu consisting of black freedmen, escaped slaves, white fugitives, and various Indian tribes that eventually became the Seminole tribe.

With this background, it is not difficult to see why the Church, in any form, had difficulty in establishing any significant presence in the region. Nevertheless, the SPG tried to establish the Anglican Church and had passing success. The Carolinas were a wild, sparsely settled, poorly governed expanse. In the scattered settlements of Albemarle (the northern district), there were no organized parishes until well into the Eighteenth Century. One parish, St. Paul’s, in present day Edenton, North Carolina, does date to 1701.

John Blair, in behalf of the SPG, toured the region in 1701, baptizing infants and appointing a few lay leaders, but the population did not extend a welcome to him. He was not allowed to settle in any one place and so after a year, with his funds exhausted, he returned to England.

In 1708, two more men were sent and they had little success. Two more men, John Urmiston and Giles Rainsford were sent to give it another try. Urmiston had to be dismissed for moral reasons and he died in a drunken fit. Rainsford gave up and went to Maryland where he had a fruitful ministry.

In spite of these failures, the North Carolina Assembly (it had become that) passed an act in 1701 that established the Church of England as the state church of North Carolina. The proprietors objected and the act was rescinded. After the colony became a Royal Colony, the Anglican Church gained a new foothold and vestries were established.

In the south, the Anglicans fared better. The first church building built in Charles Town was St. Phillip's, built in 1681. In 1704, the South Carolina Assembly passed an act requiring conformity to the Church of England and then another that made the Church of England the state church. In addition to establishing taxes to support the clergy, they authorized a commission to supervise the activities of the clergy. The SPG reacted to this control and complained to the Bishop of London, who carried the complaint to the House of Lords and the Queen, who pressured the assembly to revoke the commission. The revocation occurred and more SPG missionaries began to travel to South Carolina.

By 1723, there were 13 parishes and those in more settled areas prospered. It became the custom for the Anglican Church to send an annual delegation to the colony to assess the state of the church. Charles and John Wesley visited the colony in that role in 1737.

The Church of England in Georgia

The last of the old southern colonies, Georgia, was founded for two reasons:

- England's need to protect her other possessions from the French and Spanish.
- The charitable desire to provide a better life for England's poor.

After 1690, significant humanitarian movements developed in England and altruistic individuals became concerned about masses incarcerated in the filthy debtors prisons. By an interesting series of connections, Thomas Bray, the organizer of the SPG, had a direct influence on the

founding of Georgia. One biographer even asserts that one might claim that Bray is the very one who originated Georgia.[126]

In his later years, as the rector of St. Botolph, Aldgate, in London, Bray become quite involved in moral and humanitarian movements in England. He came in contact with James Oglethorpe, a military hero of the War of the Spanish Succession. As a member of Parliament, Oglethorpe instigated an investigation of prisons in which Lord Percival, a friend of Bray's participated. In 1723, ever the organizer, Bray formed a group of Associates to administer a fund for the evangelizing of the Negroes in America. Shortly before his death, twenty-four new associates were added to the organization, with a view to broadening Bray's vision beyond just the Negroes. After Bray's death, these associates, some of them very influential in London society, obtained both royal and Parliamentary support for a colony to be established between Carolina and Florida. This would be a highly touted earthly paradise of "Azilia."

King George granted the charter in 1732 and the colony appropriately was named after King George, rather than the exotic name of Azilia. Full proprietary rights to the vast pine-forest between the Savannah and Altamaha Rivers – from their headwaters west to "the Great South Sea." Parliament also granted substantial financial aid to the project. With Oglethorpe in charge, the first company landed early in 1733. Savannah was founded and land was purchased from the Creek Indians. In the first year, more than 500 English men and women who were on the charity roles or in debtors prison, arrived in Georgia. During the next twenty years, a thousand more individuals on charity arrived. Haven also was offered to distressed classes in other nations and various non-English began to arrive in the colony. Moravians from Saxony arrived in Savannah in 1735. In that same year, harassed Lutherans from Salzburg also arrived and founded Ebenezer, twenty-five miles up the Savannah River. Later they established a New Ebenezer. Ebenezer became one of the most prosperous regions of the colony and while also remaining a center of intense pietistic spirituality.

However, Georgia as a whole did not prosper. The trustees, though rightly motivated, did not govern well. Discontent among the colonists resulted from several things in addition to the ineptitude of the government of the colony: the prohibition of hard liquor, laws against slavery,

---

[126] Henry P. Thompson, *Thomas Bray,* (London SPCK) 1954, page 100

laws against fee-simple land ownership, unrealistic regulations concerning the planting of mulberry trees,[127] and Oglethorpe's two unsuccessful campaigns against the Spanish at St. Augustine. One bright light in Oglethorpe's military endeavors was his ambush of a Spanish attack on St. Simeon's Island – which seemed to vindicate Georgia as a buffer between the English and the Spanish.

Changes took place. In 1742 rum was legalized; in 1749 slavery was legalized; in 1750 fee-simple land ownership was provided. In spite of these changes, the colony continued to struggle and the trustees returned their charter to the King in 1752. Three years later, John Reynolds, a naval captain, became the first Royal Governor of the colony. At that time, the colony consisted of 2000 whites and 1000 slaves. The colony continued to grow very slowly, reaching 82,000 by 1790. It remained the least populous and least prosperous of the colonies.

As Ahlstrom states, "The religious history of Georgia is desultory and rather sad."[128] Anglicanism was favored and the trustees did send a chaplain, who died shortly after his arrival. The trustees turned to the SPG for a replacement. The SPG missionary didn't stay long, returning to England with the complaint that the authorities refused to cooperate with him. The trustees tried to correct the situation but the Georgians were rather obstinate. Things did not improve when Georgia became a Royal Colony, despite an act establishing the Church of England as the Georgia state church in 1758. Of the long list of ministers who came to the colony the predominant traits seemed to be extreme susceptibility to fatal disease, strange eccentricities, a strong desire to be somewhere else, and all sorts of character flaws. Apart from the Moravian and the Salzburger settlements, only Savannah, Frederica, and Augusta were places of settled worship and these usually were not supplied with quality ministers. The most notorious was the Reverend Thomas Bosomworth, who left his church in Frederica to marry an already twice-married Indian princess. He even later instigated and Indian attack on the colony. One notable exception was Bartholomew Zouberbuhler, a Swiss-American ordained in England. Zouberbuhler had a long and fruitful ministry in Georgia during the years before the American Revolution.

---

[127] Governor Oglethorpe imported 500 white mulberry trees in 1733. His intention was to grow silkworms, which feed on Mulberry trees and thus to begin a silk-manufacturing business in the colony.
[128] Ahlstom, page 227

Even so, there were some great names associated with Georgia. For example, Oglethorpe successfully pled with John and Charles Wesley to move to Georgia. Events on the trip to Georgia and the Wesley's exposure to the Moravian Bishop Spangenberg are cited as among the major influences that resulted in Methodism. John began his ministry at Savannah, and Charles at Frederica. Both of these men were in the high-church, almost Roman Catholic, period in their lives. They instituted a legalistic and punctilious ministry, to which the people did not respond. Their congregations began to diminish. One thing that caused conflict was the Wesleys' insistence that baptism had to be by immersion. John emphasized the imagery of Romans 6 and the Georgians reacted.[129] John became attracted to a young woman who was a part of a prominent Georgia family. He was not very adept at courtship and finally the woman gave up on him and married another. At one point, when she came for communion, he refused to serve her. Her uncle was the bailiff and chief magistrate and prompt action was taken. From John Wesley's journal, the following report is given,

> Herein they asserted, upon oath, "That John Wesley, clerk, had broken the laws of the realm, contrary to the peace of our Sovereign Lord the King, his crown and dignity.
> "1. By speaking and writing to Mrs. Williamson against her husband's consent.
> "2. By repelling her from the holy communion.
> "3. By not declaring his adherence to the Church of England.
> "4. By dividing the morning service on Sundays.
> "5. By refusing to baptize Mr. Parker's child, otherwise than by dipping, except the parents would certify it was weak and not able to bear it.
> "6. By repelling William Gough from the holy communion.
> "7. By refusing to read the burial service over the body of Nathaniel Polhill.
> "8. By calling himself Ordinary of Savannah.
> "9. By refusing to receive William Aglionby as a godfather, only because he was not a communicant.
> "10. By refusing Jacob Matthews for the same reason; and baptizing an Indian trader's child with only two sponsors." (This, I own, was wrong; for I ought, at all hazards, to have refused baptizing it till he had procured a third.)[130]

As John Wesley sailed back to England, his ship passed the one that was bringing George Whitefield to Georgia. Over the years, Whitefield would influence the Wesley brothers to such a

[129] Later in his life, Wesley moderated his view and wrote that the manner of baptism was not important, as long as it was water – poured, sprinkled, or by immersion. He preferred immersion because it had been the ancient church practice.
[130] August 16, 1737, section of *John Wesley's Journal*. For the entire entry see Addendum J

degree that they adopted his style of ministry, rather than that which they inherited from the Anglican Church.

With Whitefield's arrival, the church at Savannah faced a new problem; instead of a declining attendance, the building was not large enough to hold the crowds who thronged to hear one of the greatest preachers of all time. After a year and a half of very successful ministry of building up the Anglican Church in Georgia, Whitefield returned to England to raise funds for an orphanage that he wanted to establish in the colony. He returned to America a year later and experienced a sensational preaching tour of the Middle Colonies. His time in Philadelphia was a fulcrum experience for Whitefield. The Presbyterians, who by this time had established a presence in that city, welcomed Whitefield and through his contacts with them he became increasingly less of an Anglican. In time, he rejected the Arminianism of the Anglican Church and finally became firmly in the Reformation camp. This theological point caused Whitefield and the Wesleys to separate.

After the preaching tour in the north, Whitefield returned to Georgia and established the planned orphanage, which he named, Bethesda, located nine miles from Savannah. During the next thirty years he gave $16,000 of his own money and raised for the institution more than four times that amount (a huge sum of money in that era). Unfortunately, during the Revolutionary War, the institution broke up, its buildings were burned in the conflict, and the inmates were dispersed.

The dissenters in Georgia identified with the broad ministry of Whitefield, in contrast to the established Anglican Church. Whitefield put a more permanent mark on the Great Awakening and on Evangelicalism than any other colonial figure. Even as one looks beyond Whitefield to modern times, only the influence of Billy Graham could be compared to Whitefield's influence. Whitefield had to defy the Anglican establishment in every colony where ministered. He was condemned and ridiculed by the SPG missionaries. Both Whitefield and the SPG men sought to win souls, rekindle piety, and plant churches, but they worked at opposite ends of the spectrum. Ironically, while Whitefield's zeal led to the strengthening of Baptist, Congregational, and Presbyterian Churches, the SPG developed a clergy so fervently Anglican that the American Revolution almost destroyed the Anglican Church in America. The Anglicans, who for the most part were British loyalists, fled the colonies during the revolution.

Colonial Presbyterians

Episcopalian – Congregational – Presbyterian ; these three terms refer to different concepts of church polity (how the church should be structured).

Episcopalian: from the Greek term, ἐπίσκοπος (*episkopos*), meaning, "overseer," is rendered as "bishop," in most denominational circles. This refers to a church polity in which there is a ascending hierarchy of bishops over the churches, the senior bishop being the "archbishop"

Congregational: refers to a church polity in which each congregation is autonomous, calls its own clergy, determines requirements for membership, sets its own doctrinal guidelines, and conducts its own church discipline.

Presbyterian: from the Greek term, πρεσβύτερος (*presbuteros*), meaning, "elder." This form of church polity, as developed by the various Presbyterian denominations, describes a church structure that consists of an ascending hierarchy of church courts or councils (presbyteries): the local presbytery, the synod, and the general council, each level having fixed responsibilities and geographical boundaries. At each level, both clergy and unordained elders are included in the presbytery/synod/assembly. The higher bodies function in the same role as do bishops in the Episcopalian form of church polity.

As we have seen in our earlier studies, the majority of the Puritans who settled New England were Congregationalists. However, after the problems that developed out of Roger Williams' stint as the pastor of the church in Salem, and the troubles resulting from Anne Hutchinson, a number of Congregational ministers in New England began to consider the need for some sort of a connectional system in which a group of churches could bond together to handle a situation in which a local church, and/or its leadership became a threat to the Kingdom. Some began to push rather strongly for such a revision of New England Congregationalism.

Because of this mood, the Cambridge Synod was convened in 1646. All of the twenty-nine Massachusetts churches were represented, except Concord. The Boston and Salem churches did not want to participate, but finally, with reluctance, did attend. Two delegates from New Hampshire, and a few goodwill observers from New Haven, Plymouth, and Connecticut also

attended. The synod took a long recess (being impacted by the Parliament/Royalist wars in England), then they reconvened in 1647. During their last session in 1648, the synod announced the results, which was a reaffirmation of the Westminster Confession in all points except church polity.[131] Here is how they expressed both that affirmation and disagreement.

> "This Synod having perused and considered with much gladness of heart, and thankfulness to God, the Confession of Faith published of late by the reverend Assembly in England, do judge it to be very holy, orthodox, and judicious in all matters of faith; and do therefore freely and fully consent thereunto, for the substance thereof. Only on those things which have respect to Church government and discipline [in some sections of Chapters XXV, XXX, and XXXI] we refer ourselves to the Platform of Church Discipline agreed upon by this present assembly; and do therefore think it meet that this Confession of Faith should be commended to the churches of Christ among us, and to the honored court, as worthy of their consideration and acceptance. Howbeit, we may not conceal, that the doctrine of vocation, expressed in Chapter X, £1 and summarily repeated in Chapter XIII, £1, passed not without some debate. Yet considering that the term of vocation and others by which it is described are capable of a large or more strict sense or use, and that it is not intended to bind apprehensions precisely in point of order or method, there hath been a general condescendency thereunto. Now by this our professed consent and free concurrence with them in all the doctrinals of religion, we hope it may appear to the world that as we are a remnant of the people of the same nation with the, se we are professors of the same common faith and fellow-heirs of the same common salvation."[132]

Thus, the Cambridge Platform of 1648 accepted the Westminster Confession in matters of doctrine, but not in church polity. In matters of polity, the New England Puritans declared themselves to be Congregationalists. Thus, each congregation continued to be autonomous.

The Cambridge Platform did not allay the concerns of those who remembered how helpless the churches had been when they needed to do something about Roger Williams' disruptive stint as the pastor of the church at Salem. Neither had the churches been able to do anything when Anne Hutchinson had John Cotton under her spell. In both of these instances, they had to rely on the civil courts. Out of these concerns, the legislature of the colony of Connecticut called a synod at Saybrook, September 9, 1708. This synod reorganized the church in that colony into county

[131] For the text of the Westminster Confession of Faith, see Addendum K
[132] For the text of the Cambridge Platform, see Addendum L

associations which were ruled by a council of ministers and lay delegates. These councils were empowered to discipline erring congregations and to supervise the choice of new pastors. County associations sent delegations to a colony-wide regulatory assembly. Governmental support of the Saybrook Platform effectively transformed the eighteenth-century Connecticut churches into a centrally administered unit, making the church functionally a form of Presbyterianism, even though they still considered themselves to be Congregationalists.

Presbyterian Background

As we noted earlier (page 36), the origin of prebyterianism is found in John Calvin. Calvin's influence on John Knox produced the great movement that received the label, *Presbyterian*. The story begins in the early years of the 16th Century.

In 1500, Scotland was a weak, poor, and strife-torn cultural backwater. French and English factions were polarized in Scottish politics. Catholicism ruled the land. Patrick Hamilton had been burned at the stake in 1528 for his Lutheran preaching. George Wishart suffered the same martyrdom in 1546 for preaching Reformed doctrine, and in the between these two martyrdoms, many others had been executed for propagating various Protestant doctrines.

In December, 1545, Wishart visited East Lothian in Scotland. John Knox was a Roman Catholic clergyman residing in East Lothian and he began listening to Wishart with deepened interest. In time, Knox was converted from Roman Catholicism to Reformed Protestantism. Knox began his Protestant ministry in the Protestant St. Andrews Church.

The castle of St. Andrews was a stronghold and place of refuge for many Protestants. In July of 1547, the castle was seized by outside forces and John Knox became a French galley-slave for nineteen months. There he experienced hardships and miseries which are said to have permanently injured his health.

In 1549, through the intervention of the English government, Knox was released. Knox realized that in the existing state of the country, he could be of little use in his beloved Scotland. For nearly ten years, he submitted to voluntary exile. During the earliest years of his exile from

Scotland, he lived in England and served as royal chaplain for five years. This was during the brief reign of the boy-king, Edward VI.

After the death of Edward and the accession of Queen Mary (Tudor), Knox left England and began to travel the continent, moving from place to place with some uncertainty – finally settling in Geneva.

John Calvin asked John Knox, in Sept. 1554, to accept the call to an English Church in Frankfurt. Knox accepted the call, but didn't remain long in Frankfurt. The church was torn over controversies concerning the use of vestments, ceremonies, and the English prayer book. Upon his return to Geneva, Calvin asked him to become the minister of the refugee English congregation that had developed in the city. Although Knox accepted the position, in August of 1555 he set out for Scotland, where he remained for nine months preaching Evangelical doctrine in various parts of the country. He actively sought to persuade those who favored the Reformation to cease from attendance at mass, and to join with himself in the celebration of the Lord's Supper according to a Reformed ritual.

In May, 1556, he was cited to appear before the hierarchy in Edinburgh, and he boldly responded to the summons; but the bishops found it expedient not to proceed with the trial. His congregation in Geneva was quite concerned for his well being and in July they urged him to leave Scotland and return to Geneva. It seems that Knox realized that further work in Scotland would result in further persecution of Protestants, and so he returned to Geneva. While in Scotland, he had married Marjorie Bowes, daughter of Richard Bowes, captain of Norham Castle. His wife along with her mother accompanied him to Geneva, where they arrived in September, 1556.

The municipal authorities in Geneva, at Calvin's request, had granted the erection of the church building in which Knox ministered (called the *Eglise de Notre Dame la Neuve*). It served the English and Italian congregations. Knox's life in Geneva was busy. In addition to preaching and other church work, he kept up a large correspondence and produced many literary works. One of his major contributions was assisting in the translation of the Geneva Bible, the version that the colonists carried to America. One of his best known publications was his *First Blast Against the*

Monstrous Rule of Women. His long and elaborate treatise on predestination published 1560 was composed in Geneva.

When Knox returned to Scotland in 1559 his views of doctrine and church polity were crystallized and he firmly held to his convictions on these matters for the rest of his life. His return to Scotland is a part of the history of his country. When the Reformed Protestant religion was formally ratified by law in Scotland in 1560 he was appointed minister of the Church of St. Giles, then the main church of Edinburgh.

The Origins of the Presbyterian Church in America

Men with presbyterian ideals and hopes had been scattered the whole length of the colonies, from Londerry, New Hampshire, to Charles Town, South Carolina. Yet, they were scattered, and there was no formal organization with which they could affiliate. When Anglicanism began to gain ground and in some locations apply official pressure requiring all citizens to conform, those with Presbyterian leanings in some regions began to consider founding an organization. The first event that grew out of this situation was a meeting in Philadelphia in 1706, in which the first American presbytery was formed. The leader of this effort was Francis Makemie, an energetic Scot-Irishman who had been educated at Glasgow and ordained in Northern Ireland. In 1681 he was sent as a Presbyterian missionary to America. He had organized small Presbyterian congregations in Barbados, Maryland, Virginia, New York, and New England. He seemed to be a man who could be on good terms with almost anyone. He was a friend of the Mathers in Boston, as well as both the Congregationalists and Presbyterians in London (in 1691, Congregationalists and Presbyterians in London had united under the "Heads of Agreement).

Associated with Makemie in the Philadelphia meeting were one Scot, two Scot-Irish, and three New England ministers. Their congregations were quite diverse in constituency and style. The presbytery that they formed was along the lines of the Scottish model, but it declared itself independent of any existing church. So, it was an autonomous denomination. During the early years, scattered Puritan churches of Long Island, Delaware, and New Jersey, tired of trying to go it alone, joined the fledging presbytery. Because all parties adhered to the doctrines outlined in the Westminster Confession, they found their association to facilitate their union.

Thus, the Presbyterian Church in America began with a New England way of thinking and acting, but other influences began to dilute that identity. Large numbers of Presbyterians from Ireland began to immigrate to the colonies around 1700, chiefly settling in Pennsylvania. These Irish Presbyterians were Scot-Irish[133] from the province of Ulster.

Ulster had been the region of Ireland most resistant to English control during the preceding century. In order to prevent further rebellion, all land owned by the Irish chieftains of the O'Neill (*Ui'Neill*) and the O'Donnell (*Ui'Domhnaill*) clans was confiscated and designated a "plantation." Wealthy English landowners began to establish plantations in 1606, but King James took royal control of the plantation in 1609. The area consisted of about half a million acres. In order to settle in the plantation, a tenant had to be an English speaker and a Protestant. Several factors, including a famine in Scotland and royal pressure, induced many Scots to settle in the region. Other Englishmen also settled in the area. Because of the huge influx of Scots, the religion of the region quickly became Scottish Presbyterian.

> The Presbyterian Scots lived in Northern Ireland for a little over a century before emigrating to the American colonies. The English landlords found the Scot settlers too similar to the Irish natives and resented them. The English Monarchy tried to exert its own political and religious authority over the citizens of Ireland, including the Presbyterian Scots. Constant struggles developed over the issues of religious tolerance, civil liberties, and political rights such as holding office or having representation in government. Economic factors also affected the Scot-Irish decision to immigrate to the colonies. Anglican ministers made the majority of their income by imposing tithes on the Irish - Catholic and Presbyterian alike. The tenants were charged high rents for their land adding additional economic burdens on their families. Consecutive potato crop failures in 1724, 1725, and 1726, compounded all the preceding problems and as a result, many Ulster Scots sought a new life in America.

---

[133] The term, Scot-Irish, is an American term. Originally, these immigrants were identified as, "Irish." In England they were and are referred to as "Ulster Scots." The term came to have special meaning when the huge immigration of Irish began to arrive in America as a result of the potato famine in the mid-1800's. The original Irish immigrants increasingly employed the term, "Scot-Irish," wishing to make a distinction between themselves and the newcomers.

The mass immigration of the Scot-Irish took place over a 58-year span between 1717 and 1775. This time period is known as the "Great Migration" and occurred in five "waves". The immigrants from the first three waves established the major settlements of the Scot-Irish in the colonies.

The immigrants from the first and second waves landed in Philadelphia and the Delaware River in Pennsylvania. The third wave of immigrants moved beyond Pennsylvania into Virginia and beyond.

By 1716 Presbyterian churches had become so numerous that there were three presbyteries – Philadelphia and New Castle in Pennsylvania, and Long Island. These joined together to form the first Presbyterian synod. By this date, there were twenty-five Presbyterian ministers serving the churches. Eight of the ministers had come from New England, three from Wales, eight from Scotland and seven from Ireland. There were at least 3000 members distributed in at least forty churches. Even so, the Presbyterians had to overcome some major problems.

- One was situational in that most of the congregations were not in compactly settled areas. Poor communications made it difficult for them to have any sort of community life.
- For the most part, they immigrated with few financial assets and poverty was wide-spread among them.
- Ministerial training was not available outside of New England and there was no adequate procedure for examining immigrant ministers or disciplining those who already were ministering in the colonies.
- Severe tension developed between those who held differing views about how to correct this situation.
- Some of the divisions that had developed in Scotland and Ireland erupted in the New World.

The question which could not be postponed related to polity and doctrine. What standards for approving ministerial candidates should be adopted; should adherence to the Westminster standards be required and if so, how? Around these and similar issues, various parties began to form. The alignment tended to follow ethnic lines:

- The Scots and Scot-Irish, strongest in the New Castle Presbytery, demanded doctrinal subscription to the Westminster Confession and stricter presbyterial discipline (this presbytery deposed a minister in 1722 because he bathed himself in the creek on the Sabbath).

- The New Yorkers and New Englanders argued that the Bible alone was sufficient for faith and practice and that the Westminster Confession was a human product which though important should not be made the standard.

John Thomson was the spokesman for the Scot-Irish party. He asserted that the American synod was independent of every other judicatory on earth and thus responsible for its own purity. Therefore, he argued, the synod was duty-bound to make the Westminster Confession its official confession and require all of its ministers to subscribe.

Jonathan Dickson, a Yale graduate, pastor at Elizabethtown, and leader of the antisubscriptionists, voiced the alternative: the purity of the church would be better safeguarded by a close examination of every candidate's religious experiences and the strict disciplining of scandalous ministers. He said that it was a contradiction to subscribe to Chapter 20 of the Confession, which declared that God alone is "Lord of the conscience," and then forcing ministers to submit to the rigid authority of other chapters (with which their consciences may not agree).

The disagreements became so intense that some sort of compromise had to be worked out. In 1729, a Synod was held and enacted the "Adopting Act," which affirmed the idea of subscription but with two important qualifications:

- The act refused to make literal subscription to the Westminster standards a condition of ordination. It made a distinction between essential and non-essential articles and allowed the examining judiciary to decide if a given candidate's scruples violated the intent of the confession.
- The act made the synod an administrative and not a legislative body and then merely recommended the Westminster Directory on church government as a guide.

The Adopting Act of 1729 brought about an uneasy peace because the two factions with their views on how to save the church did not die. The stability of the Presbyterian denomination soon faced another challenge by the emergence of a group of Scot-Irish led by William Tennent. Tennent was an Irish-born Scotsman who had been ordained in the Episcopal Church of Ireland. After immigrating to America in 1716, he married the daughter of a Presbyterian minister. In 1718 he was accepted as a minister in the Presbyterian Church, without reordination. He served churches in Bedford, New York, and in Neshaminy, Pennsylvania. He was an excellent teacher and by 1733 had trained four young men for ministry: his three sons, Gilbert, John, and William,

and Samuel Blair. Tennent promoted a very experiential form of evangelical Purtinanism. Quite naturally, his students were potential allies of Jonathan Dickson and the antisubscriptionists. When Gilbert and John Tennent took congregations in New Brunswick and Freehold, New Jersey, they came under influences that moved them toward Dickson. Gilbert's charge was but four miles from Raritan, New Jersey, where Theodore Jacob Frelinghuysen had come from the Netherlands in 1720. Frelinghuysen taught the necessity of personal conversion and subsequent holiness of life, and enforced strict standards for admission to the Lord's Supper. The revivals which he fostered in Raritan were forerunners of the Great Awakening. Many consider him to be the father of the Great Awakening.

When Gilbert Tennent came into contact with Frelinghuysen, he felt both rebuked and inspired by his neighbor's ministry. Frelinghuysen was a gifted preacher, a pastoral counselor, and above all a converter of souls. Tennent quickly accepted the view of the Puritans, that a definite experience of regeneration followed by assurance of salvation (exemplified by holy living) was the indispensable mark of a Christian. He rededicated his life to the conversion of sinners. By 1729, the scattered congregations that he served began to show signs of new life.

John Tennent Jr.'s church at Freehold also began to be blessed by a quiet revival. After John's untimely death, his brother William assumed the post and the revival was stimulated further.

The elder Tennent, always concerned about the training of clergy, began a "seminary" at Neshaminy in 1726. This "Log College," as its enemies derisively called it, turned out a score of pietistic revival inclined ministers for the pioneer Presbyterian Church. It should be pointed out that the revivalism of all of these men was not that which critics often decry. "Stirrings" and seasons of excitement may have occurred, and certainly there was weeping over sins, but bizarre and overt display was not present. Permanently changed lives, rather than ecstatic experience was the character and goal of these men.

While the revival party was growing, immigration from Ireland slowly augmented the subscriptionist/antirevival faction. The immigrants, for the most part, were strict advocates of the Westminster Confession. The church was heading toward another major confrontation. The first one occurred in 1738 when the American Synod demanded that ministers without degrees

from major universities submit to examination by a synodical committee. This struck directly at the Log College men. Other measures, designed to keep the revivalists out of the church also transpired. The subscriptionists gained enough strength to attempt, through the higher church courts, to deprive the presbyteries of their authority (notably that of New Brunswick).

In November, 1739, the tide was turned in the other direction by the appearance in Philadelphia of George Whitefield. He was beginning his second missionary journey of America. He first preached in the Anglican Church in Philadelphia, then preached on the courthouse steps to vast multitudes. This spectacular beginning was followed by a series of meetings at many Presbyterian Churches. Whitefield's ministry produced a strong resurgence of lay support for pietistic and experimental religion. Whitefield returned to Georgia for a season, then returned to Pennsylvania, where his wide itinerations caused a strengthening of the relationship between the New England group led by Dickinson and the Log College men. Through his exposure to these theologically astute Presbyterians, Whitefield became a rather strict Calvinist. Because of this, his relationship with the Wesleys and the Moravians was damaged. As would be expected, the work of Whitefield among the Presbyterians greatly increased the ranks of the revival party.

By the time the May 1741 Synod of Philadelphia convened, things had come to a hopeless impass.
Both sides hurled many unsubstantiated accusations at their opponents. Gilbert Tennent's sermon, *The Danger of an Unconverted Ministry,* preached at Nottingham, Pennsylvania, not only was unauthorized intrusion into a Presbytery other than the one that had credentialed him, but it hit at the heart of the controversy between the two parties. It was too much to expect that any synod could resolve the problems or even to survive such deeply divided factions.

During the turbulent proceedings, the Scot-Irish group presented a protest against the "Brunswick Party," asserting that "these brethren [!] have no right to be acknowledged as members of this judicatory of Christ." When the Scot-Irish lined up to the sign the document that lodged the protest, they discovered that they had the majority in the meeting. They immediately declared themselves to be the synod. Although the proceedings were illegal, there was no recourse and so the Log College men were ejected from the Synod.

The "New Side," as the revival party was called, responded to the situation by organizing their churches into the Conjunct Presbyteries of New Brunswick and Londonderry. This group, even though harassed by the "Old Side," conducted itself with decorum and always was open to reunion. The New Side also showed great evangelical zeal for converting people. In large groups they moved into western Pennsylvania and western Virginia. Jonathan Dickinson tried to heal the breach, but when it became apparent that such a move was impossible, he and the ministers of the New York Presbytery joined with the Conjunct Presbyteries and together they formed the Synod of New York in 1745. This new synod adopted the view of the Adopting Act of 1729, made ordination a responsibility of the presbytery, and stressed the need for educational, doctrinal, and experiential qualifications for ministry. They also affirmed revivals as a work of God and indicated a desire to see the church united.

The Establishment of Princeton

The New Side's sense of responsibility for the future of the Presbyterian Church motivated them to found a college. Jonathan Dickinson led the move, and in spite of Anglican opposition, was able to secure a charter for a school in 1746, the year that the elder Tennent died. When the board of the college was formed, the trustees included Log College men. Dickinson was elected the first president and in May 1747 the first classes were held in his parsonage at Elizabethtown – there were eight to ten pupils.

Within five months, Dickinson died. He was succeeded by another New Englander, Aaron Burr, who had just married the daughter of Jonathan Edwards. The students moved into his parsonage at Newark. Burr's skilled work made him the virtual founder of the institution. He moved the school to Princeton, broadened its base of support and oversaw the building of Nassau Hall, one of the most beautiful college buildings in America, at the time. Just at the time when things really began to move forward, Burr died in 1757.

Burr was succeeded by his father-in-law, Jonathan Edwards, but before Edwards could assume his duties, he died of a smallpox vaccination in 1758. The next president, Samuel Davies, also died after two years. In 1766, Samuel Finley had his term cut short by death. In two decades, the College of New Jersey had devoured the best leadership of both the New England party and the Log College men.

By this time, the college was secure, 120 students were matriculating, and it had become an educational mainstay for the entire region. So, the election of the next president was quite crucial. Pertinent to the election of the new president is the fact that the New Side, resulting from the schism of 1741 had gained dominance in 1758. In 1741, the New Side had twenty-two ministers, but by 1758 it had seventy-three. It also had won the respect and loyalty of the laity. The Old Side, on the other hand, had not held its own and its educational efforts had accomplished little. The New York Synod's desire for reunion demonstrates the New Side's magnanimous spirit and concern for reunion. The Old Side agreed to a rapprochement and after committees had worked out details delegates met in Philadelphia with Gilbert Tennent as moderator. The terms of union essentially were those for which the New Side stood, for the most part, an acceptance of the Adopting Act of 1729. Some ministers of the Old Side felt that compromises had been made and they left the Presbyterian Church and became Anglican ministers.

With the growing influx of immigrants who were nominally Presbyterian flooding into the colonies, and with the departure of ministers into the Anglican Church, the need for educating ministers became crucial. The further development of the College of New Jersey therefore became a matter of heightened importance. The choice of the next president was crucial. The trustees, after much deliberation, invited the Reverend John Witherspoon, of Scotland, to become the president. After almost coercive supplications, long delays, and much vacillation on Witherspoon's part, he finally agreed to take the post.

He was by any account, an impressive man. He had become an organized leader of the evangelical cause in the Kirk of Scotland. He was a man of enormous intellectual stature and well equipped in many ways to take the burden of leadership in a church that was stripped of its more capable men. Even his political ideals fit a country that was hurrying toward its independence (Witherspoon was the only clergyman to sign the Declaration of Independence). Moreover, his irenic spirit was the very thing needed for a divided denomination. Finally, he was a Scot. This made him sensitive to the Scot-Irish issues and the need to minister to the large and restless, potentially Presbyterian, influx of Scot-Irish settlers who were altering the ethnic constituency of the Presbyterian Church. When he died, twenty-five years later, Princeton had

assumed a prominent place in the new nation and had lost its reputation as a death-trap for presidents.

Within Presbyterianism, many changes took place as a result of Witherspoon's presence. He made a large contribution to the constitution of 1788 and the formation of a General Assembly of the Presbyterian Churches. The congregational emphases that had characterized the New England Presbyterian Churches lost its appeal and the growth of denominational accountability prevailed. The acceptance of revivalism and insistence on the need for conversion remained, but even these emphasis had begun to fade until revived again in the evangelical resurgence that began in 1790's.

The Impact of Immigration on the Presbyterian Church

In the last analysis, it was not a theologian nor a college that changed the character of Presbyterianism in colonial America. It was the arrival of wave upon wave of Scot-Irish immigrants. In 1776, Benjamin Franklin estimated the population of Scot-Irish in Pennsylvania to number 350,000, which was a third of the colony's population. By 1778, the church consisted of at least 250 congregations, organized in sixteen presbyteries and four synods, with 177 ministers serving this constituency. Before many years, a new Scot-Irish party arose in the church, in whose eyes the New Englanders were interlopers who had somehow crept into a church that had always been essentially Irish.

There also were divisions among Presbyterians in the New World that immigrants brought with them from Ulster. One group consisted of Covenanters, who after 1660 refused to accept Charles II and the Restoration Settlement in Scotland. Members of this group came to America as early as 1720 and in 1750 their first minister arrived. In time, they formed the Reformed Presbytery of America, which was formalized at a meeting in Paxtang, Pennsylvania in 1774.

Another group consisted of Seceders. This group, led by Ebenezer Erskine, left the Kirk of Scotland in protest against the policy of allowing landholders to bestow livings on ministers without congregational approval. Such a system, naturally, enabled the more complacent, urbane, and worldly men to function as clergymen. The Seceders formed the Associated Synod of the Secession Church, and this synod grew rapidly.

The Associated Synod of the Secession Church then experienced a division over whether or not it was appropriate to have religious clauses in the oaths tendered to city officials (known as "burghers") when they were sworn into office. So, the Associated Synod became two synods: the "Anti-Burgher Seceder Presbyterian Church " and the "Burgher Presbyterian Church." In America the Anti-Burghers grew in number and by 1753, they had formed an associate presbytery (associated with the synod in Scotland) in the Susquehanna Valley of Pennsylvania.[134]

Many of these Covenanter groups did merge, after the American Revolution, but a few Seceders, showing amazing vitality in their churches, maintained a separate existence until 1858.

On the frontier, because the Scot-Irish were temperamentally inclined to be the perfect frontiersman, the various expressions of the Presbyterian Church usually constituted the greatest spiritual influence in the region.

Conclusion

As we bring this study to a close, we are very close to the time of the Declaration of Independence and the American Revolution. The Church in America was alive and well, although it existed in many forms, some of them contradictory with one another.

In the south, the Carolinas, Georgia, and Virginia, the Anglican Church had its base. With the revolution, many Anglicans left the colonies and returned to England. Those who remained formed the American Episcopal Church.

The Methodists, were a minor presence at the time of the revolution. Most were in the south. When Frances Asbury arrived in 1771, they began to gain strength, but their major growth occurred after the revolution.[135]

---

[134] The best known Anti-Burgher Seceder Presbyterians who immigrated to America were Thomas and Alexander Campbell, who launched the New Testament Church Restoration Movement that produced the Disciples of Christ, the Christian Churches, and the Churches of Christ.

[135] When in October 1771, Asbury landed in Philadelphia, there were only 600 Methodists in America. Within days, he hit the road preaching but pushed himself so hard that he fell ill that winter. This was the beginning of a pattern: over the next 45 years, he suffered from colds, coughs, fevers, severe headaches, ulcers, and eventually chronic rheumatism, which forced him off his horse and into a carriage. Yet he continued to preach.

Baptists had yet to gain significant numbers – which were immense in the decades after the revolution.

The Roman Catholic Church, although a strong presence in Maryland, was not a religious force with great influence during the revolution.

Quakers were ensconced in Pennsylvania and from that base touched other colonies. Pennsylvania also was home to various Anabaptist groups, but the influence of these groups, as well as the several Germanic sects that inhabited Pennsylvania were of little influence in the development of the religious life of the nation.Although the Unitarians (non-Trinitarians) had a flickering presence in Boston, their influence on the Church in America was quite small until the 19th Century.

Congregationalists and Presbyterians (both of which were a form of Puritanism) were at full strength. It is significant that almost all of the signers of the Declaration, even though they may not have been Puritans, were from Puritan stock or in some manner had come under Puritan influence.

During the Revolutionary War, Asbury remained politically neutral. To avoid signing an oath disclaiming his allegiance to England and to dodge the American draft, he went into hiding for several months. "I am considered by some as an enemy," he wrote, "liable to be seized by violence and abused." By war's end, he had retained his credibility with the victorious Americans and was able to continue his ministry among them.

After the war, John Wesley ordained Englishman Thomas Coke as Wesley's American superintendent. Coke, in turn, ordained Asbury at the famous Bcaptionimore [a community in Pennsylvania] "Christmas Conference" of 1784, which gave birth to the American Methodist Episcopal Church. On Christmas Day, Asbury was ordained a deacon, the following day, an elder, and on December 27, a superintendent (against Wesley's advice, Asbury later used the term "bishop"). As Coke put it, "We were in great haste and did much business in a little time." Within six months, Coke returned to England, and thereafter, Asbury held the reins of American Methodism.

Through his tireless efforts, by the time Asbury died in 1816, Methodism in America had grown to an estimated 200,000 adherents. On the eve of the war between the states, American Methodists numbered 1.5 million.
(http://www.christianitytoday.com/ch/131christians/denominationalfounders/asbury.html)

ADDENDUM A

Saint Bartholomew's Day Massacre

August 24, 1572

King Charles IX of France, under the sway of his mother, Catherine de Medici, ordered the assassination of Huguenot Protestant leaders in Paris, setting off an orgy of killing that resulted in the massacre of tens of thousands of Huguenots all across France.

Two days earlier, Catherine had ordered the murder of Admiral Gaspard de Coligny, the Huguenot leader whom she felt was leading her son into war with Spain. However, Coligny was only wounded, and Charles promised to investigate the assassination in order to placate the angry Huguenots. Catherine then convinced the young king that the Huguenots were on the brink of rebellion, and he authorized the murder of their leaders by the Catholic authorities. Most of the Huguenot leaders were in Paris at the time, celebrating the marriage of their leader, Henry of Navarre (who later became King Henry IV), to the king's sister, Margaret.

A list of those to be killed was drawn up, headed by Coligny, who was brutally beaten and thrown out of his bedroom window just before dawn on August 24. Once the killing started, mobs of Catholic Parisians, apparently overcome with bloodlust, began a general massacre of Huguenots. Charles issued a royal order on August 25 to halt the killing, but his pleas went unheeded as the massacres spread. Mass slaughters continued into October, reaching the provinces of Rouen, Lyon, Bourges, Bourdeaux, and Orleans. An estimated 3,000 French Protestants were killed in Paris, and as many as 70,000 in all of France. The massacre of Saint Bartholomew's Day marked the resumption of religious civil war in France.[136]

[136] Adapted from the article on The History Channel website http://www.history.com/this-day-in-history/saint-bartholomews-day-massacre (August 24, 1572) accessed December 27, 2010

ADDENDUM B

The Spanish/Dutch War of Independence

The rise of the German House of Habsburg in the 16th Century saw virtually all the lands of the Netherlands fall under the control of the Germans, who by this stage held the crown of Spain. The Habsburg Emperor, Charles V, granted control of Spain and the Netherlands to his son, Philip II, in 1555.

Despotic rule by the Spanish King Philip II led to the first Dutch War of Independence. The conflict raged on in fits and starts for eighty years, combining with the Protestant Reformation which started at the same time - soon the war with Spain became entangled with the general Catholic/Protestant conflagration which consumed Europe.

The implementation of the Inquisition (which in the Netherlands became an attempt to suppress Protestantism) provoked further public resistance and in 1566, anti-Catholic riots broke out in many Dutch cities which saw Catholic Churches being trashed.

Philip sent Spanish troops to avenge this outrage against the Church. The harsh rule imposed by these Spanish troops resulted in further rebellion and by 1568, a state of open war existed between the Dutch and the Spanish.

A leading Dutch noble, Prince William of the House of Orange, (also known as the Prince of Orange) led the revolt and soon won control of most of the northern part of the Netherlands. In 1579, the Union of Utrecht, an alliance of all northern and some southern territories, was formed with William being installed as King William I. The provinces that joined the union would become the Netherlands - those that did not would become Belgium.

In 1581, the Union of Utrecht proclaimed independence from Spain, provoking yet another furious invasion from the latter country. The war went poorly at first for the Dutch, who suffered many reverses including the murder of William in 1584. By 1585, the Spanish had reconquered practically all the south, including Antwerp.

The intervention of England turned the tide against the Spanish. The destruction of the Spanish Armada in 1588, after it had failed to pick up a large Spanish land based army (due to Dutch rebels closing the ports under their control) dramatically weakened Spain's ability to wage war abroad. By 1600, the last Spanish troops were driven out of the Netherlands. In 1648, the Dutch and Spanish signed the Treaty of Munster, and the Netherlands became independent for the first time since the original Roman occupation.

ADDENDUM C
Indulgences[137]

The word *indulgence* (Latin *indulgentia*, from *indulgeo*, to be kind or tender) originally meant kindness or favor; in post-classic Latin it came to mean the remission of a tax or debt. In Roman law and in the Vulgate of the Old Testament (Isaiah 61:1) it was used to express release from captivity or punishment. In theological language also the word is sometimes employed in its primary sense to signify the kindness and mercy of God. But in the special sense in which it is here considered, an indulgence is a remission of the temporal punishment due to sin, the guilt of which has been forgiven. Among the equivalent terms used in antiquity were *pax, remissio, donatio, condonatio*.

What an indulgence is not

To facilitate explanation, it may be well to state what an indulgence is not. It is not a permission to commit sin, nor a pardon of future sin; neither could be granted by any power. It is not the forgiveness of the guilt of sin; it supposes that the sin has already been forgiven. It is not an exemption from any law or duty, and much less from the obligation consequent on certain kinds of sin, e.g., restitution; on the contrary, it means a more complete payment of the debt which the sinner owes to God. It does not confer immunity from temptation or remove the possibility of subsequent lapses into sin. Least of all is an indulgence the purchase of a pardon which secures the buyer's salvation or releases the soul of another from Purgatory. The absurdity of such notions must be obvious to any one who forms a correct idea of what the Catholic Church really teaches on this subject.

What an indulgence is

An indulgence is the extra-sacramental remission of the temporal punishment due, in God's justice, to sin that has been forgiven, which remission is granted by the Church in the exercise of the power of the keys, through the application of the superabundant merits of Christ and of the saints, and for some just and reasonable motive. Regarding this definition, the following points are to be noted:

- In the Sacrament of Baptism not only is the guilt of sin remitted, but also all the penalties attached to sin. In the Sacrament of Penance the guilt of sin is removed, and with it the eternal punishment due to mortal sin; but there still remains the temporal punishment required by Divine justice, and this requirement must be fulfilled either in the present life or in the world to come, i.e., in Purgatory. An indulgence offers the penitent sinner the means of discharging this debt during his life on earth.
- Some writs of indulgence—none of them, however, issued by any pope or council (Pesch, Tr. Dogm., VII, 196, no. 464)—contain the expression, "indulgentia a culpa et a poena", i.e. release from guilt and from punishment; and this has occasioned considerable misunderstanding (cf. Lea, "History" etc. III, 54 sqq.). The real meaning of the formula is that, indulgences presupposing the Sacrament of Penance, the penitent, after receiving sacramental absolution from the guilt of sin, is afterwards freed from the temporal

[137] This article is found at *New Advent* (www.newadvent.org), the online Catholic Encyclopedia

penalty by the indulgence (Bellarmine, "De Indulg"., I, 7). In other words, sin is fully pardoned, i.e. its effects entirely obliterated, only when complete reparation, and consequently release from penalty as well as from guilt, has been made. Hence Clement V (1305-1314) condemned the practice of those purveyors of indulgences who pretended to absolve "a culpa et a poena" (Clement, I. v, tit. 9, c. ii); the Council of Constance (1418) revoked (Sess. XLII, n. 14) all indulgences containing the said formula; Benedict XIV (1740-1758) treats them as spurious indulgences granted in this form, which he ascribes to the illicit practices of the "quaestores" or purveyors (De Syn. dioeces., VIII, viii. 7).

- The satisfaction, usually called the "penance", imposed by the confessor when he gives absolution is an integral part of the Sacrament of Penance; an indulgence is extra-sacramental; it presupposes the effects obtained by confession, contrition, and sacramental satisfaction. It differs also from the penitential works undertaken of his own accord by the repentant sinner — prayer, fasting, alms-giving — in that these are personal and get their value from the merit of him who performs them, whereas an indulgence places at the penitent's disposal the merits of Christ and of the saints, which form the "Treasury" of the Church.
- An indulgence is valid both in the tribunal of the Church and in the tribunal of God. This means that it not only releases the penitent from his indebtedness to the Church or from the obligation of performing canonical penance, but also from the temporal punishment which he has incurred in the sight of God and which, without the indulgence, he would have to undergo in order to satisfy Divine justice. This, however, does not imply that the Church pretends to set aside the claim of God's justice or that she allows the sinner to repudiate his debt. As St. Thomas says (Supplement.25.1 ad 2um), "He who gains indulgences is not thereby released outright from what he owes as penalty, but is provided with the means of paying it." The Church therefore neither leaves the penitent helplessly in debt nor acquits him of all further accounting; she enables him to meet his obligations.
- In granting an indulgence, the grantor (pope or bishop) does not offer his personal merits in lieu of what God demands from the sinner. He acts in his official capacity as having jurisdiction in the Church, from whose spiritual treasury he draws the means wherewith payment is to be made. The Church herself is not the absolute owner, but simply the administratrix, of the superabundant merits which that treasury contains. In applying them, she keeps in view both the design of God's mercy and the demands of God's justice. She therefore determines the amount of each concession, as well as the conditions which the penitent must fulfill if he would gain the indulgence.

Various kinds of indulgences

An indulgence that may be gained in any part of the world is universal, while one that can be gained only in a specified place (Rome, Jerusalem, etc.) is local. A further distinction is that between perpetual indulgences, which may be gained at any time, and temporary, which are available on certain days only, or within certain periods. Real indulgences are attached to the use of certain objects (crucifix, rosary, medal); personal are those which do not require the use of any such material thing, or which are granted only to a certain class of individuals, e.g. members of an order or confraternity. The most important distinction, however, is that between plenary indulgences and partial. By a plenary indulgence is meant the remission of the entire temporal

punishment due to sin so that no further expiation is required in Purgatory. A partial indulgence commutes only a certain portion of the penalty; and this portion is determined in accordance with the penitential discipline of the early Church. To say that an indulgence of so many days or years is granted means that it cancels an amount of purgatorial punishment equivalent to that which would have been remitted, in the sight of God, by the performance of so many days or years of the ancient canonical penance. Here, evidently, the reckoning makes no claim to absolute exactness; it has only a relative value.

God alone knows what penalty remains to be paid and what its precise amount is in severity and duration. Finally, some indulgences are granted in behalf of the living only, while others may be applied in behalf of the souls departed. It should be noted, however, that the application has not the same significance in both cases. The Church in granting an indulgence to the living exercises her jurisdiction; over the dead she has no jurisdiction and therefore makes the indulgence available for them by way of suffrage (*per modum suffragii*), i.e. she petitions God to accept these works of satisfaction and in consideration thereof to mitigate or shorten the sufferings of the souls in Purgatory.

Who can grant indulgences

The distribution of the merits contained in the treasury of the Church is an exercise of authority (*potestas iurisdictionis*), not of the power conferred by Holy orders (*potestas ordinis*). Hence the pope, as supreme head of the Church on earth, can grant all kinds of indulgences to any and all of the faithful; and he alone can grant plenary indulgences. The power of the bishop, previously unrestricted, was limited by Innocent III (1215) to the granting of one year's indulgence at the dedication of a church and of forty days on other occasions. Leo XIII (Rescript of 4 July. 1899) authorized the archbishops of South America to grant eighty days (Acta S. Sedis, XXXI, 758). Pius X (28 August, 1903) allowed cardinals in their titular churches and dioceses to grant 200 days; archbishops, 100; bishops, 50. These indulgences are not applicable to the souls departed. They can be gained by persons not belonging to the diocese, but temporarily within its limits; and by the subjects of the granting bishop, whether these are within the diocese or outside--except when the indulgence is local. Priests, vicars general, abbots, and generals of religious orders cannot grant indulgences unless specially authorized to do so. On the other hand, the pope can empower a cleric who is not a priest to give an indulgence (St. Thomas, "Quodlib.", II, q. viii, a. 16).

Dispositions necessary to gain an indulgence

The mere fact that the Church proclaims an indulgence does not imply that it can be gained without effort on the part of the faithful. From what has been said above, it is clear that the recipient must be free from the guilt of mortal sin. Furthermore, for plenary indulgences, confession and Communion are usually required, while for partial indulgences, though confession is not obligatory, the formula *corde saltem contrito*, i.e. "at least with a contrite heart", is the customary prescription. Regarding the question discussed by theologians whether a person in mortal sin can gain an indulgence for the dead, see PURGATORY. It is also necessary to have the intention, at least habitual, of gaining the indulgence. Finally, from the nature of the case, it is obvious that one must perform the good works — prayers, alms deeds, visits to a church, etc. — which are prescribed in the granting of an indulgence. For details see "Raccolta".

Authoritative teaching of the Church
The Council of Constance condemned among the errors of Wyclif the proposition: "It is foolish to believe in the indulgences granted by the pope and the bishops" (Sess. VIII, 4 May, 1415; see Denzinger-Bannwart, "Enchiridion", 622). In the Bull "Exsurge Domine", 15 June, 1520, Leo X condemned Luther's assertions that "Indulgences are pious frauds of the faithful"; and that "Indulgences do not avail those who really gain them for the remission of the penalty due to actual sin in the sight of God's justice" (Enchiridion, 75S, 759), The Council of Trent (Sess, XXV, 3-4, Dec., 1563) declared: "Since the power of granting indulgences has been given to the Church by Christ, and since the Church from the earliest times has made use of this Divinely given power, the holy synod teaches and ordains that the use of indulgences, as most salutary to Christians and as approved by the authority of the councils, shall be retained in the Church; and it further pronounces anathema against those who either declare that indulgences are useless or deny that the Church has the power to grant them (Enchridion, 989). It is therefore of faith (*de fide*)

- that the Church has received from Christ the power to grant indulgences, and
- that the use of indulgences is salutary for the faithful.

Basis of the doctrine
An essential element in indulgences is the application to one person of the satisfaction performed by others. This transfer is based on three things: the Communion of Saints, the principle of vicarious satisfaction, and the Treasury of the Church.

The communion of saints
"We being many, are one body in Christ, and every one members one of another" (Romans 12:5). As each organ shares in the life of the whole body, so does each of the faithful profit by the prayers and good works of all the rest—a benefit which accrues, in the first instance, to those who are in the state of grace, but also, though less fully, to the sinful members.

The principle of vicarious satisfaction
Each good action of the just man possesses a double value: that of merit and that of satisfaction, or expiation. Merit is personal, and therefore it cannot be transferred; but satisfaction can be applied to others, as St. Paul writes to the Colossians (1:24) of his own works: "Who now rejoice in my sufferings for you, and fill up those things that are wanting of the sufferings of Christ, in my flesh, for his body, which is the Church."

The treasury of the Church
Christ, as St. John declares in his First Epistle (2:2), "is the propitiation for our sins: and not for ours only, but also for those of the whole world." Since the satisfaction of Christ is infinite, it constitutes an inexhaustible fund which is more than sufficient to cover the indebtedness contracted by sin, Besides, there are the satisfactory works of the Blessed Virgin Mary undiminished by any penalty due to sin, and the virtues, penances, and sufferings of the saints vastly exceeding any temporal punishment which these servants of God might have incurred. These are added to the treasury of the Church as a secondary deposit, not independent of, but rather acquired through, the merits of Christ. The development of this doctrine in explicit form was the work of the great Schoolmen, notably Alexander of Hales (Summa, IV, Q. xxiii, m. 3, n. 6), Albertus Magnus (In IV Sent., dist. xx, art. 16), and St. Thomas (In IV Sent., dist. xx, q. i, art.

3, sol. 1). As Aquinas declares (Quodlib., II, q. vii, art. 16): "All the saints intended that whatever they did or suffered for God's sake should be profitable not only to themselves but to the whole Church." And he further points out (Contra Gent., III, 158) that what one endures for another being a work of love, is more acceptable as satisfaction in God's sight than what one suffers on one's own account, since this is a matter of necessity. The existence of an infinite treasury of merits in the Church is dogmatically set forth in the Bull "Unigenitus", published by Clement VI, 27 Jan., 1343, and later inserted in the "Corpus Juris" (Extrav. Com., lib. V, tit. ix. c. ii): "Upon the altar of the Cross", says the pope, "Christ shed of His blood not merely a drop, though this would have sufficed, by reason of the union with the Word, to redeem the whole human race, but a copious torrent. . . thereby laying up an infinite treasure for mankind. This treasure He neither wrapped up in a napkin nor hid in a field, but entrusted to Blessed Peter, the key-bearer, and his successors, that they might, for just and reasonable causes, distribute it to the faithful in full or in partial remission of the temporal punishment due to sin." Hence the condemnation by Leo X of Luther's assertion that "the treasures of the Church from which the pope grants indulgences are not the merits of Christ and the saints" (Enchiridion, 757). For the same reason, Pius VI (1794) branded as false, temerarious, and injurious to the merits of Christ and the saints, the error of the synod of Pistoia that the treasury of the Church was an invention of scholastic subtlety (Enchiridion, 1541).

According to Catholic doctrine, therefore, the source of indulgences is constituted by the merits of Christ and the saints. This treasury is left to the keeping, not of the individual Christian, but of the Church. Consequently, to make it available for the faithful, there is required an exercise of authority, which alone can determine in what way, on what terms, and to what extent, indulgences may be granted.

The power to grant indulgences

Once it is admitted that Christ left the Church the power to forgive sins (see PENANCE), the power of granting indulgences is logically inferred. Since the sacramental forgiveness of sin extends both to the guilt and to the eternal punishment, it plainly follows that the Church can also free the penitent from the lesser or temporal penalty. This becomes clearer, however, when we consider the amplitude of the power granted to Peter (Matthew 16:19): "I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven. And whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth, it shall be bound also in heaven: and whatsoever thou shaft loose on earth, it shall be loosed also in heaven." (Cf. Matthew 18:18, where like power is conferred on all the Apostles.) No limit is placed upon this power of loosing, "the power of the keys", as it is called; it must, therefore, extend to any and all bonds contracted by sin, including the penalty no less than the guilt. When the Church, therefore, by an indulgence, remits this penalty, her action, according to the declaration of Christ, is ratified in heaven. That this power, as the Council of Trent affirms, was exercised from the earliest times, is shown by St. Paul's words (2 Corinthians 2:5-10) in which he deals with the case of the incest man of Corinth. The sinner had been excluded by St. Paul's order from the company of the faithful, but had truly repented. Hence the Apostle judges that to such a one "this rebuke is sufficient that is given by many" and adds: "To whom you have pardoned any thing, I also. For what I have pardoned, if I have pardoned anything, for your sakes have I done it in the person of Christ." St. Paul had bound the guilty one in the fetters of excommunication; he now releases the penitent from this punishment by an exercise of his authority — "in the person of Christ." Here we have all the essentials of an indulgence.

These essentials persist in the subsequent practice of the Church, though the accidental features vary according as new conditions arise. During the persecutions, those Christians who had fallen away but desired to be restored to the communion of the Church often obtained from the martyrs a memorial (*libellus pacis*) to be presented to the bishop, that he, in consideration of the martyrs' sufferings, might admit the penitents to absolution, thereby releasing them from the punishment they had incurred. Tertullian refers to this when he says (*To the Martyrs* 1): "Which peace some, not having it in the Church, are accustomed to beg from the martyrs in prison; and therefore you should possess and cherish and preserve it in you that so you perchance may be able to grant it to others." Additional light is thrown on this subject by the vigorous attack which the same Tertullian made after he had become a Montanist. In the first part of his treatise "De pudicitia", he attacks the pope for his alleged laxity in admitting adulterers to penance and pardon, and flouts the peremptory edict of the "pontifex maximus episcopus episcoporum". At the close he complains that the same power of remission is now allowed also to the martyrs, and urges that it should be enough for them to purge their own sins — sufficiat martyri propria delicta purgasse". And, again, "How can the oil of thy little lamp suffice both for thee and me?" (c. xxii). It is sufficient to note that many of his arguments would apply with as much and as little force to the indulgences of later ages.

During St. Cyprian's time (d. 258), the heretic Novatian claimed that none of the lapsi should be readmitted to the Church; others, like Felicissimus, held that such sinners should be received without any penance. Between these extremes, St. Cyprian holds the middle course, insisting that such penitents should be reconciled on the fulfillment of the proper conditions. On the one hand, he condemns the abuses connected with the *libellus*, in particular the custom of having it made out in blank by the martyrs and filled in by any one who needed it. "To this you should diligently attend", he writes to the martyrs (Epistle 15), "that you designate by name those to whom you wish peace to be given." On the other hand, he recognizes the value of these memorials: "Those who have received a *libellus* from the martyrs and with their help can, before the Lord, get relief in their sins, let such, if they be ill and in danger, after confession and the imposition of your hands, depart unto the Lord with the peace promised them by the martyrs" (Epistle 13). St. Cyprian, therefore, believed that the merits of the martyrs could be applied to less worthy Christians by way of vicarious satisfaction, and that such satisfaction was acceptable in the eyes of God as well as of the Church.

After the persecutions had ceased, the penitential discipline remained in force, but greater leniency was shown in applying it. St. Cyprian himself was reproached for mitigating the "Evangelical severity" on which he at first insisted; to this he replied (Epistle 52) that such strictness was needful during the time of persecution not only to stimulate the faithful in the performance of penance, but also to quicken them for the glory of martyrdom; when, on the contrary, peace was secured to the Church, relaxation was necessary in order to prevent sinners from falling into despair and leading the life of pagans. In 380 St. Gregory of Nyssa (Ep. ad Letojum) declares that the penance should be shortened in the case of those who showed sincerity and zeal in performing it — "ut spatium canonibus praestitum posset contrahere (can. xviii; cf. can. ix, vi, viii, xi, xiii, xix). In the same spirit, St. Basil (379), after prescribing more lenient treatment for various crimes, lays down the general principle that in all such cases it is not merely the duration of the penance that must be considered, but the way in which it is

performed (Ep. ad Amphilochium, c. lxxxiv). Similar leniency is shown by various Councils--Ancyra (314), Laodicea (320), Nicaea (325), Arles (330). It became quite common during this period to favor those who were ill, and especially those who were in danger of death (see Amort, "Historia", 28 sq.). The ancient penitentials of Ireland and England, though exacting in regard to discipline, provide for relaxation in certain cases. St. Cummian, e.g., in his Penitential (seventh century), treating (cap. v) of the sin of robbery, prescribed that he who has often committed theft shall do penance for seven years or for such time as the priest may judge fit, must always be reconciled with him whom he has wronged, and make restitution proportioned to the injury, and thereby his penance shall be considerably shortened (multum breviabit poenitentiam ejus). But should he be unwilling or unable (to comply with these conditions), he must do penance for the whole time prescribed and in all its details. (Cf. Moran, "Essays on the Early Irish Church", Dublin, 1864, p. 259.)

Another practice which shows quite clearly the difference between sacramental absolution and the granting of indulgences was the solemn reconciliation of penitents. These, at the beginning of Lent, had received from the priest absolution from their sins and the penance enjoined by the canons; on Maundy Thursday they presented themselves before the bishop, who laid hands on them, reconciled them with the Church, and admitted them to communion. This reconciliation was reserved to the bishop, as is expressly declared in the Penitential of Theodore, Archbishop of Canterbury; though in case of necessity the bishop could delegate a priest for the purpose (lib. I, xiii). Since the bishop did not hear their confession, the "absolution" which he pronounced must have been a release from some penalty they had incurred. The effect, moreover, of this reconciliation was to restore the penitent to the state of baptismal innocence and consequently of freedom from all penalties, as appears from the so-called Apostolic Constitutions (lib, II, c. xli) where it is said: "Eritque in loco baptismi impositio manuum"--i.e. the imposition of hands has the same effect as baptism (cf. Palmieri, "De Poenitentia", Rome, 1879, 459 sq.).

In a later period (eighth century to twelfth) it became customary to permit the substitution of some lighter penance for that which the canons prescribed. Thus the Penitential of Egbert, Archbishop of York, declares (XIII, 11): "For him who can comply with what the penitential prescribes, well and good; for him who cannot, we give counsel of God's mercy. Instead of one day on bread and water let him sing fifty psalms on his knees or seventy psalms without genuflecting .... But if he does not know the psalms and cannot fast, let him, instead of one year on bread and water, give twenty-six *solidi* in alms, fast till Noon on one day of each week and till Vespers on another, and in the three Lents bestow in alms half of what he receives." The practice of substituting the recitation of psalms or the giving of alms for a portion of the fast is also sanctioned in the Irish Synod of 807, which says (c. xxiv) that the fast of the second day of the week may be "redeemed" by singing one psalter or by giving one *denarius* to a poor person. Here we have the beginning of the so-called "redemptions" which soon passed into general usage. Among other forms of commutation were pilgrimages to well-known shrines such as that at St. Albans in England or at Compostela in Spain. But the most important place of pilgrimage was Rome. According to Bede (674-735) the "visitatio liminum", or visit to the tomb of the Apostles, was even then regarded as a good work of great efficacy (Hist. Eccl., IV, 23). At first the pilgrims came simply to venerate the relics of the Apostles and martyrs; but in course of time their chief purpose was to gain the indulgences granted by the pope and attached especially to the Stations. Jerusalem, too, had long been the goal of these pious journeys, and the reports which

the pilgrims gave of their treatment by the infidels finally brought about the Crusades. At the Council of Clermont (1095) the First Crusade was organized, and it was decreed (can. ii): "Whoever, out of pure devotion and not for the purpose of gaining honor or money, shall go to Jerusalem to liberate the Church of God, let that journey be counted in lieu of all penance".

Similar indulgences were granted throughout the five centuries following (Amort, op. cit., 46 sq.), the object being to encourage these expeditions which involved so much hardship and yet were of such great importance for Christendom and civilization. The spirit in which these grants were made is expressed by St. Bernard, the preacher of the Second Crusade (1146): "Receive the sign of the Cross, and thou shalt likewise obtain the indulgence of all thou hast confessed with a contrite heart (ep. cccxxii; al., ccclxii).

Similar concessions were frequently made on occasions, such as the dedication of churches, e.g., that of the old Temple Church in London, which was consecrated in honor of the Blessed Virgin Mary, 10 February, 1185, by the Lord Heraclius, who to those yearly visiting it indulged sixty days of the penance enjoined them — as the inscription over the main entrance attests. The canonization of saints was often marked by the granting of an indulgence, e.g. in honor of St. Laurence O'Toole by Honorius III (1226), in honor of St. Edmund of Canterbury by Innocent IV (1248), and in honor of St. Thomas of Hereford by John XXII (1320). A famous indulgence is that of the Portiuncula, obtained by St. Francis in 1221 from Honorius III. But the most important largess during this period was the plenary indulgence granted in 1300 by Boniface VIII to those who, being truly contrite and having confessed their sins, should visit the basilicas of Sts. Peter and Paul (see JUBILEE).

Among the works of charity which were furthered by indulgences, the hospital held a prominent place. Lea in his "History of Confession and Indulgences" (III, 189) mentions only the hospital of Santo Spirito in Rome, while another Protestant writer, Uhlhorn (Gesch. d. Christliche Liebesthatigkeit, Stuttgart, 1884, II, 244) states that "one cannot go through the archives of any hospital without finding numerous letters of indulgence". The one at Halberstadt in 1284 had no less than fourteen such grants, each giving an indulgence of forty days. The hospitals at Lucerne, Rothenberg, Rostock, and Augsburg enjoyed similar privileges.

Abuses

It may seem strange that the doctrine of indulgences should have proved such a stumbling-block, and excited so much prejudice and opposition. But the explanation of this may be found in the abuses which unhappily have been associated with what is in itself a salutary practice. In this respect of course indulgences are not exceptional: no institution, however holy, has entirely escaped abuse through the malice or unworthiness of man. Even the Eucharist, as St. Paul declares, means an eating and drinking of judgment to the recipient who discerns not the body of the Lord. (1 Corinthians 11:27-29). And, as God's forbearance is constantly abused by those who relapse into sin, it is not surprising that the offer of pardon in the form of an indulgence should have led to evil practices. These again have been in a special way the object of attack because, doubtless, of their connection with Luther's revolt (*see* LUTHER). On the other hand, it should not be forgotten that the Church, while holding fast to the principle and intrinsic value of indulgences, has repeatedly condemned their misuse: in fact, it is often from the severity of her condemnation that we learn how grave the abuses were.

Even in the age of the martyrs, as stated above there were practices which St. Cyprian was obliged to reprehend, yet he did not forbid the martyrs to give the *libelli.* In later times abuses were met by repressive measures on the part of the Church. Thus the Council of Clovesho in England (747) condemns those who imagine that they might atone for their crimes by substituting, in place of their own, the austerities of mercenary penitents. Against the excessive indulgences granted by some prelates, the Fourth Council of the Lateran (1215) decreed that at the dedication of a church the indulgence should not be for more than a year, and, for the anniversary of the dedication or any other case, it should not exceed forty days, this being the limit observed by the pope himself on such occasions. The same restriction was enacted by the Council of Ravenna in 1317. In answer to the complaint of the Dominicans and Franciscans, that certain prelates had put their own construction on the indulgences granted to these Orders, Clement IV in 1268 forbade any such interpretation, declaring that, when it was needed, it would be given by the Holy See. In 1330 the brothers of the hospital of Haut-Pas falsely asserted that the grants made in their favor were more extensive than what the documents allowed: John XXII had all these brothers in France seized and imprisoned. Boniface IX, writing to the Bishop of Ferrara in 1392, condemns the practice of certain religious who falsely claimed that they were authorized by the pope to forgive all sorts of sins, and exacted money from the simple-minded among the faithful by promising them perpetual happiness in this world and eternal glory in the next. When Henry, Archbishop of Canterbury, attempted in 1420 to give a plenary indulgence in the form of the Roman Jubilee, he was severely reprimanded by Martin V, who characterized his action as "unheard-of presumption and sacrilegious audacity". In 1450 Cardinal Nicholas of Cusa, Apostolic Legate to Germany, found some preachers asserting that indulgences released from the guilt of sin as well as from the punishment. This error, due to a misunderstanding of the words "a culpa et a poena", the cardinal condemned at the Council of Magdeburg. Finally, Sixtus IV in 1478, lest the idea of gaining indulgences should prove an incentive to sin, reserved for the judgment of the Holy See a large number of cases in which faculties had formerly been granted to confessors (Extrav. Com., tit. de poen. et remiss.).

Traffic in indulgences

These measures show plainly that the Church long before the Reformation, not only recognized the existence of abuses, but also used her authority to correct them.

In spite of all this, disorders continued and furnished the pretext for attacks directed against the doctrine itself, no less than against the practice of indulgences. Here, as in so many other matters, the love of money was the chief root of the evil: indulgences were employed by mercenary ecclesiastics as a means of pecuniary gain. Leaving the details concerning this traffic to a subsequent article (see REFORMATION), it may suffice for the present to note that the doctrine itself has no natural or necessary connection with pecuniary profit, as is evident from the fact that the abundant indulgences of the present day are free from this evil association: the only conditions required are the saying of certain prayers or the performance of some good work or some practice of piety. Again, it is easy to see how abuses crept in. Among the good works which might be encouraged by being made the condition of an indulgence, alms giving would naturally hold a conspicuous place, while men would be induced by the same means to contribute to some pious cause such as the building of churches, the endowment of hospitals, or the organization of a crusade. It is well to observe that in these purposes there is nothing

essentially evil. To give money to God or to the poor is a praiseworthy act, and, when it is done from right motives, it will surely not go unrewarded. Looked at in this light, it might well seem a suitable condition for gaining the spiritual benefit of an indulgence. Yet, however innocent in itself, this practice was fraught with grave danger, and soon became a fruitful source of evil. On the one hand there was the danger that the payment might be regarded as the price of the indulgence, and that those who sought to gain it might lose sight of the more important conditions. On the other hand, those who granted indulgences might be tempted to make them a means of raising money: and, even where the rulers of the Church were free from blame in this matter, there was room for corruption in their officials and agents, or among the popular preachers of indulgences. This class has happily disappeared, but the type has been preserved in Chaucer's "Pardoner", with his bogus relics and indulgences.

While it cannot be denied that these abuses were widespread, it should also be noted that, even when corruption was at its worst, these spiritual grants were being properly used by sincere Christians, who sought them in the right spirit, and by priests and preachers, who took care to insist on the need of true repentance. It is therefore not difficult to understand why the Church, instead of abolishing the practice of indulgences, aimed rather at strengthening it by eliminating the evil elements. The Council of Trent in its decree "On Indulgences" (Sess. XXV) declares: "In granting indulgences the Council desires that moderation be observed in accordance with the ancient approved custom of the Church, lest through excessive ease ecclesiastical discipline be weakened; and further, seeking to correct the abuses that have crept in . . . it decrees that all criminal gain therewith connected shall be entirely done away with as a source of grievous abuse among the Christian people; and as to other disorders arising from superstition, ignorance, irreverence, or any cause whatsoever--since these, on account of the widespread corruption, cannot be removed by special prohibitions—the Council lays upon each bishop the duty of finding out such abuses as exist in his own diocese, of bringing them before the next provincial synod, and of reporting them, with the assent of the other bishops, to the Roman Pontiff, by whose authority and prudence measures will be taken for the welfare of the Church at large, so that the benefit of indulgences may be bestowed on all the faithful by means at once pious, holy, and free from corruption." After deploring the fact that, in spite of the remedies prescribed by earlier councils, the traders (*quaestores*) in indulgences continued their nefarious practice to the great scandal of the faithful, the council ordained that the name and method of these *quaestores* should be entirely abolished, and that indulgences and other spiritual favors of which the faithful ought not to be deprived should be published by the bishops and bestowed gratuitously, so that all might at length understand that these heavenly treasures were dispensed for the sake of piety and not of lucre (Sess. XXI, c. ix). In 1567 St. Pius V canceled all grants of indulgences involving any fees or other financial transactions.

Apocryphal indulgences

One of the worst abuses was that of inventing or falsifying grants of indulgence. Previous to the Reformation, such practices abounded and called out severe pronouncements by ecclesiastical authority, especially by the Fourth Council of the Lateran (1215) and that of Vienne (1311). After the Council of Trent the most important measure taken to prevent such frauds was the establishment of the Congregation of Indulgences. A special commission of cardinals served under Clement VIII and Paul V, regulating all matters pertaining to indulgences. The Congregation of Indulgences was definitively established by Clement IX in 1669 and

reorganized by Clement XI in 1710. It has rendered efficient service by deciding various questions relative to the granting of indulgences and by its publications. The "Raccolta" was first issued by one of its consultors, Telesforo Galli, in 1807; the last three editions 1877, 1886, and 1898 were published by the Congregation. The other official publication is the "Decreta authentica", containing the decisions of the Congregation from 1668 to 1882. This was published in 1883 by order of Leo XIII. See also "Rescripta authentica" by Joseph Schneider (Ratisbon, 1885). By a Motu Proprio of Pius X, dated 28 January, 1904, the Congregation of Indulgences was united to the Congregation of Rites, without any diminution, however, of its prerogatives.

Salutary effects of indulgences

Lea (History, etc., III, 446) somewhat reluctantly acknowledges that "with the decline in the financial possibilities of the system, indulgences have greatly multiplied as an incentive to spiritual exercises, and they can thus be so easily obtained that there is no danger of the recurrence of the old abuses, even if the finer sense of fitness, characteristic of modern times, on the part of both prelates and people, did not deter the attempt." The full significance, however, of this "multiplication" lies in the fact that the Church, by rooting out abuses, has shown the rigor of her spiritual life. She has maintained the practice of indulgences, because, when these are used in accordance with what she prescribes, they strengthen the spiritual life by inducing the faithful to approach the sacraments and to purify their consciences of sin. And further, they encourage the performance, in a truly religious spirit, of works that redound, not alone to the welfare of the individual, but also to God's glory and to the service of the neighbor.

ADDENDUM D

Disputation of Doctor Martin Luther on the Power and Efficacy of Indulgences by Dr. Martin Luther, 1517

Out of love for the truth and the desire to bring it to light, the following propositions will be discussed at Wittenberg, under the presidency of the Reverend Father Martin Luther, Master of Arts and of Sacred Theology, and Lecturer in Ordinary on the same at that place. Wherefore he requests that those who are unable to be present and debate orally with us, may do so by letter.

In the Name our Lord Jesus Christ. Amen.

1. Our Lord and Master Jesus Christ, when He said *Poenitentiam agite,* willed that the whole life of believers should be repentance.
2. This word cannot be understood to mean sacramental penance, i.e., confession and satisfaction, which is administered by the priests.
3. Yet it means not inward repentance only; nay, there is no inward repentance which does not outwardly work divers mortifications of the flesh.
4. The penalty [of sin], therefore, continues so long as hatred of self continues; for this is the true inward repentance, and continues until our entrance into the kingdom of heaven.
5. The pope does not intend to remit, and cannot remit any penalties other than those which he has imposed either by his own authority or by that of the Canons.
6. The pope cannot remit any guilt, except by declaring that it has been remitted by God and by assenting to God's remission; though, to be sure, he may grant remission in cases reserved to his judgment. If his right to grant remission in such cases were despised, the guilt would remain entirely unforgiven.
7. God remits guilt to no one whom He does not, at the same time, humble in all things and bring into subjection to His vicar, the priest.
8. The penitential canons are imposed only on the living, and, according to them, nothing should be imposed on the dying.
9. Therefore the Holy Spirit in the pope is kind to us, because in his decrees he always makes exception of the article of death and of necessity.
10. Ignorant and wicked are the doings of those priests who, in the case of the dying, reserve canonical penances for purgatory.
11. This changing of the canonical penalty to the penalty of purgatory is quite evidently one of the tares that were sown while the bishops slept.
12. In former times the canonical penalties were imposed not after, but before absolution, as tests of true contrition.
13. The dying are freed by death from all penalties; they are already dead to canonical rules, and have a right to be released from them.
14. The imperfect health [of soul], that is to say, the imperfect love, of the dying brings with it, of necessity, great fear; and the smaller the love, the greater is the fear.
15. This fear and horror is sufficient of itself alone (to say nothing of other things) to constitute the penalty of purgatory, since it is very near to the horror of despair.
16. Hell, purgatory, and heaven seem to differ as do despair, almost-despair, and the assurance of safety.
17. With souls in purgatory it seems necessary that horror should grow less and love increase.

18. It seems unproved, either by reason or Scripture, that they are outside the state of merit, that is to say, of increasing love.
19. Again, it seems unproved that they, or at least that all of them, are certain or assured of their own blessedness, though we may be quite certain of it.
20. Therefore by "full remission of all penalties" the pope means not actually "of all," but only of those imposed by himself.
21. Therefore those preachers of indulgences are in error, who say that by the pope's indulgences a man is freed from every penalty, and saved;
22. Whereas he remits to souls in purgatory no penalty which, according to the canons, they would have had to pay in this life.
23. If it is at all possible to grant to any one the remission of all penalties whatsoever, it is certain that this remission can be granted only to the most perfect, that is, to the very fewest.
24. It must needs be, therefore, that the greater part of the people are deceived by that indiscriminate and high sounding promise of release from penalty.
25. The power which the pope has, in a general way, over purgatory, is just like the power which any bishop or curate has, in a special way, within his own diocese or parish.
26. The pope does well when he grants remission to souls [in purgatory], not by the power of the keys (which he does not possess), but by way of intercession.
27. They preach man who say that so soon as the penny jingles into the money-box, the soul flies out [of purgatory].
28. It is certain that when the penny jingles into the money-box, gain and avarice can be increased, but the result of the intercession of the Church is in the power of God alone.
29. Who knows whether all the souls in purgatory wish to be bought out of it, as in the legend of Sts. Severinus and Paschal.
30. No one is sure that his own contrition is sincere; much less that he has attained full remission.
31. Rare as is the man that is truly penitent, so rare is also the man who truly buys indulgences, i.e., such men are most rare.
32. They will be condemned eternally, together with their teachers, who believe themselves sure of their salvation because they have letters of pardon.
33. Men must be on their guard against those who say that the pope's pardons are that inestimable gift of God by which man is reconciled to Him;
34. For these "graces of pardon" concern only the penalties of sacramental satisfaction, and these are appointed by man.
35. They preach no Christian doctrine who teach that contrition is not necessary in those who intend to buy souls out of purgatory or to buy *confessionalia.*
36. Every truly repentant Christian has a right to full remission of penalty and guilt, even without letters of pardon.
37. Every true Christian, whether living or dead, has part in all the blessings of Christ and the Church; and this is granted him by God, even without letters of pardon.
38. Nevertheless, the remission and participation [in the blessings of the Church] which are granted by the pope are in no way to be despised, for they are, as I have said, the declaration of divine remission.
39. It is most difficult, even for the very keenest theologians, at one and the same time to commend to the people the abundance of pardons and [the need of] true contrition.
40. True contrition seeks and loves penalties, but liberal pardons only relax penalties and cause them to be hated, or at least, furnish an occasion [for hating them].

41. Apostolic pardons are to be preached with caution, lest the people may falsely think them preferable to other good works of love.
42. Christians are to be taught that the pope does not intend the buying of pardons to be compared in any way to works of mercy.
43. Christians are to be taught that he who gives to the poor or lends to the needy does a better work than buying pardons;
44. Because love grows by works of love, and man becomes better; but by pardons man does not grow better, only more free from penalty.
45. Christians are to be taught that he who sees a man in need, and passes him by, and gives [his money] for pardons, purchases not the indulgences of the pope, but the indignation of God.
46. Christians are to be taught that unless they have more than they need, they are bound to keep back what is necessary for their own families, and by no means to squander it on pardons.
47. Christians are to be taught that the buying of pardons is a matter of free will, and not of commandment.
48. Christians are to be taught that the pope, in granting pardons, needs, and therefore desires, their devout prayer for him more than the money they bring.
49. Christians are to be taught that the pope's pardons are useful, if they do not put their trust in them; but altogether harmful, if through them they lose their fear of God.
50. Christians are to be taught that if the pope knew the exactions of the pardon-preachers, he would rather that St. Peter's church should go to ashes, than that it should be built up with the skin, flesh and bones of his sheep.
51. Christians are to be taught that it would be the pope's wish, as it is his duty, to give of his own money to very many of those from whom certain hawkers of pardons cajole money, even though the church of St. Peter might have to be sold.
52. The assurance of salvation by letters of pardon is vain, even though the commissary, nay, even though the pope himself, were to stake his soul upon it.
53. They are enemies of Christ and of the pope, who bid the Word of God be altogether silent in some Churches, in order that pardons may be preached in others.
54. Injury is done the Word of God when, in the same sermon, an equal or a longer time is spent on pardons than on this Word.
55. It must be the intention of the pope that if pardons, which are a very small thing, are celebrated with one bell, with single processions and ceremonies, then the Gospel, which is the very greatest thing, should be preached with a hundred bells, a hundred processions, a hundred ceremonies.
56. The "treasures of the Church," out of which the pope grants indulgences, are not sufficiently named or known among the people of Christ.
57. That they are not temporal treasures is certainly evident, for many of the vendors do not pour out such treasures so easily, but only gather them.
58. Nor are they the merits of Christ and the Saints, for even without the pope, these always work grace for the inner man, and the cross, death, and hell for the outward man.
59. St. Lawrence said that the treasures of the Church were the Church's poor, but he spoke according to the usage of the word in his own time.
60. Without rashness we say that the keys of the Church, given by Christ's merit, are that treasure;
61. For it is clear that for the remission of penalties and of reserved cases, the power of the pope is of itself sufficient.
62. The true treasure of the Church is the Most Holy Gospel of the glory and the grace of God.

63. But this treasure is naturally most odious, for it makes the first to be last.
64. On the other hand, the treasure of indulgences is naturally most acceptable, for it makes the last to be first.
65. Therefore the treasures of the Gospel are nets with which they formerly were wont to fish for men of riches.
66. The treasures of the indulgences are nets with which they now fish for the riches of men.
67. The indulgences which the preachers cry as the "greatest graces" are known to be truly such, in so far as they promote gain.
68. Yet they are in truth the very smallest graces compared with the grace of God and the piety of the Cross.
69. Bishops and curates are bound to admit the commissaries of apostolic pardons, with all reverence.
70. But still more are they bound to strain all their eyes and attend with all their ears, lest these men preach their own dreams instead of the commission of the pope.
71. He who speaks against the truth of apostolic pardons, let him be anathema and accursed!
72. But he who guards against the lust and license of the pardon-preachers, let him be blessed!
73. The pope justly thunders against those who, by any art, contrive the injury of the traffic in pardons.
74. But much more does he intend to thunder against those who use the pretext of pardons to contrive the injury of holy love and truth.
75. To think the papal pardons so great that they could absolve a man even if he had committed an impossible sin and violated the Mother of God -- this is madness.
76. We say, on the contrary, that the papal pardons are not able to remove the very least of venial sins, so far as its guilt is concerned.
77. It is said that even St. Peter, if he were now Pope, could not bestow greater graces; this is blasphemy against St. Peter and against the pope.
78. We say, on the contrary, that even the present pope, and any pope at all, has greater graces at his disposal; to wit, the Gospel, powers, gifts of healing, etc., as it is written in I. Corinthians xii.
79. To say that the cross, emblazoned with the papal arms, which is set up [by the preachers of indulgences], is of equal worth with the Cross of Christ, is blasphemy.
80. The bishops, curates and theologians who allow such talk to be spread among the people, will have an account to render.
81. This unbridled preaching of pardons makes it no easy matter, even for learned men, to rescue the reverence due to the pope from slander, or even from the shrewd questionings of the laity.
82. To wit: -- "Why does not the pope empty purgatory, for the sake of holy love and of the dire need of the souls that are there, if he redeems an infinite number of souls for the sake of miserable money with which to build a Church? The former reasons would be most just; the latter is most trivial."
83. Again: -- "Why are mortuary and anniversary masses for the dead continued, and why does he not return or permit the withdrawal of the endowments founded on their behalf, since it is wrong to pray for the redeemed?"
84. Again: -- "What is this new piety of God and the pope, that for money they allow a man who is impious and their enemy to buy out of purgatory the pious soul of a friend of God, and do not rather, because of that pious and beloved soul's own need, free it for pure love's sake?"

85. Again: -- "Why are the penitential canons long since in actual fact and through disuse abrogated and dead, now satisfied by the granting of indulgences, as though they were still alive and in force?"
86. Again: -- "Why does not the pope, whose wealth is to-day greater than the riches of the richest, build just this one church of St. Peter with his own money, rather than with the money of poor believers?"
87. Again: -- "What is it that the pope remits, and what participation does he grant to those who, by perfect contrition, have a right to full remission and participation?"
88. Again: -- "What greater blessing could come to the Church than if the pope were to do a hundred times a day what he now does once, and bestow on every believer these remissions and participations?"
89. "Since the pope, by his pardons, seeks the salvation of souls rather than money, why does he suspend the indulgences and pardons granted heretofore, since these have equal efficacy?"
90. To repress these arguments and scruples of the laity by force alone, and not to resolve them by giving reasons, is to expose the Church and the pope to the ridicule of their enemies, and to make Christians unhappy.
91. If, therefore, pardons were preached according to the spirit and mind of the pope, all these doubts would be readily resolved; nay, they would not exist.
92. Away, then, with all those prophets who say to the people of Christ, "Peace, peace," and there is no peace!
93. Blessed be all those prophets who say to the people of Christ, "Cross, cross," and there is no cross!
94. Christians are to be exhorted that they be diligent in following Christ, their Head, through penalties, deaths, and hell;
95. And thus be confident of entering into heaven rather through many tribulations, than through the assurance of peace.

WWW.theopedia.com/95_theses

ADDENDUM E

Infant Baptism

Presbyterian Church (USA)

The Bible declares that God claimed humanity as God's own "before the foundation of the world." *(Ephesians 1:4)*

Both believers and their children are included in God's covenant love. Children of believers are to be baptized without undue delay, but without undue haste. Baptism, whether administered to those who profess their faith or to those presented for Baptism as children, is one and the same Sacrament. The Baptism of children witnesses to the truth that God's love claims people before they are able to respond in faith. (Book of Order W-2.3008)

Baptism, therefore, usually occurs during infancy, though a person may be baptized at any age. Parents bring their baby to church, where they publicly declare their desire that he or she be baptized. When an infant or child is baptized the church commits itself to nurture the child in faith. When adults are baptized they make a public profession of faith.

Baptism distinguishes children of those who believe in God's redemptive power from children of nonbelievers. The water that is used symbolizes three accounts from the Bible's Old Testament: the waters of creation, the flood described in the story of Noah, and the Hebrews' escape from slavery in Egypt by crossing the Red Sea. All three stories link humanity to God's goodness through water.

Baptism signifies:

- the faithfulness of God,
- the washing away of sin,
- rebirth,
- putting on the fresh garment of Christ,
- being sealed by God's Spirit,
- adoption into the covenant family of the Church,
- resurrection and illumination in Christ.

(Book of Order W-2.3004)

Unlike some denominations, Presbyterians do not require a person to be entirely immersed in water during baptism. Baptism is received only once. Its effect is not tied to the moment when it is administered, for it signifies the beginning of life in Christ, not its completion. The Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) believes that persons of other denominations are part of one body of Christian believers; therefore, it recognizes and accepts baptisms by other Christian churches.

Baptism is almost always administered as part of a worship service. In the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.), baptism must be authorized by the session of a particular congregation and performed by a minister.

ADDENDUM F

Calvinism's TULIP response to the Arminians

Both Arminianism and Calvinism were and are expressions of Reformed Theology.

A summary of the differences between Arminians and Calvinists

- Calvinism focuses on God's sovereignty, stating that God is able and willing by virtue of his omniscience, omnipresence, and omnipotence, to do whatever He desires with His creation. It also maintains that within the Bible are the following teachings: That God, by His sovereign grace predestines people into salvation; that Jesus died only for those predestined; that God regenerates the individual where he is then able and wants to choose God; and that it is impossible for those who are redeemed to lose their salvation.
- Arminianism, on the other hand, maintains that God predestined, but not in an absolute sense. Rather, He looked into the future to see who would pick him and then He chose them. Jesus died for all peoples' sins who have ever lived and ever will live, not just the Christians. Each person is the one who decides if he wants to be saved or not. And finally, it is possible to lose your salvation (some Arminians believe you cannot lose your salvation).

The Council of Dort

The Council of Dort was allegedly convened for the Arminians to present their arguments against Calvinism in a fair hearing. They were not aware that in reality it was their "Protestant Inquisition" or "heresy trial." *The Five Articles of Remonstrance* (five grievances) were prepared by the Arminian defendants to present their disagreement with the Church's official Calvinist stand. The five articles outlined the main points where Arminians objected to Calvin's theology.

The Five Arminian Articles of Remonstrance

I.That God, by an eternal and unchangeable purpose in Jesus Christ His Son, before the foundations of the world were laid, determined to save, out of the human race which had fallen into sin, in Christ, for Christ's sake and through Christ, those who through the grace of the Holy Spirit shall believe on the same His Son and shall through the same grace persevere in this same faith and obedience of faith even to the end; and on the other hand to leave under sin and wrath the contumacious and unbelieving and to condemn them as aliens from Christ, according to the word of the Gospel in John 3:36, and other passages of Scripture.

II.That, accordingly, Jesus Christ, the Saviour of the world, died for all men and for every man, so that He has obtained for all, by His death on the cross, reconciliation and remission of sins; yet so that no one is partaker of this remission except the believers [John 3:16; 1 John 2:2].

III.That man has not saving grace of himself, nor of the working of his own free-will, inasmuch as in his state of apostasy and sin he can for himself and by himself think nothing that is good — nothing, that is, truly good, such as saving faith is, above all else. But that it is necessary that by

God, in Christ and through His Holy Spirit he be born again and renewed in understanding, affections and will and in all his faculties, that he may be able to understand, think, will, and perform what is truly good, according to the Word of God [John 15:5].

IV.That this grace of God is the beginning, the progress and the end of all good; so that even the regenerate man can neither think, will nor effect any good, nor withstand any temptation to evil, without grace precedent (or prevenient), awakening, following and co-operating. So that all good deeds and all movements towards good that can be conceived must be ascribed to the grace of God in Christ. But with respect to the mode of operation, grace is not irresistible; for it is written of many that they resisted the Holy Spirit [Acts 7 and elsewhere passim].[138]

V.That those who are grafted into Christ by a true faith, and have thereby been made partakers of His life-giving Spirit, are abundantly endowed with power to strive against Satan, sin, the world and their own flesh, and to win the victory; always, be it understood, with the help of the grace of the Holy Spirit, with Jesus Christ assisting them in all temptations, through His Spirit; stretching out His hand to them and (providing only that they are themselves prepared for the fight, that they entreat His aid and do not fail to help themselves) propping and upbuilding them so that by no guile or violence of Satan can they be led astray or plucked from Christ's hands [John 10:28]. But for the question whether they are not able through sloth or negligence to forsake the beginning of their life in Christ, to embrace again this present world, to depart from the holy doctrine once delivered to them, to lose their good conscience and to neglect grace--this must be the subject of more exact inquiry in the Holy Scriptures, before we can teach it with full confidence of our mind.

T.U.L.I.P.

The Council Dort responded to the Arminians by producing the TULIP acronym that stated the Calvinist view of these issues. The following is an excerpt from *The Calvinist Corner* (http://calvinistcorner.com/tulip), explaining TULIP in contemporary terms.

Total Depravity(also known as Total Inability and Original Sin
Unconditional Election
Limited Atonement (also known as Particular Atonement)
Irresistible Grace
Perseverance of the Saints (also known as Once Saved Always Saved)

These five categories do not comprise Calvinism in totality. They simply represent some of its main points.

Total Depravity: Sin has affected all parts of man. The heart, emotions, will, mind, and body are all affected by sin. We are completely sinful. We are not as sinful as we could be, but we are completely affected by sin.

[138] *Passim*, is a literary expression meaning, "here and there, in various parts of a book."

The doctrine of Total Depravity is derived from scriptures that reveal human character: Man's heart is evil (Mark 7:21-23) and sick (Jer. 17:9). Man is a slave of sin (Rom. 6:20). He does not seek for God (Rom. 3:10-12). He cannot understand spiritual things (1 Cor. 2:14). He is at enmity with God (Eph. 2:15). And, is by nature a child of wrath (Eph. 2:3). The Calvinist asks the question, "In light of the scriptures that declare man's true nature as being utterly lost and incapable, how is it possible for anyone to choose or desire God?" The answer is, "He cannot. Therefore God must predestine."

Calvinism also maintains that because of our fallen nature we are born again not by our own will but God's will (John 1:12-13); God grants that we believe (Phil. 1:29); faith is the work of God (John 6:28-29); God appoints people to believe (Acts 13:48); and God predestines (Eph. 1:1-11; Rom. 8:29; 9:9-23).

Unconditional Election: God does not base His election on anything He sees in the individual. He chooses the elect according to the kind intention of His will (Eph. 1:4-8; Rom. 9:11) without any consideration of merit within the individual. Nor does God look into the future to see who would pick Him. Also, as some are elected into salvation, others are not (Rom. 9:15, 21).

Limited Atonement: Jesus died only for the elect. Though Jesus' sacrifice was sufficient for all, it was not efficacious for all. Jesus only bore the sins of the elect. Support for this position is drawn from such scriptures as Matt. 26:28 where Jesus died for 'many'; John 10:11, 15 which say that Jesus died for the sheep (not the goats, per Matt. 25:32-33); John 17:9 where Jesus in prayer interceded for the ones given Him, not those of the entire world; Acts 20:28 and Eph. 5:25-27 which state that the Church was purchased by Christ, not all people; and Isaiah 53:12 which is a prophecy of Jesus' crucifixion where he would bear the sins of many (not all).

Irresistible Grace: When God calls his elect into salvation, they cannot resist. God offers to all people the gospel message. This is called the external call. But to the elect, God extends an internal call and it cannot be resisted. This call is by the Holy Spirit who works in the hearts and minds of the elect to bring them to repentance and regeneration whereby they willingly and freely come to God. Some of the verses used in support of this teaching are Romans 9:16 where it says that "*it is not of him who wills nor of him who runs, but of God who has mercy*"; Philippians 2:12-13 where God is said to be the one working salvation in the individual; John 6:28-29 where faith is declared to be the work of God; Acts 13:48 where God appoints people to believe; and John 1:12-13 where being born again is not by man's will, but by God's.

Perseverance of the Saints: You cannot lose your salvation. Because the Father has elected, the Son has redeemed, and the Holy Spirit has applied salvation, those thus saved are eternally secure. They are eternally secure in Christ. Some of the verses for this position are John 10:27-28 where Jesus said His sheep will never perish; John 6:47 where salvation is described as everlasting life; Romans 8:1 where it is said we have passed out of judgment; 1 Corinthians 10:13 where God promises to never let us be tempted beyond what we can handle; and Phil. 1:6 where God is the one being faithful to perfect us until the day of Jesus' return.

ADDENDUM G

New England's First Fruits
1640

The History of the Founding of Harvard College

AFTER GOD HAD carried us safe to New England, and we had built our houses, provided necessaries for our livelihood, reared convenient places for God's worship, and led the civil government, one of the next things we longed for and looked after was to advance learning and perpetuate it to posterity; dreading to leave an illiterate ministry to the churches, when our present ministers shall lie in the dust. And as we were thinking and consulting how to effect this great work, it pleased God to stir up the heart of one Mr. Harvard (a godly gentleman and a lover of learning, there living among us) to give the one-half of his estate (it being in all about £700) toward the founding of a college, and all his library. After him, another gave £300; others after them cast in more; and the public hand of the state added the rest. The college was, by common consent, appointed to be at Cambridge (a place very pleasant and accommodate) and is called (according to the name of the first founder) Harvard College. The edifice is very fair and comely within and without, having in it a spacious hall where they daily meet at commons, lectures, and exercises; and a large library with some books to it, the gifts of diverse of our friends, their chambers and studies also fitted for and possessed by the students, and all other rooms of office necessary and convenient with all needful offices thereto belonging. And by the side of the college, a fair grammar school, for the training up of young scholars and fitting of them for academical learning, that still as they are judged ripe they may be received into the college of this school. Master Corlet is the master who has very well approved himself for his abilities, dexterity, and painfulness in teaching and education of the youths under him. Over the college is Master Dunster placed as president, a learned, a conscionable, and industrious man, who has so trained up his pupils in the tongues and arts, and so seasoned them with the principles of divinity and Christianity, that we have to our great comfort (and in truth) beyond our hopes, beheld their progress in learning and godliness also. The former of these has appeared in their public declamations in Latin and Greek, and disputations logic and philosophy which they have been wonted (besides their ordinary exercises in the college hall) in the audience of the magistrates, ministers, and other scholars for the probation of their growth in learning, upon set days, constantly once every month to make and uphold. The latter has been manifested in sundry of them by the savory things of their spirits in their godly versation; insomuch that we are confident, if these early blossoms may be cherished and warmed with the influence of the friends of learning and lovers of this pious work, they will, by the help of God, come to happy maturity in a short time.Over the college are twelve overseers chosen by the General Court, six of them are of the magistrates, the other six of the ministers, who are to promote the best good of it and (having a power of influence into all persons in it) are to see that every-
one be diligent and proficient in his proper place.

(From *Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society,* 1792, Vol 1., 242-248).

ADDENDUM H

New England Dynasty

The lives and legacies of the Mathers, America's most influential Puritan family.[139]

Dr. George W. Harper[140]

Mather… For many, the name conjures up Bible-thumping pastors, Puritan busybodies meddling in community life, and falsely accused "witches" made to pay for their alleged misdeeds at Salem in 1692. But these images have little to do with reality.

For almost a century, the Mathers were leading lights in the Congregational firmament of colonial Massachusetts. Indeed, from Richard Mather's arrival in 1635, through the long, fruitful pastorate of his son Increase, to the death in 1728 of his grandson Cotton, they were a spiritual dynasty.

Richard: Titan in Exile

"His way of preaching was very plain … aiming to shoot his arrows, not over the **heads**, but into the **hearts** of his hearers. Yet so scripturally and powerfully did he preach his plain sermons, that … he saw a great success of his labours, in both Englands [Old and New], converting many souls to God."

These are Cotton Mather's words, penned in praise of his grandfather Richard.

Born in 1596 near Liverpool, this patriarch of Puritanism came to faith while a teenager. His conversion experience was in the classic Puritan mold: self-righteous attempts to obey God's law, despair as he compared his feeble efforts to those of seasoned saints, and finally a breakthrough. At age 18, in the words of his grandson, "the good Spirit of God healed his broken heart, by pouring thereinto the evangelical consolations of His great and good promises." '

After brief study at Oxford University, in 1619 Mather was ordained an Anglican minister. In more than a decade of pastoral ministry, he upheld Calvinist orthodoxy while keeping clear of the Anglican ceremonies he and other Puritans found objectionable.

After 1630, with William Laud's installation as Archbishop of Canterbury, theological Arminianism was ascendant, and liturgical uniformity was increasingly enforced. In 1633 Mather was briefly suspended from his position; the following year he lost it. In 1635, Richard and his family took ship for Massachusetts.

Mather was soon installed as pastor of the fledgling parish in Dorchester, just south of Boston. Of his accomplishments, three stand out:

---

[139] *Christian History*, Volume 41, "The American Puritans."

[140] Professor of church history and theology at Alliance Biblical Seminary in Manila.

1. He persuaded his flock to require that applicants for membership provide a convincing account of their own conversion, the goal being a church composed of "visible saints."

2. He composed the bulk of the **Cambridge Platform** (1649), a sort of **Robert's Rules of Order** for the government of New England's churches.

3. He ultimately argued for modifying the **Platform** to allow baptized non-members (who had not told of a conversion "experience") to bring their infants for baptism. This so-called "Half-Way Covenant," which eventually became nearly universal practice in the region, kept a foothold for the gospel in a rapidly secularizing community.

Richard died in 1669, one of the last of that generation of titans.

Increase: Voice for Orthodoxy

Richard's son Increase has been hailed as "the greatest American Puritan" and even "the last American Puritan," though the first is hyperbole and the second is simply not true. Still, Increase Mather was a dominant figure and the leading voice for orthodox Calvinism in an era when rationalism was beginning to undermine the Bay Colony's religious foundations.

Increase attended Harvard College, receiving his B.A. in 1656. But instead of staying at Harvard to take his M.A., he enrolled at Trinity College, Dublin, from which he received the master's degree in 1658.

He declined Trinity's offer of a postgraduate fellowship in favor of service as a parish minister and military chaplain in Cromwell's England. The restoration of the monarchy (and the re-establishment of Anglicanism) under Charles II, though, dashed his plans, and in 1661 he returned to Boston.

In 1664 Increase was called to the pastorate of Boston's Second ("Old North") Church, where he remained until his death. At first he had a reputation as something of a radical, opposing the Half-Way Covenant. Eventually, though, he came to embrace his father's views.

A celebrated preacher, during his half-century at the helm of Old North he spent most of his waking hours in his study, preparing the biblically grounded, theologically sophisticated sermons his flock demanded. His delivery was free, his style plain and direct, his imagery vivid. Many of his sermons were eventually published.

Increase was appointed a (nonteaching) fellow of Harvard College and a member of the school's corporation in 1675; ten years later he was elected president. He reorganized and revitalized the college, enlisting as resident (teaching) fellows the able John Leverett and William Brattle.

But Mather insisted on retaining his pastorate in Boston, and his absence at Cambridge meant these two men wielded unusual influence. Their flirtation with broad-church rationalism ultimately led more than one of their students into the Church of England. Too many others came to embrace a dry Christian moralism that made little room for the grace of Christ.

Increase raised his voice in defense of Calvinist orthodoxy, but his absence from the campus made it impossible for him to mount a sustained offensive. Finally, in 1701, the progressives forced his ouster.

This was the low point of his ministry.

Its high point had come earlier, in 1688–1691, when Increase was dispatched to London to negotiate the return of the colony's original charter, which had been rescinded by Charles II.

Although Increase failed in this task, he greatly influenced the terms of the new charter granted by King William.

His death in 1723 marked the end of the middle era in New England Puritanism.

Cotton: Renaissance Puritan

Cotton Mather has been mocked as the last, dullest defender of New England's dead orthodoxy and hailed as the unwitting herald of modern American secularism. Even in his day he aroused intense loathing in some and great loyalty in others.

Born in 1663, he was named for his maternal grandfather, the learned John Cotton. The young Mather showed intellectual prowess, mastering Latin, Greek, and Hebrew as a child and graduating from Harvard at the tender age of 15.

Having experienced conversion as a teenager, he followed his father and grandfather into the ministry.

Although he received offers from a number of congregations, his most determined suitors were the parishioners at Boston's North Church. In 1685 he was ordained and installed as his father's associate.

Cotton shared his father's commitment to evangelical Calvinism, taking great pains to maintain a united front with him against their adversaries. But where Increase's sermons were plain and direct, Cotton's were flowery and ornate, full of literary references and theological tangents.

Father and son also parted company in their pastoral priorities. While Increase focused on the pulpit and study, Cotton canvassed house by house across Boston, catechizing parishioners and evangelizing the unchurched. He even composed an instructional pamphlet to guide other pastors in this undertaking.

Cotton also organized lay societies, generally numbering a dozen or so members, which met in private residences once or twice a month to pray, study the Bible, and share one another's burdens. Such groups contributed greatly to the vitality of North Church.

Regrettably, most closely associated with Cotton's name today is the execution of nineteen alleged witches in Salem Village in 1692. Cotton, like most of his contemporaries, believed in witches, and he wrote in defense of witch trials. But he denounced, as did his father, the way the Salem trials were being handled, insisting on more objective proof. The united opposition of Boston's clergy was crucial to aborting the trials and saving dozens from the gallows.

Cotton authored hundreds of books on topics ranging from theology and the supernatural to medicine and local history.

But his supreme achievement lay in drawings on the perspectives of English Puritans like Richard Baxter and German Pietists like August Hermann Francke to forge a distinctively American spirituality. This new piety would finally come into its own with the flowering of evangelicalism in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Mather's ministry bridged the gap between what was and what was to be.

For years, Cotton Mather sought New England's spiritual awakening, praying that God would again pour out his Spirit on its churches and communities. His death in 1728 brought an end to a spiritual dynasty, but within a decade came the answer to his prayers—the Great Awakening.

ADDENDUM I

ROBERT HUNT

There are times in life when godly men and women are called from obscurity and onto the world's stage to fulfill God's purpose. In December of 1606, one such man, a humble Anglican priest from a small church in the south of England, accepted that call and gave his life to help establish God's plan for America and the world. His name was Robert Hunt.

On December 19, 1606, burning with a passion to spread the Gospel of Jesus Christ to a new land, Hunt left his family behind and set sail as chaplain of the Virginia Company expedition that would birth Jamestown, Virginia, the first permanent English settlement in the New World. While others embarked on the journey to Virginia to gain wealth, power, and freedom from their former lives, Rev. Hunt sought to plant a new Christian church and bring the message of salvation to the native tribes of America.

Rev. Robert Hunt was born in 1568. He was ordained by the Church of England and selected by the Archbishop of Canterbury to be the vicar of Reculver, County of Kent, England. He served in this position from 1594 to 1602 when he was appointed vicar of All Saints Church at Old Heathfield, East Sussex, England.

Hunt was one of 105 colonists who left for the New World aboard three small ships on the river Thames that frigid December of 1606. The first six weeks of this journey were spent battling to escape the English Channel. Storms and contrary winds hindered their progress and they remained pinned down just off the coast of Kent, England, in an area known as "the Downs," a distance of less than 12 miles from Old Heathfield, where Hunt had been vicar.

Hunt earned the admiration and respect of the colonists in the midst of the delay off the Downs when he intervened in a dispute between the soon-to-be president of Jamestown, the aristocratic Edward-Maria Wingfield and the commoner soldier Captain John Smith. Wingfield and some of his gentlemen colleagues had become impatient with the delay, the cramped quarters of the ships, the tossing sea, and the frigid weather. They argued for returning to the comforts of their nearby homes. Smith insisted that the company wait out the weather.

Rev. Hunt brought peace to an increasingly tension-filled situation, gently imploring his comrades to stay resolute and wait for the winds to become favorable – this despite suffering miserably of seasickness himself.

"Master Hunt, our preacher, was so weak and sick that few expected his recovery," Captain John Smith would later write in admiration of his valor. "Yet, although he were but 20 miles from his habitation … and notwithstanding the stormy weather … all this could never force from him so much as a seeming desire to leave the business."

Hunt's courageous example and meek words inspired the crew and the colonists and they determined to stay the course and weather the storm. By early February the winds changed and the journey to the New World was finally underway.

At four o'clock in the morning of April 26, after many weeks at sea, a crewmember spotted land in the distance. After a long and arduous journey, the three small ships entered the mouth of the Chesapeake Bay and set anchor just beyond the Atlantic Ocean. They named the placed Cape Henry, after King James' son, the Prince of Wales.

Before permitting the settlers to continue with the work of looking for a permanent home, Rev. Hunt required that each of the colonists wait on the ships for three days in a time of personal examination and repentance. The journey had been filled with difficulty and in-fighting among the colonists. If they were to consecrate the land for God's purposes, Hunt wanted the company to be contrite in heart.

Though the ships they sailed upon were very small, The Virginia Company leadership insisted that they carry one item with them from England for the purpose of giving glory to God in the endeavor – a rough-hewn wooden cross. After the three days had passed, Hunt led the party to the wind-swept shore where they erected the seven-foot oak cross in the sand.

The colonists and sailors gathered around the cross, holding the first formal prayer service in Virginia to give thanksgiving for God's mercy and grace in bringing them safely to this new land. As they knelt in the sand, Hunt reminded them of the admonition of the British Royal Council, taken from the Holy Scripture: "Every plantation, which my Heavenly Father hath not planted, shall be rooted up." Raising his hands to heaven, Rev. Robert Hunt claimed the land for country and king and consecrated the continent to the glory of God.

In covenantal language he declared, "…from these very shores the Gospel shall go forth to not only this New World, but the entire world."

Once settled in the fort at Jamestown, the whole company, except those who were on guard, attended regular prayer services twice a day, led by Rev. Hunt in an open air chapel until a permanent church could be erected. Captain Smith described Rev. Hunt as "our honest, religious, and courageous divine."

During his short time as chaplain for the Jamestown colony, Robert Hunt served as a peacemaker, often bring harmony to the quarrelling men. During the voyage from England, Captain John Smith was jailed on spurious charges raised by Edward-Maria Wingfield. After arriving in the New World, Wingfield and several of his friends insisted that John Smith return with Captain Christopher Newport to England, but the soldier refused to go. Again, Rev. Hunt became an advocate for unity in the colony and for the virtue of Captain John Smith.

Hunt held the respect of the entire company. It was Wingfield, along with their mutual friend and Virginia Company founding member, Rev. Richard Haklyut, who had recruited Hunt for this mission. With the support of Hunt and Captain Newport, Smith was released from his imprisonment and was seated on the Jamestown Council -- a providential move that would later save the colony from extinction thanks to Smith's special military training and leadership abilities.

The chronicler wrote of the parson: “Many were the mischiefs that daily sprung from their ignorant spirits; but the good doctrines and exhortations of our Preacher Minister Hunt reconciled them and caused Captain Smith to be admitted to the Council June 20th. The next day, June 21, third Sunday after Trinity, under the shadow of an old sail, Robert Hunt celebrated the Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper. It is impossible to rate too highly the character and work of the aforesaid Robert Hunt, Chaplain of the Colony.” Hunt’s virtuous character was well known and respected by his fellow settlers. It was evidenced by his behavior both before and after an accidental fire in the fort in January, 1608. This fire burned the palisades with their arms, bedding apparel, and many private provisions. “Good master Hunt lost all his library,” the chronicler wrote, “and all that he had but the clothes on his back, yet none ever did see him repine at his loss… Yet we had daily Common Prayer morning and evening, every Sunday two sermons and every three months the Holy Communion till our Minister died.”

Historians believe that Robert Hunt died in the spring of 1608, though the cause remains unknown. Hunt’s will, probated in July, 1608, is the only documented evidence of his death. All authorities, including Edward-Maria Wingfield, first president of the council at Jamestown, and Captain John Smith, who agreed in nothing else, were able to concur in their praise of this worthy man. Smith wrote in memory of Rev. Hunt: “Our factions were oft qualified, and our wants and greater extremities so comforted that they seemed easy in comparison of what we endured after his memorable death…”

http://www.firstlandingthemovie.com/noindex/pdf/RobertHuntBio.pdf

ADDENDUM J

John Wesley's Journal

NOTE: As was the custom in that era, Wesley wrote his personal journal in the third-person.

August 16, 1737 -- The Charges Against John Wesley

Tuesday, 16.—Mrs. Williamson swore to and signed an affidavit insinuating much more than it asserted; but asserting that Mr. Wesley had many times proposed marriage to her, all which proposals she rejected. Of this I desire a copy. Mr. Causton replied: "Sir, you may have one from any of the newspapers in America."

On Thursday and Friday was delivered out a list of twenty-six men, who were to meet as a grand jury on Monday, the twenty-second. But this list was called in the next day, and twenty-four names added to it. Of this grand jury (forty-four of whom only met), one was a Frenchman, who did not understand English; one a Papist, one a professed infidel, three Baptists, sixteen or seventeen other Dissenters, and several others who had personal quarrels against me and had openly vowed revenge.

To this grand jury, on Monday, 22, Mr. Causton gave a long and earnest charge "to beware of spiritual tyranny, and to oppose the new, illegal authority which was usurped over their consciences." Then Mrs. Williamson's affidavit was read; after which, Mr. Causton delivered to the grand jury a paper, entitled:

"A List of grievances, presented by the grand jury for Savannah, this day of August, 1737."

This the majority of the grand jury altered in some particulars, and on Thursday, September 1, delivered it again to the court, under the form of two presentments, containing ten bills, which were then read to the people.

Herein they asserted, upon oath, "That John Wesley, clerk, had broken the laws of the realm, contrary to the peace of our Sovereign Lord the King, his crown and dignity.

"1. By speaking and writing to Mrs. Williamson against her husband's consent.

"2. By repelling her from the holy communion.

"3. By not declaring his adherence to the Church of England.

"4. By dividing the morning service on Sundays.

"5. By refusing to baptize Mr. Parker's child, otherwise than by dipping, except the parents would certify it was weak and not able to bear it.

"6. By repelling William Gough from the holy communion.

"7. By refusing to read the burial service over the body of Nathaniel Polhill.

"8. By calling himself Ordinary of Savannah.

"9. By refusing to receive William Aglionby as a godfather, only because he was not a communicant.

"10. By refusing Jacob Matthews for the same reason; and baptizing an Indian trader's child with only two sponsors." (This, I own, was wrong; for I ought, at all hazards, to have refused

baptizing it till he had procured a third.)

Friday, September 2.—Was the third court at which I appeared since my being carried before Mr. P. and the Recorder.

I now moved for an immediate hearing on the first bill, being the only one of a civil nature; but it was refused. I made the same motion in the afternoon, but was put off till the next court-day.

On the next court-day I appeared again, as also at the two courts following, but could not be heard, because (the Judge said) Mr. Williamson was gone out of town.

The sense of the minority of the grand jurors themselves (for they were by no means unanimous) concerning these presentments may appear from the following paper, which they transmitted to the trustees:

To the Honorable the Trustees for Georgia.

"Whereas two presentments have been made: the one of August 23, the other of August 31, by the grand jury for the town and county of Savannah, in Georgia, against John Wesley, Clerk.

"We whose names are underwritten, being members of the said grand jury, do humbly beg leave to signify our dislike of the said presentments; being, by many and divers circumstances, thoroughly persuaded in ourselves that the whole charge against Mr. Wesley is an artifice of Mr. Causton's, designed rather to blacken the character of Mr. Wesley than to free the colony from religious tyranny, as he was pleased, in his charge to us, to term it. But as these circumstances will be too tedious to trouble your Honors with, we shall only beg leave to give the reasons of our dissent from the particular bills….."

ADDENDUM K

THE WESTMINSTER CONFESSION OF FAITH (1646)

CHAPTER I.
Of the holy Scripture.

I. Although the light of nature, and the works of creation and providence, do so far manifest the goodness, wisdom, and power of God, as to leave men inexcusable; yet are they not sufficient to give that knowledge of God, and of his will, which is necessary unto salvation; therefore it pleased the Lord, at sundry times, and in divers manners, to reveal himself, and to declare that his will unto his Church; and afterwards for the better preserving and propagating of the truth, and for the more sure establishment and comfort of the Church against the corruption of the flesh, and the malice of Satan and of the world, to commit the same wholly unto writing; which maketh the holy Scripture to be most necessary; those former ways of God's revealing his will unto his people being now ceased.

II. Under the name of holy Scripture, or the Word of God written, are now contained all the Books of the Old and New Testament, which are these:

Of the Old Testament:

Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Ruth, I Samuel, II Samuel, I Kings, II Kings, I Chronicles, II Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, Job, Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, The Song of Songs, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Lamentations, Ezekiel, Daniel, Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Jonah, Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi.

Of the New Testament:

Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, The Acts of the Apostles, Paul's Epistles to the Romans, I Corinthians, II Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, I Thessalonians , II Thessalonians , I To Timothy , II To Timothy, To Titus, To Philemon, The Epistle to the Hebrews, The Epistle of James, The first and second Epistles of Peter, The first, second, and third Epistles of John, The Epistle of Jude, The Revelation.

All which are given by inspiration of God, to be the rule of faith and life.

III. The books commonly called Apocrypha, not being of divine inspiration, are no part of the Canon of Scripture; and therefore are of no authority in the Church of God, nor to be any otherwise approved, or made use of, than other human writings.

IV. The authority of the holy Scripture, for which it ought to be believed and obeyed, dependeth not upon the testimony of any man or Church, but wholly upon God (who is truth itself), the Author thereof; and therefore it is to be received, because it is the Word of God.

V. We may be moved and induced by the testimony of the Church to an high and reverent esteem of the holy Scripture; and the heavenliness of the matter, the efficacy of the doctrine, the majesty of the style, the consent of all the parts, the scope of the whole (which is to give all glory to God), the full discovery it makes of the only way of man's salvation, the many other incomparable excellencies, and the entire perfection thereof, are arguments whereby it doth abundantly evidence itself to be the Word of God; yet, notwithstanding, our full persuasion and assurance of the infallible truth and divine authority thereof, is from the inward work of the Holy Spirit, bearing witness by and with the Word in our hearts.

VI. The whole counsel of God, concerning all things necessary for his own glory, man's salvation, faith, and life, is either expressly set down in Scripture, or by good and necessary consequence may be deduced from Scripture: unto which nothing at any time is to be added, whether by new revelations of the Spirit, or traditions of men. Nevertheless we acknowledge the inward illumination of the Spirit of God to be necessary for the saving understanding of such things as are revealed in the Word; and that there are some circumstances concerning the worship of God, and the government of the Church, common to human actions and societies, which are to be ordered by the light of nature and Christian prudence, according to the general rules of the Word, which are always to be observed.

VII. All things in Scripture are not alike plain in themselves, nor alike clear unto all; yet those things which are necessary to be known, believed, and observed, for salvation, are so clearly propounded and opened in some place of Scripture or other, that not only the learned, but the unlearned, in a due use of the ordinary means, may attain unto a sufficient understanding of them.

VIII. The Old Testament in Hebrew (which was the native language of the people of God of old), and the New Testament in Greek (which at the time of the writing of it was most generally known to the nations), being immediately inspired by God, and by his singular care and providence kept pure in all ages, are therefore authentical; so as in all controversies of religion the Church is finally to appeal unto them. But because these original tongues are not known to all the people of God who have right unto, and interest in, the Scriptures, and are commanded, in the fear of God, to read and search them, therefore they are to be translated into the vulgar language of every nation unto which they come, that the Word of God dwelling plentifully in all, they may worship him in an acceptable manner, and, through patience and comfort of the Scriptures, may have hope.

IX. The infallible rule of interpretation of Scripture, is the Scripture itself; and therefore, when there is a question about the true and full sense of any scripture (which is not manifold, but one), it may be searched and known by other places that speak more clearly.

X. The Supreme Judge, by which all controversies of religion are to be determined, and all decrees of councils, opinions of ancient writers, doctrines of men, and private spirits, are to be examined, and in whose sentence we are to rest, can be no other but the Holy Spirit speaking in the Scripture.

CHAPTER II.

Of God, and of the Holy Trinity.

I. There is but one only living and true God, who is infinite in being and perfection, a most pure spirit, invisible, without body, parts, or passions, immutable, immense, eternal, incomprehensible, almighty, most wise, most holy, most free, most absolute, working all things according to the counsel of his own immutable and most righteous will, for his own glory, most loving, gracious, merciful, long-suffering, abundant in goodness and truth, forgiving iniquity, transgression, and sin; the rewarder of them that diligently seek him; and withal most just and terrible in his judgments; hating all sin; and who will by no means clear the guilty.

II. God hath all life, glory, goodness, blessedness, in and of himself; and is alone in and unto himself all-sufficient, not standing in need of any creatures which he hath made, nor deriving any glory from them, but only manifesting his own glory in, by, unto, and upon them; he is the alone foundation of all being, of whom, through whom, and to whom, are all things; and hath most sovereign dominion over them, to do by them, for them, or upon them, whatsoever himself

pleaseth. In his sight all things are open and manifest; his knowledge is infinite, infallible, and independent upon the creature; so as nothing is to him contingent or uncertain. He is most holy in all his counsels, in all his works, and in all his commands. To him is due from angels and men, and every other creature, whatsoever worship, service, or obedience he is pleased to require of them.

III. In the unity of the Godhead there be three Persons of one substance, power, and eternity: God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost. The Father is of none, neither begotten nor proceeding; the Son is eternally begotten of the Father; the Holy Ghost eternally proceeding from the Father and the Son.

CHAPTER III.

Of God's Eternal Decree.

I. God from all eternity did by the most wise and holy counsel of his own will, freely and unchangeably ordain whatsoever comes to pass; yet so as thereby neither is God the author of sin; nor is violence offered to the will of the creatures, nor is the liberty or contingency of second causes taken away, but rather established.

II. Although God knows whatsoever may or can come to pass, upon all supposed conditions; yet hath he not decreed any thing because he foresaw it as future, as that which would come to pass, upon such conditions.

III. By the decree of God, for the manifestation of his glory, some men and angels are predestinated unto everlasting life, and others foreordained to everlasting death.

IV. These angels and men, thus predestinated and foreordained, are particularly and unchangeably designed; and their number is so certain and definite that it can not be either increased or diminished.

V. Those of mankind that are predestinated unto life, God, before the foundation of the world was laid, according to his eternal and immutable purpose, and the secret counsel and good pleasure of his will, hath chosen in Christ, unto everlasting glory, out of his free grace and love alone, without any foresight of faith or good works, or perseverance in either of them, or any other thing in the creature, as conditions, or causes moving him thereunto; and all to the praise of his glorious grace.

VI. As God hath appointed the elect unto glory, so hath he, by the eternal and most free purpose of his will, foreordained all the means thereunto. Wherefore they who are elected being fallen in Adam are redeemed by Christ, are effectually called unto faith in Christ by his Spirit working in due season; are justified, adopted, sanctified, and kept by his power through faith unto salvation. Neither are any other redeemed by Christ, effectually called, justified, adopted, sanctified, and saved, but the elect only.

VII. The rest of mankind, God was pleased, according to the unsearchable counsel of his own will, whereby he extendeth or withholdeth mercy as he pleaseth, for the glory of his sovereign power over his creatures, to pass by, and to ordain them to dishonor and wrath for their sin, to the praise of his glorious justice.

VIII. The doctrine of this high mystery of predestination is to be handled with special prudence and care, that men attending to the will of God revealed in his Word, and yielding obedience thereunto, may, from the certainty of their effectual vocation, be assured of their eternal election. So shall this doctrine afford matter of praise, reverence, and admiration of God; and of humility, diligence, and abundant consolation to all that sincerely obey the gospel.

CHAPTER IV.

Of Creation.

I. It pleased God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, for the manifestation of the glory of his eternal power, wisdom, and goodness, in the beginning, to create or make of nothing the world, and all things therein, whether visible or invisible, in the space of six days, and all very good.

II. After God had made all other creatures, he created man, male and female, with reasonable and immortal souls, endued with knowledge, righteousness, and true holiness after his own image, having the law of God written in their hearts, and power to fulfill it; and yet under a possibility of transgressing, being left to the liberty of their own will, which was subject unto change. Besides this law written in their hearts, they received a command not to eat of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil; which while they kept were happy in their communion with God, and had dominion over the creatures.

CHAPTER V.

Of Providence.

I. God, the great Creator of all things, doth uphold, direct dispose, and govern all creatures, actions, and things, from the greatest even to the least, by his most wise and holy providence, according to his infallible foreknowledge, and the free and immutable counsel of his own will, to the praise of the glory of his wisdom, power, justice, goodness, and mercy.

II. Although in relation to the foreknowledge and decree of God, the first cause, all things come to pass immutably and infallibly, yet, by the same providence, he ordereth them to fall out according to the nature of second causes, either necessarily, freely, or contingently.

III. God, in his ordinary providence, maketh use of means, yet is free to work without, above, and against them, at his pleasure.

IV. The almighty power, unsearchable wisdom, and infinite goodness of God, so far manifest themselves in his providence, that it extendeth itself even to the first Fall, and all other sins of angels and men, and that not by a bare permission, but such as hath joined with it a most wise and powerful bounding, and otherwise ordering and governing of them, in a manifold dispensation, to his own holy ends; yet so, as the sinfulness thereof proceedeth only from the creature, and not from God; who being most holy and righteous, neither is nor can be the author or approver of sin.

V. The most wise, righteous, and gracious God, doth oftentimes leave for a season his own children to manifold temptations and the corruption of their own hearts, to chastise them for their former sins, or to discover unto them the hidden strength of corruption and deceitfulness of their hearts, that they may be humbled; and to raise them to a more close and constant dependence for their support upon himself, and to make them more watchful against all future occasions of sin, and for sundry other just and holy ends.

VI. As for those wicked and ungodly men whom God, as a righteous judge, for former sins, doth blind and harden; from them he not only withholdeth his grace, whereby they might have been enlightened in their understandings, and wrought upon their hearts; but sometimes also withdraweth the gifts which they had; and exposeth them to such objects as their corruption makes occasion of sin; and withal, gives them over to their own lusts, the temptations of the world, and the power of Satan; whereby it comes to pass that they harden themselves, even under those means which God useth for the softening of others.

VII. As the providence of God doth, in general, reach to all creatures, so, after a most special manner, it taketh care of his Church, and disposeth all things to the good thereof.

CHAPTER VI.

Of the Fall of Man, of Sin, and of the Punishment thereof.

I. Our first parents, begin seduced by the subtlety and temptations of Satan, sinned in eating the forbidden fruit. This their sin God was pleased, according to his wise and holy counsel, to permit, having purposed to order it to his own glory.

II. By this sin they fell from their original righteousness and communion with God, and so became dead in sin, and wholly defiled in all the faculties and parts of soul and body.

III. They being the root of mankind, the guilt of this sin was imputed, and the same death in sin and corrupted nature conveyed to all their posterity, descending from them by original generation.

IV. From this original corruption, whereby we are utterly indisposed, disabled, and made opposite to all good, and wholly inclined to all evil, do proceed all actual transgressions.

V. This corruption of nature, during this life, doth remain in those that are regenerated; and although it be through Christ pardoned and mortified, yet both itself, and all the motions thereof, are truly and properly sin.

VI. Every sin, both original and actual, being a transgression of the righteous law of God, and contrary thereunto, doth, in its own nature, bring guilt upon the sinner, whereby he is bound over to the wrath of God, and curse of the law, and so made subject to death, with all miseries spiritual, temporal, and eternal.

CHAPTER VII

Of God's Covenant with Man.

I. The distance between God and the creature is so great, that although reasonable creatures do owe obedience unto him as their Creator, yet they could never have any fruition of him, as their blessedness and reward, but by some voluntary condescension on God's part, which he hath been pleased to express by way of covenant.

II. The first covenant made with man was a covenant of works, wherein life was promised to Adam, and in him to his posterity, upon condition of perfect and personal obedience.

III. Man by his fall having made himself incapable of life by that covenant, the Lord was pleased to make a second, commonly called the covenant of grace: wherein he freely offered unto sinners life and salvation by Jesus Christ, requiring of them faith in him, that they may be saved, and promising to give unto all those that are ordained unto life, his Holy Spirit, to make them willing and able to believe.

IV. This covenant of grace is frequently set forth in the Scripture by the name of a testament, in reference to the death of Jesus Christ, the testator, and to the everlasting inheritance, with all things belonging to it, therein bequeathed.

V. This covenant was differently administered in the time of the law, and in the time of the gospel: under the law it was administered by promises, prophecies, sacrifices, circumcision, the paschal lamb, and other types and ordinances delivered to the people of the Jews, all fore-signifying Christ to come, which were for that time sufficient and efficacious, through the

operation of the Spirit, to instruct and build up the elect in faith in the promised Messiah, by whom they had full remission of sins, and eternal salvation, and is called the Old Testament.

VI. Under the gospel, when Christ the substance was exhibited, the ordinances in which this covenant is dispensed, are the preaching of the Word, and the administration of the sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper; which, though fewer in number, and administered with more simplicity and less outward glory, yet in them it is held forth in more fullness, evidence, and spiritual efficacy, to all nations, both Jews and Gentiles; and is called the New Testament. There are not, therefore, two covenants of grace differing in substance, but one and the same under various dispensations.

CHAPTER VIII.

Of Christ the Mediator.

I. It pleased God, in his eternal purpose, to choose and ordain the Lord Jesus, his only-begotten Son, to be the Mediator between God and men, the prophet, priest, and king; the head and Savior of the Church, the heir or all things, and judge of the world; unto whom he did, from all eternity, give a people to be his seed, and to be by him in time redeemed, called, justified, sanctified, and glorified.

II. The Son of God, the second Person in the Trinity, being very and eternal God, of one substance, and equal with the Father, did, when the fullness of time was come, take upon him man's nature, with all the essential properties and common infirmities thereof; yet without sin: being conceived by he power of the Holy Ghost, in the womb of the Virgin Mary, of her substance. So that two whole, perfect, and distinct natures, the Godhead and the manhood, were inseparably joined together in one person, without conversion, composition, or confusion. Which person is very God and very man, yet one Christ, the only Mediator between God and man.

III. The Lord Jesus in his human nature thus united to the divine, was sanctified and anointed with the Holy Spirit above measure; having in him all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge, in whom it pleased the Father that all fullness should dwell: to the end that being holy, harmless, undefiled, and full of grace and truth, he might be thoroughly furnished to execute the office of a Mediator and Surety. Which office he took not unto himself, but was thereunto called by his Father; who put all power and judgment into his hand, and gave him commandment to execute the same.

IV. This office the Lord Jesus did most willingly undertake, which, that he might discharge, he was made under the law, and did perfectly fulfill it; endured most grievous torments immediately in his soul, and most painful sufferings in his body; was crucified and died; was buried, and remained under the power of death, yet saw no corruption. On the third day he arose from the dead, with the same body in which he suffered; with which also he ascended into heaven, and there sitteth at the right hand of his Father, making intercession; and shall return to judge men and angels, at the end of the world.

V. The Lord Jesus, by his perfect obedience and sacrifice of himself, which he through the eternal Spirit once offered up unto God, hath fully satisfied the justice of his Father; and purchased not only reconciliation, but an everlasting inheritance in the kingdom of heaven, for all those whom the Father hath given unto him.

VI. Although the work of redemption was not actually wrought by Christ till after his incarnation, yet the virtue, efficacy, and benefits thereof were communicated into the elect, in all ages successively from the beginning of the world, in and by those promises, types, and sacrifices wherein he was revealed, and signified to be the seed of the woman, which should

bruise the serpent's head, and the Lamb slain from the beginning of the world, being yesterday and today the same and for ever.

VII. Christ, in the work of mediation, acteth according to both natures; by each nature doing that which is proper to itself; yet by reason of the unity of the person, that which is proper to one nature is sometimes, in Scripture, attributed to the person denominated by the other nature.

VIII. To all those for whom Christ hath purchased redemption, he doth certainly and effectually apply and communicate the same; making intercession for them, and revealing unto them, in and by the Word, the mysteries of salvation; effectually persuading them by his Spirit to believe and obey; and governing their hearts by his Word and Spirit; overcoming all their enemies by his almighty power and wisdom, in such manner and ways as are most consonant to his wonderful and unsearchable dispensation.

CHAPTER IX.

Of Free Will.

I. God hath endued the will of man with that natural liberty, that is neither forced, nor by any absolute necessity of nature determined to good or evil.

II. Man, in his state of innocency, had freedom and power to will and to do that which is good and well-pleasing to God; but yet mutably, so that he might fall from it.

III. Man, by his fall into a state of sin, hath wholly lost all ability of will to any spiritual good accompanying salvation; so as a natural man, being altogether averse from that good, and dead in sin, is not able, by his own strength, to convert himself, or to prepare himself thereunto.

IV. When God converts a sinner and translates him into the state of grace, he freeth him from his natural bondage under sin, and, by his grace alone, enables him freely to will and to do that which is spiritually good; yet so as that, by reason of his remaining corruption, he doth not perfectly, nor only, will that which is good, but doth also will that which is evil.

V. The will of man is made perfectly and immutable free to good alone, in the state of glory only.

CHAPTER X.

Of Effectual Calling.

I. All those whom God hath predestinated unto life, and those only, he is pleased, in his appointed and accepted time, effectually to call, by his Word and Spirit, out of that state of sin and death in which they are by nature, to grace and salvation by Jesus Christ: enlightening their minds, spiritually and savingly, to understand the things of God, taking away their heart of stone, and giving unto them an heart of flesh; renewing their wills, and by his almighty power determining them to that which is good; and effectually drawing them to Jesus Christ; yet so as they come most freely, being made willing by his grace.

II. This effectual call is of God's free and special grace alone, not from any thing at all foreseen in man, who is altogether passive therein, until, being quickened and renewed by the Holy Spirit, he is thereby enabled to answer this call, and to embrace the grace offered and conveyed in it.

III. Elect infants, dying in infancy, are regenerated and saved by Christ through the Spirit, who worketh when, and where, and how he pleaseth. So also are all other elect persons who are incapable of being outwardly called by the ministry of the Word.

IV. Others, not elected, although they may be called by the ministry of the Word, and may have some common operations of the Spirit, yet they never truly come to Christ, and therefore can not

be saved: much less can men, not professing the Christian religion, be saved in any other way whatsoever, be they never so diligent to frame their lives according to the light of nature, and the law of that religion they do profess; and to assert and maintain that they may is without warrant of the Word of God.

CHAPTER XI.

Of Justification.

I. Those whom God effectually calleth, he also freely justifieth: not by infusing righteousness into them, but by pardoning their sins, and by accounting and accepting their persons as righteous; not for any thing wrought in them, or done by them, but for Christ's sake alone; not by imputing faith itself, the act of believing, or any other evangelical obedience to them, as their righteousness; but by imputing the obedience and satisfaction of Christ unto them, they receiving and resting on him and his righteousness by faith; which faith they have not of themselves, it is the gift of God.

II. Faith, thus receiving and resting on Christ and his righteousness, is the alone instrument of justification; yet is it not alone in the person justified, but is ever accompanied with all other saving graces, and is no dead faith, but worketh by love.

III. Christ, by his obedience and death, did fully discharge the debt of all those that are thus justified, and did make a proper, real, and full satisfaction of his Father's justice in their behalf. Yet inasmuch as he was given by the Father for them, and his obedience and satisfaction accepted in their stead, and both freely, not for any thing in them, their justification is only of free grace, that both the exact justice and rich grace of God might be glorified in the justification of sinners.

IV. God did, from all eternity, decree to justify the elect; and Christ did, in the fullness of time, die for their sins and rise again for their justification; nevertheless they are not justified until the Holy Spirit doth, in due time, actually apply Christ unto them.

V. God doth continue to forgive the sins of those that are justified; and although they can never fall from the state of justification, yet they may by their sins fall under God's Fatherly displeasure, and not have the light of his countenance restored unto them, until they humble themselves, confess their sins, beg pardon, and renew their faith and repentance.

VI. The justification of believers under the Old Testament was, in all these respect, one and the same with the justification of believers under the New Testament.

CHAPTER XII.

Of Adoption.

All those that are justified, God vouchsafeth, in and for his only Son Jesus Christ, to make partakers of the grace of adoption: by which they are taken into the number, and enjoy the liberties and privileges of the children of God; have his name put upon them; receive the Spirit of adoption; have access to the throne of grace with boldness; are enabled to cry, Abba, Father; are pitied, protected, provided for, and chastened by his as by a father; yet never cast off, but sealed to the day of redemption, and inherit the promises, as heirs of everlasting salvation.

CHAPTER XIII.

Of Sanctification.

I. They who are effectually called and regenerated, having a new heart and a new spirit created in them, are further sanctified, really and personally, through the virtue of Christ's death and

resurrection, by his Word and Spirit dwelling in them; the dominion of the whole body of sin is destroyed, and the several lusts thereof are more and more weakened and mortified, and they more and more quickened and strengthened, in all saving graces, to the practice of true holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord.

II. This sanctification is throughout in the whole man, yet imperfect in this life: there abideth still some remnants of corruption in every part, whence ariseth a continual and irreconcilable war, the flesh lusting against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh.

III. In which war, although the remaining corruption for a time may much prevail, yet, through the continual supply of strength from the sanctifying Spirit of Christ, the regenerate part doth overcome: and so the saints grow in grace, perfecting holiness in the fear of God.

CHAPTER XIV.

Of Saving Faith.

I. The grace of faith, whereby the elect are enabled to believe to the saving of their souls, is the work of the Spirit of Christ in their hearts; and is ordinarily wrought by the ministry of the Word: by which also, and by the administration of the sacraments, and prayer, it is increased and strengthened.

II. By this faith, a Christian believeth to be true whatsoever is revealed in the Word, for the authority of god himself speaking therein; and acteth differently, upon that which each particular passage thereof containeth; yielding obedience to the commands, trembling at the threatenings, and embracing the promises of God for this life, and that which is to come. But the principle acts of saving faith are, accepting, receiving, and resting upon Christ alone for justification, sanctification, and eternal life, by virtue of the covenant of grace.

III. This faith is different in degrees, weak or strong; may be often and many ways assailed and weakened, but gets the victory; growing up in many to the attainment of a full assurance through Christ, who is both the author and finisher of our faith.

CHAPTER XV.

Of Repentance Unto Life.

I. Repentance unto life is an evangelical grace, the doctrine whereof is to be preached by every minister of the gospel, as well as that of faith in Christ.

II. By it a sinner, out of the sight and sense, not only of the danger, but also of the filthiness and odiousness of his sins, as contrary to the holy nature and righteous law of God, and upon the apprehension of his mercy in Christ to such as are penitent, so grieves for, and hates his sins, as to turn from them all unto God, purposing and endeavoring to walk with him in all the ways of his commandments.

III. Although repentance be not to be rested in as any satisfaction for sin, or any cause of the pardon thereof, which is the act of God's free grace in Christ; yet is it of such necessity to all sinners, that none may expect pardon without it.

IV. As there is no sin so small but it deserves damnation; so there is no sin so great that it can bring damnation upon those who truly repent.

V. Men ought not to content themselves with a general repentance, but it is every man's duty to endeavor to repent of his particular sins, particularly.

VI. As every man is bound to make private confession of his sins to God, praying for the pardon thereof, upon which, and the forsaking of them, he shall find mercy: so he that scandalizeth his

brother, or the Church of Christ, ought to be willing, by a private or public confession and sorrow for his sin, to declare his repentance to those that are offended; who are thereupon to be reconciled to him, and in love to receive him.

CHAPTER XVI.

Of Good Works.

I. Good works are only such as God hath commanded in his holy Word, and not such as, without the warrant thereof, are devised by men out of blind zeal, or upon any pretense of good intention.

II. These good works, done in obedience to God's commandments, are the fruits and evidences of a true and lively faith: and by them believers manifest their thankfulness, strengthen their assurance, edify their brethren, adorn the profession of the gospel, stop the mouths of the adversaries, and glorify God, whose workmanship they are, created in Christ Jesus thereunto, that, having their fruit unto holiness, they may have the end, eternal life.

III. Their ability to do good works is not at all of themselves, but wholly from the Spirit of Christ. And that they may be enabled thereunto, besides the graces they have already received, there is required an actual influence of the same Holy Spirit to work in them to will and to do of his good pleasure; yet are they not hereupon to grow negligent, as if they were not bound to perform any duty unless upon a special motion of the Spirit; but they ought to be diligent in stirring up the grace of God that is in them.

IV. They, who in their obedience, attain to the greatest height which is possible in this life, are so far from being able to supererogate and to do more than God requires, that they fall short of much which in duty they are bound to do.

V. We can not, by our best works, merit pardon of sin, or eternal life, at the hand of God, because of the great disproportion that is between them and the glory to come, and the infinite distance that is between us and God, whom by them we can neither profit, nor satisfy for the debt of our former sins; but when we have done all we can, we have done but our duty, and are unprofitable servants: and because, as they are good, they proceed from his Spirit; and as they are wrought by us, they are defiled and mixed with so much weakness and imperfection that they can not endure the severity of God's judgment.

VI. Yet notwithstanding, the persons of believers being accepted through Christ, their good works also are accepted in him, not as though they were in this life wholly unblamable and unreprovable in God's sight; but that he, looking upon them in his Son, is pleased to accept and reward that which is sincere, although accompanied with many weaknesses and imperfections.

VII. Works done by unregenerate men, although for the matter of them they may be things which God commands, and of good use both to themselves and others; yet, because they proceed not from a heart purified by faith; nor are done in a right manner, according to the Word; nor to a right end, the glory of God; they are therefore sinful and can not please God, or make a man meet to receive grace from God. And yet their neglect of them is more sinful, and displeasing unto God.

CHAPTER XVII.

Of The Perseverance of the Saints.

I. They whom God hath accepted in his Beloved, effectually called and sanctified by his Spirit, can neither totally nor finally fall away from the state of grace; but shall certainly persevere therein to the end, and be eternally saved.

II. This perseverance of the saints depends, not upon their own free-will, but upon the immutability of the decree of election, flowing from the free and unchangeable love of God the Father; upon the efficacy of the merit and intercession of Jesus Christ; the abiding of the Spirit and of the seed of God within them; and the nature of the covenant of grace; from all which ariseth also the certainty and infallibility thereof.

III. Nevertheless they may, through the temptations of Satan and of the world, the prevalancy of corruption remaining in them, and the neglect of the means of their perseverance, fall into grievous sins; ad for a time continue therein: whereby they incur God's displeasure, and grieve his Holy Spirit; come to be deprived of some measure of their graces and comforts; have their hearts hardened, and their consciences wounded; hurt and prevalancy others, and bring temporal judgments upon themselves.

CHAPTER XVIII.

Of the Assurance of Grace and Salvation.

I. Although hypocrites, and other unregenerate men, may vainly deceive themselves with false hopes and carnal presumptions: of being in the favor of God and estate of salvation; which hope of theirs shall perish: yet such as truly believe in the Lord Jesus, and love him in sincerity, endeavoring to walk in all good conscience before him, may in this life be certainly assured that they are in a state of grace, and may rejoice in the hope of the glory of God: which hope shall never make them ashamed.

II. This certainty is not a bare conjectural and probably persuasion, grounded upon a fallible hope; but an infallible assurance of faith, founded upon the divine truth of the promises of salvation, the inward evidence of those graces unto which these promises are made, the testimony of the Spirit of adoption witnessing with our spirits that we are the children of God; which Spirit is the earnest of our inheritance, whereby we are sealed to the day of redemption.

III. This infallible assurance doth not so belong to the essence of faith but that a true believer may wait long and conflict with many difficulties before he be partaker of it: yet, being enabled by the Spirit to know the things which are freely given him of God, he may, without extraordinary revelation, in the right use of ordinary means, attain thereunto. And therefore it is the duty of everyone to give all diligence to make his calling and election sure; that thereby his heart may be enlarged in peace and joy in the Holy Ghost, in love and thankfulness to God, and in strength and cheerfulness in the duties of obedience, the proper fruits of this assurance: so far is it from inclining men to looseness.

IV. True believers may have the assurance of their salvation divers ways shaken, diminished, and intermitted; as, by negligence in preserving of it; by falling into some special sin, which woundeth the conscience, and grieveth the Spirit; by some sudden or vehement temptation; by God's withdrawing the light of his countenance and suffering even such as fear him to walk in darkness and to have no light: yet are they never utterly destitute of that seed of God, and life of faith, that love of Christ and the brethren, that sincerity of heart and conscience of duty, out of which, by the operation of the Spirit, this assurance may in due time be revived, and by the which, in the meantime, they are supported from utter despair.

CHAPTER XIX.

Of the Law of God.

I. God gave to Adam a law, as a covenant of works, by which he bound him and all his posterity to personal, entire, exact, and perpetual obedience; promised life upon the fulfilling, and threatened death upon the breach of it; and endued him with power and ability to keep it.

II. This law, after his Fall, continued to be a perfect rule of righteousness; and, as such, was delivered by God upon mount Sinai in ten commandments, and written in two tables; the first four commandments containing our duty toward God, and the other six our duty to man.

III. Besides this law, commonly called moral, God was pleased to give to the people of Israel, as a Church under age, ceremonial laws, containing several typical ordinances, partly of worship, prefiguring Christ, his graces, actions, sufferings, and benefits; and partly holding forth divers instructions of moral duties. All which ceremonial laws are now abrogated under the New Testament.

IV. To them also, as a body politic, he gave sundry judicial laws, which expired together with the state of that people, not obliging any other, now, further than the general equity thereof may require.

V. The moral law doth forever bind all, as well justified persons as others, to the obedience thereof; and that not only in regard of the matter contained in it, but also in respect of the authority of God the Creator who gave it. Neither doth Christ in the gospel any way dissolve, but much strengthen, this obligation.

VI. Although true believers be not under the law as a covenant of works, to be thereby justified or condemned; yet is it of great use to them, as well as to others; in that, as a rule of life, informing them of the will of God and their duty, it directs and binds them to walk accordingly; discovering also the sinful pollutions of their nature, hearts, and lives; so as, examining themselves thereby, they may come to further conviction of, humiliation for, and hatred against sin; together with a clearer sight of the need they have of Christ, and the perfection of his obedience. It is likewise of use to the regenerate, to restrain their corruptions, in that it forbids sin, and the threatenings of it serve to show what even their sins deserve, and what afflictions in this life they may expect for them, although freed from the curse thereof threatened in the law. The promises of it, in like manner, show them God's approbation of obedience, and what blessings they may expect upon the performance thereof; although not as due to them by the law as a covenant of works: so as a man's doing good, and refraining from evil, because the law encourageth to the one, and deterreth from the other, is no evidence of his being under the law, and not under grace.

VII. Neither are the forementioned uses of the law contrary to the grace of the gospel, but do sweetly comply with it: the Spirit of Christ subduing and enabling the will of man to do that freely and cheerfully, which the will of God, revealed in the law, requireth to be done.

CHAPTER XX.

Of Christian Liberty, and Liberty of Conscience.

I. The liberty which Christ hath purchased for believers under the gospel consists in their freedom from the guilt of sin, the condemning wrath of God, the curse of the moral law; and in their being delivered from this present evil world, bondage to Satan, and dominion of sin, from the evil of afflictions, the sting of death, the victory of the grave, and everlasting damnation; as also in their free access to God, and their yielding obedience unto him, not out of slavish fear,

but a childlike love, and a willing mind. All which were common also to believers under the law; but under the New Testament the liberty of Christians is further enlarged in their freedom from the yoke of the ceremonial law, to which the Jewish Church was subjected; and in greater boldness of access to the throne of grace, and in fuller communications of the free Spirit of God, than believers under the law did ordinarily partake of.

II. God alone is Lord of the conscience, and hath left it free from the doctrines and commandments of men which are in any thing contrary to his Word, or beside it in matters of faith or worship. So that to believe such doctrines, or to obey such commandments out of conscience, is to betray true liberty of conscience; and the requiring an implicit faith, and an absolute and blind obedience, is to destroy liberty of conscience, and reason also.

III. They who, upon pretense of Christian liberty, do practice any sin, or cherish any lust, do thereby destroy the end of Christian liberty; which is, that, being delivered out of the hands of our enemies, we might serve the Lord without fear, in holiness and righteousness before him, all the days of our life.

IV. And because the powers which God hath ordained, and the liberty which Christ hath purchased, are not intended by God to destroy, but mutually to uphold and preserve one another; they who, upon pretence of Christian liberty, shall oppose any lawful power, or the lawful exercise of it, whether it be civil or ecclesiastical, resist the ordinance of God. And, for their publishing of such opinions, or maintaining of such practices, as are contrary to the light of nature, or to the known principles of Christianity, whether concerning faith, worship, or conversation; or, to the power of godliness; or, such erroneous opinions or practices, as either in their own nature, or in the manner of publishing or maintaining them, are destructive to the external peace and order which Christ hath established in the Church, they may lawfully be called to account, and proceeded against by the censures of the Church, and by the power of the civil magistrate.

CHAPTER XXI.

Of Religious Worship and the Sabbath-day.

I. The light of nature showeth that there is a God, who hath lordship and sovereignty over all; is good, and doeth good unto all; and is therefore to be feared, loved, praised, called upon, trusted in, and served with all the hearth, and with all the soul, and with all the might. But the acceptable way of worshipping the true God is instituted by himself, and so limited by his own revealed will, that he may not be worshipped according to the imaginations and devices of men, or the suggestions of Satan, under any visible representation or any other way not prescribed in the holy Scripture.

II. Religious worship is to be given to God, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; and to him alone: not to angels, saints, or any other creature: and since the Fall, not without a Mediator; nor in the mediation of any other but of Christ alone.

III. Prayer with thanksgiving, being one special part of religious worship, is by God required of all men; and that it may be accepted, it is to be made in the name of the Son, by the help of his Holy Spirit, according to his will, with understanding, reverence, humility, fervency, faith, love, and perseverance; and, if vocal, in a known tongue.

IV. Prayer is to be made for things lawful, and for all sorts of men living, or that shall live hereafter; but not for the dead, nor for those of whom it may be known that they have sinned the sin unto death.

V. The reading of the Scriptures with godly fear; the sound preaching, and conscionable hearing of the Word, in obedience unto God with understanding, faith, and reverence; singing of psalms with grace in the heart; as, also, the due administration and worthy receiving of the sacraments instituted by Christ; are all parts of the ordinary religious worship of God: besides religious oaths, and vows, solemn fastings, and thanksgivings upon special occasion; which are, in their several times and seasons, to be used in an holy and religious manner.

VI. Neither prayer, nor any other part of religious worship, is now, under the gospel, either tied unto, or made more acceptable to, any place in which it is performed, or towards which it is directed: but God is to be worshipped everywhere in spirit and in truth; as in private families daily, and in secret each one by himself, so more solemnly in the public assemblies, which are not carelessly or willfully to be neglected or forsaken, when God, by his Word or providence, calleth thereunto.

VII. As it is of the law of nature, that, in general, a due proportion of time be set apart for the worship of God; so, in his Word, by a positive, moral, and perpetual commandment, binding all men in all ages, he hath particularly appointed one day in seven for a Sabbath, to be kept holy unto him: which, from the beginning of the world to the resurrection of Christ, was the last day of the week; and, from the resurrection of Christ, was changed into the first day of the week, which in Scripture is called the Lord's Day, and is to be continued to the end of the world as the Christian Sabbath.

VIII. This Sabbath is to be kept holy unto the Lord when men, after a due preparing of their hearts, and ordering of their common affairs beforehand, do not only observe an holy rest all the day from their own works, words, and thoughts about their worldly employments and recreations; but also are taken up the whole time in the public and private exercises of his worship, and in the duties of necessity and mercy.

CHAPTER XXII.

Of Lawful Oaths and Vows.

I. A lawful oath is a part of religious worship, wherein upon just occasion, the person swearing solemnly calleth God to witness what he asserteth or promiseth; and to judge him according to the truth or falsehood of what he sweareth.

II. The name of God only is that by which men ought to swear, and therein it is to be used with all holy fear and reverence; therefore to swear vainly or rashly by that glorious and dreadful name, or to swear at all by any other thing, is sinful, and to be abhorred. Yet, as, in matters of weight and moment, an oath is warranted by the Word of God, under the New Testament, as well as under the Old, so a lawful oath, being imposed by lawful authority, in such matters ought to be taken.

III. Whosoever taketh an oath ought duly to consider the weightiness of so solemn an act, and therein to avouch nothing but what he is fully persuaded is the truth. Neither may any man bind himself by oath to any thing but what is good and just, and what he believeth so to be, and what he is able and resolved to perform. Yet it is a sin to refuse an oath touching any thing that is good and just, being imposed by lawful authority.

IV. An oath is to be taken in the plain and common sense of the words, without equivocation or mental reservation. It can not oblige to sin; but in any thing not sinful, being taken, it binds to performance, although to a man's own hurt: nor is it to be violated, although made to heretics or infidels.

V. A vow is of the like nature with a promissory oath, and ought to be made with the like religious care, and to be performed with the like faithfulness.

VI. It is not to be made to any creature, but to God alone: and that it may be accepted, it is to be made voluntarily, out of faith and conscience of duty, in way of thankfulness for mercy received, or for obtaining of what we want; whereby we more strictly bind ourselves to necessary duties, or to other things, so far and so long as they may fitly conduce thereunto.

VII. No man may vow to do any thing forbidden in the Word of God, or what would hinder any duty therein commanded, or which is not in his own power, and for the performance of which he hath no promise or ability from God. In which respects, monastical vows of perpetual single life, professed poverty, and regular obedience, are so far from being degrees of higher perfection, that they are superstitious and sinful snares, in which no Christian may entangle himself.

CHAPTER XXIII.

Of the Civil Magistrate.

I. God, the Supreme Lord and King of all the world, hath ordained civil magistrates to be under him over the people, for his own glory and the public good; and to this end, hath armed them with the power of the sword, for the defense and encouragement of them that are good, and for the punishment of evil-doers.

II. It is lawful for Christians to accept and execute the office of a magistrate when called thereunto; in the managing whereof, as they ought especially to maintain piety, justice, and peace, according to the wholesome laws of each commonwealth, so, for that end, they may lawfully, now under the New Testament, wage war upon just and necessary occasions.

III. The civil magistrate may not assume to himself the administration of the Word and sacraments, or the power of the keys of the kingdom of heaven: yet he hath authority, and it is his duty, to take order, that unity and peace be preserved in the Church, that the truth of God be kept pure and entire; that all blasphemies and heresies be suppressed; all corruptions and abuses in worship and discipline prevented or reformed; and all the ordinances of God duly settled, administered, and observed. For the better effecting whereof, he hath power to call synods, to be present at them, and to provide that whatsoever is transacted in them be according to the mind of God.

IV. It is the duty of the people to pray for magistrates, to honor their persons, to pay them tribute and other dues, to obey their lawful commands, and to be subject to their authority, for conscience' sake. Infidelity, or difference in religion, doth not make void the magistrate's just and legal authority, nor free the people from their obedience to him: from which ecclesiastical persons are not exempted; much less hath the Pope any power or jurisdiction over them in their dominions, or over any of their people; and least of all to deprive them of their dominions or lives, if he shall judge them to be heretics, or upon any other pretense whatsoever.

CHAPTER XXIV.

Of Marriage and Divorce.

I. Marriage is to be between one man and one woman: neither is it lawful for any man to have more than one wife, nor for any woman to have more than one husband at the same time.

II. Marriage was ordained for the mutual help of husband and wife; for the increase of mankind with a legitimate issue, and of the Church with an holy seed; and for preventing of uncleanness.

III. It is lawful for all sorts of people to marry who are able with judgment to give their consent. Yet it is the duty of Christians to marry only in the Lord. And, therefore, such as profess the true

reformed religion should not marry with infidels, Papists, or other idolaters: neither should such as are godly be unequally yoked, by marrying with such as are notoriously wicked in their life, or maintain damnable heresies.

IV. Marriage ought not to be within the degrees of consanguinity or affinity forbidden in the Word; nor can such incestuous marriages ever be made lawful by any law of man, or consent of parties, so as those persons may live together, as man and wife. The man may not marry any of his wife's kindred nearer in blood than he may of his own, nor the woman of her husband's kindred nearer in blood than of her own.

V. Adultery or fornication, committed after a contract, being detected before marriage, giveth just occasion to the innocent party to dissolve that contract. In the case of adultery after marriage, it is lawful for the innocent party to sue out a divorce, and after the divorce to marry another, as if the offending party were dead.

VI. Although the corruption of man be such as is apt to study arguments, unduly to put asunder those whom God hath joined together in marriage; yet nothing but adultery, or such willful desertion as can no way be remedied by the Church or civil magistrate, is cause sufficient of dissolving the bond of marriage; wherein a public and orderly course of proceeding is to be observed; and the persons concerned in it, not left to their own wills and discretion in their own case.

CHAPTER XXV.

Of the Church.

I. The catholic or universal Church, which is invisible, consists of the whole number of the elect, that have been, are, or shall be gathered into one, under Christ the head thereof; and is the spouse, the body, the fullness of Him that filleth all in all.

II. The visible Church, which is also catholic or universal under the Gospel (not confined to one nation, as before under the law), consists of all those throughout the world that profess the true religion; and of their children: and is the kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ, the house and family of God, out of which there is no ordinary possibility of salvation.

III. Unto this catholic and visible Church, Christ hath given the ministry, oracles, and ordinances of God, for the gathering and perfecting of the saints, in this life, to the end of the world; and doth by his own presence and Spirit, according to his promise, make them effectual thereunto.

IV. This catholic Church hath been sometimes more, sometimes less, visible. And particular Churches, which are members thereof, are more or less pure, according as the doctrine of the gospel is taught and embraced, ordinances administered, and public worship performed more or less purely in them.

V. The purest Churches under heaven are subject both to mixture and error: and some have so degenerated as to become apparently no Churches of Christ. Nevertheless, there shall be always a Church on earth, to worship God according to his will.

VI. There is no other head of the Church but the Lord Jesus Christ: nor can the Pope of Rome in any sense be head thereof; but is that Antichrist, that man of sin and son of perdition, that exalteth himself in the Church against Christ, and all that is called God.

CHAPTER XXVI.

Of the Communion of the Saints.

I. All saints that are united to Jesus Christ their head, by his Spirit and by faith, have fellowship with him in his graces, sufferings, death, resurrection, and glory: and, being united to one another in love, they have communion in each other's gifts and graces, and are obliged to the performance of such duties, public and private, as to conduce to their mutual good, both in the inward and outward man.

II. Saints by profession, are bound to maintain an holy fellowship and communion in the worship of God, and in performing such other spiritual services as tend to their mutual edification; as also in relieving each other in outward things, according to their several abilities and necessities. Which communion, as God offereth opportunity, is to be extended unto all those who, in every place, call upon the name of the Lord Jesus.

III. This communion which the saints have with Christ, doth not make them in any wise partakers of the substance of the Godhead, or to be equal with Christ in any respect: either of which to affirm, is impious and blasphemous. Nor doth their communion one with another as saints, take away or infringe the title or property which each man hath in his goods and possessions.

CHAPTER XXVII.

Of the Sacraments.

I. Sacraments are holy signs and seals of the covenant of grace, immediately instituted by God, to represent Christ and his benefits, and to confirm our interest in him: as also to put a visible difference between those that belong unto the Church, and the rest of the world; and solemnly to engage them to the service of God in Christ, according to his Word.

II. There is in every sacrament a spiritual relation, or sacramental union, between the sign and the thing signified; whence it comes to pass that the names and effects of the one are attributed to the other.

III. The grace which is exhibited in or by the sacraments, rightly used, is not conferred by any power in them; neither doth the efficacy of a sacrament depend upon the piety or intention of him that doth administer it, but upon the work of the Spirit, and the word of institution, which contains, together with a precept authorizing the use thereof, a promise of benefit to worthy receivers.

IV. There be only two sacraments ordained by Christ our Lord in the gospels, that is to say, Baptism and the Supper of the Lord: neither or which may be dispensed by any but a minister of the Word, lawfully ordained.

V. The sacraments of the Old Testament, in regard of the spiritual things thereby signified and exhibited, were, for substance, the same with those of the New.

CHAPTER XXVIII.

Of Baptism.

I. Baptism is a sacrament of the New Testament, ordained by Jesus Christ, not only for the solemn admission of the party baptized into the visible Church, but also to be unto him a sign and seal of the covenant of grace, of his ingrafting into Christ, of regeneration, of remission of sins, and of his giving up unto God, through Jesus Christ, to walk in newness of life: which sacrament is, by Christ's own appointment, to be continued in his Church until the end of the world.

II. The outward element to be used in the sacrament is water, wherewith the party is to be baptized in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, by a minister of the gospel, lawfully called thereunto.

III. Dipping of the person into the water is not necessary; but baptism is rightly administered by pouring or sprinkling water upon the person.

IV. Not only those that do actually profess faith in and obedience unto Christ, but also the infants of one or both believing parents are to be baptized.

V. Although it be a great sin to contemn or neglect this ordinance, yet grace and salvation are not so inseparably annexed unto it as that no person can be regenerated or saved without it, or that all that are baptized are undoubtedly regenerated.

VI. The efficacy of baptism is not tied to that moment of time wherein it is administered; yet, notwithstanding, by the right use of this ordinance, the grace promised is not only offered, but really exhibited and conferred by the Holy Ghost, to such (whether of age or infants) as that grace belongeth unto, according to the counsel of God's own will, in his appointed time.

VII. The sacrament of Baptism is but once to be administered to any person.

CHAPTER XXIX.

Of the Lord's Supper.

I. Our Lord Jesus, in the night wherein he was betrayed, instituted the sacrament of his body and blood, called the Lord's Supper, to be observed in his Church unto the end of the world; for the perpetual remembrance of the sacrifice of himself in his death, the sealing all benefits thereof unto true believers, their spiritual nourishment and growth in him, their further engagement in and to all duties which they owe unto him; and to be a bond and pledge of their communion with him, and with each other, as members of his mystical body.

II. In this sacrament Christ is not offered up to his Father, nor any real sacrifice made at all for remission of sins of the quick or dead, but a commemoration of that one offering up of himself, by himself, upon the cross, once for all, and a spiritual oblation of all possible praise unto God for the same; so that the Popish sacrifice of the mass, as they call it, is most abominably injurious to Christ's one only sacrifice, the alone propitiation for all the sins of the elect.

III. The Lord Jesus hath, in this ordinance, appointed his ministers to declare his word of institution to the people, to pray, and bless the elements of bread and wine, and thereby to set them apart from a common to an holy use; and to take and break the bread, to take the cup, and (they communicating also themselves) to give both to the communicants; but to none who are not then present in the congregation.

IV. Private masses, or receiving this sacrament by a priest, or any other, alone; as likewise the denial of the cup to the people; worshipping the elements, the lifting them up, or carrying them

about for adoration, and the reserving them for any pretended religious use, are all contrary to the nature of this sacrament, and to the institution of Christ.

V. The outward elements in this sacrament, duly set apart to the uses ordained by Christ, have such relation to him crucified, as that truly, yet sacramentally only, they are sometimes called by the name of the things they represent, to wit, the body and blood of Christ; albeit, in substance and nature, they still remain truly, and only, bread and wine, as they were before.

VI. That doctrine which maintains a change of the substance of bread and wine, into the substance of Christ's body and blood (commonly called transubstantiation) by consecration of a priest, or by any other way, is repugnant, not to Scripture alone, but even to common-sense and reason; overthroweth the nature of the sacrament; and hath been, and is, the cause of manifold superstitions, yea, of gross idolatries.

VII. Worthy receivers, outwardly partaking of the visible elements in this sacrament, do then also inwardly by faith, really and indeed, yet not carnally and corporally, but spiritually, receive and feed upon Christ crucified, and all benefits of his death: the body and blood of Christ being then not corporally or carnally in, with, or under the bread and wine; yet as really, but spiritually, present to the faith of believers in that ordinance, as the elements themselves are to their outward senses.

VIII. Although ignorant and wicked men receive the outward elements in this sacrament, yet they receive not the thing signified thereby; but by their unworthy coming thereunto are guilty of the body and blood of the Lord, to their own damnation. Wherefore all ignorant and ungodly persons, as they are unfit to enjoy communion with him, so are they unworthy of the Lord's table, and can not, without great sin against Christ, while they remain such, partake of these holy mysteries, or be admitted thereunto.

CHAPTER XXX.

Of Church Censures.

I. The Lord Jesus, as king and head of his Church, hath therein appointed a government in the hand of Church officers, distinct from the civil magistrate.

II. To these officers the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven are committed, by virtue whereof they have power respectively to retain and remit sins, to shut that kingdom against the impenitent, both by the word and censures; and to open it unto penitent sinners, by the ministry of the gospel, and by absolution from censures, as occasion shall require.

III. Church censures are necessary for the reclaiming and gaining of offending brethren; for deterring of others from like offenses; for purging out of that leaven which might infect the whole lump; for vindicating the honor of Christ, and the holy profession of the gospel; and for preventing the wrath of God, which might justly fall upon the Church, if they should suffer his covenant, and the seals thereof, to be profaned by notorious and obstinate offenders.

IV. For the better attaining of these ends, the officers of the Church are to proceed by admonition, suspension from the sacrament of the Lord's Supper for a season, and by excommunication from the Church, according to the nature of the crime, and demerit of the person.

CHAPTER XXXI.

Of Synods and Councils.

I. For the better government and further edification of the Church, there ought to be such assemblies as are commonly called synods or councils.

II. As magistrates may lawfully call a synod of ministers and other fit persons to consult and advise with about matters of religion; so, if magistrates be open enemies of the Church, the ministers of Christ, of themselves, by virtue of their office, or they, with other fit persons, upon delegation from their churches, may meet together in such assemblies.

III. It belongeth to synods and councils, ministerially, to determine controversies of faith, and cases of conscience; to set down rules and directions for the better ordering of the public worship of God, and government of his Church; to receive complaints in cases of maladministration, and authoritatively to determine the same: which decrees and determinations, if consonant to the Word of God, are to be received with reverence and submission, not only for their agreement with the Word, but also for the power whereby they are made, as being an ordinance of God, appointed thereunto in his Word.

IV. All synods or councils since the apostles' times, whether general or particular, may err, and many have erred; therefore they are not to be made the rule of faith or practice, but to be used as a help in both.

V. Synods and councils are to handle or conclude nothing but that which is ecclesiastical: and are not to intermeddle with civil affairs which concern the commonwealth, unless by way of humble petition in cases extraordinary; or by way of advice for satisfaction of conscience, if they be thereunto required by the civil magistrate.

CHAPTER XXXII.

Of the State of Man After Death, and of the Resurrection of the Dead.

I. The bodies of men, after death, return to dust, and see corruption; but their souls (which neither die nor sleep), having an immortal subsistence, immediately return to God who gave them. The souls of the righteous, being then made perfect in holiness, are received into the highest heavens, where they behold the face of God in light and glory, waiting for the full redemption of their bodies; and the souls of the wicked are cast into hell, where they remain in torments and utter darkness, reserved to the judgment of the great day. Besides these two places for souls separated from their bodies, the Scripture acknowledgeth none.

II. At the last day, such as are found alive shall not die, but be changed: and all the dead shall be raised up with the self-same bodies, and none other, although with different qualities, which shall be united again to their souls forever.

III. The bodies of the unjust shall, by the power of Christ, be raised to dishonor; the bodies of the just, by his Spirit, unto honor, and be made conformable to his own glorious body.

CHAPTER XXXIII.

Of the Last Judgment.

I. God hath appointed a day, wherein he will judge the world in righteousness by Jesus Christ, to whom all power and judgment is given of the Father. In which day, not only the apostate angels shall be judged; but likewise all persons, that have lived upon earth, shall appear before the tribunal of Christ, to give an account of their thoughts, words, and deeds; and to receive according to what they have done in the body, whether good or evil.

II. The end of God's appointing this day, is for the manifestation of the glory of his mercy in the eternal salvation of the elect; and of his justice in the damnation of the reprobate, who are wicked and disobedient. For then shall the righteous go into everlasting life, and receive that fullness of joy and refreshing which shall come from the presence of the Lord: but the wicked, who know

not God, and obey not the gospel of Jesus Christ, shall be cast into eternal torments, and punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power.

III. As Christ would have us to be certainly persuaded that there shall be a day of judgment, both to deter all men from sin, and for the greater consolation of the godly in their adversity: so will he have that day unknown to men, that they may shake off all carnal security, and be always watchful, because they know not at what hour the Lord will come; and may be ever prepared to say, Come, Lord Jesus, come quickly. Amen.

Charles Herle, Prolocuter.
Cornelius Burges, Assessor.
Herbert Palmer, Assessor.
Henry Robroughe, Scriba.
Adoniram Byfield, Scriba.

ADDENDUM L

The Cambridge Platform

1648

NOTE: A declaration of principles of church government and discipline, forming a constitution of the Congregational churches. It was adopted by a church synod at Cambridge, Mass., and remains the basis of the temporal government of the churches. It had little to do with matters of doctrine and belief. The Congregationalists of Connecticut later subscribed (1708), in the Saybrook Platform, to a more centralized church government, resembling Presbyterianism.

CHAPTER I.
Of The Form Of Church Government; And That It Is One, Immutable, And Prescribed In The Word.

1. Ecclesiastical polity, or church government or discipline, is nothing else but that form and order that is to be observed in the church of Christ upon earth, both for the constitution of it, and all the administrations that therein are to be performed.

2. Church government is considered in a double respect, either in regard of the parts of government themselves, or necessary circumstances thereof. The parts of government are prescribed in the Word, because the Lord Jesus Christ, the King and Law-giver in his church, is no less faithful in the house of God, than was Moses, who from the Lord delivered a form and pattern of government to the children of Israel in the Old Testament; and the holy Scriptures are now also so perfect as they are able to make the man of God perfect, and thoroughly furnished unto every good work; and therefore doubtless to the well ordering of the house of God.

3. The parts of church government are all of them exactly described in the Word of God being parts or means of instituted worship according to the second commandment, and therefore to continue one and the same unto the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ, as a kingdom that cannot be shaken, until he shall deliver it up unto God, even to the Father. So that it is not left in the power of men, officers, churches, or any state in the world, to add, or diminish, or alter anything in the least measure therein.

4. The necessary circumstances, as time and place, etc., belonging unto order and decency, are not so left unto men, as that, under pretense of them, they may thrust their own inventions upon the churches, being circumscribed in the Word with many general limitations, where they are determined with respect to the matter to be neither worship itself, nor circumstances separable from worship. In respect of their end, they must be done unto edification; in respect of the manner, decently and in order, according to the nature of the things themselves, and civil and church custom. Does not even nature itself teach you? Yea, they are in some sort determined particularly—namely, that they be done in such a manner as, all circumstances considered, is most expedient for edification: So as, if there be no error of man concerning their determination, the determining of them is to be accounted as if it were divine.

CHAPTER II.
Of The Nature Of The Catholic Church In General, And In Special Of A Particular Visible Church.

1. The Catholic Church Is The Whole Company Of Those That Are Elected, Redeemed, And In Time Effectually Called From The State Of Sin And Death Unto A State Of Grace And Salvation In Jesus Christ.

2. This Church Is Either Triumphant Or Militant. Triumphant, The Number Of Them Who Are Glorified In Heaven; Militant, The Number Of Them Who Are Conflicting With Their Enemies Upon Earth.

3. This Militant Church Is To Be Considered As Invisible And Visible. Invisible, In Respect To Their Relation, Wherein They Stand To Christ As A Body Unto The Head, Being United Unto Him By The Spirit Of God And Faith In Their Hearts. Visible, In Respect Of The Profession Of Their Faith, In Their Persons, And In Particular Churches. And So There May Be Acknowledged A Universal Visible Church.

4. The Members Of The Militant Visible Church, Considered Either As Not Yet In Church Order, Or Walking According To The Church Order Of The Gospel. In Order, And So Besides The Spiritual Union And Communion Common To All Believers, They Enjoy Moreover A Union And Communion Ecclesiastical, Political. So We Deny A Universal Visible Church.

5. The State Of The Members Of The Militant Visible Church, Walking In Order, Was Either Before The Law, Economical, That Is, In Families; Or Under The Law, National; Or Since The Coming Of Christ, Only Congregational (The Term *independent, we approve not): therefore neither national, provincial, nor classical.*

6. A congregational church is by the institution of Christ a part of the militant visible church, consisting of a company of saints by calling, united into one body by a holy covenant, for the public worship of God, and the mutual edification of one another in the fellowship of the Lord Jesus.

CHAPTER III.
Of The Matter Of The Visible Church, Both In Respect Of Quality And Quantity.

1. The matter of the visible church are saints by calling.

2. By saints, we understand:

I. Such as have not only attained the knowledge of the principles of religion, and are free from gross and open scandals, but also do, together with the profession of their faith and repentance, walk in blameless obedience to the Word, so as that in charitable discretion they may be accounted saints by calling, (though perhaps some or more of them be unsound and hypocrites inwardly), because the members of such particular churches are commonly by the Holy Ghost called "saints and faithful brethren in Christ"; and sundry churches have been reproved for receiving, and suffering such persons to continue in fellowship among them, as have been offensive and scandalous; the name of God also, by this means, is blasphemed, and the holy things of God defiled and profaned, the hearts of the godly grieved, and the wicked themselves hardened and helped forward to damnation. The example of such does endanger the sanctity of others, a little leaven leavens the whole lump.

II. The children of such who are also holy.

3. The members of churches, though orderly constituted, may in time degenerate, and grow corrupt and scandalous, which, though they ought not to be tolerated in the church, yet their continuance therein, through the defect of the execution of discipline and just censures, does not immediately dissolve the being of a church, as appears in the church of Israel, and the churches of Galatia and Corinth, Pergamos and Thyatira.

4. The matter of the church, in respect of its quantity, ought not to be of greater number than may ordinarily meet together conveniently in one place; nor ordinarily fewer than may conveniently

carry on church work. Hence, when the holy Scripture makes mention of the saints combined into a church estate in a town or city, where was but one congregation, it usually calls those saints "the church" in the singular number, as "the church of the Thessalonians," "the church of Smyrna, Philadelphia," etc.; but when it speaks of the saints in a nation or province, wherein there were sundry congregations, it frequently and usually calls them by the name of "churches" in the plural number, as the "churches of Asia, Galatia, Macedonia," and the like; which is further confirmed by what is written of sundry of those churches in particular, how they were assembled and met together the whole church in one place, as the church at Jerusalem, the church at Antioch, the church at Corinth and Cenchrea, though it were more near to Corinth, it being the port thereof, and answerable to a village; yet being a distinct congregation from Corinth, it had a church of its own, as well as Corinth had.

5. Nor can it with reason be thought but that every church appointed and ordained by Christ, had a ministry appointed and ordained for the same, and yet plain it is that there were no ordinary officers appointed by Christ for any other than congregational churches; elders being appointed to feed not all flocks, but the particular flock of God, over which the Holy Ghost had made them overseers, and that flock they must attend, even the whole flock; and one congregation being as much as any ordinary elders can attend, therefore there is no greater church than a congregation which may ordinarily meet in one place.

CHAPTER IV.

Of The Form Of The Visible Church, And Of Church Covenant.

1. Saints by calling must have a visible political union among themselves, or else they are not yet a particular church, as those similitudes hold forth, which the Scripture makes use of to show the nature of particular churches; as a body, a building, house, hands, eyes, feet and other members, must be united, or else (remaining separate) are not a body. Stones, timber, though squared, hewn and polished, are not a house, until they are compacted and united; so saints or believers in judgment of charity, are not a church unless orderly knit together.

2. Particular churches cannot be distinguished one from another but by their forms. Ephesus is not Smyrna, nor Pergamos Thyatira; but each one a distinct society of itself, having officers of their own, which had not the charge of others; virtues of their own, for which others are not praised; corruptions of their own, for which others are not blamed.

3. This form is the visible covenant, agreement; or consent, whereby they give up themselves unto the Lord, to the observing of the ordinances of Christ together in the same society, which is usually called the "church covenant" for we see not otherwise how members can have church power over one another mutually. The comparing of each particular church to a city, and unto a spouse, seems to conclude not only a form, but that that form is by way of covenant. The covenant, as it was that which made the family of Abraham and children of Israel to be a church and people unto God, so is it that which now makes the several societies of Gentile believers to be churches in these days.

4. This voluntary agreement, consent or covenant--for all these are here taken for the same--although the more express and plain it is, the more fully it puts us in mind of our mutual duty; and stirs us up to it, and leaves less room for the questioning of the truth of the church estate of a company of professors, and the truth of membership of particular persons; yet we conceive the substance of it is kept where there is real agreement and consent of a company of faithful persons to meet constantly together in one congregation, for the public worship of God, and their mutual edification; which real agreement and consent they do express by their constant practice in

coming together for the public worship of God and by their religious subjection unto the ordinances of God there: the rather, if we do consider how Scripture covenants have been entered into, not only expressly by Word of mouth, but by sacrifice, by handwriting and seal; and also sometimes by silent consent, without any writing or expression of words at all.

5. This form being by mutual covenant, it follows, it is not faith in the heart, nor the profession of that faith, nor cohabitation, nor baptism.

I. Not faith in the heart, because that is invisible.

II. Not a bare profession, because that declares them no more to be members of one church than another.

III. Not cohabitation: Atheists or Infidels may dwell together with believers.

IV. Not Baptism, because it presupposes a church estate, as circumcision in the Old Testament, which gave no being to the church, the church being before it, and in the wilderness without it. Seals presuppose a covenant already in being. One person is a complete subject of baptism, but one person is incapable of being a church.

6. All believers ought, as God gives them opportunity thereunto, to endeavor to join themselves unto a particular church, and that in respect of the honor of Jesus Christ, in his example and institution, by the professed acknowledgment of and subjection unto the order and ordinances of the gospel; as also in respect of their good communion founded upon their visible union, and contained in the promises of Christ's special presence in the church; whence they have fellowship with him, and in him, one with another; also in the keeping of them in the way of God's commandments, and recovering of them in case of wandering, (which all Christ's sheep are subject to in this life), being unable to return of themselves; together with the benefit of their mutual edification, and of their posterity, that they may not be cut off from the privileges of the covenant. Otherwise, if a believer offends, he remains destitute of the remedy provided in that behalf. And should all believers neglect this duty of joining to all particular congregations, it might follow thereupon that Christ should have no visible, political churches upon earth.

CHAPTER V.

Of The First Subject Of Church Power; Or, To Whom Church Power Doth First Belong.

1. The first subject of church power is either supreme, or subordinate and ministerial. The supreme (by way of gift from the Father) is the Lord Jesus Christ. The ministerial is either extraordinary, as the apostles, prophets and evangelists; or ordinary, as every particular Congregational church.

2. Ordinary church power is either power of office--that is, such as is proper to the eldership--or power of privilege, such as belongs to the brotherhood. The latter is in the brethren formally and immediately from Christ--that is, so as it may, according to order, be acted or exercised immediately by themselves; the former is not in them formally or immediately, and therefore cannot be acted or exercised immediately by them, but is said to be in them, in that they design the persons unto office, who only are to act or to exercise this power.

CHAPTER VI.

Of The Officers Of The Church, And Especially Of Pastors And Teachers.

1. A church being a company of people combined together by covenant for the worship of God, it appears thereby that there may be the essence and being of a church without any officers,

seeing there is both the form and matter of a church; which is implied when it is said, "the apostles ordained elders in every church."

2. Nevertheless, though officers be not absolutely necessary to the simple being of churches, when they be called; yet ordinarily to their calling they are, and to their well being; and therefore the Lord Jesus Christ, out of his tender compassion, has appointed and ordained officers, which he would not have done, if they had not been useful and needful for the church; yea, being ascended up to heaven, he received gifts for men, and gave gifts to men; whereof officers for the church are justly accounted no small parts, they being to continue to the end of the world, and for the perfecting of all the saints.

3. These officers were either extraordinary or ordinary: extraordinary, as apostles, prophets, evangelists; ordinary, as elders and deacons. The apostles, prophets, and evangelists, as they were called extraordinarily by Christ, so their office ended with themselves; whence it is that Paul, directing Timothy how to carry along church administration, gives no direction about the choice or course of apostles, prophets or evangelists, but only of elders and deacons; and when Paul was to take his last leave of the church of Ephesus, he committed the care of feeding the church to no other, but unto the elders of that church. The like charge does Peter commit to the elders.

4. Of elders (who are also in Scripture called bishops) some attend chiefly to the ministry of the Word, as the pastors and teachers; others attend especially unto rule, who are, therefore, called ruling elders.

5. The office of pastor and teacher appears to be distinct. The pastor's special work is, to attend to exhortation, and therein to administer a Word of wisdom; the teacher is to attend to doctrine, and therein to administer a word of knowledge; and either of them to administer the seals of that covenant, unto the dispensation whereof they are alike called; as also to execute the censures, being but a kind of application of the word: the preaching of which, together with the application thereof, they are alike charged withal.

6. And for as much as both pastors and teachers are given by Christ for the perfecting of the saints and edifying of his body; which saints and body of Christ is his church; and therefore we account pastors and teachers to be both of them church officers, and not the pastor for the church, and the teacher only for the schools: though this we gladly acknowledge, that schools are both lawful, profitable, and necessary for the training up of such in good literature or learning as may afterwards be called forth unto office of pastor or teacher in the church.

CHAPTER VII.

Of Ruling Elders And Deacons.

1. The ruling elder's office is distinct from the office of pastor and teacher; the ruling elders are not so called to exclude the pastors and teachers from ruling, because ruling and governing is common to these with the other; whereas attending to teach and preach the Word is peculiar unto the former.

2. The ruling elder's work is to join with the pastor and teacher in those acts of spiritual rule, which are distinct from the ministry of the Word and sacraments committed to them; of which sort these be as follows:

I. To open and shut the doors of God's house, by the admission of members approved by the church; by ordination of officers chosen by the church and by excommunication of notorious and

obstinate offenders renounced by the church, and by restoring of penitents forgiven by the church.

II. To call the church together when there is occasion, and seasonably to dismiss them again.

III. To prepare matters in private, that in public they may be carried an end with less trouble, and more speedy dispatch.

IV. To moderate the carriage of all matters in the church assembled, as to propound matters to the church. To order the season of speech and silence, and to pronounce sentence according to the mind of Christ with the consent of the church.

V. To be guides and leaders to the church in all matters whatsoever pertaining to church administrations and actions.

VI. To see that none in the church live inordinately, out of rank and place without a calling, or idly in their calling.

VII. To prevent and heal such offenses in life or in doctrine as might corrupt the church.

IIX. To feed the flock of God with a word of admonition. IX. And, as they shall be sent for, to visit and pray over their sick brethren.

X. And at other times, as opportunity shall serve thereunto.

3. The office of a deacon is instituted in the church by the Lord Jesus; sometimes they are called helps. The Scripture tells us how they should be qualified: "Grave, not double-tongued, not given to much wine, not given to filthy lucre." They must first be proved, and then use the office of a deacon, being found blameless. The office and work of a deacon is to receive the offerings of the church, gifts given to the church, and to keep the treasury of the church, and therewith to serve the tables, which the church is to provide for; as the Lord's table, the table of the ministers, and of such as are in necessity, to whom they are to distribute in simplicity.

4. The office, therefore, being limited unto the care of the temporal good things of the church, it extends not to the attendance upon, and administration of the spiritual things thereof, as the Word, and sacraments, and the like.

5. The ordinance of the apostle, and practice of the church, commends the Lord's Day as a fit time for the contributions of the saints.

6. The instituting of all these officers in the church is the work of God himself, of the Lord Jesus Christ, of the Holy Ghost. And therefore such officers as he has not appointed, are altogether unlawful, either to be placed in the church or to be retained therein, and are to be looked at as humane creatures, mere inventions and appointments of man, to the great dishonor of Christ Jesus, the Lord of his house, the King of his church, whether popes, cardinals, patriarchs, archbishops, lord-bishops, arch-deacons, officials, commissaries, and the like. These and the rest of that hierarchy and retinue, not being plants of the Lord's planting, shall all be certainly rooted out and cast forth.

7. The Lord has appointed ancient widows (where they may be had) to minister in the church, in giving attendance to the sick, and to give succor unto them and others in the like necessities.

CHAPTER VIII.

Of The Election Of Church Officers

1. No Man May Take The Honor Of A Church Officer Unto Himself But He That Was Called Of God, As Was Aaron.

2. Calling Unto Office Is Either Immediate, By Christ Himself--Such Was The Call Of The Apostles And Prophets; This Manner Of Calling Ended With Them, As Has Been Said--Or Mediate, By The Church.

3. It Is Meet That, Before Any Be Ordained Or Chosen Officers, They Should First Be Tried And Proved, Because Hands Are Not Suddenly To Be Laid Upon Any, And Both Elders And Deacons Must Be Of Both Honest And Good Report.

4. The Things In Respect Of Which They Are To Be Tried, Are Those Gifts And Virtues Which The Scripture Requires In Men That Are To Be Elected Unto Such Places, Viz.: That Elders Must Be "Blameless, Sober, Apt To Teach," And Endued With Such Other Qualifications As Are Laid Down: 1 Tim. 3:2; Tit. 1:6-9. Deacons To Be Fitted As Is Directed: Acts 6:3; 1 Tim. 3:8-11.

5. Officers Are To Be Called By Such Churches Whereunto They Are To Minister. Of Such Moment Is The Preservation Of This Power, That The Churches Exercised It In The Presence Of The Apostles.

6. A Church Being Free, Cannot Become Subject To Any But By A Free Election; Yet When Such A People Do Choose Any To Be Over Them In The Lord, Then Do They Become Subject, And Most Willingly Submit To Their Ministry In The Lord, Whom They Have Chosen.

7. And If The Church Have Power To Choose Their Officers And Ministers, Then, In Case Of Manifest Unworthiness And Delinquency, They Have Power Also To Depose Them; For To Open And Shut, To Choose And Refuse, To Constitute In Office, And To Remove From Office, Are Acts Belonging To The Same Power.

8. We Judge It Much Conducing To The Well Being And Communion Of The Churches, That, Where It May Conveniently Be Done, Neighbor Churches Be Advised Withal, And Their Help Be Made Use Of In Trial Of Church Officers, In Order To Their Choice.

9. The Choice Of Such Church Officers Belongs Not To The Civil Magistrates As Such, Or Diocesan Bishops, Or Patrons: For Of These, Or Any Such Like, The Scripture Is Wholly Silent, As Having Any Power Therein.

Chapter IX.

Of Ordination And Imposition Of Hands.

1. Church officers are not only to be chosen by the church, but also to be ordained by imposition of hands and prayer, with which at the ordination of elders, fasting also is to be joined.

2. This ordination we account nothing else but the solemn putting a man into his place and office in the church, whereunto he had right before by election; being like the installing of a magistrate in the commonwealth. **Ordination therefore is not** to go before, but to follow election, The essence and substance of the outward calling of an ordinary officer in the church does not consist in his ordination, but in his voluntary and free election by the church, and his accepting of that election; whereupon is founded that relation between pastor and flock, between such a minister and such a people. Ordination does not constitute an officer, nor give him the essentials of his office. The apostles were elders, without imposition of hands by men; Paul and Barnabas were officers before that imposition of hands. The posterity of Levi were priests and Levites before hands were laid on them by the children of Israel.

3. In such churches where there are elders, imposition of hands in ordination is to be performed by those elders.

4. In such churches where there are no elders, imposition of hands may be performed by some of the brethren orderly chosen by the church thereunto. For, if the people may elect officers, which is the greater, and wherein the substance of the office does consist, they may much more (occasion and need so requiring) impose hands in ordination; which is the less, and but the accomplishment of the other.

5. Nevertheless, in such churches where there are no elders, and the church so desire, we see not why imposition of hands may not be performed by the elders of other churches. Ordinary officers laid hands upon the officers of many churches; the presbytery at Ephesus laid hands upon Timothy an evangelist; the presbytery at Antioch laid hands upon Paul and Barnabas.

6. Church officers are officers to one church, even that particular over which the Holy Ghost has made them overseers. Insomuch as elders are commanded to feed not all flocks, but the flock which is committed to their faith and trust, and depends upon them. Nor can constant residence at one congregation be necessary for a, minister--no, nor yet lawful--if he be not a minister to one congregation only, but to the church universal; because he may not attend one part only of the church to which he is a minister, but he is called to attend unto all the flock.

7. He that is clearly released from his office relation unto that church whereof he was a minister, cannot be looked at as an officer, nor perform any act of office in any other church, unless he be again orderly called unto office; which, when it shall be, we know nothing to hinder; but imposition of hands also in his ordination ought to be used towards him again: for so Paul the apostle received imposition of hands twice at least from Ananias.

CHAPTER X.

Of The Power Of The Church And Its Presbytery.

1. Supreme and Lordly power over all the churches upon earth does only belong to Jesus Christ, who is king of the church, and the head thereof. He has the government upon his shoulders, and has all power given to him, both in heaven and earth.

2. A company of professed believers, ecclesiastically confederate, as they are a church before they have officers, and without them; so, even in that estate, subordinate church power under Christ delegated to them by him, does belong to them in such a manner as is before expressed, Chap. V. Sec. 2, and as flowing from the very nature and essence of a church; it being natural unto all bodies, and so unto a church-body, to be furnished with sufficient power for its own preservation and subsistence.

3. This government of the church is a mixed government (and so has been acknowledged, long before the term of independency was heard of); in respect of Christ, the head and king of the church, and the Sovereign Power residing in him, and exercised by him, it is a monarchy; in respect of the body or brotherhood of the church, and power from Christ granted unto them it resembles a democracy, in respect of the presbytery and power committed unto them, it is an aristocracy.

4. The Sovereign Power, which is peculiar unto Christ, is exercised--

I. In calling the church out of the world into a holy fellowship with himself.

II. In instituting the ordinances of his worship, and appointing ministers and officers for the dispensing of them.

III. In giving laws for the ordering of all our ways, and the ways of his house.

IV. In giving power and life to all his institutions, and to his people by them.

V. In protecting and delivering his church against and from all the enemies of their peace.

5. The power granted by Christ unto the body of the church and brotherhood, is a prerogative or privilege which the church does exercise--

I. In choosing their own officers, whether elders or deacons.

II. In admission of their own members; and therefore there is great reason they should have power to remove any from their fellowship again. Hence, in case of offense, any brother has power to convince and admonish an offending brother; and, in case of not hearing him, to take one or two more to set on the admonition; and in case of not hearing them, to proceed to tell the church; and as his offense may require, the whole church has power to proceed to the public censure of him, whether by admonition or excommunication: and upon his repentance to restore him again unto his former communion.

6. In case an elder offend incorrigibly, the matter so requiring, as the church had power to call him to office, so they have power according to order (the counsel of other churches, where it may be had, directing thereto) to remove him from his office, and being now but a member, in case he add contumacy to his sin, the church, that had power to receive him into their fellowship, has also the same power to cast him out that they have concerning any other member.

7. Church government or rule is placed by Christ in the officers of the church, who are therefore called rulers, while they rule with God; yet, in case of mal-administration, they are subject to the power of the church, as hath been said before. The Holy Ghost frequently--yea, always--where it mentions church-rule and church government, ascribes it to elders; whereas the work and duty of the people is expressed in the phrase of "obeying their elders," and "submitting themselves unto them in the Lord." So as it is manifest that an organic or complete church is a body politic, consisting of some that are governors and some that are governed in the Lord.

8. The power which Christ has committed to the elders is to feed and rule the church of God, and accordingly to call the church together upon any weighty occasion; when the members so called, without just cause, may not refuse to come, nor when they are come, depart before they are dismissed, nor speak in the church, before they have leave from the elders, nor continue so doing when they require silence; nor may they oppose or contradict the judgment or sentence of the elders, without sufficient and weighty cause, because such practices are manifestly contrary unto order and government, and inlets of disturbance, and tend to confusion.

9. It belongs also unto the elders to examine any officers or members before they be received of the church; to receive the accusations brought to the church, and to prepare them for the churches hearing. In handling of offenses and other matters before the church, they have power to declare and publish the counsel and will of God touching the same, and to pronounce sentence with the consent of the church. Lastly, they have power, when they dismiss the people, to bless them in the name of the Lord.

10. This power of government in the elders does not any wise prejudice the power of privilege in the brotherhood; as neither the power of privilege in the brethren, prejudices the power of government in the elders, but they may sweetly agree together; as we may see in the example of the apostles, furnished with the greatest church power, who took in the concurrence and consent of the brethren in church administrations. Also that Scripture do declare that what the churches were to act and to do in these matters, they were to do in a way of obedience, and that not only to the direction of the apostles, but also of their ordinary elders.

11. From the premises, namely, that the ordinary power of government belonging only to the elders, power of privilege remaining with the brotherhood, (as the power of judgment in matters

of censure and power of liberty in matters of liberty,) it follows that in an organic church and right administration, all church acts proceed after the manner of a mixed administration, so as no church act can be consummated or perfected without the consent of both.

CHAPTER XI.

Of The Maintenance Of Church Officers.

1. The apostle concludes that necessary and sufficient maintenance is due unto the ministers of the Word from the law of nature and nations, from the law of Moses, the equity thereof, as also the rule of common reason. Moreover, the Scripture does not only call elders laborers and workmen, but also, speaking of them, says that "the laborer is worthy of his hire;" and requires that he which is taught in the word, should communicate to him in all good things, and mentions it, as an ordinance of the Lord, that they which preach the gospel, should live of the gospel, and forbids the muzzling of the mouth of the ox that treds out the corn.

2. The Scriptures alleged requiring this maintenance as a bounden duty, and due debt, and not as a matter of alms and free gift, therefore people are not at liberty to do or not to do, what and when they please in this matter, no more than in any other commanded duty and ordinance of the Lord; but ought of duty to minister of their "carnal things" to them that labor among them in Word and doctrine, as well as they ought to pay any other workmen their wages, and to discharge and satisfy their other debts, or to submit themselves to observe any other ordinance of the Lord.

3. The Apostle, Gal. 6:6, enjoining that he which is taught communicate to him that teaches "in all good things," does not leave it arbitrary, what or how much a man shall give, or in what proportion, but even the latter, as well as the former, is prescribed and appointed by the Lord.

4. Not only members of churches, but "all that are taught in the Word," are to contribute unto him that teaches in all good things. In case that congregations are defective in their contributions, the deacons are to call upon them to do their duty; If their call suffices not, the church by her power is to require it of their members; and where church power, through the corruption of men, does not or cannot attain the end, the magistrate is to see that the ministry be duly provided for, as appears from the commanded example of Nehemiah. The magistrates are nursing fathers and nursing mothers, and stand charged with the custody of both tables; because it is better to prevent a scandal, that it may not come, and easier also, than to remove it, when it is given, it's most suitable to rule, that by the church's care each man should know his proportion according to rule, what he should do before he do it, so that his judgment and heart may be satisfied in what he does, and just offense prevented in what is done.

CHAPTER XII.

Of The Admission Of Members Into The Church.

1. The doors of the churches of Christ upon earth do not by God's appointment stand so wide open, that all sorts of people, good or bad, may freely enter therein at their pleasure; but such as are admitted thereto, as members, ought to be examined and tried first, whether they be fit and meet to be received into church society or not. The Eunuch of Ethiopia, before his admission, was examined by Philip, whether he did believe on Jesus Christ with all his heart. The angel of the church at Ephesus is commended for trying such as said they were Apostles, and were not. There is like reason for trying of them that profess themselves to be believers. The officers are charged with the keeping of the doors of the church, and therefore are in a special manner to make trial of the fitness of such who enter. Twelve angels are set at the gates of the temple, lest such as were "ceremonially unclean" should enter there into.

2. The things which are requisite to be found in all church members, are repentance from sin, and faith in Jesus Christ; and therefore these are the things whereof men are to be examined at their admission into the church, and which then they must profess and hold forth in such sort as may satisfy "rational charity" that the things are indeed. John Baptist admitted men to baptism confessing and bewailing their sins; and of others it is said that "they came and confessed, and showed their deeds."

3. The weakest measure of faith is to be accepted in those that desire to be admitted into the church, because weak Christians, if sincere, have the substance of that faith, repentance and holiness, which is required in church members; and such have most need of the ordinances for their confirmation and growth in grace. The Lord Jesus would not quench the smoking flax, nor break the bruised reed, but gather the tender lambs in his arms, and carry them gently in his bosom. Such charity and tenderness is to be used, as the weakest Christian, if sincere, may not be excluded nor discouraged. Severity of examination is to be avoided.

4. In case any, through excessive fear or other infirmity, be unable to make their personal relation of their spiritual estate in public, it is sufficient that the elders, having received private satisfaction, make relation thereof in public before the church, they testifying their assents thereunto; this being the way that tends most to edification. But whereas persons are of greater abilities, there it is most expedient that they make their relations and confessions personally with their own mouth, as David professes of himself.

5. A personal and public confession and declaring of God's manner of working upon the soul, is both lawful, expedient and useful, in sundry respects and upon sundry grounds. Those three thousand, before they were admitted by the apostles, did manifest that they were pricked at the heart by Peter's sermon, together with earnest desire to be delivered from their sins, which now wounded their consciences, and their ready receiving of the word of promise and exhortation. We are to be ready to "render a reason of the hope that is in us, to every one that asks us"; therefore we must be able and ready upon any occasion to declare and show our repentance for sin, faith unfeigned, and effectual calling, because these are the reason of a well grounded hope. "I have not hidden thy righteousness from the great congregation."

6. This profession of faith and repentance, as it must be made by such at their admission that were never in church society before; so nothing hinders but the same way also be performed by such as have formerly been members of some other church, and the church to which they now join themselves as members may lawfully require the same. Those three thousand, which made their confession, were members of the church of the Jews before; so were those that were baptized by John. Churches may err in their admission; and persons regularly admitted may fall into offense. Otherwise, if churches might obtrude their members, or if church members might obtrude themselves upon other churches without due trial, the matter so requiring, both the liberty of the churches would thereby be infringed, in that they might not examine those, concerning whose fitness for communion they were unsatisfied; and besides the infringing of their liberty, the churches themselves would unavoidably be corrupted, and the ordinances defiled; while they might not refuse, but must receive the unworthy which is contrary unto the Scripture, teaching that all churches are sisters, and therefore equal.

7. The like trial is to be required from such members of the church as were born in the same, or received their membership, or were baptized in their infancy or minority by virtue of the covenant of their parents, when being grown up unto years of discretion, they shall desire to be made partakers of the Lord's Supper; unto which, because holy things must not be given unto the

unworthy, therefore it is requisite that these, as well as others, should come to their trial and examination, and manifest their faith and repentance by an open profession thereof, before they are received to the Lord's Supper, and otherwise not to be admitted thereunto. Yet these church members that were so born, or received in their childhood, before they are capable of being made partakers of full communion, have many privileges which others (not church members) have not; they are in covenant with God, have the seal thereof upon them, viz: baptism; and so, if not regenerated, yet are in a more hopeful way of attaining regenerating grace, and all the spiritual blessings, both of the covenant and seal; they are also under church watch, and consequently subject to the reprehensions, admonitions and censures thereof, for their healing and amendment, as need shall require.

CHAPTER XIII.

Of Church Members, Their Removal From One Church To Another, And Of Letters Of Recommendation And Dismission.

1. Church members may not remove or depart from the church, and so one from another as they please, nor without just and weighty cause, but ought to live and dwell together, forasmuch as they are commanded not to forsake the assembling of themselves together. Such departure tends to the dissolution and ruin of the body, as the pulling of stones and pieces of timber from the building, and of members from the natural body, tend to the destruction of the whole.

2. It is, therefore, the duty of church members, in such times and places, where counsel may be had, to consult with the church whereof they are members about their removal, that, accordingly, they having their approbation, may be encouraged, or otherwise desist. They who are joined with consent, should not depart without consent, except forced thereunto.

3. If a member's departure be manifestly unsafe and sinful, the church may not consent thereunto; for in so doing they should not act in faith, and should partake with him in his sin. If the case be doubtful and the person not to be persuaded, it seems best to leave the matter unto God, and not forcibly to detain him.

4. Just reasons for a member's removal of himself from the church, are:

I. If a man cannot continue without partaking in sin.

II. In case of personal persecution: so Paul departed from the disciples at Damascus; also, in case of general persecution, when all are scattered.

III. In case of real, and not only pretended want of competent subsistence, a door being opened for better supply in another place, together with the means of spiritual edification.

IV. In these or like cases, a member may lawfully remove, and the church cannot lawfully detain him.

5. To separate from a church, either out of contempt of their holy fellowship, or out of covetousness, or for greater enlargements, with just grief to the church, or out of schism, or want of love; and out of a spirit of contention in respect of some unkindness, of some evil only conceived or intended in the church, which might and should be tolerated and healed with a spirit of meekness, and of which evil the church is not yet convinced (though perhaps himself be) nor admonished; for these or the like reasons, to withdraw from public communion in word or seals, or censures, is unlawful and sinful.

6. Such members as have orderly moved their habitation, ought to join themselves unto the church in order where they do inhabit, if it may be; otherwise, they can neither perform the duties nor receive the privileges of members. Such an example, tolerated in some, is apt to

corrupt others, which, if many should follow, would threaten the dissolution and confusion of churches, contrary to the Scripture.

7. Order requires that a member thus removing, have letters testimonial and of dismission from the church whereof he yet is, unto the church whereunto he desires to be joined, lest the church should be deluded; that the church may receive him in faith, and not be corrupted in receiving deceivers and false brethren. Until the person dismissed be received into another church, he ceases not by his letters of dismission to be a member of the church whereof he was. The church cannot make a member no member but by excommunication.

8. If a member be called to remove only for a time where a church is, letters of recommendation are requisite and sufficient for communion with that church in the ordinances and in their watch; as Phoebe, a servant of the church at Cenchrea, had a letter written for her to the church at Rome, that she might be received as becomes saints.

9. Such letters of recommendation and dismission were written for Apollos, for Marcus to the Colossians, for Phoebe to the Romans, for sundry others to other churches. And the apostle tells us that some persons, not sufficiently known otherwise, have special need of such letters, though he, for his part, had no need thereof. The use of them is to be a benefit and help to the party for whom they are written, and for the furthering of his receiving among the saints, in the place whereto he goes, and the due satisfaction of them in their receiving of him.

CHAPTER XIV.

Of Excommunication And Other Censures.

1. The censures of the church are appointed by Christ for the preventing, removing and healing of offenses in the church; for the reclaiming and gaining of offending brethren; for the deterring of others from the like offenses; for purging out the leaven which may infect the whole lump; for vindicating the honor of Christ and of his church, and the holy profession of the gospel; and for preventing of the wrath of God, that may justly fall upon the church, if they should suffer his covenant and the seals thereof to be profaned by notorious and obstinate offenders.

2. If an offense be private, (one brother offending another) the offender is to go and acknowledge his repentance for it unto his offended brother, who is then to forgive him; but if the offender neglect or refuse to do it, the brother offended is to go, and convince and admonish him of it, between themselves privately, if there upon the offender be brought to repent of his offense, the admonisher has won his brother; but if the offender hear not his brother, the brother offended is to take with him one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established, (whether the word of admonition, if the offender receive it; or the word of complaint, if he refuse it,) for if he refuse it, the offended brother is by the mouth of the elders to tell the church, and if he hear the church, and declare the same by penitent confession, he is recovered and gained; and if the church discern him to be willing to hear, yet not fully convinced of his offense, as in case of heresy, they are to dispense to him a public admonition; which, declaring the offender to lie under the public offense of the church, does thereby withhold or suspend him from the holy fellowship of the Lord's Supper, till his offense be removed by penitent confession. If he still continue obstinate, they are to cast him out by excommunication.

3. But if the offense be more public at first, and of a more heinous and criminal nature, to wit, such as are condemned by the light of nature; then the church, without such gradual proceeding, is to cast out the offender from their holy communion, for the further mortifying of his sin, and the healing of his soul in the Day of the Lord Jesus.

4. In dealing with an offender, great care is to be taken that we be neither over strict or rigorous, nor too indulgent or remiss: our proceeding herein ought to be with a spirit of meekness, considering ourselves, lest we also be tempted, and that the best of us have need of much forgiveness from the Lord. Yet the winning and healing of the offender's soul being the end of these endeavors, we must not daub with untempered mortar, nor heal the wounds of our brethren slightly. On some, have compassion; others, save with fear.

5. While the offender remains excommunicate, the church is to refrain from all member like communion with him in spiritual things, and also from all familiar communion with him in civil things, further than the necessity of natural or domestical or civil relations do require; and are therefore to forbear to eat and drink with him, that he may be ashamed.

6. Excommunication being a spiritual punishment, it doth not prejudice the excommunicate in, nor deprive him of his civil rights, and therefore touches not princes or magistrates in respect of their civil dignity or authority; and the excommunicate being but as a publican and a heathen, heathens being lawfully permitted to come to hear the Word in church assemblies, we acknowledge therefore the like liberty of hearing the word may be permitted to persons excommunicate that is permitted unto heathen. And because we are not without hope of his recovery, we are not to account him as an enemy, but to admonish him as a brother.

7. If the Lord sanctify the censure to the offender, so as by the grace of Christ, he does testify his repentance with humble confession of his sin, and judging of himself, giving glory unto God, the church is then to forgive him, and to comfort him, and to restore him to the wonted brotherly communion, which formerly he enjoyed with them.

8. The suffering of profane or scandalous livers to continue in fellowship, and partake in the sacraments, is doubtless a great sin in those that have power in their hands to redress it, and do it not. Nevertheless, in so much as Christ, and his apostles in their times, and the prophets and other godly men in theirs, did lawfully partake of the Lord's commanded ordinances in the Jewish church, and neither taught nor practiced separation from the same, though unworthy ones were permitted therein; and inasmuch as the faithful in the church of Corinth, wherein were many unworthy persons and practices, are never commanded to absent themselves from the sacraments, because of the same; therefore the godly, in like cases, are not to presently separate.

9. As separation from such a church wherein profane and scandalous livers are tolerated, is not presently necessary; so for the members thereof, otherwise unworthy, hereupon to abstain from communicating with such a church in the participation of the sacraments, is unlawful. For as it were unreasonable for an innocent person to be punished for the faults of others, wherein he has no hand, and whereunto he gave no consent; so is it more unreasonable that a godly man should neglect duty, and punish himself; in not coming for his portion in the blessings of the seals, as he ought, because others are suffered to come that ought not; especially considering that he neither consents to their sin, nor to their approaching to the ordinance in their sin, nor to the neglect of others, who should put them away, and do not; but, on the contrary, heartily mourns for these things, modestly and seasonably stir up others to do their duty. If the church cannot be reformed, they may use their liberty, as is specified, CHAP. XIII. Sect. 4. But this all the godly are bound unto, even every one to do his endeavor, according to his power and place, that the unworthy may be duly proceeded against by the church, to whom this matter does pertain.

CHAPTER XV

Of The Communion Of Churches One With Another.

1. Although churches be distinct, and therefore may not be confounded one with another, and equal, and therefore have not dominion one over another; yet all the churches ought to preserve church communion one with another, because they are all united unto Christ, not only as a mystical, but as a political head; whence is derived a communion suitable thereunto.

2. The communion of churches is exercised sundry ways.

I. By way of mutual care in taking thought for one another's welfare.

II. By way of consultation one with another, when we have occasion to require the judgment and counsel of other churches, touching any person or cause, wherewith they may be better acquainted than ourselves; as the church of Antioch consulted with the Apostles and elders of the church at Jerusalem, about the question of circumcision of the Gentiles, and about the false teachers that broached that doctrine. In which case, when any church wants light or peace among themselves it is a way of communion of the churches, according to the Word, to meet together by their elders and other messengers in a Synod to consider and argue the points in doubt or difference; and, having found out the way of truth and peace, to commend the same by their letters and messengers to the churches whom the same may concern. But if a church be rent with divisions among themselves, or lie under any open scandal, and yet refuse to consult with other churches for healing or removing of the same, it is matter of just offense, both to the Lord Jesus and to other churches, as bewraying too much want of mercy and faithfulness, not to seek to bind up the breaches and wounds of the church and brethren; and therefore the state of such a church calls aloud upon other churches to exercise a fuller act of brotherly communion, to wit, by way of admonition.

III. A third way, then, of communion of churches, is by way of admonition; to wit, in case any public offense be found in a church, which they either discern not, or are slow in proceeding to use the means for the removing and healing of. Paul had no authority over Peter, yet when he saw Peter not walking with a right foot, he publicly rebuked him before the church; though churches have no more authority one over another, than one apostle had over another, yet, as one apostle might admonish another, so may one church admonish another, and yet without usurpation. In which case, if the church that lies under offense, does not hearken to the church which does admonish her, the church is to acquaint other neighbor churches with that offense, which the offending church still lies under, together with their neglect of the brotherly admonition given unto them. Whereupon those other churches are to join in seconding the admonition formerly given; and if still the offending church continue in obstinacy and impenitency, they may forbear communion with them, and are to proceed to make use of the help of a Synod or counsel of neighbor churches, walking orderly (if a greater cannot conveniently be had) for their conviction. If they hear not the Synod, the Synod having declared them to be obstinate, particular churches approving and accepting of the judgment of the Synod, are to declare the sentence of non-communion respectively concerning them; and thereupon, out of religious care to keep their own communion pure, they may justly withdraw themselves from participation with them at the Lord's Table, and from such other acts of holy communion, as the communion of churches otherwise does allow and require. Nevertheless, if any members of such a church as lies under public offense, do not consent to the offense of the church, but do in due sort bear witness against it, they are still to be received to wonted communion, for it is not equal that the innocent should suffer with the offensive. Yea, furthermore, if such innocent members,

after due waiting in the use of all good means for the healing of the offense of their own church, shall at last (with the allowance of the counsel of neighbor churches,) withdraw from the fellowship of their own church, and offer themselves to the fellowship of another, we judge it lawful for the other church to receive them (being otherwise fit) as if they had been orderly dismissed to them from their own church.

IV. A fourth way of communion with churches, is by way of participation; the members of one church occasionally coming unto another, we willingly admit them to partake with them at the Lord's Table, it being the seal of our communion not only with Christ, not only with the members of our own church, but also of all the churches of the saints; in which regard we refuse not to baptize their children presented to us, if either their own minister be absent, or such a fruit of holy fellowship be desired with us. In like cases, such churches as are furnished with more ministers than one, do willingly afford one of their own ministers to supply the place of an absent or sick minister of another church for a needful season.

V. A fifth way of church communion is by way of recommendation, when a member of one church has occasion to reside in another church; if but for a season, we commend him to their watchful fellowship by letters of recommendation; but if he be called to settle his abode there, we commit him, according to his desire, to the fellowship of their covenant by letters of dismission.

VI. A sixth way of church communion, is in case of need to minister relief and succor one unto another, either of able members to furnish them with officers, or of outward support to the necessities of poorer churches, as did the churches of the Gentiles contribute liberally to the poor saints at Jerusalem.

3. When a company of believers purpose to gather into church fellowship, it is requisite for their safer proceeding and the maintaining of the communion of churches, that they signify their intent unto the neighbor churches, walking according to the order of the gospel, and desire their presence and help, and right hand of fellowship; which they ought readily to give unto them, when there is no just cause of excepting against their proceedings.

4. Besides these several ways of communion, there is also a way of propagation of churches; when a church shall grow too numerous, it is a way, and fit season to propagate one church out of another, by sending forth such of their members as are willing to remove, and to procure some officers to them, as may enter with them into church estate among themselves; as bees, when the hive is too full, issue forth by swarms, and are gathered into other hives, so the churches of Christ may do the same upon the like necessity and therein hold forth to them the right hand of fellowship, both in their gathering into a church and in the ordination of their officers.

CHAPTER XVI.

Of Synods.

1. Synods, orderly assembled, and rightly proceeding according to the pattern, we acknowledge as the ordinance of Christ; and though not absolutely necessary to the being, yet many times, through the iniquity of men and perverseness of times, necessary to the well being of churches, for the establishment of truth and peace therein.

2. Synods being spiritual and ecclesiastical assemblies, are therefore made up of spiritual and ecclesiastical causes. The next efficient cause of them, under Christ, is the power of the churches sending forth their elders and other messengers, who being met together in the name of Christ, are the matter of a Synod; and they in arguing, debating and determining matters of religion, according to the Word, and publishing the same to the churches it concerns, do put forth the

proper and formal acts of a Synod; to the conviction of errors, and heresies, and the establishment of truth and peace in the churches, which is the end of a synod.

3. Magistrates have power to call a Synod, by calling to the churches to send forth their elders and other messengers to counsel and assist them in matters of religion; but yet the constituting of a synod is a church act, and may be transacted by the churches, even when civil magistrates may be enemies to churches and to church assemblies.

4. It belongs unto Synods and councils to debate and determine controversies of faith and cases of conscience; to clear from the Word holy directions for the holy worship of God and good government of the church; to bear witness against mal-administration and corruption in doctrine or manners, in any particular church; and to give directions for the reformation thereof; not to exercise church censures in way of discipline, nor any other act of church authority or jurisdiction which that presidential synod did forbear.

5. The Synod's directions and determinations, so far as consonant to the Word of God, are to be received with reverence and submission; not only for their agreement therewith, (which is the principal ground thereof, and without which they bind not at all), but also, secondarily, for the power whereby they are made, as being an ordinance of God appointed thereunto in his Word.

6. Because it is difficult, if not impossible, for many churches to come altogether in one place, in all their members universally; therefore they may assemble by their delegates or messengers, as the church of Antioch went not all to Jerusalem, but some select men for that purpose. Because none are or should be more fit to know the state of the churches, nor to advise of ways for the good thereof, than elders; therefore it is fit that, in the choice of the messengers for such assemblies, they have special respect unto such; yet, inasmuch as not only Paul and Barnabas, but certain others also were sent to Jerusalem from Antioch, and when they were come to Jerusalem, not only the apostles and elders, but other brethren also do assemble and meet about the matter; therefore Synods are to consist both of elders and other church members, endued with gifts, and sent by the churches, not excluding the presence of any brethren in the churches.

CHAPTER XVII.

Of The Civil Magistrate's Power In Matters Ecclesiastical.

1. It is lawful, profitable and necessary for Christians to gather themselves together into church estate, and therein to exercise all the ordinances of Christ, according unto the Word, although the consent of the magistrate could not be had thereunto; because the apostles and Christians in their time did frequently thus practice, when the magistrates, being all of them Jewish or pagan, and most persecuting enemies, would give no countenance or consent to such matters.

2. Church government stands in no opposition to civil government of commonwealths, nor any intrenches upon the authority of civil magistrates in their jurisdictions; nor any whit weakens their hands in governing, but rather strengthens them, and furthers the people in yielding more hearty and conscionable obedience unto them, whatsoever some ill affected persons to the ways of Christ have suggested, to alienate the affections of kings and princes from the ordinances of Christ; as if the kingdom of Christ in his church could not rise and stand, without the falling and weakening of their government, which is also of Christ; whereas the contrary is most true, that they may both stand together and flourish, the one being helpful unto the other, in their distinct and due administrations.

3. The power and authority of magistrates is not for the restraining of churches or any other good works, but for helping in and furthering thereof; and therefore the consent and countenance of magistrates, when it may be had, is not to be slighted, or lightly esteemed; but, on the, contrary,

it is part of that honor due to Christian magistrates to desire and crave their consent and approbation therein; which being obtained, the churches may then proceed in their way with much more encouragement and comfort.

4. It is not in the power of magistrates to compel their subjects to become church members, and to partake of the Lord's Table; for the priests are reproved that brought unworthy ones into the sanctuary; then it was unlawful for the priests, so it is as unlawful to be done by civil magistrates; those whom the church is to cast out, if they were in, the magistrate ought not to thrust them into the church, nor to hold them therein.

5. As it is unlawful for church officers to meddle with the sword of the magistrate, so it is unlawful for the magistrate to meddle with the work proper to church officers. The acts of Moses and David, who were not only princes but prophets, were extraordinary, therefore not inimitable. Against such usurpation the Lord witnessed by smiting Uzziah with leprosy for presuming to offer incense.

6. It is the duty of the magistrate to take care of matters of religion, and to improve his civil authority for the observing of the duties commanded in the first, as well as for observing of the duties commanded in the second table. They are called gods. The end of the magistrate's office is not only the quiet and peaceable life of the subject in matters of righteousness and honesty, but also in matters of godliness; yea, of all godliness. Moses, Joshua, David, Solomon, Asa, Jehoshaphat, Hezekiah, Josiah, are much commended by the Holy Ghost, for the putting forth their authority in matters of religion; on the contrary, such kings as have been failing this way, are frequently taxed and reproved of the Lord. And not only the kings of Judah, but also Job, Nehemiah, the king of Nineveh, Darius, Artaxerxes, Nebuchadnezzar, whom none looked at as types of Christ, (though were it so there were no place for any just objection) are commended in the book of God for exercising their authority this way.

7. The objects of the power of the magistrate are not things merely inward, and so not subject to his cognizance and view; as unbelief, hardness of heart, erroneous opinions not vented, but only such things as are acted by the outward man; neither is their power to be exercised in commanding such acts of the outward man, and punishing the neglect thereof, as are but mere inventions and devices of men, but about such acts as are commanded, and forbidden in the Word; yea, such as the Word does clearly determine, though not always clearly to the judgment of the magistrate or others, yet clearly in itself. In these he of right ought to put forth his authority, though oft times actually he does it not.

8. Idolatry, blasphemy, heresy, venting corrupt and pernicious opinions, that destroy the foundation, open contempt of the Word preached, profanation of the Lord's Day, disturbing the peaceable administration and exercise of the worship and holy things of God, and the like, are to be restrained and punished by civil authority.

9. If any church, one or more, shall grow schismatical, rending itself from the communion of other churches, or shall walk incorrigibly and obstinately in any corrupt way of their own, contrary to the rule of the Word; in such case, the magistrate is to put forth his coercive power, as the matter shall require. The tribes on this side Jordan intended to make war against the other tribes for building the altar of witness, whom they suspected to have turned away therein from following of the Lord.

FINIS