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Abstract

Though rarely identified as such, the English Civil War was a transformative event in early New England history. Founded upon religious idealism, the New England colonies were particularly susceptible to the religious and political movements in England which influenced Puritan motives and emigration. Reliant on a steady flow of immigrants to sustain the young colonial economy, the Puritan community in New England found itself reliant on the continuation of religious dissatisfaction in England strong enough to drive emigrants to settle in the colonies. During the 1640s, the religious and political contest produced by the English Civil War completely overturned the status quo of England and enticed many Puritans to remain in England rather than seek religious satisfaction in the wilderness of America. Foreseen by John Winthrop and confirmed by the 1640s trend of ‘remigration’ out of New England, religious reforms in England reduced the colonies’ former appeal and forced a reevaluation of New England’s niche within the English world. This thesis examines the religious and political ramifications which war in England had on Puritan New England, not only demographically, but also culturally. Communication and intimate trans-Atlantic connections, along with direct participation in the wars and debates of England, illustrate colonists’ continued dedication, as well as vulnerability, to the seemingly-distant events across the Atlantic. The religious and political resolutions following the wars of the 1640s are shown to have had deep impacts on New England by removing the religious incentive to remove to the colonies. New England religious ‘declension’, a concept heavily debated by historians, is examined in the context of Civil War outcomes across the Atlantic rather than in its traditional internal colonial context. The notion of declension itself is revealed to have arisen as a harbinger of 1640s cultural transformation in response to the war in England.
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Introduction

Early colonial American history, especially concerning the Puritan settlers in New England, is often retrospectively analysed as the foreshadowing precursor to American sovereignty and independence.¹ In turn, the American Revolution is often taken for granted, and even was by contemporaries, as an inevitable conclusion, either fated or deliberate, to the founding of New England.² Contemporary conditions and motives for the earliest New England settlers, however, were not those which have been anachronistically attributed to them. Migrant Puritans removing to New England were neither, as professor Perry Miller argued, transient settlers collectively intent on uprooting and returning to England at the earliest opportunity for reformation, nor an isolated ‘distant curiosity’ to observers in England as David Cressy has suggested.³ Rather, the New England Saints, despite theological tensions with the Crown and established Church of England, maintained an intimate connection with England and participated as an integrated entity within the English world while they simultaneously attempted to establish their own reformed version of England in the New World.

If the Saints were dissatisfied with the establishment in England, they needed to contend with the development of their own religious and political systems in the colonies. By the mid-1630s and 1640s, a firm antipathy toward Arminian hierarchy became a defining feature of Puritan theology.⁴ Subsequently, New England ministers and magistrates were

---


forced to contend with their specious positions against papist hierarchy while they themselves attempted to devise an effective new government and church organisation within the colonies. The resolution produced was the New England Way, which dispensed with Episcopal hierarchy in favour of what John Cotton outlined as, ‘the way of churches walking in brotherly equalitie, or co-ordination, without subjection of one Church to another’. New England’s Way, which the colonial Saints themselves termed ‘Congregationalism’ and which detractors would label ‘Independency’ in England, reflected a compromise between anti-hierarchical sentiments and necessary leadership, accomplished by reducing ecclesiastical hierarchy to individual congregations.

Establishing a new system of church and governance in the colonies raises the question of how such fundamental alterations in traditional English society pursued by the New England Congregationalists would colour relations between England and the colonies. While developing their own Church and government policies, the New England Saints remained mindful of the fact that colonial relations with England would be defined by the new policies adopted by colonial magistrates. As a result, New England Puritans maintained official conformity within the established Church of England and sought to emphasise connection and integration with England while distancing themselves from the Separatists of Plymouth. For proponents of stronger Church authority, particularly Arminians and Presbyterians, New England’s Way resembled an unstable decentralisation of power, which

---


might threaten traditional English lifestyle and values by inviting anarchy wherever it gained acceptance within the English world.\textsuperscript{8} In response to detractors in England, New England theologians and magistrates were compelled to defend and justify their own developing system and its merits to simultaneously preserve a unique New England identity while affirming continued cultural connectedness with England itself.

With the outbreak the English Civil Wars just over a decade after the arrival of the Saints in Massachusetts Bay, what were the implications for the young New England colonies still dependent on financial and immigrant support from England? Despite distance, many New England colonists felt an intimate connection with the conflict in England and sought to contribute, often through personal involvement in the war as soldiers or chaplains. How did participation and interconnectedness with the war in England during the 1640s shape and challenge the new civil and theological establishments founded by the Saints in the colonies? How did the brethren in New England cope with the changes wrought by war in England, which confronted the colonies with the question of purpose?\textsuperscript{9} If important aspects of the theological and societal cleansing pursued by New England Congregationalists had been largely achieved in England during the war, what then would be the motive for new colonists to uproot their lives to resettle in the harsh wilderness of New England? In light of the compromises introduced by the Independents in England and in order to remain relevant for dissatisfied migrants, New England Congregationalists were forced to reassess their own theological platform to preserve a religious identity as a separate and unique alternative to the mainstream Church of England. As a result, Congregationalists sought to produce in New


England a community in the colonies which simultaneously clung to familiar English culture and values while diverging from England’s ostensibly corrupted political and religious institutions enough to continue to draw dissatisfied migrants to the colonies.

The following thesis seeks to investigate the cultural identity of New England as perceived by both New Englanders themselves as well as observers in England during the 1630s and 1640s. The thesis focuses primarily on the consequences felt in New England as a result of the English Civil War across the Atlantic. For the purposes of this study, the ‘Civil War’ will be considered the conflict between Parliament and King Charles I spanning from 1642 until Charles’ execution in January 1649. During this period, New England viability was reliant on establishing an atmosphere at once comfortable and familiar to English settlers, yet different enough from England itself to warrant the dangerous passage and risky settlement for prospective colonists. For the Congregationalists of New England, that difference lay in the purity of the New World settlement, purged of the corruptions under England’s established political and religious hierarchy. As will be seen, the political and religious upheaval associated with the Civil War jeopardised New England’s core purpose as a purified sector of the English world. By threatening the basis of New England’s religious enterprise, the Civil War forced a reconsideration of New England’s purpose if a religious alternative was no longer necessary in light of the Independents’ ascension following the war.

It is worth noting the source materials used in the course of this study as well as their limitations. Primary source documentation has been used from both sides of the English Civil War and must be considered with biases in mind. Records which have been used from the House of Lords, as well as from colonial officials like John Winthrop, may have political biases or motives which must be accounted for when using these sources. As noted in David M. Scobey’s analysis of contemporary views of declension, it is sometimes difficult to
separate facts and accurate history from individual perceptions and experiences which may not reflect the historical reality.\textsuperscript{10} Especially in the case of declension and cultural anxiety in mid-seventeenth century New England, an important theme in this thesis, contemporary emotional influences and context must be considered when examining primary source documentation. It is for this reason that heavily emotionally and psychologically influenced matters like declension have been the subject of extended debate among historians. As a result, this thesis has also taken into consideration supporting statistical and demographic studies to reduce reliance on biased accounts. Nonetheless, both the primary accounts and secondary studies used in this study are limited to the available data, which is by no means complete, but which, taken collectively, offers a valuable insight into the era.

The first chapter examines the contradictions of separation and interconnectedness between England and the New England colonies during the 1630s and 1640s. Contemporary publications are used to analyse the promotion of New England theology and scientific achievements as evidence of the Congregationalists’ desired image in England as an integral contributor in the English world. John Canup’s argument, emphasising the perceived importance of New England intellectual legitimacy, is supported by observing the tireless promotion of all aspects of New England achievement and merit within English society.\textsuperscript{11} As attested by the Puritans’ adherence to English intellectualism, or learned culture, New England’s cultural legitimacy derived from continued connection with their English roots and their Atlantic connection was adamantly preserved despite contention with England’s


established religious and governing bodies. For the purposes of this thesis, the terms ‘intellectual’ and ‘learned’ have been used to identify persons and thought processes subscribing to the standards of the educated classes of contemporary England.

In examining interconnectedness, the colonies’ continued dependence upon close relations with England is revealed. Though New Englanders desired a preservation of their English culture and self-identification, as the Saints’ migration demonstrated, they sought to distance themselves from the corruptions of English institutions and society. In short, Virginia Dejohn Anderson’s assertion is analysed, that, ‘[i]n this Puritan society, as perhaps nowhere else in British North America, the decision to retain certain English ways was as deliberate and self-conscious as the determination to change or reject others’. New England Puritans were intentionally selective about which aspects of English society to implement in the colonies and which to exclude. Congregationalist New England’s relationship with Old, torn between close association with English culture and divergence from her institutions, would become a defining feature of the settlement and drive the region’s cultural development as a unique branch of the English world intended to endure as a bastion of purity within a corrupted English society.

This thesis will take the post-revisionist approach outlined by David R. Como, recognising Puritanism as a crucial movement in Stuart England and important catalyst in pre-Civil-War tensions. This study will investigate Puritan identification as a central


influence in New England development as the colonies were simultaneously integrated with English society, yet opposed to its religious and ruling institutions. For New Englanders, it was not merely a comfort to cling to traditional English culture, but rather an absolute necessity to embody old England in the New World for the purpose of attracting new settlers and maintaining respectability within the English sphere and wider European world. Despite the presence of Presbyterians and non-Puritans in the New England colonies, this thesis focuses primarily on the Congregationalist core of New England, championed by figures like John Winthrop and John Cotton, with which the colonies most closely identified.

The second chapter examines New Englanders’ contributions during the Civil War and explores the effects from the conflict that were felt in the colonies. During the 1640s, continued close connections with England prompted many colonists to return to the mother country to participate in the war and seek new ministerial opportunities within newly-opened pulpits. Perry Miller’s claim that New Englanders had intended to return to England is challenged by supporting Susan Hardman Moore’s argument that remigration was more an unpredicted result of homesickness and unforeseen changes in England than a grand design from the outset of colonisation. The impact of the sharp influx of New Englanders into England is addressed along with social reactions in England. Differing responses from both Parliamentarians and Royalists are examined as they responded to the contributions of New Englanders during the war. As illustrated by Harry S. Stout’s demographic study, The Morphology of Remigration, changing colonial demographics, namely the return of almost a

---


quarter of New England colonists to England, is shown to have been a consequential catalyst in shaping New England identity in reply to English events.\(^\text{18}\)

Finally, the third chapter investigates New England influence in England, particularly in the form of the ‘New England Way’. Contrary to Andrew Delbanco’s argument, which asserted that it was primarily the most dedicated Puritan reformers who remigrated back to England, closer analysis supports Francis Bremer’s assertion that the reverse was true, and that it was the Congregationalists who remained in New England, like John Cotton and John Winthrop, who represented the most fervent supporters of New England’s thorough reformation.\(^\text{19}\) While Bruce Tucker’s *The Reinvention of New England* suggests that a religious decline forced the reshaping of New England culture from the last decade of the seventeenth century, evidence indicates that a cultural transition began as early as the 1640s, only ten years after the settlement of Massachusetts Bay.\(^\text{20}\) In response to the remigration of the 1640s, coinciding with changes in England during the war, New England theologians and magistrates recognised that the religious compromise following the overthrow of traditional religion and government in England had left New England relevancy in question.\(^\text{21}\) If the ‘New England Way’ and reformation could be enjoyed in England in the form of Independency, why would anybody in England consider uprooting from the comforts of home and removing to the wilderness of America? The question of purpose and relevancy forced a redefinition of New England culture, moving away from the intolerant roots of the


first generation of Congregationalists and toward a more worldly and practical, though perhaps less devout, second generation embodied by the likes of John Winthrop Jr. In ‘Revising the Errand’, Scobey addresses New England Congregationalists’ ‘sociologically false’ though ‘culturally real’ fears of second-generation declension amongst the New England Puritans.\(^{22}\) That is, in Scobey’s words, ‘the actual behavior of the churchgoers’ versus ‘the ministers’ perception of that behavior and their responses to it’.\(^{23}\) Taking a similar approach to Scobey, this thesis focuses primarily on perceptions of New England Congregationalists in response to political and religious transitions in England and analyses the colonial cultural response necessitated by those changes. The study contained is intended to place the perception of second-generation declension, itself a harbinger of New England’s cultural transition, into its appropriate context as a colonial reaction to the changes wrought by the Civil War in England.

\(^{22}\) Scobey, ‘Revising the Errand’, p.6-10.

\(^{23}\) Ibid. 7.
New England’s earliest cultural foundations may be better understood by considering the original motives for settling the region. While the Separatists at Plymouth sought an official break from the Church of England, the disappointingly low numbers of immigrants combined with harsh accusations against the colony’s theocracy by aggrieved entrepreneurs, demonstrated that outright separation from the support of English institutions proved costly to young and feeble colonies.\textsuperscript{25} Taking a different approach, outlined in Winthrop’s \textit{Reasons to be Considered}, the Puritan Saints migrating to Massachusetts Bay in 1630 would establish the colony on similarly religious premises with a very clear moral platform centred around religious purity and reform.\textsuperscript{26} Despite the Saints’ attraction to the wilderness of America for its un tarnished remoteness as an ideal setting for societal cleansing, they took care to distinguish themselves from the ambitions of the Plymouth Separatists by noting their continued devotion to their ‘deare mother’, the Church of England.\textsuperscript{27} A close investigation of the colonists’ motives as well as their precarious position reveals the Saints’ devotion to the

\textsuperscript{24} Anon., ‘An excellent Medley, Which you may admire at (without offence) For every line speaks a contrary sense’, (London: F. Grove, c. 1630). Broadside.


\textsuperscript{26} John Winthrop, \textit{Reasons to be considered for justifying the undertakers of the intended Plantation in New England, and for encouraging such whose hearts God shall move to join with them in it} (London, 1629).

Church of England to be more of a reflection of their vulnerability in the colonies rather than
genuine support for the established institutions of England.28

Colonial malcontents like the Separatist Roger Williams and Familist Samuel Gorton, among many others who protested against the theocratic governments of New England, underscored the necessity of transatlantic publications and agents to improve the reputation of New England abroad.29 Soon after John Winthrop’s fleet landed in Massachusetts Bay, the Bay Colony superseded Plymouth as the dominant colonial power in New England and the Saints took particular interest in promoting their new settlement across the Atlantic.30 As infant colonies, the New England settlements remained completely dependent upon English supply and immigration and it was not merely desirable, but rather absolutely essential, to present the New England settlements in an attractive light to English merchants, prospective settlers, and necessary creditors in England, along with powerful political allies like the Earl of Warwick in London.31 During the 1640s, the political and religious atmosphere accompanying the shift in power toward Parliament prompted new campaigns for political favour in light of the new government. As will be seen, efforts were undertaken by individuals and organised colonial governments alike as the Congregationalists belaboured the legitimacy and merits of their new enterprise.

Contrary to Perry Miller’s claims that the New England colonies were only established as a short-lived outpost populated primarily by colonists intent on returning to England to spread their vision of reformation, the colonies were established, as Francis


Bremer has argued, to endure.\(^{32}\) As a result, the migrant Saints recognised from the outset that they would require close integration and communication with England for political and financial support, as well as to draw new settlers who desired a purified, but familiar, world.\(^{33}\) Thus, colonial Saints, magistrates, entrepreneurs, and committed settlers tirelessly promoted the merits of a yet-unproven New England to prospective settlers and powerful backers in London like Lord Saye and Sele.\(^{34}\) By the 1640s a crippling economic downturn and reversed trend in migration back to England placed the colonies at the mercy of support from England and incoming settlers.\(^{35}\) Thus, the very survival and success of the New England colonies depended upon establishing a favourable reputation in England and maintaining successful recruitment of new Saints to support colonisation.\(^{36}\) Contending with disenchanted settlers and backlash following the Antinomian Controversy, New England identity, both perceived by settlers themselves in the colonies and by onlookers across the Atlantic, came to be defined by ceaseless defences and moral justifications published in London on behalf of the colonies.\(^{37}\) The resulting culture produced in the colonies was at once a reflective extension of the settlers’ English origins, though defined by a zealous drive to cleanse those origins for a purified legacy.

**New England Origins, Conceptions, and Promotion in Print**


\(^{34}\) Pestana, *The English Atlantic in an Age of Revolution, 1640-1661*: p.60.


As early as the year 1627, John Bellamie was offering a pamphlet in his shop entitled *An Historical Discoverie and Relation of the English Plantations in New England*. The contents, ‘Containing their [colonists’] Aventurous passages, their happie Arivall and comfortable planting, manifesting the goodnesse of God in their preservations from many apparent dangers’, recounted the brave exploits of colonists, gloriously assisted like the Biblical heroes of old by the Providence of God’s divine favour.\(^{38}\) Besides the bold endeavours of the heroic colonists, the practices of the foreign natives and the nature of exotic wildlife were described as well.\(^{39}\) For readers in England, such enthralling tales of the New World evoked excitement and curiosity about the infant colonies abroad, which is evidenced by the high expectations new colonists had upon their arrival in the New World.\(^{40}\) Besides publications circulating through London from the shops of printers like John Bellamie, John Winthrop personally pressed interested individuals to emigrate with his fleet.\(^{41}\) David Cressy has observed that before the departure of Winthrop’s fleet, the Winthrop family’s personal connections were exploited for recruiting New England settlers and subsequently remained an important source of immigrants through the 1630s:

In October 1629, Winthrop dispatched ‘all the late news from New England’ to his family in Suffolk. ‘I would have some of you read it to your mother,’ he told John, Jr., ‘and let Forth copy out the observations from the [...] and the letter in the end, and show it [to] Mr. Motte and others that intend this voyage.’ Winthrop distributed letters to ‘others that have a mind to New England’, urging them ‘to read seriously over’ the encouraging reports from Massachusetts. Circulating in manuscript and carried enthusiastically by word

---


39 Ibid.


41 Cressy, *Coming Over*: p.46-47.
of mouth, Higginson’s rosy ‘True Relation’ was finding its audience even before it appeared in print.\textsuperscript{42} 

John Winthrop approached the Bay Colony enterprise with very high expectations and invested heavily in its success.\textsuperscript{43} Winthrop’s personal religious motivations and fervent desire to see his settlement succeed illuminate his incessant efforts to lead New England’s campaign for favourable perception in England. Winthrop realised that the settlement could only succeed with a large body and steady influx of committed colonists. Due to New England’s immigrant-based economy, new colonists represented a crucial lifeline for the region’s sustainability.\textsuperscript{44} Increasing scrutiny of New England’s theocracy occasioned by unfavourable reports required dedicated campaigning by New England leaders to improve the region’s damaged reputation, especially following the Antinomian Controversy.\textsuperscript{45} The efforts to alter perceptions of the colonies in England themselves proved to be shaping factors in the development of New England as colonial governments recognised a need to appeal to disenchanted prospective emigrants as well as new authorities rising in London.\textsuperscript{46}

Before the departure of Winthrop’s Fleet in 1630, there existed critics in England against the proposed colonisation by the Massachusetts Bay Company on moral grounds. English Protestants were keen to avoid any resemblance with the Catholic Spanish conquistadors, whose atrocities had been recorded (and likely inflated) by Bartolomé de las Casas and republished in English by 1583, followed by many other European accounts into

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{42} Ibid.
  \item \textsuperscript{43} Ibid., p.15.
  \item \textsuperscript{44} Moseley, \textit{John Winthrop’s World}: p.59.
  \item \textsuperscript{45} Pestana, \textit{The English Atlantic in an Age of Revolution, 1640-1661}: p.31.
\end{itemize}
the seventeenth century. In 1641, William Castell, a minister at Courtenhall, would highlight the importance of Indian conversion in New England through a petition to Parliament, in which he addressed the cruelty of earlier approaches by the Spanish. In his 

*Reasons to be considered for justifieinge the undertakers of the intended Plantation in New England*, John Winthrop addressed concerns that the Massachusetts Bay Company had ‘noe warrant to enter upon that Land which hath been soe long possessed by others’. Winthrop defended the venture, asserting that since the ‘Natives of New England . . . inclose noe land, neither have any setled haytation, nor any tame Cattle to improve the Land by . . . if we leave them sufficient for their use, we may lawfully take the rest, there being more then enough for them and for us’. Distancing themselves from the example set by the Spanish, New England planters consciously presented their own settlement to the European community as more generous and benevolent than previous colonisation efforts had been. The intent was to place the Saints of New England upon a moral pedestal before they had even departed for the colonies and established their envisioned community.

In favour of English colonisation, Winthrop made the argument that the native population would benefit from the introduction of European culture and technologies. David M. Scobey has claimed misleadingly that ‘the efforts of John Eliot notwithstanding,

---


50 Ibid.

51 John Winthrop, *A Model of Christian Charity*, 1630

the Puritans generally took . . . a negligent attitude toward Indian conversion’. Similarly, Joseph Conforti has referred to Native American conversion as a ‘recessive element in the colonies’ reason for existence. While it is true that little progress was actually accomplished in converting Indians during the first two decades of Puritan settlement, Scobey and Conforti’s assertions overlook the weight that the Saints placed on conversion efforts in justifying the moral merits of their venture to Protestant observers across the Atlantic. In using missionary labour to promote the colonies, tangible successes were not as important as the supposed effort itself, which was widely advertised in England. Carla Gardina Pestana has asserted that along with, ‘rehabilitat[ing] the colony’s reputation in England’, Indian conversions carried the added benefit of suppressing the spread of dissenting radical sects like the Gortonists’. Besides civilising the natives with English culture and technology, Winthrop noted first on his list of justifications ‘the service to the Church of great consequence to carry the Gospel into those parts of the world’. Colonial officials, including Winthrop, used Indian conversions to appeal to authorities within the Church of England and to garner greater support, especially through monetary donations, for their colonial enterprise. In 1649, both Oxford and Cambridge Universities established collections to be sent to New England for the continued propagation of the gospel there, indicating the successes of the

57 Pestana, The English Atlantic in an Age of Revolution, 1640-1661: p.79.
58 John Winthrop, Reasons to be considered.
New England missionaries’ Indian conversion campaign and promoting its religious deeds. The quantity of conversions soon became an important measure of New England’s progress and status as Puritan colonists continued to justify their venture through the 1640s and 50s to both statesmen and prospective settlers in England. Targeting many of the New England Algonquin tribes aside from the hostile Pequot, missionaries encountered some resistance from tribes like the Narragansett, who perceived English conversion as a threat to their culture. Even the Mohegans, strong allies of the English, were slow to convert during the 1630s and 40s. Still, conversion efforts were promoted despite obstacles and disappointing progress. Regardless of sectarian affiliations and political rifts, Christianising the Indians was widely regarded as a commendable endeavour in the English world and was used to attract interest in the New World colonies and promote the successes of the industrious settlers.

The departure of Winthrop’s Fleet represented a momentous occasion for the Saints in England and was an event that was celebrated by many Puritan sympathisers within the Church. John Cotton, who would later emigrate himself and become an important minister in Massachusetts Bay, preached a sermon in Boston, Lincolnshire, entitled *Gods Promise to His*

---


60 Cressy, *Coming Over*: p.86.


63 Ibid.

64 Ibid.

Plantation, in which he celebrated the departure of the fleet and hopes for their success in New England. The fact that the sermon was published in London and disseminated for English readers suggests a far-reaching interest in the Puritan venture beyond those who could attend Cotton’s sermon in Lincolnshire. For interested readers, New England would not have appeared so distant as is sometimes portrayed, as papers in London consistently updated the public on matters in the colonies. The flow of publications assisted in maintaining connections across the Atlantic and preserved the colonies as an integrated entity connected and influenced by events of the wider English community.

The decade prior to the Civil War saw the rise of New England from a small band of Plymouth Separatists to a thriving Puritan community centred at Boston. Unlike the Separatists, the Puritans of Massachusetts under Winthrop specifically sought to fashion themselves as a loyal and, perhaps more importantly, a cultured English community neither spiritually distant from the English Church, nor culturally abandoned to the savagery of the wilderness, but rather transplanted with all their civility and Englishness intact. Despite the high numbers of settlers arriving for economic rather than spiritual purposes, New England was primarily advertised as a religious haven, cleansed of the corruption which Puritans believed had in recent years befallen the Church of England under Arminian influence. By the 1640s, the coming of war and the challenging of established political, social, and religious

---

67 Ibid.
68 Ibid., 26; Moseley, John Winthrop’s World: p.99.
69 Cressy, Coming Over.
norms in England gravely threatened the position New England had attempted to cultivate as an appealing alternative to the problems of England.\textsuperscript{73} As a result, New England culture and identity coalesced around defending the colonies against criticism and accusations directed towards the religiously intolerant magistrates and clergy of Massachusetts’ theocracy.\textsuperscript{74} To theologians like John Winthrop, Edward Winslow, and John Cotton, the New England enterprise, centred around religious purity, represented a life’s work, and New England’s credibility was defended as the lifeblood of the Saints’ achievement.\textsuperscript{75} As accusations mounted against the policies of colonial governments and changes in England forced a reassessment of New England policies, the colonies would be compelled to adapt in response.\textsuperscript{76}

Considering the tireless promotion of the new colonies by their patrons, expectations were high for incoming settlers.\textsuperscript{77} With so much invested in the venture, even those who knew better continued to spread notions of endless bounty and healthy, comfortable living contrary to the reality which newcomers discovered was a cold, rocky wilderness. David Cressy notes that it was primarily the unofficial news from the colony which was the most foreboding.\textsuperscript{78} Thomas Dudley, a member of Winthrop’s 1630 fleet, wrote honestly about the hardships suffered during the harsh winter of 1630-1, which came as a surprise to immigrants accustomed to England’s mild climate and trusting the ‘too large commendations’ of New


\textsuperscript{74} Pestana, \textit{The English Atlantic in an Age of Revolution}: p.74.


\textsuperscript{76} Scobey, ‘Revising the Errand’, p.29; Conforti, \textit{Imagining New England}: p.39-40.

\textsuperscript{77} John Spencer, \textit{Votive Angliae, Englands Complaint to their King} (London: Printed by H. Dudley, 1643). p.29.

\textsuperscript{78} Cressy, \textit{Coming Over}: p.15.
England. Even John Winthrop privately expressed that the conditions had been difficult upon arrival, but continued to assert, ‘I would not have altered my course, though I had foreseen all these afflictions; I never fared better in my life’. Despite setbacks, Winthrop continued to promote an appealing image of the settlement and remained hopeful for the future. The dispersal of critical accounts like Dudley’s were limited and often eclipsed by the positive publications of colonial patrons enticing new colonists. If an early New England print culture may be spoken of, it developed around defending and justifying the colonies in the face of plentiful criticisms. New England Atlantic discourse did not so much evolve on its own as respond and react against English publications and perceptions.

As early as November of 1632, Captain Thomas Wiggin, a close friend and ally of John Winthrop, wrote to Secretary John Coke in London, ‘to cleare the population of the plantation from certaine false rumo[re]s and fraudulence, which I p[er]ceive Since my reterne to England Some p[er]sons ill affected to the plantations there, have cast abroad’. Addressing many of the criticisms which would plague New England for decades to follow, Wiggin assured Coke that all unflattering testimony had been spread by ‘discontented and scandalous persons’, whose mistreatment, Wiggin claimed, was the result of their own ill deeds. Warning of the harm negative perceptions may have on the colonies, Wiggin cautioned that both false rumour as well as the rivalry with Episcopal Maine, could result in, ‘the utter ruine of this hopefull plantation, by hindringle all such as would goe to them, and
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drivinge those already planted there, either to returne, or disperse into other places’. Having firmly emphasized the benefits of the New England plantations for all of England, ‘especially in the Mattachusetts (being the largest best and most prospering in all that land)’, Wiggin implored Coke to defend Puritan New England against damaging rumour. In his letter, Wiggin acknowledged the vulnerability of New England by recognizing the region’s complete dependence on positive perceptions for success. Though unpublished, Wiggin’s account certainly qualifies as hyperbolic praise for New England and acted as one of the many influences shaping English perceptions of the colonies.

Writing in July of 1635 to his cousin, M. Bullie, a minister in New England, John Spencer commented on both the separation between himself and his cousin, as well as the disappointment which he expected his cousin to meet upon arrival in New England.

MY very louing Cousin, seeing we can no longer enjoy your company in old England, we would be glad to heare of your safe arrivall in new England, and I feare in this little time you finde by experience that all things are not answerable to your expectation, and likewise that your friends that did so earnestly desire your stay were not altogether mistaken, when they told you that you should find many inconveniences in that place.

Spencer’s assessment of the colonies suggests that many Puritans in England, though perhaps supportive of the migrant Saints’ ambitions, remained skeptical of the practicality of living in the New World. Understandable concerns for living conditions likely prevented many sympathetic Saints in England from joining their brethren in the colonies. Still, Spencer’s letter also indicates that maintaining connections across the Atlantic was important to family and friends divided by the ocean. ‘And therefore’, Spencer wrote, ‘now though we are far remoted in the body, yet let us be present in spirit and prayer, and although you are retvrned
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to a place of more privacy, and where your eyes (I hope) doe not see such abominations to vexe your heart with as ours doe’. Though Spencer foresaw uncomfortable living for his cousin in the colonies, Spencer recognised the spiritual attraction of the isolation and purity found in New England. Spencer’s call for a presence ‘in spirit and prayer’ between himself and his cousin represented more than merely a consolation to a distant friend. Rather, it was an appeal for a form of continued connectedness and integration within the English community despite physical separation across the Atlantic. Spencer’s letter in itself was a token of continued connection and a gesture of closeness. For many settlers, similar letters, as well as news sources and publications, would become tangible features of a continued integration within the wider English community.

Alongside its place in real-world affairs, New England also found its way into contemporary arts and entertainment in poetry, literature, ballads, and comedies. The 1634 ‘A Propper Ballad called the Summons to New England’ warned naïve prospective settlers by satirising the region’s extravagant promises to incoming colonists. New England Puritans responded with ‘New England’s Annoyances’, a satirical ballad on living conditions in America. Jasper Mayne’s 1639 comedy, The Citye Match, lightly denigrates colonial customs when Madam Aurelia, one of the women in the play, defends her marital status at the expense of New England women by asserting, ‘I doe not mean to marry / Like Ladies in New England, where they couple / With no more ceremony then birds choose their Mate / Upon St
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A character in Henry Glapthorne’s *Wit in a Constable* makes a familiar Puritan reference to ‘all the Brethren at Amsterdam / And in new England’. New England was also mentioned on occasion in popular poems and broadside ballads such as *An Excellent Medley* exclaiming, ‘Heigh for New-England, hoyse upsaile’. Even small references to New England in popular forms of entertainment indicate the presence of New England within English culture across the Atlantic. The consumers of such entertainment would have been expected to be familiar with the region and understand the references being made to the colonies. Without direct financial incentive to promote or detract from the overseas settlements, popular entertainment provided perhaps one of the most honest forms of contemporary commentary on the colonies.

The volume of publications alone does not tell the complete story of book and pamphlet circulation concerning New England. Besides the publications themselves, contemporary writers provided commentary on the texts available and the predominant perceptions around England of the young colonies. David Cressy notes a particularly telling example from 1630:

Another glimpse of the circulation of print concerning New England appears in the diary of the Suffolk minister John Rous, who recorded in June 1630, ‘I saw a book at Bury at a bookseller’s containing a declaration of their intent who be gone to New England, set out by themselves, and purposed for satisfaction to the king and state (as I conceive) because of some scandalous misconceivings that run abroad . . . Rous had evidently come across Winthrop’s *Humble Request*.97
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Rous’ account is particularly enlightening because he not only revealed the ease of accessing books regarding New England by noting their sale at ordinary shops, but he also hinted at common perceptions in England of the colonists’ departure to New England. Though Rous did not explicitly state the ‘scandalous misconceivings’, it is clear from Winthrop’s *Humble Request* that rumours abounded in England accusing the Puritan emigrants of renouncing their loyalties to the Crown and English state. Winthrop attempted to diffuse speculation by calling on ‘the rest of their Brethren, in and of the Church of England. For the obtaining of their Prayers, and the removall of suspicions, and misconstructions of their Intentions’. Winthrop tried to distance his own colony’s ambitions from the Separatists of Plymouth, asserting, ‘wee are not of those that dreame of perfection in this world; yet we desire you would be pleased to take notice of the principals, and body of our company, as those who esteeme it our honour, to call the Church of England, from whence we rise, our deare Mother, and cannot part from our native Countrie . . .’. Winthrop’s appeals to the Church of England represent more than just the theological relationship between the established Church and Puritan subordinates, they also reveal a crucial aspect of the balance of power and New England’s continued reliance on powerful institutions in England for the success of the colonies. New England Saints found themselves in a difficult position, both drawn to the power of the established Church and government in England, yet intent on establishing a cleansed and renewed English settlement liberated from the perceived corruptions of the official Church backed by the King.

---

98 Ibid.


100 Ibid.

101 Ibid., p.2-3.

102 Miller, *Errand into the Wilderness*: p.19-146.
Unity and Separation - New England’s Contradictions

New England’s cultural foundations were very conflicted. On one hand, the Saints desired a religious and societal cleansing for their community through physical separation from corrupt government and religious institutions in England. On the other, the Saints recognised that their feeble and unproven settlement required strong backing from both Church and government authorities and remained dependent on the ability to attract large numbers of English settlers who would be hesitant to leave the comforts of traditional English society, especially to remove to so foreign and philistine a place as the American wilderness. Citing Perry Miller, David Scobey has observed, ‘contradictions between New England as a separate place and as an extension of the old country, between the Calvinist call to purity and the Calvinist sanction of worldly action, between the elect community as church and as nation’. New England was at once intended to exist as an extension of England as well as a unique entity with exclusive theological customs unachievable in England. Joseph Conforti has emphasised New England’s cultural harmony with England, noting that, ‘[t]he founding generation saw the region as a “new” England where they could re-create ancestral English culture, reform the national church, and generally restore an industrious, pastoral way of life that they associated with an idealised English past’. Despite dissatisfaction with established institutions and societal purity, New Englanders desired a continued integration within the English world to preserve their sense of civilisation in the wilderness and reap the benefits of continued support under the Church and government in England. As a result,
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New Englanders’ perceptions of the colonies, their relationship with England, and their place in the English world developed around the contradiction between unity and separation.

Puritan New England must be understood within the broader context of the English world and events of the Civil War. Patrick Collinson argued, ‘[Puritanism] was not a thing definable in itself but only one half of a stressful relationship’. Conversely, Peter Lake has opposed Collinson’s view by noting that a form of Puritanism had existed prior to open confrontation between Puritan nonconformity and the established Church:

I have wanted to argue, on the contrary, that the persons and characteristics being caricatured and stereotyped as puritan demonstrably existed prior to the period in which the literary stereotypes of the puritan and the polemical narratives of the rise of a puritan threat to order in Church and state came to full coherence, in the late 1580s and early 1590s.

Regardless of the origins and self-awareness of Puritanism as a body of opposition rather than an independent entity, the movement coalesced around negativity and resistance within the Church of England. The New England Saints were different, however, in that their theological community was new in the 1630s and represented a unique assemblage of similarly-motivated migrants sharing a collective dissatisfaction with the Church of England strong enough to have inspired removal to the colonies. Perceiving the Saints’ migration and Church reforms as gestures of insubordination, Laud considered means of enforcing Church hierarchy upon the colonists. If Puritanism as a whole was not necessarily dependent upon opposition, the self-identification of New Englanders was as they came under fire from detractors opposed to the Saints’ nonconformist theocracy in the colonies. It

followed that New Englanders’ perceptions of themselves in relation to England and her institutions were strongly influenced and formulated through resistance against pressures of conformity.\(^{113}\)

In New England, the Puritan characteristic of religious opposition extended to the colonists’ self-image and community development. As Scobey has argued, the Saints’ mission in the New World was, in part, to free their devout community from the limitations of not only the Church of England, but also their ‘European’, or societal, roots.

There were no a priori relationships, no ordinances and sacraments, no pastor and no flock, until the church covenant; it instituted a breach in time between what had been and what was to come. Such an ecclesiology implied that the Puritans were in certain ways free from historical determination, detachable from their European and Anglican pasts, and embarked on something original. They viewed themselves as “the Lords first-born in this Wilderness,” as “a Nation borne in a day,” and they tied this imagery of priority and new birth explicitly to the covenant theology: “The Name and Interest of God, and Covenant-Relation to him, it hath been written upon us in Capital Letters from the beginning,” preached William Stoughton, and Edward Johnson exulted that “this is the place where the Lord will create a new Heaven, and a new Earth in, new Churches, and a new Common-wealth together.”\(^{114}\)

As Scobey argues, the Saints had set out to establish something new in the colonies unbounded by the traditional confines of the English Church and European societies. Scobey also recognises the Saints’ incongruous desire to contribute to the same English world they were physically separating themselves from by contending, ‘[t]he only way they could redeem the Old World was to withdraw from it’.\(^{115}\) Puritan New Englanders simultaneously perceived themselves as separated from the troubles of old England while envisioning their own settlement as a purified extension of that same English society.
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From the outset, the motives and necessary conditions for New England colonisation seemed to conflict with one another. The Saints departed from England for a degree of separation from social and religious corruption, but simultaneously relied on religious continuity, power structures in England, and a supply of immigrants from the motherland.\textsuperscript{116} Virginia Dejohn Anderson has asserted the cultural distinctness of New England, but overlooks the necessity in that interconnectedness perceived by contemporaries. ‘In this Puritan society’, Anderson argues, ‘as perhaps nowhere else in British North America, the decision to retain certain English ways was as deliberate and self-conscious as the determination to change or reject others’.\textsuperscript{117} David M. Scobey has placed more emphasis on the dualism of New England’s emergent culture, underlining the contradictions of the Puritan community as both breaking from the old while attempting to preserve a divine continuity drawing authority from the ancient Christian Church. ‘Their sense of past was paradoxical from the start;’ Scobey claims, ‘they had formulated it by weaving together moments of separation or rupture into an overall continuity, by turning apostasy into a typological call for further reformation’.\textsuperscript{118} The Puritan role within the Church of England, and English society as a whole, appeared ambiguous to contemporaries torn between opposition and congruity.\textsuperscript{119}

Worthwhile insight on the colonies may be gleaned from the religious dissidents of Rhode Island. Having been rejected by both England and the Puritan New England colonies as undesirable heretics, Rhode Islanders acted as an isolated faction in the colonies and provided a unique commentary as observers rather than welcomed participants in the
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mainstream English religious discourse. Roger Williams chided in *The Bloody Tenent* that the New England Puritans were reluctant to separate from the established Church of England. He remarked that, ‘those persons in the New English plantations accounted unfit for Church estate, yet remaine all members of the Church of England, from which New England dares not separate, no not in their Sacraments, (as some of the Independents have published)’. Williams’ wording subtly conveys New England’s reluctancy, likely rooted in fear, of separating from the power of the established Church of England. Unlike the true Separatists of Plymouth, Massachusetts ministers recognised the benefits of maintaining amicable relations with as many powerful allies as possible in England, even if some of those allies would inevitably hold views opposed to their own. Williams also specifically noted that deceptive publications had been produced by the New England ‘Independents’, attesting to their loyalty to the Church of England and consistency with its practices. Williams’ observation makes clear that it was recognised even in his time that New Englanders invested considerable efforts into encouraging an image of loyalty and submission despite a clear desire to create distance from official English government and religious institutions.

A number of historians have questioned religious incentive as a primary motivation for many colonists to remove to New England. David Grayson Allen has disputed Anderson’s claims that religious motivations outweighed financial draw of New World opportunities. Allen goes on to remark, ‘the question can be turned around to ask whether the Netherlands, given its history as a haven for religious malcontents, were not also a “rational choice” for
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1630s migrants with religious motivations'. Bremer attempted to address Allen’s question by noting that, ‘[t]he importance of the American outpost grew, however, after 1633, as the English government successfully pressured Dutch civil and church authorities to conform to Laudian decrees’. The general focus on religious motivations, however, overlooks a crucial selling point of the New England colonies: their Englishness. Certainly other religious havens existed in Europe and even served as inspiration for the New England model. Solt has shown that besides the Netherlands, the Massachusetts Congregationalists drew inspiration from Frankfort and Geneva and recognised those cities as attractive theological centres. The problem with continental religious havens, however, was their foreign language, culture, and customs. For the most uncompromising of Saints, the choice was between unacceptable religious concessions in England or cultural abandonment in continental cities. New England offered an unspoiled template for a perfected English society free of religious and societal corruption.

Though they were welcomed into European religious circles, English nonconformists desired the cultural comforts of England and familiar company, merely excluding the theological limitations of home. Commenting on the Pilgrims at Plymouth, historian A. D. Innes has highlighted the importance of English cultural identity even to those who had been welcomed in the Netherlands.

The Pilgrim Fathers went out into the wilderness with no thought of shaking the dust of England from their feet; although the idea of transplanting themselves under the Dutch flag was mooted, it was clearly a leading desire with them to remain under the English flag, if they could be permitted to do so.
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without violation of conscience, which was not possible for them on the actual soil of their native land.\textsuperscript{130}

Innes’ characterisation of the Plymouth settlers desirous of maintaining an English identity holds true with the Saints of Massachusetts Bay as well. Conforti has argued similarly that, ‘[t]he founders’ encounter with the New World served less as a catalyst for an emergent American identity than as a colonial setting for the reaffirmation of their English origins’, while Lepore has suggested that English culture was a crucial consoler for colonists confronted with the wilderness.\textsuperscript{131} New England’s ‘city upon a hill’ was not intended to exist, nor be promoted, as a new and separated colony merely populated by English individuals, but rather was intended to represent a revitalisation of traditional English lifestyle and values in a perfected, idealistic form.\textsuperscript{132} Despite differences with the established Church of England, and especially its contemporary hierarchy, New England was promoted as a traditional English experience, complete with a purified Church under the label of customary English faith so as not to offend either prospective colonists or potential financial and political supporters in Parliament and the King’s court.\textsuperscript{133} In order to remain relevant as a desirable destination for English immigrants, the Puritan colonies were required to be marketed in England striking a balance between comfortable similarities and appropriate reforms. A universally-appealing image was difficult to create for the diverse classes of potential seventeenth century English colonists, but New England Congregationalists’ primary goal, especially following economic downturn and the religious and political turmoil of the civil war years, was to craft such a portrait of themselves.\textsuperscript{134} The pursuit of new colonists and support during the formative 1630s and 40s would play a crucial role in New England cultural development and become a
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central factor in shaping the region’s identity and relationship with England, particularly as religious and political policies shifted with events in England over time.

Unlike the declared Separatists of Plymouth, the Saints of Massachusetts Bay regarded themselves as integrated contributors within the English theological community. As David Scobey has put it, ‘[t]he ministers who defined the errand viewed themselves not as exiles subsisting in outer darkness but as actors in the penultimate scene of sacred history’. New England’s contribution to the English world was not limited to theological commentary, but encompassed a wider cultural integration within the English community. In order to demonstrate that the colonies represented a respectable facet of English society, New Englanders emphasised their worldly and learned prowess by establishing centres of learning in the colonies and publishing their societal achievements for readers in London.

New England’s Intellectual Relevancy and Integration with Old

Relying heavily on continued immigration and cultural interest in the colonies, New Englanders recognised the need to emphasise their continued cultural integration and relevance within the wider European circle. On the political stage, Jim Egan has claimed that New Englanders were expected to prove their continued political relevance and integrity despite the challenges of the wilderness.

Before they could even begin to persuade readers back in England that establishing subjects in a different climate could benefit the body politic, colonial authors had to demonstrate that living in a different climate did nothing to compromise one’s political identity. They did so by transforming the very basis of English identity, reimagining the body politic as dependent for its stability and perpetuity on the body’s ability to grow, rather than on the head’s ability to contain and subordinate that body.
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The statement Egan limits to the political sphere may be extended to all aspects of New England society. New Englanders presented their contributions to the English world as useful and relevant to the advancement of English theology, learning, and even culture with the publication of their own books. Rather than behave as inferior subordinates helplessly struggling in the wilderness, Puritan colonists tried to prove their merits by contributing valuably to the English world. The intended goal was to influence English society by demonstrating the benefits of a Saintly utopia while drawing in new interest and settlers by proving the colonies to be worthy of support and expansion.

Alongside purifying the theology of the Church, New England Saints desired a complete societal cleansing and elevation for their colonial community. Historian William Hunt has argued that an important aspect of the Puritan movement was its superimposition of religious discipline and morals upon the poor and young in their English communities, noting that it was generally the ‘better sort’ of parishioners, that is the most prosperous and educated, who associated with Puritanism. The social facet of Puritanism was translated into the settlement of New England and the theocracy established there. Similarly, Bruce C. Daniels has noted that ‘[o]ver 150 university graduates immigrated to New England in the founding years - approximately one for every 150 people, compared to one graduate per 600 in the home isles’. Indeed, religious dogmatism fuelled in part by elitist arrogance may be seen in Massachusetts’ dismissal of dissident settlers’ divergent theologies. In denouncing
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the purported Familism of Samuel Gorton and his followers, Edward Winslow derided that
‘[t]hey were all illiterate men, the ablest of them could not write true English, no not common
words, yet they would take upon them the interpretation of the most difficult places of
scripture . . .’.143 Apart from strictly religious concerns, Puritan New Englanders wished to
elevate their settlements above the societal standards they had perceived in England.144 Not
only would their religious ranks be purified, but also their social order. In all respects, New
England was hoped to be a cleansed and renewed version of old England, and expected to
attract settlers seeking the highest societal standards.

As attested by the establishment of Harvard in 1636, New Englanders were interested
in developing and maintaining a respectable learned community, though primarily based
around scripture and religious education. Despite the ambitious efforts of New Englanders in
establishing their own university in such a young colony, Harry S. Stout has noted the
criticism which it received for being too close in resembling the institutions of England.

By 1640, the question of practical education geared to the special needs of a
New World society had not yet been raised at Harvard College and the school
remained in all respects a duplicate of the mother institutions in Cambridge,
England. Consequently, Harvard remained an institution lacking any original
identity and relegated to an inferior position, with nothing to add to the
English progenitor. Such a situation did not go unnoticed in New England and
it prompted Thomas Lechford to remind John Winthrop to ‘Consider how
poorely your schooles goe on, you must depend upon England for help of
learned men and schollers, bookes, commodities infinite almost.145

Criticisms against New England’s university undermined the institution’s intended purpose as
a worthy contribution to the English intellectual community. Lacking credibility in New
England, many of the best colonial scholars sought or continued their educations at Oxford
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In pursuing the quality educations desired in the colonies, high levels of literacy were necessary in New England. Kenneth A. Lockridge has commented that a high level of literacy developed in New England as a result of Puritanism and the necessitated study and understanding of scripture. Similarly, Daniels has recognised that ‘Puritans devoured reading material with a hunger unmatched among their contemporaries. Because they feared that migration to the New World threatened to cut them off from English culture, the Puritan leadership took strong measures to avoid literary starvation’. Daniels’ analysis of New England Saints ‘hunger’ for literature and English culture attests to the colonists’ inferiority complex spurned by their removal in to the uncivilised wilderness. Daniels attributes New England’s high literacy rate, judging the region to be ‘more [literate] than any other region in the western world’, to the fact that ‘in New England, it became democratised, part of popular culture’. As Bremer has observed, ‘[b]ecause of its stress on the importance of studying Scripture, Puritanism was more accessible to the educated than to their less fortunate
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neighbors’. Though the Puritan movement was primarily composed of the ‘middling sorts’, adherents tended to be better educated, on average, than the general population.

Despite criticisms of Harvard’s unoriginal foundation, New England was still recognised by contemporaries as a centre of learning and quality education. In 1643 an anonymous author lauded ‘New Englands First Fruits; in respect first of the conversion of some, conviction of divers, preparation of sundry of the Indians. 2. Of the progress of Learning, in the Colledge at Cambridge in Massacusetts [sic.] Bay’. Interestingly, the cover of First Fruits also noted that it had been ‘Published by the instant request of sundry Friends, who desire to be satisfied in these points by many New-England Men who are here present, and were eye or eare-witnesses of the same’, remarking on the presence of New Englanders in London and first-hand accounts provided by colonists. Bruce Daniels promotes the consensus belief that the authors were likely Hugh Peter and Thomas Weld, publishing with the hopes of inspiring financial assistance toward Harvard College and Indian conversion efforts. Regardless of who the authors may have been, the promotion of New England learning was effective, as is attested by the demand for Harvard graduates returning from New England during the 1640s. New England’s growing reputation for knowledge and learning would help to bolster the region’s credibility later when New England divines entered the theological debate during the Civil War years in England.
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The fact that New England’s educational centre was named in honour of England’s own at Cambridge lends important insight into the colonist’s sense of self and identification. Though New Englanders may have been rebelling against aspects of the Church of England and the political situation in England, they were not opposed to English culture itself. Their English identity was something that New Englanders proudly cherished and wanted present in their new settlement.\textsuperscript{157} In her book, \textit{The Name of War}, Jill Lepore argues that English identity was crucial for separating the refined New England colonists from their savage Indian neighbours, though John Canup has suggested that a completely successful ‘transplantation’ and preservation of English culture into the American wilderness was not possible due to the physical realities of settling in the New World.\textsuperscript{158} In light of colonial perceptions of English identity, the first element of praise in the 1643 \textit{First Fruits}; the Christianisation of the Indians; bears an intimate relationship with the second point praising New England education.\textsuperscript{159} New England Puritans viewed and presented themselves as a civilising force, bringing order and advancement to the New World.\textsuperscript{160} With regard to their religious and theocratic aspirations, it may be said that New Englanders attempted to further civilise the English world, in the sense that they desired a purification of its religious and political structure, which they hoped to successfully implement and demonstrate as an example in the colonies.\textsuperscript{161} If the Reformation was going to be halted by the rise of Arminianism in England, then New Englanders would seek to establish a purified world in
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the colonies free from the corruption of Church and state witnessed in England.\textsuperscript{162} The continued attachment New Englanders felt to their English heritage and culture was an important factor in the colonial response to the outbreak of war, ensuring that a close connection would be felt to the events in England despite physical distance.\textsuperscript{163}

Besides maintaining networks of news and correspondences, some New Englanders desired to participate in the intellectual Atlantic community with their own publications from the wilderness of the New World. Letters and pamphlets had been flowing out of New England soon after settlement concerning religious practice and sermons preached in America, but some more practical minds wished to contribute to the thriving scientific community across the Atlantic. Indeed, Canup has recognised that during New England’s early development, a strong desire existed in the colonies to be perceived as intellectually compatible with the ‘metropolitan standards’ of developed England.\textsuperscript{164} Historian Sarah Rivett has illuminated the connection between science and shifting attitudes towards religion which came to prominence during the Scientific Revolution in Europe. It was a connection which would have greatly influenced the development of scientific inquiry and discourse in Puritan New England and manifested itself in transatlantic scientific discourse.\textsuperscript{165} Rivett argues that the development of empirical study assisted Puritan ministers in evaluating conversion experiences in the developing ‘science of the soul’.\textsuperscript{166} While New England divines were keen on utilising the latest methods of inquiry for enhancing their approach to conversion and
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worship, they were also eager to participate in secular scientific pursuits.\textsuperscript{167} These efforts, both religious and secular, attest to New Englanders’ desires to maintain close participation in the wider Atlantic world and keep pace with developments in England and continental Europe.\textsuperscript{168}

While John Winthrop the Elder was more concerned with theology and religious purity, his son, John Winthrop the Younger, still a devout Puritan, was more interested in the latest scientific pursuits in England and Europe.\textsuperscript{169} During the seventeenth century, alchemy represented a thriving field of study practiced by some of the most respected members of the Western scientific community. Historian Walter Woodward has argued that John Winthrop Jr. of Connecticut, a learned alchemist, was actually an instrumental figure in introducing alchemy and mainstream science into New England during the 1630s and 40s.\textsuperscript{170} During the 1640s, at the start of New England’s economic downturn following the end the Great Migration, John Winthrop Jr. set about establishing New London as a cultural centre of New England. The very name chosen for the settlement, suggestive of Winthrop’s high aspirations, was initially thought by contemporaries in the General Court to be too audacious for the minor settlement.\textsuperscript{171} Winthrop successfully recruited several prominent alchemists from England and Europe to join him in founding a scientific centre in the new colony, which was hoped to bring economic improvement and greater prestige to the region.\textsuperscript{172}
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In his efforts to assemble great European scholars to vitalise New England’s scientific community, John Winthrop Jr. made the mistake of gathering individuals too lenient in their Puritan beliefs for the liking of many New England divines. One of these alchemists was Dr. Robert Child, an English Presbyterian who openly confronted Massachusetts magistrates on the colony’s restrictive religious and political practices.\textsuperscript{173} Child’s criticism drew scorn from the Puritan community within the new confederation known as the United Colonies of New England, comprising Massachusetts, Plymouth, New Haven, and Connecticut, which thereafter tried to sabotage the alchemical community in New London and seriously curtailed Winthrop Jr.’s efforts.\textsuperscript{174} Besides promoting science and surveying of the New World and establishing a community of learned academics who could enhance New England’s intellectual contributions toward the European circle, Winthrop Jr. and his followers had worked to improve New England industry through the establishment of the Saugus ironworks.\textsuperscript{175} Due to the religious controversy and hostility towards the incoming alchemists and iron workers, New London never developed to the full potential John Winthrop Jr. envisioned.\textsuperscript{176} Winthrop Jr.’s failed attempt to bring greater respect to the New England community through science and industry represented one of the greatest consequences of Massachusetts’ detrimental policies. During the first generation of stubborn theocrats, New England immigration, reputation, and economy were sacrificed upon the altar of religious purity. In the wake of war, the Saints’ restrictive colonial policies would be challenged more
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than ever before and would be forced to become more accommodating and worldly in line with the beliefs of more amenable magistrates like John Winthrop the Younger.177

The tension surrounding John Winthrop Jr.’s failed scientific foundation in New England illustrates an important point about colonial New England. While all of the New England colonists desired a favourable reputation for their respective plantations in England, they disputed the means of achieving that status and were quite willing to undermine their colonial neighbours for their own colonies’ gains.178 Where Winthrop Jr.’s community sought scientific achievement and recognition abroad, the more devout community, including John Winthrop the Elder in Massachusetts, perceived a potential threat to the religious purity of New England.179 For John Winthrop, the humiliation and suppression of his religious opponents was one of few sources of positive news regarding the reputation of Massachusetts:

John Winthrop crowed in his journal that he had heard reports that Robert Child had been forced to apologize for boxing the ears of a Mr. Willoughby . . . after they argued over Child’s assertion that New England men “were a Company of Rogues & knaves” . . . [it] was the best news Winthrop had received about his colony’s reputation in a long time.180

Child’s experience highlights an important difference between Winthrop the Elder and his son, and more broadly underlines a generational difference in the New England colonies. While the former took a more conservative approach, valuing the preservation of religious purity above all else, Winthrop Jr. and his generation of magistrates recognised more fully the importance of toleration, especially in light of war transitions in England, for the survival of
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the colonial settlements.\textsuperscript{181} Indeed, the difference between Winthrop and his son paralleled the contrast in Europe between conservative religious zealots and still-devout, though more tolerant, minds embracing the movement now known as the Scientific Revolution.\textsuperscript{182} Unlike his father, Winthrop the Younger saw the future in scientific enlightenment rather than bigoted theology and intolerance and wished to assimilate New England into the modernising Atlantic fold.\textsuperscript{183} Commenting on the relationship between Winthrop Jr. and his father, Bernard Bailyn has observed, ‘… increasingly, and especially at this time, the two Winthrops differed on the limits of toleration, the father deeply entrenched in defence of his carefully delimited domain, the son reaching out more and more broadly to the open-ended world of science, arcane experimentation, and energetic entrepreneurship’.\textsuperscript{184} Winthrop Jr.’s efforts to cultivate a greater scientific community in New England were not fruitless in that they brought him respect from an international scientific community and made clear that New England was capable of producing more than theological thought for the Atlantic community.\textsuperscript{185}

The efforts of John Winthrop Jr. and others to justify New England’s reputation as a centre of learning and intellect may be better understood in light of their critics. In 1644, Presbyterian Thomas Edwards, writing on behalf of the Church of Scotland against the Independents, targeted New England as a site of particular religious malpractice. In a scathing criticism of New England society, Edwards’ \textit{Antapologia} claimed, ‘Take the prime man of them all in new England, and yet, he is not to be accounted as judicious and learned.
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as ever any this kingdome bred’. Though Edwards conceded that there were perhaps two ‘judicious Divines’ of quality to be found in New England, he insisted that none could compare to the intellectual and spiritual standards of England. Indeed Edwards’ rebuke, which had been occasioned by the religious animosity between the Presbyterian Church and the Congregationalists of New England, represented a nightmarish offence against the intellectual reputations of both individuals like Winthrop Jr. as well as at the broader colonial level considering the establishment of Harvard. New Englanders resented the supercilious judgements of contemptuous observers in England and dedicated themselves to dispelling any English notions of colonial cultural inferiority.

New England’s integration in the Atlantic network represented a critical and defining feature of the region’s identity during its early development. Scientific research, industry, theology, publishing, and effective governance were all pursued as means to justify the young settlements in the eyes of observers in England. Efforts toward showcasing the merits of the unproven colonies were not only for regional prestige, but were important for attracting necessary new colonists to settle in the region. Promotion and defence of the region would be of particular importance once civil war broke out and reverberated through the English world, forcing the colonies to adapt to the changes in England. As distant as the colonies seemed physically, they remained very well-connected with England during the war and colonists took sides with the same zeal as those in England with some colonists even deciding to return
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to England to participate in the war effort.\textsuperscript{193} Though most colonies remained outwardly neutral, obvious tensions rose between colonial governments commensurate with their religious and political affiliations.\textsuperscript{194} The war in England was a defining feature in the development of New England and played an important role in future development of colonial culture through demographic determination.\textsuperscript{195} The war’s impact also attested to the level of integration and communication between England and its American colonies during the 1640s and would leave a lasting legacy by compelling New England ministers to adopt religious compromises necessary to remain relevant in the English world.\textsuperscript{196}
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New England’s Tears and Old England’s Fears:  
Shifting Perceptions of New England and the Transatlantic Civil War

Good Sir,
There coming to my hands a Letter that was sent by a godly minister in New-England to one of my Parishioners, against Anabaptists, Separatists, and Antinomians, and Familists: and knowing that it hath done much good, I desire to have it printed, that it may be more publicke.\textsuperscript{197}

- John Thornbecke, December 10, 1644

The sharp divisions created by Civil War in England were no less evident in the colonies than they were in England. It was clear from the outbreak of war that the Saints of New England would be more partial toward Parliament in the conflict, though the feeble colonies maintained an official policy of outward neutrality as a safeguard against potential retribution at the war’s conclusion.\textsuperscript{198} Even without the entanglement of official factious affiliations, many New Englanders returned to England through personal initiative to participate in the war and take up new ministerial opportunities.\textsuperscript{199} Contrary to arguments presented by Perry Miller and Harry S. Stout, however, most Saints had not initially envisioned their eventual return to England during the 1640s.\textsuperscript{200} Rather, remigration was the result of unforeseen circumstances occasioned by war in England, to which New Englanders were forced to respond.\textsuperscript{201} The flow of so many colonists back to England provided Puritans
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in England, as well as their detractors, a new opportunity to assess New Englanders first
hand. As colonists made efforts to emphasise their cultural integration and commitment to
English affairs through participation in the war, they also drew the colonies under greater
scrutiny from observers in England. As a result of the reforms made to the Church and
state during the 1640s, New England’s advantages came into question, as well as the
colonies’ continued relevance in light of the changes in England itself.

In December of 1644, Thomas Shepard in Cambridge, Massachusetts composed a
letter for a friend in England in which he mourned the ‘sad condition of England’. In just
over three months, with the help of John Thornbecke, the letter was published in London for
the purpose of disseminating Shepard’s views on the war raging in England. Though Shepard
acknowledged the distance across the Atlantic, he made clear that the events in England were
of grave concern for his fellow New Englanders, remarking that while New England was
happily at peace, ‘... this peace giveth us no rest, while our deare England is in trouble, for
which we would weep ...’. Speaking not just for himself, Shepard indicated that he was
expressing common sentiments of frustration and sorrow prevalent in New England on the
crisis across the Atlantic. Though physically distant, England was present in the minds of
New Englanders as tensions led to war in 1642. During the crisis, many colonists considered
themselves not passive bystanders, but rather integrated participants in the events across the
Atlantic.
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Communication and Transatlantic New England Connections

On September 22, 1642, John Winthrop entered in his journal that a fast had been occasioned, in part by, ‘the ill news we had out of England concerning the breach between the king and parliament’. Receiving letters through merchant vessels and preferred carriers, New Englanders, especially colonial magistrates, maintained close contact with correspondents in England and kept informed on recent events, however recent the Atlantic passage would allow. In private letters and his journal, John Winthrop cited Captain Thomas Hawkins on numerous occasions as a trusted courier who carried news and messages for Winthrop and his family, as well as official news for other colonial magistrates. Besides personal letters, New Englanders received a number of newspapers from England through various sources. Some New England travelers who returned to England endeavoured to collect news sources to pass to friends and family in the colonies while others sent publications to distributors such as Thomas Dudley in Boston. In terms of newspapers, New Englanders tended to be more partial to the Parliamentarian *Mercurius Britannicus*, though occasionally faulted the paper, as evidenced by the harsh comments found in the Cavalier *Mercurius Aulicus*, from Reverend Nathaniel Rogers of Ipswich, condemning *Britannicus* for slander against the King. Through distributors and republications, many New Englanders would have had access to newspapers, albeit several weeks out of date.

212 Ibid., p.41.
New Englanders sought news not only out of personal interest, but also to remain integrated within the English Atlantic network. Keeping informed on matters in England, especially for colonial magistrates and principal ministers in the colonies, was an important reflection on their stations in the colonies as well as an indication of a more general class standing within English society. Historian Fritz Levy has emphasised the importance of knowledge of news and familiarity with current events, which came to be defining features of social distinction by the seventeenth century. ‘Claiming inside knowledge’, Levy argues, ‘was the way to be noticed; indeed, for many of them, news replaced (or at least supplemented) clothes as the new social marker, the way of distinguishing themselves from the hordes pressing on them from below’. For the Saints of New England, and especially Governor John Winthrop in Massachusetts, access to news also represented interconnectedness and facilitated participation with important events taking place in England. Winthrop’s concerted efforts to acquire news through numerous sources and carriers indicates how highly he valued the latest information pertaining to England. Keeping informed of events in England was not only a way for the Saints to maintain their English identity and association, but also allowed them to show their capabilities within the colonies and willingness to participate and contribute in the wider world and events across the Atlantic.

With knowledge on events in England, New Englanders provided their own perspectives on matters across the Atlantic. In 1644, Nathaniel Rogers assured the House of
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Commons, ‘. . . be pleased to understand hereby our due respect to and remembrance daily, and almost continually of the great and high worke that you have in hand: and our labours and travailing thoughts and desires (according to our condition and measure) to promote that Cause, which you have the heaviest end of at present lying upon your hands . . . ’. Rogers argued in religious terms that England’s continued misery was wrought not only by the unholy acts of Cavaliers and King Charles, but perhaps also by Parliamentarians’ unwillingness to acknowledge their own fault of inaction in the years preceding the war.

Addressing the House of Commons, Rogers asked, ‘hath it [House of Commons] confessed the guilt of neglecting such Reformation in former Parliaments, yea, the rejecting of motions presented that way: and justifying the then present state of the Church, as being pure & c?’ By allocating the blame for offending God and catalysing war to Parliament as well as Royalists, the religious justification for establishing the New England colonies is further clarified. Settlers like Rogers sought to distance themselves, not only from the Church of England, but also from the pretence of satisfaction under the official Church and government institutions upholding it. For devout New Englanders, even tolerating the crimes within the Church of England had been a punishable offence in the eyes of God.

Rogers’ suggestions to Parliament and his comments on the war were evidence of the deep connection New Englanders felt to the events in England. Though few New Englanders directly addressed Parliament on matters of war, many felt an intimate connection with those suffering from the conflict in England. In July of 1640, before the outbreak of open civil war, William Hooke of Taunton, Massachusetts preached a sermon entitled *New Englands Teares,*
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for Old Englands Feares, in which he addressed the deteriorating ties between factions in England, which many predicted would soon result in war.\textsuperscript{220} In 1642, Hooke preached another sermon entitled New-Englands Sence, of Old-England and Irelands Sorrowes, in which he expressed the grief and frustrations over the injustice and suffering witnessed in England using biblical analogy alluding to David’s war with the Ammonites.\textsuperscript{221} The subtitle on the London publication described Hooke’s sermon as, ‘A Sermon Preached upon a day of generall Humiliation in the Churches of New-England. In the behalfe of Old-England and Irelands Sad condition.’\textsuperscript{222} During the war, sermons mourning the crisis were not uncommon in New England and were accompanied by fasting days corresponding with important battles and developments during the war in England.\textsuperscript{223} Sympathetic fasts and sermons held in New England marking events during the war demonstrated continued connectedness with England and expressed empathy for kin suffering across the Atlantic.

Though some in England were welcoming the advice of New England preachers and returning Harvard graduates during the war years, others warned against England replicating the religious and political course taken by the New England colonies. Thomas Lechford, America’s first lawyer and disgruntled New England colonist, had quickly become disillusioned with the so-called New England Way shortly after his arrival in 1638.\textsuperscript{224} By 1639, Lechford’s unwillingness to cooperate with New England’s civil and church officials resulted in him being temporarily banned from practicing law and prevented from attending
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church at Boston.\textsuperscript{225} Having tasted New England life and culture, Lechford eagerly returned to England in 1641.\textsuperscript{226} In 1642, the year of his death, Lechford published \textit{Plain Dealing} on his experiences in New England, warning those in England against emulating the inhospitable and unaccommodating conditions of the colonies.\textsuperscript{227} After his death, Lechford’s \textit{Plain Dealing} was republished in 1645 by an unknown publisher with the addition of a qualifying epithet indicating that the contents were, ‘Written by one that hath lived there [New England], and seene the division and danger that followeth upon the obtruding a different Government to that of Old England’.

Lechford’s use of New England as an infamous example suggests that his audience was familiar with the region and its popular repute. Indeed, it was in part the prevalence of such sentiments, promoted by common publications in London, which discouraged prospective immigrants from emigrating to New England during the Civil War.\textsuperscript{229}

Just as Edward Winslow had acted as an agent responding to transatlantic critiques against Plymouth and Massachusetts Bay, John Cotton was eager to come to the defence of Congregationalism in New England on behalf of the clergy. In 1648 Cotton dismissed Lechford’s entire book, asserting, ‘The book is unfitly called Plain dealing, which (in respect of many passages in it) might rather be called false and fraudulent’.\textsuperscript{230} Using rhetoric familiar
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to those accustomed to defending New England’s reputation from disaffected colonists, Cotton served as a clerical agent of sorts for the Saints of Massachusetts Bay. In this stead, Cotton was required to defend the Bay Colony’s theocratic governance from both suspicious English authorities in London, as well as skeptical prospective colonists who might have been deterred by common reports of restrictive Puritan standards and religious persecution. Cotton’s profusion of publications printed and sold in London attests to his voice in England, as well as to the determination of Bay Colony officials and clerics to propagate a favourable reputation among common readers in England.

As the war progressed and London became a Parliamentarian stronghold, a publishing war broke out between the Cavalier headquarters at Oxford and the Parliamentarians in London. Royalist appeals like No Peace ’till the King Prosper and A letter to a friend Shewing, the illegall proceedings of the two houses of Parliament were published from Oxford for Cavalier readers, while London represented a more tolerant hub of Parliamentarian and diverse religious publications. The battle of publications reflected an important aspect of the propaganda war during the Civil War and the importance of cultivating appealing perceptions of the respective armies and their supporters, which included New England predominantly associated with the Parliamentarians. Edward Winslow, in particular, sought to incorporate England’s Civil War rhetoric into New England
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discourse to portray the colonies as an integrated and relevant piece of the English world connected to events across the Atlantic.  

When Edward Winslow appealed to Parliament in defence of Massachusetts, he framed his argument against Samuel Gorton and other New England radicals in a very calculated way, tailored toward the shifting fashions in Parliamentarian policy and politics. During the war, radical groups such as the Levellers under John Lilburne had established a sizeable following within the New Model Army. During his time in the New Model Army, Gorton had become involved with these same radical groups, identifying so closely with the John Saltmarsh, a prominent Ranter, that Gorton later published *Saltmarsh Returned from the Dead* in his honour, encouraging English readers to adopt religious and political reforms similar to the Leveller positions which had been prominent in the New Model Army. Historian Michelle Burnham argues that Samuel Gorton and other dissidents in the colonies shared political philosophies which were closely aligned with the Levellers in England. Phillip Gura has even suggested that Gorton’s return to New England in 1648 was likely occasioned by the decline in Leveller influence following the Putney Debates of 1647, along with his own discouragement with faltering and disappointing religious and political reforms in England. In 1649, Winslow capitalised on shifting trends in English public perception of the radical factions produced by the war, publishing *The Danger of Tolerating Levellers in a Civil State* (London: Richard Cotes for John Bellamy, 1649).
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Taking advantage of widespread disillusionment with radical reforms, Winslow warned those in England against trusting the radical dissidents who criticised the political order and religious stability of the Saints in Massachusetts. The fact that Civil War rhetoric was intentionally adopted by New England agents to describe matters in the colonies is important in understanding the degree to which colonists felt interconnected with the events and community in England. By using a term reserved for a particular branch of political radicals within the army, Winslow simultaneously appealed to allies in England, who would have preconceived notions of true Levellers, while asserting the colonies’ integration and awareness of matters taking place in England.

Winslow’s strategy of equating radicals in the New England colonies with unpopular factions in England was significant for a number of reasons. By referencing familiar factions in England to describe the dissatisfied parties within New England, Winslow appealed to existing emotions in England regarding potentially dangerous radical ideologies. The application of a Civil War party to a group within New England also helped to foster the notion that New England was an integral piece of the wider English world. As such, Winslow intended to demonstrate the loyalty of Massachusetts and suggest that a common religion and government practice acceptable to Parliament tied the distant colonies to English culture and events. The reference to Levellers in Winslow’s piece against Gorton sought to portray the
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radicals of New England as enemies of both colonial governments and the new leadership in London.\textsuperscript{246} Thus, by painting the enemies of New England as the same enemies of England, persecution against New England’s political foes was justified as a protection of the broader English commonweal the same as religious persecution.\textsuperscript{247} By tying events in New England to current concerns in England, Winslow also imparted a greater sense of urgency on dealing with colonial dissidents like Gorton, who Winslow claimed were active in the dangerous movements troubling England. Winslow’s efforts to illustrate tensions in New England as connected to the conflict in Old also helped to foster the notion of intimacy between the colonies and their overseers in England, upon which amicable relations could be developed between the colonies and the new government in London.\textsuperscript{248}

By the end of the war, New England’s participation in the conflict and affiliations with the ideologies of the New Model Army and Parliament had become defining features through the English transatlantic lens. Congregationalists in New England, praised by Parliament and sympathetic soldiers, were thoroughly vilified by bitter Royalists fulminating over the downfall of traditional English government and policy.\textsuperscript{249} The anonymous Royalist author of \textit{The British Bell-man} made his sentiments clear by the dating of the piece as being ‘Printed in the Year of the Saints fear’.\textsuperscript{250} In the book, the author berated immoral Puritans in England, imagining former New Model Army soldiers departing for New England in pursuit
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of the stolen gold that the Parliamentarian Army had previously sent to the colonies.\textsuperscript{251} The author chided, ‘[Puritan] Caterpillers of our Common-wealth, to \textit{New-Engl}and and the \textit{Spaw}, after our gold you have sent away, lost on a sudden we send you to \textit{Styx} without a penny in your mouth: to pay your passage to your God \textit{Pluto} . .’.\textsuperscript{252} In the author’s fantasised ill-fated passage to New England undertaken by Puritan Parliamentary supporters, New England Puritans are portrayed as enabling affiliates conspiring with the unscrupulous Parliamentary soldiers and equally worthy of God’s condemnation. As Parliament thanked New Englanders for their valuable contribution to the war and sympathetic ministers in England welcomed New England ideologies into open English religious discourse, Royalists perceived New England as a pestilent stronghold of ungodly men, representative of the worst influences in England.\textsuperscript{253}

Though physically distant, New Englanders remained concerned and connected to events in England and anxiously awaited news of recent developments. For the duration of the war, colonists remained very conscious of the war’s progress and kept in contact with friends and family who had remained in England.\textsuperscript{254} As Hooke’s sermons suggest, many New Englanders were very emotionally invested in the war and general events in England despite their removal to the colonies, reflecting both connectedness with England, as well as the sensitivity of New England identity in relation to events in England.\textsuperscript{255} Observing the changes in England made some colonists question their lives in the harsh wilderness of
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America. During the Civil War, news from England would promote the changes there and the opening of ministerial positions following Puritan advances, which attracted many disillusioned Saints tired of their exile in America. Atlantic communication during the Civil War played a central role in facilitating remigration and colonial participation during the war. Publications promoting reforms in England, combined with correspondences expressing dissatisfaction in the colonies, placed a heavy burden on magistrates trying to preserve their settlements in the face of challenges from England. Remigration and Civil War involvement would deplete some of New England’s most important university men, and even some leading colonial officials, and call into question the relevancy of wilderness settlement in light of new reforms in England.

New England Remigration and Civil War Involvement

At the outbreak of Civil War, many New England colonists felt compelled to return to England, some answering a moral calling to arms, others for personal opportunistic advancement in a renewed England. Remigration, beginning in the 1640s, sent roughly a quarter of New England colonists back to England and had important cultural impacts for those who remained in the colonies. The reform of Church and government institutions in England removed much of the original incentive for migration to the colonies and reshaped New England demographics by drawing away many of the learned university men who
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comprised the unique community of New England Saints. The threat to the New England colonies from the mass departure of important individuals was recognised by contemporaries and those departing were often scorned by zealous Congregationalists loyal to the colonies’ principles. As Andrew Delbanco has noted, ‘[w]hether they were Parliament men like Downing or royalists like Starkey, those who returned to England were considered traitors’. Atlantic migration and war participation would highlight New Englanders’ willingness to participate in the English world, but would also challenge the unique religious community of the colonies. The sweeping reforms produced by war would result in a renewed England, not only enticing to Puritans, but posing as a serious rival threatening the survival of the colonies which were increasingly seen as unnecessary alongside a reformed England.

Even before the Civil War began, Protestant officials in England who respected the New England venture expressed an expectation that the supposed bastion of godliness would contribute substantially to the support and defence of English Protestantism, especially against Catholic threats. In July of 1640, William Fiennes, Lord Saye and Sele, wrote a letter chastising John Winthrop for neglecting his duties of defending English faith in America. Referring to the perceived threat of Spanish Catholicism, Fiennes stated his
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hopes, ‘most of all for the advancement of the gospell & puttinge downe the great adversary thereof, that man of siñ, wherewith to you are now you neither are able, nor are likely to be, to putt your handes to the least wheele that is to be turned about in that work . . .’. 268 Fiennes’ expectations for New England’s active offence against Catholics in America were not unusual among prominent English noblemen concerned with the protection of Protestantism in Christendom. 269 In the same vein as Lord Saye and Sele, prominent Parliamentarian John Pym delivered a speech, published after his death in 1643, in which he argued for a joint coalition of the English colonies in America to conquer Spain’s American holdings while Spain was occupied with war in Germany and the Netherlands:

> It is not unknown how weak, how distracted, how discontented the Spanish Colonies are in the West Indies. There are now in those parts in New England, Virginia, and the Caribe-Islands, and in the Barmudos, at least 60000 able persons of this Nation, many of them well armed, and their bodies seasoned to that Climate, which with a very small charge might bee set down in some advantagious parts of these pleasant, rich and fruitfull Countreys, and easily make his Majestie Master of all that treasure, which not only foment the war, but is the great support of Popery in all parts of Christendom. 270

Pym viewed his desired American crusade as an important moral fight against the strength of Catholicism in Europe and the spread of popery in America. 271 In the minds of prominent Parliament officials in England, the American colonists, especially the Saints in New England, had a moral obligation to participate in the defence of their faith, just as many Puritans fighting for the Parliamentarians in England believed they were doing during the Civil War. 272 Though magistrates generally wished to avoid entanglements beyond the means
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of their small colonies, direct personal connections to the war in England justified significant and impassioned participation from New Englanders during the 1640s.273

While John Winthrop, like other colonial governors, attempted to maintain an outward appearance of neutrality, he and most other colonial Puritans favoured Parliament’s cause, as both the King and Parliament had suspected New Englanders would.274 The influx in New England migration back to England for soldiering in the Roundhead army was seen as a sign of general support and was rewarded by the Parliamentarians, who regarded and treated the New England colonies as allies.275 Writing from Oxford in October of 1643, Sir Edward Nicholas sent a letter to Colonel Henry Hastings addressing the condition of both the King’s and Parliamentarians’ forces, indicating that the rebels were losing ground in the war. Nicholas revealed that, in desperation, the Parliamentarian forces had, ‘lately sent away a ship for New England laden with 300 chests, trunks and hampers, besides cases wrapped up with leather, to the value of at least a million of money it is thought’.276 The fact that Parliament’s army entrusted New England in the safekeeping of such a sum of money indicates a very high level of confidence and cooperation between the colonies and Parliament, and suggests a conviction that New Englanders would be willing to defend the trove against Royalist incursion. With all of the turmoil in England, New England would have represented one of the most secure locations in the English world for Parliamentarian valuables. New England loyalty to Parliament was rewarded in 1644 when Parliament granted the New England colonies custom-free trading to all regions under Parliamentary
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control ostensibly, ‘in regard they were well-affected to the Gospel of Truth, and the Honourable Proceedings of Parliament’.\textsuperscript{277} Favours granted by Parliament to New England helped to bolster the colonies’ relationship with Parliament as colonists discovered that they could receive the same or better treatment under Parliament as they had under the King.

Parliament’s treatment of New England during the war reflected the colonies’ roles as branches of England across the Atlantic. New England magistrates recognised the high expectations placed on the Saints for contributions to the troubles in England and sought ways to capitalise on support from Parliament while maintaining a relatively neutral official colonial policy for fear that actions against the potentially victorious king might result in treason charges following the conflict.\textsuperscript{278} For the safety of the colonies, New England magistrates kept any cooperation with Parliament quiet, lest it stir vengeance from Royalist ships or those loyal to Charles in Virginia.\textsuperscript{279} Maintaining a balance between neutral observer and satisfactory participant during the war proved to be one of the chief challenges facing magistrates crafting Atlantic colonial policy and greatly influenced the development of New England and its relationship with England.

For many New Englanders, emotional attachment to England and crisis in the 1640s extended to active participation in the war effort in England.\textsuperscript{280} As early as 1640, Nathaniel Barnardiston wrote John Winthrop from England concerning the loss of so many Saints to the colonies who could have supported the Puritan cause in England in the time of need. ‘Now we see and feele’, wrote Barnardiston, ‘how much we are weake by those that are gonn from us, who should haue stood in the gapp, and haue wrought and wasled mightily in this great
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business’. Many Saints in the colonies heard and heeded the Puritan call during the 1640s and were willing to take up arms at the start of war. During the war, John Winthrop’s own son Stephen left New England to fight for Parliament, writing his father that he believed war service in support of Parliament to be the most useful offering a person of his generation could provide. Stephen’s sense of moral obligation to serve the Puritan cause by assisting Parliament through active service in the war in England was not unusual in New England as many colonists departed to join the Parliamentarian army. Though no effort was officially organised by the New England colonies to send soldiers to the war, many colonists left on their own initiative to fight in England. Thomas Rainsborough’s Regiment in particular included many New Englanders who had returned to serve in the war. The departure of soldiers, ministers, and doctors greatly contributed to the reversal in the Atlantic migration trend in New England during the 1640s and brought a wave of New England thought and influence into England.

Not all New Englanders were happy to see fellow colonists returning to support Parliament in war, even if there was hope that it may further the Puritan cause in England. Among others, John Winthrop was disappointed to see his colony’s small population dwindle further following the economic crisis. Joseph Conforti argues that despite improving Puritan prospects in England, New England’s Congregationalist core remained focused on success in the colonies.
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As [Edward Johnson] revealed in ‘New England’s Annoyances,’ Johnson grew impatient with migrants who hastily quit New England, even if it was to join the Puritan cause at home. The founders’ purpose endured ‘to rebuild the most glorious Edifice of Mount Sion in a Wilderness’. 287

Even though returning Saints could potentially bolster the reputation of New England as a contributor toward the Puritan cause in England, it was feared that it reflected poorly on the colonies to have so many settlers leave. 288 Frustrated Congregationalists dedicated to the original founding vision of the colonial Saints presumed that those leaving were forsaking the colonies for selfish purposes of comfortable resettlement in England, as was, in fact, proved to be the case for many hopefuls returning to England. 289

While many New England immigrants were eager to begin new lives in the wilderness of America, others had left England reluctantly and wished to return to the comforts of home. 290 This fact became painfully obvious to Governor John Winthrop of Massachusetts during the period of New England’s ‘Reverse Migration’ from 1640 until the Restoration in 1660. Immigration had already been dwindling towards the end of the 1630s, which precipitated an economic downturn in New England’s immigrant-reliant economy. 291 Having already lost immigrants to the reforms in England, the subsequent economic collapse of New England only contributed to the reversing trend in migration. Winthrop lamented in 1641 that the fall in prices and poor economic prospects ‘occasioned many there to speak evil of us’, though he noted that the industrious colonists quickly went on to resolve those issues,
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especially matters concerning the Bay Colony’s reputation in England.\textsuperscript{292} Bay officials desired to improve the appeal of the colony in the eyes of prospective immigrants, as well as reassure necessary English benefactors that the troubles in New England’s economy were only temporary.\textsuperscript{293}

In order to ease fiscal concerns from investors in England, Massachusetts sent selected individuals to London, purportedly to celebrate the welcome reforms in English government, though their true purpose was to repair the fiscal state of the colony through whatever means necessary. The agents’ first task was to inform London creditors for Massachusetts Bay on the ‘the true cause why we could not make so current payment now as in former years we had done’. The Massachusetts agents were also instructed to find whatever help they could for the colony, but told ‘that they should not seek supply of our wants in any dishonorable way’.\textsuperscript{294} Massachusetts Bay officials, already concerned with the damage done to their colony’s standing by the economic downturn, wanted to prevent further disparagement as a result of begging and uphold the region’s honour as best as they could. Sending the agents to England was purely intended to bolster the standing of Massachusetts in England by amassing new respect in celebrating war successes while preserving old supporters connected to the colonies financially. The use of such agents besides Edward Winslow reasserts how important perceptions of the colonies in England were to the colonial magistrates in government policy. New England success was dependent on the credibility and respectability of its Congregationalist community.\textsuperscript{295}
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In the wake of such changes that even enticed respected minister John Davenport to depart for England, New England ministers and magistrates were required to craft new policies and justifications to appeal to potential colonists in England.\textsuperscript{296} The traditional target demographic for New England recruitment - dissatisfied Saints seeking freedom from coercive Arminian policy - no longer felt the need to leave England for religious purposes.\textsuperscript{297} Besides the cultural threat posed by new competition with English reforms, New England witnessed the departure of many of the learned university men who made the colonies and their demographics so unique in the English world. As Harry Stout has observed, ‘[l]eading in the removal out of New England were nearly half of the highly trained ministers and university men who, in large measure, accounted for the uniqueness of the New England settlements’.\textsuperscript{298} The removal of so many important New England Saints was a detriment to a colonial community which prided itself on its learned prowess and religious piety.\textsuperscript{299} On the other side of the Atlantic, the mass return of so many nonconformist colonists highlighted New England character to observers in England and provided detractors much to criticise.

**Royalist and Episcopal Sentiments of New Englanders**

Arminian supporters in England has initially celebrated, to an extent, the New England colonies as an adequately distant exile for the most uncompromising Puritans who might otherwise openly contest practices within the Church in England.\textsuperscript{300} The return of roughly a quarter of New England’s population during the war, however, brought the ‘New England Way’ directly into England and threatened the established Church and government


hierarchy with Congregationalism. The return of New Englanders to England during the war prompted new criticisms against the colonies from Royalists and Arminians and proved to be yet another obstacle to attracting new settlers.

Though the colonies were highly respected by many Parliamentarians, Royalist sympathisers held a contemptuous view of New England as a dumping ground for undesirables, namely Puritans. In a pamphlet purportedly revealing Scottish intelligence gathered in 1642 during the Scottish Wars, the author recorded a prominent Cavalier opinion that, ‘The voice went that all the Protestant strangers should have beene sent into New England (if the King could have spared shipping) and the others should have made a catholicke Army, to have gone against the Scots . . . ‘. The dream of disposing of the King’s enemies in distant New England was not a short-lived fantasy, but endured through the Restoration, when Charles II’s advisors proposed exiling the Crown’s enemies to the New England colonies. In 1643, Archbishop John Bramhall of Ireland defended monarchy and the Church of England against those who wanted to overturn the status quo with religious pluralism. To enhance his point, he provided a caricatured version of New England as preferable to the anarchy which he suggested would ensue without a king and strong Church of England.

Shall we without need put our lifes into the hands of crackbrain’d unskilfull Empericks? [sic] which have taught us already to our losse, that a new Phisitian must have a new Church-yard: rather mutemus clipeos, let us leafe.
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them old England, and content our selves with new England. It will be better to live in hollow Trees, among Savages and Wild Beasts, then here, to be chopping and hanging our Religion every new Moon.\textsuperscript{306}

It is important to note that Archbishop Bramhall’s remark on New England represented more than a passing comment within political commentary. Bramhall depicted New England, very intentionally, as not only sub-par; something to be merely ‘content’ with; but socially uncivilised.\textsuperscript{307} Though obviously inserted as a piece of wry satire, a true disdain of New England colonists underlay the remark and would have been familiar among Bramhall’s Cavalier readers. It was attitudes like Bramhall’s which drove magistrates like John Winthrop, ministers like John Cotton, and scientific minds like John Winthrop Jr., to publish and participate in European discourse to prove the capabilities of learned colonists and demonstrate an interconnectedness with the wider world.\textsuperscript{308} For Royalist observers, New England’s Puritan theocracy and wilderness inspired derision too strong to overcome with unconvincing propaganda. Many Royalists viewed the Episcopal hierarchy and the monarchy as forces of stability in England that were absent in the Puritan colonies.\textsuperscript{309} To Cavalier observers, the Civil War, along with its destabilising influences and spectrum of religious and political philosophies, represented the ultimate breakdown of English society and order which could only be made worse with New England influence.\textsuperscript{310} While New England was revered by many like-minded Saintly ministers in England, it was viewed with great suspicion and disdain by Royalists who perceived the New England Way as a poison corrupting traditional, orderly English religion and politics and contributing to the turmoil.
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during the war.\textsuperscript{311} Even within the confines of New England, religious tensions characterised intercolonial relations between Episcopal Maine and its neighbouring Puritan colonies, which dominated the region.\textsuperscript{312}

Though New England appeared far removed from the violence of England, war very nearly broke out in the colonies in response to events across the Atlantic. John Winthrop recorded that in 1644 a battle nearly took place in Charlestown harbour when Captain Stagg ordered the surrender of a Bristol ship under a Parliamentary commission authorising the seizure of ships originating in Royalist ports.\textsuperscript{313} Though the Bristol ship yielded, Winthrop noted that ‘[t]wo or three would have fought, and rather have blown up their ship than have yielded; but the greater part prevailed, and so she was quietly taken . . .’.\textsuperscript{314} Earlier that same year, Winthrop recorded a Powhatan attack against Virginia, which the Indians had claimed was occasioned by the distraction of the Civil War and the sighting of two English ships at battle in a local river.\textsuperscript{315} In stark contrast to New England’s Parliamentarian favour, Virginia adamantly supported the monarchy during the war.\textsuperscript{316} Governor Berkeley even carried on private correspondence with Charles II during and after the war. One letter to Richard Kemp, secretary of Virginia, from Charles II even included instruction to fortify Old Point Comfort off the Virginia Coast for the purpose of waging war against the New England Puritans.\textsuperscript{317} Berkeley’s actions illustrate from another angle how intimately connected colonists felt with
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the action in England. Berkeley, at Charles II’s command, was prepared to carry out war in
the New World between the same factions which existed in England. According to Winthrop,
even neighbouring native tribes recognised the impact of the war on the colonies.\footnote{Winthrop, \textit{Winthrop’s Journal} 2: p.168.} Regardless of physical distance and a pretence of neutrality, colonists across the Atlantic were
as zealously partisan and factious as their counterparts in England and as intimately affected
by the war.\footnote{Bremer, \textit{The Puritan Experiment}: p.124-6.}

Despite insubstantial traces of royalism within the Puritan colonies as well as Maine’s
more obvious favour of the King, Royalists in England collectively dismissed the New
England colonies as rebellious Puritan schismatics whose corrupting influence was best left
Cotton felt morally compelled to respond to the dismissive attitudes and publications from
detractors for the sake of furthering the Congregationalist cause and defending New England
settlements.\footnote{John Cotton, \textit{A Letter of Mr. John Cottons, Teacher of the Church in Boston in New England, to Mr. [Roger] Williams, a Preacher There} (London: Printed at London for Benjamin Allen, 1643); John Cotton, \textit{The Way of the Churches of Christ in New England} (London: Printed by Matthew Simmons, 1645); Pestana, \textit{The English Atlantic in an Age of Revolution}: p.74.} Indeed, the utmost, albeit unreachable, hope for New England
Congregationalists was to see the eventual spread of their brand of Puritan theocracy reform
Saints’ ambitions, as well as the fate of their colonies, depended upon ceaseless justification
of Congregationalism. With the necessity of the colonies in question following government
and religious reforms in England, the New England Saints continued to promote the colonies as a worthy alternative to the religious compromises and societal troubles of England.\textsuperscript{323}

**New England as the Alternative**

Lamented by John Winthrop and confirmed by demographic studies on early New England, Atlantic migration patterns during the 1640s indicated that the changes occasioned by the war in England had dramatically altered emigration motives.\textsuperscript{324} Following Laud’s removal and the reduction in Charles’ authority, it was no longer necessary for Puritans to depart from England to practice their faith more comfortably. Indeed, many Saints in England called for the return of colonial Saints to restore greater strength to the Puritan movement in England during the war as well.\textsuperscript{325} Prior to the 1640s, the advantages of New England were clear to Puritans and even celebrated by one Laudian official who perceived the Puritan migration as a retreat from meddlesome confrontation with the official Church.\textsuperscript{326} The decision to migrate, which had been difficult enough during the 1630s with clearer advantages, became harder to justify following reforms in England and the subsequent downturn of New England’s economy.\textsuperscript{327} Changing conditions in England posed not only a recruitment challenge for the Puritans of New England looking to entice new colonists, but also produced an identity crisis. In the wake of new reforms in England, the continued relevance and necessity of the New England colonies as a nonconformist alternative to
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official English institutions came into question and demanded a reevaluation of New England’s most fundamental purpose.\textsuperscript{328}

Despite slowing immigration into New England and reports of persecution in the colonies, many Puritans in England continued to defend the colonies as an attractive haven for those unsatisfied with institutional policies in England. Against Royalist criticism of the Puritans, Edward Bowles defended the New England Congregationalists as honest Protestants who were unrightfully targeted as disloyal to English institutions.

Then for \textit{Puritanes}, men cordially Protestant and zealous of their own Religion, which no where but among us is a fault, because they were tenacious of just Liberty, and true Religion, how studiously and spightfully are they disgraced, as men of Antimonarchicall Principles, factious spirits, ranked with \textit{Iesuites} (who were yet better used) as the Incendiaries of Churches and State.\textsuperscript{329}

Contrary to the Cavalier’s perception of New England as the preferred site of exile for religious and political agitators, Bowles identified the New England colonies as potentially the nearest ‘shelter’ for Saintly religious divines seeking uncompromising religious and societal purity in the English world.\textsuperscript{330} Bowles was not alone in continuing to defend New England as a desirable alternative to religious and political upheaval in England during the Civil War. Dissatisfaction with conditions in England and disappointment with the direction of religious reforms endured after the outbreak of war and continued to entice new settlers, albeit fewer, to the colonies.\textsuperscript{331}

Emigration to New England was actually considered cause for social concern for some English ministers, despite the precipitous decline of migration. An unnamed preacher
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lamented in a sermon in 1643 at the confusion and turmoil within the English state and religious community, which he felt cast many devout English Protestants into an uneasy limbo between remaining in a religiously conflicted England and abandoning family to emigrate to the harsh New England colonies.332

What shall we do? This indeed (Beloved) was a hard question when the Lordly Bishops did raigne over us, for then many of our holy brethren were compelled to flie over to Amsterdam and New England, and there become Weavers and Buttonmakers, and Feltmakers, and the like, and were saine to leave our wives and children to be maintain'd by the Parish, so that then we might well say, What shall we do?333

Even those who sympathised with New England theology identified problems associated with mass migration away from English communities, especially when it was at the expense of families left behind. Sentiments on emigration were mixed even among the Saints in England, with some respecting those willing to depart for their beliefs, and others criticising such departures as selfish in the light of war and social commitments.334 David Cressy has argued that, in reality, most people did not emigrate to New England for their beliefs alone, but rather out of personal crisis or necessity. ‘Rarely’, Cressy asserts, ‘was the decision to emigrate based solely on an appraisal of England’s religious or political situation or the prospects for church government in New England’.335 Though contemporary assessments of New England’s religious community, and the subsequent reversal in migration in response to political and religious shifts during the Civil War, somewhat contradict Cressy’s contention, Cressy raises an important point. Many migrants to the colonies, or potential migrants, were not particularly drawn toward the religious aspects of New England life, while others were
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completely repulsed by it.\textsuperscript{336} Though the Saints desired maintaining the purest community possible in New England, they recognised the necessity of drawing in pious, though perhaps not as zealous, settlers as themselves and sought to promote settlement for a wider audience over time.\textsuperscript{337} Changes resulting from the Civil War in particular drove the reassessment of settler recruitment in response to new conditions in England and changing motives for prospective colonists to resettle in America.\textsuperscript{338}

In 1642, Nehemiah Wallington wrote James Cole in New England on conditions in England and remarked on the years prior that, ‘the whole land was overrunne with idolatry and popery and all manner of abominations that God must needs of his Justice among us which many of you did [forsee] which did make you fly to New England as to a city of refuge for to preserve yourselves . . .’.\textsuperscript{339} While Wallington respected Cole’s apparent foresight in predicting the potential outbreak of war, Daniel Featley, a Calvinist theologian who sided with Charles I during the 1640s, arraigned that ‘cowards have run away to New England, when old England was on fire . . .’.\textsuperscript{340} Regardless of religious and political allegiances, many participants passionate about active engagement in the war effort in England viewed departure to the colonies as a cowardly escape from a necessary fight.

Though many New Englanders returned to England during the war and fewer emigrated to the colonies, New England remained an alternative, albeit unattractive, to the turmoil of England. John Vicars, a contemporary writer and Civil War commentator, provided
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a particularly telling example in the case of a former Parliamentarian soldier, Master Whitleigh, who had moved with his family and children to London’s Golding Lane in September of 1643, ‘principally desiring to remove thence because of the wicked conversation of the Cavaliers, billeted where he lived’. After three months of unemployment, Whitleigh reluctantly began considering rejoining the Parliamentarian army, though his fears were too great to follow through. ‘. . . [T]hereupon at last he had some thoughts to goe into New-England, and advising with his wife, who also was most unwiling hee should any more put himselfe into the Service of the Parliament, but by all meanes began to strengthen his resolution to goe away for New-England.’ Falling ill just before making the journey to the colonies, Whitleigh renounced his desire to proceed, becoming ‘very much troubled in his minde, lamenting and crying out very much against the sinne of Cowardise and Fearfulnesse (which hee conceived to bee the ground of his intended removall to New-England)’. Before his sudden death, Whitleigh blamed his wife for encouraging his departure and promised God that if he regained his health, he would wholly devote his body to Parliament’s ‘holy Cause’.

While Vicars was obviously not a supporter of Parliament’s cause himself, given the affiliations of those he described as ‘malignants’, his account holds some merit as a barometer gauging shifting opinions of New England from the start of the war. In Vicars’ account, which he assures the reader was gathered from those who were close to the Whitleighs, emigration to New England is portrayed as a particularly undesirable option, even for Whitleigh’s family suffering financial hardship during the war. Disregarding Vicars’ intended religious criticism condemning Whitleigh’s spiritual association with Parliament’s
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cause, it is clear that Whitleigh unwillingly considered risking his life in the army before reluctantly entertaining the idea of removing to New England. Despite deliberation, the Whitleigh family ultimately never emigrated and Whitleigh himself died having condemned the option as cowardly flight from a necessary war. From Whitleigh’s experience, it may be induced that even some Parliamentary supporters felt disdain towards fleeing Puritans, who would sooner exile themselves in New England rather than defend their ideologies in the war at home. Certainly, as seen in the case of Whitleigh, fears of tarnished honour and spiritual degradation from cowardice were greater and more potent for some than the fear of death in battle. In light of Featley’s condemnation and Whitleigh’s personal experience, it is clear that some potential colonists were discouraged from leaving England during the war by the ignominy of departure along with perceived moral obligations to remain for the war’s duration.343

It is impossible to know how many potential immigrants to New England shared Whitleigh’s experience, if Vicars’ account is believed, though it is certain that others in England weighed their options as the Whitleighs did. Theodore Bozeman has summarized the common concerns and doubts weighed by prospective colonists considering departure for New England and supported the notion that Whitleigh’s deliberation was a common feature of migration.

The decision to depart England often was taken, if at all, only after anxious and sometimes protracted debate. There were not only the expostulations of friendly critics to meet; of greater importance were the array of doubts and scruples entertained by the prospective emigrants themselves. Would it, for example, not be ‘a great wrong to our own country to take away the godly people’ and thus increase the likelihood of covenantal judgment? Should not Christians ‘stay and suffer for Christ’ in the teeth of worsening conditions?344


Indeed, as Nathaniel Barnardiston’s letter to Winthrop had suggested, some of the Saints who remained in England felt a sense of betrayal by those who seemingly separated themselves from the troubles of England for personal comfort in the colonies.\(^{345}\) Concerns of prospective colonists represented a formidable hurdle to overcome for the Congregationalists in New England trying to entice new settlers to depart for the colonies. As a result, emigration to New England needed to be marketed as a morally just cause with spiritual benefits outweighing the perceived faults of abandoning the Puritan community in England. Certainly, Winthrop and Cotton believed and promoted the notion that supporting the Saints in New England represented the highest order of services to Christ and even denounced those who abandoned the colonial community to serve the Puritan cause across the Atlantic.\(^{346}\)

Though some emigrants were judged harshly in the eyes of passionate Puritans devoted to the war effort, others respected New England colonists who migrated for their religious ideals. Respect for New England was particularly prominent among English clergymen who were sympathetic towards Congregationalism and respected the colonists’ diligence in crafting their own religious utopia in the wilderness of America.\(^{347}\) In a sermon delivered to the House of Commons in November of 1643, George Gipps defended righteous Saints who sought separation from papist extravagance and royalist indulgence.

> Our voluntary exemplar abstinence should evidence, not that we are not worthy of the world, but that it is not worthy of us: not that these things are too good for us, but we for them to place our affections thereon: shall we, because we refuse to have holy vestments pinned on us by Canon, confute this no way, but by all loose, new, costly attire, and fashions, Cavaleere-like, that nothing of our outside may have any colour, or shew of gravity, and modesty? Certainly it was not so within these few yeares, when the poore fugitives posted to new England in another cut of haire and clothing. True, by their


Gipps respected New England and those who were willing to uproot their lives in support of their beliefs. For conformist clerics within the Church of England, what Gipps perceived as devout piety represented an affront to the English faith, state, and king. Henry Hammond, Archdeacon of Chichester and close supporter of Charles I during the war, characterised those who left for New England as ‘malicious’ deviants, who ‘upon dislike of the present state . . . have gone to New-England. . . to raise an odium upon the Old . . .’ and likened their removal to a ‘revenge without Arms’. Those opposed to the New England colonies and their religious practices viewed the colonies’ existence as a symbol of rebellion against traditional English ways and customs. For all the benefits of the New England alternative, observers as dissimilar as fellow Saints and Arminian Cavaliers could perceive departing colonists as selfishly fleeing in a time of need or depraved traitors rejecting the just and rightful leadership of English Church and government institutions.

Following the changes in England, New England’s original purpose as a nonconformist alternative to the official policies of England came under increased scrutiny. By the 1640s, rather than abandoning England in favour of the uncompromising theology of New England, more Puritans perceived an opportunity to facilitate reformation in England itself through participation in war. On one side were critics like Whitleigh andFeatley who scorned those who would abandon contributing to the greater reform of England in favour of exiling themselves to the safe religious haven of New England for personal reasons. On the
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other were the New England Congregationalists and their sympathisers, like Cotton and Gipps, who continued to defend the colonies as a necessary religious haven where the energies of the most uncompromising Puritans would be better spent on complete reformation rather than fighting a war in England. On top of the challenge posed by the new rival reforms in England, the colonial Saints would need to contend with an unfavourable reputation for intolerance while facing returning soldiers, many of whom had become critical of New England policies after being exposed to the changes in a renewed England.

**Persecution, Returning Soldiers, and Opinions of New England**

Political reversal in England was not the only reason fewer people were willing to remove to the colonies. What was once revered as a Puritan haven in Massachusetts had increasingly become subject to harsh criticism from colonists opposed to the Congregationalists’ theocratic government and restrictive religious practices. As prospective colonists witnessed unfolding events in England, they found their own homeland becoming increasingly tolerant under Parliament’s authority as New England appeared to transform into a den of persecution under sanctimonious theocrats. Those who had joined the New Model Army, in particular, relished the freedoms permitted in the army as a result of its dependence on mass recruitment of soldiers of diverse theological backgrounds. Colonists who did return to the colonies following participation in the war found themselves dissatisfied with colonial policy after experiencing England’s reforms and pushed for greater
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toleration in the colonies along the lines of the reforms occurring in England. As Susan Moore has argued, New England magistrates considered persecution of dissenters critical for preserving the orthodoxy which set the colonies apart from conditions in England. Despite efforts to promote New England purity, new competition following English reforms deprived the colonies of their greatest Puritan recruitment base and threatened New England’s unique brand of uncompromising Church reform in favour of accommodating English policies.

Besides known dissidents who were directly persecuted, some moderate Puritans found themselves disillusioned by the uncompromising restrictiveness of New England’s Congregationalist policies. Even some respected and devout members of the Puritan community, themselves on good terms with colonial government officials, found the intolerance too much to bear. Prominent Bostonian merchant, shipwright, and friend of John Winthrop, Nehemiah Bourne, left for England during the 1640s, allegedly due to God’s Providence and a moral obligation to serve Parliament in the war. In a letter to John Winthrop Jr., Bourne later admitted that he, like many other disenchanted Massachusetts immigrants, had left due to frustration with the Bay Colony’s restrictive religious policy. Historian William Sachse notes that even John Winthrop Jr., along with other prominent and respected figures, departed for England with hopes that their fortunes and religious freedom might improve there.

John Winthrop the younger, having met with several reversals in New England, flirted with the idea of casting in his lot with the Dutch in the New Netherlands, but Hugh Peter, once of Salem, prevailed upon him to come to
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England. Other prominent men who left for England in the early forties were George Cooke, Samuel Eaton, George Fenwick, John Leverett, and Israel Stoughton.\textsuperscript{362}

Indeed, the Dutch in New Netherland, famous for their toleration and accommodation for fringe religious groups, tempted many New Englanders, including Antinomians like Anne Hutchinson and Captain John Underhill.\textsuperscript{363} For those who desired to remain in the English sphere, England remained a more viable option. As religious toleration prevailed in England, many who had previously sought religious refuge in New England found conditions reversed and returned to England in anticipation of new liberties.\textsuperscript{364} For magistrates concerned with preserving New England’s reputation as a religious haven and desirable alternative, their departing friends represented the most damaging losses to the colonies and painful reminders of the colonies’ diminishing relevance in light of the changes wrought by war.\textsuperscript{365}

Despite official neutrality, New Englanders were frequently associated with the Parliamentarian ‘Roundheads’ in Royalist propaganda. In his \textit{The Devil Tvrn’d Rovndhead, Or Pluto Become a Brownist}, John Taylor, the so-called ‘Water Poet’, argued that the Devil had discovered ‘men, which exceeded him in knavery [and] resolved himself to equiparate them in emulation . . . First, he began with Puritans, but they were all in preparation for beyond Sea, into new Plantations, especially into New-England; that he thought most of them were safe enough under his tuition’. Taylor continued to cite the other two factions as Brownists, commonly associated with Plymouth Colony, and the Roundheads of the Civil
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Later in February 1644/5, Taylor belittled the Puritan colonies as a sort of correctional exile for unruly Parliamentarians like the Earl of Warwick.

I would entreat Warwicke, to provide for his owne and their security in the Admirall Ship of Fooles, and wish a faire Gale for them as farre as New-England, till they shall learne more sincerity in Religion, more loyalty to their Soveraigne, more charity to their Christian Brethren, and Prinne cease falsifying and perverting Records, Presidents, and Allegations. . .

Likening New Englanders to the Devil and representing their colonies as fitting banishment grounds reflected the contempt of New England held by many Cavaliers. A satirical piece written in 1643 mocked New England’s affiliation with Parliament and colonists’ participation in the war by asserting that New Englanders’ godly skills would be required in the Roundhead army to deal with Prince Rupert’s supposedly magical dog skilled in the arts of witchcraft. The satire referenced Parliamentary rumours surrounding Prince Rupert’s white dog, which became the source of much humour and ridicule against Puritans within Royalist circles. To Royalists, New Englanders and Parliamentarians alike represented disloyal, deluded, and disobedient subjects causing unnecessary turmoil and division within the English world in the hopes of selfish gains. Though the New England colonies were seen as sufficiently distant to be an appropriate site of exile for cantankerous troublemakers, Royalists feared that New Englanders themselves might bring the colonies’ brand of theocracy across the Atlantic if provided a chance through Parliament. The Westminster
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Assembly would provide the opportunity Royalists and Arminian’s feared might topple the established order of Church and state authority.  

In 1643, Cavalier poet Samuel Butler published *A Letter from Mercvrivs Civicvs to Mercurius Rusticus*, in which he remarked that New Englanders were prized additions to the largely Puritan Parliamentary army. After admitting with derision his surprise that men who ‘in two yeares practice could not be brought to discharge a musket without winking’ had successfully established a formidable army opposed to the King, Butler added that Parliament had recruited far afield for soldiers and administrators, including men from New England.

Secondly, that they might fill all places of authority with such as should advance the designe, all care is taken to fill the Bench of Aldermen, and the Common-Councel, with men disaffected to the Government, both Ecclesiasticall, and Civill. To this purpose if London did not afford men bad enough, they would call them from other Corporations, as *Alderman Atkins* from *Norwich* and the like: but if he had seen *Amsterdam* or had been an Adventurer to *New England*, or been the host of the silenced Ministers, he was a jewell . . .

Butler’s observation indicates that New Englanders were held in particular esteem by the Parliamentarians, as if their odyssey to find religious satisfaction, along with those who had been to Amsterdam, was taken as an indication of their devout commitment to Parliament’s cause against the King and established Church. To the contrary, Cavalier writers claimed that New Englanders represented one of the less-scrupulous components within an already deplorable Parliamentarian army. In 1646, Captain John Bastwick of the Presbyterian army echoed earlier contempt for the cowardice of emigrants who left for Holland and New England, deriding that they not only, ‘cowardly left the cause’, but ‘since have brought over their New Lights here amongst us, to the darkning of the truth it selfe, and disordering of all
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things, and hindring of Reformation...’.

Bastwick also wrote that New England soldiers were particularly notorious for taking vast amounts of plunder and sending it to the colonies, ‘in so much that the very Cavaliers, and Gentlemen of good ranke and place have told mee, that if ever they got the day, they would make a voyage into New-England, to demand their plundered goods of them’. Bastwick derided New Englanders for entering England, ‘under pretence of relieving the poore Saints there, and for the sending over boyes, and young children and so they have all of that party bestirred themselves in getting of monies under the pretext of good uses’. In Royalist eyes, New Englanders were particularly contemptible for feigning adherence to the Parliamentarian cause for the sake of theft and unscrupulous personal gains. For commentators like Bastwick, New Englander’s were nothing more than unsavoury pillagers only returning to shamefully take advantage of the crisis in England.

The colonies were not only influenced from afar by the changes across the Atlantic, but were faced with returning soldiers who had participated in the war and experienced the new atmosphere in England for themselves. Louise Breen has commented on the soldiers returning to England, noting, ‘these men’s sympathies for religious views at odds with the New England Way had deepened or developed during their service in England, and when they returned to the Bay they spearheaded efforts to ameliorate the colony’s policy of religious intolerance’. Considering the influx of returning soldiers following the war, it is obvious that those returning New Englanders were themselves directly influenced and changed by personal participation in the war in England. New perspectives brought back to New England by such intimately affected participants would have changed the demographics
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of the colonies themselves and influenced the intellectual and theological composure of the post-war New England community. Breen’s observation on returning soldiers contradicts Harry Stout’s claim that remigration purified the New England community by removing those Saints who were not committed to New England’s Congregational way.\textsuperscript{377} To the contrary, post-war New England was required to adapt to the changes of the war and contend with new perspectives brought by returning soldiers and secular settlers.\textsuperscript{378} Breen comments that suspicion surrounded returning soldiers, whom the Congregationalists feared may have changed while abroad, remarking that, ‘... in practice, it was sometimes difficult for Bostonians to determine whether actual participants should be hailed as returning heroes or feared as agents of cultural contamination’.\textsuperscript{379}

In light of the new opportunities arising alongside the war in England, maintaining an appealing reputation for the New England colonies was more important than ever before, but also more challenging. News from England and returning war participants confirmed to New England ministers that reforms had ameliorated many of the conditions which had initially motivated migrants to remove to the colonies.\textsuperscript{380} Reforms in England raised questions about New England’s continued relevancy in the English world as an alternative sanctuary to previously unappealing conditions in England.\textsuperscript{381} While England itself appeared renewed, New England appeared increasingly conservative and less enticing to the Saints’ traditional recruitment base in England.\textsuperscript{382} Reversing conditions and increasing scrutiny of colonial
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conditions forced a reassessment of New England culture and purpose in the English world as a yet-appealing alternative to a reformed England.

Cultural Impact and Preserving New England Relevancy

Considering New England’s intended purpose as a reformed outpost of the English world, the reformation in England occasioned by the war threatened the colonies’ societal niche. Remigration beginning in the 1640s and subsequent economic downturn attested to New England’s reliance on nonconformist immigrants populating the Congregationalist community. If, as Perry Miller has argued, the colonial Saints had initially intended to remigrate at the earliest opportunity for reformation in England, then the remigration and consequences of the Civil War would not have troubled Winthrop and Cotton as they did. On the contrary, the Congregationalists had intended to prove the merits of their colony through longevity and, if successful, hopefully one day spread their theology back to England, though not at the expense of their own settlement in America. As a result of the war, however, New England’s necessity was questioned as Puritans began once again to perceive policy and comforts in England as preferable to the offerings in the colonies. In response, Congregationalists remaining in the colonies would be forced to reassess their position in the English world and shape colonial policies to be more accommodating to potential immigrants who were no longer primarily driven to the colonies by religious zeal.
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Though many colonists remigrated back to England during the 1640s, Winthrop indicated that their removal had been occasioned by changes in England and not predetermined from the start of colonisation.\(^{389}\) Perry Miller argued that the New England colonies were originally envisioned as only temporary and that the migrant Saints had hoped to see an overturning of authority, exactly as it subsequently played out during the Civil War, so that they might return to a renewed and malleable England awaiting reformation under the direction of the experienced New England Congregationalists.\(^{390}\) Miller’s argument may appear convincing in retrospect, but his conclusions were based on anachronistic assumptions considering what was known by contemporary Puritans migrating to New England. Indeed, Nehemiah Wallington praised the New England Saints for their apparent foresight in departing from England before God’s judgement for English sin was manifested in war, but even the most insightful Puritans could not have accurately predicted the events to come when they departed.\(^{391}\) There was no way that the colonists could have known or accurately predicted when they originally migrated that conditions would change so drastically in England to enable their return to a reformed homeland within a decade. Close examination of those who returned and their correspondences indicates that, rather than seeking to contribute to a monumental reformation in England, many colonists simply fled from New England following disillusionment with the hardship of the wilderness and in light of unexpected opportunities in England.\(^{392}\) To assume that colonists had departed from England intending to remigrate at the earliest convenience misconstrues the aspirations of the New England
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Congregationalists and undermines their cultivated cultural development as a cleansed extension of English society.\textsuperscript{393}

In the 1990s, Robert Middlekauff attempted to revise some of Miller’s outdated interpretations, arguing against Miller’s conception of the grand errand and finding little evidence aside from Winthrop’s famous ‘City Upon a Hill’ speech indicating that the Congregationalists conceived of New England as strictly a model for a reformed Europe.\textsuperscript{394} Likewise, Theodore Dwight Bozeman has argued against the supposition that the Congregationalists intended to return at the first sign of renewal in England, observing that, ‘given the arrest of reform in England and the rise of a powerful Arminian, high-church party under the Stuarts, immigrants like Mather actually held out little hope for the mother country’.\textsuperscript{395} Neither the Civil War nor its outcomes could have been anticipated during the Great Migration of the 1630s. Therefore, Miller’s argument concerning the Congregationalists’ unspoken plans for remigration back to England at the earliest opportunity must be dismissed as a retrospective misunderstanding of Congregationalists’ contemporary attitudes toward the colonies and conception of their purpose. Although the historical field has certainly benefited from Miller’s research, his historiography has been called into question by more recent scholars who have regarded his work as closer to ‘art’ than accurate history.\textsuperscript{396} Bozeman has defended Miller, in part by suggesting that Miller’s accurate assessment of the Congregationalists’ covenanted community and government aims has been misunderstood or ignored by later historians. Even so, Bozeman still rejected
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Miller’s argument that Congregationalists had intended to act as an exemplary beacon of reformed religion. 397

Despite the uncertainty of war and religious reformation, Stout has argued in favour of Miller’s assessment of New Englanders’ original intentions to return to England. 398 Stout has asserted that, ‘[m]any of the first generation university men were individuals who never viewed New England as a permanent place of settlement and, with the first sign of renewed opportunity in England, they promptly returned’. 399 Indeed, it cannot be denied that Winthrop’s own observations seem to support Miller and Stout to some extent. Referencing the opening of the Long Parliament and changing sentiment in England, Winthrop recorded in December of 1640 that fishing ships, ‘brought us news of the Scots entering into England, and the calling of a parliament, and the hope of a thorough reformation, etc., whereupon some among us began to think of returning back to England’. 400 Though Winthrop’s observation indicates that some colonists had considered returning to England after hearing promising news of reformation there, he did not indicate that those colonists had any plans of removal before hearing such news. 401 In the same journal entry, Winthrop recorded that other New Englanders refused to return to England, but were considering moving to the southern colonies for improved living conditions and better supply from England. 402 Moore has asserted that, regardless of initial expectations for remaining in the colonies, the return home was occasioned by change in England. 403 ‘While these settlers sailed home for a variety of
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reasons’, she argues, ‘what catalysed their return to live in England (whether they intended to stay on at first, or not) was a change in circumstances - an end to the “extraordinary cause” that sent them to America’.\textsuperscript{404} Whether or not remigration had been anticipated from New England’s founding is less important than the movement itself. Regardless of original intentions, the nearly one-quarter of New England settlers who left the colonies permanently during the 1640s had decided that the colonies were no longer necessary alongside a reformed England.\textsuperscript{405}

When examined closely, certain patterns can be seen among individuals who remigrated, and Stout himself does not seem to recognise some of the implications of his own findings. As Stout notes, at least 49 percent of first generation ministers brought their parishes and followers with them.\textsuperscript{406} During the 1640s, many of those same ministers who had brought followers decided to remain in New England. Stout argues that those ministers had no need to return to England because they had brought their employment with them to the colonies.

Quite simply, first generation ministers with followers brought their means of employment in New England with them and, therefore, they were not as susceptible to the job shortage that encouraged so many of their colleagues to seek better opportunities in England.\textsuperscript{407}

It would appear then that remigration was, in large part, a result of financial necessity and employment opportunity rather than a predetermined conclusion to a brief ‘errand’ into the wilderness of North America.\textsuperscript{408} Stout goes on to discuss the general mobility of colonial
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university men lacking a following base and concludes that the ministers who moved the most did so because they were seeking employment in the colonies.

The higher rate of mobility among those clergymen lacking followers from England suggests a clerical subgroup that was not fully assimilated into the larger geographical community in which they worked. In this context, the heightened geographic mobility of those lacking congregational attachments may not be a sign of upward mobility, but rather an index of failure. That is, an inability among the unattached to establish themselves in the New England communities despite persistent searching.409

With the opening of new positions in England, it is understandable that many struggling ministers, or university men, would have desired to take advantage of the new offerings back home in England. The remigration of Saints seeking work in England contributed, not only to economic decline, but to a reduction in intellectual and religious prestige, which in turn discouraged more potential colonists from migrating to the colonies or remaining in New England. The remigration back to England cannot be assumed to have been premeditated in an unspoken pact to return at the first sign of reform as suggested by Miller.410 The New England Congregationalists had migrated intending to remain in the colonies to prove the merits of their reformation as a viable model for a reformed society, though had not expected to construct that society in England themselves.

Certainly some colonists, particularly entrepreneurs seeking economic gains more than spiritual salvation, migrated with short-term goals in mind and intended to uproot eventually and return to England, but it is inaccurate to assume that a large portion of Puritans had emigrated with remigration in mind from the start.411 Susan Moore’s research has found that some of the settlers returning to England were not necessarily unrooted in the
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colonies, but were mostly drawn by unforeseen ministerial openings in England. Even some Puritans who had established firm roots in the colonies found the new changes in England too persuasive to ignore. The most devout Congregationalists, of course, remained unmoved and devoted to their colonial project. Bernard Bailyn’s recent work has contradicted Miller’s assessment and shown that even following Parliament’s success and the rise of Independent influence under Cromwell, many New England settlers had already settled too deeply, or invested too much, to abandon the world they had created. Commenting on the wave of migration back to England following the conclusion of the war, Bailyn asserts that many settlers would not consider leaving.

For some, of course, return was inconceivable: secular leaders like Winthrop and Dudley, whose commitment to the new Jerusalem had consumed their lives; leading clerics like Hooker, Cotton, and Shepard, who were responsible for defining New England’s Puritanism; and prosperous farmers now possessed of land of their own and deeply invested in its cultivation.

The determination of Congregationalists like Hooker, Cotton, and Shepard attested to the original intentions of leading colonial Congregationalists to create a lasting and enduring legacy in the colonies. John Cotton and others even received invitations from former colleagues in England to return to their parishes after the mid-1640s, but many, including Cotton, rejected such invitations judging that they could do more good for the Saints’ reformation by remaining in New England. Thus, Francis Bremer has rightfully rejected the notion argued by Andrew Delbanco, that remigrating colonial ministers represented the
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most zealous reformers, by showing that it was the Puritans who remained in the colonies who were the most devoted to New England’s Congregationalist reformation.417

The most persuasive evidence of the colonists’ commitment to the international reform can be found in their reactions to the events of England’s Puritan Revolution, a subject at the center of Andrew Delbanco’s essay. Delbanco argues that New Englanders felt left behind as reform advanced in England. His case, however, is based on a misreading of English events and tends to focus on those colonists returning to England who were not in sympathy with the New England Way. While there is no denying that Roger Williams, Samuel Gorton, and other New England radicals identified with friends among the English sects, orthodox colonists took inspiration from and supported the gradual rise to influence of men such as Thomas Goodwin, Philip Nye, and John Owen who advocated a New England-style church polity for England. It is this story that Delbanco does not tell.418

Though Delbanco accurately identifies perceptibly increasing self-doubt and a sense of inadequacy in the writings of colonial ministers, he attributes the cause of these sentiments to the Congregationalists’ disappointment in themselves in falling behind the progress of England’s reformation during the war.419 More likely, as will be seen, New England ministers despaired the acceptance of inadequate reforms in England, even by some of their well-respected colonial colleagues, and recognised that they themselves would be forced to accept compromises in the colonies to remain relevant and attractive in the face of English reforms.420 Following reform in England, the existence of an external religious sanctuary in the colonies was no longer a pressing necessity for English Puritans and New England slowly succumbed to secular interests.421 Even the most zealous New Englanders, who were unwilling to embrace the changes resulting from war by returning to England, would still be required to adapt to the new order within the colonies.
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The distinction between planned remigration and circumstantial returns is quite significant in understanding New England cultural development. If one assumes, like Miller, and to an extent Stout, that a substantial portion of the migrant Puritans never intended to remain in New England, then the entire purpose of the Congregationalist venture changes.\textsuperscript{422} When the intended purpose of the colonies is understood as a demonstration of the viability of a reformed theocracy, then the importance of an enduring, liveable colony becomes much clearer. Even if, as Richard Waterhouse has suggested, the colonies were established for self-imposed exile with little intention of spreading Congregationalist reforms to the wider world, the reputation of the New England colonies would have remained crucial for their longevity and attracting new colonists.\textsuperscript{423} Bozeman, however, contends that even if New Englanders did not expect an imminent return to England following their founding, their ultimate long-term hope was to eventually share their model with England after proving Congregationalism’s merits and viability in the colonies.\textsuperscript{424} The colonies were established as a purified cultural transplantation of the English world into America.\textsuperscript{425} The merits of the Congregationalist experiment would be proven through success and longevity.\textsuperscript{426} Long-term expectations for the colonies also exposes why Winthrop was so disheartened by remigration.\textsuperscript{427}

As early as 1641, John Winthrop had identified the primary motive of remigration in religion, noting that religious changes in England were believed to herald the coming of the completed reformation Puritans desired for the Church.
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The parliament of England setting upon a general reformation both of church and state, the Earl of Strafford being beheaded, and the archbishop (our great enemy) and many others of the great officers and judges, bishops and others, imprisoned and called to account this caused all men to stay in England in expectation of a new world. . . .

It was the ‘expectation of a new world’ in old England which redefined New England’s position in the English world. Puritans did not originally migrate with expectations that a coming civil war would completely overturn Church and government institutions in England and pave the way for sweeping reforms, remigration was merely a reaction to changes in circumstance as colonists observed shifting trends in England. Those changes, however, were deeply challenging to New England identity and purpose as demonstrated by the remigration of the 1640s. If a ‘new world’ was being developed in England, what would be the purpose of prolonging the New England enterprise in the discomfort of the wilderness? Stout has aptly summarised the New England Congregationalists’ contemporary sentiments on the changes in England threatening their own existence.

Just as the denial of positions to Puritan university men in pre-Revolutionary England drove them in exile to New England, so also was Cromwellian England a new City Upon a Hill replete with pulpits and positions for the qualified saints. The reversed state of Puritan enthusiasm was not lost on Cotton Mather who ruefully acknowledged that: ‘Whereupon ensued such a change of Times, that instead of Old England’s driving its People into New, it was itself turned into New.’

Stout’s observation encapsulates the identity crisis facing New England during the 1640s. If England had adopted the reforms which had originally drawn the Saints to the colonies, what benefits would the colonies then offer for new settlers? As witnessed during the remigration, without a strong incentive, Puritans in England would be unwilling to uproot from the
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comforts of home and risk their livelihoods on the uncertainties of the unproven colonies.\textsuperscript{431} The necessitated response in the colonies to the overturned political and religious institutions in England greatly influenced early New England’s relations with London and shaped the region’s identity as it coped with a new purpose. Following the war in England, the colonies lost some of their religious appeal as a haven from religious corruptions within the Church of England and were required to adapt to a new generation of immigrants who were driven more by secular interests than religious motivations.\textsuperscript{432}

The war in England had brought changes to English culture and set new religious and political precedents which influenced New England’s approach to transatlantic relations and colonist recruitment. Bernard Bailyn has acknowledged that, ‘[t]he effect of [the Civil War] on New England was transformative. Impulses were set in motion that together shaped the future of the Puritan colonies’.\textsuperscript{433} New England’s response to the war and political upheaval would come to define the region, its transatlantic relations, and its role in the English Atlantic. Theological concerns during the war would place considerable pressure on New England Congregationalists to adapt to the changes in England as well as defend their own community from the pressures of dissatisfied colonists and critical onlookers across the Atlantic alike. The changes in England occasioned by the war challenged New England’s unique identity and rendered it redundant in light of the sweeping reforms to English Church and government organisation.\textsuperscript{434} As will be seen, New Englanders responded to changes in England by promoting New England Congregationalism for widespread adoption.\textsuperscript{435} The
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acceptance of Independency in England was a disappointment to uncompromising Congregationalists in the colonies, but proved enough to prevent the migration of many potential colonists and entice the return of many Puritans who had previously migrated.\footnote{Conforti, Imagining New England: p.39-41.} By the end of the 1640s, the challenge posed by the new Church rival in England would force a complete reassessment of New England relevancy and purpose in the English world and begin to drive secular growth.\footnote{Scobey, ‘Revising the Errand’: p.6-10; Stout, ‘The Morphology of Remigration’}. Inward examination of the colonies would lead second-generation ministers to reevaluate, and retrospectively recreate, the original goals of the first-generation Congregationalists in the face of a perceived cultural declension away from the original aspirations of the founding generation.\footnote{Miller, Errand into the Wilderness: p.13.}
'New England's Way':
Transatlantic Religious Discourse and Civil War Consequences

For, believe it, my Brethren, ye give us too great cause to set a mark upon you (Rom. 6. 17.) for raising and causing such unjust divisions and offences among us & to wish ye had all kept in New-England & Holland still, then thus to come among us, to molest our (at first) so hopefull and happy peace and remation, as ye have done, ever since ye came over to us.439
- John Vicars, 1645

The Congregationalists of New England, having founded their colonies upon nonconformist religious grounds, closely observed the religious changes taking place in England during the Civil War with a keen interest in the ultimate resolution. Even, or perhaps especially, those colonists who did not return to England during the war desired to take advantage of widening religious discourse to promote their Congregational Church, which was represented by Independents in England and sometimes referred to as the ‘New England Way’.440 The Assembly had finally provided Puritans with an opportunity to implement further reforms within the Church of England, though Puritans were divided between the Independent and Presbyterian factions.441 Following Parliament’s adoption of Presbyterianism in 1645 during the Westminster Assembly, Presbyterians, once the insurrectionary Covenanters opposed to Charles’ Book of Common Prayer, became the conservatives within a transformed English Church.442 The shifting role of the Presbyterian Church during the 1640s, along with the Independent-led Pride’s Purge of 1648, further shaped the religious discourse of England and fuelled the flames between the Presbyterians and Independents. The controversy played a major role in shaping religious discourse with
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New England, which was initially known as a citadel of Independency, but later split from the Independent faction on toleration within the Church.\textsuperscript{443}

At the start of the Westminster Assembly in 1643, New England’s Congregationalism, or ‘Independency’ as it was often referred to by contemporary critics, came into direct competition with Presbyterianism as a potential reformed successor to the Arminian Church of England.\textsuperscript{444} The Westminster Assembly provided the Congregationalists of New England with the opportunity which Perry Miller asserted New England Puritans had anticipated from the founding of the colonies, though the outcomes contradict Miller’s analysis.\textsuperscript{445} Rather than uprooting and returning to England, the most uncompromising New England Congregationalists found themselves disappointed with the concessions of Independency and chose to remain in the colonies instead of embracing the reforms in England.\textsuperscript{446} While adoption of Independency in England would not satisfy the most zealous Congregationalists in the colonies, it would effectively challenge New England’s continued purpose as a reformed haven in the English world.\textsuperscript{447} In order to combat the rival Independent Church in England, New England Congregationalists would be forced to redefine their own policies and practices to attract new colonists who were no longer primarily driven by religious motives.\textsuperscript{448}

As discussed in the previous chapter, contrary to Andrew Delbanco’s assertion that it was the most zealous ministers who returned to England to embrace new reforms, Francis
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Bremer has accurately shown that the opposite was true and that those ministers who remained in the colonies did so because they were disappointed with the inadequate reforms adopted in England. As a result, the most zealous Congregationalists who remained in the colonies were forced to rebuild their colonial community after the departure of a significant portion of New England ministers who were willing to accept the compromises of English reform. The demographic shift during remigration demanded new settlers to sustain New England’s immigrant-based economy, though reform in England had deprived the colonial Congregational community of its previous position as a unique religious offering within the English world. Forced to accept new colonists who were no longer motivated primarily by religious discontentment in England, colonial ministers perceived a dilution of their communal piety and feared societal declension. David Scobey has argued that religious declension was never actually present outside the minds of concerned ministers, though notes that the perception of declension resulted in real cultural consequences, which altered the religious perceptions and demographic composition of the New England colonies. Over time, New England’s altered sense of religious purpose led to a divergence away from the first-generation’s restrictive piety and toward a more tolerant, worldly Puritan community. Though declension and its consequences have often been associated with post-Restoration population growth, the cultural transformation which preceded it was firmly rooted in 1640s Civil War transitions.

451 Ibid. p.170-1.
453 Scobey, ‘Revising the Errand’, p.10.
An understanding of New England’s primary purpose as a theological experiment intended to demonstrate the merits and viability of a reformed Puritan theocracy underlines the significance of establishing and maintaining a good reputation for the colonies to observers in England.\footnote{Miller, \textit{Errand into the Wilderness}: p.1-15; Pestana, \textit{The English Atlantic in an Age of Revolution}: p.74; Bozeman, ‘The Puritans’ “Errand into the Wilderness” Reconsidered’, p.249-50.} A positive reputation was not only crucial for New England to attract devout colonists convinced of the benefits of the colonial religious community, but it was also considered necessary for advocating New England Congregationalism in England itself, particularly during the Westminster Assembly.\footnote{Ibid., p.251; Pestana, \textit{The English Atlantic in an Age of Revolution}: p.77-9.} Religious persecution, which had been deemed necessary by colonial magistrates attempting to preserve the purity of their theocratic communities, had damaged New England’s reputation as a desirable alternative to the corruptions of English society.\footnote{Conforti, \textit{Imagining New England}: p.39-40.} In competition with a newly reformed English Church, colonial ministers depended upon, and vigorously defended, the reputation of the colonies to onlookers in England. Through the endless transatlantic debates on religious doctrine, the credibility of New England ministers and their theological practices was entirely dependent upon English perceptions of the Congregationalists in the colonies.\footnote{Pestana, \textit{The English Atlantic in an Age of Revolution}: p.71.}

Following many disillusioned accounts of unhappy settlers in New England, the reputation of the region declined as early hopes for the ‘city upon a hill’ waned. By the start of the Civil War, those hoping to experience a reformed Church in the colonies began to see greater hope in England itself, and felt less compelled to remove to New England.\footnote{Stout, ‘The Morphology of Remigration’, p.170.} As conditions in England began to look more promising for dissatisfied Puritans, New England’s
own prestige, particularly that of Massachusetts, began to decline following economic
collapse, which itself had largely been caused by departing colonists. Of those who did not
return to England, some opted instead for the inviting diversity of New Netherland. Others,
to John Winthrop’s disappointment, were tempted to help populate the rival Puritan colony,
Providence Island, in the West Indies led by John Humphreys, who had been a respected
member of the Massachusetts Bay Company. A glimpse of inter-colonial migration may be
gleaned from a 1641 document indicating that two New England ships, the Sparrow and
Salutation, each 140 tons, were offered by Emanuel Truebody for the transportation of
‘Captain Humphreys, and others willing to accompany him, from New England to
Providence, or other parts under the government of the Company’. The 1641 reference was
only one of many mentioning ships of passengers following Humphreys to Providence,
indicating that the lure was significant. Winthrop, displeased with the draw of competing
colonies, took comfort in God’s punishment of those who would leave the sanctity of New
England, noting that misfortune befell some of the ships transporting settlers away from New
England:

The Lord showed his displeasure against others, though godly, who have
spoken ill of this country [New England], and so discouraged the hearts of his
people; even the lords and others of Providence having spoken too much in
that kind, thinking thereby to further their own plantation.

---
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Winthrop recognised the competition posed by Providence Island as well as the effect that speaking ‘ill’ of New England had on colonial settlement. The short-lived rivalry of Providence Island paled in comparison to the draw of England itself in luring colonists and prospective settlers away from New England, but underlined the importance of maintaining an appealing reputation for attracting new settlers.\textsuperscript{467}

Alongside economic disorder, New England religion was portrayed in many publications in a very unflattering light, accusing New England ministers of religious abuses against innocent settlers worse than the hostility which Puritans decried under Laudian policy. Citing John Childs, Pestana underlines how Childs presented New England Congregationalism to English audiences in the unflattering light of Independency, which had recently been defeated during the Westminster Assembly in August of 1645.\textsuperscript{468} Pestana notes that detractors like Childs took advantage of predominant fears in London that the uncompromising nature of New England Congregationalism inherently encouraged suppression of dissent, which would result in widespread persecution resembling what had already been witnessed in the colonies against heretics. ‘This warning’, she argues, ‘built on the conservative critique of Independents then current in London: they would advocate toleration only until they had power, at which time they would emerge as greater tyrants than those they had previously chastised for intolerance’.\textsuperscript{469} Those who perceived the fall of Laudian Church policy as a victory for liberty of conscience were understandably hesitant to adopt Church reforms which might result in an equally-oppressive Church of England.
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Even in New England, some ministers were reluctant to adhere to the restrictiveness of Congregationalist authorities. Polly Ha remarked, ‘it is worth noting that an increased conservatism among certain New England clergy who inclined to presbyterianism in the early 1640s followed closely upon the Antinomian controversy of the late 1630s’. Supporting Ha’s analysis, the example of Richard Denton, a West Yorkshire Presbyterian minister who left New England for New Netherland in 1644 due to contention with the Congregationalist Church, suggests that New England Presbyterians felt little contentment in the Congregational colonies. Pestana observes that anti-independents in New England, including Presbyterians, openly expressed hostility toward the Congregationalist policies of New England once Presbyterianism gained leverage over Independency in the Westminster Assembly.

Not only the anti-independent faction in Bermuda but also the much smaller one in orthodox New England felt emboldened to demand reforms as the Westminster Assembly and Parliament endorsed presbyterianism over congregationalism. A handful of Massachusetts residents questioned the colony’s policies in a “Remonstrance” dated May 1646.

Not satisfied with local invalidation, Pestana also emphasises that critics of New England took full advantage of Atlantic networks to discredit colonial ministers with the Remonstrance. ‘Mindful of the Atlantic dimension of religious politics in the 1640s’, she argues, ‘the Bay’s critics also broadcast their complaints to other colonies, sending the “Remonstrance” to various ports to undermine orthodox New England’s reputation in those
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places’. As criticisms were raised against the young colonies, religious concerns came to dominate the growing transatlantic discourse over New England’s policies.

Those in England who followed colonial news, primarily prospective settlers, family connections, and theologians, constantly received conflicting reports of the conditions in the colonies from the ongoing transatlantic war of letters waged between opposing parties both for and against New England policies. Following reports of persecution in the colonies, detractors began to criticise more generally the inhospitable demeanour of the New England Puritans and their restrictive community. In May of 1645, William Barkeley and Henry St. John petitioned Parliament about being unjustly treated when stopped at Boston harbour, supposedly under suspicion that they were carrying goods for the ‘kings party’.

After the said shippe came neare to the River of St. Johns she was forced to goe to Boston in New England & after her arrival there, the M[...] merchants & divers of the maryners were arrested, imprisoned, and kept indurance under the hangman’s hand o’ by John Indicott, who stiles himself governor there, Steven Wentrop Recorder of Boston there and diverse others of the Magistrates in Boston in New England . . . .

The next month, Stephen Winthrop fired back at Barkeley and St. John, publicly refuting their claims against the hospitality of New England’s official magistrates and asserting that Berkeley and St. John’s petition had been the first of its kind criticising New England’s magistrates of hostility. Contrary to Winthrop’s assertion, by 1645 petitions citing

---

grievances against New England hospitality were familiar, though frequently targeted specifically at Massachusetts’ theological policy. Stephen Winthrop’s apologetical defence of the magistrates’ treatment of Barkeley’s merchant crew resembled previous vindications reflecting the necessity of maintaining a favourable reputation in England. The Puritan community in New England was completely dependent upon new settlers, many of whom were drawn by the religious appeal of settling in the colonies. The continued viability of the colonies relied on maintaining that appeal through a positive reputation and theological credibility.

For the Puritan founders of New England, theological accusations against the colonies represented a grave threat. Religious leaders like William Bradford and John Winthrop saw themselves simultaneously pitted against internal threats of heresy and moral corruption as they fought external criticisms from opponents in England and exiled colonists who had found the colonial theocracies insufferable. Congregationalists soon recognised the undesirable tone their actions were setting and had their justifications published in London, even for intercolonial disputes as in *A Letter of Mr. John Cottons, Teacher of the Church in Boston in New England, to Mr. [Roger] Williams, a Preacher There*. Unfortunately for New England Congregationalists, some of their justifications, such as in Winthrop’s *A Short Story of the Rise, Reign, and Ruin of the Antinomians, Familists, & Libertines, that Infected the Churches of New-England*, backfired and only served to illustrate a harsh and intolerant
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theocracy hardly appealing even to many Puritans across the Atlantic.\textsuperscript{484} Thomas Weld, an
agent for Massachusetts Bay, had actually reissued the tract, altering the opening from the
originally titled \textit{Antinomians and Familists condemned by the Synod of Elders in New
England}, not because he feared the first might be interpreted too harshly, but rather because
he wanted to clarify the severity with which radicals were handled in the Bay Colony.\textsuperscript{485}
Pestana has observed:

\begin{quote}
Weld clearly believed that the major challenge to New England’s reputation was the accusation that its lax church polity encouraged heresy. . . . Weld’s concerns were firmly rooted in the political reality of the 1630s, when the major criticism leveled at religious radicals was that they encouraged anarchy.\textsuperscript{486}
\end{quote}

By the 1640s, Weld’s concerns proved to be outdated and only contributed to the sense in
England that colonial magistrates were ignorant of their own abuses and detrimental policies.
Far from a resembling a hospitable home, New England Congregationalists were establishing
a reputation as an unwelcoming sect of radical theocrats bent on oppressive subjugation of
religious dissidents.\textsuperscript{487} It was intolerance which severed Congregationalism’s alliance with
Independents and established a poor reputation which New England Congregationalists were
never able to fully repair.\textsuperscript{488}

New England’s infamous persecution was not only denounced by critics of the
colonies, but also by supporters of New England as well, who admonished magistrates like
John Winthrop that their uncompromising theocratic rule was damaging to the Puritans’

\begin{footnotes}
\item[484] John Winthrop, \textit{A Short Story of the Rise, Reign, and Ruin of the Antinomians, Familists, \& Libertines, that Infected the Churches of NEvv-England}.
\item[485] Winthrop, \textit{Antinomians and Familists Condemned By the Synod of Elders in NEvv England}.
\item[486] Pestana, \textit{The English Atlantic in an Age of Revolution}: p.68.
\item[487] Roger Williams, \textit{The Blovdy Tenent} (London, 1644).
\end{footnotes}
religious mission. As early as 1631, Sir Richard Saltonstall berated Governor John Winthrop for such, ‘sadd things are reported dayly of your tyranny and persecution in New England,’ and reproved that, ‘rigid ways have layd you very lowe in the hearts of the saynts.’ George Downing reflected similar sentiments when he commented in 1645 that the ‘law of banishing for conscience . . . makes us stinke every wheare’. An anonymous tract published in 1645 by ‘One of King James ancient Protestants’ likened the New England magistrates to the infamous Emperor Nero of Rome, who persecuted early Christians, forcing them to hide rather than publicly profess the teachings of Christ. ‘I do wonder’, the author pondered, ‘that so many learned able Divines doe not gain some order against this New-England brood but I am perswaded in my heart that many are partakers with them, and will not or dare not write or once open the mouthes against them’.

Considering the criticism against the New England churches, detractors of Congregationalism like Thomas Edwards pointed to conditions in the colonies as a warning against the intolerance which might arise in England should Independency be adopted. Even Thomas Hooker, whose 1648 Survey of the Summe of Church-Discipline professed support for Independents and the churches of New England specifically, chose to establish himself in Connecticut away from the overbearing theocracy of John Winthrop and John Cotton in Massachusetts. The fact that Hooker, a renowned and popular preacher in New
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England, famous for his work in the colonies, would himself judge it prudent to distance himself from Massachusetts’ persecution and intolerance speaks volumes of the Bay Colony’s contemporary reputation. One can imagine the damaging effect such removals would have had on a colony’s appeal.

A letter by the news writer, Edmund Rossingham, illustrates the extent to which Atlantic religious debates were followed in Parliament by listing the documents which had been taken from several prominent members one day.¹⁴⁴

Last Wednesday the Earl of Warwick, Lord Say, Lord Brooke, Sir Walter Earl, John Pym, and John Hampden, all Parliament men, had all their papers taken from them. Lord Brooke had a discourse taken from him between Mr. Cotton, a minister in New England, and Mr. Bull, concerning the English Church Liturgy, one maintaining it against the other; he had also some petitions from silenced ministers complaining of grievances.¹⁴⁵

It is signifiant that Rossingham mentions that members of Parliament were in possession of petitions of grievances against colonial leadership, the existence of which Stephen Winthrop had attempted to dismiss during the Barkeley debacle.¹⁴⁶ The books Rossingham referenced by Mr. Bull and John Cotton represented typical specimens in the Atlantic religious debate and suggest the awareness in Parliament on the nuances of the ceaseless Atlantic discourse. The collection of documents provides a glimpse into the knowledge and considerations of Parliament members addressing matters of religion in both the colonies and England. As members of Parliament weighed sides in the Atlantic religious debate, they took detractors’ criticisms into consideration.¹⁴⁷ Colonial apologists were mindful of the weight resting on
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New England’s reputation and sought to defend all aspects of their settlement against any criticism.

While justification of their theocratic practices was a primary concern for the New England Congregationalists, they themselves recognised danger in being overzealous, even within their colonial haven. Bernard Bailyn has noted that, ironically, colonial Congregationalists themselves feared the unwavering religious zealotry of which they had been accused, though they perceived it in the form of dissident radicals. Bailyn asks, ‘Where was the line between dangerous fanaticism and benevolent zeal? Once Puritanism was released from traditional ecclesiastical and social constraints, an inexorable logic took over that could sweep one through deepening stages of sectarian radicalism’.\(^498\) Creating a favourable balance suitable for both zealous Saints and less devout colonists proved a difficult task which would define the development of New England policy and shape the region’s demographics and character.

Efforts to repair New England’s reputation could not be merely superficial, but required actual cultural alterations to draw a new generation of settlers distanced from the ideological origins of the colony’s original restrictive foundations. During the course of the 1630s and 1640s in particular, New England policies required adaptability, in Massachusetts’ case through outward neutrality, to survive the war in England and emerge without great consequence. Religious discourse from New England during the war recognised the shifting conditions of England and Congregationalists adapted their rhetoric to meet new expectations.\(^499\) New England reputation in London would play a central role during the Westminster Assembly when colonial ministers advocated New England Congregationalism over Presbyterianism to be adopted as the new reformed religion of England. Indeed, as
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Pestana has commented, ‘[a]fter the intolerance of the colonial system was exposed, New England, and Independents who had once identified their own fortunes with it, lost ground in the struggle to reshape the ecclesiastical order’.\textsuperscript{500} The reputation of the colonies was a crucial factor in the perceived legitimacy of New England practices.

The Convergence of Church and State

A key feature of seventeenth century English government was its inextricable link to official Church policy. The king’s position as the head of the Church of England brought religious policy firmly into the realm of government and thoroughly politicised theological debate throughout the English world. For Puritans, the religious debate became far more politicised when Puritans no longer tolerated impurity or acknowledged non-Saints within the Church of England, especially for the Puritans who went so far as to remove to the religious community of New England.\textsuperscript{501} The so-called ‘pragmatick’ compromises of the Church of England, whose leadership recognised the impracticality of Puritan idealism, were unacceptable to Puritans who perceived a degeneration of English society and morals under a supposedly lenient, corrupted Church and State.\textsuperscript{502} After the fall of Laudian Arminianism, Presbyterianism was adopted as the successor in 1645, replacing the former conservatism of the Arminian Church.\textsuperscript{503} The challenge to Presbyterianism presented in Independency, the manifestation in England of New England Congregationalism, offered not only new religious doctrine, but government reorganisation as well.\textsuperscript{504} Commenting on the Presbyterian versus Independent debate taking place in the Somers Islands, Richard Norwood of Bermuda
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equated the Independents’ religious antagonism with political subversion against the state.\textsuperscript{505}

In the case of Bermuda, Pestana has noted that, ‘the local Independent movement shaped political as well as religious affairs. Royalism and popular animosity toward independency went hand in hand, and “the country” linked its drive to rid the islands of Independents to its declaration of allegiance to the king’.\textsuperscript{506} Though commenting on Bermuda, the same religious and political biases existed throughout the colonies, linking Independency with anti-royalism.\textsuperscript{507} The radical political implications of New England Congregationalism resulted in it facing strong resistance in England, with some, including John Cotton himself, ultimately concluding that Congregationalism was simply impossible to implement into English government and society at the time.\textsuperscript{508}

New Englanders’ successes in defending the colonies’ merits may be seen in publications within England revealing the respect many English divines held for colonial ministers. In 1643 *A letter of many ministers in Old England requesting the judgement of their reverend brethren in New England* was published, suggesting the esteem in which the godly Saints of New England were held for some in England.\textsuperscript{509} Despite support from like-minded Puritans in England, many were not so happy with the thought of New England influences and opinions spreading across the Atlantic. In 1643, James Howell dismissed hearsay of a plot to reintroduce Catholicism to England, which he credited in part to treacherous rumour proliferated by ‘brain-sicke Lecturers, of whom some were come from
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Critics of New England’s Church feared more than just gossip and malign rumour, but were convinced that the introduction of colonial Congregationalism in England would ruin traditional hierarchy and encourage anarchy and tyranny. The success of ‘New England’s Way’ in England may be inferred by the numerous critical publications lamenting and warning against its spread. John Taylor, the ‘Water Poet’ and firm supporter of King Charles and Arminianism, cited New England as a chief influence in corrupting traditional English religion and virtues. In a thorough censure of the debasing influences faced by the Church of England in 1642, Taylor cited New England theology as a particularly toxic influence which had infiltrated the English Church.

The World is growne into a new confused Chaos, full of new wine lately come from New England, a new Spirit, new Revelations, & new Formes of Prayer. There is such a giddinesse in the profession of Religion, that every one almost is led by his own opinion, and most men in matters of judgement are divided one against another. 'Tis too true, that many places in the Kingdom of England, and in this Citty of London are too much Amsterdamnified by brainelesse opinions, and severall senses, which indeed are senselesse senses in Religion. Religion is become common Table-talke, the ordinary discourse at very our [sic.] Commons and Ordinaries, where a man shall hardly find foure together of one mind.

Entitled, *The Anatomy of the Separatists*, Taylor’s work purportedly targeted the Brownist faction, though the religious influences he referenced as originating in New England primarily emerged from Massachusetts clerics like John Cotton. Taylor’s use of the broad label ‘New England’ rather than specifically ‘New Plymouth’ where the Separatists from Amsterdam were known to have settled suggests that Taylor’s intent was to brand all New Englanders as schismatic Separatists. One year later in 1643, Taylor grieved that England
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continued to be corrupted by Congregationalist influence declaring, ‘Thus the *Publique Faith* hath surpassed *Pharaoh’s* Magicians in Legerdemain, it hath trasform’d our Land into the Isle of *Guls* temporally, and old *England* into New *England* spiritually.’\(^5\)\(^1\)\(^3\) For Taylor’s Cavalier readers, the presence of New England’s religious community in England represented a particularly abhorrent degeneration of traditional English culture.

Observing the theological strife between religious conservatives and the Congregationalists, Thomas Povey, a relatively neutral merchant and statesmen who would serve under both Cromwell and Charles II, commented that moderates were being overlooked in much of the discourse. Povey argued that the middling persuasion was ‘as much afraid of the medling severe Clergy of New-England, as of the Ambitious pragmatick Clergy of old England’.\(^5\)\(^1\)\(^4\) It is worth examining Povey’s presented contrast between the ‘severe’ New England ministers versus the ‘pragmatic’ clergy of England as the distinction is very important for understanding the Congregationalists’ perceived purpose in the colonies.\(^5\)\(^1\)\(^5\) Francis J. Bremer has accurately captured the essence of the divergence in analysing Congregationalists’ frustrations with pragmatists in the colonies who refused to embrace the exclusive purity of the colonies. ‘Endecott’, Bremer notes, ‘was supported by Winthrop and John Cotton, all of them sharing a zeal for purity and a rejection of the pragmatic willingness to compromise shown by Hooker, Vane, and others’.\(^5\)\(^1\)\(^6\) Pragmatic clergy were those willing to sacrifice religious purity for the sake of inclusion and practical policy under a state Church. In spite of practical considerations for attracting more diverse settlers to the colonies, compromise within the New England Church threatened the unique purity of the colonies.
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which specifically set them apart from the corruptions in the broader Church of England.517

The uncompromising, or ‘severe’, nature of the New England Congregationalists is what prevented Thomas Lechford and others from entering the New England congregations and becoming full members of the colonial community.518 Besides contending with religious perceptions of New England Congregationalism, colonial ministers were forced to defend the government implications of separate congregational churches, which detractors claimed would result in a threat to State and societal stability in England.

Bernard Bailyn has argued that despite consistent efforts from New England clergy and magistrates to defend their theocratic policies, Congregationalists themselves feared that their practices may result in radical anti-authoritarian revolts against official organisation.519 To combat the threat, New England authorities were forced to examine their own policies and consider sacrifices and alterations so that order and social stability might be preserved for the greater good of the colony above theological ideals.

How far the ultimate limits of Puritanism could stray from respectable religion and ordinary civility, how close to the abyss of chaos a society in which religion was the source of morality and order, could be seen in the elemental fears of the colony’s leaders. Though there were differences among them on precise points of doctrine and church organization, they shared the fear that the fierce passion for spiritual satisfaction and the irrepressible anti-authoritarianism that lay at the heart of Puritanism might erupt into wild, destructive excesses: of “Familism,” antipedobaptism, “Fifth Monarchy” anarchy, radical spiritism, and a pervasive antinomianism that would lead God-besotted enthusiasts to all kinds of “phanatic doctrines and practices”.520

New Englanders’ own concerns surrounding theocratic restrictiveness cited by Bailyn perfectly encapsulate Presbyterian arguments against the ‘New England Way’.
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‘Conservatives’, Pestana has echoed, ‘believed that an Independent or congregational system also encouraged religious experimentation, augmenting the numbers of heresies that, under the New England approach, at least, had to be suppressed’.\footnote{Pestana, The English Atlantic in an Age of Revolution: p.71.} The threat of increasing heresy under Congregationalism was perceived by detractors as a threat to basic social order with the potential of leading to disastrous anarchy without stronger order.\footnote{Samuel Rutherford, The Due Right of Presbyteries (London: Printed by E. Griffin, 1644); Bailyn, The Barbarous Years: p.428-430.} With the church and state inextricably united in seventeenth century England, any religious upheaval would also represent a political threat to the established order. Thus each religious sect carried with it its own unique political implications, which for Independency appeared obvious to its detractors: disunion and anarchy.\footnote{Ibid.} In light of the turmoil of the Civil War, any hint of chaotic inclination appeared particularly abhorrent to a majority who wished to see a return to peace and order, not another regression into mayhem.\footnote{Ibid.}

In 1642, Thomas Lechford, a disaffected Bostonian lawyer who returned to England after only three years, having found New England theocracy unbearable, published New-Englands Advice to Old-England, which voiced common contemporary concerns on religious matters in England. Considering all available options, Lechford addressed both Presbyterianism and Independency among other existing churches in England. Vouching for moderation, he noted that of Presbyterians, ‘we have no experience, and which moderate wise men think to be lesse consonant to the Divine patterne, and may prove more intolerable than said Episcopacie’?\footnote{Thomas Lechford, Plain Dealing: Or, Nevves from New-England (London: Printed by W. E. and I. G., 1642). A3. Transcription by Colonial State Papers.} Though he cautioned against the unknowns of Presbyterianism,
Lechford firmly opposed the Congregationalism of New England, warning that adoption of colonial policies would bring anarchic ruin to England. Considering potential successors to the Arminian polity, Lechford expressed his disapproval of the Congregational model using the rhetoric of Presbyterians:

Or an independent government of every congregationall Church ruling it selfe, which introduceth not only one absolute Bishop in every Parish, but in effect so many men, so many Bishops, according to New-Englands rule, which in England would be Anarchie & confusion.\(^{526}\)

Lechford highlighted conservative fears that anarchy would accompany the adoption of New England’s Congregationalism in England as he believed it had in the colonies. The presence and persistence of heresy in the colonies along with economic collapse and concerns over moral decay, which featured prominently in John Winthrop’s journal, contributed to critics’ notions that New England itself exemplified the adverse outcome of Congregational disarray.\(^{527}\) Considering common perceptions of the New England Congregationalists as fractious and disorderly, Thomas Shepard’s insistence that New England and its churches were united comes to light as a necessary defence against a prevalent criticism.\(^{528}\) Despite efforts to improve the image of Congregationalism, Presbyterian commentators continued voicing the same criticisms through the end of the decade as seen in examples like the 1647 *Sir John Presbyter not Dead*, wherein a resurrected Sir John Presbyter threatened to torment New Englanders until he witnessed the replacement of their anarchy by an orderly monarchy.\(^{529}\) Anarchic caricatures of the colonies were perceived as an insult to the young New England governments, whose officials endeavoured ceaselessly to refute such claims.\(^{530}\)
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While many Presbyterian critics focused on the decentralisation and apparent disjointedness of the New England churches, others warned against the infamous intolerance and oppression associated with Congregationalist New England. Writing in 1645, George Gillespie presented what he perceived to be the crucial differences between Presbyterianism and Independency, highlighting the accommodating position of the former.

A Presbytery is not so ill a neighbour, that no man who hath the least differing opinion may live beside it. But 2. this objection doth as much strike against the New England government, as against the government of the neighbouring reformed Churches. For in New England there hath been severity enough (to say no worse) used against Hereticks and Schismaticks.531

It is noteworthy that Gillespie actually defended heretics above the New England authorities persecuting dissenters in the colonies. Though many believed that Massachusetts in particular tended to be unduly harsh to non-Puritans, mainstream Protestants generally perceived some benefit in cleansing the Church of the worst manifestations of heresy.532 Thomas Alle argued that abuses against freedom of conscience in New England had ‘brought forth monstrous Errours’ and supported Thomas Lechford’s belief that adoption of New England policy in England would lead to similarly disastrous results.533 Alle specified that he desired ‘a Reformation, and not a Toleration’ to reduce said ‘errours’ above, though he regarded New England’s policies as too authoritarian and restrictive.534 Others like Gillespie did appeal for greater toleration in England, which was entirely at odds with New England’s theocratic order under Congregationalism. Considering that toleration advocates like Lechford and anti-toleration reformers like Alle both rejected the restrictive doctrines of New England ministers indicates that Congregationalist policy was perceived by a broad spectrum of reformers as an
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inapplicable theological solution for England. The intolerance of New England Congregationalism had a significant impact on Congregationalist relations with the Independents in England, who by 1644 had largely renounced ties with New England ministers.\(^{535}\) Having demonstrated the apparently unfavourable outcomes of thorough reformation in New England, many in England remained unconvinced of the practicality of New England’s theology.\(^{536}\)

In dismissing Independency as an unsuitable option for England, Edward Bowles actually made a broader appeal for cooperation, reminding readers in his *Manifest Truth* of the true papist foe in England.

> I beleeeve Old England uncapable of that Government is in New. All that is particularized (with respect to Church-Government) on the behalfe of Scotland, is that wee joyne in preservation of it against the common Enemy, supposed by all to be Papists and Prelates; the plaine intent of which to me seems to be an endeavour to preserve Scotland from any relapse to the corruptions they had escaped, and not to preclude it from any further reformation, if need should be’.\(^{537}\)

Bowles’ rejection of Independency was far less severe than that of many of his peers suggesting that he held a more moderate opinion than some concerning the qualities of the opposing factions. Bowles’ primary concern, as was likely the case for the more-moderate though generally less-vocal majority, was for the defence of Protestantism in the face of Catholic threats in England.\(^{538}\) Bowles’ remark that further reform could be pursued within the Presbyterian Church appealed to those reformers who desired further reformation but who were unwilling to risk full adoption of New England’s restrictive practices.\(^{539}\) Carla Gardina Pestana has cited the 1646 ‘Remonstrance’ from Massachusetts colonists against the colony’s
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church government as the catalyst after which ‘Presbyterians gave up on winning over Massachusetts Bay, either through eliciting support in the colony or complaining to the center’.  

During the war, shifting religious platforms greatly influenced how people in England perceived New Englanders and their faith. As Presbyterianism came to represent the new conservatism after the fall of Arminian power and 1645 adoption of Presbyterianism, Independency increasingly came to be seen by its critics as a ‘novel’ faction, too immature in existence to offer a valuable contribution to the English Church. Perhaps some of the animosity between Congregationalists and Presbyterians stemmed from their Reformation platforms accustomed to funnelling energy toward opposition and negativity rather than toward positive support for desired ends. With the fall of the greatest Arminian foes, Presbyterians and Independents turned toward each other to battle for what might succeed Arminianism within the Church of England. In a turmoil of persecution, suspicion, and accusations between religious factions during the tumultuous war years, Henry Robinson stood out as a voice of reason above inimical sectarian squabbling.

If the Protestants of Old England use the same meanes and patience to convince those of New England, may they not as lawfully persecute them for being wilfully obstinate if they will not submit, as be persecuted by them for the very same reason? If the Protestants of New England will not grant a toleration unto the Protestants of Old England; with what equity can they expect it in Old England, unlesse from the highest perfection of Christianity in doing good for evill?

Pleading for mutual respect and freedom to practice, Robinson’s argument largely fell on deaf ears. Though New England Congregationalists recognised the need to defend their practices from critics in England, the colonial approach was purely to justify persecution and
intolerance rather than attempt to heavily reform New England practices for broader appeal.⁵⁴³

Presbyterianism and New England Congregationalism

Considering New England’s poor reputation abroad and especially its infamous religious policies and persecution, it was easy for critics of the colonies to highlight their shortcomings to a disaffected audience in England. The Presbyterians of Scotland had become religious rivals of New England ‘Independents’ and entered the same transatlantic discourse of debate and accusation previously seen between Massachusetts and colonial dissidents like Roger Williams. Very similar to the term ‘Puritan’, New England Puritans did not describe themselves as ‘Independent’, but rather as Congregationalists. The term ‘Independent’ was used by their detractors such as Presbyterian Adam Steuart in Some Observations and Annotations upon the Apologetical Narration, in which Steuart disparages the incongruous clergy of New England.⁵⁴⁴ From a Presbyterian standpoint, characterising the New England churches as ‘Independent’ highlighted the perceived lack of organisation and hierarchy in Independent parishes. New England Puritans early adopted the Congregational name for themselves, which promoted the notion of community and connectedness rather than the isolation and confusion suggested by the ‘Independent’ label. Samuel Eaton and Timothy Taylor, teacher and pastor respectively at the church of Duckenfield in England, published in 1645 The Defense of Sundry Positions & Scriptures for the Congregational-way Justified, which sought to dispel falsehoods associated with New England’s Church and

⁵⁴³ Winthrop, A Short Story of the Rise, Reign, and Ruin of the Antinomians; Winslow, The Danger of Tolerating Levellers in a Civil State.

⁵⁴⁴ Adam Steuart, Some Observations and Annotations Upon the Apologetical Narration (London: C. Meredith, 1643/4).
notably refrained from using the derogatory ‘Independent’ label.\textsuperscript{545} By the 1650s writers like John Cotton used the distinction more consistently to contrast against Presbyterianism.\textsuperscript{546} New England efforts to censor even the labels of their practices further reveals the strong desire of colonial clergymen to see New England’s reputation repaired in England.

Even before the outbreak of Civil War, the nobility of England petitioned the House of Lords in 1641 with concerns over ‘dangerous disobedience’ brewing among the commons, partly fuelled by subversive publications coming over from New England Congregationalist ministers. The nobles themselves took issue with the status of the Church of England, though desired far more moderate reforms than those proposed by the Puritans of New England and dissenters in England. ‘These petitioners’, they wrote, ‘petition for abolition of Bishops, their impious courts, their dependent officers, their corrupt canons, book of articles, and ‘English refined’ mass book of common prayer, with all their popish significant ceremonies therein contained’. As an example, the nobles submitting the petition attached opinions from New England minster, Samuel Eaton, preacher at St. Johns, to illustrate the seditious policies which they bemoaned. Foreshadowing the remarks of Presbyterians in the following years, the nobles petitioning the House of Lords warned that Eaton’s ‘more arbitrary government of a numerous Presbytery’ would result in anarchy and disorder if seriously considered as a replacement for conventional Episcopacy.\textsuperscript{547}

It is worth examining one of Samuel Eaton’s most telling summons, which called upon ‘all good people’ to petition Parliament, not the King, for the complete reformation of

\textsuperscript{545} Samuel Eaton and Timothy Taylor, \textit{A Defence of Sundry Positions; And Scriptures Alledged to Justifie the Congregationall-way; Charged at First to be Weak Therein, Impertinent, and Unsufficient} (London: Printed by Matthew Simmons, 1645).

\textsuperscript{546} John Cotton, \textit{Certain Queries Tending to Accommodation and Communion of Presbyterian & Congregationall Churches by Mr John Cotton} (London: Printed by M.S., 1654).

\textsuperscript{547} ‘Petition of the Nobility’, House of Lords (London: Parliamentary Archives: HL/PO/JO/10/1/53, 1641).
the established Church of England. Eaton’s radical remarks provide a window into pre-war attitudes among New England ministers and openly express the sentiments of colonial Congregationalists before the outbreak of war made such candid partisanship too dangerous to announce.\textsuperscript{548}

That all good people should pray [...] unto god, and not cease to petition the Parliament for the razing of the old foundation, which was never rightfully layd, and for the laying of a new foundation, meaning . . . the abolishing of Episcopal government and the establishing of their now Presbyterian discipline as also for the purging of all filth & ceremonyes out of the house of god.\textsuperscript{549}

Eaton’s proposed ‘Presbyterian’ church governance was clearly in line with New England Congregationalism, arguing ‘[t]hat the power of the keyes is comitted neither to the pastors nor government but to the whole congregation and to every particular member of the same’.\textsuperscript{550} While the nobility petitioning Parliament agreed that reform was needed within the Episcopal structure, they did not take kindly to the suggestions of New England ministers like Eaton, who called for a complete overhaul of church organisation and practice.

But the contrary when not considered the [...] writing as in the names of petitioners are spread amongst the common people, the tenets preached publicly in pulpits, and the contents of many printed pamphlets [...] amongst us, all of them dangerously encyting a disobedience to the established forme of government; and their . . . intimations of the desire of the power of the keyes, and that their congregations may opointe eclesiastical [authorities] themselves nott [...] oppress some just feare that their desire is to introduce an absolute [...] of Presbyteriall government.\textsuperscript{551}

Here the nobles’ petition has specifically cited Samuel Eaton’s Congregational sentiments, yet has likened such beliefs to Presbyterianism. The consistency in both the nobles’

\textsuperscript{548} Pestana, \textit{The English Atlantic in an Age of Revolution}: p.31.
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name in regard to Congregational policy suggests that less disparity existed, or at least was perceived, between the Scottish Church and the New England establishment at the opening of the 1640s. The lack of contention between the two is further corroborated by New England’s sympathies for Scotland during the crisis over Charles’ Book of Common Prayer.\footnote{Bremer, ‘Communications’, p.325.} Indeed, as Francis Bremer observed on the grander scale, despite the existence of sectarian differences under the umbrella of Puritanism, distinctions were only recognised once Puritans were presented with the task of institutionalising their collectively desired reforms.

The thrust of recent work by Patrick Collinson, Christopher Hill, and other English scholars is that Puritanism in the early seventeenth century carried within it the seeds of various divergent ecclesiologies in a kind of balance that allowed the movement as a whole to retain its unity. Only when Puritans grappled with the task of translating reform impulses into an institutional program did tensions emerge and unity fracture.\footnote{Bremer, ‘Communications’, p.325.}

Before Puritans were presented with an opportunity to implement their own reforms, Puritans were relatively united against perceived ‘popery’ and corruptions within the Church of England. Tension and controversy between Congregationalism and Presbyterianism only fully developed alongside the Westminster Assembly, which turned the two from Calvinist allies against Arminianism into staunch opponents jostling to reform the entirety of the English Church beneath their respective theologies.

It is a true testament to the ideological changes wrought by the Civil War, and shifting sentiments as a result, that Presbyterianism, the adoption of which Richard Hooker had once warned would result in a world ‘clean turned upside down’, had become synonymous with conservatism by the late stages of the war.\footnote{Hill, The World Turned Upside Down (London: Clays Ltd, 1991). p.32.} As late as 1642, a tract was published recounting an earlier testimony by George Carleton, in which he contrasted the ‘novelty’ of

\footnote{Fenwicke, Christ Ruling in Midst of his Enemies (London: Printed for Benjamin Allen, 1643). p.2.}  

Presbyterianism with the ‘antiquity’ of ‘Episcopall government’, mirroring the same arguments Presbyterians would soon make against the immaturity of New England Congregationalism.\textsuperscript{555} The Solemn League and Covenant of 1643 had a major impact on the standing of Presbyterianism in the England, pulling the Scottish Church from the fringes of Church reform into the English mainstream. ‘As a result of Parliament’s full embracing of the “Solemn League,”’ writes Germaine Fry Murray, ‘the establishment of “classical presbyteries” throughout England was initiated in 1645’.\textsuperscript{556} The year 1645 also coincided with the execution of Archbishop Laud as well as the London publication of John Cotton’s explanation and promotion of the New England Way as the definitive reformed Church.\textsuperscript{557} John Cotton’s timing was not coincidence, for he, like other New England Congregationalists, observed the ascendancy of Presbyterianism and wished to promote the merits of the New England Congregational Church for consideration.\textsuperscript{558} In the eyes of Congregationalists, the rigid hierarchy of the Presbyterian Church was no better than the episcopacy which had been discarded by Parliament. It was this fear of compromise which drove New England Congregationalists like Cotton to contribute much more substantially to the debate at Westminster to ensure a thorough reformation of England’s Church rather than a superficial attempt.\textsuperscript{559}


\textsuperscript{559} Bremer, \textit{The Puritan Experiment}: p.131-2.
New England Congregationalism and the Westminster Assembly

Though historians have debated the validity of Perry Miller’s assertion that the New England Puritans had intended from the outset to return to England at the earliest convenience to champion their reforms, one fact is clear: colonial ministers made concerted efforts to advocate Congregationalism for adoption in England during the Westminster Assembly.Independent, who initially acted as representatives in England for New England theology, contended with Presbyterianism to establish a reformed Church of England to fill the void left after the fall of Laudian Arminianism. While the millennial fervour of New England ministers has been debated by historians, the participation of New England ministers in transatlantic discourse provides the most convincing evidence that, on some level, colonial ministers envisioned an ultimate spread of their theology back to England, though not at the expense of their own community in New England.

The start of the Westminster Assembly presented New England Puritans with the opportunity they had yearned for and illuminates why the Congregationalists’ standoff against the Presbyterian model became so heated during the 1640s. Sargent Bush, Jr. has noted the important role that New England Congregationalists played in bolstering the position of the Independents during the debate.

Independents who remained in England, though a decided minority in the assembly, were prepared to represent their congregationalist opinions on church polity as strenuously as possible. Accordingly, they looked to New England for assistance, both through the hoped-for attendance of eminent

---


Besides providing an opportunity for New England ministers to advocate their church system as the new official ecclesial policy of England, the debate surrounding the Westminster Assembly allowed New Englanders to retrospectively refine and modify their original goals for colonial settlement, placing more emphasis on widespread Church reformation.

By asserting that it had been their original goal, as Miller argues, to pioneer Church reform as a model for England, the colonists hoped to gain additional credibility in the eyes of dedicated reformers in England. Miller has argued that it was the grand design of the New England colonies to act as a reformed model since the landing of Winthrop’s fleet at Massachusetts Bay in 1630. David M. Scobey contradicts Miller, however, by observing that, ‘it was not until the mid-1640s that they began to proclaim “reformation of churches” as their chief reason for crossing the sea’. Taking a moderate position between the opposing viewpoints, Francis Bremer has suggested the plausible explanation, also supported by Bozeman’s research, that although the reformation of England may not have been the primary goal of the colonial expedition, the ultimate spread of Congregationalism was likely still hoped for as a desirable outcome. Bremer argues:

While explicit avowals of a desire to transform and revolutionize England might be tactfully few prior to the Interregnum, the colonists did demonstrate a concern not only passively to exemplify the truth but actively to work for their cause. New Englanders corresponded with their friends in the mother
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565 Scobey, ‘Revising the Errand’.
566 Miller, Errand into the Wilderness: p.11.
567 Scobey, ‘Revising the Errand’, p.3.
country and in the Netherlands to explain and defend the system they were creating.\textsuperscript{569}

Bremer’s remark resembles Miller’s indefensible assertion of the Congregationalists’ ‘unspoken assumption’, though neither historian’s argument can be supported by contemporary records on account of the supposedly secretive nature of the Saints’ intentions.\textsuperscript{570} Regardless of their earliest objectives, the New England Puritans took advantage of the opportunity presented by the Westminster Assembly to promote their vision of true reformation.\textsuperscript{571} Though that vision had previously been part of a conglomerate Puritan opposition to the Laudian Church, the necessity of settling on a specific policy to implement led to greater disparity between the Presbyterian and Independent parties as they jostled for supremacy within the Church of England.\textsuperscript{572}

John Fenwicke, a prosperous Newcastle merchant who would join the Parliamentary army during the war, wrote in 1643 that around the time that the ‘new Service Booke [was] imposed’, he had received a copy of the Scottish Covenant from an old friend in Scotland. Fenwicke recorded that he not only read, but seriously considered the Covenant and suggested it to New England for consideration.

\begin{quote}
When I read and seriously weighed the Covenant it selfe and passages about it, I writ under it: Inde Triumphabit Chr[...]us post praelia i[...]or. That is in English, From thence after bloody battailes Christ shall triumph and begin his conquests throughout the World. And so sent it to my Friends in New-England; who where no lesse affected with it then I: and earnestly solicited my constant elligence about that busines of Scotland, which I also as willingly performed untill I was driven out of England.\textsuperscript{573}
\end{quote}
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At the time of the Prayer Book crisis, New Englanders were engaged with the events in Scotland and expressed sympathy for Scottish sufferings at the hands of their mutual Arminian foes. In 1645, New England Congregationalist William Hooke’s *New-Englands Sense of Old-England and Irelands Sorrowes* summarised the sentiments of both English and Scottish Calvinists when he inquired, ‘What forlorne creatures, Papists, Atheists, Neuters, and mongrell Protestants, had they procured to fight against the Scottish Nation?’ The ‘forlorne creatures’, and especially ‘Papists’, cited by Hooke represented the Arminian faction supported by Charles I and the Royalist army, characterised by Hooke as barbarous animals preying on Scotland. The passage highlights the greater sense of Puritan unity in the face of Arminian opposition prior to the war and in its early stages. The fall of the Laudian Church removed the opponent which had formerly united the two theologies and pitted Independents and Presbyterians against each other as new rivals in the contest for Church leadership.

Reflecting the sentiment of Hooke’s *New-Englands Sense*, historians Robert Paul and Francis J. Bremer have recently revised sectarian notions of Puritanism, emphasising the blurred lines between denominations. Bremer has summarised Paul’s conclusions on sectarian divisions:

Robert Paul’s recent study of the Westminster Assembly likewise shows how lines along which sects were later divided were not evident in the early sessions of the assembly and even when they began to be seen were scarcely as clearly drawn as later denominational historians would have them. Allen’s identification of divergent sectarian tendencies among colonial Puritans thereby serves to place them within the broad stream of Puritanism.
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Before an opportunity was presented for Puritans to craft an official Puritan policy for widespread English adoption, Puritanism existed as a collective manifestation of opposition against the status quo within the Church of England.\textsuperscript{577} The movement coalesced around negativity, but little was formalised until Puritans were forced to contend with each other over how best to implement reformation within the Church.\textsuperscript{578} Independent and Presbyterian Calvinists alike shared a resentment of Arminianism, though it was not enough to rectify their own differences on Church structure and hierarchical organisation during the Westminster Assembly.\textsuperscript{579} The Westminster Assembly officially sanctioned a debate between the religious factions as Independents and Presbyterians jockeyed for their respective faiths to replace waning Arminian authority. As a result, New England came under sharper criticism from Presbyterians as Congregationalism was no longer perceived as a Calvinist ally, but rather an imposing rival. During the war years, Independents and Presbyterians would be pushed further apart as Presbyterians began to replace the former conservatives and Independency became regarded as a radical novelty which encouraged disunion and leanings towards anarchy.\textsuperscript{580}

Though Presbyterians and Independents were theological opponents, some writers of the early 1640s were more interested in supporting their coexistence rather than enmity. Henry Robinson wrote extensively during the 1640s on behalf of religious toleration, though his own sympathies lay with the Independents and he was a supporter of the New England venture. In 1643, Robinson published \textit{Liberty of Conscience: Or, the Sole Means to Obtain} \textcite{Collinson}.
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Peace and Truth, in which he argued in favour Presbyterians showing greater religious
toleration towards their New England brethren, the irony of which may be seen when
considering Massachusetts’ own inclination towards persecution. Robinson’s example used
himself and a hypothetical brother, Robinson of the faith generally professed in New England
and his fictitious brother a Presbyterian, each attempting to convert the other to his own faith.
The exercise concluded with the lesson that neither brother may be compelled to conversion,
but that each must decide based on his own analysis of the merits of each faith. 581

In his Short Answer to A. S., John Goodwin thoroughly repudiated the criticisms of
Presbyterian Adam Stewart against the Congregationalists of New England, though he made
modest efforts to reconcile the differences between the two sects as he defended
Independency. Playing devil’s advocate, Goodwin inquired why Stewart had abandoned
efforts ‘for convincing them [Congregationalist New Englanders] of this worse than Heretical
tenet’. 582

Ought you not to endeavour their conversion equal to your brethrens of Old-
England, and that as well unto your Disciplin as to your doctrin? Are their
soules not worth saving? Or their Country not worth living in? . . . But why
should not the soules of your New-English Brethren bee as deare unto you, as
those of Old-England? Or though your Brethren of New-England should know
the way to heaven of themselves; How can you with a quiet mind endure they
should get thither without your Passe, your Mittimus, your Peter-pence? 583

While Goodwin had no legitimate desire to see New Englanders converted to
Presbyterianism, his defence of the New Englander’s conscience and ecclesial worth is
important in understanding the transatlantic perception of New Englanders. Goodwin was
surprised to see Stewart discontinue efforts to persuade New Englanders away from

582 John Goodwin, A Short Answer to A. S. Alias Adam Stewart’s Second Part of His Overgrown Duply to the
Independency, understanding Stewart’s conviction as an unwarranted dismissal of New Englanders’ spiritual worth. New England apologists like Goodwin perceived the colonists as fully English and integrated into the religious sphere of England, while their detractors regarded their settlement as a hopeless terminus for the spiritually inept.

Though he firmly denounced Presbyterian hierarchy and ambition as Romish in nature, Goodwin recognised the similarities and closeness of Presbyterians and Independents. ‘For since the Churches of Scotland and New England for Doctrin agree in fundamentals, differ onely in Disciplin . . . How come,’ Goodwin asked, ‘the New-English and Scots not to be both Sects alike, since AS. calls the Apologists a Sect?’ With some bitterness, even the Presbyterian Commissioners for the Church of Scotland observed that the ‘godly people’ who departed for New England could have discovered like-minded friends in Scotland who would have welcomed the aspiring colonists into the Church of Scotland. Despite the animosity between the two, Presbyterians still praised Congregationalist New Englanders for having the wisdom and ardor to leave England in search of religious liberty and freedom of conscience.

We may be very confident, that the godly people, who did transplant themselves out of this Island, (the fame of whose piety and zeal shall never suffer detraction or the smallest diminution from our thoughts or words) might have lived in the Church of Scotland, enjoying the pure Ordinances of God, with peace in their consciences and comfort to their souls, and would have willingly come into Scotland, when they went into New-England, could they have been free of the usurpation and tyranny of Prelats and the Prelatical party, which at that time did reign and rage in that Kingdom, vexing the Godly Ministry and people there, with many and bitter sufferings.

The Presbyterian Commissioners expressed sympathy for the ‘godly people’ who emigrated to New England to free themselves of the same prejudices suffered by the Scottish Presbyterians under Charles I. Though the authors lamented that the emigrating colonists had
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not chosen their own Church of Scotland rather than departing for the New World, the Commissioners respected the Saints for their ‘piety and zeal’ and recognised justification in their departure.

During July of 1644, Thomas Edwards submitted to Parliament his *Antapologia*, in which he elaborated in a three-hundred-page tome all the errors in the ‘Apologeticall narration’ of Independent writers, including John Goodwin. New England played a central role in Edwards’ rebuke of Independency, where Edwards closely associated the Independents with the more radical Separatists, asserting, ‘And in a word it is evident thus: You agree with the way of *New-England* (as is confest by some of yourselves) and we may judge so by your high praise of them. Now the Churches of *New-England* agree with them of M. Robinsons Church, who are moderate and qualified Brownists . . .’. As seen in John Winthrop’s writings as well as John Cotton’s sermons, Massachusetts Bay divines had worked hard to rectify growing rifts with the established Church of England and particularly sought to contrast themselves with the infamous Separatists at Plymouth. Critics of New England and its religious and political organisation, however, tended to portray New England as an indiscriminate collection of disloyal subjects opposed to both the English Church and State. Edwards’ submission of his *Antapologia* to Parliament serves to highlight the Presbyterian sympathisers there as Edwards’ intended audience and suggests the tensions which existed between the Independent New Model Army and Presbyterian Parliament.

Mindful of the similarities between the Presbyterian and Independent churches, many theologians took a civil and understanding approach to the debate, taking serious consideration of their opponent’s views and the merits of their arguments. Richard Mather’s *Apologie of the Churches in New-England for Church-Covenant*, written in 1639 as a rebuttal
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to a Master Barnard and published in 1643, read as a justification of New England Congregationalism rather than an attack against Presbyterianism.\textsuperscript{588} In 1643 Richard Mather published another response against Presbyterian Charles Herle, though Mather even notes himself in the title that the issues raised by Herle were ‘friendly examined’ before a response was delivered.\textsuperscript{589} Though Mather himself promoted New England Congregationalism over Presbyterianism, his works regarding the Church of Scotland were not divisive, but rather encouraged meaningful discourse between the opposing faiths for the collective benefit of improved Church reformation.\textsuperscript{590} Despite some efforts towards reconciliation and moderate discussion, much of the debate centred around polarising opinions which became less tolerant by the early 1640s, coinciding with the Westminster Assembly. As John Brown has suggested, the Presbyterian alliance with Charles I, in which Charles would grant the Presbyterians concessions if they assisted in returning him to the throne, greatly contributed to ‘the widening divergence between presbyterian and independent, for if the concessions proposed were admitted, it would mean the surrender of everything for which the independents had been contending since the war began’.\textsuperscript{591} As time went on into the later 1640s, many Presbyterians and Independents found themselves arguing against the views of former Puritan allies.

William Prynne represented a prominent case of shifting sentiment during the mid-1640s. Both he and Henry Burton had formerly been aligned Puritans united in opposition against Archbishop Laud, for which they both, along with John Bastwick, lost
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their ears in 1637 for publishing unflattering words against the Archbishop. By 1645, Prynne published *Truth Triumphing over Falshood*. In refutation of Mr. John Goodwins *Innocencies Triumph: my deare brother Burtons Vindication of churches, commonly called ‘Independent’*. Prynne’s book recognised the former closeness of members of the two factions, though warned against trusting Independency’s ‘novelty’ over the old wisdom of Presbyterianism. The next year, Henry Burton published a response arguing the exact opposite, that the New England Way must have been the best of the reformed churches as it was the latest in development and thus the most current in ideology.

> If that of *Scotland* plead for it, we desire a clear demonstration of it. But why not the Churches of New-England, which are of the latest Reformation, and therefore likeliest to be the Best? And if the Best reformed, we must, by our solemn Covenant, look over rather the great Ocean to New-England Churches, than over Twede to that in Scotland.

It is important to note that despite his personal Independent leanings, Burton recognised the importance of the Presbyterian Church in Scotland as an ally against common foes of Church Reformation. While Burton appreciated the necessity of Presbyterian allies, he desired to see their Church isolated in Scotland, arguing, ‘although we shall endeavour (as afore) the preservation of that Reformed Religion in Scotland against our common Enemies; yet we do not binde our selves to the erection, and so preservation of the same in England’. Henry Burton believed that the Congregationalist Church of New England, however, was appropriate for full adoption within a reformed Church of England.

> Following the execution of Archbishop Laud, Thomas Edwards published his *First and Second Part of Gangraena* in which he acknowledged the mutual goals and shared desires of both Independents and Presbyterians, noting, ‘That now God had delivered us both (namely, the Presbyterian and Independent) from such bondage and oppression, we might not
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be guiltie of bringing our brethren into bondage, lest the Lord carrie us back again into Egypt for it’.\textsuperscript{595} Despite the similar dispositions between the Presbyterians and Independents, Edwards criticised the Independents for overreaching their boundaries and imposing their beliefs upon unwilling Protestants as the Independents themselves sought protection from Parliament to preserve their own faith against Presbyterian influence.

This last moneth in \textit{December}, one of the Independent Ministers in his prayers at a Lecture, two or three severall Lectures, prayed to God that the Parliament might give libertie to tender consciences. One of the Independent Ministers at his Church-meeting in a house, gave thanks unto God for the libertie of conscience granted in \textit{America}, and said, Why, Lord not in \textit{England} as well as in \textit{America}? or words to that purpose. Another Independent Minister in his prayer put up this petition, O Lord make the Parliament friends to the Saints.\textsuperscript{596}

Edwards argued that the Independent faction in England had unjustly criticised Presbyterians for oppression and overreach, demanding unwarranted protections for their faith and practices. Addressing what he perceived as the hypocrisy of the Independents, Edwards inquired, ‘Would they in \textit{New-England} endure one or more Presbyterians to live among them, and to go up and downe their Countrey, and in chieffe Towns and places to preach against, cry downe their Churches and Church-government, and to extoll and cry up a contrarie way, as Mr. \textit{Peters} and others do here?’\textsuperscript{597} Citing New England specifically, Edwards suggested that if allowed to reign freely in England with the same power that they wielded in the colonies, the Independents ‘would have trod [Presbyterians] downe as mire in the street, casting them out with scorn before this time of day, not have suffered a Presbyterian to preach among us, or to have been in any place or office, militarie or civill, but all would have been shut up in prisons, banished, or else hiding themselves in holes and corners’.\textsuperscript{598} In a way, Edwards’
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warnings against the rise in Independent influence could be said to foreshadow the coming of Pride’s Purge in 1648. In the contest for religious supremacy in a rapidly changing religious atmosphere spurred by war, the debate was not limited to religious ideology, but expanded to the moral and political compasses of competing factions. New England’s reputation for stringent authority and harsh persecution did not bode well for the defence of their practices and was a reputation the colonies sought to ameliorate so that they could more easily persuade the English populace to adopt their practices and faith.

In 1647, an anonymous pamphlet was published entitled *Sir John Presbyter Not Dead* in direct response to an earlier pamphlet published against Presbyterianism. ‘Alas, alas, Independents,’ the pamphlet read, ‘and am I againe revived; I live againe, and shall doe so, till I behold the Babel you have builded, demolished by your selves, and your Anarchy bee reduced to Monarchy’. In contemptuous derision, the author announced, ‘My sweet friends, I have the coldest comfort for you, that your greatest enemies can wish, during my confinement to the shades below, for to me it was permitted, as once to the righteous Lazarus, to take a view of things there done, and thence once more to visit the Earth’. The ridiculing pamphlet brings light to the increasing animosity between Independents and Presbyterians leading up to the Parliamentary confrontation of 1648. In examining the shifting ideological platforms of the opposing factions during the 1640s, it is important to note the Presbyterian pamphlet’s insinuation that Independency bred anarchy; a fear previously espoused by Royalists and Arminians. In criticising Independency, *John Presbyter Not Dead* also mocked the New England colonies for producing such characters as Samuel Gorton,
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suggesting that their Church system established in the colonies had little worth to contribute
toward the English community besides heretical excess.602

By 1648, Samuel Rutherford, the famous Scottish Presbyterian clergyman, published
his *Survey of the Spirituall Antichrist*, in which he condemned Familists and Antinomians as
poisonous heretics in New England.603 Rutherford recognised that the New England Saints
were justified in persecuting dangerous heretical parties flourishing in the colonies, though he
blamed New England’s Independent Church organisation for enabling the rise of such
divisive factions within their colonies. In contrast to Thomas Edwards’ *Antapologia*, which
asserted in 1644, ‘Now . . . the Church-way of New-England is the same with them of M.
Robinsons [Brownist] Church’, Rutherford suggested that by 1648 New Englanders
themselves had begun to recognise their own error through the rise of radical factions in their
midst.604 ‘They learned by sad experience of these seducers from that time, as I am
informed’, Rutherford claimed, ‘to remove farther from *M. Robinsons democracie* and
popular government, and come a little nearer to *Presbyteriall* Government, and while they
imbrace that Apostolicke Government, they shall ever be infested with heresies, as now they
are this day with new Bee-hives of *Anabaptists, Seekers Enthusiasts, Familists*, and
*Antinomians*’.605 Both Edwards and Rutherford indicated that the Independent churches of
New England represented a form of Brownism, thereby associating the Independents with the
negative connotations connected to the Separatist movement. Rutherford’s remark that New
England Saints had seen their own errors under Congregational organisation reads as a subtly
condescending assertion against church structure under the New England brethren.

Rutherford implied that the colonial magistrates’ supposed recognition of the potential
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strengths of the Church of Scotland, as well as the Saints’ purported adoption of certain Presbyterian principals, marked a new level of maturity for the Congregational Saints. For critics of Independent churches, the New England Puritans were deluded in asserting the practicality of Congregationalism and could only be taken seriously once they began to cast off their foolish, ill-conceived policies.

After all the debate of the Westminster Assembly, the post-war religious settlement in England was ultimately decided by Pride’s Purge when the Independent faction forced Presbyterians out of Parliament.606 Though New England Congregationalism had previously been known for its association with the Independent movement in England, the adoption of Independency as the official State religion in England actually proved to be detrimental to the Puritan community in the colonies.607 The new rival in England represented by the rise of Independency was enough to draw many New England Saints back to England to participate in what the most zealous colonists considered a compromised, inadequate reform.608 New England ministers witnessed a demographic shift in the colonies away from the religiously pure community of the first-generation and toward the more lenient society which characterised, and concerned, the the community of the second-generation Congregationalists.609 As a result of the war and the changing religious atmosphere in England, New England ministers were compelled out of necessity to sacrifice religious purity as a practical measure to sustain the colonial economy and draw immigration beyond the religiously motivated to preserve the viability of the colonies.610
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Though New England Congregationalists and English Independents were closely associated during the early 1640s, and united in their promotion of a Congregationalist Church of England, the two factions had essentially diverged on toleration and become rivals by mid-1644. The two theologies, which differed by their policies on toleration; the New England Congregationalists demanding Church purity while the English Independents had embraced toleration out of recruitment necessity in the army, had essentially diverged and become rivals by 1644. Perry Miller identified religious toleration as the greatest deterrent to New England Congregationalists, remarking, ‘the Independents, who in polity were carrying New England’s banner and were supposed, in the schedule of history, to lead England into imitation of the colonial order, betrayed the sacred cause by yielding to the heresy of toleration’. As Stout has noted, some New England Congregationalists even embraced the hierarchy of Presbyterianism over the toleration of Independency.

English Independents diverged from the New England Way in one extremely important aspect: namely, their espousal of toleration in the face of military and political necessity. Upon arrival in England, several remigrating New England university men adopted Presbyterian loyalties and chose to ally themselves with the anti-toleration forces represented in Parliament.

The religious atmosphere in England had placed the most unyielding of New England Congregationalists in a difficult position. The most zealous Puritans who remained in the colonies were faced with an unacceptable religious compromise in England, but one appealing enough to draw potential Puritan settlers away from the colonies. As a result, as had been the case in the New Model Army, New England ministers themselves were forced to
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compromise their own policies and communal purity out of necessity to compete with the
draw of Independent reformation in England.\textsuperscript{616}

It was the uncompromising resolve of New England Congregationalists which
resulted in their disappointment over the religious settlement in England at the conclusion of
the war.\textsuperscript{617} Though the Congregationalist community denied having any expectation of
spreading their reforms back to England, Bozeman agrees with Miller that it was very likely
still a desire to do so eventually.\textsuperscript{618} The desire to ultimately spread Congregationalism,
however, scarcely resembled the militant ambitions later ascribed to the founding generation
of New England Puritans.\textsuperscript{619}

If a sense of world mission had brought these Puritans across three thousands
miles of ocean, we would not expect to find them speaking with humility, even
skepticism, about the exemplary function of their society. Yet at least six of the
founders, including eminent clergy, openly discounted the world-redeeming
role now fashionably ascribed to them.\textsuperscript{620}

Outside of Perry Miller’s ‘unspoken’ assumptions about the New England
Congregationalists’ motives, contemporary evidence does not support the notion that the New
England clerical founders had intended to return to England to oversee a millennial
reformation.\textsuperscript{621} According to Bozeman, what the first-generation Saints were concerned about
was the un tarnished purity of their religious community which had defined the errand and
separated colonial society from the corruptions of England. Citing some of the most
important contemporary descriptions of colonial theology by John Cotton, John Davenport,
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and Richard Mather, Bozeman concludes that purity defined the colonies, not millennialism.  

These documents make it clear that the quest for purity was a principal theme of the clerical founders, but they also disclose that the envisioned state of New World congregations—kept “pure from hypocrites” and returned to “first purity”—was associated primarily with ideals of conversion, sanctification, and apostolicity. None reflects the “fervent millennial ideology” that has been ascribed unhesitatingly to the immigrants.

Bozeman’s sound dismissal of first-generation millennial fervour does not diminish the likelihood, as Bozeman concedes, that the Saints hoped to eventually see New England Congregationalism spread throughout England as the reformed Church. Bozeman’s assessment of the New England ministers’ more modest aspirations, though devout piety, illuminates the Saints’ post-war reactions to the changes in England. Disappointment over Independent compromises in England coupled with the new theological rivalry it posed simultaneously prevented the New England Congregationalists from remigrating and inspired an appraisal of their own communal piety in the colonies.

While New England Congregationalists had once rejected the practical concessions allowed by Thomas Hooker, Sir Henry Vane, and the clergy of England, even the most zealous colonial Puritans were forced to accept theological compromise following war reforms. Leo Solt has observed, ‘[e]ven Scottish Presbyterianism and, later, New England Congregationalism, theocratic as they were, found it necessary to adopt a covenant theology, a compromise between an all-embracing Arminianism and a restrictive Calvinism’.
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Cotton himself, who had been one of the foremost apologists of New England Congregationalism during the 1630s and 40s, began to endorse the adoption of Presbyterianism in England where he believed Independency represented an indefensible compromise in Church policy.\textsuperscript{628}

About the same time [c. 1650] Cotton was telling his Boston parishioners that for the foreseeable future it was unreasonable to expect England to adopt the Congregational way: ‘for [the] present, it is certain [that] the body of the nation of England is not Capable of Fellowship in Independent Churches.’ Therefore he advocated a flexible establishment providing presbyterian nurture for the larger portion of the citizenry. Proceeding with similar reserve in 1648, John Allin and Thomas Shepard addressed themselves to the charge that New England had contributed to the stalling of ecclesiastical reform in the mother country by strengthening the hand of independency.\textsuperscript{629}

Bozeman emphasises Cotton’s recognition that Congregationalism could not adequately address reforming existing churches by creating new covenanted ones, but overlooks the fact that England’s version of Independency itself was compromised by impurity.\textsuperscript{630} As Perry Miller has argued, the New England Saints were not merely concerned with the practicality of Congregationalism in England, they also feared allowing tolerant Independents to successfully implement a spurious reformation masquerading as true Congregationalist reform.\textsuperscript{631} As the remigration showed, English reforms were tempting enough to entice a substantial proportion of New England ministers, but remained unacceptable to the most zealous of colonial clergy.\textsuperscript{632}

The failure of Congregationalist reform in England following the Westminster Assembly not only prevented the most zealous New England Saints from returning to England to embrace the reformed Church, it also forced them to redefine their own errand in
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the colonies. If reform had been achieved in England, indeed, good enough to have enticed many colonists to remigrate, what was the continued purpose of the Puritan utopia in the colonies? Robert Middlekauff and David Scobey have recognised the retrospective cultural revision engineered by New England Puritans in an attempt to justify their continuation in light of the changes in England.

The chorus of calls for a history of the planting of New England was not simply the natural result of time passing; it was the expression of a need. Robert Middlekauff has offered the provocative thesis that the whole Puritan errand was itself a projection of that need: the picture of the Congregational Way that comes down to us via the later sermons and writings, he suggests, was a retrospective invention of the second generation to give measure to its sense of failure and belatedness. If this overshoots the case a little, it is surely true that the younger ministers bestowed on New England a past that the place never quite had and, with that past, polished the errand into a more pristine form than the founders had usually given it. They answered their call for a domestic history by assimilating the founders to the heroes of the Bible or the Reformation. They endowed their fathers with the monumentality of sacred history and came to speak of them in the cadences of scripture. . . .

As corroborated by Bozeman’s analysis of the New England Congregationalists’ modest original aspirations, second-generation histories sought to create a purified past of grandiose ambition, which differed from historical reality. As Rachelle E. Friedman has argued, ‘Seventeenth-century New England Puritans wrote histories not so much as a forum to glorify God but as a means of explaining their decisions, justifying their actions, and ultimately trying to understand what they had done and who, in the process, they had become’. The second-generation New Englanders’ retrospective idealisation of the first brought about an alarming sense of decline in the colonial Congregationalist community, but also inspired
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revival in purpose. Retrospective analysis by second-generation ministers, which attributed the same sense of militant ministry to the first generation Saints as Perry Miller’s later analysis, invoked a sense of continued purpose in the New England venture despite reformation in England. As Friedman has suggested, second-generation historians were motivated to write from a sense of inadequacy and self-doubt. Their histories were to prove what they feared was not self-evident; that they remained committed to the Congregational vision of the founding generation:

The second generation, the children of the founders, were constantly being reminded that they lacked the same commitment as their parents, and thus historians William Hubbard and Nathaniel Morton sought to write themselves into history and to prove that they were continuing the worthy endeavors of the founders.

If the Independent compromise accepted in England was unsatisfactory for devout Congregationalists, then there was reason to continue pursuing the ultimate spread of New England Congregationalism into England. The notion of declension was both a reflection of a sense that New England had begun to diverge from its original errand as well a call to return to the embellished objective of the colonies.

Though Scobey recognises second-generation fears of declension as a cultural reaction to the Halfway Covenant and the perception of decreasing adherence in New England’s Puritan standards, he overlooks the importance of the Civil War and its outcomes as root causes of these issues. Perceived declension following remigration and new settlement was the major cultural consequence in New England resulting from the war. Forced to contend with reforms in England, colonial Puritans were required to revise their own policies to have any chance of competing with the draw of Independency in the comfort
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of England. As David M. Scobey has observed, ‘[e]ven if New England was not coming apart at the seams, Puritan orthodoxy, with its conception of the original errand, was. In this sense “declension” remains a valid concept, a way of naming Puritanism’s cultural crisis rather than New England’s social change’. Relaxed Puritan restrictions in the colonies enabled the introduction of Quakerism into the colonies and radical ideologies present in England began to trickle first into Rhode Island before spreading throughout the colonies. Philip Gura has attributed the changing religious atmosphere of New England in part to the dissident radical Samuel Gorton, who had been a strong opponent of Massachusetts’ theocracy. ‘In good measure through him’, Gura asserts, ‘the “wranglings and disputes” that informed the debates in Bell Alley, as well as the radical ideology of such men as Saltmarsh and Dell, entered the religious discourse of Rhode Island and, eventually, all New England’. Loosening Puritanical standards during the second generation, which would be officialised through the Halfway Covenant of 1662, were indicative of a cultural shift away from the dogmatic, restrictive theocratic roots of New England. During the second half of the seventeenth century, the cultural shift in New England was interpreted by remaining vestiges of first-generation attitudes as a decline in communal piety. Contradicting David Stout’s assertion that declension existed more in imagination than reality, James Hoopes has noted
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that studies measuring piety have been compromised by examining false indicators such as the statistics of communicants, which do not effectively reveal underlying sentiments.\textsuperscript{646} Regardless of the evolution of inner piety in New England over time, the fact that declension was perceived as an issue in itself is significant in revealing the growing sense of inferiority present in New England congregations following the post-war religious settlement in England.\textsuperscript{647}

Harry Stout has argued that the remigration during the war actually had a positive effect on the New England religious community for the Puritans who remained in the colonies. Building upon historiography identifying Puritanism as a conglomerate body of diverse views, rather than accepting Catherine Armstrong’s claim that the New England Congregationalists existed as a coherent ‘tribe’, Stout suggests that remigration resulted in a beneficial societal cleansing for the Congregationalist community.\textsuperscript{648} After the mass departure of compromising and tolerationist university men, Stout asserts that only the most committed and intransigent Congregationalists remained in New England, comprising a coherent body of concurring Saints.

Clearly the return of so many university men to England contributed, in no small way, to such an homogeneous public culture. In light of the remigration, it becomes apparent that the emergence of a - however temporary - unified cultural system, was not so much the product of the Founding Fathers as it was of the second generation, whose task it became to ‘invent’ a mission and a meaning for the New World in the face of a substantial exodus of intellectuals to England.\textsuperscript{649}

Indeed, second-generation revisionism indicates that the remaining Saints in the colonies recognised a threat to their continued purpose; namely the threat of new religious competition
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posed by Independent reform in England. The urgency of cultural reinvention, however, betrays an insecurity present among Congregational ministers in the colonies, rather than implying strength through uniformity as Stout suggests. David Scobey has argued that, though New England Congregationalists hoped to remain faithful to the founders’ intentions, there was a perceptible, and accepted, relaxation of Puritan standards among a large portion of New England Puritans, which was ultimately institutionalised in the Halfway Covenant.

The proponents of the halfway covenant did not view this tempering as a dilution or secularization of the New England orthodoxy. They insisted that fundamentally they were going on in the same Way; they had merely settled the Puritan city a little lower down the hill, where the air was not so thin.

Contrary to Stout’s analysis, the exodus of so many university men from the colonies contributed to notions of futility and self-doubt, it did not ameliorate them. Existing fears of cultural inferiority as a result of colonisation, combined with the new competition posed by reformation in England, gave way to anxiety over perceived declension within the colonial community.

As Richard Gildrie has argued, the introduction of new religious denominations, particularly Quakerism, ultimately contributed to fears of declension by challenging doctrinal purity in Massachusetts. Second-generation idolisation of the first must not be understood as an indication of unified purpose, but rather an appeal to restore the neglected Puritan standards which had originally imbued purpose into the errand.
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In short, as New England Puritans themselves conceded, the errand had failed.\(^{656}\) Facing a reformed England, New England theocracy proved to be too restrictive to encourage adequate immigration on theological grounds to preserve the religious purity desired by Puritan zealots.\(^{657}\) As Joseph Conforti has shown, ‘[t]he Puritan settlement of New England in the 1630s appeared to the second generation as a Great Migration in part because the region did not become a magnet for new colonists during the rest of the seventeenth century’.\(^{658}\) As Michael G. Hall has noted, for most Puritan reformers, ‘[t]he center of action was now in England’.\(^{659}\) With the arrival of reformation in England itself, many Puritans, especially the Presbyterian majority in England, perceived that New England had run its course and had outlived its usefulness as a reformed alternative.\(^{660}\) As a result of remigration, New England’s economy was forced to diversify while colonial ministers dedicated to New England’s Congregationalist experiment desired greater uniformity and distinction from England.\(^{661}\)

During and after the Civil War, New England population increase was largely attributable to native births rather than immigration, resulting in a new generation not only culturally disconnected from England, but entirely detached from the religious concerns which originally drove the first-generation Saints.\(^{662}\) Following the 1640 and 1650s remigration of university men adopting reforms in England, New England’s significance as a religious haven became secondary to economic priorities and financial motivations for
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Conforti argues that secular development in the colonies and resulting commercial interests represented a great concern to the remaining Puritans who were committed to the founding vision of New England as a pious community dedicated to theology.

For in addition to a new sense of moral and cultural isolation from England, the second generation also confronted the reality of secular colonial development that posed a challenge to New England’s religious origins and identity. Population growth, increased commercial trade, land hunger, and the surge of contention and litigiousness that accompanied such changes provoked concerns that Puritan New England was gradually succumbing to “Rhode Islandism”.

Once reforms in England deprived the colonies of their unique religious status in the eyes of Puritans, it became necessary to accept greater development and colonisation along secular lines rather than relying on obsolete religious ideals to draw colonists. Echoing Conforti’s observations, Robert Middlekauff has asserted that secularisation was a consequence of the necessity to remain relevant in the English world and sustain a practical economy once the original religious fervour of the first-generation had begun to wane:

Surely the process of secularization of society began in the seventeenth century as business and the market, farms and fields, and styles of life separated from the meetinghouse, assumed increasing importance. The State gave ground too, as internal diversity and external imperatives forced the abandonment of an official policy of intolerance. And while these changes occurred, children were born and reared who experienced distress, incomprehension, and indifference at their inability to recapitulate in their lives the religious psychology of their fathers.

The notion of declension was rooted in a fear of communal dilution by infectious secular influences which had grown in the colonies following the war and settlement in England.
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Bernard Bailyn has examined the quarrelling nature of early New Englanders and the ministers’ decades-long struggle to settle on a reasonable theocratic policy that would suit the Saints’ original purpose, yet still be moderate enough to attract prospective colonists.\textsuperscript{667} Bailyn notes that in the process of conciliating rival factions and accommodating moderates, New England gradually compromised its rigid religious platform out of necessity.

If in New England there were to be a Puritan orthodoxy against which dissent could be defined, it would have to be constructed and fought for against competing strains. . . . From the start and for three decades that followed, New England was a scene of conflicting enthusiasms, a hothouse of holy rage, as Puritanism’s inner force, in Edmund Morgan’s phrase, ‘hurl[ed] itself outward to its ultimate limits.’ The struggles were fierce and unending. . . . By the time New England’s delicately balanced moderate Congregationalism was established, it could no longer exclude all other strains, and its inner contradictions were leading to its own declension.\textsuperscript{668}

Ultimately, creating an inviting environment for new settlers and unhappy dissenters proved to be a more urgent concern than preserving the dogmatic ideals of the first generation of migrant Puritans. The myriad of religious beliefs and customs in England, which Conrad Russell has argued was itself a major cause for the war, dramatically reshaped English religious discourse, forcing the colonies to contend with a reformed England for theological appeal.\textsuperscript{669} Following reform in England, the continued relevancy of the colonies came into question and forced the Congregationalists to accept a new, more lenient community developing increasingly around secular enterprise, which would be hospitable to a wider range of prospective colonists than previous dogmatism had allowed.\textsuperscript{670}
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The death of John Winthrop in 1649 marked the end of an era for New England. In Massachusetts, Winthrop represented the attitudes of the original first-generation's dogmatic Puritans, intent on constructing a spiritual utopia in the New World. As Bailyn has recognised, in contrast to his father, John Winthrop Jr. embodied a new generation for the Saints. ‘A modernizing, worldly Puritan, he was an aspiring scientist and entrepreneur, open to the emerging world, tolerant of religious dissent’. Besides his accommodating tolerationism, Winthrop Jr. established himself as an important member of not only the English, but European scientific community and would help bring recognition to New England as an increasingly sophisticated and maturing settlement. As Scobey observes, the transition was part of a broader generational change. ‘Throughout the 1650s’, he argues, ‘it came more and more to seem that the second-generation children were simply not growing up to be saints’. Despite New England Puritans’ firm religious foundations and aspirations, it became increasingly clear that a viable colony could be neither so restrictive, nor idealistic as the Congregationalists desired. While it is true that a variety of motives drove colonists to New England from 1620, following the Civil War, a fundamental cultural shift replaced predominantly religious motives with secular interests. The Civil War and its outcomes produced a fundamental transformation in New England culture away from its dogmatic origins of intolerance and toward a worldly community of pious, albeit less zealous, intellectuals. In rendering New England’s religious community obsolete, reforms in England
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demanded a cultural reinvention of the colonies toward modernisation and diversification, which drove and defined the continuing development of the region away from the intolerant roots of its origins.
Conclusion

The English Civil War is not often considered an important event in American history, though the war’s effects across the Atlantic have not been extensively investigated by historians. An examination of the evidence presented in this thesis indicates that the English Civil War was no minor distraction for English colonists in the New World, but rather was perceived as a momentous occasion throughout the English world. For New Englanders, the war and its resolution represented more than just a turning point for England, but would directly influence the future of the Puritan endeavour into which colonists had invested so much. Though the Parliamentarian victory represented, for some, a Puritan triumph over Arminian Popery, for the Congregationalists of New England the religious settlement at the war’s conclusion forced a reevaluation of the colonies’ purpose as a cleansed religious haven within a corrupted English Church.

The opening chapter of this thesis has examined the intimate interconnectedness between England and the New England colonies and investigated how that relationship shaped early colonial development. Early New England was entirely reliant on a steady flow of settlers to feed the colonies’ underdeveloped and largely immigrant-based economy.\(^{677}\) The religious mission outlined for Massachusetts Bay within Winthrop’s *Reasons to Be Considered* primarily targeted discontented Puritans and, Congregationalists hoped, would encourage religious homogeneity within the New England colonies.\(^{678}\) Heavily reliant on new immigrants to sustain the settlement, though unwilling to abandon the religious component of the ambitious theological venture, New England apologists like John Cotton and the Winthrop family aggressively promoted and defended the merits of New England theocracy
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in contrast to Old World corruptions. The Congregationalist defence proved more telling of the settlement’s weakness than advantages by revealing a sense of desperation beneath the unwavering spiritual facade. As recognised, and feared, by New England’s Congregationalist authorities, New England success depended upon discontent in England pressuring Puritans to remove to the religious community offered in the colonies. Following the Civil War, England’s transformed religious atmosphere eliminated the primary motivation which had formerly enticed the Congregationalists’ target demographic to leave England in favour of the colonial alternative.

In order for New England to succeed in the eyes of its Puritan founders, New England’s religious mission needed to remain intact and appealing enough to sustain settlement. Attracting new English settlers required not only a unique religious atmosphere, but also a thoroughly English setting. The importance of English ‘civilisation’ to combat the wilderness has been emphasised by Jill LePore, A. D. Innes, and Joseph Conforti, all of whom have characterised New England settlers as clinging to their English origins despite their removal. Similarly, John Canup has identified the importance of New England’s learned classes in strengthening the cultural reputation of New England colonists to onlookers in England. At the same time, the colonies needed to be distinguished from England itself enough to persuade prospective colonists to depart from the comforts of England and risk their lives in the wilderness of America. Thus New England’s sustainability depended on a delicate balance between clinging to traditional English culture and
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simultaneously departing from its undesirable features. As recognised by devout Congregationalists loyal to New England’s religious mission, the Civil War and its political and religious consequences threatened that delicate balance upon which New England sustainability depended.  

New Englanders’ direct participation in the Civil War across the Atlantic illustrates how intimately connected the colonies remained to the conflict despite physical separation. During the period, New England was not viewed as the ‘distant curiosity’ described by Cressy, but rather seen as a consequential player in English events.  

Certainly for the Members of Parliament who carried John Cotton’s writings in session, along with the theologians sitting at the Westminster Assembly considering the propositions of ‘New England’s Way’, the distant colonists were perceived as active contributors in English religious and political discourse. Great numbers of New Englanders returning to England as soldiers, lamented in Winthrop’s Journal and Cavalier newspapers alike for different reasons, exhibited colonists’ strong continued commitment to England and Old World events despite removal to the New World. Though the colonies remained closely connected to England, the Congregationalist reaction to English reform contradicts Perry Miller’s dismissal of the New England theocracies as a temporary haven for Puritans intent on returning to a reformed England. On the contrary, New England was intended to endure, with or without a reformed Church of England, as a permanent Congregationalist community in the New World. Figures like John Winthrop, and later Cotton Mather, acknowledged the
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attraction of Puritanisms’ rise in England, but lamented the theological competition rather than celebrating the success of fellow Puritans.687

By rejecting Perry Miller’s claim that New England was perceived as temporary, only intended to endure until a permanent Puritan reform was adopted in England, this thesis supports the work of Susan Hardman Moore and Francis Bremer, who have argued that a permanent New England Puritan theocracy was planned from the outset.688 The distinction is important for interpreting the cultural impact of the Civil War and religious resolution on the New England colonies. Perry Miller’s argument, advocated by Harry Stout, would suggest that the ascension of Independency following the war altered the New England community by drawing away the core of its Puritan adherents and depleting the region’s Congregationalist fervour.689 This study has found the opposite to be true; that the cultural consequence of the war’s political and religious settlement was not a depletion of the colonial Puritan community, but rather a dilution of it. As evidenced by Winthrop’s and Cotton’s reactions to remigration, it was the most-devoted Congregationalist zealots of the New England community who chose to remain in the colonies, rejecting the compromised reforms offered by Independency.690

By rejecting rather than embracing the Puritan post-war settlement in England, the New England Congregationalist community further confined itself to the radical fringes of English Puritanism, confirming the Congregationalists’ reputation for impractical religious rigidity. Though considered inadequate for the New England Puritan community, the religious


reforms enacted following the war in favour of Puritanism satisfied many Puritans who might have previously considered removal to New England. As a result, New England required a new demographic from which to draw new colonists, which, as Conforti has noted, was found in the secular entrepreneurial community seeking economic opportunity in the New World rather than religious sanctuary. As evidenced by increasing secular immigration, the new trend in immigration diluted the formerly predominantly homogeneous Congregationalist community and contributed to the contemporary sense of anxiety over perceived religious deterioration within New England known as ‘declension’. Nineteenth century historians like Leonard Bacon and Henry Martyn Dexter identified the Halfway Covenant of 1662 as a cultural catalyst, which began a slow process of religious deterioration marked by decline and neglect of the Church in the colonies.

The traditional portrait of New England’s declension depicts a period of increasing religious apathy - a spiritual deadness and loss of piety which was manifested in steadily declining church membership. That stream of new saints envisioned by the founding generation simply failed to materialize in the free air of the new world. The ministers, in order to cope with the threat this represented to the continued institutional life of the churches and their own influence in the community, supposedly devised a succession of innovations which made church membership more easily attainable. These innovations not only compromised the original toughness and intellectual integrity of the first generation, but also contributed to further attenuation of religious zeal.

More recent scholarship, exemplified by Scobey, Miller, and Andrew Delbanco tends to consider the fear of declension as an internal cultural phenomena without considering external stimuli for the movement, but still tends to place weight on the 1662 Halfway
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Covenant. The attention given to the Halfway Covenant disregards the earlier cultural developments stemming from the post-war religious transition, which themselves ultimately produced the Halfway Covenant. Perry Miller and Darrett Rutman pushed back the timeline for the process of declension arguing that it began much earlier, Miller arguing in favour of a late-1640s turning point in the Halfway Synod while Rutman pushes the beginning of declension back almost to the founding of New England itself. Some scholars like Robert Pope have dismissed the notion of declension altogether as an imagined concept of deterioration based on the assumption that an ideal first-generation Puritan community had existed in America. More recently, David Scobey has examined declension, not as a realised phenomena, but rather as it existed within the minds of contemporary Congregationalists who feared the existence of the trend.

In terms of declension, this thesis identifies closest with Scobey’s assessment of declension as a culturally present element in contemporary New England in the sense that it existed as an anxiety, even if true decline was not realised in Church participation or piety. As far as that anxiety’s causes, Scobey overlooks the significance of the post-war religious resolution in England, focusing primarily on local, internal catalysts within New England as the driving forces behind, if not a real declension, a contemporary perception of it. Francis Bremer’s research has supported the notion that it was the most zealous Congregationalists who remained in New England while Harry Stout has argued that the religious resolution in post-war England drew away necessary settlers to support the uncompromising
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Congregationalist community in New England.\textsuperscript{700} Taken together, Bremer and Stout’s research supports the argument that the Congregationalist community was forced to adapt to a decline in Puritan interest, but neither historian explicitly connects the cultural shift to Civil War events in England. The conclusions of this thesis differ from the existing scholarship by identifying the primary catalyst behind New England religious cultural transformation as the English Civil War and post-war religious settlement in favour of Independency.

It is ironic, though was recognised by New England contemporaries, that the success of the colonial settlement depended upon continued dissatisfaction with Old England’s corrupted policies and institutions. In a sense, it was New England’s interconnectedness with Old England which brought about the collapse of her unique religious community. When presented with the compromised option of Independency back home in England, the draw proved too strong to preserve the same New England religious community for the second generation as had existed in the first. As Winthrop recognised as early as 1640, when only the first hints of change were arriving in the colonies, the mere suggestion of renewal in England threatened to deprive the colonies of continued appeal and sustainable settlement.\textsuperscript{701} Following the war, the full adoption of Independency in England was enough to persuade many prospective colonists to remain in England.\textsuperscript{702} With the post-war religious settlement, a Puritan haven was no longer perceived as necessary in the English world and, as later recognised by Cotton Mather, New England’s religious purpose became obsolete.\textsuperscript{703} Deprived of its former religious appeal, New England required greater secular immigration and


\textsuperscript{701} Winthrop, \textit{Winthrop's Journal} 2: p.31
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acceptance to remain a viable settlement. Though the Congregationalist community endured, the second generation perceived a decline in religious and societal standards indicative of underlaying concern over perceived cultural and religious transition. If the perception of decline, known as ‘declension’ was, in fact, exaggerated, or even fabricated, as suggested by David Scobey, then it is all the more important for reflecting a nurtured communal anxiety rather than observed reality.

Further research into contemporary perceptions of declension might investigate shifting New England attitudes toward the Church of England during the 1650s and 1660s and consider the tumultuous political and religious upheavals taking place in England during that time. A greater synthesis of the English world and New Englanders’ perceived place in the contemporary religious and political network might also shed light on shifting mid-century cultural perceptions within the colonies. As is the trend in more recent scholarship considering the greater ‘Atlantic World’, historiography examining coinciding developments in England and her colonies would certainly benefit the field and help to understand the English world as a cohesive unit rather than a scattered arrangement of detached settlements.
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