

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php

ARTICLE II.

THE PURITAN AND HIS ANGLICAN ALLEGIANCE.¹

BY LOUIS MARTIN SEARS,
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS.

A STUDY of the Puritan and his Anglican allegiance involves contradictory issues. The Puritans themselves recognized their continuance in the National Church; but their immediate adoption of Congregationalism has cast a doubt upon their sincerity in proclaiming devotion to a church from whose tyranny they were seeking to escape. Conscientious scruples against church practices drove the Puritans to America. Prompt adoption of a new system meant a rupture with the old. But a just estimate of the transition premises sincerity on the part of the Puritans, whose departure from the Church was not a formal act, but an evolution, silent and inevitable, inherent in the philosophy of the exodus.

Any stigma of hypocrisy is especially premature until the Puritans' idea of a true national church is defined. It is evident that they did not identify it with episcopacy or church hierarchy or ritual. Neither did they regard independence in local parishes as incompatible with a larger unity. Thus, in a modern sense, both their Churchmanship and their Congregationalism are dubious. But the Puritans based their claim to Churchmanship upon the fundamental Protestantism of the nation, strengthened by traditional preference for religious unity.

¹The writer's thanks are due to Professor A. C. McLaughlin of the University of Chicago for helpful criticism and suggestion.

The Puritan looked with reason upon the Church of England as a Protestant body in which he could participate without sacrificing the principles of the Reformation. And to deny his membership in a national organization which he sought to preserve and to reform is to accept the ultramontaniam of a small party of extremists armed with the sword of persecution. Such a position deprives the Puritan of his due credit as the moderate Churchman, and fails to estimate the Revolution as the nation's protest against extremes, religious as well as political.

In truth, from the Reformation to the Revolution, the Church of England held a middle course, which justified the Puritan as a moderate. The reign of Edward VI. was ultra-Protestant; Elizabeth maintained an intricate system of checks and balances; and James I., though tending toward the ultimate Laudian position, placed the Puritanic Abbot over the See of Canterbury.¹ To be sure, the Puritans were brusquely treated at the Hampton Court conference in 1604; but a friendly primate lent them countenance, and nonconformity in church practices was distinctly tolerated, especially in the great diocese of Lincoln, which furnished so large an element of the early migrations.² Continuity, however, with the church catholic of pre-Reformation times, combined with the absolutist claims of James and Charles to exalt monarchy and priesthood, and to introduce a Roman ceremonial utterly abhorrent to the Puritans. Thus the Puritan was placed in an anomalous situation. In reality a conservative, his antagonism to the King and to the men whom the King delighted to honor, condemned him

¹ P. Heylyn, *Cyprianus Anglicanus* (1627), p. 108.

² Laud's Works, vol. vi. part 1. p. 313. Letter of John Williams, Bishop of Lincoln, to Archbishop Laud, Sept. 9, 1633.

to the position of a seeming revolutionist,— a turn of matters by no means fair to its victims.

Strangely enough, Laud's own diocesan reports to the King, by recognizing the failure of the High Church claims, confirm the Puritan as the historic Churchman. After five years of power, the Archbishop was still lamenting an incorrigible non-conformity,¹ and another three years were to see the prelate in the Tower, his hopes in ruins, a witness to the futility of aiming at an extreme where the people preferred a mean. Nevertheless, while it remained in force, Laud's persecuting policy drove many into exile, of whom the Puritans were most notable.

By a strange dramatic irony, Laud had himself proclaimed the wanderers as the true church. The Puritan exodus was the fulfilling of that prophecy which Laud delivered on the proud day in 1625 when he preached before the King in coronation: "For the Church cannot dwell in the State. You never read that she 'fled' out of the State 'into the wilderness,' but when some 'dragon' persecuted her."² Like the Babylonian king of old, Laud had been granted the vision, but denied the wisdom to interpret it. Obsessed with the spirit of persecution, he himself enacted the "dragon's" rôle, casting forth the Puritans to establish their church in the wilderness.

They left home, not as enemies of their country, but as missionaries who would develop an English life uncontaminated by the heresies of crown and miter. In theory, their exodus was an extension of the Church of England, not a separation therefrom. Only its evil practices were condemned, and the religious aspect of the migration contemplated a godly com-

¹ Laud's Works, vol. v. part II. p. 355. The Archbishop's Account of his Province for 1638.

² *Ibid.*, vol. I. p. 64.

munity only a shade more extreme in thought and action than the church which Archbishop Abbot¹ and Bishop Williams² had tolerated and protected. While such an hypothesis looks for proof to Puritan utterances in America, it offers a suggestion of historic continuity too important to be ignored.

The historical claim for Puritan membership in the English Church is strengthened by the philosophical. In the seventeenth century, the wave of world and church universality, although receding before a rising nationalism, had so pervaded the newer creation with remnants of things past as to impose religious uniformity as a test of good citizenship. The Puritans deferred to this sentiment in their theoretical Churchmanship and their practical insistence upon unity in the Bay colony. But here and there groups of radicals opposed tradition and set up independent churches on a Congregational model, based upon the theory of compact. Of such were the churches of Plymouth.

The underlying philosophies of nationalism and separatism are antithetical; so that when the Puritan in his new environment elected to follow the Pilgrim example, he drove a wedge which meant his final separation from the National Church. Yet so imbued was the Puritan with the recently awakened English spirit that he was slow to recognize the inevitable result of casting in his lot with Separatists. For a time, therefore, he sought to reconcile the incompatibilities of Separatism and conformity by a philosophy which would harmonize Congregationalism with a national church. The attempt explains many cross currents in early Massachusetts Bay.

The Puritans fashioned their state at a time when various shades of the theory of compact, a new interpretation of the

¹ Heylyn, *op. cit.*, p. 108.

² Laud's Works, vol. vi. part i. p. 313.

divine right of kings, a changing attitude toward corporations, and a fresh conception of the dignity of individual man were forging their way in a world still influenced by the medieval belief in a possibility of religious and political molds into which all humanity should be pressed. Amid this conflict of conservatism and progress, the Puritan was fundamentally a progressive. In adherence to the theory of compact, especially, he set his face toward the future, in line with the mighty rôle which that theory was to play in American history.¹

From its introduction in the childhood of New England, the theory of compact remained for more than two centuries the undisputed political philosophy of America. Underlying the Colonial Charters and Governments, it upheld the Federation, and vitalized the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. It furnished the early criterion of relations between the United States and its constituents, and continued even into the nineteenth century as the doctrine of surviving founders of the Nation. Only recently has it been superseded, though even now not wholly relegated, by the organic concept of society, wherein membership is by birth and of necessity, in contravention to the earlier view that all human relations were contractual.

An invariable postulate of the compact theory presupposed a state of nature from which man emerged into society by a definite volition, embodied in a contract. Entrance upon social relations implied the forfeiture of individual sovereignty to the superior claims of a group, and much seventeenth-century philosophy pondered the completeness of individual renunciation, the power or responsibility of the sovereign, the violability or inviolability of the compact, and the practical operation

¹ A. C. McLaughlin, *The Courts, the Constitution, and Parties*, p. 253, etc., is authoritative on the position of compact in America.

of the theory. Depending upon its interpreters, absolutists or democrats, the theory of compact contained the germs of despotism or of liberty. To the Puritans it meant the latter.

The Puritans, in utilizing the theory of compact as a basis for church and political organization, bore witness to the gulf between early modern and medieval ideas. The divinely instituted unity of an all-encompassing empire protecting men by the "sword," and a universal church at once consoling and terrifying them by the "keys,"¹ succumbed at the close of the Middle Ages before a new nationalism which heralded the states of modern Europe. Altered conditions necessitated their own philosophy, and the theory of compact arose as a working hypothesis for political transformations which were in actual process of accomplishment.

Acceptance of political modernism did not preclude attachment to religious medievalism, with its emphasis on church unity. Thus long after the rise of absolute monarchies had shattered the empire, and reformation had dismembered the church, there still obtained in the early modern state a theory of the religious unity of its citizens, a doctrine not wholly abandoned in Britain until 1829, when the last disabilities against Roman Catholics and dissenters were removed. Such insistence upon church unity was illogical, for once the perfect solidarity of the church catholic was broken, there was no mandate to preserve its fragments. But tradition as well as national necessity favored local unity through the transformation of a universal into a national church. The influence of this medieval legacy upon their religious environment accounts for the otherwise inexplicable reluctance of the migrating

¹ For a careful statement of medieval unity, see Dr. Otto Gierke, *Political Theories of the Middle Ages* (tr. and intro. by William Maitland, Cambridge, 1900), pp. 7, 10, and 18.

Puritans to sever their connection with a church which had persecuted them.

Church nationalism and Congregationalism found a reconciling medium in corporations, a medieval¹ survival reanimated by the new doctrines of compact. Corporations existed in the medieval world as exotics, creations of compact foisted upon an organic society at the bidding of the state. In the seventeenth century, however, corporations assumed a new importance as demonstrations of compacts in the making, yet adapted to either the organic or the compact theory of the state. Their significance extended to the church through the possibility of local incorporations within a national church and a common Christianity,—an aspect of corporations of obvious bearing upon Puritan continuance in the English Church.

Complicating the new nationalism and the theory of compact was the doctrine of the Divine Right of Kings,² an extreme statement of compact assuming the people's surrender of every vestige of political rights. Such an exaltation of royal prerogative won general support only in so far as it buttressed a national defense against papal or foreign aggression. As a domestic issue, it challenged the individualism of the Puritans, who opposed absolutism rather from the tyranny of its exercise than from the theory of its existence, although even to the latter they did not subscribe.

The philosophy of the period thus points, on the whole, to the Puritans' recognition not only of their right but of their duty to remain within the national organization of church as well as of state. This will appear more clearly in the speci-

¹ Gierke, *op. cit.*, pp. 64 and 98, etc., showing the position of corporations in medieval society.

² John N. Figgis, *The Theory of the Divine Right of Kings*, esp. pp. 202, 203, and 206, gives the most important statement of this subject.

fically English development of the compact theory, which has an importance of its own, because, in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, Englishmen were the great political theorists, besides a special importance for the subject in hand as an introduction to the Puritan's own view of his membership in the National Church.

Three great names adorn this period of English thought: Hooker, the philosopher of a national Churchmanship; Hobbes, the champion of absolutism and divine right; and Milton, the protagonist of theocratic compact. The religious-political philosophy of Hooker, including within the "visible church" all whose children were signed with the mark, "one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism,"¹ is a strong argument for the Puritans' membership in a church whose principles and acts did not meet their approval. Hooker looked upon baptism as a symbol of compact whereby men entered the universal church. And upon this broad principle, the Church, at any rate, regarded all her baptized sons, however erring, deluded, and stiff-necked, as members. Here was a generous nationalism which did not wholly please either the ritualists or the extreme Protestants. The extremists of the one faction favored a narrower basis which should emphasize the sovereign's ecclesiastical supremacy. The Puritanic element disliked a doctrine which made it too comfortable for the wicked, and failed to part the sheep from the goats. They resented all inclusiveness as one of the intolerable errors incident to a national church, and their whole congregational system was devised to exclude from communion those "impious idolaters, wicked heretics, persons excommunicable, yea, and cast out for notorious improbity"² whom Hooker so charitably ad-

¹ Hooker, *Ecclesiastical Polity* (7th Ed., Oxford, 1888, vol. i. p. 342), bk. iii. chap. i. sect. 7.

² *Ibid.*, sect. 8.

mitted. Yet the same Puritan who strove for Congregational exclusiveness in the individual life of Christians might well contend for Christian unity in the corporate life of the nation. The historic trends already noticed justify such an hypothesis.

The friends of despotism looked to Hobbes for a philosophical bolstering of their theories. His "Leviathan" did not appear until after the Puritan migration, yet it is undoubtedly the most perfect expression of a theory more or less definitely formulated by many before him. He went to the extreme of proclaiming the right of a whole nation to contract itself into complete nonentity,¹ its natural rights being wholly and irrevocably transferred to a sovereign, responsible for his acts to God alone,—an enlargement upon Grotius's² theory of the possibility of an actual transfer of sovereign rights to one or more persons with no reservation whatever. Having established the sovereign's supremacy in church as well as in state, Hobbes shows that the rights of all other pastors, be it the Pope himself, are *jure civili*, not *jure divino*, being wholly derivative from the sovereign: "And these rights are incident to all sovereigns whether Monarchs or Assemblies, for they that are the Representants of a Christian People, are Representants of the Church; for a Church and a Commonwealth of Christian People are the same thing."³

The Puritans occupied a middle ground between Hooker and Hobbes, with Milton as their spokesman. They followed Hooker in a general approval of church nationalism, although they found communion with sinners highly distasteful. But the absolutism of Hobbes's theory is manifestly incompatible with Puritan revolt against all tyranny, spiritual or political.

¹ Hobbes, *Leviathan* (Oxford, 1909), p. 362.

² Hugo Grotius, *The Rights of War and Peace* (Universal Classics Library, M. Walter Drum, New York and London), p. 63, sect. 8.

³ Hobbes, *op. cit.*, p. 428.

As Milton defined it, the Puritan's conception was that of a compact with the reserved right of nullification. "The Lord gave and the Lord hath taken away." For a Puritan, the approach to a theory of compact was through the Bible. The Golden Age of man's innocence was the period of his individual sovereignty. His fall through Adam's transgression precipitated a reign of violence so overwhelming that a league for the common protection was the sole salvation for the race. "Hence came cities, towns, and commonwealths."¹ But Milton, as a Puritan, could not occupy the extreme ground of Hobbes, or even of Hooker. Biblical origins foreshadowed a compact; but, in Milton's view, even as the common law restrained the King in civil government, so the same Scriptures which authorized his existence through a compact were themselves a fundamental law which he durst not break.² The religious compact was thus inviolable, as binding upon the King as upon his subjects; and they, not God, as with Hobbes, were to be the judges of its breach. Bastide, a French commentator, illuminates this point with Gallic clearness. "Theology guided Milton to conclusions whither logic had conducted Hobbes. Nevertheless, and it is here that Milton differs from Hobbes, the people having preserved its sovereignty of which the kings possess only a delegation, can depose them if they are good and ought to depose them if they are tyrants."³ In this right of the people to judge the sovereign and to dissolve a violated compact, lay the germs of world-encompassing democracy.

Upon this background of theory, the Puritans worked out

¹ Milton, *The Tenure of Kings and Magistrates* (*Prose Works of John Milton*, ed. by J. A. St. John, London, George Bell and Son, 1890), vol. II. p. 9.

² Milton, *Of Reformation in England*, *op. cit.*, vol. II. p. 413.

³ Ch. Bastide, John Locke, p. 158.

their grand experiment. The Mayflower Compact, individual covenants of local churches, all the instruments by which they erected the fabric of society in the New World, were practical demonstrations of an underlying theory already current in the Old. The break with the past was not so evident to them as to us; for the new Congregationalism, with its church membership founded on direct covenant, was no more inconsistent with a wider Churchmanship than partnership in corporations was incompatible with a larger citizenship. The Puritans themselves as shareholders in merchant companies, and in other trade relations, had long participated in legal covenants quite independent of that implied covenant which, according to the theory of compact, made them citizens of the state. Where, then, lay the impropriety of coördinating local covenants in the formation of parishes with a larger theory of covenant, implied rather than expressed, which constituted the basis of all Christian brotherhood in England? Surely a philosophy which dominated the century echoed, if it did not originate, in the minds of the people. Just as modern thought is far more profoundly influenced by the theory of evolution than would appear from the writings of our time, so it is reasonable to assume that the theory of compact, with its implication of national church membership, was basic in the thought of the period under discussion, buttressed as it was in addition by the lingering conception of an organic whole which it was both irreligious and unpatriotic to dismember. A philosophy familiarized by Hooker and expanded by such antipolar intellects as Milton and Hobbes was inevitably featured in the mind of the emigrating Puritan. Silent or expressed, it operated for a national consciousness, linking the emigrant with the stay-at-home by strong fraternal bonds.¹ Traditions of a

¹ Milton, *Of Reformation in England*, *op. cit.*, vol. II. p. 399.

formerly dominant, or at any rate tolerated, Puritanism, and a more or less conscious philosophy of church unity, bound the New Englander to the religious life of the Mother Country. What, then, were to be his reactions in a new world whither the disintegrating forces of persecution had driven him?

Obsequious acquiescence in prelatical innovation would obviously constitute no feature of the Puritans' program. The chief object of the migration was to escape from ecclesiastical novelties. Yet they felt themselves to be members of the church in its truest and most catholic sense as a national brotherhood of Christians. Once the Puritans left their old home, the not quite spent force of medieval unity would encounter the fresh strength of rising Congregationalism as developed on the theory of compact by the Separatists at Plymouth. For a time the Puritan needs must face in two directions. Old England lay behind him with all the enchantment of distance. America arose before him, a "New English Canaan" and the Land of Promise. Was the Puritan to be a British empire builder in church as well as in state? or was that theory of compact which he both brought and found here to be the cornerstone of a new nation?

The Puritan scarce glimpsed the vision. His first thought was for Old England, and its expression was no light protestation of a shallow attachment. The stern founders of New England were schooled to weigh their words. The currents of their life ran strong and deep; so that when they professed a love for the Mother Church yet disclaimed her practices, the hypothesis of sentimentality or hypocrisy is unworthy. An explanation should be sought in fact. Practically they had of a truth separated from those ceremonies which scandalized their religious sensibilities. It was the separation, however,

not of enemies of the Church; rather of zealots on her behalf, missionaries who conceived of the church in North America as the Mother Church extended and purified, the dross of her false practices refined away. As they themselves formulated it,

“ We desire you would be pleased to take notice of the principles and body of our Company as those who esteem it an honour to call the Church of England, from whence we rise, our dear mother, and cannot part from our native country, where she specially resideth, without much sadness of heart and many tears in our eyes, ever acknowledging that such hope and part as we have obtained in the common salvation we have received in her bosom and sucked it from her breasts. We leave it not, therefore, as loathing that milk wherewith we were nourished there, but blessing God for the parentage and education, as members of the same body shall always rejoice in her good and unfeignedly grieve for any sorrow that shall ever betide her, and while we have breath, sincerely desire and endeavour the continuance of her welfare with the enlargement of her bounds in the Kingdom of Christ Jesus.”¹

How tender, also, the loyalty of that touching “ Farewell to England ” of the Rev. Francis Higginson:—

“ We will not say, Farewell Babylon! Farewell Rome! but we will say, Farewell dear England! Farewell the Church of God in England, and all the Christian friends there! We do not go to New England as separatists from the Church of England, though we cannot but separate from the corruptions in it; but we go to practice the positive part of the Church reformation, and to propagate the Gospel in America.”²

The corruptions which bore so grievously upon the principles of the exiles were of two kinds: first, those which were inherent in any national church; and, secondly, those which were peculiar to the Church of England. Any national church,

¹ Ellis, *Puritan Age in Massachusetts*, pp. 53, 54: “ The Humble Request of His Majesty's loyall Subjects, the Governor and the Company late gone to New England to the rest of their Brethren in and of the Church of England, for the obtaining of their Prayers, and the removal of suspicions and misconstructions of their intentions.”

² *Ibid.*, p. 55.

however justified by a philosophy of compact, was a departure from the customs of the early Christians, though the Church of England was partially redeemed from such an enormity by an element of congregationalism within its individual parishes. "For there are some parish assemblies that are true churches by virtue of an implicit covenant amongst themselves, in which regard the Church of England may be held and called a true church."¹ Moreover, the catholic tendency of any national church to regard itself not as a communion of saints, but rather of all men, sinners naturally predominating, was repugnant to the Puritan. The Phariseism of his "better than thou" attitude is out of harmony with the social consciousness of the twentieth century; but in his individualism, he was on that firm ground which has ever been the source of personal piety. Yet even as the Church's nationalism was redeemed by an element of congregationalism; so, also, was the menace of open communion with sinners reduced in some measure by that "publick Rubrick before the Catechisme," with its admonition to a later profession of faith and obedience, "Which if it be seriously done and not perfunctorily, is somewhat of like nature with our receiving of members into the Church, and joyning them by Covenant."² The exhortation before the Communion Service warning sinners of the peril of an unworthy participation was a further guarantee that sanctity was not dead even among the users of the Prayer Book. "All these things presupposed, really performed, and seriously attended to," wrote the Puritan apologist in 1645, "might

¹ Governor Bradford's Dialogue, 1648 (printed in *Chronicles of the Pilgrim Fathers of The Colony of Plymouth 1602 to 1625*, by Alexander Young, Boston, 1841), and elsewhere.

² John Cotton, *The Way of the Churches of Christ in New England* (1645), p. 112.

open a doore to sundry passages of a more full and perfect Reformation.”¹

Thus the Puritans were not irreconcilable upon the issues incidental to any national church. Their real grievances were the hierarchical organization and prelatical administration of the Church of England, and they further complained against a false education wherein “most children (even the best wittiest and of fayerest hopes) are perverted, corrupted and utterly over-powered by the multitude of evill examples and licentious governors of those seminaries.”² To the Puritan view, the Church had fallen upon evil days. Her prelates, her ceremonies, her church government, her whole principle of incorporation and methods of education, were obnoxious. Long and steadfast opposition in England had proved fruitless. Retreat alone remained to the vanquished. They went forth accordingly, bitter against the outward and visible forms of the Church, but loyal toward her ‘inward and spiritual grace.’

Once in their new home, the Puritans laid ax to the root of offenses. Episcopacy was abolished by common consent. Not a single reference to bishops appears in the Records of Massachusetts from 1628 to 1641;³ so far had the “tyranny of Monarchall Archprelates, which caused the servants of Christ to wander from their home,”⁴ seduced the faithful from their one-time toleration of bishops and their assent to royal authority over “sinods, classes, convocation or assembly of Ecclesiastical Officers.”⁵

¹ John Cotton, *op. cit.*, p. 113.

² A Collection of Original Papers Relative to the History of the Colony of Massachusetts Bay (Boston, 1769), p. 27.

³ Vol. 1.

⁴ Captain Edward Johnson, *Wonder-Working Providence of Zion's Saviour in New England* (A.D. 1638), p. 129.

⁵ Williston Walker, *Creeds and Platforms of Congregationalism*, p. 90. The Seven Articles of 1617, Article 6.

Less unanimous was the sentiment for abandoning the Prayer Book. The ancient ritual counted among its champions Mr. Samuel Brown and his brother John, "both of them amongst the number of the first patentees, men of estates, and men of parts and port in the place."¹ Followers gathered about them, and it required the prompt intervention of Governor Endicott to suppress the threatened schism. In a convention of both factions before the Governor, the nonconformist ministers of Salem denied the charge of separation from aught but "the corruptions and disorders" in the Church, and declared that liberty of worship having been purchased at the cost of long suffering and exile, they would make no use of the Common Prayer and ceremonies, "because they judged the imposition of these things to be sinful corruptions in the worship of God."² The Browns were promptly sent home to England. There they breathed dire threats, but "the Lord so disposed of all, that there was no further inconvenience followed upon it."³

Distance was the great separator. A close second was the widening breach in church observances. The right hand of fellowship extended from Plymouth inserted the additional wedge of communion with avowed separatists. With bishop and Prayer Book set at naught, and all conformists lay and clerical put to rout,⁴ the Anglican life was a shadow indeed. But as a shadow it persisted. What the Puritan of 1630 deemed good Churchmanship is apparent in a letter from Governor Dudley to the Countess of Lincoln. After the conven-

¹Nathaniel Morton, *New England's Memorial* (6th Ed., Boston, 1855), p. 100.

²*Ibid.*, pp. 100-101.

³*Ibid.*, p. 101; see, also, *The Clarendon Papers*, New York Hist. Soc. Coll. 1869 (New York, 1870, vol. II.), p. 100.

⁴Mr. Bright, who came over in 1629, stood out for just one year. See Morton, *op. cit.*, p. 97.

tional denial of Brownism, and an assurance of the steadfastness of New England devotion, he applies this touchstone of conformity: "We doe continue to pray dayly for our sovereigne lord, the king, the queene, the prince, the royal blood, the counsaile, the whole state, as duty bindes us to doe."¹

Further tests of Churchmanship lay in the validity of Anglican orders, and joint participation at Communion. In the former, a compromise retained the English clergy, yet deferred to Congregationalism so far as to regard their ministry as terminating with the end of a pastorate,² and renewable only by a formal induction into office. That clergymen of the Established Church were looked upon with favor is shown by the preference which was manifested toward "the most Orthodox and ablest Christians, and more especially of such as the Lord had already placed in the ministry."³ The allusion is even more specific in John Cotton's statement that the founders of a new church first "inquire out some one or other of eminent gifts, usually such as have been Preachers — of good esteeme in England who may guide and go along with them in so great an action."⁴ The work of organization completed, prayers are offered for God's "blessing upon themselves and all the Churches both in this country, and throughout the world, especially in England."⁵ Winthrop's account of the election of Mr. Wilson as "teacher" in 1630 illustrates an interesting compromise between the new congregationalism and the historic past. This nephew of Archbishop Grindall was inducted into office with an "imposition of hands, but

¹ Joseph B. Felt, *Ecclesiastical History of New England*, p. 147.

² E. H. Byington, *The Puritan in England and New England*, p. 161.

³ Edward Johnson, *op. cit.*, p. 177.

⁴ J. Cotton, *op. cit.*, p. 7.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 9.

with this protestation by all, that it was only a sign of election and confirmation, not of any intent that Mr. Wilson should renounce his ministry he received in England.”¹ Anglican orders thus met a respect not accorded to the Anglican liturgy. Detesting all bishops, the exiled Puritans ascribed no virtue to the apostolic laying on of hands. The claim of English pastors to New England reverence was personal, or at best congregational on the basis of their earlier ministry, not to the Church at large, but to its individual parishes.

When the Puritans excluded their brethren of the churches of England from the most vital of all religious ties, the Communion, separation might well be termed complete. This we know they did, not even admitting the children of Anglicans to baptism.² The moment when closed communion barred all road to reconciliation and church unity marks the passing of an era. Old England and her national church were at most a memory; New England Congregationalism was the reality. Puritan and Pilgrim were alike separatists, and to trace a mythical connection with the tottering fabric in the Mother Country would be a snare and a delusion.

The precise date for the final parting of the ways cannot be assigned with certainty. John Cotton speaks of it as an accomplished fact in 1645. It was probably much earlier, but could scarcely have happened till after the exile of Roger Williams in 1636. Little favor attended even the more moderate efforts of Williams. So mild a heresy as his attempt to remove the cross from his parish church was opposed as likely to offend the Council for New England and the King.³ The sentiment which curbed the symbols of radicalism, which im-

¹ Winthrop's Journal (ed. by Jameson), pp. 51, 52; also W. Walker, *op. cit.*, p. 129.

² J. Cotton, *op. cit.*, p. 76.

³ J. B. Felt, *op. cit.*, vol. 1. p. 202.

pelled Plymouth to eject and Salem to reject the enthusiast from a fear "that he would run the same course of rigid separation and anabaptistry which Mr. John Smith, the se-baptist at Amsterdam had done";¹ would scarcely proceed to the extremity of closed communion, the final sealing of the gates against the Mother Church. It was not until later, then, sometime between 1635 and 1645, that the solemn point was turned, one of those dateless moments in that historic continuity which links the present with the past.

If the Puritan still had a right to call himself an Anglican, he scorned to exercise it. If the theory of compact taught him his membership by implied compact in an imperial Britain, its practical workings established him in a church and state of his own foundation. The past might bury its dead. The Puritan was building for the future.

From Laud's imprisonment in 1641 to the restoration of Church and King was the Babylonian Captivity of the Church of England. In the New World as in the Old, the Puritan and his Congregational churches reigned supreme.² Old times were yielding place to new. A second generation was succeeding to a different world. The ties with a national church, which their fathers had deemed too precious to sever, for them had little meaning. Their early recollections, their impressionable years, had been stamped with the form and with the spirit of Congregationalism. No bishop and no Prayer Book united them with the currents of the religious life of the Established Church. They remembered, however, that its persecuting spirit had driven their fathers into the wilderness. They rejoiced at its temporary downfall, and at the recognition in England of those independent principles which had been their

¹ N. Morton, *op. cit.*, p. 102.

² Osgood, *The American Colonies in the Seventeenth Century*, p. 208.

own from youth. The Prayer Book and the Prayer Book church was an alien. Arbitrary power could alone secure a footing, for the Prayer Book in 1662,¹ for the Church in 1688,² a weak and struggling parish in Boston. A real foothold was beyond the power of despotism itself. The Church of England, prelateless, lacking an overseeing shepherd, representing a theory of government and organization which found no favor in New England, led but a meager life at best until the American Revolution rendered complete its separation from the state, and by removing the strongest ground for the hatred and suspicion which had opposed it, paved the way for a steady growth which makes it in the twentieth century a potent influence in the Commonwealth of the Puritans.

But this later growth of Episcopacy is a graft upon, not an evolution of, Puritanism. Rather Puritanism was the point of departure from which have developed those protests, at first religious, later political, and more recently social, which have been the glory of American democracy. In the tide of events which swept the Puritan from his Anglican allegiance, he severed, first, the religious ties, and secondly, the political. In his present combat with those shackles which still bind the race, the Puritan, as leader in the new democracy, brings to the solution of his problems a conservatism which respects the past, as well as an initiative which dares the future. That moderation which favored the continuation of Anglicanism in church and political life, augurs that the America of to-morrow will be an evolution, not a cataclysm, from the America of yesterday. And in it, the Puritan, with all his Anglican traditions and his New World achievements, must prove an historic as well as a dynamic and creative force.

¹ Ellis, *op. cit.*, p. 123.

² *Ibid.*, p. 123; see, also, Prince Society Collections, vol. vi. p. 211.