Early Puritanism in the Southern and Island Colonies

BY BABETTE M. LEVY

Preface

ONE of the pleasant by-products of doing research work is the realization of how generously help has been given when it was needed. The author owes much to many people who proved their interest in this attempt to see America's past a little more clearly. The Institute of Early American History and Culture gave two grants that enabled me to devote a sabbatical leave and a summer to direct searching of colony and church records. Librarians and archivists have been cooperative beyond the call of regular duty. Not a few scholars have read the study in whole or part to give me the benefit of their knowledge and judgment. I must mention among them Professor Josephine W. Bennett of the Hunter College English Department; Miss Madge McLain, formerly of the Hunter College Classics Department; the late Dr. William W. Rockwell, Librarian Emeritus of Union Theological Seminary, whose vast scholarship and his willingness to share it will remain with all who knew him as long as they have memories; Professor Matthew Spinka of the Hartford Theological Seminary; and my mother, who did not allow illness to keep her from listening attentively and critically as I read to her chapter after chapter. All students who are interested

in problems concerning the early churches along the Atlantic seaboard and the occupants of their pulpits are indebted to the labors of Dr. Frederick Lewis Weis and his invaluable compendiums on the clergymen and parishes of the various colonies.

Much of my debt is not quite so concrete. I feel, nevertheless, that this study of earnest men sincerely seeking God is my offering to the memory of my parents, Henry and Elizabeth C. Levy, and of their only son, Henry Coll Levy, who by lifelong example taught me the value of truth and the meaning of integrity.

BABETTE M. LEVY

Hunter College
March, 1960

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
I.	Seventeenth-century Puritanism in England and in the Southern and Island Colonies	73
II.	Virginia: Puritanism Within and Without the Church	
	1. Under the Virginia Company	92
	2. The development within the Established Church	113
	3. The development of Congregationalism and Presbyterianism	122
	4. The Society of Friends	149
III.	Bermuda: Nonconformity "Safe from the Storms' and Prelates' Rage"	164
IV.	Maryland: Puritanism Unhampered by an Established Church	201
V.	The Carolinas: Puritanism Under a Policy of Broadest Toleration	242
VI.	The West Indies and Bahamas: Puritanism in Conflict with Tropical Island Life	278
VII.	Southern Puritanism and Its Successor, Methodism	308
Bibliography		326

Chapter I

SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY PURITANISM IN ENGLAND AND IN THE SOUTHERN AND ISLAND COLONIES

DURING the seventeenth century, the period of England's greatest colonial enterprise, Puritanism was always an important force that more or less dominated the thought of many Englishmen, whether they stayed to face the strife at home or endured the hardships of emigration. How strong religious influences were in the early history of New England has become common knowledge. Less recognized is the effect that Puritanism had on the development of the other colonies, the southern and island settlements.

That there was this strong factor in these colonies is not to be doubted, but local conditions and circumstances often confused the picture. The Englishmen that sought refuge or opportunity in these warmer areas were of many opinions and tenets, some content with the Church of England, some shifting as far to the left as the Society of Friends, many somewhat uncertainly between the two extremes. Nor did these colonists stay fast in their beliefs as they were persuaded in one direction or another. No one church retained a commanding position, as was so often true in New England towns. The power and prestige of the various religious factions shifted throughout the period.

By and large, Puritanism in the southern and island colonies lacked literary expression. The dearth of sermonic and polemic writing was not primarily due to the weakness of the dissenting party, although the more cautious and conservative element in the latter must often have been willing not to excite active antipathy. The authorities in the various plantations saw no reason for allowing the

establishment of printing presses, which would merely serve to air the all too frequent dissatisfaction of settlers. This prohibition was the more easily maintained because of the lack of large towns. Consequently, any move by Puritans to find this means of making their influence felt would have been bitterly and probably successfully opposed. Puritan pamphlets that found their way into print had to do so by way of England, Holland, or Massachusetts. In the later years of the century, for instance, the Massachusetts presses were open to Bermuda dissenting ministers, whose religious ideas at the time were surprisingly akin to New England concepts of theology and church polity. Earlier in the century, however, Bermuda nonconformists, torn between Presbyterianism and Independency, had sought English publication for their disputes.

Convenience or lack of convenience in the matter of printing obviously was not the only reason for the contrast between the many voices of New England Congregationalism and the comparative muteness of southern and island nonconformity. New England's more outstanding ministers, many of them even before their emigration to the New World the best-known preachers of their day, were merely carrying on a tradition when they automatically thought of their sermons and disputes in terms of publication. Most (but by no means all) of the ministers who chose to emigrate to the colonies in which they had little hope of being other than barely accepted servants of God, were not men of prominence, in the habit of having their pulpit oratory quickly find its way into print. Then, too, no matter how many Puritans there were in any colony, they varied so in their beliefs that each particular sect or group was in the minority; hence no printed book could have the enthusiastic reception that greeted ministerial outpourings in the northern colonies where comparative unanimity of

opinion reigned. These southern and island ministers, often leading strenuous lives in an attempt to cover many churches and to care for widely distributed parishioners, had to be content with the effect of their oral preaching and teaching. Obviously, this want of worldly fame, this lack of publications, has no bearing upon the question of the ardor and sincerity of their Calvinism.

Nor is the obscurity of many of the southern and island ministers any adverse reflection upon the Puritan spirit of a goodly number of settlers in colonies that are rarely thought of as having been developed under Puritan influences. The records, scanty as they are, indicate clearly that nominal conformists and outright nonconformists composed a strong minority in Virginia, Barbados, and Jamaica, and a scarcely disputed majority in Bermuda, Maryland, and the Carolinas during practically all of the century in which colonial foundations were being laid. Nor do numbers tell the whole tale, for both Calvinists and Quakers were men of vigor in whom the reforming, protesting spirit never died. In a century of frequent dispute on religion, politics, and colonial economy, the Puritan faction, minority or majority, made itself felt, as colonizing companies and proprietors as well as local authorities soon discovered.

Considered in its most general aspects, Puritanism is the belief in the close personal relationship of man and God. For many men of the seventeenth century this mystical union of man and his Creator took the more particular form of a Covenant, sealed with the Blood of Christ. The duties and obligations involved in this partnership became more definite as man considered God's immense and undeserved favor in choosing him to be of the Elect, destined to share the greatest glory for eternity. No matter what level the bond between God and man was placed upon, whether it remained purely spiritual or was worded in the concrete

terms of everyday life, the result of this way of thinking was that many men devoted themselves to religion and ethical problems. Otherworldly concerns loomed as far more important than this world's difficulties, although the latter had to be resolved so that man—or at least regenerate man—could fulfill his great destiny.

The conviction that man and God could approach each other as two members of a pact also carried with it certain negative ideas. Ceremony ceased to be an expression of man's worship, but became a block that separated man from God. Therefore, Puritans were not only bitterly anti-Catholic but also unyielding in their opposition to whatever parts of the Church of England ritual and organization seemed to be relics of what to them was a corrupt church, the "whore of Rome" in the familiar seventeenth-century anti-Catholic phrase. And as is the way with hate and fear, the violent objections to Catholicism (or to the abuses to which they considered Catholicism lent itself) often influenced Puritans when they thought they were approaching their problems through pure faith and disinterested reason. With little or no realization, except on the part of scholars, of how close much of their basic thinking was to scholastic philosophy, the average Puritan was blinded to all other considerations by the fear that a concept or practice was "papist." The most bitter recrimination made by conservative nonconformists against the Quakers was that the latter were Jesuits in disguise, and in this attack is revealed a dread that all too often motivated the minds of seventeenth-century Puritans. The whole question of tolerance was consciously or subconsciously prejudiced by the conviction that any relaxation of Puritan vigilance would put Catholics in power again.

Belief in the possibility—and the necessity for—a close relationship between man and God was the basis upon which

all Puritans built their spiritual life. Closely associated with this concept was the fear of ritualism and ceremony as a barrier against a truly spiritual approach to the Creator. But this fundamental concord was often overshadowed by acrimonious dissension. Indeed, the most common slur cast by their contemporaries upon England's Puritans of this period was their inability to be of one mind on any topic, important or unimportant. How correct this censure was, later and more impartial surveys of seveneenth-century thought have shown. In the sense that only in unity lies strength, staunch Church of England men, understandingly critical of their more radical brethren, were very correct in contemning Puritan discord. Only in the sense that in the exercise of judgment men find common growth, can Puritanism be seen to justify its contentiousness. Moreover, although constant disagreement among themselves and their resulting weakness often cost Puritans dearly, to some extent this tendency to sink into controversy was overcome by their spirited activity. They had all the zeal of dedicated men, absolutely convinced that they were right. Consequently, the influence of any sect was never to be measured by its numerical strength. Then, too, wits were sharpened, determination made more steadfast by the driving influence of constant opposition.

Certainly the Puritan population in England and her southern and island colonies proclaimed their allegiance to many banners. There were faithful Anglicans merely seeking some modifications in the liturgy and church polity, Presbyterians, Congregationalists, Independents, Separatists, Baptists, Fifth Monarchy Men, Levellers, Familists, Diggers, Seekers, and Quakers—not to mention extremists of another dozen varieties whose influence was either temporary or slight. On no question was there less accord than on the way to achieve a more complete reformation of the

Anglican church. Many laymen and ministers felt that they should stay within the church, and so accomplish their ends with a minimum of distress to all concerned. It has been estimated that until 1642 the greater number of Puritans considered themselves faithful Church of England adherents. In contrast to these Nonconforming Conformists, as they have been somewhat scornfully labeled, other men were positive that this gradual transformation of the national church was impossible at a time when emotion ran high. For such more radical thinkers, independent churches were the only possibility, and these would set the example of true worship. Here was an essential point of polity on which there was the greatest diversity of opinion. Nor was the cleavage clean-cut. Many Congregationalists, standing half-way between the nominal conformists and the independents (or separatists), believed in virtually independent churches that would eventually be comprehended in a latitudinarian Church of England. Nor was the attitude on this issue of separation static. The Presbyterians, for instance, long hoped to change the organization of the Church without leaving it; only after the Restoration and the failure of the Savoy Conference did they despair and change their views. Independent or Separatist churches, on the other hand, showed some tendency to drift into the organization of Congregationalism, and so join the ranks of those who had hope of a final reconciliation with the Anglican church.

The whole question of separation from the Church of England, admittedly a difficult ethical dilemma, with tradition and conscience often at odds, was but one of many problems facing a seventeenth-century Puritan. From right-wing to left-wing, from conservative Nonconforming Conformists to dramatically protesting Quakers, the range of thought was wide on more problems than that of church

polity. Each group felt that their leaders had shown them the truth as it lay in the Bible and the souls of men. The variation in the details of belief and practice had no boundaries, and often overshadowed more fundamental ideas. Although certain patterns can be seen in the Puritan response to the larger issues of the day, social, political, and economic as well as religious, these generalizations are always open to some exception.

In other words, there was often a reaction by some Puritans against the very beliefs held so fervently by many of their fellow objectors to the ceremonialism of the Church of England. For example, most Puritans lived by the principle that the Bible was the key to the good life. In the Old and New Testaments were to be found all the rules that man needed to live by, no matter what type of problem he faced. As a logical corollary, all corruption in church and state was the result of getting away from Biblical exempla. The Quakers, however, saw no reason why God's revelation of His wishes for mankind's behavior stopped at any given time or with any particular man. Within everyone was a guiding light, if he could be led to be conscious of it. For members of the Society of Friends, consequently, the Bible as interpreted by any minister assumed second place to the doctrine of the Inner Light. Quaker beliefs are often thought to be modifications of earlier Anabaptist tenets, and some groups of Anabaptists, too, were inclined to resort to a similar theory of the Inner Light as necessary for understanding the Word of God and as a supreme court of final appeal in delicate ethical or religious problems.

The basic theological agreement of conservative Puritans and the counter-reaction of extremists may also be observed in the stands they took on other major religious concepts. As might very well be expected, most Puritans were orthodox Trinitarians, but there were exceptions to be

found among the extremists. Not only were there small Arminian and Socinian sects, but the Familists and Gortinians approached Unitarianism. Again, within and without the Church, most Puritans were Calvinists, and so predestination loomed large in their theology; in fact, so dominant was the Calvinistic trend of their thinking that the terms "Puritan" and "Calvinist" are still often used interchangeably. But some of the radicals, such groups as the Arminian Baptists and the more influential Quakers, rejected these Genevan doctrines. One of the cardinal teachings of George Fox, the ascendant mind of the Society of Friends, was that every true Christian was capable of reaching spiritual perfection. The same distinction between the thought of the main body of Puritanism and of its fringes may be seen in the different attitudes towards the sacraments. Baptism and the Lord's Supper were observed and valued by most men, whether Churchmen or not, regardless of sectarian differences, although the time of baptism and the frequency of communion raised many difficulties and divisions. Many Anabaptists, however, followed Zwingli in feeling that the ordinances had no sacramental significance. For such leftists, baptism was only a declaration of faith, the Lord's Supper only a memorial ceremony. Still further from the ideas of conservative Puritanism, the Quakers shocked their contemporaries by rejecting all sacraments.

Whatever other problems Puritans sought to solve in the light of the Bible and their consciences, there was one ethical decision that had to be made: Was it the duty of God-fearing men to remain in England, to endure the abuses of temporal authority? Or were good men serving their Creator better by seeking a place in which they could worship Him as He had commanded? Either course of action called for courage and sacrifice, and either course could be much

influenced by practical and economic motivation. How far the latter force was recognized in each man's decision remains undeterminable. Certainly during most of the long period between the rise of sectarianism in the 1580's and the coming of William and Mary in 1689, English Puritans had good reason to emigrate for religious reasons. They always suffered from the prejudice of their fellow Englishmen and frequently also had to endure active persecution.

For those who wanted to escape the intolerance of their fellow Englishmen, the Low Countries served as a first refuge. In the late sixteenth century and the first decade of the seventeenth century, a number of churches established themselves in Holland, mostly around Middelburg and Amsterdam. Of these, two congregations re-emigrated in part to America, a portion of the Scrooby Separatist church planning to go from Leyden to Virginia but finally reaching New England, and one division of the "Ancient Church," formerly in London, setting out from Amsterdam with the hope of finding asylum in Virginia. As the possibilities of the New World opened, the intermediate step of a continental stay was soon abandoned. Puritans no longer thought in terms of Dutch refuge, but turned directly to America. The expanding colonies offered much. Poverty need not keep a man from emigrating, for as an indentured servant he could earn his passage and in a few years have property of his own. He was going to an English community where his children could maintain their cultural identity. By choosing the right colony, he could worship as he wished, joining other men of similar ideas. Above all, he was not merely escaping trouble at home. A patriotic citizen, helping to hold England's possessions against the papist French and Spanish, he was carrying the true Gospel to the neglected savages on the shores of the New World. There could be no better face-saving motivation.

Until the Puritan Revolution, nominal conformists and sectarians left England in a steady stream. Emigration started before Massachusetts, the most noted Puritan colony, had been founded, and continued thereafter. Puritans of many shades of belief went to Bermuda, Barbados, and the other island colonies, to Virginia and Maryland. Congregationalists, most of whom did not consider themselves Separatists, went in great number to Massachusetts, then to Connecticut. This more northern colonization has been much publicized because of New England's later importance, both economic and cultural. Less well known is the Puritan settling in the 1630's of Providence on Santa Catalina and in the 1640's of Eleuthera on one of the Bahamas, both unfortunate and relatively shortlived experiments, but of interest as they show so obviously that nonconformists did not confine their colonizing activities to Massachusetts and Connecticut. But these avowedly Calvinist settlements were havens only for men of one shade of belief. Fellow Puritans either to the theological right of the Massachusetts settlers, as were nominal conformists and Presbyterians, or to the left, as were Baptists and the lesser, more radical sects, soon knew that they would be far from welcome in New England towns. Consequently, even while some Calvinists were flocking to the northern colonies, others were seeking new homes in Bermuda, the West Indies, Virginia, and Maryland. In addition, such was the lure of the southern and semi-tropical plantations that included in the settlers of these places were men who held beliefs closely allied to the tenets of the average New England Congregationalists. The economic possibilities may have been the deciding factor for many of these men, but there was another issue raised at least occasionally: Were not Puritans safer in spots less notoriously offensive to Church of England authorities?

During the Interregnum, Puritan emigration from England lagged but did not cease entirely. No longer did the major part of nonconformist congregations remove as units with their ministers to the New World; on the contrary, a number of prominent Calvinists seized the opportunity to go "home" to the mother country. Nevertheless, sectarianism and political dispute still ran high, and many disgruntled Puritans could look with some longing to the colonies. Then, too, in such plantations as Bermuda nominally nonconforming churches at this time became openly nonconforming. Consequently, there was a continual demand for Puritan ministers to fill their pulpits. The bitter attackers of these more conservative preachers also left England around this time, for it was in the late 1650's that Quaker itinerant ministers set forth to convince the colonists of the Truth as George Fox saw it.

With the Restoration, dissenters faced new persecution. As a natural result, they again sought American colonies as sanctuaries. To the older settlements were now added Jamaica and the Carolinas, new lands of opportunity, offering full toleration of all churches. During the first twenty-five years of the restored monarchy four other colonies were also opened for English settlement. Conditions were indeed such as to lead Puritans to thoughts of emigration. After the Act of Uniformity in 1662, followed as it was by the harsh Conventicle Act and the Five-Mile Act, nonconformists suffered severely again. Not only were the authorities active in prosecuting them under the law, but many of their fellow citizens also showed little or no mercy. In Anglican eyes, no longer were the sectarians in any sense pathetic groups of misguided souls; they were now the have-nots who, having seized power once, were to be feared and rooted out. There was a brief respite from this oppression when Charles II issued his Declaration of

Indulgence in 1672, but early in the following year it was nullified. Again in 1687 came some easing in the situation when James II proclaimed another Declaration of Indulgence. These were, however, only temporary alleviations. Moreover, throughout the Restoration years a growing terror of the return of Catholicism possessed Protestant thought, especially in Calvinist and Quaker groups. Sincere Puritans could well feel the colonies beckoning to them.

Because of the need for havens for England's more Calvinistic population, outstanding Puritan leaders had every reason to be interested in colonization projects. Patriotism, economic gain, and religion urged them on. It is not surprising, then, that the man commonly considered the most capable Puritan leader in the pre-Cromwellian era should also be the organizer and backer of various schemes to build plantations in the New World. Robert Rich, the second Earl of Warwick, was interested in the New England, Somers Island, Virginia, and Providence companies, as well as in the development of Guiana, Newfoundland, and Barbados. In most of these undertakings he played a principal part, often being head of the controlling faction in the company of shareholders or adventurers. After the dissolution of the Virginia Company, he became a member of the Council for Virginia. It was Warwick who proved to be instrumental in getting the first patent for the Plymouth Company and secured for them the second patent of 1630; among his other servies to Calvinistic groups were his procuring the 1628 patent for the Massachusetts Bay Colony and his granting the Sayebrook patent to a group of eminent Puritans that included Lord Saye and Sele and Lord Brooke. Under the Long Parliament, Warwick served as governor-in-chief of the colonies and gave Roger Williams his Providence grant.

If Warwick's interest in colonization—and especially in Puritan colonization—was extraordinarily wide-spread, his holdings differed only in number from those of other prominent Puritans. His relative, Sir Nathaniel Rich, shared his enthusiasm to the point of investing in and being active in at least three companies, those that settled Bermuda, Virginia, and Providence Island. Sir Edwin Sandys, often at loggerheads with the Riches, was one of the chief members of the Somers Island and Virginia companies; as an influential man in the latter company, he supported the request of that noted group of Puritans, the Leyden exiles, when they sought permission to settle within the Virginia Company's domain. If Sandys had had his way, the famous Pilgrims of Plymouth Company would have been good Virginians.

For active investors in colonial enterprises, interest in more than one settlement in the New World was often taken for granted as part of the spirit of the day. Sir Thomas Smith for some years was governor of both the Virginia and the Somers Island companies; a man of many activities, he devoted much of his attention to the problems of these two colonizing organizations. Robert Greville, Lord Brooke, and William Fiennes, Viscount Saye and Sele, the two opponents in the House of Lords of the king and of the policies of the Established Church, were the leaders in the group of twelve that in the 1630's obtained from Lord Warwick a patent for a large tract of land on the Connecticut River and commissioned the younger John Winthrop to found Sayebrook; they also hoped to develop a plantation they purchased at Dover, then within the boundaries of Massachusetts, but now part of New Hampshire. Their third colonial investment was in the Providence Island Company. Lord Ashley, Earl of Shaftesbury, no Puritan but tolerant of all Protestant beliefs, after 1672 was presi-

dent of the Council of Trade and Plantations. In this office he was in a supervisory position for all the colonies, but his personal interest (and investment) lay in the Carolinas and Bahamas. Many other influential backers of colonial enterprise were interested in the development of more than one colony. (The Catholic proprietors of Maryland were the obvious exception, for after some initial attempts at a Newfoundland settlement, the Calverts contented themselves with Maryland.)

The numerical strength of Puritanism in the southern and island colonies remains, of course, difficult to determine. Only occasionally can definite figures be given. Church and vestry records are scanty, many of them having been destroyed by time and in some plantations by the ravages of semi-tropical climate. Even vestry books that have survived are inclined to approach the question of nominal conformity and dissent cautiously. What everyone knew did not have to be worded, with the consequent risk—or so the attitude seems to have been. Town records, needless to say, are non-existent for the century; county records in any number have outlived their day only for Virginia and Maryland. Genealogical interest has run high in many of the places under consideration, but most earnest descendants have taken for granted that their revered ancestors belonged to the Church of England; curiosity about the faith of individuals rarely has gone beyond ascertaining this fact.

By way of exception to the general paucity of information, the Society of Friends, especially in the continental colonies, came nearest to leaving a satisfactory record of its early activities. The evidence of Quaker numerical strength lies largely in two types of accounts: Many meetings, both local ones and half-yearly and yearly ones that covered a larger territory, kept careful minutes and registers, from

which can be gathered the names of Friends attending meetings and weddings, those travelling from one meeting to another, those wealthy enough to contribute to Quaker causes and charity, and those in need of guidance or aid of some sort. The other type of account of seventeenth-century life consists of the surprisingly numerous journals (in diary or letter form) that the travelling Friends wrote; these reports, very detailed as they are, especially in their manuscript versions, often corroborate and complete the more formal annals of the various meetings.

To return to the question of the strength of more conservative dissenters, every indication suggests that ardent Calvinists must have been in greater numbers than can be proved by surviving records. A particularly nice question is raised in attempting after these many years to distinguish such Puritans as were able to reconcile their consciences to staying within the Church of England. Often only the most accidental evidence remains to reveal these men. A stray comment in a letter, for example, may point out that a certain minister (and presumably his congregation) belittled the value of ritual and the use of vestments.

On the other hand, more radical dissenters stand out in greater distinctiveness. Their detection, however, often depends upon chance conflicts with the law. In a colony such as Virginia, where the Church of England was established as the one legal means of worship, nonconformists more than occasionally got into trouble with the local authorities. Offenders consequently left some record of themselves as well as of the penalities they had to pay for their beliefs. Conversely, in such colonies as Maryland and the Carolinas, where for many years there was no established church, legal data of this type are missing, and the presence of dissenters can be deduced only from other contemporary references. In these more tolerant colonies,

fortunately, there was greater freedom of speech about sectarian differences. Moreover, traces of the Quakers as one of the most radical groups of dissenters are to be seen in all the colonies, no matter what the more conservative church set-up was. As the victims of much legal prosecution because of their seeming lack of community cooperation in their refusal to take oaths and to join the militia, members of the Society of Friends often showed their numerical strength as well as their intractability. Other extremists, who did not so often run afoul of the law, are less noticeable in the general early colonial picture.

Conflict with the law, definite as this type of evidence may be, and partisan name-calling often do not prove to be the only indications of nonconformity in a community. Naturally enough in a theologically-minded age, the more prominent the man, the more frequently the question of his religious beliefs arose—and consequently the more complete is the record of his religious development. This general rule of course applies not only to laymen, but to clergy as well. Provided that a man was sufficiently outstanding to have his ministerial career traceable, either wholly or in part, in the series of parishes he served may be seen his stand on the theological issues of the day. If either before or after his southern or island stay, a minister held successful pastorates in Massachusetts or Connecticut, then he may be judged a Congregationalist or Independent. But if he came from a New York parish, either in Westchester County or on Long Island, his orthodoxy from a New England point of view is open to question, although his Calvinism is undoubted. Obvious, too, is the dissent, if not always the type of dissent, of men who, having been ousted from their English churches after the Act of Uniformity in 1662, sought during the next decade to find a livelihood in the colonies. Neither the Puritan churches of New England nor those of England,

however, sent all the ministers whose services their distant fellow churches enjoyed, meager as the supply always was. Some ministers, very certainly Presbyterian in their way of thinking, came directly from Scotch-Irish pulpits. Still others preachers were French and Swiss Huguenots, men brought up on Calvin's teachings despite their acceptance of more ritualism than most English Puritans were ready to permit.

Another indication of a man's fundamental beliefs may be seen in his friends and correspondents. There was a widespread fellowship among Calvinist leaders, even though they might have diverse opinions about some matters of church polity. Oppression—or the threat of oppression—and the common enemies of Catholicism and high Anglicanism brought forth a spirit of kindliness toward distant fellow sufferers that closer relations might have destroyed. New England's Cottons and Mathers and Winthrops were men of broad acquaintanceship, not unconcerned with the fate of any struggling Puritan church, no matter how far from Boston. Helped by diligent correspondence that in turn depended upon frequent trade contacts with other colonies, prominent New Englanders followed with as close attention as they could church events in Virginia, Maryland, Eleuthera, Barbados, Jamaica, and the Carolinas. In response to the needs of these far-flung brethren, the prospering Massachuetts churches to the best of their ability sent aid: sometimes practical advice, once in a while material support, more than occasionally ministers. But even when not in a position actually to help their fellow Calvinists, Puritans—always feeling God's Elect to be persecuted in this wicked world—naturally had the keenest interest in the fate of their co-religionists. Consequently, although the links between churches in different colonies are often tenuous, they are very real. One typical demonstration of these connections

may be seen in a small event commonly noted in later Bermuda accounts. The first American visitor to seek to regain his health in this now famous resort was none other than the Reverend Michael Wigglesworth, famed through the ages for his fervid belief in hell-fire as the just fate for the youngest of babes. No chance induced the ailing versifier in 1663 to leave cold Massachusetts for a sojourn of some months on what were then known as the Somer Islands. He was going to visit fellow nonconformist ministers, who welcomed him and respected his type of Calvinism.

The Puritanism of any individual preacher is important not only for the radius of his influence but also for the degree to which his beliefs and code of life represent the thinking of his congregation. With the exception of Quaker travelling missionaries, who welcomed the largest possible audiences, including many men not yet convinced of the truth of Fox's doctrines, Puritan preachers went to the southern and island colonies in response to a definite demand of a church or community or group of new settlers. The beliefs of the laity are to be seen in the very presence of these more conservative nonconforming ministers, for it signified the willingness of their parishioners to hear them and in almost all cases to support them.

The Puritanism of the laymen may also be seen in the reaction of various churches to changing conditions in England. When the news of the success at home of the Puritan party reached the colonies, some nominally conforming churches seized the opportunity to engage unordained ministers whose beliefs were to the community's liking. Other churches that had more or less abided by the law until the 1640's announced that they were now Independent or Presbyterian in their views. Colonists did not change their ideas to become more or less Calvinistic because of political upheavals in England. The Interregnum, with

its policy of toleration, merely gave the churches the chance to allow their latent Puritan tendencies to develop without fear of legal interference. In their course during the years in which the southern and island churches knew that they had protection for their nonconformity, the flowering of the more quiescent Puritanism of the preceding and succeeding periods may be observed.

The Puritan approach to man's problems of course neither began nor ended with the century: Puritanism has always been a factor within the Christian church, has always periodically broken out into so-called heresies. Because of the limitations of the Protestant Reformation in England, many men, hopeful of more radical changes, were dissatisfied. Their desire for reform manifested itself obviously in the theological and political history of England during the latter part of the sixteenth century and continued to be a powerful incentive as well as a source of contention for many years, the very years of the principal English settlement of America. Only as the eighteenth century neared did the spirit of Puritanism seem to have temporarily spent itself, or at least changed many of its characteristics. Even then, in so far as faith in man's judgment and the spirit of tolerance were the out-growth of Puritan thinking, the Age of Reason might also be considered a manifestation of the type of Puritanism that had been potent in the preceding century. But true religious Puritanism (as the term is usually understood) did not again show its strength in England and her colonies until Methodism proved a vent for those dissatisfied with the way the regularly established churches were leading them to God.

Chapter II

Virginia: Puritanism Within and Without the Church

I. *Puritanism under the Virginia Company*

The old belief that Virginia, in striking contrast to the New England settlements, was a gay Cavalier colony has long vanished. Any such school-boy concept is precluded by better knowledge of the economic conditions surrounding its establishment and especially of the many men and women of all classes who, after working as indentured artisans and laborers in order to pay for their passage to the new land of opportunity, soon prospered, and in many cases rose to prominence in the growing colony. Settled by no one sectarian, political, or economic group, and not by one influx of men fleeing from persecution but by continuous immigration, Virginia has been well called a cross-section of the mother country; the intellectual and emotional impulses that dominated men in England, naturally affected them in Virginia as well.

Religion played a large and essential part in the life of seventeenth-century Englishmen, no matter where they stood in regard to the theological controversies of the day. The men and women who came to the southern colonies were no exception in a world that was religiously minded. During the first twenty years of Virginia's settlement, the English tendency toward Puritanism in matters of faith and church polity was undoubtedly strong, as it was throughout the post-Reformation period when so many earnest Protestants feared a return to "papist" ideas and customs. In those ante-Laudean days before the zealous archbishop forced the cleavage, many loyal churchmen within the Established Church were strongly Genevan in their sym-

pathies, with only a relatively few extremists allowing their thoughts to approach the question of separation. Virginia received her due proportion of men who even while they hoped for reforms in the Church of England, had no thought of becoming independent of it; most of Virginia's early Puritans belonged to the right of the general Puritan movement. Nevertheless, there was also some immigration of men much nearer the radical fringe of that large part of England's population which was tinged with Puritanism.

The Virginia Company, until 1624 directly responsible for the promotion of the colony, had among its members and subscribers a number of known Puritans. Indeed, two of the leaders of factions within the Company, however much they differed in other points of view, had in common a tolerant attitude towards Puritans; moreover, this sympathy extended even to those who in their own day were considered to be far to the left of the general movement. Sir Robert Rich, the second Earl of Warwick, was a helpful friend of Puritans throughout his long life. Sir Edwin Sandys, who was for many years a dominant force in the Company, had come under Genevan influences in his formative years and, while never a nonconformist, was politically a Puritan, as is shown by his record of service in Parliament. These men also had practical reasons to demonstrate their friendly attitude toward various groups of nonconformists. All contemporary records and comments indicate that the Company was always eager to secure settlers, especially those that bid fair to be well-behaved, diligent workers. It is not surprising, then, that a few years after the settlement of Virginia had started, the Company was willing to issue a patent to a group of Puritan extremists, the Leyden Separatists, in order that they might settle in Virginia. In 1621 the Company also expressed itself as willing that Walloon and French refugees, to the number of sixty

families or three hundred individuals, be sent to Virginia, provided that they took the oath of allegiance and scattered themselves through the colony.[1] Undoubtedly the refusal to permit them to form a foreign community was owing to the acknowledged weakness of the struggling settlement, but this decision to have them join other communities meant that the Company thought these Calvinist newcomers would be content with the English churches and ministers being provided by the Company. The Leyden Separatists, however, finally established themselves at Plymouth, beyond the boundaries of the Company's patent; many of the Walloons settled around New Amsterdam. More important, of course, for the future of the southern colonies than these two abortive attempts to obtain settlers was the Company's tacit allowance of the emigration to Virginia of other groups that were definitely Puritan in their beliefs.

But there are also less obvious indications that the Company, especially in the last five years before its dissolution, was far from being anti-Puritan. For instance, arrangements were made with the Reverend Patrick Copland to be rector of the college that was to be seated at Henrico; in return for his efforts in behalf of the proposed college, he was given three shares in the Company and was to be allowed fifty acres for each person that he and his associates should transport.[2] The Indian massacre of 1622 ended these plans, but not the somewhat stormy career of Copland, a friend of Sandys and a correspondent of such noted Puritans as Governor Winthrop of Massachusetts and the Reverend Hugh Peter, the well-known leader in the English revolution. Copland in his later days in the island colonies showed himself to be a very radical Puritan, far more extreme in his views than his New England friends.

[1] Susan M. Kingsbury, ed., *The Records of the Virginia Company of London* (Washington, 1905–36), III, 491–492.

[2] *Ibid.*, I, 591.

Copland and his proposed college were not the only indications that the Company was willing to allow Puritan ideas to be inculcated in the colony. About the same time as negotiations were being carried on to secure this ambitious minister's services, the Reverend John Brinsley was engaged to write a textbook for colonial use.[3] This volume, *A Consolation for our Grammar Schooles*, appeared in 1622. Brinsley, the father of a well-known nonconformist minister of the same name, was himself a prominent Puritan preacher, schoolmaster, and educational writer who, because of his nonconformable beliefs, had already been enjoined from teaching.[4] The Company also showed its care to advance education in the colony on two other occasions. Among the valued gifts accepted in 1620 by the Company for the use of the infant colony were a translation of Augustine's *De Civitate Dei* and a copy of Perkins' works,[5] both of which would be more than acceptable to ministers with any Puritan leanings. Augustine's basic influence on Calvinistic doctrine is well recognized, and the Reverend William Perkins was a standard and much quoted authority for all seventeenth-century Puritans, who were inclined to rank his voluminous writings with those of Calvin and Luther. Early in 1622 four more books were accepted as an additional gift for use in Virginia; this time a church Bible, a small Bible, a common Prayer Book, and *Ursinaer Catechisme* were to be sent over.[6] This last volume seems to have been Ursinus' *Catechisme*, perhaps the English translation by H. Parrie published in 1591;[7] it may even have been the Heidelberg Catechism (in which Ursinus had a hand and

[3] *Ibid.*, pp. 152, 174.

[4] *Dictionary of National Biography*, II, 1256–1258.

[5] Kingsbury, *Records*, III, 576.

[6] *Ibid.*, IV, 271.

[7] Cf. William S. Powell, "Books in the Virginia Colony Before 1624," *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 3d Ser., V (1948), 183–184.

which used to be largely attributed to him). In either case, the book was strongly tinged with Calvinism.

With such evidence of the acceptance of Puritanism by the colony's English sponsors, it is not surprising to find the same inclination in early Virginia under the Company's rule. The religious spirit of the times immediately made itself evident. As soon as the first settlers landed, provision was made for a church—at first only a tent made of an old sail, then a frame building. Daily prayers both morning and evening were the custom, according to Captain John Smith, with two sermons every Sunday and Holy Communion celebrated every three months.[8] This devout plan soon had to be modified because of the early death of the Reverend Robert Hunt, the minister accompanying the expedition. To counteract this setback, Lord Delaware, who arrived to govern the faltering colony in 1610, also set an example of piety by his own actions and by his interest in the church.[9]

It is, however, with the arrival in 1611 of Sir Thomas Dale as High Marshall (really acting governor) that the Puritan trend of the period becomes apparent. This energetic and capable soldier has been credited with saving the very weak colony by forcing the adventurers to be law-abiding and industrious, and by doing away with the economic communism that was retarding all development. Dale, who saw himself as engaged in "religious warfare" to build up "this heavenly new Jerusalem" and whom his fellow settler, the Reverend Alexander Whitaker, called "a man of great Knowledge in Divinity, and of good conscience

[8] John Smith, *Works 1608–1631* (The English Scholar's Library, 1884 ed.), pp. 957–958.

[9] William Strachey, *A True reportory of the wracke, and redemption of Sir Thomas Gates . . . his coming to Virginia, and the estate of that Colonie then . . . July 15, 1610*, in Samuel Purchas, *Hakluytus Posthumus or Purchas His Pilgrimes Contayning a History of the World (1625)*, (Glasgow, 1905), XIX, pp. 5–84. (Hereafter referred to as *Purchas His Pilgrimes*.)

in all his doings,"[10] set up a rigorous code: Every one was to attend morning and evening prayers and go to church twice on the Sabbath; in addition there were Saturday evening services in Dale's own house, catechising Sunday afternoons, and Wednesday sermons. Communion was to be celebrated monthly, a fast to be observed yearly. Derision of the Holy Word or of the ministers was punishable by whipping; moreover, anyone who spoke against the Trinity, blasphemed, or committed any sacrilege against church property warranted death. The Sabbath was to be kept duly sanctified, with no gaming. In addition to these rules, all newcomers to the colony had to give an account of their faith to the ministers, with the severest penalties for negligence in this matter.[11]

Dale's instructions to the colony's soldiers were equally stringent: they were to serve God publicly and privately, with no blasphemy and with no playing of dice, cards, or other games. The captain of the guard or one of the principal officers had to hold daily morning and evening prayers. The three-thousand word model suggested for reading is as Calvinistic in tone as any that might have been heard on Massachusetts' bleaker shores:

And thou our Father of al mercies, that hast called us unto thee, heare us and pitie thy poor servants, we have indeed sinned wonderously against thee through our blindnesse of mind, prophaneness of spirit, hardnesse of heart, self-love, worldlinesse, carnall lusts, hypocrisie, pride, vanitie, unthankfulnesse, infidelitie, and other our native corruptions, which being bred in us, and with us, have defiled us even from the wombe, and unto this day, and have broken out as plague sores into innumerable transgressions of all thy holy lawes, (the good waies whereof

[10] Ralph Hamor, *A True Discourse of the Present State of Virginia . . . till the 18 of June, 1614* (London, 1615), pp. 51, 60.

[11] William Strachey (compiler), *For the Colony in Virginea Britannia. Lawes Divine, Morall and Martiall* (London, 1612), p. 59, in Peter Force, ed., *Tracts and Other Papers,* III, No. 2.

we have wilfully declined), & have many times displeased thee, and our own consciences in chusing these things which thee hast most justly & severely forbidden us....[12]

After dwelling upon God's "infinite and incomparable" patience in not "revenging" himself upon them for their manifold sins, they ask to be stirred to frequent prayer, to have their eyes opened to their natural infirmities (so that Satan may be circumvented), and to be blessed with "faithfull and fruitfull" ministers who will not "deceive themselves with a formalitie of religion in steed of the power there of." Then there is a plea for these "days of iniquity" to end so that they with "all thine elect people may come to see thy face in glorie, and to be filled with the light thereof for evermore." Next is the justification for God's consideration: had they not risked their lives "principally to honour thy Name, & advance the Kingdome of thy son" and in so doing had they not undergone the reproofs and scorn of the base world? At last, a loyally patriotic note closes this supplication:

Lord blesse England our sweet native countrey, save it from Popery, this land from Heathenism, & both from Atheisme.[13]

There is no way of ascertaining how many of the men that listened to this prayer were in complete sympathy with this Puritan viewpoint that they, the most miserable of sinners, were settling Virginia mainly for the sake of religion. It is known that when Sir Thomas Gates, Lord Delaware's deputy governor, arrived in the colony, Dale chose three hundred and fifty men to found two new settlements a little farther up the James. The main settlement was named in honor of Henry, Prince of Wales; the tract on the opposite side of the river was known as Hope-in-Faith. Accompanying this group in the development of Henrico and the

[12] *Ibid.*, p. 64.
[13] *Ibid.*, pp. 65–68.

neighboring Bermuda Hundred was the Reverend Alexander Whitaker, who later returned with Dale to Jamestown when Gates went back to England.

This young minister was the son of a noted Calvinist, the Reverend William Whitaker, who had earned considerable fame in his day for his polemical writings against the Jesuits and for his service in framing the Lambeth Articles, an attempt at an adaptation of the Genevan theory of predestination for the use of the Church of England. The younger Whitaker's cousin and correspondent was the Reverend William Gouge, a prominent Puritan preacher at Black Friars, London, who later frequently served as Moderator of the 1643 Westminster Assembly of Divines. When Whitaker sent home the manuscript of his short *Good Newes from Virginia* (published in 1613), the Reverend William Crashawe, another close friend, supplied the preface. Crashawe, too, was a noted Puritan. This evidence of Whitaker's Puritan connections is interesting and suggestive, but hardly conclusive about his own beliefs. Nor is his only published pamphlet very indicative. *Good Newes from Virginia* is really a plea for more generous English support of the colony. Half sermon on the virtues of charity and the wisdom of casting one's bread upon the waters, half travelogue on the phenomena of the New World, this readable piece of propaganda is genuinely revealing of its author only in that it shows that he habitually used and quoted the Genevan Bible. His Puritan sympathies are indicated more clearly in an often quoted letter to his "very deere and loving Cosen" Dr. Gouge, in which the young Virginia preacher wondered why the colony was not being made better use of as a field of service by ministers who objected to wearing a surplice and who were unwilling to subscribe to the Act of Conformity.[14] Inasmuch as the

[14] Alexander Whitaker, Letter, in *Purchas His Pilgrimes*, IV, 1770–1771; Edward Lewis Goodwin, *The Colonial Church in Virginia* (Milwaukee, 1927), I, 41–42.

wearing of the surplice and the use of the liturgical forms of the Prayer Book (to which the Act of Conformity would bind them) were moot points of conscience for many Puritans, Whitaker carefully noted that such tests were not stressed in Virginia. And, very apparently, he thought that nonconforming divines would be welcomed by his fellow settlers.

Whitaker died fairly early, in 1617, but there were other ministers in the colony with Puritan ideas, although most of them, too, seem to have been content to remain within the fold of the Church of England. At least twenty-two ministers are known to have gone to the colony before 1625, but many of these men had such short careers in the new world that very little can be positively determined as to where they stood in regard to the doctrinal and theological controversies of their day. Sometimes, indeed, little more than a name has survived, and it can be surmised that the Virginia days of these men were indeed brief. Then, too, little more is known about many of the others who came, only to die within a few months. Even those who served in Virginia for a few years before dying or returning to England left their mark upon their churches and fellow settlers rather than upon recorded history. And these short periods of Virginia service were the rule rather than the exception in the colony's first years. Besides Whitaker, of all the first group of ministers sent out by the Virginia Company, only a half-dozen men had somewhat more extensive periods of service that can be definitely traced, and the New World careers of most of these men, too, were not really lengthy, rarely extending beyond a decade.

Nevertheless, despite the general, and natural, paucity of information about these first ministers, and especially about their Virginia pastorates, concerning some of them there are evidences of Puritanism that cannot be denied. It

has been thought that the Reverend Richard Buck, who succeeded to Hunt's pulpit at James City Parish, serving there from 1610 to 1624, was a Puritan.[15] This assumption is based on the Reverend William Crashawe's praise of him as "an able and painful preacher,"[16] words which are indeed typical of one Puritan's praise of another, and on the unhappy Biblical names which he gave his children. On better evidence lies the belief that the Reverend Hawte Wyatt, who preached at Jamestown for three years, was inclined to be a nonconformist; in later years, after his return to England and while he was Vicar of Boxley (his ancestral seat) and Merston in Kent, he got into difficulties with Archbishop Laud. Although Wyatt was arraigned before the High Commission, his early death in 1638 saved him from the troubled years just preceding the English revolution.[17]

In contrast to Wyatt and his harassed career after leaving the colony, another of the early ministers showed his Puritanism before he reached Virginia. More conservative members of the Established Church, judging by his previous record, may well have wondered if the Reverend George Keith[18] would not prove to be a disturbing factor in their midst. This earlier Keith, who is not to be confused with the erstwhile Quaker of the same name, in 1617 came to Virginia from Bermuda, bringing with him his wife, young

[15] George MacLaren Brydon, *Virginia's Mother Church and The Political Conditions Under Which It Grew* (Richmond, Va., 1947), pp. 22–23.

[16] William Crashawe, "The Epistle Dedicatorie," in Alexander Whitaker, *Good Newes from Virginia* (London, 1613).

[17] Lyon G. Tylor, "Notes by the Editor," *The William and Mary College Quarterly*, III (1894–95), 35–38; Neill, *Virginia Vetusta* (Albany, 1885), p. 174.

[18] Chapman, *Wills and Administrations of Elizabeth City County*, pp. 9, 18, 32; J. H. Lefroy, *Memorials of the Discovery and Early Settlement of the Bermudas* (London, 1877), I, 61, 80, 107, *et alii;* H. R. McIlwaine, ed., *Minutes of the Council and General Court of Virginia* (Richmond, 1924), pp. 22, 189; Kingsbury, *Records*, IV, 557; W. G. Standard, ed., "Abstracts of Virginia Land Patents," *Virginia Magazine of History*, III (1895–96), 279; "The Randolph Manuscript. Virginia Seventeenth Century Records," *Virginia Magazine of History*, XVIII (1910), 7 ff.; Lyon Gardner Tyler, *The Cradle of the Republic: Jamestown and James River* (Richmond, 1906), p. 237.

son, and fourteen other persons whom he was transporting at his own expense. During the five years that he had spent in Bermuda he had had a stormy career, frequently in disagreement with both the civil authorities and his fellow preachers. Among the accusations that flew back and forth in this strife was one of possible significance: Keith, his opponents averred, was "no minister," perhaps implying that this Scot was not then episcopally ordained. Unlike the Bermuda episode, Keith's Virginia years passed in such comparative peace that no echoes of any trouble have survived. Was Keith getting older and more worldly wise, less given to constant fault finding? Or did he find his new surroundings more congenial? At any rate, he served several parishes, including Elizabeth City and Martin's Hundred, and finally settled in Charles River (York) County, where in 1634 he received a large land grant.

If Keith had a number of parishes even though he was not episcopally ordained, he was not the only Virginia minister in this position while the Company was in control of the colony. Apparently, according to the 1624 report of the Virginia Assembly,[19] there were by that year a number of officiating ministers who had no orders, and two slightly earlier preachers so serving have been identified. The Reverend William Wickham seems to have officiated as Whitaker's assistant or curate at Henrico until the latter's death in 1617 and he may very well have held the same position of subordinate colleague while the Reverend Thomas Bargrave had the church from 1619 to 1621. Little is known definitely about Wickham: He may have come as early as 1611 or 1612; certainly he was at Henrico in 1616 when John Rolfe noted that he was serving there and spoke of him as

[19] Arthur Lyon Cross, *The Anglican Episcopate and the American Colonies* (New York, 1902), p. 11; Governor Wyatt's 1623 report to the same effect is cited in Edward D. Neill, *Terra Mariae; or, Threads of Maryland Colonial History* (Philadelphia, 1867), p. 75.

one who in his "life and doctrine" gave "good examples and godley instructions to the people";[20] presumably he was dead or gone by 1622. According to Governor Argall's report of March 1617/8, Wickham's eyes were so "dim" that a reader for him should be sent over; perhaps this meant that he was elderly or ill. Scarcely more is known about the Reverend Samuel Maycocke (also spelt Macocke), although there was a Puritan preacher of that name in Southwark, England, with whom the Virginia immigrant has been tentatively identified. A Cambridge man, he had come to the colony in or before 1617; in 1619 he was appointed by the Virginia Company to serve as a member of the Council,[21] an honor that meant that he sat in the historic first General Assembly; in 1622 he was killed, one of the many victims of the Indian uprising of that year.

For both of these men Governor Argall wrote to the Company urging that their ordination be solicited from the Archbishop. If the two men had been merely deacons, as has sometimes been supposed, this request could not have been granted without the greatest irregularity. In fact, Governor Argall could hardly have been asking the Archbishop to break the law of his church. On the other hand, if the two men in question were ministers of Genevan or Presbyterian ordination, the Archbishop did have the authority to license them to hold parishes in the Church of England, with the privilege to administer the sacraments.[22]

Despite their Calvinistic leanings, these six men—Whitaker, Buck, Wyatt, Keith, Wickham, and Maycocke—did not serve obviously Puritan communities. Their parishioners—at James City, Martin's Hundred, Elizabeth City, Henrico, and Charles City—must have shared their

[20] John Rolfe, "The Present State of Virginia," in *Purchas His Pilgrimes*, III, 947–948.
[21] Kingsbury, *Records*, III, 424, 483, 588.
[22] Brydon, *Virginia's Mother Church*, pp. 28–29.

minister's beliefs sufficiently to accept their teaching, but they were able to do so without thought of separating from the Established Church. On the other hand, the Virginia Company allowed, and in some cases encouraged, settlements to be developed by men who before their Virginia days had broken with the Church of England. As a matter of fact, there was a substratum of truth in an exaggerated charge made when the Crown took over the colony: Sir Edwin Sandys, who had virtually controlled the policies of the Company for some years before its dissolution, was then accused of having wanted to populate Virginia with Barrowists and Separatists.[23] Certainly the original attempts at colonization of the territory south of the James River were backed and to some extent manned by Puritans of the more extreme type, by men whose religious ideas paralleled those of the early settlers of Plymouth; in comparison, most of the Massachusetts Bay colonists were conservative Puritans. And as was true of the better known Pilgrims of Plymouth Colony fame, the leaders in this colonization of southern Virginia came from the exiled English churches in the Netherlands.

But for the misfortunes that overtook some of these radical Puritans in their struggle from Holland to America, Virginia's nonconforming population might have been well established before 1620. The Virginia Company both in its own day and since has often been accused of concealing its failures, publicizing its successes so that none would be discouraged from attempting the New World. Certainly a discreet silence was officially maintained about one particular catastrophe that involved the emigration of a group of Puritans whose conflict with the authorities had already driven them out of England. Only Governor Bradford's natural interest in the fate of his former fellow exiles in

[23] Wesley Frank Craven, *Dissolution of the Virginia Company* (New York, 1932), p. 277.

Holland, although he was much out of sympathy with the leaders of this particular church, made the Plymouth ruler keep some record of the sad outcome of the endeavor of these Puritans to betake themselves to Virginia.[24] Bradford, it is interesting to note, was told the story in a letter from Elder Robert Cushman, who was in England trying to arrange with the Virginia Company for the passage of the Leyden Pilgrims to Virginia. (The unpleasant details of this earlier Separatist attempt to reach America were naturally of great interest to other nonconformists waiting to leave Holland.)

The history of this pathetic fiasco in colonization goes back to 1592, for in that year an Independent church had been organized in London by the Reverend Francis Johnson, with John Greenwood as his associate. By 1597 Johnson and his followers were forced to seek refuge in Holland, where the Reverend Henry Ainsworth was closely connected with the group, which became known as the Ancient Church or the Ancient English Church. Soon, as in most of these independent churches, composed as they were of very individualistic thinkers, dissension sprang up and the church was divided. By the spring of 1618 Johnson was dead, and a remnant of the church, with one of the elders, the Reverend Francis Blackwell, in charge, decided to seek a new home in Virginia. There were many difficulties about getting away. Finally, on August 24, 1618, the group, one hundred eighty strong, sailed on the *William and Thomas.*

The hopeful emigrants were badly overcrowded, and various calamities made their lot more painful. As the weather proved to be exceptionally stormy, the ship was driven off its course. Consequently, the trip took six months instead of the customary three, with the fresh water giving out all too soon. When Virginia was finally reached in March,

[24] William Bradford, *History of Plymouth Plantation* (Boston, 1912), I, 86–89.

1619, one hundred and thirty were dead, including the ship's captain and Blackwell, the leader. Nor was the surviving remnant of what was called Blackwell's remnant of the Ancient Church destined to help form Virginia. Most of the remaining fifty either quickly succumbed to illness or lost their lives in the massacre of 1622. In sad fact, by February of 1623 only seven remained alive.

Other attempts at colonization by Englishmen who had spent some years in exile in Holland proved to be much less disastrous than Blackwell's struggle to lead his followers to Virginia. One of the elders of Johnson's Ancient Church during its Amsterdam period was a man by the name of Christopher Lawne; at the time of his marriage in 1610 he had, incidentally, described himself as a buttonmaker. The following year he disagreed with Johnson, apparently concerning the moot question of Separation; subsequently, he was expelled from the Ancient Church. Nevertheless, despite his somewhat violent dispute with one group of Puritans, Lawne was still out of sympathy with the Church of England, as is shown by the fact that he joined the Scotch Presbyterian Church at Amsterdam, which had as its minister the noted Dr. John Paget.

By 1618 Lawne, like Blackwell, was ready to try his luck in Virginia, but was more successful in arranging for English backers and for the transportation of his settlers. In May of that year he arrived in Virginia with his family and a number of other immigrants—how many is uncertain, but at least fifteen; a hundred more came the following year to "Lawne's Creek," his settlement in Warrascoyak (Isle of Wight). Lawne survived long enough to represent his plantation in the first General Assembly in July of 1619, but in November he died at Charles City, having apparently quitted, at least temporarily, Lawne's Creek.[25] Many of

[25] Kingsbury, *Records*, III, 154, 163, 246.

his colonists also did not survive the sickness that attacked most newcomers to Virginia's shores; it is estimated that not more than a fifth lived of those that Lawne transported. The plantation, however, did not completely fail. In November, 1620, Lawne's English associates and financial supporters received a confirmation of his patent, agreeing to transport a number of settlers to what was renamed "Isle of Wight Plantation."[26]

One of Lawne's backers was Mr. Nathaniel Basse, who on November 21, 1621, received with an associate a patent for another plantation on the south side of the James.[27] A hundred persons came originally to this plantation, called "Basse's Choice," situated to the east of Lawne's and on the Pagan River, a small tributary of the James. This settlement seems to have developed normally and was under the guidance of Basse for some years; in 1629 he represented his plantation in the House of Burgesses. Soon after, however, Governor Harvey asked him to negotiate with the Massachusetts settlers to see if some of the latter did not want to migrate to Delaware Bay.[28] Basse apparently left for New England in 1631, and there is no further mention of him in the Virginia records.

The most successful of these Puritan settlements south of the James undoubtedly was that started by the wealthy Edward Bennett, who had also been an elder of Johnson's Ancient Church at Amsterdam. Indeed, Lawne, after his apostacy from that church, had spoken of Bennett as "one of the two chief pillars of that rotten Separation" and had dwelt much upon his wealth, especially the use made of it:

As for this *Edward Benet*, he is to be considered as a *horne of the beast*, that lends his power, wealth, and authoritie to the maintenance of the

[26] *Ibid.*, I, 414.
[27] *Ibid.*, I, 561.
[28] McIlwaine, *Minutes of the Council*, p. 484.

beast, according to that in Revalation 17.13. so that it is not unfittely spoken by some of Master *Ainsworths* Company, viz. *As the King of Spain is unto the Pope: so is Master Benet unto Master Johnson.*[29]

Bennett's patent, granted in November, 1621,[30] at the same time as Basse's, lay between Lawne's Creek and Basse's Choice on what is now called Burwell Bay; no fewer than three hundred men were to be transported. His settlers started to come early in 1622, at an especially unfortunate time inasmuch as the plantation received a great setback when fifty-three people were slain in the massacre of March of that year. One of Bennett's men who lived through this dreadful experience was Bernard Sims or Symmes. With the usual Puritan belief in education, when he died in 1634 at Elizabeth City, he provided in his will for the first free school in America, which was to have as its site two hundred acres of his land on the Poquoson River and to be maintained by the milk and increase of eight of his cows.[31]

Symmes was not the only man who left the Burwell Bay area after the 1622 catastrophe of the Indian uprising. The survivors deserted the place for a while; even by February, 1623, there were only thirty-three persons living there. Conditions improved, however; all told, the Bennett family is thought to have brought over more than six hundred persons. Edward Bennett had many obvious advantages over the other Puritan adventurers that tried to establish plantations. He stood in high favor with the Virginia Company for his early efforts to have Spanish tobacco prohibited in England; for this purpose he wrote a tract which the officers of the company used to attempt to persuade the government to ban all tobacco except that grown in the

[29] Christopher Lawne, *The Prophane Schisme of the Brownists or Separatists* (1612), pp. 11–12.

[30] Kingsbury, *Records*, III, 63, 571, 643.

[31] Lyon G. Tyler, "Education in Colonial Virginia," *William and Mary Quarterly Magazine*, 1st Ser., VI (1897–98), 72.

English colonies. He was, as has been said, a man of great wealth who had interests in the East India Company and who owned a fleet of ships that could be used for transporting his colonists as well as for trading purposes. In addition, Bennett had one more advantage: as the youngest of fifteen children he was rich in brothers and nephews and other relatives who could look after his interests while he was in England. His brothers Robert and Richard managed the plantation until Robert died in 1623, Richard in 1626. Then Edward Bennett himself came over for a few years, representing the plantation in the House of Burgesses in 1628, but later his nephew, another Richard Bennett, became the leader of the Puritan colony and eventually governor of Virginia. Other Bennetts that obtained large land grants were Philip and a second Robert; undoubtedly the Reverend William Bennett also was a relative, and still another member of the family was the Reverend Thomas Bennett, who started to preach at Warrasquoyak in the late sixteen-twenties, about five years after William's death.

In addition to these nonconformist plantations to the south of the James, there were other settlements that presumably were strongly Calvinistic even though they were not backed by exiled Puritans from the Low Countries. The Eastern Shore was not colonized by direct emigration from England, but by Virginians who came from across Chesapeake Bay. Originally—about 1613—the first small settlement was called "Dale's Clift" as it was owned by the governor and the purpose was salt making. The peninsular settlements, with the general lack of easy communication as an effective barrier, grew but slowly at first, with not more than fifty-odd settlers there when the first church was organized in 1625. Afterwards, however, the population increased more rapidly, especially as trade with New England and Holland thrived. Little is known about the

very early days of this development, but as the century progressed this section showed a strong tendency toward Puritanism. This may have been fostered by Dutch and New England influences both through trade and some immigration, but the isolated position of the old Kingdom of Accomack, as it was called, may from the beginning have attracted men who were not in full sympathy with the Established Church. Then, too, a good many artisans found their way to the Eastern Shore, perhaps because the nature of the settlement made them such valued citizens, and the artisan class in England during the first decades of the seventeenth century was much inclined to Puritanism. Certainly if later history can be said to prove anything about the earlier seed, then the Eastern Shore was probably Genevan even before the records are full enough to be suggestive about such matters.[32]

Even less definite are the ascertainable facts about another plantation which can at least be suspected of being among the more definitely Puritan spots in early Virginia. In 1621 the elder Daniel Gookin, father of the more famous son of the same name, established above Newport News a plantation called Marie's Mount, presumably after the elder Mrs. Gookin. Daniel, Sr., originally brought over some fifty men for this adventure; he then returned to England, but in 1623 sent over another forty men. An old Kent family that had moved for business reasons to Ireland, the Gookins showed strong Puritan tendencies; although nothing can be proved about the elder Gookin's beliefs, his two sons and a cousin of theirs were outstanding Puritans.[33] Contemporaries spoke of this plantation as "Irish," but

[32] Jennings Cropper Wise, *Ye Kingdome of Accawmacke; or, the Eastern Shore of Virginia in the Seventeenth Century* (Richmond, 1911), pp. 36–68.

[33] Frederick William Gookin, *Daniel Gookin 1612–1687. His Life and Letters and some Account of his Ancestry* (Chicago, 1912), pp. 40–45; *Dictionary of National Biography*, *s.vv.* "Daniel Gookin," "Vincent Gookin," VIII, 152–156.

certainly the men that came were not Catholics, for then they would not have been welcomed by the Virginia authorities. Some may have been Irish Anglicans, but others most likely were either Englishmen coming by way of Ireland or they were Scotch-Irish.

The Puritan settlers south of the James River and on the Eastern Shore must have wanted ministers that were of their way of thinking. During the period that the Virginia Company controlled the destiny of the colony, at least three ministers came who served, or intended to serve, these parishes. Little is known about one of these men, the Reverend William Bennett.[34] Probably a Cambridge graduate, he arrived on the *Sea Flower* in 1621; until his untimely death in 1623 or 1624, he served at Warrasquoyak, his kinsmen's plantation. His successor, the Reverend Francis Bolton,[35] who was more certainly a Cambridge graduate, came with Governor Wyatt in 1621, having been recommended to the Company for "his honestie and sufficiencie of learninge" by Sir Edwin Sandys' friend, the Earl of Southampton. Unlike Bennett, Bolton had a long career in Virginia, serving a number of parishes before his death in 1652 in Northumberland County. Before his Warrasquoyak days, Bolton had been for two years on the Eastern Shore at Hungars Parish, preaching there long before the church was officially organized.

Concerning these two men, Bennett and Bolton, the records show only their willingness to serve Puritan communities, but one minister who came to these plantations

[34] "Minutes of the Council and General Court 1622–1629," *Virginia Magazine of History*, XXV (1917), 117; Philip A. Bruce, *Institutional History of Virginia in the Seventeenth Century* (New York, 1910), I, 200, 253.

[35] Kingsbury, *Records*, I, 506; Neill, *History of the Virginia Company*, p. 220; Beverly Fleet (compiler), *Northumberland County Records, 1652–1655* (Richmond, 1938), pp. 16, 92; Henry F. Waters, *Genealogical Gleanings in England* (1884), pp. 197–199; Kingsbury, *Records*, IV, 404; "The Randolph Manuscript. Virginia Seventeenth Century Records," *Virginia Magazine of History*, XVII (1909), 231.

had already left his mark upon English church history. By far the best known Puritan preacher who felt a call to the young colony was the Reverend Henry Jacob,[36] who arrived in 1624, apparently to serve in Isle of Wight County. An Oxford graduate and the author of many religious and eristic tracts, this nonconformist, like so many of his fellow-thinking ministers, had spent some years of virtual exile in the Low Countries; while in Holland he came under the influence of the Reverend John Robinson, the revered pastor of the Puritans who were soon to settle Plymouth. Upon returning to England, Jacob established in 1616 the Southwark Church, often considered the first Congregational Church in England. Although in practice he had gathered an Independent Church, in theory he did not look upon himself as a real Separatist, but throughout most of his life apparently had every hope that the Church of England could be made to conform with the pattern of the primitive churches.[37] A very influential nonconformist during his years in England and Holland, Jacob had a disappointingly short career in the New World, for he died within a few months of his arrival.

From whatever records are available, then, the religious situation in the colony when the Virginia Company was forced in 1624 to relinquish its control was this: During these crucial years of first settlement the Church of England had been very sympathetic to Genevan influences, despite a "high" church faction which was about to be exemplified in Archbishop Laud and his party; the Virginia Company had a number of members who were either Calvinists or tolerant of those whose Calvinism was more pronounced than theirs. As a result of these English conditions, the Established

[36] "Minutes of the Council and General Court 1622–1629," *Virginia Magazine of History*, XXIX (1921), 294–295.

[37] Champlin Burrage, *The Early English Dissenters in the Light of Recent Research (1550–1641)* (Cambridge, 1912), I, 319; II, 295.

Church in Virginia was far more Genevan than it would have been if the James River had been colonized a little later in the century. A goodly proportion of the ministers sent by the Company or allowed to emigrate under its aegis were Calvinistic in their beliefs, but of these only a few were of the more extreme type that at some time in their careers, either before or after their Virginia stay, wandered to the left as far as Separation from the Church of England. This general conformity, nominal though it may have been, was natural, as Puritans of the day rarely thought of themselves other than as particularly sincere members of the Church; only for those at the extreme left of the movement had the question of Separation come up. Moreover, at this period in Virginia there was no active prejudice, on the part of either English or Virginia authorities, against churches and plantations that were more Puritan than their neighbors; for example, Edward Bennett's large scale colonizing activities had been most cordially welcomed by the Company[38] and from the beginning the decidedly Puritan settlements sent their representatives to the House of Burgesses to partake in the government of the colony.

2. *The Development of Puritanism within the Established Church*

Considered generally, the church situation in Virginia did not change during the rest of the century as much as might be expected when English church history during these same years is recalled. In many ways the Company had set the pattern for what was to follow. Governor Wyatt's instructions of 1621 had been that he was to keep the Virginia church "as near as may be" to the mother church, and this compromise between hypothetical unity and colonial reality soon became a standard whenever the

[38] Kingsbury, *Records*, I, 446; II, 366, 388, *et alii.*

problem was discussed. In other words, there was a natural recognition that new economic and geographic conditions would affect the colonial church, at least in certain outward matters of organization and discipline. And, as her own historians have freely admitted, the Virginia church never did become one with the Church of England.[39] Circumstances contrived for the American churches far more individualism than their English counterparts enjoyed. The lack of a resident colonial bishop and of any system of visitations undoubtedly gave the Virginia churches more freedom to develop as they would; distances and the lack of easy communication, with the consequent difficulty in enforcing the governor's will, helped this feeling of quasi-independence. Then, too, the much discussed vestry system, for all its later anti-democratic evils of self-perpetuation, placed very complete control of each church in the lay hands of a group of its more prominent parishioners.

There is abundant evidence that in many ways the Virginia churches throughout their first century were inclined not to conform too strictly; "no discipline nor Canons of the Church are observed,"[40] wrote the Reverend Nicholas Moreau in 1697, with the usual exaggeration of the newcomer to colonial shores. The Reverend Alexander Whitaker, writing around 1612, had noted that the wearing of a surplice was not considered an essential test of a minister's worth;[41] over a hundred years later the Reverend Hugh Jones commented that surplices had been "disused" for "a long Time in most churches." Even more interesting is Jones' disclosure that in some parishes people received communion in their seats, "a Custom introduced for Oppor-

[39] *Cf.* J. Edward Kirbye, *Puritanism in the South* (Boston, 1908), *passim;* Brydon, *Virginia's Mother Church, passim.*

[40] William Stevens Perry, ed., *Historical Collections relating to the American Colonial Church* (Hartford, 1870), I, 30.

[41] *Purchas His Pilgrimes*, IV, 1770–1771; Neill, *Virginia Vetusta*, pp. 174–176.

tunity for such as are inclined to Presbytery," and that it was not easy to bring them to the Lord's table on their knees.[42] Jones was writing after there had been some infiltration of Scottish ministers into the Virginia churches, but he seems to think that these variations in church discipline had had their start much earlier. Throughout the seventeenth century, too, there were protests that marriages and burials were being held at private plantations, not in churches and churchyards.[43] Distances and the warm climate were unquestionably the deciding factors here, but it is worth noting that during the first years of settlement no strong tradition had been built up to make the people feel that these rites had to be conducted in the churches.

The Virginia Company had tacitly allowed a number of ministers with Genevan sympathies to come to Virginia and to preach there. Throughout the rest of the century the need for ministers was always greater than the supply. This constant shortage of ordained men must have encouraged parishes to become lax about accepting unordained ministers as well as ordained men who were not strict conformists. Governor Berkeley's rather peevish statement in 1671[44] that too many Virginia ministers devoted their energy to preaching rather than to prayer may be interpreted to mean that a number of ministers shared the Lutheran and Calvinist viewpoint about the sermon's being the all important part of the service; the value of the Book of Common Prayer consequently would suffer in their eyes. And since Berkeley heartily approved of those Virginia ministers who came because they had been ejected from their English pulpits during Cromwell's ascendency, his

[42] Hugh Jones, *The Present State of Virginia* (London, 1724), in Sabin's Reprints (New York, 1865), No. 5, p. 69.

[43] Perry, *Historical Collections*, I, 213, 223; Jones, *The Present State of Virginia*, p. 68.

[44] William Walker Hening, ed., *The Statutes at Large; being a Collection of all the Laws of Virginia, from the First Session of the Legislature, in the year 1619* (Richmond, 1809), II, 517.

complaint that the "worst" of ministers were sent to Virginia may well mean that he saw signs of nonconformity in many of the other ministers.

Certainly both before and after the Commonwealth period there was fairly frequent legislation demanding that nonconformists be ejected from all pulpits. In 1643 and 1647 there were such acts, perhaps directed against the more radically Puritan settlements to the south of the James, but not expressly so limited. During the Puritan regime of the 1650's the law gave complete control of the churches to the individual parishes. How much advantage was taken of this statute is difficult to determine, but after the Restoration the parishes were ordered to get rid of men presenting themselves as ministers and to make sure that all ministers had regular ordination.[45] That the problem was not solved by this law of 1662 may be seen in Bishop Compton's memorial of 1677 on conditions in the Church in the plantations: One of the outstanding abuses listed as having crept into the Virginia church was that persons without orders were preaching there.[46] A few years later the same charge was made, for when Lord Howard came over as governor in 1684 his instructions included the provision that care be exercised to have all ministers properly licensed and conforming to the canons of the Church of England; those that "gave scandal" by doctrine or manners were to be removed from their pulpits.[47] Despite Lord Howard's orders and his proclamation of 1686 demanding obedience to the law that only duly licensed ministers and schoolteachers be allowed to serve, in 1691 it was reported to the Council that some vestries were still entertaining ministers who did not conform to the doctrine and rules of the Church.[48]

[45] *Ibid.*, I, 240 ff., 341–342, 431–433; II, 44 ff.

[46] Cross, *The Anglican Episcopate and the American Colonies*, pp. 26–27.

[47] H. R. McIlwaine, ed., *Executive Journals of the Council of Colonial Virginia* (Richmond, 1925), I, 508–509, 515.

[48] *Ibid.*, I, 176.

The various statutes passed urging the parishes to oust nonconformists were mild recognition of a situation that must have occasionally annoyed ordained and regularly licensed ministers; for instance, the Reverend Morgan Godwyn, who during his brief stay in the colony found much wrong with conditions there, wanted all "invaders" of the pulpits "cashiered and punished for their bold and prophane Usurpations."[49] One of these typical "invaders" may have been the Reverend Jonathan Davis, who was seeking a parish in York County in the early 1680's and who, rather unconventionally, occupied another minister's pulpit without the latter's permission.[50] A less belligerent cleric, the Reverend Andrew Jackson, did not have Church of England ordination, as his vestry regretfully admitted;[51] nevertheless, he served Christ Church Parish, Lancaster County, from 1686 to 1710.

Contemporary criticisms and endeavors to correct the situation obviously indicate that the seed sowed in the early days of the colony did not entirely die out. Throughout the colony ministers were lax about keeping the canons of the Established Church. Variations from the standard practices of the Church of England may have been partly due to colonial conditions, but the variations all smacked of the spirit of Calvinism and nonconformity. During the whole century not only were there at least a few nonconforming clergymen in Virginia, even in sections that were not originally notably Puritan, but there were also nominal conformists who tended to "low" church usages.

Two types of ministers that from their background would

[49] Morgan Godwyn, *The Negro's & Indians Advocate, Suing for their Admission into the Church . . . To which is added A brief Account of Religion in Virginia* (London, 1680), p. 173.

[50] McIlwaine, *Executive Journals*, I, 3.

[51] Goodwin, *Colonial Church in Virginia*, p. 281; William Meade, *Old Churches, Ministers and Families of Virginia* (Philadelpha, 1900), II, 123.

have sympathy with Genevan ideas may have added to Virginia's only nominally conforming clergy. After the Reverend George Keith's arrival during the Company's regime, there was always a scattering of Scots serving various parishes: the Reverend Alexander Moray (Murray)[52] was the incumbent of Ware Parish, Gloucester County, from 1653 to 1672; the Reverend John Munro, Sr.,[53] occupied the pulpit of Stratton Major Parish, King and Queen County, in the 1650's; the Reverend David Lindsay[54] not only was at Wicomico Parish, Northumberland County, from 1655 to 1677, but during part of this period he also preached in Lancaster County. In time this Scottish element grew so much stronger that during the last years of the century and well into the next there were various complaints about how Scottish the Church had become. Less resentment was felt about the various Huguenots who were occupying a number of pulpits in the last quarter of the century. Among these men were the Reverend Michael Zyperne,[55] who came from the French Reformed Church of New York to Kingston Parish, Gloucester County, where in the 1680's he preached for at least seven years; the Reverend Stephen Fouace,[56] who served Yorkhampton Parish, York County, from 1692 to 1702; the Reverend James Boisseau,[57] who was at St.

[52] "Letters written by Mr. Moray, a Minister . . . from Ware River . . . Feb. 1, 1665," *William and Mary Quarterly*, 2d Ser., II (1922), 157–161; Brydon, *Virginia's Mother Church*, pp. 183–184. (Politically, Moray was far from Puritan in his sympathies.)

[53] "The Ancestry of James Monroe," *William and Mary Quarterly*, 2d Ser., IV (1924), 45; Frederick Lewis Weis, *The Colonial Churches and the Colonial Clergy of the Middle and Southern Colonies 1607–1776* (Lancaster, Mass., 1938), p. 94.

[54] Bruce, *Institutional History of Virginia*, I, 203, 272, 279; *Colonial Churches in the Original Colony of Virginia* (Richmond, 1908), p. 232.

[55] C. G. Chamberlayne, ed., *Vestry Book of Kingston Parish, Mathews County, Virginia 1679–1796* (Richmond, 1929), pp. 2, 4, 5, 6; Weis, *The Colonial Churches and the Colonial Clery*, pp. 52, 68.

[56] Bruce, *Institutional History*, I, 161; II, 383, 395; Goodwin, *Colonial Church in Virginia*, p. 270.

[57] McIlwaine, *Executive Journals*, I, 280; Brydon, *Virginia's Mother Church*, pp. 234–235.

Peter's Parish, King and Queen County, in 1692 and 1693; and the Reverend Nicholas Moreau,[58] who in the late 1690's spent two years at St. Peter's Parish, New Kent County. Most, if not all, of these Scottish and Huguenot preachers were ordained Church of England clergymen, but in view of their early training, it would be only natural for these men to be good Calvinists as well.

Nominally conforming ministers and Low Churchmen would not have been welcome in their various parishes unless many members of their congregations were of similar theological ideas. Not only were men of Puritan sympathies accepted as early settlers in the days of the Virginia Company, but later comers to Virginia were often men whose beliefs inclined toward Calvinism. Nor did these colonists seek only the avowedly Puritan plantations on the Eastern Shore and south of the James; on the contrary, their presence was felt throughout the colony. Certain groups of Virginians that must have been more or less influenced by Genevan thought can be identified.

Englishmen, many of whom must have been religious as well as political Puritans, came over in some numbers after the Restoration. Governor Berkeley's instructions of 1662 strongly hinted that the King expected to lose a good many of his quondam enemies in this way and that Virginia should do nothing to prevent this natural process.[59] Another indication that there were a good many Cromwellians in the colony may be seen in the apparently excessive fear with which the authorities reacted to the threatened rebellion of some indentured servants in 1663. If the latter were exiled followers of Cromwell, as Beverley claimed they were, and

[58] C. G. Chamberlayne, ed., *The Vestry Book and Register of St. Peter's Parish, New Kent and James City Counties, Virginia 1684–1786* (Richmond, 1937), pp. 49–55.

[59] Edward D. Neill, *Virginia Carolorum: the Colony under the Rule of Charles the First and Second, A.D. 1625–A.D. 1685; based upon Manuscripts and Documents of the Period* (Albany, 1886), p. 283.

if there were a number of these disgruntled men in the colony, there may have been good reason for the Assembly's being thankful for the preservation of the colony from these "mutinous villains" who by their "desperate conspiracy" were trying to bring about the "inevitable" and "utter" ruin of Virginia;[60] the scare was even reported to the King. Other Cromwellians seemingly settled in King and Queen County, where in 1683 a petition bearing their names protested an illegal vestry that had been elected and made up without the knowledge and consent of all the members of St. Stephen's Parish.[61] Then, too, the early historian Beverley, writing while the events of the seventeenth century were still fresh in mind, remarked that just as "several good Cavalier families" came over during the Commonwealth period, so "many People of the opposite party took Refuge" in Virginia at the Restoration, but not as many as fled to New England.[62]

In addition to these Englishmen of Puritan tendencies who came over in the second half of the century, the course of events in the British Isles and on the continent also provided Virginia with a number of Scottish and French settlers. A good part of the earlier arrivals, the Scotsmen, may well have been Presbyterian in their sympathies. How many of these victims of civil war got to Virginia remains uncertain, but they formed a recognizable division of the population. After the battle at Dunbar in 1650, eleven hundred prisoners, most of whom are thought to have been Scots, were assigned to be sent to Virginia; in 1651, after Worcester, seventeen hundred and sixty captured men were supposed

[60] Hening, *Statutes*, II, 191, 204.

[61] St. Stephen's Parish Petition of 1683, Colonial State Papers 1657–1687, Archives Division, Virginia State Library; in Beverley Fleet, ed., *Virginia Colonial Abstracts, King and Queen County* (Richmond, 1946).

[62] Robert Beverley, *The History and Present State of Virginia* (London, 1705), edited by Louis B. Wright (Chapel Hill, N. C., 1947), p. 287.

to meet the same fate.[63] Perhaps only a small proportion of these men were actually sent over, but there was enough Scottish immigration for the Reverend Alexander Moray, writing in 1665 from Ware River in Gloucester County, to feel that the English were jealous of the Scots who "after Hamiltons engagement and Worster fight" had been "sold slaves," but now were "great masters of servants themselves."[64] Nor did the Scottish immigration stop after the civil wars were over, for a trickle of Covenanters kept on coming after 1660, as well as a number of Scottish indentured servants,[65] always much in demand in Virginia.

However mixed may have been the emotions with which settlers of other than English birth were received, the Scots were not the only national group of Calvinistic background that seventeenth-century Virginia assimilated. While the great bulk of the Huguenot immigration came at the very end of the century in 1699 and in the first years of the eighteenth century, some of these French Calvinists sought refuge in the colony as early as the late 1680's.[66] Mild suspicion of foreigners in their midst was a natural reaction of settlers in a new plantation struggling through its first century of existence, but whatever bias there was seems to have been rooted in nationality rather than in matters of faith.

Prejudice against churches that inclined to outright independence, against foreigners who, somewhat incidentally, were Calvinistic in their thinking, against the Quakers in their first years of almost phenomenal growth, may be

[63] Abbot Emerson Smith, *Colonists in Bondage. White Servitude and Convict Labor in America 1607–1776* (Chapel Hill, N. C., 1947), pp. 154–155, 155–156.

[64] "Letters Written by Mr. Moray, A Minister . . . Feb. 1, 1665," *William and Mary College Quarterly*, 2d Ser., II (1922), 160.

[65] Smith, *Colonists in Bondage*, p. 180.

[66] Charles W. Baird, *History of the Huguenot Emigration to America* (New York, 1885), II, 175.

found in Virginia's early history. In comparison with other colonies, especially the northern ones, the lack of bigotry is, however, noteworthy. Conformists showed few signs of feeling that nominal conformists were alien to them; as a rule, conformists and nominal conformists did not look upon moderate nonconformists with noticeable antipathy. In Virginia so general and basic was Genevan influence, the question was really not so much one of Anglican versus Calvinist as of how far a man's Calvinism would lead him, within or without the Established Church.

3. *The Development of Congregationalism and Presbyterianism*

For some years the Puritan plantations along the south shore of the lower James River grew normally, with a general movement in the late 1630's toward the east, from Isle of Wight County to Nansemond, and later from Nansemond to Lower Norfolk County. Typical of the first shift eastward in the population were the acquisitions of the Bennett family: no longer satisfied with his Isle of Wight property, Richard Bennett in June, 1635, received a patent for two thousand acres on the east side of the Nansemond River, and within a few years three Bennetts—Richard, Philip, and Edward—had Nansemond County holdings totalling over ten thousand acres. On a lesser scale, the stories of other families show the same pattern.

But Isle of Wight men were not the only settlers in Nansemond. The second Daniel Gookin transported nearly fifty persons to the colony and received early in 1635 a land grant of two thousand five hundred acres northwest of the Nansemond River.[67] This was the Daniel Gookin who later was noted for his active life of service not only to Massachusetts Bay Colony but to the English Commonwealth,

[67] Gookin, *Daniel Gookin*, pp. 62, 66.

for he acted in 1655 as Cromwell's agent for the settling of Jamaica—one of his many services that showed his staunch Puritanism. His brother, Captain John Gookin, had his career cut short by death in 1643, but he, too, had secured land grants in Nansemond of thirteen hundred and fifty acres for his expenses in transporting settlers, as well as an additional 1641 grant of six hundred and forty acres in Lower Norfolk County, to the east again of Nansemond.[68] As there is no doubt about the ardent Puritanism of this second generation of Gookins who helped colonize Virginia, presumably many of the men and women that they brought over would be of the same way of thinking.

The church records of the whole southern Virginia area for the first half century of settlement are extremely incomplete. After the death or departure of the first ministers who came over in the days of the Company's rule, the Reverend John Rosier preached in Isle of Wight County; he was there as early as 1637 and he apparently left to go to Accomack early in 1641.[69] From the locales in which he chose to exercise, and his conduct in his Eastern Shore parish, he is judged to have had Puritan tendencies. Even less is known about the Reverend Thomas Faulkner and a Mr. Osier (or Otis), both of whom were preaching in the county in the early 1640's.

Somewhat more detailed is the story of the church in Nansemond County, the section along the lower James to which so many of the Puritans from Isle of Wight County moved. The Reverend Thomas Bennett seems to have been the only minister for some years, but by 1642 many settlers felt a need for more pastoral care. Consequently, a petition signed by some seventy-odd inhabitants, including

[68] *Ibid.*, pp. 66, 70, 75.

[69] "Case of Anthony Penton (Robinson Ms.—Va. Hist. Soc.)," *Virginia Magazine of History*, V (1897–98), 127.

Richard Bennett, Daniel Gookin, and John Hill, was sent to New England by the hand of Mr. Philip Bennett. The Massachusetts churches had a little difficulty in deciding who should answer this call; naturally, congregations were unwilling to part with their ministers, and the latter could see small reason to leave a life of active and profitable pulpit service for the uncertainties of Virginia.

After some discussion, Mr. William Tompson of Braintree and Mr. John Knowles (or Knolles) of Watertown agreed to go to the James River settlers, and their churches, each having two pastors, consented to spare them. They sailed on October 7, 1642, with Mr. Thomas James of New Haven joining them for what proved to be an exceptionally long passage of eleven weeks.[70] By New England standards for their clergy, these three ministers were not especially outstanding or influential; nevertheless, each in his own way was a worthy man, typical of New England Puritanism and its variations. All three were English university men, experienced preachers who had held pastorates for some years and who returned from Virginia to continue in their calling both in New England and England.

One of the three, Tompson,[71] an Oxford graduate and a collaborator with the better-known Richard Mather on several books, was an extraordinarily humble man who later in life was afflicted with melancholia. Despite his tendency to belittle himself and his pious efforts to serve God, he possessed at this period of his life the strength to be, in the words of a contemporary, "abounding in zeal for the propagation of the Gospel." He had served at Agamenticus (York), Maine, before going to Braintree in 1639; in both

[70] John Winthrop, *History of New England*, edited by James Kendall Hosmer (New York, 1908), II, 73–74, 94–95.

[71] *Winthrop Papers* (Boston, 1929–47), IV, 32; Edward Johnson, *Wonder-Working Providence of Sion's Savior in New England* (New York, 1910), p. 198; Winthrop, *History of New England* (Hosmer ed.), I, 325.

pastorates he had been successful, Governor Winthrop speaking of him as an "instrument for much good" who was both "very holy" and "a very gracious, sincere man."

The second of the trio, Knowles,[72] was a Magdalene College man who had been a fellow of St. Catherine's College, Cambridge, and a lecturer at Colchester, Essex. After getting into difficulties with Archbishop Laud in 1637, Knowles came to New England, where his character and scholarship were well appreciated by his fellow Puritans, for he was "a godly man and a prime scholar," according to Winthrop. The Watertown church, which he had been serving since 1639, was of a more extreme type of Congregationalism or Independency than most of the Massachusetts churches; this characteristic is shown by the refusal of the Watertown elders to consult with the representatives of other churches before taking action concerning their organization, a failure which Governor Winthrop aggrievedly noted. Nevertheless, although the Watertown church's Congregationalism was a little more radical than that of most of the New England churches, Knowles so held the respect of his contemporaries that in later years, while he was living in England, he was proposed for the presidency of Harvard College.

Of the three men who answered Nansemond's call, only James[73] had had a somewhat difficult career in New England. His record seems to show that he was a man of shifting, perhaps even developing, ideas—and one who did not always work happily with others. He had been educated at Emmanuel College, Cambridge, to which so many of his fellow Puritans flocked. As John Harvard's predecessor in the Charlestown pulpit, James did not manage to live in harmony with his congregation. "A very melancholy man,

[72] Winthrop, *History of New England* (Hosmer ed.), II, 17.

[73] *Ibid.*, I, 196; *Winthrop Papers*, IV, 89–90.

and full of causeless jealousies," in 1636 he was forced to leave. During the next few years he was with Roger Williams in Rhode Island, living in Providence but with some hopes of being called back to Massachusetts, to the Seekonk pulpit. By the summer of 1640 he had settled anew, this time in Connecticut; and now, after a brief two years, he offered himself for this new field of service in Virginia.

The stormy voyage from Narragansett Bay to the James River, with a number of near catastrophes, seemed a poor omen for this mission, but once safely in Nansemond, the three New Englanders found themselves very well received by the people. Their pleasure in the receptivity of Virginians to New England preaching was cut short, however; the political situation had changed since the invitation had been sent to them. Governor Berkeley was now in power, and the legislature had just passed another, stricter law demanding conformity to the Established Church. Tompson, Knowles, and James could not remain long under these adverse circumstances, but they did tarry for a few months into the late spring of 1643, preaching to the people in private houses, with every indication of success.

The history of Elizabeth River Parish in Lower Norfolk, the third strongly Puritan county along the south shore of the James, starts with the Reverend John Wilson,[74] who was preaching there as early as May of 1637. Unfortunately, only his struggle to collect the tithes due him has survived in the records—and in this difficulty he was meeting a practical problem common to many colonial preachers of his day, especially those in less prosperous districts. Wilson died before the summer of 1640, to be succeeded by a man of some note in his own day, the Reverend Thomas Harrison.[75]

[74] *Lower Norfolk County Antiquary* (Baltimore, 1897), I, 82, 84–85; Meade, *Old Churches, Ministers and Families of Virginia,* I, 271.

[75] *Calamy Revised*, edited by A. G. Matthews (Oxford, 1934), pp. 250–251; Lower Norfolk County Records, Orders, May 25, 1640, Virginia State Library; also printed in *Virginia Magazine of History*, XL (1932), 36–38; *Winthrop Papers*, V, 434–440.

This eloquent preacher had been born in England in 1616 and brought up in New England, according to Calamy, who offers no direct evidence for this interesting sidelight upon Harrison. More certainly, the latter was a Bachelor of Arts from Sidney College, Cambridge. In May, 1640, this preacher, soon to be famed for his gift in prayer and his flights of spiritual rhetoric, made an agreement to serve the people living along the Elizabeth River; on alternate Sundays he was to preach at Sewell Point and at a spot convenient for those living on the upper reaches of the river. For some years all apparently went smoothly, but in April, 1645, the church wardens brought charges that he was violating the law, both civil and canonical, inasmuch as he was not reading the Book of Common Prayer, he was not catechising on Sundays in the afternoon, and he was not administering the sacrament of Baptism according to the canons of the church. In the next few years Harrison considered migrating with his followers, but before making such a grave decision he consulted Governor Winthrop by letter. The Massachusetts governor and Harrison agreed that it would be better for the church to remain in Virginia. Thereupon, Harrison himself shifted his sphere of activity from Elizabeth River to Nansemond, where he was welcomed. Soon he was able to report to Winthrop that his church was growing. During these years Harrison felt that conditions would improve in Virginia as the changes taking place in England were reflected upon the colony; he was especially hopeful of the benefits to be gained from the 1647 Ordinance of Toleration passed in England and of the promised intercession by the Earl of Warwick in favor of these Virginia Puritans. Consequently, Harrison lingered in Virginia. (It is thought that Governor Berkeley, in the hope that such a brilliant preacher might be brought to conform, allowed him this leeway of three years before forcing his departure.)

In 1648, however, Harrison left for New England, where he was able to report his nonconformist group as having grown to one hundred and eighteen members, with a full one thousand more in Virginia of a like mind.[76] He also wanted to seek advice on a definite invitation that the church had had to leave Virginia and to settle in the Bahamas. Southern Puritans were being tempted to join island Puritans in a venture that promised to relieve them of all persecution. Captain William Sayle of Bermuda, later governor of the Carolinas, had secured English help for the establishment of a Puritan colony. This new venture was to be called Eleuthera and to be located on an island twenty-eight miles from San Salvador. Sayle, with a few English settlers, then sailed for Bermuda, where he picked up the other strong advocate of the plan, the Reverend Patrick Copland, now a man of eighty but still a militant crusader for Puritanism; with Copland went about sixty members of his church. All did not go well with the venture. Owing to the loss of one ship and a consequent shortness of provisions, Sayle was forced to seek help from sympathizers in Virginia. Upon the discovery there that the authorities were moving against the nonconformist ministers of the southern counties, these Bermuda Puritans asked their Virginia friends to join them in the development of Eleuthera. After hearing the story, the New England magistrates were quick to point out the weakness of the enterprise: even on the way to the new colony, Copland had not been able to control his followers, a few of whom had been near mutiny. What repelled the officials of the Massachusetts colony was, of course, that in Eleuthera there was to be toleration and its necessary corollary, complete separation of church and state. (Nevertheless, the judgment of the New Englanders about the

[76] Winthrop, *History of New England* (Savage ed.), II, 334; Johnson, *Wonder-Working Providence*, pp. 351–353.

practicality of the whole plan was quite right, for, despite charitable aid from Massachusetts, the project had to be abandoned after a brief trial.)[77]

Thus discouraged about the Eleutheran invitation, Harrison remained in Boston long enough to marry Governor Winthrop's niece; he then returned only briefly to Virginia in the winter of 1649. Despite his strong New England ties, the success of the Puritan party in England soon drew him there, and he became a very popular preacher in London and Cheshire before he left to serve as Henry Cromwell's chaplain in Dublin. Then came a few more years of success and prominence: Harrison was the most popular preacher in Ireland, if Jeremy Taylor's opinion is to be trusted, as well as the best paid. Dublin University made him a Doctor of Divinity in 1658, the same year that marked the appearance of his book of devotions, *Topica Sacra*, dedicated to Henry Cromwell; another publication of note was his funeral sermon for Oliver Cromwell, *Threni Hibernici*, in which all Ireland is poetically (but perhaps not too accurately) pictured as weeping for the dead dictator. The death of Cromwell and the subsequent changes in the English government brought altered fortunes to Harrison. After he was silenced in 1662, he returned to England to hold conventicles and to preach. In trouble with the authorities because of his activities, he finally went back again to Dublin, to preach privately until his death in 1682.[78]

Nansemond, both vestry and ordinary parishioners, had welcomed Harrison; after his forced exile in 1648, the church loyally petitioned to the Council of State in England to have him reinstated. On the other hand, there is good reason to believe that Harrison was too extreme in his Puritan-

[77] Winthrop, *History of New England* (Savage ed.), II, 334–336; Edward D. Neill, "A Chapter of American Church History," *New Englander*, July, 1879.

[78] Francis Burton Harrison, "The Reverend Thomas Harrison, Berkeley's 'Chaplain'," *Virginia Magazine of History*, LIII (1945), 302–310.

ism, too ready to think of his church only as a fellowship of divinely elected saints, for his Elizabeth River vestry to be pleased with him, despite the fact that he seemingly had enthusiastic followers in this Lower Norfolk County section. After his departure this vestry not only added to their number the church wardens that had brought charges against him in 1645, but they also wrote of their late pastor as "deserting" his ministerial office.

Nevertheless, although they might not fully approve of Harrison, the Elizabeth River vestry included a number of Puritans. The Lloyds, Cornelius and Edward, as well as other prominent members, were much more loyal to the Reverend William Durand,[79] who was preaching to the people of Lower Norfolk County in the spring of 1648. An Oxford man, Durand had come under the influence of a noted Puritan preacher, the Reverend John Davenport of New Haven, when the latter was Vicar of St. Stephen's in London, before his New England days. Evidently Durand's more moderate Calvinism better suited the vestry, for when he was arrested for his activities, his friends among the members of that body rescued him. He escaped to Maryland, where he soon could be instrumental in the removal of his former neighbors and parishioners to the haven of the Severn River.

By the 1640's conditions in Virginia for nonconformists approached a crisis. After having been quietly accepted for a good many years, they were now to be forced to conform—or to leave. By an act of 1643, the law was that "the littargie of the Church of England for the administration of the word and sacrament be duely performed according to the booke of Common prayer"; all nonconformists were to

[79] *Lower Norfolk County Antiquary*, II, 14–15, 61–62; Edward D. Neill, *The Founders of Maryland as portrayed in Manuscripts, Provincial Records and Early Documents* (Albany, 1876), pp. 116–117, 142.

depart "with all conveniencie." An act of 1647 attacked from a different angle the problem of getting the ministers (and subsequently their followers) to leave. If any ministers were reported as not reading the Book of Common Prayer (as several had been), their parishioners need not pay their tithes.[80] The idea behind this legislation was obvious: Once the support both of the less ardent members of the congregation as well as of the more parsimonious residents of the parish should be withdrawn, such ministers would be forced to leave.

Oddly enough, these Virginia anti-Puritan measures came at a time when Puritan factions in England were rising to control in the national government. Perhaps, then, Virginia's sudden change of heart about a heretofore welcome part of the population arose from political motives rather than from religious fervor. Governor Berkeley was a staunch royalist, determined that Virginia should remain loyal to the king. What was more natural than to try to get rid of potential, if not actual, members of the opposition? In fact, Berkeley was such a determined advocate of the Stuart cause that the execution of Charles I only whetted his own loyalty and made him the more eager to keep Virginia in line, for among the acts that he had passed in 1649 was one declaring that anyone defending the execution of the late king would be adjudged an accessory *post factum* and prosecuted accordingly.[81] In these efforts to get rid of the Puritan element in Virginia, Berkeley and the rest of the royalist party were partially successful. Deprived of their ministers by the acts of 1643 and 1647, the Puritans in Nansemond and the neighboring counties were naturally aware of the advisability of resettling themselves where they would have greater freedom. Even though many

[80] Hening, *The Statutes at Large*, I, 240, 277, 341–342.
[81] *Ibid.*, I, 359.

were reluctant to leave Virginia, especially at a time when they might hope for aid from England, Harrison's repeated consultations with Governor Winthrop, both by letter and in person, clearly indicate that after 1643 the pros and cons of emigration began to be seriously considered by the Virginia Puritan leaders. Soon a more promising refuge than Eleuthera was opened to them.

If the 1640's made Virginia more intolerant of her Puritan element, these years of internal strife in England had brought very different changes to Maryland. Lord Baltimore, seemingly a better politician than Berkeley, quickly saw that with the Puritan party in control in England, a colony such as his, in which all the prominent officials were Roman Catholics, would be in a very embarrassing, not to say hazardous, position, one even worse than Virginia's, stubbornly royalist and Church of England though Berkeley might be. The palatine thereupon appointed as governor of Maryland William Stone, a Protestant from Virginia's Eastern Shore and a man who would be fairly satisfactory to any Puritan element in England or America. Baltimore was always eager for settlers, regardless of their religious beliefs; whether his attempts in the 1640's to secure new colonists were motivated by true tolerance or by his realization of the good political move he was making, remains debatable. Certainly in 1643 he sent an emissary to New England to inquire if some of the people would not prefer Maryland's warmer climate to the cold northern winters. And now, in 1648, among the conditions made when Stone became governor was one that he bring into the colony five hundred settlers.[82] It cannot be proved that the Nansemond Puritans were the group or the only group Stone had in mind, but they later claimed—and there is no reason to

[82] Daniel R. Randall, *A Puritan Colony in Maryland* (Baltimore, 1886), in Johns Hopkins University, *Studies*, IV, No. 6, p. 17.

doubt their assertion—that they had been "invited and encouraged" by Captain Stone to remove into Maryland and that they had been promised liberty of conscience if they should do so.[83]

During 1649 about three hundred nonconformists migrated north from Virginia to the Severn River. Berkeley's 1649 attempt to control their political judgment about the death of the king may well have been the last spur to make some of the more reluctant Puritans join the exodus that was going on, for politics and religion were inseparable in the seventeenth century. Figures are very uncertain; that three hundred may have left is estimated from the fact that seventy-eight Puritan dwellers on the Severn signed a petition[84] a few years after their arrival in their new home, which they called Providence. As these signers were property holders and heads of families, and as presumably not all of these signed the petition, it is judged that three or four times their number is a conservative estimate of those that left Virginia. Most of this migration was from the southeastern part of the colony, but not all, as some Virginians from other counties seem to have joined in the venture.

By no means did all Puritans leave the territory south of the lower James. How many refused to re-establish themselves in Maryland is difficult to ascertain, but if Harrison's estimate of his Nansemond followers and of Virginia's potential nonconformists is to be at all accepted, then more Puritans stayed than emigrated. Certainly the southeastern section of Virginia still showed unmistakable indications of Puritanism during the decade following this removal of part of the population, even though a good

[83] *Virginia and Maryland, Or, The Lord Baltamore's printed Case, uncased and answered* (1655), pp. 28–29, in Peter Force, ed., *Tracts and Other Papers*, II, No. 9.

[84] *Ibid.*, pp. 29–31.

many royalist refugees moved into these counties in the 1650's. It is clear, for instance, that a number of prominent Puritans kept their plantations along the James. Although Richard Bennett, soon to be governor of Virginia, had much to do with the migration and stayed for some months in the new settlement on the Severn, he retained his Virginia citizenship and some of his property. Nor was Bennett the only man from Nansemond and the neighboring counties to hold high office during the Puritan regime in the 1650's. The two speakers of the assemblies held under the Commonwealth also were Nansemond men: Edward Major was followed in office by Colonel Thomas Dewes (or Dew). Members of other prominent Puritan families also remained in Virginia. John Hill, for example, who had signed the 1642 petition to New England asking that ministers be sent, stayed in Isle of Wight County to become in the 1660's sheriff and diligent prosecutor of the Quakers. Although Edward Lloyd went to Maryland and held an important office there in the Puritan settlement, his brother Cornelius did not join him but served as burgess from Lower Norfolk in 1652–1653.[85]

Although information about many parishes is meager, there are also signs that even after the emigration of 1649 the churches in these southern counties continued to prefer ministers who were somewhat Calvinistic. Unfortunately, little is known about some of the men who served in this area. By way of example, the Reverend Robert Bracewell, an Oxford Bachelor of Arts, is thought to have been a Calvinist, on the ground that he was elected to the House of Burgesses in 1653, a year when Isle of Wight County might very well choose a man who would be acceptable to the Puritan authorities then in control; he was, however,

[85] John Bennett Boddie, *Seventeenth Century Isle of Wight County* (Chicago, 1938), pp. 114–115.

refused his seat on the ground that he was a clergyman.[86] His family connections, too, were somewhat Puritan, but little can be determined about Bracewell's own beliefs.

In contrast to the paucity of information about Isle of Wight and Nansemond churches, a little more is known about affairs in Lower Norfolk after 1649. Here the Reverend Sampson Calvert served in the 1650's. He was chosen unanimously by the Elizabeth River parishioners, but disappointed them by his faulty private life. In 1655 a number of the more active Puritans in the county sent another appeal to New England for a minister that would be agreeable to their ideas. Negotiations were carried on in 1656 with the Reverend John Moore,[87] an unordained minister who was then serving in his second Long Island pastorate. A few years earlier, about 1651, he had preached in Hempstead, which, like most English towns on Long Island, had been settled by New Englanders with Presbyterian leanings. Following his Hempstead stay, he went to Middelburg (after some years to be better known as Newtown). This region had lately received an influx of families from Connecticut and Massachusetts. Although opinion in Middelburg was apt to be divided on church matters as there were Congregational and Presbyterian factions active, Moore did not lack devoted followers who persuaded him to stay for the rest of his brief life.

This attempt to secure Moore's services for a southern pastorate took place during the days of Cromwell and Virginia's Puritan regime, when parishes were managing their own affairs. After the Restoration and the statutes of 1662, Puritan vestries for some years had to be more cau-

[86] Hening, *Statutes*, I, 372.

[87] James Romeyne Brodhead, *History of the State of New York, First Period 1609–1664* (New York, 1859), p. 690; Beatrice Schultz Marshall, *Colonial Hempstead* (Lynbrook, New York, 1937), p. 179; James Riker, *The Annals of Newtown, in Queens County, New York* (New York, 1852), pp. 40, 45–46, 49.

tious about whom they engaged, but one more nonconformist may have been heard in Virginia's southern plantations during the 1660's and 1670's. The story of the Reverend Morgan Jones is much confused, simply because this Welshman shared his name with too many other men. (There were nine of the name at Oxford within a fairly brief period; two were preaching at the same time in the Swansea district in Wales; at least four, none of whom seems to have been the minister, came to Virginia between 1639 and 1655; there were at least two—including the minister—in New England in the late 1670's.) The Reverend Morgan Jones[88] who figures briefly in Virginia history was a disciple of the Reverend John Myles, an Antipaedobaptist with Presbyterian leanings; presumably Jones was of the same mind. In 1649 Myles founded an Antipaedobaptist church in Wales in which Jones acted as his assistant; there was another of the same name preaching in the same parish, and this other Morgan Jones was an unlettered man. Unfortunately, Calamy in writing of the Welsh nonconformists confused the two and so maligned the scholarship of the one who is supposed to have been an Oxford graduate and a learned man in the eyes of Welsh commentators. Less jumbled is the tale of Myles, who came to New England with part of his church, settled at Rehoboth in 1663 but was forced to leave; he then founded at Swansea the first Baptist church in Massachusetts.

There is no evidence that Jones was with Myles in his New England venture or came over to join him; on the con-

[88] Edmund Calamy, *An Account of the Ministers, . . . Ejected or Silenced after the Restoration in 1660* (London, 1713), II, 732; Thomas Rees, *History of Protestant Nonconformity in Wales, from its Rise* (London, 1861), pp. 130–132, 154; Thomas Richards, *A History of the Puritan Movement in Wales . . . 1639–1653* (London, 1920), pp. 171, 207; Riker, *Annals of Newtown*, pp. 100–106, 114; *cf.* Clayton Torrence, *Old Somerset on the Eastern Shore of Maryland* (Richmond, 1935), pp. 516–517; Cotton Mather, *Magnalia Christi Americana* (Boston, 1820), II, 469–470; Robert Bolton, *The History of the . . . County of Westchester, from Its First Settlement* (New York, 1881), I, 315.

trary, Myles is supposed to have entrusted the remaining remnant of his Welsh congregation to two of his followers, one of whom was Jones. Nevertheless, according to Jones's own statement, in the spring of 1669 he was serving as chaplain to Major-General Bennett, former governor of Virginia, then in command of the colony's militia. Jones's story, as he told it later in life, was that in that year he accompanied an expedition sent from Virginia to Port Royal, South Carolina, at the time that Captain Sayle was being sent from England to act as governor of the colony. Unhappy at the stringencies of life in the new settlement, the chaplain left his post to make his way back to Virginia, but was captured by the Tuscarora Indians. Perhaps to salve his conscience, he diligently preached to these savages three times a week—in English. After four months of this, the Indians permitted him to continue on his way.

How long he was in Virginia before the 1669 expedition, how long afterwards, remain unknown. But with Bennett's plantations to the south of the James, it would not be surprising if his chaplain occasionally was to be heard there, in addition to any other duties he may have had. Jones's later career was less exciting than his Indian captivity, but he continued to serve in a number of notedly Puritan churches scattered through the colonies. By the late 1670's he was in Somerset County, Maryland; sometime between 1678 and 1680 he tried out for the Brainford, Connecticut, pulpit, which he did not get, much to Cotton Mather's delight, for this good New Englander had violent objections to Jones's religious beliefs. From 1680 to his death about 1692 Jones served various nonconformist churches around New York, in Westchester County, on Staten Island, and at Newtown, Long Island (where Francis Doughty and John Moore had been his predecessors).

Men like Moore and Morgan Jones showed Presbyterian

tendencies in their beliefs, and the fact that pulpits were opened to them is indicative of the position, at the time, of Virginia's nonconformist churches in her southeastern counties. Moreover, by the 1680's one part of southern Virginia had gone beyond this tincturing of Presbyterianism, and a Presbyterian church was established. The Reverend Francis Makemie,[89] a minister from the Presbytery of Laggan, Ireland, in 1684 quite accidentally reached Elizabeth River when contrary winds blew his ship off her course between North Carolina and Ashley River. Writing to Boston to the Reverend Increase Mather, whom he had not met but whom he knew to be interested in other dissenting churches, Makemie commented that the good people of Lynnhaven Parish had had an Irish dissenting minister who died in August of 1683; by "Irish" he seemingly meant Scotch-Irish, a common confusion of terminology in his day. This man for whom Lynnhaven was grieving probably was the Reverend James Porter, who had been preaching there since 1678 and who died in 1683. Because his would-be parishioners were so eager for his services, Makemie abandoned his Carolina trip to remain with them from the winter of 1683 through the summer of 1685, perhaps a year or so longer. With his acceptance of this charge on the Eastern Branch of the Elizabeth River, American Presbyterianism is considered to have assumed organic life.

The "father of the Presbyterian church in America," as Makemie has been dubbed by church historians, led a very active life, with the dual interests of trade and religion. This Elizabeth River area was but one of Makemie's fields of service, for he also diligently spread Presbyterianism in Barbados and on the Eastern Shore of Maryland and Virginia; toward the end of his life he was one of the chief

[89] Charles Augustus Briggs, *American Presbyterianism: Its Origins and Early History* (New York, 1885), Appendix, p. xlvi.

organizers of the first American Presbytery, which met in Philadelphia in 1706. He was succeeded at Lynnhaven by another Scotch-Irish Presbyterian from County Donegal, Ireland, the Reverend Josiah Mackie[90] (or McKee), who was there before 1692, when he subscribed to the Articles of Religion with certain exceptions then allowed dissenting ministers; at the same time he took the oath of fidelity. During his busy and long pastorate, he arranged to serve his widely-spread parishioners by preaching at no fewer than four spots: Tanner's Creek, Eastern Branch, Western Branch, and Southern Branch. Mackie, like his predecessor, supplemented his ministerial income by engaging in trade, but this forced attention to practical affairs did not cause the two men to lose their scholarly interests or their missionary zeal.

The decided Puritanism of southeastern Virginia, ranging as it did from nominal conformism to attempted Independency or Congregationalism and then to Presbyterianism, is paralleled in a lesser degree by the religious history of the Virginia Eastern Shore, which was first called Accomack, then in 1642 Northampton, and then in 1662 divided into the two counties of Accomack and Northampton. At least three ministers held pastorates at different times in their lives in the plantations south of the lower James and on the Eastern Shore; and Northampton, like Nansemond and Lower Norfolk counties, welcomed nonconforming ministers from New England. Perhaps because of the remoteness of its situation, perhaps because its Puritan features were less pronounced, prior to 1676 the Eastern Shore church met with less interference from the colonial authorities than did the parishes in and around Nansemond. Nevertheless, driven by the hope of economic betterment

[90] Isaac W. K. Handy, "Josias Mackie," in William B. Sprague, ed., *Annals of the American Pulpit* (New York, 1857–1869), III, 5–9.

as well as by the promise of religious freedom, a number of Eastern Shore families migrated up the peninsula to Maryland. This trend northward was apparent around 1637 and reached a distinct peak in 1648[91] when Captain William Stone, a resident of Northampton for many years, was made governor of Baltimore's colony. Despite the fact that the Virginia end of the Eastern Shore in this way lost a number of Puritans, there is multiple evidence of a tendency on the part of many of those remaining to conform only nominally and whenever possible to secure ministers who were Calvinists.

As in the case of the clergy serving in more southern plantations, distressingly little is known about many of the Eastern Shore ministers. The early records for this part of the colony also are often suggestive but hardly conclusive about both local parish problems and the larger issue of general conformity or nonconformity. Nevertheless, some of the men occupying Eastern Shore pulpits occasionally in one way or another show their Genevan spirit or their nonconformist connections; sometimes, too, a man's previous or subsequent field of service is indicative. Under the Virginia company the Reverend Francis Bolton, for instance, was preaching on the Eastern Shore before he went to Bennett's Puritan plantation, Warrasquoyak, in 1623. The next known Accomack minister, the Reverend William Cotton,[92] left a much more definite imprint of his ministerial activities and also of his personality. He had, moreover, some ten years of service in this part of the colony, for he was in Hungars Parish as early as 1632 and he died before the fall of 1642, when his widow remarried.

Whatever may be surmised about Cotton and his pastoral activities, his Accomack days certainly were not dull,

[91] Wise, *Ye Kingdome of Accawmacke*, pp. 93–94.

[92] Accomack Records, Transcripts, Virginia State Library, pp. 11–12, 23, 25, 39, 43, 44, 62, 74, *et al.;* Nell Marion Nugent (compiler), *Cavaliers and Pioneers: Abstracts of Virginia Land Patents and Grants 1623–1800* (Richmond, 1934), pp. 59, 101.

for the county records are filled with his difficulties. One parishioner he had punished for swearing, another for not treating his cloth with due respect. He frequently had trouble in collecting his tithes and other debts. At one time there even seems to have been a rival minister in Accomack, the Reverend William Cawnoe or Cainhoe, who may have come across the bay on a temporary trial visit. On the other hand, although Cotton did not pass his Eastern Shore years basking in the serene appreciation of his congregation, he occasionally triumphed. The authorities did back him in his various disagreements with his parishioners. More important, in 1635 orders came from James City that Accomack was to provide its ministers with glebe land and parsonage, and the church itself was to be organized with a vestry. Notwithstanding these known details about his career, there is really nothing in Cotton's record to indicate that he was as Calvinistic as the men who preceded and followed him in the same pulpit. Despite his name, he does not seem to have been related at all closely to the noted Puritan Cottons of Massachusetts. But this Virginia Cotton was not without Puritan connections: one of his vestrymen, his closest neighbor, and his brother-in-law was William Stone, later governor of Maryland; Stone in turn had close family connections with the Reverend Francis Doughty, very certainly a nonconformist. And after Cotton's death, his widow married in succession two noted nonconformists, Nathaniel Eaton, the deposed head of Harvard College, and the previously mentioned Francis Doughty.[93]

Cotton was followed in Hungars Parish by a much more popular man, the Reverend John Rosier.[94] Like Bolton,

[93] Mrs. P. W. Hiden, "Three Rectors of Hungar's Parish and their Wife," *William and Mary College Quarterly*, 2nd Ser., XIX (1939), 38–41.

[94] Accomack Records, Transcripts, pp. 93, 211, 238, 297, 353, 360, 379, 382, 386, 258; Fleet, *Northumberland County Records*, 1652–1655, pp. 16, 22, 69; Nugent, *Cavaliers and Pioneers*, p. 418.

Rosier had served Bennett's plantation at Warrasquoyak; he was in Nansemond in the late 1630's, but around 1640 was in York, apparently only briefly, for by May of 1641 he was on the Eastern Shore. Curiously enough, he later moved to Northumberland, getting there by 1650 and succeeding Bolton when the latter died in 1652. Rosier was followed in turn by a Scotsman, the Reverend David Lindsay, and went on to Westmoreland. During his Northampton days Rosier was indeed trusted by his neighbors, for he frequently served the community as arbitrator in various law suits that came up and as a witness (and probably writer) of a number of wills. Besides his previous service in Nansemond County, Rosier's Puritan tendency is most clearly indicated by his acceptance of Nathaniel Eaton as a fellow worker and fellow preacher.

If ever there was a Puritan anomaly, the Reverend Nathaniel Eaton[95] was one. For many years, undoubtedly, he had professed to be a Calvinist who believed in the Congregational way of church government; otherwise, the New England clergy would not have trusted him to train their young men to be the next generation of preachers. That he was a brilliant scholar even his bitterest New England critics—no mean students themselves—admitted. His academic record was indeed satisfactory, especially from a Puritan point of view: He attended Trinity College, Cambridge, for about three years, but did not receive a degree; he then went to the University of Franeker where he studied under the revered Dr. William Ames and published a very well received tract on sabbatarianism; after his Virginia stay, he took the degrees of Doctor of Philosophy and Doctor of Medicine at Padua. His family was more than respectable, for his father was a vicar, his brother

[95] Samuel Eliot Morison, *The Founding of Harvard College* (Cambridge, Mass., 1935), pp. 228–240; Accomack Records, Transcripts, pp. 26–27, 213, 282; Nugent, *Cavaliers and Pioneers*, p. 135.

Theophilus a prosperous Puritan merchant and the governor of the New Haven colony, his brother Samuel a Congregational minister and a prolific writer on religious topics. But Nathaniel Eaton repeatedly got into trouble. Honored as the first head of Harvard College, he sadistically abused his young students and also managed the infant college's finances so oddly that he fled to Virginia rather than face an inquiry. The good men of Hungars Parish who welcomed this newcomer and made him their minister's assistant had no way of knowing Eaton's late disgrace or that he had fled owing his creditors over one thousand pounds.

The Eastern Shore career of this outcast from New England's wrath was comparatively uneventful; he arrived in Accomack late in 1639 and was accepted by the most prominent men of the county. His income as clerk of the parish and assistant to Rosier was necessarily small, for the parish could not afford to pay Rosier his full salary and to pay Eaton, but the latter in a few years found a way to better his position. As his first wife and most of his children were drowned when they attempted to follow him to Virginia, Eaton was soon free to marry the widow of the Reverend John Cotton and to take over the latter's estate. By 1647, however, Eaton was again in debt and once more forced to flee, this time to England. He left behind his Virginia wife, Cotton's widow, and apparently did not communicate with her again, for she, believing her second husband to be dead long before he was, subsequently married a third Eastern Shore minister, the Reverend Francis Doughty. Eaton in his later career followed the same pattern of getting into debt, rescuing himself in some way, having an honorable position for a few years (he conformed in 1662), and then getting into difficulties once more. He died in prison in 1674.

Little is known about the men who followed Rosier and Eaton at Hungars Parish, but in the late 1640's and the

1650's three ministers served there in succession, the Reverend Thomas Palmer, the Reverend John Armourier, and the Reverend Thomas Higby. It was while the last of these was in office that the pulpit was opened to the Reverend Samuel Drisius,[96] who in 1653 served as Governor Stuyvesant's emissary to the Eastern Shore. Intercolonial traffic had been disrupted by the 1652 Dutch-English war, and now it was hoped that friendly relations between New Amsterdam and Northampton could be resumed. Drisius, who before coming to America had had a Dutch congregation in England, was probably chosen for this trade mission because of his linguistic ability as he could preach in French and English as well as his native Dutch. Before and after his brief Virginia trip he served as assistant to the elderly Domine Johannes Megapolensis of the Dutch Reform Church in New Amsterdam, but later in life Drisius was at Flushing, Long Island, and also for some time helped a French congregation on Staten Island by coming to them periodically. As a clergyman of the Reformed Church of Holland he unquestionably was a strong Calvinist who bebelieved in a modified Presbyterian form of church government. That Higby—and presumably his congregation—wanted this man with his church connections to preach at Hungars is indicative of the feeling of the parish; indeed, it is a forecast of their next choice of a minister.

The Reverend Francis Doughty,[97] the following incum-

[96] Brodhead, *History of the State of New York*, I, 561; Mrs. Schuyler Van Renssalaer, *History of the City of New York in the Seventeenth Century* (New York, 1909), I, 327; Joel Munsell, *The Annals of Albany* (Albany, 1856), VII, 93.

[97] Francis Baylies, *An Historical Memoir of the Colony of New Plymouth*, ed. by Samuel G. Drake (Boston, 1866), I, 286, 289–290; Thomas Lechford, *Plain Dealing or News from New England*, ed. by J. Hammond Trumbull (Boston, 1867), pp. 90–91; *Winthrop Papers*, I, 308; E. B. O'Callaghan, *History of New Netherland* (New York, 1848), I, 257–258; Riker, *Annals of Newtown*, 17–27; "Rev. Francis Doughty (Rappahannock County Records)," *Virginia Magazine of History*, V (1897–98), 288–90; Brodhead, *History of the State of New York*, I, 666; Louis Dow Scisco, "The First Church in Charles County," *Maryland Historical Magazine*, XXIII (1928), 155–162; Old Rappahannock County Records, Virginia State Library, II, 195; III, 21, 40, 51, 61–66, 119, 195.

bent of Hungars Parish, had a turbulent career from the very beginning of his search for freedom of worship in the New World, for he was a man of strong convictions which he never attempted to conceal. On arriving from England, where he had been silenced in 1636, he apparently went first to Dorchester, Massachusetts, but there is no record of his preaching or of his taking active part in the town's life. By 1638, however, he joined a group who put up the money to establish the town of Cohannet or Taunton, within the boundaries of Plymouth Colony. Here he met with his first disappointment in America: when the church was gathered with a score or so of men within the Covenant (the Elect) as the body of the church, Doughty protested. Rising in meeting to voice his objection to the course that was being followed, he put his opposition on the ground that the children of all baptized parents should be baptized, not only the children of the Elect; the church was being gathered with a false tenet.

In this controversy Doughty was ahead of his fellow New England theologians, for he was really arguing for what became known in the 1660's as the Half-Way Covenant: Children of unregenerate members of the church (that is, children of those parents that did not feel that they were definitely of the Elect) should in turn become church members that were not in full communion. Only the Elect, those who had experienced conversion, could partake in the Lord's Supper; on the other hand, children of other well-intentioned members of the church should be baptized and be considered in partial communion. This much disputed compromise about church membership in a large measure broke down the walls around the communion of the saints; considered from another point of view, it undoubtedly extended the influence of the New England churches. When it is recalled with what bitter opposition the Half-Way

Covenant was received some twenty years later, the Taunton reaction to Doughty's public protest seems obvious.

The Plymouth Colony magistrates rapidly decided against Doughty as a disturber of the peace, and he was forced to move on, losing at least part of his investment. He was in Rhode Island briefly in 1641, but soon arranged with the Dutch that a thirteen-thousand-acre tract on Long Island be given to him and a number of other New Englanders who were willing to join in this colonization project. By 1642 Mespat was beginning to take form as a settlement, but an Indian uprising the following year drove the people to seek some measure of safety on Manhattan Island. Here Doughty remained for a few years, supported in part by his own English parishioners, in part by the generosity of the Dutch Reformed Church. Then another attempt was made to establish Mespat as a town, but this time Doughty and his fellow settlers disagreed over the control of the land. The Dutch authorities agreed with the majority. Doughty meanwhile had accepted a pastorate at Flushing, but he continued to feel that not only had he been robbed but that the New Amsterdam authorities were most unjust in refusing to allow him to appeal his case to a higher court in Holland.

Perhaps because of this lingering resentment on his part, not to mention the unfriendly attitude of the Dutch governor, by 1655 Doughty had left Dutch jurisdiction and was on the Eastern Shore. There is no reason to question that his selection of this field of service was influenced by the fact that his brother-in-law was William Stone, long a Northampton resident before becoming governor of Maryland. Doughty stayed on the Eastern Shore for four years, preaching at Hungars Parish. It is significant that these were years during which there would be no protest from the authorities at Jamestown, for these, too, were Puritan and

were following the policy of allowing parishes to manage their own affairs. By 1659 Doughty had left Virginia for Maryland; by the fall of that year he was at Patuxent, Maryland. Again his choice of residence may have been influenced by the Stone connection, for the Maryland governor owned property here. This time he stayed only a brief two years before looking for a new field.

Moving back to Virginia, Doughty now established himself and some of his family in Old Rappahannock County. By 1665 his ministry at Settingbourne Parish was not running smoothly, and by 1669 the forces opposing him were able to make him move on once more. The charges were that he was a nonconformist, that he barred certain members of his congregation from receiving the holy sacrament, and that he impeached the supremacy of his sacred majesty, the king. In other words, Doughty was still a militant Puritan, rejecting the Book of Common Prayer and the ritual of the Anglican Church, believing only the Elect—God's chosen—to be worthy of partaking in the Lord's Supper. Even the charge of disloyalty to the king probably meant not that Doughty was a die-hard Cromwellian, but that he was preaching the old Puritan doctrine that the pomp of earthly kings is nothing in comparison to the power and the glory of God. Perhaps he may even have been preaching the Puritan theory that public officials should be chosen—and controlled—by the Elect, for he is thought to have been silenced, some thirty years earlier in his career, for just such a radical statement. This time Doughty went to the island colonies, where he had hopes his health would improve.

Doughty's Presbyterian tendencies have induced church historians to consider him the "apostle of Presbyterianism" in Virginia. Much less is known about the beliefs of his two successors at Hungars Parish, the Reverend John Rodgers

and the Reverend David Richardson, but there is no doubt that the latter was not episcopally ordained. Just what form his dissent took is uncertain, but his later career in Maryland seems to suggest that he, too, may be considered Presbyterian. Although Richardson had been in Hungars Parish a number of years previously, Governor Berkeley evidently was not aware until 1676 that the church was harboring a dissenter. Then, when the royal governor and his party took refuge on the Eastern Shore during Bacon's Rebellion, the disobedience of the parish was discovered. Under pressure, the vestry accepted the Reverend Isaac Key, who was "well-known" to Berkeley, in Richardson's stead;[98] the latter moved out of Virginia, north to Somerset County, Maryland, where he died in 1696.

It was not long after Richardson's forced departure that the Reverend Francis Makemie[99] established himself in the very northern part of Accomack County, near the Maryland border, but most of Makemie's influence in this area was felt in the first years of the eighteenth century. He had come over from Ireland by way of Barbados around 1683, with an invitation to settle in Maryland; nevertheless, he spent several years at Elizabeth River before making his home on the Eastern Shore. He was in Accomack by the end of 1687 and soon married the daughter of a wealthy merchant, but Makemie's trade and missionary interests kept him from uninterrupted service there. In 1691 he was in London; in 1692 he was in Philadelphia. After this trip he spent a number of years in Barbados, not returning to Virginia until the fall of 1698. In August of the following year he was licensed to preach under Virginia's new toler-

[98] Susie May Ames, *Studies of the Virginia Eastern Shore in the Seventeenth Century* (Richmond, 1940), p. 235; Torrence, *Old Somerset*, pp. 126–128, 517.

[99] Briggs, *American Presbyterianism*, pp. 115–120; Henry James Ford, *The Scotch Irish in America* (Princeton, N. J., 1915), pp. 176–178; Torrence, *Old Somerset*, pp. 216–220; *cf.* Littleton P. Bowen, *The Days of Makemie* (Philadelphia, 1885).

ance act; and, until his death in 1708, he preached intermittently around Snow Hill in Maryland and in the northern part of Accomack County, where he maintained a home at Matchatank. Despite his leaving Virginia for frequent trips, including one famous one to New York where he ran into trouble with the law for preaching without the permission of the local authorities, Makemie built up considerable following on the Eastern Shore. Many fell away after his death, but Makemie certainly prepared this section for the later Presbyterianism of the 1730's.

4. *The Society of Friends*

There were, then, in seventeenth-century Virginia a number of sections where nonconformity ranged from nominal acceptance of the ritual and doctrine of the Church of England—but with a constant inclination toward reforming the church on Genevan principles—to the more occasional Independency parallel to the position of the New England and Long Island churches. Early nonconformist churches in Virginia were sometimes of a Congregationalist type, sometimes nearer to Presbyterianism, but by the last years of the century most of the colony's more conservative dissenters were Presbyterians. Despite the encouragement that the 1650's and a politically Puritan regime gave to Puritanism in this, its moderate development, by the end of that decade a far more radical type of dissent had claimed a large part of the nonconformist population. New England (with the exception of Rhode Island) fought a bitter battle against the Quakers; Virginia, on the other hand, after expressing some natural opposition to a new sect, soon accepted the Friends. Even this early opposition did not seem to be based on religious grounds *per se* as much as on the practical problems raised by the Quakers' refusal to bear arms in the colony's defense and to take the oaths necessary to carry on

ordinary government and business. How much the New England opposition stemmed not from the people but from the powerful clergy backed by the magistrates becomes apparent in the light of Virginia's quieter acceptance of this extreme form of Puritanism. It was, in large part, the Puritans of Virginia who became Quakers, and did so with surprising rapidity. They even moved beyond conservative Quakerism to Perrotism, very far to the left indeed.

The first Quaker "publishers of the Truth," Josias Coale and Thomas Thurston, arrived in Virginia toward the close of 1657 and remained in the colony until the summer of 1658. Close upon them were three more missionaries: William Robinson, Christopher Holder, and Robert Hodgson. In 1661 there were at least five of these itinerant preachers: Josias Coale (on a second visit), George Wilson, George Rose, Elizabeth Hooten, and Joan Brocksoppe. Toward the end of the succeeding year four more came: Joseph Nicholson, John Liddal, Jane Millard, and John Perrot. In 1663 two more women arrived, Mary Tompkins and Alice Ambrose, as well as the Massachusetts martyr, Wenlock Christison. A few years later, better known Quaker preachers began to include Virginia in their fields of work; John Burnyeat was there in 1665 and 1671, Daniel Gould came from Rhode Island in 1671, William Edmundson preached extensively in 1672 and 1676, and the great George Fox spent two brief but effective periods there in 1672. Accompanying Fox were three close Quaker friends of his, Robert Widders, James Lancaster, and George Pattison. Five years later William Gallway of Scotland died while preaching in Nansemond. The following year John Boweter visited most of the settled meetings, and so the tale goes on, with Thomas Story, Thomas Chalkley, and William Ellis the most prominent of these visiting missionaries that came before the close of the century.

There were many others, men and women, who felt the call to devote years of their lives to this type of service. They were still coming well into the eighteenth century.[100] Some left a clear record of their stay, either in their own journals or letters, or in local court proceedings; about others and their labors little is definite. With the obvious exception of men like Christison and Gould, who had been in New England for some time, most of these men and women came from England by way of Barbados and Jamaica, frequently landing in Maryland on the Patuxent River, preliminary to working their way across Virginia to North Carolina, and then back again. The Patuxent River section was also convenient for trips across the bay into the Eastern Shore district of both Maryland and Virginia. Sometimes they remained within Virginia's boundaries for only a few weeks; sometimes, feeling that there was much work to be done for the Lord or that they were being particularly successful in their convincements, they lingered for a good many months.

Not all of these itinerants helped the Quaker cause. A few, in fact, were regarded by later missionaries as a source of embarrassment and of much additional labor. One influential preacher of this troublesome sort was John Perrot,[101] who (in the eyes of his more conservative brethren) nearly wrecked the movement. Perrot was a man haunted by one fear: Even the truest Christian might find himself dropping into the use of "forms" rather than worshiping his Creator sincerely. He considered that uncovering the head during prayer was a "form" and so to be guarded against. (In his fervor, he took no cognizance of the fact that by objecting to the conventional actions of men he was making

[100] Rufus M. Jones, *The Quakers in the American Colonies* (London, 1911), pp. 265–294, 302–303, 306–307; James Bowden, *History of the Society of Friends in America* (London, 1850), I, 342 ff.

[101] Bowden, *History*, I, 305–351.

the Quakers a sect apart, a "peculiar" people, and that this difference might cause many to react unfavorably to the Friends.) Soon he had a more devastating theory: attendance at regular meetings for worship was another "form." This idea he urged during his 1662 and 1663 trips through Virginia. As a result, Quakerism, without the sustenance of fellowship and the inspiration of meetings, nearly foundered. As attendance at meetings fell off, many who had been convinced drifted away again, back into worldly ways, according to Quaker judgment.

Although Perrot, putting his plea on the grounds of spirituality, was only emphasizing the Quaker objection to all formalized religion, many influential Friends saw the practical danger involved. The Quaker missionaries that came after Perrot were forced to devote much of their energy to combatting this schism, which took particular hold in Virginia. In 1665 John Burnyeat found that the "greatest part" of the Friends had been led astray. Not only had they forsaken their meetings, but they also had "become loose and careless, and much *one* with the *World* in many things." On this trip Burnyeat even had difficulty in arranging a meeting among them, but by his third trip in 1671 he regarded many of them as restored to their original freshness of spirit.[102] Nevertheless, William Edmundson, whose 1672 visit followed closely upon Burnyeat's last Virginia expedition, considered affairs to be "much out of order."[103]

The reaction against Perrotism was not merely defensive. There was able opposition to this spirit of individuality in the ability of some of the better known itinerants to promote harmony and systematized practices. Burnyeat, Fox,

[102] John Burnyeat, *The Truth Exalted in the Writings of that Eminent and Faithful Servant of Christ* (London, 1691), pp. 34, 43.

[103] William Edmundson, *A Journal of the Life, Travels, Sufferings, and Labour of Love in the Work of the Ministry* (London, 1820), p. 88.

and Edmundson, all strong preachers, also possessed good organizing ability. They urged the Friends in different sections to have men's and women's meetings as well as quarterly, half-yearly, and yearly gatherings; sometimes they attended the first of these as guiding spirits. Fox also had the vision to see that there should be some intercourse between Quakers in different parts of the world and so he encouraged correspondence between meetings in the various colonies and the mother country. Many of his disciples spent more time in Virginia than did Fox, and served effectively, but wherever the latter went in his missionary travels he gave the Quaker cause new impetus that lasted for some years. With all this earnest endeavor from 1657 on into the next century, the number of Friends grew rapidly, although figures remain uncertain. Almost all the missionaries speak happily—and vaguely—of "large and precious" meetings and of "large convincements."

Many factors, however, have to be considered in forming any judgment from these roseate statements about the numbers that welcomed Quakerism. First, there is the natural optimism of the traveling preacher about his reception and the good he is doing. Important, too, is the admitted fact that many attended meetings who were not Friends and had no intention of becoming members of the sect. From the accounts of the preachers it is obvious that any novelty in the way of entertainment attracted many. Some who came for purely social purposes did not bother to go into the meeting until after the speakers got under way; others enjoyed disputing with and heckling the visitors. Then, again, in trying to compute the probable spread of Quaker principles, it must be kept in mind that many meetings were held in private houses, in regions but sparsely settled, and that the attendance might have seemed large considering these conditions.

Nor is the evidence from official sources such as court records any more definite about the numbers convinced, but apparently enough of the people were soon affected for the colonial authorities to take measures against these new sectarians. Early in 1660, less than three years after the coming of the first missionaries, an act was passed setting up a fine of one hundred pounds sterling to be levied against any shipmaster transporting Quakers into the colony; ordering that all Quakers within the colony be jailed until they left, and not return under penalty of being treated first as "contemners of the law" and then as felons; and establishing heavy fines for all sympathizers who entertained them. Two years later, in March of 1662, a law was passed that any one not attending church was liable to a fine of twenty pounds sterling each month and that Quakers and "other recusants" were to be fined two hundred pounds of tobacco each for holding their own meetings. Again in December of the same year another legislative attack was made: a fine of two hundred pounds of tobacco was to be imposed upon all "schismaticall" people who did not have their children baptized. Quakers would fall within this group, of course. Even more direct was an enactment that anyone refusing to give his judicial oath as a witness or office holder should be cast into prison until he complied. This legislation was followed in September, 1663, by a repetition of the provisos against importing and harboring Quakers, plus another law against their assembling.[104]

As in most of the other colonies, there were early martyrs for the cause, but in Virginia these were comparatively few. Occasionally the itinerant preachers were arrested, and one man, George Wilson, died while in gaol at Jamestown; at least two of the women, Mary Tompkins and Alice Ambrose, were whipped. The more usual persecution that the Friends

[104] Hening, *Statutes*, I, 532–533.

endured may be seen in the records of Lower Norfolk County. After August of 1660, when Governor Berkeley rebuked the local sheriff for not stopping the frequent meetings of the Quakers that were being held, to about 1665, the records show frequent presentations for court action of Quakers and their sympathizers. One man is to be sent to Jamestown for allowing the Friends to meet at his house. On another occasion a woman is to be punished for abusing the sheriff as he arrested some Friends. More frequently, groups of twenty or more are to be fined heavily for holding meetings.[105] After the early 1660's there was a lull in these cases, but again in the middle and late 1670's there was a somewhat similar outcrop of prosecutions of Quakers, both in Henrico and Nansemond counties.[106]

The distribution of Quakers throughout the colony was far from even, with the more obviously nonconformist counties having the greater percentage of convincements to the new religion. While going between Maryland and the Carolinas, George Fox devoted a good part of his proselytizing energy to the region between the James River and the North Carolina boundary;[107] Edmundson also sojourned in this area with striking results, and there had been a good many conversions here as early as 1660. By 1661 there was a regular meeting at Nansemond, and by 1674 a yearly meeting had been organized at Chuckatuck.[108] Major General Richard Bennett himself, one-time governor of the colony and still a very important man in local affairs, was converted in 1672 by Edmundson, as was Colonel Thomas Dewes, the Speaker of the Assembly during the Puritan regime. The Jordans, the Boddies, the Porters—all promi-

[105] *Lower Norfolk County Antiquary*, III, 103–106, 132–146; IV, 32, 78–89.

[106] William P. Palmer, ed., *Calendar of Virginia State Papers and other Manuscripts, 1652-1781* (Richmond, 1875), I, 9; *Lower Norfolk County Antiquary*, V, 122-123.

[107] George Fox, *The Journal of* (Cambridge, 1911), II, 233–234.

[108] Lower Virginia Monthly Meeting Minutes, pp. 145, 180.

nent South Shore families with Puritan leanings—had many members of their families join this new, more radically dissenting movement.[109] The Boddies were the largest land owners in Isle of Wight County; the Porters, too, held various local offices and were men of some note and wealth. The Jordans, who had been active in Isle of Wight and Nansemond counties since the early 1620's, became the most prominent Quaker family in that vicinity, perhaps at least partially because of their very numbers: at one time Thomas Jordan, Senior, and his ten mature sons with their families were members of the Society. Southern Virginia also became the home of John Copeland, a well-known Quaker and one of the more persistent Massachusetts martyrs who had had his ears clipped by order of the angry magistrates there. He was an active member of the Chuckatuck meeting in the last part of the century.[110]

For some years the number of meetings increased steadily. During the 1670's and 1680's there were meetings in Surry; in Isle of Wight, notably on the Pagan River; in Nansemond, at Chuckatuck and on the Nansemond River; and in Lower Norfolk, on the Elizabeth River. Later there were other meetings, especially on the branches of the Elizabeth River and also inland, some west of the original meetings as well as some nearer the Carolina border. An idea of the strength of the Friends in the counties south of the lower James may be gained from contemporary evidence that ordinary mixed meetings (without any visiting preacher of note) often had more than twenty men and women present; eleven men signed one of George Fox's open letters written at Elizabeth River and addressed to the Nansemond meeting.

Although southeastern Virginia seems to have been most

[109] Boddie, *Seventeenth Century Isle of Wight County*, p. 180.
[110] Lower Virginia Monthly Meeting Minutes, *passim*.

affected by the coming of the Quaker missionaries and the spread of Fox's doctrines, Quakerism was by no means confined to this territory. On the north side of the James, too, there soon were meetings of Friends, in Warwick, York, and Henrico counties especially. In this part of the colony the Quaker families seem to have been more scattered, but there was some concentration of Friends around the Curles meeting in Henrico County. Here there was a meeting house which by the end of the century had fallen into disrepair. When plans were afoot to reconstruct the old building or to build a new one, nineteen Friends felt that they were able to contribute to the costs of this new project. Earlier records have been lost, but some indication of how many members of the Society there were around Curles may be gathered from the knowledge that in the first years of the eighteenth century from twenty to thirty Friends witnessed the average Quaker wedding held in this section.[111]

Another part of the colony distinctly influenced by Quaker ideas was the Eastern Shore; both Accomack and Northampton counties had for some years a number of converts. Here William Robinson had done outstanding pioneer missionary work in the spring of 1658, to be followed in later years by George Fox and Thomas Story. Under threat of being made to pay their tithes for the support of the local minister and of having the 1660 law enforced against them, a good many of these Eastern Shore Quakers, however, moved north in the early 1660's to Maryland, settling below the Choptank River. Somerset County, erected in 1666 immediately over the border from Accomack, had as some of its earliest settlers these Virginia Friends.[112] Not all left; some chose to remain and were accepted as good citizens

[111] Record Book, Monthly Meeting of Friends in Henrico, Homewood Friends Meeting House, Baltimore, Md., *passim*.

[112] Torrence, *Old Somerset*, p. 86.

long before the end of the century.[113] In fact, despite the emigration to Maryland, two Eastern Shore meetings flourished for some years, one at Nassawadox in Northampton County, the other at Muddy Creek in Accomack County.

How long a goodly number of the men and women in these sections of Virginia—notably along the James River and on the Eastern Shore—retained their Quaker principles is a matter of some dispute. John Farmer, traveling through Virginia around 1712, found eighteen meetings to visit;[114] many of these, however, may have been small and held in private homes. It is also true that during the first years of the new century a number of new meeting houses were built in the settlements south of the James, the old stronghold of Puritanism where so much of the effort of the traveling Quakers had been concentrated. One new meeting house was on the southern branch of the Nansemond River, another on Western Branch; in each case ten members of the Society contributed substantially, and others supplied nails and incidentals. This activity may well have been the result of the Act of Toleration, which went into full effect in Virginia in 1699, rather than any marked increase in the prosperity of the Quaker meeting involved.

Despite these indications that the Friends were still persevering in their chosen way, most of the evidence suggests that considerable falling-off in their numbers took place as early as the 1690's. During this decade meeting records show a sharp decline in attendance at weddings in Isle of Wight, Nansemond, and Lower Norfolk counties. In the 1680's thirty-odd witnesses signed (on one occasion

[113] Ames, *Studies of the Virginia Eastern Shore*, p. 233. Among others, the Nicholas Waddelow, Timothy Coe, George Johnson, Thomas Brown, and Christopher Mather families remained.

[114] Henry J. Cadbury, ed., *John Farmer's First American Journey 1711–1714* (Worcester, Mass., 1944), p. 6.

all of forty-two), but in the 1690's there were sometimes twenty-odd, now and then even fewer (and on one occasion eleven of a smallish number were Jordans).[115] In the 1690's, too, the traveling missionaries noted that many in this section were losing the ardency of their belief. James Dickinson, reaching Chuckatuck in 1691, felt called upon to warn his audience "to keep out of the superfluous Fashions of the World, which had too much prevailed among many."[116] More outspoken was William Ellis, journeying through this section late in 1697 and in 1698, for he wrote his wife from Chuckatuck: "We find many poor dejected people that profess Truth, who for want of true care in themselves, and of visiting by Friends in love and zeal, are grown too cold." In another letter from Pagan Creek, he found things "much out of order amongst Friends." The following year, while recalling his trip for the benefit of his fellow missionary William Edmundson, Ellis again commented unhappily on conditions around Chuchatuck: Although there were many Friends, there was "too much indifference amongst some" and among the young people "great darkness."[117]

The tone of early eighteenth-century accounts is much the same. Itinerant preachers in the plantations south of the James had to admit that meetings were "not large" or "indifferent large"—at best "pretty large."[118] In the 1720's, however, there was a revival of Quaker (and Anabaptist) strength.[119] This resurgence, which disturbed at least one

[115] Lower Virginia Monthly Meeting Minutes, p. 135.

[116] James Dickinson, *Journal of his Life, Travels and . . . Work of the Ministry* (London, 1745), p. 53.

[117] William and Alice Ellis, *The Life and Correspondence of* (Philadelphia, 1850), pp. 79, 81, 151.

[118] Thomas Story, *A Journal of the Life of . . . his Travels and Labours in the Service of the Gospel* (Newcastle Upon Tyne, 1741), pp. 336, 337; John Fothergill, *An Account of the Life and Travels in the Work of the Ministry* (London, 1753) p. 258.

[119] Samuel Bownas, Mss. Journal, Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore, Pa.; Perry, *Historical Collections relating to the American Colonial Church*, I, 333; Henry J. Cadbury, ed., "Samuel Hopwood's Travels in America, 1741–1744," Friends Historical Association, *Bulletin*, XXXIX (1950), 98.

of the local ministers, lasted until the 1740's. Nevertheless, by 1761 the once thriving Chuckatuck meeting, long a noted center of Quakerism, had been reduced to three or four families.[120] Even more rapidly than along the James River and its tributaries, did Eastern Shore Quakerism weaken, perhaps because of the early migration to Maryland. Many in both Accomack and Northampton counties came to hear the itinerant preachers, but actual membership in the Society seems to have fallen off. By 1740 the Muddy Creek meeting was definitely gone and the Nassawadox one nearly so.[121]

The tendency toward conformity, on the other hand, was neither so early nor so decided as unsympathetic contemporaries persuaded themselves to be the case. Anglican writers tended to minimize the strength of the Friends and to emphasize how rapidly members of the Society were rejoining the Established Church. There was also some understandable tendency not to realize that there were far more Quaker meetings than there were visible meeting houses. Accordingly, a somewhat official report of conditions in Virginia noted that in 1697 there were only three or four Quaker meetings.[122] In the fall of 1703 George Keith, who had by then shifted from the Society of Friends to the Established Church, cheerfully wrote that there were "few Quakers in Virginia" and even those were "very much asunder";[123] under the circumstances, it can be suspected that his vision was not too clear. But Robert Beverley, a much less biased observer, knew of but three Quaker meetings in

[120] Stephen B. Weeks, *Southern Quakers and Slavery* (Baltimore, 1896), Johns Hopkins University, *Studies*, Extra Volume XV, 85.

[121] Thomas Chalkley, *A Journal, or Historical Account of the Life, Travels, and Christian Experiences, of* (Philadelphia, 1749), p. 16; Story, *Journal*, p. 236; Fothergill, *Account*, pp. 116, 258; Bownas, Mss. Journal.

[122] Henry Hartwell, James Blair, and Edward Chilton, *The Present State of Virginia, and the College* (London, 1727), edited by Hunter Dickinson Farish (Williamsburg, 1940), p. 65.

[123] *Collections of the Protestant Episcopal Society, for the Year 1851* (New York, 1851), p. xxviii.

1705;[124] he also observed that the Society was decreasing daily since the persecution of its members had stopped. Still later, Hugh Jones noted in 1724 that there were only a few members of the Society in the lower parts of Nansemond; nor did he believe these sectarians to be so ardent in their dissent that they could not be brought over to the Church of England if the latter was to do a little counter-missionary work among them.[125]

These estimates of Quaker strength (or rather weakness) were made, of course, before the immigration during the mid-years of the eighteenth century of Friends from the northern colonies, especially Pennsylvania and Nantucket; this influx of substantial Quaker families did much to revive the Society. Nevertheless, although it is quite true that the early Quaker communities did not long retain their pristine fervor and vitality, Quaker records and journals prove the obvious exaggeration in these Anglican statements about the general conformity in Virginia at the end of seventeenth and the beginning of the eighteenth centuries. Conservative contempt for and fear of radicalism can be seen to have influenced the prejudiced eyes of observers who doubtless felt themselves to be sincere in their judgment of conditions in the colony.

The story of Virginia Puritanism is not, then, a simple tale of one sect and its development. The Established Church did not change radically during the seventeenth century; in its first years it had not been able to maintain itself as truly one with the Church of England; and this tendency away from the tenets of the mother church is visible throughout the century. There were always nominal conformists and partial conformists who were more Calvinistic than their fellow ministers. Nonconformist Puritanism,

[124] Beverley, *The History and Present State of Virginia*, p. 48.

[125] Jones, *The Present State of Virginia*, pp. 23–24.

as the minor party, had a more varied history during the same period. Unlike the situation in New England, there were in Virginia no lay authorities, no powerful clergy to keep the *status quo*, to feel (as men in control are apt to feel) that change in itself is sinful. Virginia Calvinists differed among themselves and apparently had little feeling of unity other than geographic; early nonconformists had a tendency toward Congregationalism or Independency; later dissenters were more inclined to Presbyterianism. This shift, by the end of the seventeenth century, was not one of much theological import, for the cleavage by that time was more a matter of church government than of belief. Independency had come over with the first settlers to occupy the plantations south of the lower James. The explanation of Virginia's seventeenth-century Presbyterianism may be found not only in the beginnings of that Scottish immigration which became much more pronounced in the next century, but also in the economic and religious conditions in the northern colonies that gave Virginia a number of early ministers with Presbyterian tendencies. After the abortive attempt in 1642, Congregationalists were not apt to leave Massachusetts for the uncertainties of Virginia, where they could be silenced at any time. The men who did not get along with the New England authorities and who had been more or less forced to re-establish themselves on Long Island, had less to lose and more to gain: they were leaving life under a foreign government with all the consequent disadvantages, for an English colony; and these men at odds with their fellow Puritans in Massachusetts often had Presbyterian sympathies—indeed, this variation in belief had usually been the original cause of contention between them and their fellow Puritans in New England.

But Calvinism, whether of a Congregational or Presbyterian mould, was not the final answer for all dissenters. Unrestrained by powerful clergy or magistrates, many Virginia

Puritans allowed themselves to follow their own belief in man's covenant with God to the logical extreme of Quakerism. A good many persuasive itinerant preachers and some early persecution fanned their enthusiasm. And having—in their eyes—purified their beliefs to the point of doing away with the sacraments, with all ritual, and with a professional clergy, many of them saw their sons return to a more obviously disciplined church. No one reason can account for this tendency of Virginia's radicals to turn to the theological right. Fox, the Society's founder, died in 1691, and during the following decade the ranks of the first convincements were being thinned by death; second generations often have been known to react adversely to a way of thinking that had been welcomed by their parents. Another factor that may have influenced this early weakening was the tardiness of many Quaker leaders to realize the value of schools and education. Then, too, many churches have made the bitter discovery that they thrived only under persecution: toleration carries with it the evil of indifference. Whatever the reason or combination of reasons for the decline, county records before the end of the century show signs of a shifting back to the Established Church in the regions originally effected by this type of extreme Puritanism.

Throughout the century, then, Puritanism showed itself as a variable and changing force: from conformity to nonconformity—and sometimes back again, from one type of dissent to another, from orthodox Calvinism to mystic Quakerism. Nevertheless, despite these natural developments, seventeenth-century Puritanism, both in its conservative and radical phases, made itself felt in the colony. Eighteenth-century Virginia, with its strong sense of individual responsibility and ethical independence, becomes more comprehensible in the light of the plantation's earlier religious history.

Chapter III

Bermuda: Nonconformity "Safe From the Storms' and Prelates' Rage"

The somewhat turbulent history of Bermuda during her first century of English history was presaged even before there was any permanent settlement. Moreover, the first recorded incidents of English life on the islands suggest the major part that religious controversy was to play. As is well-known from William Strachey's forceful and much quoted account,[1] the Somers-Gates expedition on its way to Virginia suffered shipwreck, and the survivors were forced to rebuild their ships at Bermuda, a spot hitherto only vaguely noted (and avoided) by English mariners. During the months that the 140 men and women destined for Virginia and the seamen were on the islands—from August, 1609, to May, 1610—the minister accompanying them, the Reverend Richard Buck, usually thought to have been a conservative Puritan, probably a nominal conformist, diligently performed his duties. The mixed company of voyagers to the New World and sailors every Sunday heard two sermons in which they were reminded how thankful all should be to have survived and how all should work for one another. Weekdays there were firm calls, under threat of punishment for absence, to morning and evening prayers.

This helpful program to keep men out of mischief did not prove completely successful. Many of the men thought the freedom and apparent plenty of Bermuda bid fair to be vastly preferable to the hard work and risky future that awaited them in Virginia. As a result, the peace was broken by a series of minor mutinies against the work program that

[1] William Strachey, *A True Reportory of the Wracke, and Redemption of Sir Thomas Gates*, in *Purchas His Pilgrimes*, XIX, 5–84.

had been organized to hasten their departure to the continent. According to Strachey, who was writing from the conservative viewpoint of authority as it was represented in the men in charge of the expedition, the rebellious leaders in these successive conspiracies included three radical nonconformists. Nicholas Bennet, one of the trouble-makers, was a carpenter "who made much profession of Scripture, a mutinous and dissembling Imposter." John Want, another protester, was "both seditious, and a sectary in points of Religion, in his owne prayers much devout and frequent, but hardly drawne to the publique, insomuch as being suspected . . . for a Brownist, he was often compelled to the common Liturgie and forme of Prayer." Even more dangerous to the Virginia Company's plans was Stephen Hopkins, whose knowledge of the Scriptures was so thorough that the Reverend Mr. Buck chose him as an assistant; but Hopkins, ungratefully, used his Scripture-quoting ability to prove that every man has the right to take care of himself and his family—a primary privilege and duty that preceded any claims that the Company had upon its shipwrecked settlers.[2]

Conservatism and authority won out. These Virginians-to-be, willing or unwilling, finally got on their way in the pinnaces that had been built during these many months on the islands. They left behind, however, three men who some two years later were on hand to greet the first settlers sent out to develop the Bermudas or Somers Islands, as they were renamed about this time. The Somers Island Company,[3] the group of adventurers responsible for this new project, was closely allied to the Virginia Company. Indeed, at first the two companies were one, some members of the older company having decided to invest in this island colonization. Even after the separation of the two com-

[2] *Ibid.*, XIX, 29–31.

[3] Henry Wilkinson, *The Adventurers of Bermuda* (London, 1933), pp. 90–106.

panies in 1615, most of the shareholders in each enterprise held stock in the other as well. (A third group of adventurers that a little later was to try to develop Catalina or Providence Island consisted of the avowedly Puritan members of the Somers Island Company and of the then defunct Virginia Company, together with some of their friends who shared their political and religious views.)

Like its parent company, the Somers Island Company itself was strongly Puritan. Most of the earlier shareholders were Londoners or from the eastern (and Puritan) counties. As was the way with these companies of investors in colonial enterprises—of "adventurers" in the parlance of the day—factions soon sprang up in the management of this organization, too. But no matter what faction was temporarily in power, many of the men controlling the company's (and so the colony's) destinies were decidedly Puritan in their sympathies; in fact, the same investors dominated both the Virginia and the Somers Island companies. Sir Thomas Smith, the newer company's first head or "governor," was a well-known Puritan. Sir Edwin Sandys, first a friend and then an opponent of Smith's, was a Parliamentarian whose coöperative attitude toward sectarians was recognized, sometimes to the detriment of his own reputation. A third leader, the Earl of Warwick, who became openly Presbyterian in his later years, also helped many Puritan enterprises; associated with him was his kinsman, Sir Nathaniel Rich, another Puritan leader. During the mid-years of the century, governors included Sir John Danvers, the noted regicide, and the Reverend John Oxenbridge, one of the outstanding Puritan preachers of his day. Still later in the history of this long-lived company, when the religious impulse among its members had largely died out, the Earl of Shaftesbury controlled its policies. Not only was the Earl himself tolerant, but under his management in the 1670's

religious prejudices were not allowed to hinder any hopes of having a profitable plantation—a business-like approach that governed all of Shaftesbury's colonial investments.

Just as newly planted Virginia welcomed all Protestants, both Anglicans—many of them only nominally conforming—and nonconformists, so did Bermuda accept settlers without undue questioning about their religious beliefs. But in this island colony the tendency to dissent was always much stronger. Many of the shareholders sent over relatives or dependents that may have shared their patrons' Calvinism.[4] There was some feeling, too, as Andrew Marvell sympathetically pointed out in "The Bermudas," that the islands were such distant dots on the map that no prelates would interfere with anyone's tendency away from the Church of England.[5]

That the general Puritanism of the settlement was tacitly recognized by the Somers Island Company may be seen in many of the latter's efforts to promote a prosperous and contented colony. After initial difficulties about securing satisfactory governors, the shareholders sent out more successful men, many of them acknowledged Calvinists. Captain Nathaniel Butler held office from 1619 to 1622; Captain John Bernard served briefly in 1622, but died within six weeks of taking office; Captain John Harrison, the islands' sheriff, substituted for Bernard in 1623; Captain Philip Bell ruled from 1626 to 1629; Captain Roger Wood from 1629 to 1636; Captain William Sayle in 1641, from 1643 to 1645, and again from 1658 to 1662; Josias Forster was in power briefly in 1642–3 and with two other Puritans (Stephen Paynter and William Wilkinson) about 1646, then held sway from 1650 to 1659. Some of these men were more

[4] *Ibid.*, pp. 100–104.

[5] Marvell knew the point of view of Bermudians as he had lived at Eton with the Reverend John Oxenbridge after the latter's return from the islands.

radical nonconformists than others, but in their religious theories they were all to the left of the Church of England.

Essentially, a Puritan community was set up in the infant colony, even though some of the local regulations indicate a discordant minority of the more worldly. An early act promulgated strict laws for the keeping of the Sabbath, and the church wardens were ordered to be active in reporting breaches in the observance of the day.[6] An overindustrious woman caught sewing her apron and three self-indulgent men detected in the act of fishing promptly found themselves indicted.[7] Church wardens and sidesmen also carefully regulated behavior in church, with "none to walke or stand idley or talk or sleepe or use an unreverend gesture."[8] By 1627 some threat to the Calvinistic morality of the community caused an act to be passed prohibiting interludes and stage plays of any kind whatsoever.[9] In short, according to a man of Presbyterian leanings, forced to leave England rather than have his beliefs questioned, Bermuda in the 1620's was a place where men might "enjoy the meanes of true religion and salvation, to wit, the syncere ministrie of the Word and Sacramentes," and where the government was "good without vigour and oppression."[10]

Another indication of the Puritan temper of adventurers and settlers may be seen in the prominent position that ministers occupied in the local government. At first every clergyman was supposed to be a member of the governor's council; a little later he was given his choice in the matter.

[6] Nathaniel Butler, *The Historye of the Bermudaes or Summer Islands* (London, 1882), pp. 229, 283; J. H. Lefroy, *Memorials of the Discovery and Early Settlement of the Bermudas* (London, 1877), I, 256.

[7] Lefroy, *Memorials*, I, 482.

[8] *Ibid.*, I, 319; also pp. 131–132, 451.

[9] *Ibid.*, I, 418.

[10] Presumably written by Richard Norwood, the surveyor, in 1622; *cf.* Champlin Burrage, ed., *John Pory's Lost Description of Plymouth Colony . . . Together with Contemporary Accounts of English Colonization . . . in the Bermudas* (Boston, 1918), p. 13.

If a man lived too far away or was too occupied with his studies, he need not attend meetings.[11] This inclusion of the ministers as acknowledged temporal as well as spiritual leaders is especially interesting in view of the choice of preachers sent out to the budding colony. The plan was to supply four ministers,[12] but at times there were fewer; occasionally, as a matter of fact, only one was serving the entire plantation. But one or four, the ministers sent out, with few exceptions, were ardent Calvinists.

The first man, after Buck, to preach regularly at Bermuda, was a Scotsman who accompanied Governor Moore in 1612, at the very beginning of the settlement. The Reverend George Keith[13] had a difficult five years on the islands. A contentious man, he never agreed with his superiors; one cause of enmity was his accusation that the laborers whom the company had sent over were being abused inasmuch as their services were put to private use rather than employed for the public benefit. Although both he and the only other minister on the islands, the Reverend Lewis Hughes, were both basically Calvinistic, Keith also disagreed with this co-worker. As a result, the fiery Scot found himself in a vulnerable position, for he was not episcopally ordained, nor was his preaching considered particularly edifying by some of his listeners. Wearying of his bitter struggle to improve matters in the colony and to hold his own against the more forceful Hughes, Keith in 1617 removed himself, his family, and a little group of dependents and followers to Virginia.

The second minister, serving with Keith for some years but remaining after the latter had left, was far more prom-

[11] Lefroy, *Memorials*, I, 377.

[12] *Ibid.*, I, 212–213.

[13] Butler, *The Historye of the Bermudaes*, pp. 24–25, 49, 56–57; Lewis Hughes, *To the Right Honourable The Lords and Others of His Majesties most Honourable Privie Councell* (1625), A3, A4; Lefroy, *Memorials*, I, 61, 63, 74, 80, 107, 124, 706.

inent in his own day. An experienced preacher, the Reverend Lewis Hughes[14] had started his troubled Bermuda career by 1613 and spent the next twelve years on the islands, his service interrupted only by two trips to England, in 1620 and 1623. He wanted, as he wrote frankly to his friends at home,[15] to found a church free from the corruptions of the Church of England. Accordingly, he established a Presbyterian form of church government and wrote a liturgy for his church's use. These measures he accomplished by 1617, for it was good policy, he thought, to organize a proper church before the island became heavily populated; then newcomers would accept its blessings without question. Neither ceremonies nor the use of the Book of Common Prayer, he noted, was in request during these early years, and so he apparently met with little opposition from his parishioners, although he had his enemies. A strong believer in the Puritan Sabbath, Hughes preached and wrote against any profanation of the day, by sports or unnecessary work. Perhaps his popularity was better augmented by his spirited protests against the usurping of power and the consequent abuse of the people by various local authorities. Twice he was jailed by an unsympathetic governor for exciting the settlers to object to tyrannical practices. Such persecution only endeared Hughes to his parishioners. An influential man, he reconciled the dis-

[14] Hughes, *To the Right Honourable The Lords, passim;* Butler, *The Historye of the Bermudaes*, pp. 49–51, 60, 72, 81–82, 91, 111, 112–113, 143–144, 152, 225, 243–245, 291, 301, *et al.; Eighth Report of the Royal Commission of Historical Manuscripts*, Appendix, Part II, Item 229 (1617/8), pp. 32–33; Item 283 (1620), p. 36; Lefroy, *Memorials*, I, 80, 107, 230 ff., 349; George W. Cole, *Lewis Hughes the Militant Minister of the Bermudas and His Printed Works* (Worcester, 1928); E. D. Neill, *Virginia Vetusta, During the Reign of James the first. Containing Letters and Documents never before Printed* (Albany, 1885), pp. 185–191; Wesley Frank Craven, *An Introduction to the History of Bermuda* (1938), pp. 47, 66, 80, 107, 112, 125–127, 160–161, 163, *et al.;* Craven, "Lewis Hughes' 'Plaine and True Relation of the Goodnes of God towards the Sommer Islands,'" *William and Mary College Quarterly Historical Magazine*, 2nd Ser., XVII (1937), 56–89.

[15] *Eighth Report of the Royal Commission*, Appendix, Part II, Items 209, 233, 234, 239, 252, 262, 264 (1618–20/1), pp. 33–34.

satisfied with the Company's often dilatory actions, and he was partially responsible for the welcome given to his fellow Puritan, Captain Nathaniel Butler, when the latter came in 1619 to take over the confused affairs of the colony.

As a point of wisdom, Hughes refrained during his Bermuda days from preaching against the Church of England—or so he claimed when questioned by the Company about some of the accusations made against him.[16] During his post-Bermuda years, when the time was ripe in England for such utterances, he published his refutation of the practices of the Anglican churches.[17] Among the foul errors and "horrible blasphemies" to be found in their worship were the custom of bowing the body and taking off one's hat at the name of Jesus, kneeling at communion, having the congregation repeat after the minister, using the cross in baptism, and employing rings in marriage ceremonies. His acrimonious criticism seemed to have no end. Bishops, holy days, holy water, the churching of women after childbirth, burial prayers—all met the same scorn. Surely, hot-headed as he was, he allowed his Bermuda congregation to share with him these detestations during his long years of preaching to them.

After Keith left, Hughes had for some months the burden of being the only minister in the colony. In 1618 the Reverend William Bridges came over, but proved unable to fill his office, perhaps because of ill-health. In July, 1619, a more promising clergyman arrived. Hughes welcomed joyously the coming of the Reverend Samuel Lang and his family.[18] Here was a man after a Puritan's own heart—

[16] Hughes, *To the Right Honourable The Lords.*

[17] Hughes, *Certaine Grievances Well Worthy the Serious Consideration of the Right Honourable, and High Court of Parliament* (1640); *Certain Grievances, or the Popish Errors and Ungodlinesse of the Service-Book Laid Open* (London, 1642); *The Errors of the Common Catechisme, Plainly Laid Open* (London, 1645).

[18] *Eighth Report of the Royal Commission,* Appendix, Part II, Item 252 (1618), p. 34; Item 264 (February 1619/20), p. 34.

the type of preacher Bermuda needed. This unity did not last long. In a year or so Hughes and Lang discovered that, while they both could see the malpractices of the Church of England, they could not agree on the nature of the reformation to be made, especially in the forms of the sacraments and of the marriage ceremony that should be used.

At this point Governor Butler, with the air of a man who has borne much from the stubbornness of the clergy, stepped into the breach. In order to restore harmony, he suggested the use of still another liturgy—not the Anglican one, not Hughes's, not Lang's, but that followed by the churches in the islands of Guernsey and Jersey. The governor himself translated this liturgy that had been used, with the king's permission, some years previously by French Protestants and that had the full approval of good Calvinists;[19] the clergy were not to wear surplices, nor use the sign of the cross in baptism, nor have their parishioners receive communion kneeling. The practical Butler, trying to appease the colony's only ministers so that they would stay, perhaps accomplished more than he had fully foreseen. Keith in 1612 had started the Bermuda church as nonconforming or nominally conforming, presumably with Presbyterian leanings; by 1617 Hughes had created a definitely Presbyterian church that to all intents and purposes was independent of the Church of England; Butler in 1620 by introducing this Genevan liturgy was officially sanctioning a nonconformist church, and most of Bermuda's churches remained tacitly dissenting for the rest of the century.[20]

[19] Butler, *The Historye of the Bermudaes*, pp. 171–173; *Eighth Report of the Royal Commission*, Appendix, Part II, Item 264 (February 1619/20), p. 34.

[20] Bermuda's first outstanding historian, Sir J. H. Lefroy, was extremely anti-Puritan in his attitude, but he meticulously reprinted records that cast doubt upon his conclusions; W. Robson Notman (in "The Early Bermuda Church," *The Presbyterian and Reformed Review*, VII (1896), 630–647) pointed out various places where Lefroy apparently had allowed his bias to influence his judgment. Later historians, notably Wesley Frank Craven and Henry Wilkinson, have agreed that Bermuda was essentially a Puritan colony.

The early colonists complained with understandable acerbity that the Company did not send over a sufficient supply of ministers. One or two clergymen could not serve adequately 1500 settlers. In 1622 these requests were answered, for Governor Bernard arrived with no fewer than four preachers. Unfortunately, one of them, the Reverend Joseph Wright, did not have many days of usefulness on the islands before his demise. A second member of the quartet, the Reverend Robert Staples, proved to be of such uneven temper that after eight years of contention the Company at last permanently dismissed him. The other two men who came with Governor Bernard were both Puritans and in their own day ministers of considerable note.

The Reverend Nathaniel Bernard,[21] the brother of the governor sent out in 1622, had a difficult career on the islands after the latter's early death. The young minister, having quarrelled with Governor Woodhouse about the Company's oppressive economic policies, was imprisoned for some time in 1625. With the backing of the Earl of Warwick in this dispute, into which no religious note was injected, Bernard was vindicated before he left Warwick Tribe[22] early in 1627, and his return was much desired. He served for another three years, and when he finally left for England his departure was followed by urgent pleas to reconsider his decision. It is interesting that his sermons while he was in the colony attracted no protest or censure, for his later preaching in England as a lecturer at St. Sepulchre's in London and at Cambridge brought him the unfavorable notice of Archbishop Laud. Continued frankness (or indiscretion) in attacking the royal family and the

[21] Lefroy, *Memorials*, I, 258, 288, 317, 342, 359–361, 401–403, 415–416, 430, 477, 691–692.

[22] "Tribe" corresponds in Bermuda terminology to county; parish and tribe boundaries were one. The islands were divided into nine tribes, and then into shares. Eight tribes were for the shareholders, the ninth being held as the common property of the Company for the colony's officials, etc.

Church of Rome made him see the inside of an English prison at least three times. When the tide turned in favor of the Puritans, however, Bernard was once more triumphant, with the abuses he had suffered used as a test case against his old enemy, Laud.

Somewhat quieter was the life of the Reverend George Stirke,[23] but he too had his difficulties with the Bermuda local authorities. A Scot, he spent some twelve years preaching in Southampton Tribe, with only two trips back to England to interrupt his labors. He was married to a daughter of Stephen Paynter, popular leader among the people, a holder of many offices during his long life, and a man often accused of being a Brownist—the contemporary term of opprobrium for any radical. Perhaps influenced by his father-in-law, Stirke, like Bernard, protested against the unfairness of the Company (or the Company's representatives) in dealing with the settlers. Consequently, both Stirke and Paynter were banished temporarily, but later were restored to active service. Stirke's health failed, unfortunately, soon after he had returned to his church, and he died in 1637, leaving a widow and young family. It was his son, another George Stirke, who was sent to Harvard by his father's friends with the idea that he would follow in his learned parent's footsteps; he disappointed his ministerial well-wishers, nevertheless, to become a prominent London physician with scientific interests. The elder Stirke had loyal friends as their care for his son shows, and even the men who disagreed most thoroughly with him admitted his scholarship and sincere piety, both of which he

[23] *Eighth Report of the Royal Commission*, Appendix, Part II, Item 416 (1629), p. 48; George Stirke, Petition to Lord Say and Sele, Lord Brookes, Sir Nathaniel Rich (January 1633/4), Public Record Office, Facsimile in Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston; George Stirke, Letter to Sir Nathaniel Rich (January, 1633/4), Public Records Office, Facsimile in Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston; Lefroy, *Memorials*, I, 147, 317, 359, 474–476, 515–516, 536, 708; George L. Kittredge, "George Stirke, Minister," Colonial Society of Massachusetts, *Publications*, XIII (Boston, 1912), 16–59.

demonstrated in a little book called *Musae Somerenses.* This 1635 publication, a summary in Latin verse of fundamental doctrines and church history, was intended for the use of a school that still another Puritan minister, the Reverend Patrick Copland,[24] was organizing at the time.

Copland was neither young nor unknown when he shifted his energies to Bermuda in 1626. Educated at the University of Aberdeen, he had a long and active career behind him. His correspondence during his island residence indicates that he was on intimate terms with such noted Puritans as Governor John Winthrop and Hugh Peter, as well as with the leading New England ministers—Hooker, Shepard, and Davenport, among others; he also numbered among his friends Sir Edwin Sandys and Nicholas Ferrar, both very powerful members of the Somers Island Company.[25] It was not surprising, then, that orders came for the colony officials to see that Copland was assisted in all his projects. He needed this support, moreover, because his two favorite schemes met with some opposition. Copland wanted to establish a free school on the islands; indeed, he would have gone further and built up a missionary college from which men could be sent to convert the Virginia Indians. In the less ambitious plan of educating the young he was somewhat successful, and Bermuda had a more or less adequate school after 1633, frequently manned by dissenting ministers or their relatives. Copland's other heartfelt belief was in the value of catechizing. Young and old were to be subjected to weekly instruction of this type. Here, too, Copland, backed by other ministers who shared his theory, was partially successful. For some time, during the mid-years of the century when Puritanism, both in its

[24] Lefroy, *Memorials,* I, 376–378, 395, 533–534, 538, 624, 633; Edward D. Neill, *Memoir of Rev. Patrick Copland Rector Elect of the First Projected College in the United States* (New York, 1871).

[25] *Winthrop Papers,* III, 84–85; V, 96–97, 182–185.

political and religious aspects, was at its zenith, this weekly catechizing was well accepted by many. On the other hand, less enthusiastic souls registered constant protests against the practice.

Copland was accompanied to Bermuda by the Reverend Bellingham Morgan, who died in 1628, before he could play a serious part in the colony's affairs. In this same year of 1628, however, two more Calvinists arrived; they, too, had brief stays on the Islands. The Reverend Alexander Graeme [Graemes, Graham], who was briefly in charge of the Pembroke and Devonshire churches, had to be sent home in 1629 as a trouble-maker. The Reverend Nathaniel Ward,[26] with whom Graeme had quarrelled at length, spent some three years preaching at St. George's and in Devonshire Tribe. This Ward is sometimes thought to have been the nephew and namesake of the more famous Nathaniel of later Massachusetts fame, rather than the "Simple Cobler of Aggawam" himself. Uncle or nephew, the Bermuda minister of the name, although not a strict Sabbatarian, was a recognized Puritan whom the newly organized Providence Island Company, strongly Puritan as it was, would have liked to send to their new plantation.

The 1630's saw additional Puritan ministers dominating the Bermuda scene. Governor Wood did his best to secure the services of Dr. William Ames, one of the top-ranking Calvinistic preachers and writers of his day, but death robbed both New England and Bermuda, almost equally hopeful, of this eagerly-sought honor.[27] Lesser luminaries had to fill his place. The Reverend John Ward, for instance, labored for six years before transferring his services to Providence Island. But three other Puritan ministers who

[26] *Eighth Report of the Royal Commission*, Appendix, Part II, Item 417 (1629?), p. 49; Lefroy, *Memorials*, I, 477, 485–486, 501–502, 514–515, 522, 527, 710.

[27] George Lyman Kittredge, "A Note on Dr. William Ames," Colonial Society of Massachusetts, *Publications*, XIII (Boston, 1912), 60–69; Lefroy, *Memorials*, I, 535–536.

came about this time carried far more weight in Bermuda history.

The first of these was a man whose type of Calvinism and concept of a true church enabled him in later years to become one of New England's leading divines. The Reverend John Oxenbridge,[28] dismissed from his Magdalen Hall, Oxford, tutorship because of the too great individuality of his beliefs, started his colonial career in 1635. His companion on the voyage to the Bermudas, significantly enough, was his cousin, Josias Forster, later to be governor, twice briefly and then during most of the Commonwealth period. Oxenbridge's island years were indeed fruitful. As his contemporaries realized, he planted his Calvinistic ideas of a true church so deeply that they lived long after his departure. True, the colony was well prepared to accept his beliefs; true, too, was his advantage in leaving behind able disciples. But Oxenbridge was early recognized as a powerful man in his persuasive sincerity. After seven influential years, he left for England to take part in the rising controversies of the times. There followed twenty years of prominence and activity; for a time he even held the governorship of the Somers Island Company, reorganized during the Interregnum. In 1662, ejected from his Berwick living, he again turned to the colonies as the best places to exercise his talents. Then came fairly brief periods in Surinam and Barbados, but by 1669 Oxenbridge reached Massachusetts, where he crowned his pastoral career with four years' service as minister of the First Church of Boston.

Oxenbridge's theories of the ideal Independent church were well inculcated by the time he left the Bermudas.

[28] Richard Beake, "A Transcript of a Letter," p. 4, in William Prynne, *A Fresh Discovery of Some Prodigious New Wandering-Blasing-Stars, & Firebrands* (London, 1645); Lefroy, *Memorials*, I, 556, 569–573, 617, 675; II, 42, 58; A. G. Matthews, *Calamy Revised* (Oxford, 1934), 377–378; Cotton Mather, *Magnalia Christi Americana* (Hartford, 1855), I, 597–599; William B. Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit* (New York, 1857-69), I, 170–171.

Then, too, it was his catechism, *Baby Milk*, that was used extensively on the islands for a decade or so after his departure. Before the latter event, moreover, two other ministers had arrived, both of whom shared not only his Calvinistic ardor but also his plans for the colony's religious future. The Reverend William Goulding[29] was in Warwick Tribe by the Fall of 1638. The Reverend Nathaniel Whyte[30] came the following Spring to preach in the Southampton and Sandys churches. A little later, when Goulding and Whyte temporarily returned to England, Oxenbridge was aided in spreading his ideas by still another Puritan minister, the Reverend Nicholas Leverton,[31] who apparently by pure chance arrived in the Bermudas at this opportune time. An Oxford graduate, he had served briefly in Barbados and in the new plantation tried on Providence Island. His Bermuda experience lasted only a year or so, and then he returned home; after he was ejected from his English living at the time of the Restoration, he rejoined Oxenbridge, who by that time was in Surinam. Leverton was not unknown in Puritan circles, but his stay in the Bermudas was comparatively inconsequential in relation to the longer and more effectual labors of Goulding and Whyte. With the aging Copland's ready assistance, these two men were destined to cause Bermuda to have a troubled decade that in many respects repeated conditions in the mother country. Bermuda's difficulties, however, began while Oxenbridge

[29] Lefroy, *Memorials*, I, 550, 608, 623, 638, 704; II, 9, 14, 59, 597.

[30] Lefroy, *Memorials*, I, 557, 565, 631, 632–635, 642–643, 711–713; "The Humble Petition and Declaration of the generall Inhabitants of the Plantation and Colony in the Sommer-Islands," in Prynne, *A Fresh Discovery* (Second edition, London, 1646), p. 85; *Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series, America and West Indies*, I, 323, 326–327 (thereafter referred to as *Calendar*); Richard Pinder, *The Spirit of Error* (London, 1660), pp. 9, 16–19.

[31] Edmund Calamy, *The Nonconformist's Memorial* (London, 1802), I, 371–376; Arthur Percival Newton, *The Colonizing Activities of the English Puritans* (New Haven, 1914), pp. 254–256.

was still preaching in the plantation, as were Whyte, Goulding, and Copland.

The colony, of course, could not harbor nonconformist churches with these well-known Puritans in their pulpits without word of this disobedience reaching the English authorities. In 1639, Puritanism's obdurate enemy, William Laud, Archbishop of Canterbury, complained that the greater part of the Somers Island Company itself as well as the governor and council of the islands consisted of nonconformists. Furthermore, the churches were reported as refusing to follow the Book of Common Prayer; other failings were that the orthodox practices of kneeling at the Lord's Supper and of using the sign of the cross in baptism were regularly ignored. The Company quickly denied the charges and wrote warningly to the Bermudas: as the colony had long been under accusation, the civil authorities and the ministers were to take care to conform in all particulars.[32]

How hopeful or desirous the Company was of being obeyed remains open to considerable doubt. Changing affairs in England soon nullified these cautions, but not the flow of advice from the Company. The Earl of Warwick carefully urged the colonists to wait before taking action until Parliament had determined the form of the national church; then they could adapt their own churches accordingly.[33] Moderates on the islands, led by Mr. Richard Norwood, the plantation's original surveyor and long a man of prominence in Bermuda affairs, could see the wisdom in thus delaying. In other words, they wanted to wait for a reformed Church of England, presumably to be modeled according to Presbyterian ideas. Furthermore, the argument was, the Bermuda churches had already been

[32] *Calendar*, I, 303; Lefroy, *Memorials*, I, 558–560.

[33] "A Declaration of the Right Honourable Robert, Earle of Warwick," in Prynne, *A Fresh Discovery* (Second edition, London, 1646), pp. 77–80.

shorn of much of their ritual; therefore, the colonists should be content to let matters stand.[34] But such tactics did not suit all. "Parliamentary Christians," who did not know what to think until instructed, were held up to scorn by those who thought they could clearly discern the way ahead. Indeed, said those eager to gather independent churches, to mark time was an insult to truth, to Parliament, and to the Bermuda churches. Would not all be in agreement before long?[35] The leader of this more radical party was the Reverend Nathaniel Whyte, gently described by his opponents as "a most seditious turbulent, and hatefull malicious person, and as politick as Achitophell, and as crafty and subtle as the Devill."[36]

Soon ecclesiastical affairs on the islands became more confused. The Whyte-Goulding-Copland faction in 1643 succeeded in forming a Congregational church that in all the main articles of faith and polity agreed with the New England churches. In January of 1644 this church seceded from the other Bermuda churches. As Whyte defined his beliefs and those of his two fellow Independents, theirs was a church based on the covenant theory, willing to hold out the hand of fellowship to other sister churches, willing to acknowledge the king as their temporal leader (but always remembering Christ as their true King). On two other burning ecclesiastical issues of the day Whyte also took his stand: He advocated that children of church members were to be baptized without question. Nor would he limit church membership unduly, as he maintained that corrupt members did not necessarily mean that a church was not a true one. Whyte denied absolutely that his doctrines had been

[34] Richard Norwood, in Prynne, *A Fresh Discovery* (London, 1645), p. 14; Lefroy, *Memorials*, I, 581, 594.

[35] "The Humble Petition . . . of the generall Inhabitants of . . . the Sommer Islands," in Prynne, *A Fresh Discovery* (Second edition, London, 1656), pp. 81–83.

[36] Beake, "A Transcript of a Letter," p. 2, in Prynne, *A Fresh Discovery* (London, 1645).

derived from Anabaptist, Brownist, or Donatist sources. Even the agreement with New England doctrine was not to be attributed to the influence of the Massachusetts churches —both his Bermuda and its northern sister churches were based upon truth and so had to coincide on major issues.[37]

For a time the Independents carried the day. The Reverend Daniel Wight, who dared to differ with them, left the islands. Nevertheless, the forming of this Congregational church did not, of course, go uncontested. The opposition, the Parliamentary Christians, had a strong case. The Independents could be accused of disloyalty to the Company from the beginning of the plantation. Had not Hughes, Stirke, Bernard, and Copland, all nonconformists, protested against the trade restriction that the Company had erected, for its own benefit only, according to their allegations? As late as 1647 Goulding was still demanding free trade in tobacco, without the restrictions that forbid marketing of the colony's main crop except through the Company. Again, the Independents had desired and were still requesting the right to emigrate from the Bermudas whenever they wished and opportunity arose; unauthorized desertion of this type would weaken the plantation.[38] Furthermore, the Independents, with Whyte and Goulding as able leaders, had gone over the heads of the Company to appeal to Parliament for the right of freedom of worship—a request that had been granted in 1645 and then acceded to by the Company.[39] The grounds of this Bermuda petition, interestingly enough, were that the islands had been

[37] Nathaniel Whyte, *Truth Gloriously Appearing, From Under The sad and sable Cloud of Obloquie. Or, A Vindication Of the Practice of the Church of Christ in the Summer-Islands* [London, 1645], pp. 52–53, 56–58, 116, 125, 126–127.

[38] William Goulding, *Servants on Horse-Back . . . being A Representation of the dejected state of the Inhabitants of Summer Islands . . .* (1648), pp. 3–5, 8, 11–12, 18.

[39] Lefroy, *Memorials*, I, 600–603; William Frith Williams, *A Historical and Statistical Account of the Bermudas, from their Discovery to the Present Time* (London, 1848), pp. 39, 261–266.

settled by sufferers from the episcopal party and by men "flying from the avengers of nonconformity."

By 1647 there were two distinct sects on the islands, one Presbyterian, the other Congregational, with two ministers each. (Gould had gone with Sayle to England so that they could truly present the Independent point of view to the English authorities, or there would have been three Independent preachers.) The Presbyterians, whose numbers must have included many of the erstwhile Parliamentary Christians, were the most numerous, if not the most zealous.[40] They had, at first, strong English support, for William Prynne, an active pamphleteer and an outstanding member of the Long Parliament, was one of their backers. He gladly published attacks[41] on the Whyte-Goulding-Copland radicals, with at least the result that he in turn was characterized by Whyte as "a cock fed with garlick, which overcomes with rankness of breath, not with strength of body."[42] On the other hand, although the Independents did not claim supremacy in numbers, they did assert that they had among their followers the "most considerable" of Sandys Tribe and "many" of Smiths Tribe. At any rate, the original church probably consisted of thirty to forty members, but soon grew, for about ninety names of sympathizers could be gathered for a petition.[43] The Independents, moreover, rejoiced in the backing of men politically powerful in Bermuda. Among their lay leaders were William Sayle, who at different times had served as sheriff and governor; Stephen Paynter, one of a trio of co-governors in 1647, and at other times in his long career a councillor for Southampton Tribe, the factor of the Earl of Warwick,

[40] *Calendar*, I, 326–327, 328.

[41] In the two editions, 1645 and 1646, of *The Fresh Discovery*.

[42] Whyte, *Truth Gloriously Appearing*, p. 162.

[43] *Ibid.*, p. 29 and appended petition.

a sheriff, and a captain in charge of the island's defence; William Wilkinson, another co-governor and active Bermudian; and William Raynor, the sheriff of Pembroke Tribe. While Independents and Parliamentary Christians, and then Independents and Presbyterians disputed, the lost souls were those between the two parties, those who felt that they could not whole-heartedly join either faction; robbed of a ministry and of the sacraments, unable to have their children baptized, they were—in their island fastness—little better than excommunicated medieval serfs.

The early triumph of the Independents soon faded. Despite the 1645 declaration of Parliament and the Somers Island Company that there should be religious freedom on the islands, the more conservative faction was able to silence, at least partially, the more radical group and then to drive the latter out of the Bermudas. This shift in power was only a temporary victory. How it was accomplished remains somewhat vague. Governor Turner, sent over by the Company in 1647, certainly had no sympathy for the Independents, and during his regime laws were passed forbidding the Independents to hold meetings, to preach, and to take part in the government.[44] Undoubtedly Turner's adroit political maneuvering to bring about these bans was aided by a sudden burst of loyalty for the Crown, which the more radical elements in England were bent upon destroying. Bermuda's radicals, royalist or not in their sympathies, had to suffer for the acts of their fellow leftists who had remained at home. The governor, however, could not fully enforce the laws he had fathered. A major effort was made to silence the Reverend Nathaniel Whyte, as the true source of all the trouble. Consequently, Whyte left for England early in 1648 to defend himself against charges of treason; with him went Stephen Paynter, also under

[44] Goulding, *Servants on Horse-Back*, p. 19.

attack. Goulding died soon after his colleague's departure. Independency, although deprived of many of its leaders, refused to collapse. With lay preachers stepping into the breach, the people continued to flock to the Old Mill, the Independent meeting house; worse still, they refused to listen to other ministers.[45]

Nevertheless, handicapped by the restrictions placed upon them, many of the group decided to emigrate to the Bahamas, a scheme that had been in the air for some time, at least as early as 1646.[46] Later these men spoke of themselves as abused and exiled, and the opposition confessed to partial responsibility for driving them out. But at the time the emigrants may have been more willing to go than they afterwards admitted, for the Eleuthera experiment started with high hopes and then petered out with surprising rapidity and thoroughness. Here was to be a colony founded on the principle of complete liberty of conscience, with no man reproaching his neighbor for his beliefs.[47] Here was to be found the prosperity that releases men from temporal bondage.

The moving spirit in this emigration was William Sayle, the former governor of Bermuda, who was again to hold office in that colony as well as in South Carolina, and a man who always proved himself to be an optimist and idealist. It was he who obtained a charter[48] for the experiment and the potential support of some twenty-six proprietors. These backers included some of the leading Puritans of the day. Among them were men with close New England connec-

[45] *Winthrop Papers*, V, 224–227; Lefroy, *Memorials*, I, 635–637, 651–652; Goulding, *Servants on Horse-Back*, p. 8–12, 18, 23.

[46] Edward Duffield Neill, "A Chapter of American Church History," *The New Englander*, XXXVIII (1879), 471–486; *Winthrop Papers*, V, 71–73, 96–97.

[47] Fulmer Mood, "A Broadside Advertising Eleuthera and the Bahama Islands London 1647," The Colonial Society of Massachusetts, *Publications*, XXXII (1937), 78–86.

[48] John T. Hassam, *The Bahama Islands. Notes on an Early Attempt at Colonization* (Cambridge, Mass., 1899), pp. 17–58.

tions—John and Joseph Bolles, Nicholas Bond, Robert Haughton, and John Humphrey; Cromwell's secretary, John Rushworth; and three of the regicide judges—John Hutchinson, Cornelius Holland, and Gregory Clement. In Bermuda, Sayle had the active cooperation of William Raynor and of the two ministers, the aged Copland and Whyte, the latter presently vindicated of the charges against him.

Disaster struck quickly. Discord broke out on shipboard among the emigrants, and Sayle tried to separate his followers on two islands. In doing so he lost a large part of his provisions and one ship. Still undaunted, he sought aid and recruits in Virginia, but the nonconformists there questioned the wisdom of joining in the experiment. New England, originally doubtful of an experiment that involved complete liberty of conscience, generously sent aid, but more than temporary sustenance was needed. The islands proved to have become too barren and the soil too shallow to support a prosperous plantation.

By 1650 the authorities in England had grown aware of what was taking place in Bermuda. The Parliamentary act of 1645 granting freedom of religion was being flouted, with Puritans suffering for their beliefs. Orders were issued that the Eleuthera settlers be welcomed back to Bermuda. When the Commission for Foreign Plantations feared that their commands in this respect had not been fully obeyed, instructions went to Jamaica to rescue any Eleutherans that remained in the Bahamas. Apparently most of the Independents did return to their homes in Bermuda, some seventy men and women going back as early as the fall of 1650; others lingered as late as 1656 and 1657 before seeking to re-establish themselves in the Bermudas; a few families, some of whom eventually settled in Maine, remained even longer, and there were Bermudians on Eleuthera as late as

1684.[49] But Sayle's brave attempt to create a truly tolerant Puritan colony was virtually over very shortly after its ambitious beginnings.

With the new decade, the 1650's, Bermuda's religious fervor, at least as it manifested itself in bitter controversy, seems to have died out. With surprising complacency and rapidity, the different parties agreed to let bygones be bygones. Independent ministers continued to flourish. Just when the Reverend Nathaniel Whyte returned is uncertain, but it was probably around 1655 or 1656, and then he went to the Paget church. Shortly thereafter, he also preached in Pembroke on every third Sabbath. That in his later years he was a respected member of the community may be seen in the Council's unanimous request to him to deliver a sermon at the 1661 General Assizes. By the summer of 1668 he was too aged and infirm to fulfill his parish duties, but was generously pensioned until his death in the fall of the year.[50] At the time of the return of Whyte, another fairly radical minister arrived. The Reverend Dr. Thomas Brown[51] spent some five or six years—until his death about 1661—serving in a number of pulpits, at St. George's and in Smith, Hamilton, Pembroke, and Paget Tribes. The authorities interfered with his labors only once: he was ordered to cease preaching in the Paget churches, for he and William Reighton were stirring up the people.[52] This William Reighton, a former servant of Hugh Peter's, was a layman. He had, nevertheless, permission to preach, according to an act of 1655.[53]

[49] *Copy of a Petition From the Governor and Company of the Sommer Islands . . . presented to . . . the Councel of State July the 19th 1651* (London, 1651), pp. 14–15, 16; *Calendar*, I, 453; "Minutes of His Majesty's Council of the Bermudas or Somer's Islands," *Bermuda Historical Quarterly*, I (1944), 56; Lefroy, *Memorials*, II, 86, 98, 112.

[50] Lefroy, *Memorials*, II, 84, 86, 89, 135, 146–147, 159, 162, 200, 276, 277, 280, 636.

[51] *Ibid.*, I, 694; II, 68, 92, 97, 100, 122, 135, 153, 664; Pinder, *The Spirit of Error*, p. 10.

[52] Lefroy, *Memorials*, II, 77.

[53] *Ibid.*, II, 56, 68, 77, 85, 99; *Calendar*, XII, 50.

Another minister active during the Commonwealth period and certainly an Independent or Congregationalist was the Reverend Jonathan Burr.[54] This man appears to have been the New Englander of the same name who was educated at Harvard, where he proceeded to the Master of Arts degree in 1654. Arriving in the Bermudas in 1656, he spent some years in preaching in various parts of the islands, in Hamilton, Paget, Warwick, and Devonshire parishes. As he does not seem to have been in orders, the Company in 1662 decided that he should be discharged from the ministry but allowed to remain as a schoolmaster, a service he had been rendering for several years. He had, however, only three more years of life, dying some time in the later part of 1665.

The Restoration had little effect upon Bermuda nonconformity. Dissenting ministers, some ordained and some not, continued to fill the pulpits. In October of 1662 the Company commissioned the Reverend Samuel Smith[55] to preach at St. George's; he was the son of one of their members of the same name. The younger Smith, a graduate of Emmanuel College, Cambridge, and "dearly beloved Brother" of Whyte's, was not episcopally ordained but he served until 1671, a good part of the time in some difficulty with the local authorities. (Ministers in the Bermudas were constantly being urged to fill empty pulpits as well as perform their own pastoral duties. As this practice smacked of the dualism so objected to in the Church of England, nonconformists often refused.)

Smith's service and consequent difficulties were, however, very unspectacular in comparison with the career of a fellow

[54] Lefroy, *Memorials*, I, 695; II, 80, 131, 135, 147, 162, 175, 177; Pinder, *The Spirit of Error*, 10, 23; J. L. Sibley, *Biographical Sketches of Graduates of Harvard University* (Cambridge, 1873–85), I, 309–310, 592; Chauncey Rea Burr, *Burrs of Suffolk England and Burr of Massachusetts Bay Colony New England* (New York, 1926), pp. 30, 33; *Boston Evening Transcript*, December 13, 1905, p. 27.

[55] Lefroy, *Memorials*, I, 707; II, 123, 173–174, 177, 267, 268, 276–277, 280, 294, 317, 320, 329, 345, 540, 637; Wilkinson, *The Adventurers of Bermuda*, pp. 342–343, 352, 354.

Puritan who also found his way to the islands in those years of adjustment after the Interregnum. Early in 1663, on the same ship as Smith, came the Reverend Sampson Bond,[56] for many years Bermuda's most outstanding minister, popular with many, detested by some. Those that had urged the Company to appoint him called him a "Godly orthodox & Paineful Divine," but others had raised the question of whether he was not a "litigious" person. Perhaps both opinions of the gentleman possessed a strong element of truth in them. At least, the Somers Island Company lasted long enough twice to regret their decision in his favor and order him removed from office—and each time to reverse themselves in his favor.

All started well. Governor Sayle, again in office, welcomed Bond with the greatest cordiality, and in the stormy days ahead the governor remained faithful to him. Within three years of his arrival Bond was indeed in trouble. Not only had he caused dissension to break out on the islands, but he had raised the delicate question of whether Negroes embracing Christianity should not be given their liberty and (the converse of the problem) whether an attempt should be made to instruct Negro children in any of the teachings of Christianity. Perhaps because of the controversy thus aroused, in 1669 he seriously considered removing with some hundreds of his followers to New York; on Staten Island he hoped to find the complete liberty of conscience he sought. This plan fell through, but another immediately presented itself. Sayle had emigrated to South

[56] *Calendar*, XII, 51; Lefroy, *Memorials*, II, 171–173, 174, 177, 207, 262, 280, 289–290, 317, 329–330, 334, 335, 336–338, 338–339, 368–369, 458, 460–461, 483, 500, 506, 525, 551, 557, 561; Massachusetts Historical Society, *Collections*, 4th Ser., VII, 319, VIII, 388; Francis Estlake, William Wilkinson, R. R., John Tysoe, *A Bermuda Preacher Proved a Persecutor* (London, 1683), *passim*; Worthington C. Ford, "Rev. Sampson Bond of the Bermudas," Massachusetts Historical Society, *Proceedings*, LIV (1920–21), 295–318; Matthews, *Calamy Revised*, pp. 63–64; Wilkinson, *The Adventurers of Bermuda*, pp. 352, 355, 358.

Carolina along with a good many other Bermudians; as the first governor of the new colony, he wanted Bond to settle there, for he believed that many from Bermuda and the other island colonies would follow this preacher wherever he might settle. Nothing came of this idea either, but in the meantime the Somers Island Company dismissed him as a trouble-maker.

Bond's parishioners in Devonshire and Pembroke promptly came to their favorite's defense. It is difficult now to determine the source of this man's popularity, but he seems to have had a most compelling personality. Throughout his life, in youth and old age, he could always command the loyalty of hundreds of followers. One source of his power may well have lain in his preaching. By ill chance, however, the only surviving sermon of his many years of preaching is one delivered in England before an audience of fellow divines. In this somewhat elaborate piece of pulpit oratory his learned allusions are somewhat painfully profuse, undoubtedly calculated to impress his peers; on the other hand, his rhetorical devices are forceful, and his imagery striking, often—in typical Puritan fashion—depending upon homely metaphor. Pride, he told his listeners with memorable brevity, was a horse, but lust was a mule. Or in discussing man's propensity to wrath and violence, he could aptly point out the other side of the picture:

> Certainly the bone was never well set, that easily slips out of joint; a man ful of juyce and sap of grace is like greene wood, which is long before it is kindled; mercy is not hasty, is not violent; it breaks no bones. . . .[57]

If this sermon is to be considered in some measure Bond's usual style of preaching to lay audiences as well as to clerical gatherings, much of his appeal for his listeners can be ex-

[57] Sampson Bond, *A Sermon Preached before the Reverend Committee of Divines, the 20th of May 1646* (London, 1646), p. 14.

plained. But again the question of how typical this sermon was of his weekly labors must insert itself on a different score, for the young minister was accused of plagiarizing parts of this discourse, a charge that he met with a long and unsuccessful law suit. Nor was this the last time that the originality of his sermons was to be questioned. Nevertheless, despite his tendency to overrely at least occasionally on other men's pulpit oratory, Bond seems to have had a succinct and convincing way of approaching religious concepts. Certainly when there was need of clarity he could reduce his style to the essential, clear his points of needless allusion and reference. Nothing could be simpler, less apt to raise doubts than the catechism[58] he wrote for the benefit of Bermuda children.

Bond had to go to England to vindicate himself of the various charges that had been made against him in Bermuda, but the Company did reinstate him in 1672. His checkered career during the rest of his long life echoed these earlier tribulations. Twice he considered emigrating to Massachusetts. The arrangements even went so far in 1682 that the old man preached a trial sermon in Boston, but he had to retire from the candidacy in disgrace, again accused of preaching a sermon that was not his own. He was in constant difficulty with the Bermuda authorities, both before and after this Boston fiasco. In 1679 he was dismissed for the second time, only to be reinstated in 1681. As late as 1686 Governor Coney longed to imprison him so that the islands might enjoy some much needed peace. Nevertheless, the Governor, canny for once, restrained himself, knowing that such a gesture would be in vain: Bond's loyal friends would always rescue him.

Bond and Smith were not the only ministers to arrive in

[58] Bond, *The Sincere Milk of the Word, For the Children of Bermuda. In a Short and Plain Catechism* (Boston, 1699).

1663. Still another came, the Reverend Henry Vaughan.[59] This ejected Vicar of Grantham, Lincolnshire, had had a troubled English career even during the days of the triumph of the Puritan party, for he was a zealous royalist and a bitter critic of the Rump Parliament. The Somers Island Company in 1662 appointed him to Warwick and Paget Tribes. Although Vaughan did not go so far in his dissent as to accept the idea of Independency in its fullest development, he soon found himself in friendly accord with Whyte, as these two men obviously shared many points of view. Indeed, Whyte, Smith, Bond, and Vaughan seem to have formed the small coterie that welcomed the Reverend Michael Wigglesworth when that Massachusetts minister sought to regain his health in the warm climate of the Bermudas. In 1669, however, Vaughan left, not to return until 1678, when he brought with him his son, another Henry Vaughan. This second Henry Vaughan was at first thought to be a conservative Church of England man; nevertheless, he soon fell under the spell of Sampson Bond and proved a true son of his nonconformist father. The latter died in 1680, but his son continued to preach at St. George's for a good many years.

Other dissenting ministers, deprived of their English livings after the Restoration, also tried to find in the islands both a refuge and an outlet for their talents. When the elder Henry Vaughan returned to England in 1669, his place in Warwick and Pembroke Tribes was filled, but only briefly, by the Reverend Charles Hotham,[60] the son of Sir John Hotham, the noted Parliamentarian and governor of Hull. This Cambridge graduate, having received his degrees from Christ's College, served as a Fellow of Peterhouse from

[59] Lefroy, *Memorials*, I, 708–709; II, 207, 250, 262, 280, 289, 483, 499, 551, 556–557, 559; Matthews, *Calamy Revised*, 500–501.

[60] Lefroy, *Memorials*, I, 704–705; II, 307; John and J. A. Venn, *Alumni Cantabrigienses* (Cambridge, 1922), I, 412; Matthews, *Calamy Revised*, pp. 278–279.

1644 to 1651, when his beliefs led the university authorities to dismiss him. He then held various livings in England until he was ejected in 1662. A Fellow of the Royal Society, Hotham typified the budding scientist of his day, much interested in astronomy and astrology as well as in chemical experiments. In addition, he earned considerable contemporary reputation for his distinguished scholarship, which his translation of Boehme well evidenced. As he did not reach the islands until 1670 and died early in 1672, his influence was limited, but it is interesting to note that he sought a home in this island colony rather than in New England.

A less distinguished ejected minister but one who had many years of service with the Somers Island Company was the Reverend William Edwards,[61] who accompanied Hotham on the voyage from England to the islands, both men having been appointed at the same time. Edwards, an Oxford graduate and an experienced preacher, had many opportunities to spread his ideas throughout the colony, as he was heard in a number of Bermuda churches. He seems to have preached in Smith, Hamilton, Somerset, Southampton, and Pembroke Tribes. One reason for this dispersion of his efforts may be seen in the fact that for two years, from 1673 to 1675, he was the only preacher in the Bermudas.

The Reverend John Fowle,[62] appointed by the Company to preach in Sandys and Southampton Tribes, by 1675 relieved Edwards of some of his multiple duties. The

[61] Lefroy, *Memorials*, I, 703; II, 307, 317, 368, 374, 403, 516, 525; Matthews, *Calamy Revised*, p. 180.

[62] John Fowle, *Deus Visibilis; or, a God, Manifested in the Flesh. Being a Discourse, Concerning the Fundamental and Essential Articles of the Christian Religion* (Boston, 1704); *Calendar*, XII, 51; Lefroy, *Memorials*, I, 703; II, 416, 520, 525, 560, 643, 644; Elmer Allen Pierce, *Immigrant Ancestors of the Various Fowle Families of America* (1912), p. 303; John Outerbridge Brown, "The Bermuda Islands and their Connection with New York," *New York Genealogical and Biographical Record*, XXV (1894), 185–187; Henry C. Wilkinson, *Bermuda in the Old Empire* (London, 1950), pp. 26–32.

newcomer was New England-born; his father, Thomas Fowle, had been one of the most prominent Boston settlers until he fell out with the Winthrops. The elder Fowle, a believer in toleration at least to the point of the acceptance of Anabaptists and their principles, returned to England with his family in 1646. The son, consequently, received his degrees from the University of Dublin rather than from Harvard, where he most probably would have been a student if his father's New England stay had been less contentious. The younger Fowle, however, married a New England girl and later in life turned to Boston when he wanted to publish a statement of his faith. He enjoyed a long life of service in the islands, apparently unhampered in his work except that in 1694 he was warned to avoid in his preaching adverse reflections upon the Church of England. In his old age Fowle became minister of a duly organized Presbyterian church in Warwick Tribe.

All these dissenting ministers who reached the Bermudas after the Restoration were thought by observers both in England and the islands to be very nearly akin in their ideas about church polity to New England's religious leaders of the same period. Not only was there considerable inclination toward Presbyterianism, but there was also decided variation about the question of separation from the Church of England, with some men abhoring the very notion, others coming very near to accepting it in practice if not in theory, and still others frankly admitting to themselves that they were Independents. As far as can be seen in the surviving records, most congregations were largely in rapport with their ministers, but there were some exceptions.

The Bermuda Independents, considered by their more unsympathetic contemporaries in England to be disturbing radicals, were in turn not untroubled by a still more radical group, the Quakers. By 1660 a few of the traveling Friends

began to consider including the islands in their itineraries;[63] the first to arrive were George Rofe and Richard Pinder. Some five years later, in 1665, Elizabeth Carter reached the plantation. She returned twice in the 1670's, on one occasion accompanied by Anne Butler, but afterwards having as her companion Katherine Norton. Still later, around 1685, Henry Currier visited the colony, and in the first years of the new century one of the better known itinerants, Thomas Chalkley, sojourned briefly there.

Comparatively few of the many zealous traveling ministers of the Society of Friends labored in the Bermudas, and this limited group of Fox's disciples were only moderately successful in their efforts. The convincements that they did succeed in making were, for the most part, erstwhile Independents,[64] men who had followed Whyte, Goulding, and Copland in their formal secession from the Anglican church and had not been able to reconcile themselves to the more moderate course that many Bermuda churches were taking. This winning away of their parishioners naturally added much to the bitterness of the dissenting ministers in their attacks upon the Quakers. Moreover, a few prominent Bermudians became active members of the Society. William Wilkinson, for a brief time one of the co-governors of the islands and an ardent supporter of the Independents, joined the Society, as did William Reighton, Jr., the son of a very active Independent. Another prominent member of Whyte's church, Stephen

[63] Henry C. Cadbury, "George Rofe in these American Parts," Friends Historical Association, *Bulletin*, XXXV (1946), 17–26; "Notes on Friends in Bermuda," Friends Historical Association, *Bulletin*, VI, 20–21; Alice Curwen, *A Relation of the Labour, Travail, and Suffering of that faithful Servant of the Lord* (1680), pp. 7–10; Lefroy, *Memorials*, II, 133, 137, 145, 161, 183, 202, 215, 227–228, 243, 249, 250, 272–273, 273–274, 290, 312, 368, 377–379, 434–436, 502.

[64] Richard Baxter, *A Defence of the Principles of Love, Which are necessary to the Unity and Concord of Christians; and are delivered in a Book called The Cure of Church Divisions* (London, 1671), pp. 50–51; Part II, 175.

Paynter, saw his daughter, Governor Seymour's wife, become a member. Officially, according to Bermuda law at the time, this act on her part disqualified her husband from holding office, but no legal action seems to have been taken. Well-known as these Bermudians were, the most vociferous leader of the Friends was one Francis Estlake,[65] who led all protests against the government and ministers.

Nevertheless, despite the Quaker success in making inroads into the Independent congregations and in convincing some men and women of note, the meetings remained small, and a limited number of families were connected with the movement. In the 1660's, when membership was increasing, usually fewer than a half-dozen men were annually in trouble for refusing to bear arms. By 1701, when the first crest of the movement undoubtedly had passed, Thomas Chalkley admitted that there were very few Friends in the colony.[66] During the years between, in the 1670's and 1680's, the Society undoubtedly prospered; but in contrast to its history in other colonies, it never reached an important position in Bermuda life.

Mild, too, in comparison to other colonies, was the persecution that members of the Society had to endure. In fact, at first the local authorities, with Governor Sayle at their head, prepared to accept these adherents of a new creed. Soon, however, this attitude changed as the Quakers proceeded to interrupt church services and seemingly to mock the ministers. The Reverend Nathaniel Whyte had a difficult time with these disrupters, as did Sampson Bond a little later; other ministers, especially the senior Vaughan, also suffered in this way. Encouraged by the Company, the Bermuda officials rapidly began to deal more severely

[65] *A Bermudas Preacher Proved a Persecutor Being a Just Tryal of Sampson Bond's Book, entituled, a Publick Tryal of the Quakers . . . and that the True Christ is Owned by the People Called Quakers, Plainly Made Manifest* (London, 1683).

[66] Thomas Chalkley, *A Collection of the Works of . . .* (Philadelphia, 1754), I, 34.

with such offenders as could be caught breaking the law. Penalties were exacted for not attending church, and men who refused to join the militia were punished or threatened with punishment. Periodically after 1662, particularly when the colony seemed to be in some danger from foreign attack, the Quakers were fined for not sharing in the usual defense measures.[67] On the other hand, despite their eagerness to discourage the Society, authorities did not attempt to prohibit meetings of its members, nor were the latter prevented from holding public disputes with some of the ministers.

Whether suffering active persecution or not, the leftist fringe of dissent had comparatively little influence in the Bermudas; neither the Quakers nor other radical groups were able to become more than somewhat belligerent small minorities. More conservative nonconformists remained in the majority during the latter part of the century, with progress toward the right rather than the left. Even Independency, admittedly always a minority church, gradually gave way to Presbyterianism. In 1677 a contemporary report stated that two-thirds of the people were Presbyterians, the rest Independents, Anabaptists, and Quakers.[68] Which of the dissenting ministers were truly Presbyterian remains doubtful, except in the case of the Reverend John Fowle, who labored unremittingly to bring the people to this way of thinking. Even the names of the Anabaptist preachers are lost, although probably Mr. William Milburne (Milborne), licensed in 1672 to read and to explain the Scriptures, was one of their number. (In later years, having left the islands, he became a Baptist preacher.[69]) In 1683 an official comment on the Bermuda situation did not

[67] "Minutes of His Majesty's Council of the Bermudas or Somer's Islands," *Bermuda Historical Quarterly*, I (1944), 56.

[68] Lefroy, *Memorials*, II, 433.

[69] Wilkinson, *Bermuda in the Old Empire*, p. 7.

try to determine the strength of different groups but merely noted that the ministers were all violent nonconformists who refused to pray for the king.[70] Three years later Governor Coney bitterly accused Bermudians of knowing only by hearsay the Book of Common Prayer and the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper.[71] By the latter charge he may have been referring to the Quakers or the overlax ministers or, most probably, to the way in which the rite of communion was administered. In 1691, seven years after Bermuda had become a royal colony, Governor Isaac Richier more philosophically reported to the Lords of Trade and Plantations that his subjects "generally" were dissenters;[72] he saw either no need to differentiate further among them or no way to distinguish sects or churches.

Despite this apparent continued loyalty throughout the century to dissent as a general principle, both social and political pressure was exerted in favor of conformity after 1684. In this year, upon the dissolution of the Somers Island Company, the islands became a Crown colony. The royal governors as representatives of both the Crown and the Lords of Trade, thereafter became more important in the life of the colony. They were, of course, all good Church of England men; by 1686 members of the Council had to conform in the same manner or lose their positions.[73] Then, too, new authorities had good cause to look with decidedly prejudiced eyes upon the dissenting ministers, for the latter had fought the change in the colony's status. The nonconforming clergy, in turn, soon had practical reasons for regretting the old regime. Although liberty of conscience was proclaimed, the glebe lands were to be used for the

[70] *Calendar*, XI, 439; Lefroy, *Memorials*, II, 515.

[71] *Calendar*, XII, 136.

[72] "Minutes of His Majesty's Council of the Bermudas or Somer's Islands," *Bermuda Historical Quarterly*, II (1945), 188.

[73] *Ibid.*, I, 57.

support only of regular Church of England ministers.[74] Nor were the dissenting ministers the only group to suffer. Some regicides, safe these many years on this distant island, had their property confiscated and reassigned to loyal monarchists.[75]

But this outward pressure to bring about conformity of belief and to establish a truly Anglican church was not the only cause of a gradual weakening in dissent. In the years before and after the Company's dissolution, the Puritan population was divided within itself as a result of differences of opinion concerning Bermuda's future welfare. History to some degree repeated itself. In the 1680's, as in the 1640's, Bermuda nonconformists split into two parties, and again political implications were interwoven with religious issues. From the beginning of the settlement there had been protests against the Somers Island Company. Again and again, charges of selfishness in their trade policies were made by the islanders against this organization, and many Bermudians undoubtedly believed that they, the actual planters, had long been sacrificed for the greed of a limited group of men who thought only of their own profits and who knew little or nothing of colonial conditions. These protests often had been led or encouraged by Puritan ministers and laymen. In fact, the most vociferous objectors to the Company's trade policies and the more radical religious dissenters were popularly considered to be one and the same party. For years irrepressible Stephen Paynter had been the chief protagonist in the serial drama of island planter versus financial adventurer; Paynter was such an out-and-out nonconformist that he was accused of being a Brownist, and very certainly he was a particularly vigorous Independent.

[74] *Ibid.*, III, 15.
[75] *Ibid.*, II, 190.

During the Restoration years Paynter's place as a fomenter of protest was largely taken over by another conspicuous dissenter, William Reighton.[76] This was the man who in his pre-Bermuda days had been in Hugh Peter's service and in his earlier years on the islands had been a lay preacher, active especially during the manifestly Puritan days of the Interregnum. Still later, he did not endear himself to the more conservative element by his defense of the Quakers, a group that his son openly joined. Nevertheless, despite his lack of popularity in some quarters, the senior Reighton was able to convince many dissatisfied Bermudians that their only hope for the future lay in the dissolution of their old enemy, the Somers Island Company. This attack from its own settlers undoubtedly injured the Company's cause in its struggle[77] to maintain itself during the political upheavals going on in England. The shareholders, however, found unexpected if ineffectual support in the Bermuda clergy. The dissenting ministers, rather to their own surprise, discovered themselves to be sudden advocates of the advantage of life under the Company's rule.[78] Their fear was obvious and openly voiced: Bermuda as a royal colony would follow England into Catholicism. The pope would be able to claim one more colony as his own. Considering events in England at the time, this typically Puritan apprehensiveness for both the home country and the plantation was not entirely unfounded.

Such evil forebodings proved, needless to say, to be exaggerated. But if future conditions in the islands did not warrant the dark prophecies made in Puritan pulpits, the concern of the ministers at the change in rule was not with-

[76] *Ibid.*, I, 57 *et seq.;* William Reighton, *The Disloyal Actings of the Bermuda Company in London* (1678); *Calendar*, XII, 50; Wilkinson, *The Adventurers of Bermuda*, pp. 366 *et seq.*

[77] Wilkinson, *The Adventurers of Bermuda*, pp. 363–373.

[78] Lefroy, *Memorials*, II, 515.

out some justification. Bermuda dissent, contentious within itself but vigorous from the colony's first settlement, lost its virtually free development after 1684. The Presbyterians remained the dominant group for some years and then, as the eighteenth century progressed, became a resolute minority. As late as the 1720's a dissenting church was in correspondence with New England Mathers in an effort to secure a satisfactory ministry, but sympathetic ties with Massachusetts weakened. Generally speaking, the religious issues of the seventeenth century were largely forgotten. Puritanism had not taken advantage of its years of safety from the prelates' rage, but had weakened itself by discord almost to the point of extinction. The important issue of the control of the colony by the Somers Island Company or by the Crown had been so clouded by the fear of Catholicism that the dissenting ministers and their leading supporters were in complete disagreement. Socially and politically, the advantage henceforth was with Anglicanism, and a few popular governors did much to cement the idea of loyalty to England and the Church of England. While dissent, even in its conservative form, lost its numerical strength, the Established Church, bestirring iself to missionary activity in the early decades of the new century, was able to claim more and more members. Soon Bermuda could no longer be regarded as a Puritan colony, in its ideology close to New England.

Chapter IV

Maryland: Puritanism Unhampered by an Established Church

Not a few articles and books treat Maryland's early history with due regard to the part religion played in this proprietary colony's varied fate during the upheavals in England's troubled seventeenth century. And a goodly proportion of these essays reveal as much about their authors' points of view, not to say prejudices, as they do about conditions in Maryland. Many have been the disputes about the relative power at various times of the Catholic and Protestant factions. Certainly religious controversy started early. Difficulties beset the Calverts' adventure from its very beginning when William Claiborne—a Protestant, a Virginian, and one of the most stubborn fighters in colonial history—had to be ousted from his Kent Island and Palmer Island trading posts to make way for this new colonization. Maryland, hitherto considered part of Virginia, became in 1634 the property of the Baltimore family, who had been converted to Catholicism but held the colony by grace of Protestant or avowedly Protestant kings and of decidedly Protestant parliaments. Moreover, at least partially in order to protect their Roman Catholic settlers, the Calverts inaugurated a policy of toleration of all Christian sects. For some years, too, the second Lord Baltimore's bitter and protracted dispute with the Jesuits about property rights complicated the situation. Nor is the history of the colony simplified by the fact that the Baltimores, after some early difficulties with England's Interregnum rulers, swung over temporarily to the Parliamentary party, as did many other Catholics.

Of all the colonies, Maryland had the tenure of its rulers most often threatened or actually broken. William Claiborne was but the first of a number of prominent Protestant rebels against the proprietorship. For many years such men as Richard Ingle, John Fendall, William Davyes, John Pate, and John Coode were willing to seize any opportunity to overturn the government. From 1645 to 1647 the Claiborne-Ingle uprising put the colony into turmoil. From 1655 to 1658 a Puritan faction had control of the government. When the Calverts regained possession of the colony, their regime was quickly upset by the Fendall rebellion of 1660. Again in 1676 there was a small uprising, to be followed by two more serious insurrections, the Coode-Fendall conspiracy of 1681 and the Protestant Revolution in 1689, with Coode once more as a dominant leader. In none of these controversies was the issue purely religious; indeed, Catholics occasionally joined the rebelling party, and Protestants were often faithful to their oaths of allegiance to the Baltimores. Personal rivalries and economic problems often motivated the actions of men on both sides. Nevertheless, the Protestant-Catholic divergency was never so far in the background that it could not be quickly employed to arouse the people emotionally. The cleavage was always sufficiently decided that the temporary success of these insurrections may be taken to demonstrate the power of the Protestant settlers when conditions in England encouraged them to show their strength.

But whatever the machinations of Maryland's politics, complicated by conditions within the colony as well as by repercussions of the English situation, all contemporary comments and records indicate that from the very beginning of settlement numerically the Protestants were in the ascendancy and remained so throughout the century. In 1641, before there had been any immigration of Puritan

groups, Father White, the Jesuit, judged that "by far the greater part" of the people were heretics, that is, Protestants.[1] Thirty-five years later, in 1676, Lord Baltimore put the Protestant proportion of his population even higher: he claimed that three-fourths of the people belonged to independent Protestant sects, and some of the remaining fourth were Church of England, while others were Catholic.[2] By the end of the century a Protestant calculation put the Catholic population as not above one-twelfth of the total;[3] by 1708 a census showed 2974 Catholics out of a 40,000 population.[4]

Granted, then, that the Protestants were a constantly growing majority, the difficulty lies in determining the comparative conformity and nonconformity of this part of the population. That there were always nonconformists in Maryland cannot be doubted. From the first arrival of the *Ark* and the *Dove* in 1634 with their two hundred odd London artisans, there must have been Puritans in Maryland. No group of any size made up of working men from England's capital would have been free during this period of the radical tinge of Genevan thought. As if in demonstration of this tendency of the times toward Calvinism, the young colony's records in 1638 include an interesting judicial case.[5] Three indentured servants and one freeman, all Protestants,

[1] Henry Foley, ed., *Records of the English Province of the Society of Jesus* (London, 1878), III, 362, 364. The 1642 report reads in part that "by far the greater part are heretics, the country itself, *a meridie Virginiae ab Aquilone*, is esteemed likewise to be a New England, that is two provinces full of English Calvinists and Puritans."

[2] William H. Browne, ed., *Archives of Maryland, Proceedings of Council 1667–1687/8* (Baltimore, 1883–), V, 133, 267–268. Volumes in this series hereafter cited as *Archives*.

[3] Thomas Lawrence, *The Present State of the Protestant Religion in Maryland* (1696), in Bernard C. Steiner, ed., *Thomas Bray His Life and Selected Works*, Maryland Historical Society, *Fund Publications*, XXXVII (1901), 160.

[4] Bradley T. Johnson, *The Foundation of Maryland*, Maryland Historical Society, *Fund Publications*, XVIII (1883).

[5] *Archives: Judicial and Testamentary Business of the Provincial Court 1637–1660*, IV, 25–29.

rebelled against their Catholic overseer's forbidding them to read a book of sermons which had anti-Catholic passages. This famous case, which the Catholic authorities decided in favor of the Protestant working men and against Father Philip Fisher's overseer,[6] has often been cited to show Maryland's early toleration in practice. But this little tempest-in-a-teapot shows more. The book involved, interestingly enough, was a collection of the works of a well-known Puritan, the "golden-voiced" Henry Smith, whose preaching at St. Clement Danes, London, attracted much attention;[7] significantly, his sermons were repeatedly printed and reprinted during the period of the rise of English Puritanism, the first half of the seventeenth century. Some one of Maryland's new settlers had thought enough of Smith's ideas to take with him across the ocean this volume of pulpit oratory; a group of men were willing to argue vehemently, to petition, to take the case out of the colony if necessary, for the right to read the book aloud. There can be no question of the Puritanism of these men.

In addition to the normal infiltration of Puritans among the men and women settling Maryland from England and Virginia, there were two group immigrations of Calvinists. In their eagerness to secure settlers and to maintain satisfactory relations with England's rising Puritan party, Maryland's Catholic proprietors made no objection to Puritan immigrants. On the contrary, in the 1640's nonconformists were invited to move into the colony. As early as 1643 Baltimore sent a proposal to Massachusetts Bay Colony that "liberty of religion and all other privileges" would be granted to such New Englanders as preferred the warmer climate of Chesapeake Bay.[8] While this offer did

[6] James Walter Thomas, *Chronicles of Colonial Maryland* (Baltimore, 1900), p. 43.

[7] Anthony A. Wood, *Athenae Oxonienses* (London, 1813), I, 603–605.

[8] John Winthrop, *The History of New England* (Savage edition), II, 148.

not meet with an enthusiastic reception, a few years later several other groups of Puritans were more willing to accept Maryland's hospitality.

The larger of these group emigrations came from Virginia, and had been preceded by some careful maneuverings on the part of the Calverts. In 1648 William Stone, a Protestant from Virginia's Puritan Eastern Shore had been made governor of Maryland, an appointment with double advantage to the colony at that particular time. Not only could the charge no longer be made that all officials of the colony were Catholics, but Stone also agreed to bring into the colony five hundred new settlers.[9] Feeling the force of Virginia's anti-Puritan legislation of the 1640's and encouraged by Governor Stone's promise that they would be allowed liberty of conscience, a good part of Virginia's Puritan settlement south of the James River decided to emigrate to the section of Maryland's Western Shore offered to them, from Magothy River south to Herring Bay. Richard Bennett, the most prominent of the Virginia Puritans and later governor of that colony during the 1650's, had had for some years business dealings in Maryland[10] and presumably had some knowledge of this new terrain. While he himself kept his Virginia residence, he was closely connected with this removal and especially with the settlement at the mouth of the Severn River called Providence. All together, some hundreds must have been involved in this 1649 influx of Calvinists into Maryland; certainly the latter were numerous enough to have seventy-eight householders and freemen in the Severn River area sign a petition a few years later. At the same time another Puritan petition signed by sixty-one householders and freemen originated on

[9] *Archives, Proceedings of the Council 1636–1667*, III, 201–209.

[10] *Archives, Judicial and Testamentary Business*, IV, 269, 295, 304, 321–322, 344, 382, 488.

the north side of the Patuxent River.[11] These signers included settlers from Virginia who had spread to the south of the original settlement along the Severn, but by this time another group of Puritans was settled along the Patuxent.

Contemporaneously with the encouragement of the migration of the Virginia nonconformists to Maryland, Lord Baltimore saw fit to add to his colony's population a number of Protestant settlers who had not yet made trial of any American plantation. In 1649 arrangements were made that Robert Brooke, a well-to-do English Puritan, should transport himself, his wife, his family of ten children, and a "Great Number of other Persons" to Maryland.[12] All honors were to be paid to Mr. Brooke: he was made a commissioner and a member of the governor's council, and a new county was to be set up for his benefit. This second Puritan colony, which started to arrive in 1650, was granted land along the south side of the Patuxent River. The original party included the Brooke family and twenty-eight other settlers;[13] how many more joined them is unknown.

While these two groups from Virginia and England on the Severn and Patuxent Rivers added materially to Maryland's Puritan population about the mid-century, still other Calvinists were entering the colony in the 1650's and thereafter. Scottish immigration[14] is thought to have started after the battle of Dunbar in 1650 when a number of Scottish pris-

[11] *Virginia and Maryland, Or, The Lord Baltamore's Printed Case, Uncased and Answered* (London, 1655), pp. 28–31, in Peter Force, ed., *Tracts and Other Papers*, II, No. 9; J. D. Warfield, *The Founders of Anne Arundel and Howard Counties, Maryland* (Baltimore, 1905), has lists of Anne Arundel settlers whom he could positively identify as coming from Virginia.

[12] *Archives, Proceedings of the Council*, III, 237–240, 256, 259–260.

[13] *Ibid.*, pp. 237–240, 256, 259–260, 308; Thomas, *Chronicles of Colonial Maryland*, pp. 302–303.

[14] Some of this immigration was by way of Barbados. *Cf. A Brief Account of East-New-Jarsey in America* (Edinburgh, 1683), p. 5; Edward D. Neill, *Terra Mariae; or Threads of Maryland Colonial History* (Philadelphia, 1867), p. 193; Richard Webster, *A History of the Presbyterian Church in America* (Philadelphia, 1857), pp. 66–68; Matthew Page Andrews, *The Founding of Maryland* (New York, 1933), p. 350.

oners were ordered transported to the colonies. Certainly there were Scots in the colony by the 1650's and in some number by the 1670's; by the late 1680's that part of the Western Shore along the upper reaches of the Patuxent River and around Marlborough and Bladensburg was popularly known as New Scotland. There was also considerable Scottish and Scotch-Irish immigration to the Eastern Shore, both before 1680 and in the next decades, but there is no way of determining how many came during this first century of incomplete records. Welshmen, too, were scattered through the colony, some coming directly, others by way of Virginia; there were, for instance, a number of Welsh families, including the prominent Lloyds who later moved to Talbot County, in the 1649 influx from Virginia's more southerly plantations. While Welsh names are more common in the decidedly Puritan Providence (or Anne Arundel) section, they are, however, to be found in other sections of the colony as well.

But the British Isles did not supply all of Maryland's pioneer settlers. After 1650 there was a steady trickle of men of other nationalities, and a good many of these aliens were people of Calvinist or Lutheran background. The records of this immigration are far from complete. Not all the foreigners who entered the colony applied for denization. Probably only men of some standing and property bothered with this formality. Some applications for citizenship were made for individuals, others included large families. Some of these would-be citizens came directly from a European country, others by way of another colony; some applications indicated nationality or last place of residence or both, others lacked such details. But the records[15] do show that

[15] *Archives*, II, 144–145, 205–206, 270–272, 282–283, 318–319, 331–332, 400–404, 460–462; III, 372, 430–431, 465–466, 467, 470, 471, 488, 489, 490, 495; V, 11, 35–36, 37–38; VII, 79, 291, 293, 294.

in the twenty years after 1659—a period during which denization items appear to have been entered more fully than usual—there were at least ninety-seven requests for citizenship made by men of different nationalities, and these included thirty-five Dutch, thirty-two Swedish, nineteen French, four German, three Portuguese, and two Spanish applicants or families, as well as one Danish and one Bohemian (the noted Herrman family). Of these men and women of varied birthplaces, the Portuguese and Spaniards undoubtedly were Catholic, and some of the Frenchmen and Germans may have been. But some of the French and German arrivals may have been Protestants (Calvinists or Lutherans). Certainly the Dutch, Swedish, Bohemian, and Danish newcomers would have been brought up in Reformed and Lutheran churches.

Maryland's heterogeneous Puritan settlers brought with them no ministers, but seem to have been much divided into sects. The famous "Act Concerning Religion"[16] of 1649 prohibiting name-calling, surely suggests that both conservative Calvinists and members of the so-called radical fringe of Puritanism were not unknown in the colony. No one, according to this statute, was in a "reproachfull manner" to call a fellow settler a "heretick, Scismatick, Idolator, puritan, Independant, Presbiterian, popish priest, Jesuite, Jesuited papist, Lutheran, Calvenist, Anabaptist, Brownist, Antinomian, Barrowist, Roundhead, Sepatist [*sic*], or any other name or term"; the penalty was a ten-shilling fine or whipping. George Alsop, a decidedly anti-Puritan commentator who knew Maryland in the early 1660's, noted that one part of the inhabitants consisted of "great pretenders to Holiness" who were much taken with any new religious fads. While aware that there were other sects in

[16] *Archives, Proceedings and Acts of the General Assembly, January 1637/8—September 1664*, I, 244–247.

the colony, he contented himself with observing that the Quakers were most prominent and the Anabaptists had little to say. He met no Fifth Monarchy men, Adamites, or Ranters.[17] In this last respect his stay in the colony was in some contrast to John Burnyeat's, for this Quaker mentions casually that in 1672 he had a dispute with a "kind of Fifth-Monarchy man."[18] The difference in the report of the two travellers may be due to the fact that Alsop, backed by Lord Baltimore, was writing to encourage immigration to the colony, and members of these radical sects were far from popular in England at the time. On the other hand, Burnyeat had no point in concealing the beliefs of the men to whom he was trying to bring the truth as he saw it.

Other contemporary reports indicate that Maryland's dissenters, varying among themselves in many beliefs, during the last decades of the century formed a large part of the population. In the spring of 1676 the Reverend John Yeo, a Church of England clergyman, was worried that many colonists were "daily" falling away to Popery, Quakerism, or "Phanaticisme."[19] By this last derogatory classification he probably meant the more extreme Puritan sects. A few months later Lord Baltimore claimed that three-fourths of the population consisted of Presbyterians, Independents, Anabaptists, and Quakers, all of whom supported their own ministers and had their own meeting houses. Furthermore, he asserted that the original colonists had wanted general toleration and, in order to get settlers, he had had to consent to this condition. The proprietor, of course, may have been overestimating the percentage of nonconformists within the colony, for he was defending himself against charges that

[17] George Alsop, *A Character of the Province of Maryland* (London, 1666), reprinted Maryland Historical Society (1880), pp. 45, 50.

[18] John Burnyeat, *The Truth Exalted in the Writings of that Eminent and the Faithful Servant of Christ* (London, 1691), p. 59.

[19] *Archives, Proceedings of the Council*, V, 130–131.

neither he nor the colonists had supported an established church. Nevertheless, granting very possible exaggeration, his figures—taken with other evidence—do strongly suggest that most of Maryland's Protestants were nonconformists.

But during most of the seventeenth century, these Protestant settlers, whatever their beliefs or desires, had for the most part to get along with surprisingly few ministers; only the Quakers were well supplied with travelling preachers and only the Quaker records have survived in any number. Church of England adherents were no exception to the general pattern of religious life in seventeenth-century Maryland, for at no time during the century did they have many clergy. Occasionally various records contain meager notices of men performing ministerial duties, but in 1676 there do not seem to have been more than four "conformable" ministers.[20] Even in 1691, a year before the Establishment, not more than eight Anglican clergymen were serving in the colony.[21] The lateness and scarcity of parish records, and in some cases the paucity of all information about the ministers themselves, make it impossible to determine whether these scattered men were truly conformable or only nominally so. At least occasionally, however, some doubt can be raised about the orthodoxy of men preaching in Anglican pulpits. For instance, the Reverend William Wilkinson,[22] sometimes noted as the first permanent Church of England clergyman in Maryland, was rector of St. George's Church (Poplar Hill) from 1650 to 1663. He is thought to have been closely connected with Brooke's settlement on the Patuxent River; if this relationship is

[20] *Ibid.*

[21] Percy G. Skirven, *The First Parishes of the Province of Maryland* (Baltimore, 1923), p. 106.

[22] *Inventory of Church Archives in the District of Columbia. The Protestant Episcopal Church Diocese of Washington* (Prepared by District of Columbia Historical Records Survey, Washington, D.C., 1940), I, 31; Ethan Allen, *Who Were the Early Settlers of Maryland* (Baltimore, 1866), p. 7.

true, then Wilkinson may indeed have had Puritan tendencies. More definite is the suspicion of only nominal conformity in the case of the Reverend Lawrence Vanderbush, although only the outlines of the latter's career in the New World can be traced.

In 1685 this Lawrence Vanderbush (or Laurentius Van Den Bosch, as his name was frequently spelled) was pastor of the newly arrived Huguenot church in Boston. Here he was guilty of nothing worse than disagreeing with his consistory as to whether one of his parishioners should be admitted to "holy meetings"—and he refused to accept the consistory's ruling to ban this fallen sheep. Here, too, he had the great misfortune to antagonize the Reverend Increase Mather, a powerful enemy indeed. His fellow exiles, moreover, were very eager to remain on friendly terms with the Massachusetts authorities; to offend them might mean expulsion from this northern haven. That Vanderbush should not be allowed to linger in Boston seemed only politic. From the Bay Colony he went to a French church on Staten Island. He did not remain long, however, for Domine Henricus Selyns, pastor of the Dutch Reformed Church in New York with which this Huguenot church was allied, ousted him. Mather, incidentally, had written Selyns of Vanderbush's misdeeds, but there also seems to have been some feeling that the latter was destroying the unity of the Huguenots by attracting groups to himself.[23] In 1689 or a little earlier this unfortunate man, who seems to have been trilingual as he had been educated in Holland, moved up the Hudson River to be a resident of Esopus in Ulster County and to preach very acceptably in the Dutch Reformed Church there; his congregation was composed of French, Dutch, and Flemish families.[24] Here, again, he got

[23] Charles W. Baird, *History of the Huguenot Emigration* (New York, 1885), II, 224–226, 398–400.

[24] Nathaniel B. Sylvester, *History of Ulster County, New York* (Philadelphia, 1880), p. 223.

into trouble and was accused of drunkenness and incivility. In vain did the church try to end their relations with him: he utterly refused to stop drinking (or so it was charged) and to stop preaching. When the church building was closed to him, he continued to preach in private houses,[25] certainly a step that smacked of nonconformity.

While somewhat frantic appeals were being made to the Classis of Amsterdam to find some way to silence this stubborn minister, he migrated in 1692 to Kent County, Maryland. As a shortage of Anglican clergy still persisted in the last years of the century, a few French Huguenot refugees, duly licensed by English authority, served in Church of England parishes. Vanderbush, accordingly, was able to occupy during the next three years three separate Anglican pulpits in this northern part of the Eastern Shore: Shrewsbury Church (Locust Grove) in South Sassafras Parish, Kent County; St. Stephen's in North Sassafras Parish, Cecil County; and, after resigning from St. Stephen's, St. Paul's, on the Chester River, also in Kent County. But his Maryland service, too, was cut short, this time by death, sometime in 1695.[26] The records are too incomplete to indicate whether or not he had kept his rebellious attitude toward authority until the end, but his very presence in Church of England pulpits suggests that nominal conformists were neither unknown nor unwelcome, at least in some counties.

Compared with Maryland's few Anglican clergy, orthodox or not in their beliefs, openly nonconformist preachers may well have been always more numerous. From the staunch conformist point of view, obviously, the colonists had the services of far too many men who lacked affiliation with the

[25] Hugh Hastings, ed., *Ecclesiastical Records State of New York* (Albany, 1901), II, 936, 945, 947–948, 1003, 1005, 1007, 1020–1021, 1043.

[26] Maryland Testamentary Proceedings, Liber 16, p. 177; Inventories and Accounts, Liber 13B, p. 108; Kent County Bonds, Box 1, Folder 92, Hall of Records, Annapolis.

Church of England. Even while one loyal churchman was bewailing the fact that there was a dearth of Anglican clergymen in good standing, he noted with some bitterness that unfortunately there were others preaching, those "that runne before they are sent," without legal call or ordination.[27] These men thus incurring Anglican wrath by taking advantage of Church of England weakness to proselytize, evidently were not the travelling Quaker missionaries frequenting Maryland at this time, for this particular attack on nonconformity included a separate diatribe against the Friends. The preachers thus accused of administering the sacraments illegally must have been members of various nonconformist sects. Nor did conditions in this respect change much during the rest of the century, for in 1696 the local clergy of the Established Church reported to the Lord Bishop of London how the people were being led astray by "a sort of wandering pretenders to preaching that came from New England and other places."[28] It is worth noting that whether the various men preaching in Maryland were there only temporarily as missionaries or were resident for longer periods of time, many of them were forced by circumstances and local conditions to be itinerant ministers only. The settlers—and the settlers of any one church especially—were widely spread, and towns were few; hence any minister had to serve a wide area, often preaching at a different house each Sunday of the month, and in other matters caring for his parishioners as best he could.

The names of many of these nonconformist ministers that served within the colony—perhaps only for fairly brief periods of time—have been lost. Here and there are to be found definite traces of Puritan preachers, but until the last decades of the century there is rarely enough information

[27] *Archives, Proceedings of the Council,* V, 130–131.

[28] Thomas, *Chronicles of Colonial Maryland,* p. 182.

about such men to make certain just where in the broad field of dissent they stood. Nevertheless, a few of the Western Shore nonconformists were men of some prominence (or notoriety) in their day. The Reverend Francis Doughty, who had had a stormy career in New England and around New Amsterdam before his Eastern Shore days in Virginia and who was destined to return to more trouble in his next stay in the Old Dominion, was in Maryland from the fall of 1657 to the spring of 1662. He is known to have been in the Patuxent section, that old stronghold of nonconformity, in the fall of 1659. Inasmuch as he was connected by his first wife with Governor Stone, Doughty established his headquarters at Nanjemoy, Charles County, one of the Stone estates. Little, however, is known about Doughty's Maryland interlude, except that he was troubled by financial concerns and that he was somewhat involved in a witchcraft case that never came to trial.[29]

Ten years later there arrived in Charles County another minister who also had had a somewhat checkered pre-Maryland career owing to his dissent from Anglicanism. The Reverend Matthew Hill was both a scholar of some repute, having specialized in the study of Hebrew, and an experienced pastor who had served in several English parishes. In further praise of this Master of Arts from Magdalene College, Cambridge, Calamy noted that Hill was a "serious, warm, and lively preacher, and of a free and generous spirit."[30] Falling upon straitened days after being ejected from his Yorkshire pulpit in 1662, he finally decided to emigrate, encouraged and helped in this step by his friend, the Reverend Richard Baxter. Hill's Maryland years,

[29] J. William McIlvain, *Early Presbyterianism in Maryland*, Johns Hopkins University, *Studies*, VIII (Baltimore, 1890), 319–321; Louis Dow Scisco, "The First Church in Charles County," *Maryland Historical Magazine*, XXIII (1928), 155–162.

[30] Edmund Calamy, *The Nonconformists Memorial* (London, 1803), pp. 471–472.

from 1669 until his death in 1679,[31] were spent in the Port Tobacco section, where he found his services welcome. His certificate of ordination shows his Presbyterian background;[32] he married into the Bean (or Bayne) clan, one of a number of Scotch-Presbyterian families that had emigrated into this section after 1650; and before 1704 there was a Presbyterian church established on the Patuxent. Hence there is no reason to doubt that Hill shared and went beyond the Presbyterian tendencies of his predecessor, Doughty, and doctrinally was one with his successors in the district. During part of his Maryland service Hill rejoiced in a colleague or assistant, a young Scotch-Irish preacher of unknown name.[33] If Hill had an immediate successor, however, all record of him has been lost, for the next known minister was the Reverend Nathaniel Taylor, who was preaching there in the early eighteenth century when the church was definitely Presbyterian. Despite the gaps in its ministry, the church is supposed to have been in continuous existence, perhaps since Doughty's day and more certainly since Hill's time, as there seem to have been elders serving it.

In the very year of Hill's arrival in Maryland another dissenting minister made quite a stir by his bold preaching at St. Mary's. In the spring of 1669 the Reverend Charles Nicholet(t) preached to the Lower House of the legislature on the provocative subject "the sin of permission." He reminded his audience that they had been chosen by God and their fellow men to bear the responsibilities of government; in making their decisions, they should keep in mind the brave proceedings in the past of the House of Com-

[31] Maryland Testamentary Proceedings, Liber 12, p. 93; Inventories and Accounts, Liber 7A, pp. 156–159.

[32] Charles Augustus Briggs, *American Presbyterianism; Its Origins and Early History* (New York, 1885), Appendix, pp. xl–xli.

[33] *Ibid.*, Appendix, pp. xli–xliii.

mons, for the liberty of settlers in Maryland equalled that of the people of England. Let the legislators consider the poor people and the suffering that last year's heavy tax put upon them. This plea for courageous independence of thought and action was promptly called sedition by the higher colonial authorities, who obviously would have preferred a more submissive attitude on the part of the settlers and their representatives. All that Nicholet could—or would—say in self-defense was that he had been asked to so preach by some members of the House, but he refused to name his backers. Consequently, he was fined and ordered to acknowledge his errors.[34]

The whole Nicholet incident takes on added significance from the circumstance that the Lower House that year was questioning the authorization of the previous year's levy. Another protest was that the great charges of probating wills and administering estates, together with the travel expenses involved in the required trip to the capital, consumed smaller estates, leaving the family of the deceased destitute. In addition to these complaints, the Lower House had a list of "Publick Grievances" that they wished to present for the consideration and action of the Governor and Council: unfair levies, unjustified seizures of tobacco for debts, excessive fee-taking by officers, and "vexatious" informers in their midst were exasperating the patience of the smaller plantation owners.[35] This spirit of rebellion on the part of the burgesses brought about one result: the suffrage in 1670 was restricted to freemen owning plantations of fifty acres or more, or possessing personal property to the amount of fifty pounds sterling. By this order the governor obtained a house of burgesses whose compliancy

[34] *Archives, Proceedings and Acts of the General Assembly, April 1666–June 1676,* II, 159–160, 162–163.

[35] *Ibid.*, pp. 168–169.

was so pleasing to the Baltimore family that by means of yearly adjournments it was kept alive until 1676.[36]

While the abortive rebellion in which he had participated was being put down in Maryland, the Reverend Mr. Nicholet found a new field of service—and more contention with colonial rulers. The next episode in his career shows that this outspoken preacher had indeed the viewpoint of the ordinary colonist, and for his approach to colonial problems and the popularity that ensued he was to suffer once more before leaving the New World. Shortly after getting into trouble with the Maryland authorities, Nicholet must have arrived in Massachusetts, for the Salem town records of April, 1672, indicate that the question was being considered whether or not he should continue in that town for another year as the Reverend John Higginson's assistant. He was asked to stay on, remaining on a yearly basis and supported by voluntary contributions every Lord's Day. By 1675, however, Nicholet was so popular with the people that they did an unheard of thing in the annals of the towns of early Massachusetts: "By a full and fre Vote of the Towne" he was to remain with them for life.[37] Unfortunately, by this time the Reverend Mr. Higginson did not share the town's high opinion of his colleague.

The reaction to the vote of the townspeople was prompt. Governor Leverett and a committee, after examining the state of affairs in Salem, condemned the townsmen's most irregular action in taking matters into their own hands rather than allowing only church members to vote on Mr. Nicholet's tenure. As Higginson and Nicholet were both urged by the investigating commission to try to live together in harmony, no serious fault could have been found

[36] *Archives, Proceedings of the Council of Maryland 1667–1687/8*, V, 77 *et seq.;* John Fiske, *Old Virginia and Her Neighbors* (New York, 1898), II, 154–155.

[37] *Town Records of Salem, Massachusetts* (Salem, 1913), II (1659–1680), 145, 157, 186, 195, 204.

with Nicholet doctrinally. He had, in effect, passed the severest examination of his orthodox Calvinism of the New England type. Nevertheless, he could not find himself a satisfactory niche in the Massachusetts theocracy. There were attempts to build for the people's favorite a separate church at Salem and at neighboring Lynn, but these plans fell through because of the pressure of authority. Finally Nicholet decided matters by returning to England in the early months of 1676.[38]

Men like Doughty, Hill, and Nicholet were of some small prominence in their day. Occasionally the name of less distinguished Puritan ministers appear in the records; for instance, the Reverend Clement Brown was preaching in Ann Arundel County in the mid 1690's, and a Reverend Mr. Bartlett was at Herring Creek around the same time. Both men probably were dissenters, but only the most meager impression of their labors has survived.[39]

The story of conservative Puritanism on the Western Shore—nonconformists whose shades of belief cannot always be definitely ascertained but who appear to have been Independents or Congregationalists, as well as men of a Presbyterian way of thinking—is duplicated on the Eastern Shore, with two important variations: even less is known about the earlier ministers in this section who have been identified as nonconformists, and in Old Somerset County regular Presbyterian organization took hold earlier. Among the Eastern Shore clergy thought to have been dissenters were George Monroe, Robert Maddox, Ezekiel Fogg, Ben-

[38] Joseph B. Felt, *The Annals of Salem, from its first settlement* (Boston, 1845–49), I, 253; Sidney Perley, *The History of Salem, Massachusetts* (Salem, 1928), III (1671–1716), pp. 53–55; James Duncan Phillips, *Salem in the Seventeenth Century* (Boston and New York, 1933), pp. 221–222; for the threatened schism in the Salem church caused by the Higginson-Nicholet controversy, *vide* Daniel Appleton White, *New England Congregationalism in Its Origin and Purity* (Salem, 1861), pp. 80–82.

[39] Ethan Allen, History of the Church in Maryland 1692–1873, Photostatic copy of ms. volume (Maryland Diocesan Library, Baltimore, Md.), p. 22.

jamin Salisbury, Morgan Jones, and the two Richardsons, David and Robert.

Of this little group of men, none of whom left very clear-cut traces of his New World career, the most shadowy figure is the Reverend George Monroe[40] (spelled in Somerset records as "Moonerow"). He appears to have been on the Eastern Shore in 1669, long enough to baptize a child—and then he disappears. Another figure that appears but briefly in Somerset County annals is the Reverend Benjamin Salisbury,[41] who officiated there in January, 1674; presumably he was in the colony some time prior to this date, but whether or not he lingered thereafter is unknown. A longer sojourner—or at least a more active one—was the Reverend Robert Maddox (or Maddock), who died in 1678.[42] Early in 1672 a Somerset County Grand Jury, feeling that the people were in need of pastoral care, arranged that each month on successive Sundays there should be services at four places: Pocomoke (Rehoboth), Anamessicks (Annemessex Hundred), Manoakin (Manokin, later Princess Anne), and Wiccocomoco (Wicomico). Furthermore, one "Mr. Matix" was to preach. As nothing is known of this clergyman except that he performed a good many marriages in this part of Maryland from 1671 to 1675, it is of some interest to note that both the Court and the Grand Jury concerned in making this arrangement seem to have had a mixed membership of Church of England men, Quakers, and Scotch Presbyterians. The presiding magistrate, Colonel William Stevens, was a Church of England adherent of such liberal views that a half-dozen years later he was influential in bringing to Somerset County the series of

[40] Clayton Torrence, *Old Somerset on the Eastern Shore of Maryland* (Richmond, Va., 1935), pp. 115–116.

[41] *Ibid.*, p. 125.

[42] Maryland Testamentary Proceedings, Liber 10, pp. 159–160; Inventories and Accounts, Liber 5, pp. 161–162.

North of Ireland ministers who established Presbyterianism in this part of the colony.[43]

The beliefs of some of the other dissenting ministers briefly on the Eastern Shore in the 1670's can be determined more accurately by the other colonial pulpits they occupied than by the scanty records of their Maryland days. The Reverend Ezekiel Fogg (Fogge) was preaching at Westchester, New York, prior to 1674, for in that year the neighboring town of Eastchester invited him to come to them. He accepted, but did not stay long; by the fall of 1677 Eastchester was again looking to Westchester for a minister. These two churches were closely connected, with their ministers going from one to the other, and after 1684 the two combined in hiring one minister to serve both communities. Eastchester in its first days was practically a New England town, having been settled in the 1660's by emigration from Fairfield, Connecticut; their church was Independent or Congregational, perhaps with Presbyterian tendencies.[44] Fogg went from these Westchester County, New York, pulpits to Dorchester County, Maryland, settling near the Great Choptank River; here he combined the duties of a physician with those of a minister. He did not, however, long survive the change of environment, but died in January of 1680.[45] The Fogg family have traditionally held that they were of Welsh origin. The Reverend Ezekiel Fogg's successor in his New York pulpits was the Reverend Morgan Jones, very surely a Welshman and an Antipaedobaptist. Fogg went from Westchester to Eastchester to Dorchester County, Maryland; interestingly

[43] Torrence, *Old Somerset*, pp. 117–125.

[44] Robert Bolton, *History of the Protestant Episcopal Church, in the County of Westchester* (New York, 1855), pp. 3, 359–360; Bolton, *The History of the Several Towns, Manors, and Patents of the County of Westchester* (New York, 1881), I, 219, 228.

[45] Maryland Wills, Liber 2, p. 82, Hall of Records, Annapolis; Inventories and Accounts, Liber 17A, p. 11.

enough, Jones reversed this order: He is known to have officiated at a Somerset County wedding in 1678;[46] later in that same year he was at Eastchester; and in 1680 he was at Westchester, to be succeeded in 1684 by the Reverend Warham Mather.[47]

As in the case of Ezekiel Fogg, the definite evidence of the nonconformity of the Reverend David Richardson is shown in his pre-Maryland service. This seems to be the nonconforming minister of Hungars Parish, Northampton County, Virginia, who was forced out of this pulpit in 1676, Governor Berkeley having discovered that this Eastern Shore community was entertaining a minister not episcopally ordained. By 1679 Richardson was performing his clerical duties in the haven of Somerset County; in the spring of 1682 he purchased a plantation at Bogerternorton and carried on his itinerant duties from this point. He continued in active service only until 1689, but did not die until 1696.[48] For part of his active ministry the Reverend David Richardson had as his fellow laborer in the field his namesake, the Reverend Robert Richardson. Nothing is known of this second Richardson except that he was in Somerset County and functioning as a clergyman in May of 1682; he may have died shortly thereafter or he may have been in the colony at least as late as August, 1684.[49]

The Richardsons were not the only nonconformist ministers preaching on the Eastern Shore in the 1680's. Organized Presbyterianism in this section of the colony is usually

[46] Torrence, *Old Somerset.*

[47] Bolton, *History of the Protestant Episcopal Church, in the County of Westchester*, pp. 3, 360.

[48] Jane Baldwin, ed., *The Maryland Calendar of Wills* (Baltimore, 1901), II, 103; Torrence, *Old Somerset*, pp. 126–128, 517.

[49] A Mr. Robert Richardson of Somerset County died between June 15 and November 29, 1682 (Maryland Wills, Liber 4G, pp. 6–8; Testamentary Proceedings, Liber 13, pp. 23, 135; Inventories and Accounts, Liber 8, pp. 152–154.) If this was the minister in question, there probably is an error in the 1684 marriage records when a man of the same name appears as the minister officiating at a wedding. *Cf.* Torrence, *Old Somerset*, pp. 127, 517.

said to begin with the arrival in 1683 of the Reverend Francis Makemie[50] and the Reverend William Traill. These men from the North of Ireland had responded to an appeal made by Colonel William Stevens of Rehoboth to the Presbytery of Laggan for a godly minister. Makemie, however, having founded or given new impetus to the church at Rehoboth, did not linger long in Maryland, but went south to Elizabeth River, Virginia. Returning to the Eastern Shore by 1688, he established his home at Matchatank, over the Virginia line in Accomack County, but preached in Maryland as well; in 1691, it is certain, he was regarded as the regular incumbent of the Rehoboth church. While Makemie maintained his Eastern Shore home and interest until his death in 1708, his service in both Accomack and Somerset counties was interrupted by a number of journeys that he took to Philadelphia, Barbados, England, and New York. But there were other Presbyterian ministers in this section of the Eastern Shore. During the first period of Makemie's absence, from 1683 to the end of the decade, the Reverend William Traill[51] seems to have served at Rehoboth. Traill, a graduate of the University of Edinburgh, was a man of some prominence in his church, for he had served as Moderator of the Presbytery of Laggan. Forced to leave Ireland because of persecution, he stayed in Maryland only while Scottish and Scoth-Irish pulpits were closed to him. As soon as conditions permitted, he betook himself back to his native Scotland and a parish near Edinburgh.

[50] Torrence, *Old Somerset*, pp. 216–220. There are two book-length studies of Makemie and his influence—Littleton P. Bowen, *The Days of Makemie; or, The Vine Planted. A.D. 1680–1708* (Philadelphia, 1885) and I. Marshall Page, *The Life Story of the Rev. Francis Makemie* (Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1938)—as well as a chronological outline of his career in Henry Pringle Ford, *History of the Manokin Presbyterian Church, Princess Anne, Maryland* (Philadelphia, 1910).

[51] McIlvain, *Early Presbyterianism in Maryland*, p. 331; Torrence, *Old Somerset*, pp. 220–222.

Shortly after the arrival in Maryland of Makemie and Traill came two more Presbyterian ministers, the Reverend Samuel Davis and the Reverend Thomas Wilson. Davis,[52] who was in Somerset County by the fall of 1684, was the guiding spirit in the founding of the church at Snow Hill, serving there until 1698; he then moved, apparently for business reasons, north to Lewes, Delaware, but returned in 1718 to Snow Hill, where he died in 1725. While Davis was spoken of by his contemporaries as an Irish Presbyterian, his field of service before coming to Maryland has not been verified; on the other hand, like Makemie and Traill, the Reverend Thomas Wilson[53] is known to have been a member of the Presbytery of Laggan. The fourth of this group of Presbyterian ministers to reach Somerset County, Wilson was on the Eastern Shore by January of 1686 and served as the first pastor of the Manokin Presbyterian Congregation until his death around 1702. An experienced minister who had served at Killybegs, a poverty-stricken parish in the North of Ireland, Wilson prospered in Maryland and was well thought of by his parishioners. The latter, incidentally, included two men of wealth and public position, Major Robert King and Colonel David Brown, both of whom were prominent in Coode's Rebellion of 1689, the Protestant uprising that led to Maryland's being changed from a proprietary to a royal colony. Thus indirectly the now almost unknown Wilson may have influenced Maryland's history.

In the very years that Presbyterianism was taking hold in the southern part of the Eastern Shore, a party of much more radical Calvinists were establishing themselves in the northern part, near the head of Chesapeake Bay. Unlike

[52] McIlvain, *Early Presbyterianism in Maryland*, pp. 332–334; Torrence, *Old Somerset*, pp. 222–226.

[53] McIlvain, *Early Presbyterianism in Maryland*, pp. 331–332; Ford, *History of the Manokin Presbyterian Church*, pp. 12–13.

Maryland's more conservative Puritans, the Labadists enjoyed but a brief period of prosperity. The nucleus of this Cecil County colony came in 1683, and at its peak the little band of settlers on Great Bohemia Creek may have numbered a hundred or more. Before many years of the eighteenth century had passed these extremists had disbanded as a sect; in fact, by 1698 they had abandoned some features of their communal sharing of property.[54] Although some of these settlers remained in Maryland, to augment the nonconformist population, their church organization was too ephemeral to be in itself influential in the history of the colony.

The founder of this sect, Jean de Labadie, had ended his tempestuous career before the decision was made to establish a colony and church in the New World. A French Jesuit who turned to Calvinism in 1650, Labadie preached at Orange, Geneva, Middelburg, and Veere before he had the opportunity to start his communal colony at Amsterdam; he and his followers were then forced to seek refuge at Herford in Westphalia, going from this sanctuary to Altona, Denmark, and finally settling at Wieuwerd in Friesland. It was from this latter center that the Maryland colony was sent out, and at least nominal control of the American church remained with the parent organization. Jasper Danckaerts and Peter Sluyter, the two emissaries sent in 1679 to secure land, were able to persuade Ephraim Herrman of the truth of Labadist doctrines, and through this convert managed to obtain part of Bohemia Manor, the estate of his father, Augustine Herrman. Here the Labadists moved and constructed their communistic colony, despite Augustine Herrman's later unwillingness to have them on his erst-

[54] Very adequate studies of the Labadists are to be found in the introduction to Bartlett Burleigh James and J. Franklin Jameson, eds., *Journal of Jasper Danckaerts 1679–1680* (New York, 1913) and Bartlett B. James, *The Labadist Colony in Maryland*, Johns Hopkins University, *Studies*, XVII (1899), No. 6.

while property. The new settlers on Bohemia Manor were for the most part former members of the Dutch Reformed Church whose enthusiasm had carried them beyond the tenets of that Church. Coming from the Low countries of Europe, they are supposed to have gained some converts from New York, but few in Maryland, and these for the most part temporarily.

To casual observers the Labadists were marked by their firm belief that they were the Elect, a convinction that they carried so far as to force all converts to abandon any wives or other members of their families who did not share their ideas; believers and unbelievers were to be completely separated. Families that did join the Labadists gave up their property rights in order to live in communal houses; there was a sharp division of the sexes at the table and at work. Theologically, the Labadists were Calvinists, believing man to be living under a superior covenant with Christ and that there would be a millennium, with Christ reigning triumphant. Like the Quakers, Labadists discountenanced infant baptism. Again like the Quakers, they relegated reading of the Bible and obedience to Old Testament law to second place: the law of the spirit was all important.

So many of the ideas held by the Labadists coincided with Quaker beliefs that in 1667 William Penn thought that the two groups could join forces. Nevertheless, with a spirit typical of most seventeenth-century sectarians, such members of both societies as later recorded their opinions seemed to scorn their fellow extremists who differed in some tenets. Jasper Danckaerts in his journal never hesitated to cast a slur upon the many Quakers he encountered in his trip through Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Delaware on his way from New York to Maryland. Samuel Bownas, a Quaker itinerant minister who visited the Labadist colony in 1702,

was more bewildered by than enthusiastic over the behavior of his hosts.[55] This reaction is understandable, for in the struggle for existence, the odds were against the Labadists: they were attempting to destroy the family unit to preserve their doctrine of the separation of the Elect from the world. And in this attempt to establish a colony based upon communal labor and property, they had poor leadership that degenerated to the point of dishonesty. Far otherwise is the history of Quakerism in Maryland.

Quaker itinerant ministers started their invasion of Maryland as early as 1656, and their efforts to spread the Truth as they saw it met with immediate and striking success. During the rest of the seventeenth century and well into the eighteenth century many members of the Society who felt the call to labor in the New World sailed from England or Ireland to Barbados or Jamaica, then continued on their way to Maryland, disembarking on the Patuxent River; eventually they sailed from this same shipping center back to the island colonies or directly to the British Isles. While sojourning in America, these visitors frequently crossed Maryland on their way both to Virginia and the Carolinas and to Long Island and New England. In other words, Maryland received the fresh force of the enthusiasm of these earnest men and women as they landed on the continent; geographically she was so situated that they crossed her territory many times as they felt the call to other fields to the north and south; and any time that would have to be spent in waiting for passage back, these travelling Friends could handily devote to Maryland. This position of Maryland as the point of arrival and departure and as the bridge between the other colonies of course only partially accounts for the rapid growth of Quakerism there. With only scat-

[55] Samuel Bownas, Original Manuscript including his Journal of Travels in America, III, 2–3, Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Pa.

tered ministers to take care of the people throughout the century and with no established church until the 1690's, the field was open to all who would try to convince the people of any way of thinking. Undoubtedly the Marylanders by their receptivity to Quaker doctrines encouraged these visitors to take their difficult way from house to house, from meeting to meeting, on both the Western and the Eastern Shores.

Elizabeth Harris, the first of the Friends to reach Maryland,[56] was particularly successful along the Severn River in Anne Arundel County, the erstwhile stronghold of more conservative Puritanism. She was followed in her labors by many of the men and women who have been noted as preaching in Virginia. Josias Coale, Thomas Thurston, and Thomas Chapman were intermittently in Maryland between 1658 and 1660, before they were banished from the colony and forbidden to return.[57] About the same time—in 1659—William Robinson, Christopher Holder, and Robert Hodgson were active, but this second trio does not seem to have run afoul of the authorities. They were followed in the early 1660's by at least six more itinerant preachers, men and women; of these earlier arrivals, the one of most note was George Rofe, whose career was cut short in 1663 by drowning in Chesapeake Bay.[58]

Then came the more prominent Quaker leaders who served to organize the growing numbers of the Society, and, in general, to increase its prestige. John Burnyeat[59] arrived early in 1665 and was also within the colony for short periods towards the end of the year as he went from Virginia to New

[56] Rufus M. Jones, *The Quakers in the American Colonies* (London, 1911), pp. 266–267.

[57] A "Letter of Josias Coale, 1658," *Bulletin*, Friends Historical Association, VI (1914), 2–5; *Archives, Proceedings of the Council*, III, 348, 349–350, 353, 362, 364.

[58] Henry J. Cadbury, "George Rofe in these American Parts," *Bulletin*, Friends Historical Association, XXXV (1946), 18, 19.

[59] Burnyeat, *The Truth Exalted*, pp. 33–34, 35, 42–43, 43–44, 59, 60.

England. Around 1672 he was once more in Maryland, this time for lengthier periods of service and accompanied on some of his trips by Daniel Gould, the Rhode Island Quaker. But Burnyeat and Gould were far from being alone in their labors, for the winter of 1672–73 saw the full force of the Quaker efforts to convince Lord Baltimore's varied colonists that the right way of living and the only hope of salvation lay in the tenets of the Society of Friends. No fewer than eight travelling ministers were preaching in the colony at this time. George Fox himself, accompanied by a group of fellow Quakers, visited many of the meetings, making two separate journeys in 1672, and the following year spending five busy months on the Western and Eastern Shores.[60] One of his most active companions and fellow workers was William Edmundson, who twice spent some time in Maryland in 1672 and returned for a more extended stay in 1676 and 1677.[61]

Nor were the meetings destitute of the inspiration of distinguished travelling Friends both from the Old World and from other colonies during the rest of the century and for some years thereafter. True, only those northern Maryland Quakers who attended the Burlington, New Jersey, yearly meetings in the late 1680's had the opportunity to hear the noted George Keith[62] while he was still regarded as one of the most effectual and intellectual leaders that the Society had. A few years later, when he was out of favor, he visited some of the Maryland meetings in a futile effort to have them back him in his attempt to reform the Society or at least to have his schism gain control. (Keith, earlier a Calvinist and on his way to become an Anglican minister,

[60] Norman Penney, ed., *The Journal of George Fox* (Cambridge, 1911), II, 204, 217, 230, 232, 431.

[61] William Edmundson, *A Journal of the Life, Travels, Sufferings* (London, 1713), pp. 57, 63, 95–96.

[62] Ethyn Williams Kirby, *George Keith 1638–1716* (New York, 1942), pp. 51, 71.

caused dissension among the Friends by placing too much emphasis upon the teaching of the Bible, at the sacrifice of the doctrine of the Inner Light.) But less controversial "publishers of the Truth" were to be heard in many meetings. In 1677 John Boweter, who "preached well, both in Doctrine and Practice," visited Friends in some thirteen Maryland settlements.[63] In 1686 Elizabeth Carters was in Maryland, on her way from Barbados to Virginia.[64] Twice in 1691 Thomas Wilson[65] covered both Shores, fervently inculcating the belief that Quakers must separate from the world; with him on his travels was James Dickinson. Seven years later William Ellis[66] devoted most of his energy to the Eastern Shore, spending five or six months there. Early in this same year of 1698 Thomas Chalkley[67] was in Maryland, as was Thomas Story,[68] who crossed the colony in that year and in 1699 on his way back and forth to New England. In the first years of the next century Story and Chalkley periodically continued their labors and later were joined by such noted Quaker leaders as Samuel Bownas and John Fothergill.

In addition to all these ministers from the British Isles, of whom only the better known have been named, two prominent New England Friends came to Maryland. Daniel Gould, who had travelled with Burnyeat in 1671, was again in Talbot County in 1682, for at that time the famous Tred-

[63] John Boweter, *Christian Epistles, Travels and Sufferings* (London, 1705), pp. 55-57.

[64] Baltimore Yearly Meeting and Miscellaneous Book and Advices 1681-1824, Vol. VIII, Friends School Library, Baltimore.

[65] Thomas Wilson, *A Brief Journal of the Life, Travels and Labours of Love . . . of . . .* (Dublin, 1728), pp. 28, 32, 49, 56.

[66] William and Alice Ellis, *The Life and Correspondence of . . .* (Philadelphia, 1850), pp. 66, 82ff.

[67] Thomas Chalkley, *A Journal, or, Historical Account of the Life, Travels, and Christian Experiences of . . .* (Philadelphia, 1749), pp. 15-16, 33, 37, 103.

[68] Thomas Story, *A Journal of the Life of . . .* (Newcastle Upon Tyne, 1741), pp. 172 ff., 227-236, 374-375.

haven meeting expressed its gratitude for his having "truly and faithfully laboured" among its members.[69] Another Quaker of note, Wenlock Christison, whose stormy New England career had included a stay in the Boston prison, also served as an active member of the Tredhaven community from 1670 to his death in 1679.[70] Then, too, in the last years of the century a good many New Jersey and Pennsylvania Friends felt called to travel south—Thomas Ollive, Edward Luffe, George Hutchinson, James Martin, and James and Ann Dilworth (Delworth) were active in the late 1680's; Robert Haskins, Thomas Musgrove, Griffith Owen, and William Gabbitt in the 1690's.[71]

According to their own accounts, all these travelling Friends had no difficulty in securing good audiences. Burnyeat reported "large" meetings as early as 1665.[72] Six years later, Edmundson wrote enthusiastically of having spoken at "several large heavenly meetings."[73] Fox, too, happily noted how "large" and "great" the meetings were at Tredhaven, Severn, and the Clifts; indeed, he estimated over one thousand in attendance at the 1672 meeting at Tredhaven.[74] More customary than Fox's brave attempt to fix upon a figure for the number of his listeners was an attitude of complete vagueness on the part of other visiting Friends as to the crowds that turned out to hear them. Their taking for granted of large and satisfactory Maryland audiences is, however, apparent in the various Quaker

[69] Third Haven Monthly Minutes 1676–1871, under date 2 day, 12 month, 1682, microfilm, Friends Library, Swarthmore College, Pa.

[70] Samuel A. Harrison, *Wenlock Christison, and the Early Friends in Talbot County, Maryland*, Maryland Historical Society, *Fund Publication*, XII (1878), 59, 61.

[71] James Bowden, *The History of the Society of Friends in America* (London, 1850, 1854), II, 52; Stephen B. Weeks, *Southern Quakers and Slavery*, Johns Hopkins University, *Studies*, Extra Volume XV (1896), 46, 63, 52n.

[72] Burnyeat, *The Truth Exalted*, p. 44.

[73] Edmundson, *A Journal*, p. 57.

[74] Penney, *The Journal of George Fox*, II, 230.

journals that the travelling ministers so diligently kept; as a result, surprisingly little definite comment was made upon the meetings held and the reaction of the people, although many of the visitors felt gratified at the progress being made by the Society.

By no means were all who listened to the itinerant preachers convinced of the truth of Quaker doctrines. But such records of Quaker meetings as have been preserved indicate that a good many men and women did become active members and that the Society held its strength throughout the seventeenth and well into the eighteenth century. True, in the early 1660's affairs did not run smoothly, as in this colony also the more conservative members of the Society were troubled by the spread of Perrot's ideas, to which another travelling Friend, Thomas Thurston, also succumbed.[75] But such schisms were only passing difficulties. As early as 1661 George Rofe had been able to report that there were "many settled meetings in Maryland";[76] by 1672, under John Burnyeat's influence, there were half-yearly meetings held on alternate shores, at West River and Tredhaven; after 1677 annual sessions were held alternately at these two centers. Undoubtedly, most of Maryland's Friends were convinced only after they had arrived in the colony, but there also was some immigration of men and women who had joined the Society before arriving in the colony. A few families came from New England, more from Virginia. The Eastern Shore meetings were considerably strengthened by immigration from Northampton and Accomack counties that started in the early 1660's, for among the nonconformists that went north from the Virginia Eastern Shore to the region below the Chop-

[75] Josias Coale, *The Books and Divine Epistles* (1671), pp. 57–62; Bowden, *History of the Society of Friends*, I, 371.

[76] Jones, *The Quakers in the American Colonies*, p. 279.

tank River were a number of Quaker families.[77] Indeed, the Somerset County meetings—Bogerternorton, Monie, and Annemessex—had as their leading spirits former Virginians, some of whom were convinced before they had established themselves in Maryland, some afterward.

During the last thirty years of the century there were always fifteen or more local meetings reporting to the larger meetings. Some small meetings died out fairly early, as did that at Michaels River; some groups, with the shifting of population, found it convenient to join with others, as Betty's Cove became one with Tredhaven, South River with West River, Kings Creek with Tuckahoe. On the other hand, new meetings were settled from time to time: apparently Dividing Creek, Little Choptank, Poketenorton, Upper Machotuck, Pickawaxen, and Corotoman (Curratomon) were not in existence before the mid 1680's—and Upper Machotuck and Pickawaxen never had much vigor; Baylies, Transquaking, and Cecil are not heard from earlier than the 1690's. While there were changes of this sort in the roll-call of meetings that were sending their representatives to the half-yearly and yearly gatherings, many meetings maintained themselves more or less steadily through the period of the last quarter of the seventeenth century and even continued to flourish for some decades thereafter; among such thriving meetings on the Western Shore were Patuxent, Clifts, Herring Creek, West River and Severn; on the Eastern Shore, Tuckahoe, Choptank, Sassafras (Sassifrax), Chester, Anamessex, Munny (Monie) Creek, and Bayside.[78] In addition, the journals of itinerant

[77] Torrence, *Old Somerset.*

[78] Records of Baltimore Yearly Meeting, Minutes of Meeting held at West River & Third Haven from 1677–1758, Vol. 1; Records of Baltimore Quarterly, Half-Yearly and Yearly Meetings, Minutes of Meeting held at West River 1680–1688, Vol. 33; Records of the West River Monthly Meeting Minutes 1698–1759, Vol. 112; Minutes of Monthly Meeting held at Clifts, Herring Creek, West River and Indian Spring 1677–1771, Vol. 113A; Baltimore Yearly Meeting and Miscellaneous Book and Advices 1681–1824, Vol. 8, Friends School Library, Baltimore.

Quakers show that there were Friends in areas where either there was no settled meeting reporting or where it would be some years before such a meeting was organized.

How many Maryland Quakers there were at any time is, of course, difficult to estimate, but the surviving records give some indication of numbers within certain sections of the colony and, more frequently, within the boundaries of certain neighborhoods. Obviously, only minimum figures are suggested each time, for there always must have been more Friends in a vicinity than were able to attend a given meeting or wedding, even if all those present were recorded. We know that a half-yearly meeting at West River in 1681 had nearly a hundred present. Some years later, in the 1690's, there were often more than forty witnesses at weddings taking place in this section of Anne Arundel County.[79] Across Chesapeake Bay, over thirty men at a presumably much larger half-yearly meeting held at Tredhaven in 1677 were able to contribute to the relief of the poor, and at least thirty-seven men were at a joint Tredhaven-Betty's Cove meeting in 1679. Weddings on the Eastern Shore in the 1670's, 1680's, and 1690's usually drew twenty-odd witnesses, but occasionally many more Friends attended. When John Edmundson's daughter married a mariner from England in 1682, her family's popularity and standing in Quaker society increased the number of witnesses to fifty-five; weddings in other families of note, such as the Berry clan, had more than forty men and women present.[80] The minutes of the Cecil Monthly Meeting do not start until 1698 and then they show that the weddings in this neighborhood did not run to more than thirty witnesses until the beginning of the next century when the attendance was over

[79] Records of Baltimore Quarterly, Half-Yearly and Yearly Meetings; Marriage Certificates of West River, Herring Creek and Indian Spring Meetings 1682–1824, Vol. 116, Friends School Library.

[80] Third Haven Monthly Meeting: Marriages 1668–1755, Friends School Library.

forty.[81] Another indication of the flourishing state of the Society in this Eastern Shore section may be found in the fact that seventy-seven marriages are included in the Tredhaven records between 1668 and 1700. Nor was there any decline in this section in the first quarter of the eighteenth century, for seventy-one marriages took place between 1700 and 1725; after this date the Quaker population in this area must have fallen off sharply, with only thirty-six weddings between 1726 and 1755.[82]

Even those contemporaries who had little or no sympathy with Quakers and their ways could not ignore the rapid spread of Fox's doctrines. As early as July of 1658 the Council had worried about the increase of Quakers; in fact, Indians and Friends were classified together as threats to the colony's safety.[83] In the following years there was plenty of protest against the progress that the Society was making in winning members, but little or no definite estimate of the actual strength of the movement. George Alsop, in his prejudiced 1666 description of colonial conditions mockingly noted that of the sectarian groups the Quakers seemed to be "bearing the Bell away."[84] Ten years later the Reverend John Yeo complained to the Archbishop of Canterbury that Quakerism was one of the evils into which Marylanders were daily falling, all for lack of Church of England ministers. When Lord Baltimore then claimed—in defence of his not having arranged for the support of an Established Church—that three-fourths of his settlers were Presbyterians, Independents, Anabaptists, and Quakers, he gave no inkling of the strength of these various parties.[85] But it is significant that he named the Quakers as one of the four

[81] Cecil Monthly Meeting Minutes 1698–1779, Friends Library, Swarthmore College.
[82] Third Haven Monthly Meeting: Marriages 1668–1775.
[83] *Archives*, III, 347.
[84] Alsop, *A Character of the Province of Maryland*, p. 50.
[85] *Archives, Proceedings of the Council*, V, 131, 133–134.

main types of dissenters in the colony; and it is more significant that in some counties the Quakers obviously were numerous enough to make themselves felt politically, for in 1681 their "frequent clamors" in Anne Arundel County moved his lordship to publish the declarations of all assemblies "for the satisfaction of the People."[86] (Evidently the Friends felt that the people were entitled to know what their legislative body was doing.)

Still later in the century an official report to the Bishop of London on the state of religion in Maryland noted that there were eight Quaker meeting houses and three groups meeting in private houses;[87] this last estimate is certainly open to question as to its unprejudiced accuracy, for Quaker records clearly indicate that there were many more local meetings. Four years later, at the very beginning of the eighteenth century, the Reverend Thomas Bray, trying to judge the possibility of winning converts to the Established Church, reported that he estimated one-twelfth of the population to be Quakers, but that members of the Society claimed a much larger membership.[88] By this time, considered proportionately, Quakerism may well have been losing ground, as the colony's population quadrupled in the last part of the century.[89]

Although the Quakers did not have their full civil rights until the beginning of the eighteenth century, whatever active persecution they had to contend with in Maryland came in the first years of the growing Society. The refusal of Friends to join the militia against Indian uprisings caused natural resentment, as did their early inability to share in the responsibilities of local government because

[86] *Archives, Proceedings and Acts of the General Assembly, October, 1678–November, 1683,* VII, 221 (November, 1681).

[87] Thomas, *Chronicles of Colonial Maryland,* p. 182.

[88] Lawrence, *The Present State,* p. 160.

[89] Andrews, *The Founding of Maryland,* p. 255.

of their oath-taking scruples. The futile attempts of the authorities to control the situation were two-fold. Laws were passed forbidding itinerant Quakers within the colony's boundaries; any such men and women already in Maryland were to depart and not return, on pain of being whipped from town to town. Anyone entertaining visiting Quaker ministers was to be punished. In addition to these steps to prevent further conversions, there was a prompt general movement against those who had already joined the Society and who could be caught in some infringement of the law.[90] As early as 1658 there were over thirty cases in which Quakers were fined for various offenses; in other words, they had refused to serve in the militia or on juries, to take oaths of fidelity or of office, to remove their hats in the presence of authority; or they had more positively broken the law by entertaining itinerant Quakers. The number of cases dropped off sharply in the next few years, as in 1660 the Quakers claimed only forty-four cases of persecution so far; but in the fall of 1662 fifteen members of the Society were ordered by an Anne Arundel court to be fined or imprisoned, and there were at least nine other cases in other parts of the colony. After this time there were no prosecutions except for a few that cropped up in the 1670's.[91]

Nevertheless, for some years longer the Friends were liable to heavy fines for refusing to take oaths; then, too, members of the Society were much handicapped because they could not protect their rights in legal cases. But suggestive of a change in public sentiment in the 1670's

[90] *Archives, Proceedings and Acts of the General Assembly*, I, 411–412; *Proceedings of the Council*, III, 347, 348, 349–350, 351–352, 352–353, 353, 358–359, 362, 364; *Proceedings of the County Courts*, LIV, 139, 146, 160, 195, 220, 599.

[91] *For the King and both Houses of Parliament, For You . . . to Read over and Consider these Sufferings of the People . . . called Quakers* (London, 1660), pp. 29–31; Francis Howgill, *The Deceiver of the Nations Discovered and his Cruelty Made Manifest* (London, 1660), *passim;* Joseph Besse, *A Collection of the Sufferings of the People Called Quakers* (London, 1753), II, 378–380.

are the requests made from time to time by the Assembly that anti-Quaker laws be so mitigated that members of the sect would be allowed to testify in civil and testimentary cases, and in 1688 Lord Baltimore granted this request by proclamation.[92] This alleviation paved the way for the granting in 1702 of full legal rights.

One explanation of the comparatively mild course of this persecution of Quakers may be found in a state of affairs that quickly became apparent. From its earliest inception in the colony, the Society of Friends could name among its adherents men of local prestige. Many of these men who found their sympathies to be with these more radical sectarians had long held Calvinistic beliefs and had been leaders of the Protestant party in the colony. At the very beginning of her Maryland labors, Elizabeth Russell had numbered among her "convincements" William Durand and Robert Clarkson. Durand, who had served the Virginia Puritans in lower Norfolk County as a minister or ruling (and preaching) elder, had been one of the leaders in the migration of part of that group to Maryland about 1650. He continued to be prominent in the Providence settlement on the Severn; indicative of his high standing is his position in 1654 as one of the most powerful members as well as secretary of Cromwell's commission for the government of Maryland.[93] Clarkson, who also was from Anne Arundel County, was a member of the Lower House at the time he underwent this change in his beliefs.

Soon other men who were active in the colony's political life found that they, too, were willing to risk their careers for this new way of thinking. Such early Quakers as Thomas Meares and William Burgess, both of Anne Arundel County, had served as judicial commissioners, justices of the peace,

[92] *Archives, Proceedings of the Council*, 1687/8–1693, VIII, 57–58.

[93] *Archives, Proceedings of the Council*, III, 311–313.

and members of the council and assembly. Puritan Robert Brooke's son Michael had held various offices in the colony. Even more outstanding had been the career of one of George Fox's converts, Thomas Taefer, who at the time of his change of faith was speaker of the Lower House of the Assembly and member of the governor's Council. Nor did the role that the Quakers played in the government of seventeenth-century Maryland end with these men who had been active in the colony at the time they were convinced by Fox or his itinerant preachers. Members of the Society served in both county and colony positions throughout the century. For instance, in Talbot and Somerset counties, both notable strongholds of Quakerism, the records show that a number of Friends—six or more at one time—were members of the judiciary. Among the active members of the Assembly during the last decades of the century were such well-known Quakers as John Edmundson, Wenlock Christison, William Berry and Richard Johns.

This, then, is the story of nonconformity in Maryland: Puritans formed part of the colony's population from its founding, and throughout the century newcomers augmented the Calvinistic segment of settlers. In addition, the Society of Friends spread its doctrines steadily. By the last quarter of the century, through both immigration and proselytizing, dissenters—according to all contemporary estimates and evidence—outnumbered both Anglicans and Catholics.

Puritans were fairly numerous in Maryland before the colony on the Severn arrived in 1649, but the sudden accession of nonconformists, mostly from Virginia and some from England, did have a noticeable effect on the political history of the colony, especially during the days of the Commonwealth. This group of staunch fighters for what

they thought right enjoyed two advantages: they had fairly able leadership and the times were with them. Consequently, by refusing to pledge fidelity to a proprietor and a local government that supported (or even tolerated) Catholicism, they were able to endanger Baltimore's hold on the colony. For nearly six years—from 1652 to 1658—the Puritans were in power before Baltimore was able, by compromise, to regain control.[94] Many have thought that later attempts to overthrow the proprietary government, such as Fendall's usurping of power in 1659 and the Fendall-Coode insurrection of 1681, also were Puritan-supported; but proof of this Puritan factor or of the dominance of this factor in these rebellions is hardly demonstrable. There can be no doubt that the revolution of 1689 had Presbyterian backing.

But Maryland's Puritanism, whatever its strength, was far from being a concerted movement. Not only were there frequently the usual cleavages between political Puritans or Parliamentarians and religious Puritans or Calvinists; the Calvinists themselves also showed many shades of belief, from conservative Presbyterianism through the various types of Independency and Anabaptism to the radicalism of the various sects in which the seventeenth century abounded. And, as if English extremists were not enough, the colony also had a sect of French and Dutch background, the Labadists. Far more widespread than the teachings of such minor sectarian groups was Quaker indoctrination, a steady force after the 1650's.

That Maryland's Puritanism should develop, for the most part, to the right or to the left of New England's Congregationalism was the result of the influence of religious leaders, both local ministers and itinerant Friends. Some of the

[94] *Cf.* Daniel R. Randall, *A Puritan Colony in Maryland,* Johns Hopkins University, *Studies,* IV (1886). No. 6.

preachers occupying the colony's more Calvinistic pulpits came either from the settlements around New York or from the north of Ireland. If they came from Westchester or Long Island towns, the chances were that their tenets disagreed to a greater or lesser extent from those of the average Massachusetts church; in some cases this divergence undoubtedly was toward Presbyterianism. As for those Maryland ministers who came directly from Scotch-Irish parishes, their Presbyterianism was even more decided in its character. The other type of vigorous influence upon the colony's religious thought came from the visiting Quakers, diligently working their way from house to house, holding meetings in one community after another. The field was peculiarly theirs, with no established church to oppose this attack on conservative doctrine.

The religious picture in Baltimore's troubled colony was never static. As the Society of Friends won more and more adherents, other sects seem to have died out. Many conservative Puritans were convinced of the truth of Fox's doctrines; others swung back to the Anglican church, and the sons of Maryland's most prominent Puritans are more than occasionally the Church of England vestrymen of the next generation. Quakers, too, lost some of their second generation to the Church as these younger men felt the need of a more ritualistic discipline—and no desire to separate from the world. Toward the end of the century, despite these perhaps natural fallings away, the two extremes of dissent, Presbyterianism and Quakerism, were still influential forces moulding the thoughts of men and women. Presbyterianism, moreover, was already foreshadowing its future as it was being strengthened and fed by Scottish and Scotch-Irish immigration, both of laymen and ministers.

At no time during the century were Maryland's Protestants free of the fear of Catholicism. This might be said of

all Protestants of the time, for their literature—and especially their Puritan literature—teems with attacks on popery. But in Maryland the situation was more acute, inasmuch as the colony for the greater part of its early history was ruled by Catholics. As a result, anti-Catholicism could not be openly aired, as it was in New England, but ran all the deeper.[95] This fear was so dominant that Maryland's Protestants consented in 1692 to having an Established Church; they recognized that this church, which would have to be supported, represented the ideas of only a minority in the colony, but any established Protestant church would serve as a bulwark against Catholicism. The act of 1692 served its purpose in preventing Catholics from gaining proselytes and power in the colony, but the Establishment in effect also ended the period of real toleration of Protestant nonconformity; a modification of the law in 1702 gave dissenters the right to worship in their own meeting houses and churches, but the Episcopal church was supported by poll tax until the Revolution. Betrayed by their desire to prevent a spread of Catholic doctrine and power, the dissenters, as they realized too late, had hampered their own practically free development.

[95] Anti-Catholicism made itself very evident after Maryland became a royal colony. From 1704 to 1718 a series of laws were passed offering rewards to informants in order to prevent masses being said, forbidding all Catholic education, and limiting the inheritance rights of Catholics.

Chapter V

The Carolinas: Puritanism Under a Policy of the Broadest Toleration

The story of the first successful colonization of the Carolinas begins with promises of full religious toleration. True, the Church of England was to be the established church, and provision was made that it was to be supported at some time when the infant colonies were on their feet. But when Charles II thought it wise to reward eight of his loyal supporters with a huge tract to the south of Virginia, he also gave them, in the words of a contemporary, "an Over-plus Power to grant liberty of Conscience, altho' at home was a hot persecuting time."[1] The Charter of 1663 demanded of dissenters only that they take oaths of fidelity, loyalty, and obedience to the king, and that the peace should not be disturbed nor the Church of England suffer reproach. Even more specific in its protective attitude toward nonconformists was the second charter, issued in 1665. No one was to be molested for differences of opinion or practice, but at all times to "enjoy his conscience" and follow his own judgment in matters of religion. Four years later Locke's *Constitutions* provided for the Church of England, although it has been claimed that the philosopher only inserted this section under pressure from the proprietors; but then this remarkable document goes on to declare that any seven members of the community may form a church, to worship in their own way, without fear of persecution. Only in one respect was there to be a curtailment on religious liberty: in order

[1] John Archdale, *A New Description of that Fertile and Pleasant Province of Carolina: With a Brief Account of its Discovery, Setling, and the Government Thereof* (London, 1707), in B. R. Carroll, ed., *Historical Collections of South Carolina* (New York, 1836), II, 100.

to have his legal rights in the colony, every man had to be a member of some church.[2]

During the seventeenth century this broadness of mind in accepting all Christian creeds was indeed surprising and much commented upon, even if the situation was not exactly unique. Maryland, except during the Puritan regime in the 1650's, had fairly complete toleration, with only the Quakers suffering some hardships. Maryland's acceptance of men of many creeds, however, was always open to the suspicion that it was motivated by the desire of the successive Lords Baltimore to protect their Catholic subjects as well as by the economic need of more settlers, regardless of their beliefs. Undoubtedly toleration in the Carolinas had this latter economic need at its core.

With the Earl of Shaftesbury as a powerful exception in his sympathy with dissenters, most of the original eight proprietors of the Carolinas were regular communicants of the Church of England. This was also true of their heirs and successors during the rest of the century, although before 1700 a few dissenters were able to buy shares in this colonization project. But the proprietors, a worldly group, well used to taking advantage of whatever the times offered, were not thinking in terms of religion. It made no difference to them whether their colonists wanted religious or economic freedom as long as they were willing to help develop the new plantations. Successful colonies needed many men, especially in warm climates where the death rate was high. In the Restoration period disgruntled Roundheads and Dissenters obviously were the leading possibilities to be persuaded to emigrate from their native land, where so many opportunities were closed to them. Dissenters for some twenty-five years after the Restoration, in point of fact, had almost as strong incentives to emigrate as had moved

[2] William L. Saunders, ed., *The Colonial Records of North Carolina* (Raleigh, 1886), I, 23, 102 ff., 187-205. Cited hereafter as *Colonial Records*.

earlier nonconformists to seek to escape Laudean strictures. Nor was England thought of as the only or even the main source for settlers. The plan was to drain off the excess population of the West Indies and Bermuda, again appealing to those who might want either more liberty of conscience or more liberty of trade than these older colonies offered under the new royal regime. New England, also, was hopefully regarded as able to supply men who might want greater scope for their economic activities, if they did not have to sacrifice their religious scruples to gain it.[3]

Consequently, promotional literature for the Carolinas stressed the assurance that, in addition to the chances for making a fortune, here at last was a haven where none would be persecuted for his beliefs. In 1663 "A Declaration and Proposal to All that will Plant in Carolina" stated unequivocally:

> We will grant, in as ample manner as the undertakers shall desire, freedom and liberty of conscience in all religious or spiritual things, and to be kept inviolably with them, we having power in our charter so to do.[4]

A few years later these promises were repeated when arrangements were being made for a group of adventurers to plant the Cape Fear region.[5] A 1666 pamphlet that was to all intents and purposes an advertisement of the colony outlined the "chief of the Privileges" allowed to settlers and started the list of these inducements with religious liberty:

> First, there is full and free Liberty of Conscience granted to all, so that no man is to be molested or called in question for matters of Religious Concern; but every one to be obedient to the Civil Government, worshipping God after their own way.[6]

[3] Francis L. Hawks, *History of North Carolina* (Fayetteville, N. C., 1858), II, 82–83; John Ogilby, *America: Being the Latest and Most Accurate Description of the New World* (London, 1671), p. 211.

[4] *Colonial Records*, I, 45.

[5] *Ibid.*, I, 80–81.

[6] *A Brief Description of the Province of Carolina on the Coasts of Floreda* (London, 1666), p. 6.

And only then followed such points as freedom from customs on certain products, the granting of acreage, and the right to an elected assembly. Later promotional literature still made much of the principles of civil and religious liberty under which the colony had been founded. In 1710 a typical pamphlet, now appealing to European settlers, recounted that "intire Liberty of Conscience" was firmly secured for the inhabitants.[7] Again in 1731, a similar "encouragement" for Swiss immigrants had as its last point—but one "of greatest importance"—that there was "entire Liberty of Conscience and commerce."[8]

With this vaunted freedom of worship went all the opportunities of a new, uncrowded territory with plenty of land and a warm (but not too tropic) climate—all good talking points to convince men who might want to leave some of the older settlements. It is no wonder that the proprietors expected substantial profits from the three colonies that were hopefully started on their large grant. Geographic and climatic conditions in the territory varied from the north to the south; settlers came from different sources. Consequently, despite the fact that the three struggling settlements shared the same general plan of government and that from time to time the two surviving colonies had one governor, each colony had a separate and distinct history.

Albemarle, the most northern of the Carolina colonies, had originally been considered as part of Virginia. Its first settlers were Virginians who came down from Nansemond and the neighboring counties to build their homes along the rivers running into Albemarle Sound. Plans for exploring

[7] Thomas Nairn, *A Letter from South Carolina; Giving an Account of the . . . Government, Laws, Religion, People* (2nd ed., London, 1718), p. 16.

[8] *Proposals by Mr. Peter Purry . . . for Encouragement of such Swiss Protestants as should agree to accompany him to Carolina,* in B. R. Carroll, ed., *Historical Collections of South Carolina,* II, 139.

and occupying this territory were afoot in the older colony in the early 1650's, and some years before the end of the decade actual settlement had begun.[9] These men from one of the more Puritan parts of Virginia were joined by some New Englanders as well as by men from the island colonies of Bermuda and Barbados. Gradually Albemarle spread southward to the Roanoke River and then beyond to the Pamlico, where in 1691 a colony of French Huguenots settled; the latter, like the original planters, came by way of Virginia, for they had been temporarily located on the James River.

From the beginning of its existence as a separate colony, Albemarle was conceded to have many nonconformists among its settlers. When the proprietors in 1663 took over this territory that had hitherto somewhat vaguely belonged to Virginia, they had the government established by Sir William Berkeley, a most satisfactory emissary for the purpose as he was one of the proprietors in this new enterprise as well as governor of Virginia. The suggestion was made to him that he might select two governors, one for either side of the Chowan River, because some settlers who were for liberty of conscience might wish to select their own governor, and their choice might not suit other settlers.[10] Berkeley, however, solved the problem by appointing a governor, William Drummond, who apparently was satisfactory to most or all of the area's small but varied population. If Nathaniel Batts shared honors with Drummond and was formally chosen "governor" of Roanoke Island, as a contemporary entitles him, there is no record of any official action. Drummond, whose position as Albemarle's first governor the proprietors confirmed, was a Scotsman and so

[9] W. P. Cumming, "The Earliest Permanent Settlement in Carolina," *The American Historical Review*, XLV (1939), 82–89.

[10] *Colonial Records*, I, 54.

presumably a Presbyterian. The fact that such a staunch Church of England man as Berkeley would appoint a dissenter to a position of importance has seemed extraordinary to some historians,[11] but the Virginia governor was perfectly capable of using a nonconformist to further his own ends or that of any project dear to his heart. Richard Bennett, Virginia's leading Puritan and governor during the Commonwealth period, in the 1660's was in charge of the colony's militia, with the title of major general; furthermore, he represented Berkeley and Virginia at various trade conferences held in this decade with Maryland. Presbyterian or not, Drummond, who served as governor of Albemarle for three years, later returned to Virginia and took a prominent part in Bacon's Rebellion. Berkeley summarily—but with a good deal of pleasure—had his one-time appointee put to death.

Without doubt, Albemarle's population was composed in part of conformists, in part of nonconformists, and both were welcomed by the proprietors, always eager for planters. Nevertheless, whatever the beliefs of Albemarle's seventeenth-century settlers, Church of England or dissenting, they established no churches. Undoubtedly this peculiar lack of houses of worship and of church organizations was owing to the physical conditions that controlled the new colonists. They settled along the rivers, with their plantations widely separated. There were practically no roads, and communication was by small boat along the rivers and inlets. Even in the beginning of the eighteenth century, when conditions had presumably improved if they had changed at all, the missionaries sent over by the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel complained long and bitterly of the difficulties they faced in getting to many of the in-

[11] Stephen B. Weeks, "William Drummond, First Governor of North Carolina, 1664–1667," *The National Magazine*, XV (1892), 616–628.

habitants who were destitute of religious solace and instruction. To travel around the colony or even within a county was the hardest type of work, requiring great physical endurance. It was impossible to reach everyone with any frequency, nor did the people deem it safe or wise to travel more than five miles to hear a preacher.[12]

Not only were these northern Carolina settlers widely scattered, but for the most part they were not men of such wealth that a few families of similar beliefs could afford to support a minister. The field was in many ways an ideal one for the Quakers, whose itinerant ministers asked no support other than hospitality, nor did they spare themselves in their journeying from family to family as they progressed through the colonies. The first of these Quaker preachers to get as far south as Albemarle was William Edmundson in 1672. He reported coming across only one Quaker family, that of Henry Phillips, who had been convinced in New England before re-establishing himself on the Albemarle River.[13] If there were other Friends in the colony, Edmundson did not know of them nor did he in his brief stay come across them. They would have been, nevertheless, not unwelcome, at least by the colony's promoters. In 1665 provision had been made by the proprietors that any one having scruples about taking the oath of allegiance should be allowed to make a declaration in a book to be kept for that purpose.[14] These instructions were sent to control the

[12] *Colonial Records*, I, 260, 721, 763–772, 862, *et al.;* F. W. Clouts, "Travels and Transportation in Colonial North Carolina," *The North Carolina Historical Review*, III (1926), 16–35.

[13] William Edmundson, *A Journal of the Life, Travels, Sufferings, and Labour of Love in the Ministry* (Dublin, 1820), pp. 88–90. While Phillips is generally acknowledged to have been the first member of the Society of Friends resident in Albemarle, Andrew Woodward, a witness in a 1670 legal case, refused for an unnamed reason to give his oath. As this refusal kept an estate from being settled, his angry fellow colonists threw the unfortunate Woodward into jail; he may or may not have been a Quaker at the time.

[14] William James Rivers, *A Sketch of the History of South Carolina To the Close of the Proprietary Government ... With An Appendix Containing many Valuable Records hitherto Unpublished* (Charleston, 1856), pp. 347–348; *Colonial Records*, I, 181.

actions of a South Carolina governor, but there is no reason to believe that the proprietors would have had a different policy on this difficulty for the more northern settlement. In 1681 practically the same orders were repeated for the benefit of a governor serving this territory;[15] presumably by that time the problem had become more pressing in parts of Albemarle.

Edmundson started to sow the seeds of belief in the tenets of the Society, and he was shortly followed in his labors by George Fox. The latter, accompanied by three of his fellow preachers, Robert Widders, James Lancaster, and George Pattison, was able to spend eighteen days in the colony.[16] Apparently these men were extremely successful in convincing the Albemarle settlers that they had found the truth. The new Friends thus convinced must in turn have convinced a good many other Carolinians. When Edmundson returned in 1676 he recorded that the Quakers were organized into meetings and that they were "finely settled," with no room for ministers of other faiths.[17] In the succeeding years of the century other itinerant ministers built up the strength of the Friends. By the 1690's a number of these traveling Quakers were able to include North Carolina, as Albemarle came to be called around this time, in their circuits. Thomas Wilson and James Dickinson in 1692 rejoiced in "many good and heavenly meetings";[18] five years later Dickinson came back, this time with Jacob Fallowfield as a companion. The same year James and Ann Dilworth came down from Philadelphia, to be followed by another English visitor, Jonathan Taylor, and before the close of the 1690's three more prominent Friends—William

[15] *Colonial Records*, I, 334.

[16] George Fox, *The Journal of* (Cambridge, 1911), II, 234–235.

[17] Edmundson, *Journal*, pp. 124–125.

[18] Thomas Wilson, *A Brief Journal of the Life, Travels and Labours of Love . . . of . . .* (Dublin, 1728), p. 29.

Ellis, Robert Gill, and Thomas Story—did not stop at the Virginia border but continued to work their way south through this newer colony. While these itinerant Friends convinced a good many that they should live by the tenets of the Society, the Quaker population was also increased by some slight immigration of Irish, Pennsylvania, and Virginia members of the Society.[19]

How many nonconformists, exclusive of Quakers, were in Albemarle during the seventeenth century remains incalculable. Their numbers presumably increased normally. Certainly Drummond's successor, Governor Samuel Stephens, in 1677 received detailed instructions that nonconformists were not to be "molested, punished, disquieted, or questioned" concerning their beliefs or practices;[20] evidently the proprietors were most reluctant to have any religious restrictions prevent the coming of settlers. Then, too, some New England influence was always to be felt, for much of the colony's trade was carried on by New Englanders. The Culpepper Rebellion in 1677 against an attempted enforcement of the Navigation Acts was largely backed by New Englanders, working in collaboration with such Carolinians as George Durant, one of the first settlers. This former Virginian, always prominent in Carolina politics, is thought to have been a man of Genevan beliefs, largely on the evidence of the family Bible and of his New England friendships.[21] Also indicative that the population was composed partly of Calvinistic dissenters are reports dating from the early 1700's that the Presbyterians were being encouraged

[19] Stephen B. Weeks, *The Religious Development in the Province of North Carolina* (Baltimore, 1892), Johns Hopkins University, *Studies*, X, Nos. V, VI, p. 32. Dr. Weeks has gotten this information from manuscript sources.

[20] *Colonial Records*, I, 162.

[21] Joseph Blount Cheshire, *Sketches of Church History in North Carolina* (Wilmington, N. C., 1892), Appendix, p. 434; Julia S. White, "Was George Durant a Quaker," Friends Historical Society, *Bulletin*, V (1913), 8–14.

by itinerant preachers in resisting an Established Church.[22] These nameless ministers, about whom nothing is known except that they went through the country preaching and baptizing, may well have been the successors of earlier dissenters performing the same duties. In the first years of the eighteenth century there were also complaints that the Presbyterians in the colony combined with the Quakers against the Church of England party, and the implication seems to be that the Presbyterians were neither a new nor a negligible element in the population.

According to contemporary testimony, the Quakers certainly prospered during the last quarter of the seventeenth century. In the 1680's John Archdale, a Quaker who had bought into the Carolina company, came over to Albemarle as a temporary governor and settler of disputes; he was again governor, this time of both North and South Carolina, from 1695 to 1699. With his support, and that of the deputy governor he appointed, Friends soon occupied positions of prominence in the colony. Even before Archdale's day, however, twenty-one Quakers, evidently men of some standing, thought it worth while to protest that they had taken no part in the Culpepper Rebellion.[23] Also suggestive of Quaker numbers during this period of the Society's greatest flourishing in the colony are the surviving records of meetings held before 1700. These minutes, extremely incomplete as they are, indicate only minimum figures for active members of the Society: over fifty names occur in the Pasquotank minutes, over thirty in the Perquimans.[24] Not only are the records fragmentary, but many of the names occur only by chance, as witnesses of marriages, for instance.

[22] *Colonial Records*, I, 601–602.

[23] *Ibid.*, I, 250–253.

[24] William Wade Hinshaw, *Encyclopedia of American Quaker Genealogy* (Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1936) I, 1, 13, 36, 38, 59, 61, 64, 68, 70, 91, 93, 99, 131, 135, 137, 152, 155, 161, *et al.*

Many other faithful members must be unrecorded, as eighteenth-century determinations of their numbers plainly indicate. Steady growth in numbers, accompanied by the building of new meeting houses, could still be a cause of rejoicing among Friends for the first two decades of the new century.

It was not until the early 1700's that any attempts were made to discover the strength of the various religious factions in the colony. In 1699 a strong Anglican, Henderson Walker, became governor. During the next few years he put every effort into having the colony support an Established Church. Only by some adroit maneuvering was a bill to this effect passed by the Assembly in 1701: parishes, vestries, and churches were to be set up, their maintenance provided by a poll tax. However, by the following session, that of 1703, the Quakers and Presbyterians were able to combine to defeat Governor Henderson's hopes.[25] This question of an Established Church continued to be a difficult problem for some years, but the odds were still with the Anglican party. In 1702 Lord Granville, one of the proprietors, took virtual command of the Carolinas, and if ever dissent had a strong and wily enemy, that man was Granville. During these early years of the eighteenth century the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel also stepped into the situation by sending over a series of missionaries. From a Church of England point of view the results of the labors of many of these men were somewhat unsatisfactory. Nevertheless, they were often the only ministers in large stretches of territory and so undoubtedly did bring some Carolinians into the Church.

During these troubled years of religious and political controversy, champions of the Church of England of course

[25] Letter from Governor Henderson Walker, in Hawks, *History of North Carolina*, II, 293–294.

claimed both that the strength of the Quakers lay in their organization rather than in their numbers and that irreligious elements in the population, thinking more of their purses than of their souls, were only too willing not to have to support a church. On the other hand, the earlier success of the Anglican party had been carried only with difficulty. Once the people were aroused to what was happening, there had been a prompt reversal. It is fairly clear, then, that at the very beginning of the eighteenth century—and so presumably in the last years of the seventeenth century—Church of England adherents were in a minority; conservative and radical dissenters, sincere Presbyterians and Quakers, with those who opposed any form of additional taxation, formed more than half of North Carolina's population.

Early eighteenth-century reports[26] made by the S. P. G. missionaries concerning Albemarle's population and its divisions into religious denominations corroborate this evidence of confused conditions in the colony. That the Quakers were the most "powerful" enemies of an Established Church was one point of agreement in Anglican minds. And it was certain that the Society of Friends had its main strength in Perquimans and Pasquotank, with at least 210 members in the latter county.[27] According to various estimates, however, they formed only one-seventh to one-tenth of the whole population.[28] The influence of Governor Archdale was credited with giving them their power, for he had put them into significant positions in the courts, assembly, and council. In addition to true members of the Society, there were also would-be Quakers, who lacked the character to follow all the tenets of the Society.

[26] Hawks, *History of North Carolina*, II, 294 *et seq.*

[27] *Ibid.*, II, 296, 302–304, 308, 311.

[28] *Ibid.*, II, 299–300, 305.

Perhaps some of these lax Quakers, scornfully noted by a good Anglican, were really sectarians allied to the Quakers, but not completely of their belief—or so a more generous judgment placed them. Less radical dissenters, Presbyterians and Independents, were acknowledged to be numerous, but lacking in political power. Many men, or most men, were without any definite religious beliefs that could be detected by an observer; they were, apparently, "anythingarians."[29]

The relative strength of the various divisions of sectarianism could be judged by Anglicans with less bias than they could make a similar estimate of the number of adherents to the Church of England. Seeking to control ecclesiastical affairs in the colony, they could not help realizing that to conceal their numerical weakness was to their advantage. Nor could any exactitude in determining membership be expected. Because of missionary activity in the early 1700's their church undoubtedly was growing. Then, too, an occasional S. P. G. worker showed some tendency to be optimistic about his success in the district to which he had been assigned. Nevertheless, despite such natural blurring of the true picture, Churchmen usually were judged by their own ministers to be decidedly in the minority.

Various and perhaps even prejudiced these amateur calculations by Anglican clergymen may have been. But there is no doubt about the conclusion to be drawn from them and from the political maneuverings that were resorted to in attempting to have an Established Church organized and tax-supported. In the decades before and after 1700, the Friends, concentrated in Pasquotank and Perquimans, were the strongest religious group, although not the most numerous; there were other dissenters, some more conservative

[29] *Ibid.*, II, 331.

in their ideas, but no estimate of their number was possible, presumably because they were too disorganized. Quakers and other dissenters, considered together, were numerous enough to be feared by the minority group that, with the aid of the proprietors and governor, was attempting to establish the Church of England. One other indication of persistent nonconformity may be seen in the small success achieved by the ministers sent out by the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel between 1703 and 1765.[30] Granted that conditions were difficult, both geographically and economically, and that some of these missionaries had personal weaknesses to handicap them, the slow progress in establishing the Anglican church still seems to indicate that the spirit of dissent was not weak.

Like Albemarle, the Cape Fear River settlement started before the grant of the Carolinas to the eight Lords Proprietors. Unlike Albemarle, this colony never attained any degree of prosperity, and consequently the enterprise was abandoned within a few years. Around 1660 there was a settlement here, made by men from New England, but this attempt was quickly relinquished. Plans were soon on foot again for another trial of the region. By 1663 arrangements were being made for new ventures, mostly by Barbadians, but with some New Englanders and London merchants interested. The planters started to arrive in May of 1664, and at its height there may have been 600 or more in the colony. Nevertheless, despite the high hopes of all concerned, by the summer or early fall of 1667 the place was again depopulated, this time to remain unsettled by white men until 1719.

[30] David D. Oliver, *The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in the Province of North Carolina* (Raleigh, N. C., 1910), *The James Sprunt Historical Publications*, IX, No. 1; Lachlan Cumming Vass, *History of the Presbyterian Church in New Bern, N. C., with a Resumé of Early Ecclesiastical Affairs in Eastern North Carolina* (Richmond, 1886), pp. 27–28.

The abortive Cape Fear colonization is of interest only in that it shows that in this Carolina project, too, dissenters were welcomed and apparently formed a good part of the population. All evidence indicates that many of the settlers were Puritans with close connections with men of their own way of thinking in other colonies. Just before the collapse of the plantation, help was sent to the struggling settlers by Massachusetts Bay Colony.[31] When the decision was made to give up the endeavor, some of the erstwhile Carolinians went to Nansemond County, Virginia, others to Boston; still others, former Barbadians, went to Albemarle.[32]

Neither Albemarle nor Cape Fear seemed to the proprietors as promising as Port Royal, the third Carolina settlement, and it was to this more southern plantation that they devoted a good deal of their thought and energy. The warmer climate aroused hopes that here was a rival to the island colonies, without the land restriction that the latter suffered from. The excess population of these older colonies was to be drawn off, and the new venture was to gain by previous colonial experience in successful crops and products that could be sent back to England.

By 1670 colonists started to arrive at Port Royal; shortly thereafter, however, it was thought advantageous to shift the center of the colony to the Ashley River, and still later the seat of government was moved across the river to Oyster Point. Many of the men coming in the first years were from Barbados, where various political dissensions and climatic disasters had discouraged all but the most hardy souls. If circumstances thus urged the Barbadians to try their luck in the new development, overcrowding in the other island

[31] Thomas Hutchinson, *History of the Province of Massachusetts-Bay* (London, 1768), I, 260.

[32] *The Shaftesbury Papers.* South Carolina Historical Society, *Collections*, V (1897), 89; *Colonial Records*, I, 159–161.

colonies caused settlers to emigrate from them, too: families came from the Bahamas, Bermuda, St. Christopher, and Antigua and the other Leeward Islands.[33]

There is good evidence that the religious beliefs of these early immigrants ranged from outright Puritan nonconformity to the milder type of nominal conformity that was not very different from the position taken by many of their predecessors to American shores, some of the Virginia planters. One small incident in the new colony's first year seems to indicate that dissenters of various types quickly recognized that here was a field of missionary endeavor. The Earl of Shaftesbury arranged for the shipping of supplies to the infant colony through the Virginia Puritan leader, Richard Bennett;[34] this move on the part of the proprietors was not surprising inasmuch as planters and their necessities for some years regularly arrived at the Carolinas by way of Virginia, and the Bennetts owned a large fleet of available vessels. On one of these ships Richard Bennett sent down his chaplain, the Reverend Morgan Jones, a Welsh Antipaedobaptist who made brief stays in many of the colonies, from Massachusetts south, including in his fields of service Connecticut, Long Island, Staten Island, Virginia, and Maryland. His Carolina visit, too, was brief.[35] Evidently Jones's type of Puritanism did not meet the approval of Captain William Sayle, the first governor of South Carolina and himself a fiery Calvinist.

[33] *Shaftesbury Papers*, pp. 211, 230, 251, 252, 255, 258, 259, 260, 263, 269, 278, 283, *et al.*

[34] *Ibid.*, pp. 152, 163, 164, 177, 226, 320, 326.

[35] James Riker, *The Annals of Newtown, in Queens County, New York* (New York, 1852), pp. 101–102. Some doubt has been cast upon Jones' claim to have been in South Carolina at this time, because he said he was at Oyster Point; Charleston was not moved to this location until 1680. There were earlier settlers at Oyster Point, however, and Jones may have been there. On the other hand, writing more than fifteen years after the event, he may have been confused in his geography. His story fits in with other evidence as to Bennett's connection with the colony; in view of the fervid sectarian feeling among dissenters, the fact that Governor Sayle ignored Jones' presence and wanted the Reverend Sampson Bond to be settled in the colony is no disproof of the Antipaedobaptist's account of his stay in South Carolina.

This doughty old man earlier in his career had joined the Reverend Patrick Copland in the Eleuthera venture, that unsuccessful Puritan settlement made from Bermuda in the late 1640's; it had been in this planned stronghold of nonconformity that Puritans from Virginia's southern plantations had been tempted to seek refuge before they decided to migrate to Maryland. Copland was long since dead, and Sayle was now giving his loyalty to another Puritan preacher, the Reverend Sampson Bond. The governor wrote urgently to Shaftesbury that Bond should be induced to leave Bermuda for this new colony. In Sayle's eager, pleading letters[36] the argument was threefold: many of the first settlers, who had stopped at Bermuda on their way over, knew and wanted Bond; such was Bond's reputation that many would leave the islands for Carolina if they knew he was settled there; and if Shaftesbury did not act quickly, New England would call Bond to her shores, and the opportunity to secure this most desirable preacher would be gone. Shaftesbury must have believed in the cogency of Sayle's arguments, for he did offer a Carolina living to Bond, who for unknown reasons did not accept it.[37]

That Sayle's Puritanism went beyond that of many of the early planters is evident from the scanty surviving comments on the situation. There are general hints that at least some of the other leaders in the settlement thought that the old governor was in or approaching his dotage. One of Sayle's opponents gave a seemingly unprejudiced opinion of how religious matters stood in the early days. In the spring of 1671 William Owen, a prominent early planter, wrote back to England his prescription for success in Carolina: in addition to the necessary learning and diplomacy that leadership called for, a man must be of "moderate

[36] *Shaftesbury Papers*, pp. 165, 171–173, 180–181.
[37] *Ibid.*, p. 312.

zeale not strickt episcopalle not yet licentious nor rigid presbiterian nor yet hypocriticall but swaying himselfe in an even Ballance betweene all opinions but especially turneing his face to the Liturgie of the Church of England."[38] Certainly Mr. Owen believed that the planters were of many minds concerning religious observances, but united in their opposition to the extremes of conformity and nonconformity; he was, of course, writing before the greater part of the population had arrived. Nor was he quite right about the colony's future leaders. During South Carolina's first thirty years six of her governors—Sayle, West, Blake, Morton, Smith, and Archdale—turned their faces away from the Church of England liturgy in various degrees of dissent; all together, they served for over twenty of the thirty years.

Although many of the first settlers came from the island colonies, the latter were not the only source for men. England, Ireland, France, New York, and New England all contributed to the peopling of South Carolina—and in many cases obviously adding to the Calvinist element in her population. Both Dutch and English came from New York around 1671, settling first on the southwest side of the Ashley River, but soon dispersing through the settlement.[39] A few Quaker families arrived from England later in the decade, part of a much larger immigration of Friends that was planned but failed to materialize.[40] A small group of Frenchmen were sent over in 1680 at the king's expense, about eighteen families or forty-five adults and twenty-odd children.[41] These first comers were followed by a much heavier Huguenot and Swiss immigration. Some seventy

[38] *Ibid.*, p. 304.

[39] *Ibid.*, pp. 368, 389, 391, 437.

[40] *Ibid.*, p. 464.

[41] *The Currant Intelligence*, February 17 to February 21, 1679/80; St. Julien R. Childs, "The Petit-Guerard Colony," *South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine*, XLIII (1942), 1–17.

families of these refugees settled in Charles Town and along the Santee and Cooper rivers and the latter's tributaries; by the end of the century the Huguenots must have formed close to a tenth of the colony's inhabitants.[42] Nor were the French the only Calvinist arrivals in the 1680's. A number of English dissenters came, as many as 500 in one month, according to common report, and among them were such wealthy nonconformists with close New England connections as the Blakes, Axtells, and Mortons.[43] There was a very unfortunate Scottish venture in 1684, a project that had been under way for some twelve years before the actual settlement was made on Port Royal Island. Stuart's Town had a troubled existence of only two years before it was destroyed by the Indians, and the few survivors escaped to Charles Town. Despite the tragic fate of this long-planned plantation to the south of the main English development, the Scottish element in the population of the colony was still discernible at the end of the century.[44] The 1680's and 1690's also saw small influxes of New England Calvinists, some of whom founded the towns of Somerton and Dorchester, while others added their numbers to the growing capital.[45] As a result of the arrival of settlers from these various sources, by the end of the seventeenth century the colony had a population of from five to six thousand.

The diverse elements in this population were not without means of worship. Surviving records are so scanty, how-

[42] William Henry Foote, *The Huguenots; or Reformed French Church* (Richmond, 1870), pp. 592–596.

[43] John Oldmixon, *The History of Carolina* (London, 1708), in Carroll, *Historical Collections of South Carolina*, II, 399, 401, 403, 407–408, 411, 450. Oldmixon was not a dissenter.

[44] George Pratt Insh, *Scottish Colonial Schemes 1620–1686* (Glasgow, 1922), pp. 186–211, 278–279.

[45] H. A. Tupper, ed., *Two Centuries of the First Baptist Church of South Carolina, 1683–1883* (Baltimore, 1889); Henry A. M. Smith, "The Town of Dorchester, in South Carolina—a Sketch of its History," *South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine*, VI (1905), 62–95; Archdale, *A New Description of that Fertile and Pleasant Province of Carolina*, pp. 104, 109.

ever, that there is no way of ascertaining even the existence of some congregations. There is in the early accounts one reference[46] to a Dutch church, or possibly churches, as having enjoyed certain privileges with the French congregations. Nothing more appears about this church or these churches, perhaps because the Dutch soon dispersed through the colony and rapidly lost their identity as a foreign element in the settlement. The years have also obscured all or almost all traces of some of the first ministers serving the colony's spiritual needs. For instance, the presence of three preachers is known only through fortuitous references in correspondence that happened to survive. The Reverend Thomas Barrett, according to one of Francis Makemie's letters,[47] was in South Carolina around 1684; inasmuch as Makemie planned to take Barrett's place, the latter is thought to have been an early Presbyterian; nothing more is known about him. Similarly, another contemporary letter[48] supplies whatever is known about two other men who presumably were in orders: Mr. Gilbert Ashley, an Anabaptist preacher, and a Mr. Curtice, a Presbyterian preacher; both perished in the yellow-fever epidemic of 1699. These casual references to otherwise unidentified preachers seem to indicate that there may have been others whose names are gone.

In contrast to these unknowns among the colony's early clergy, some of the ministers serving in South Carolina were men of considerable prominence in their day. A man of wide reputation was the Reverend William Dunlop,[49] one

[46] A. S. Salley, ed., *Journals of the Commons House of Assembly of South Carolina For the Four Sessions of 1693* (Columbia, S. C., 1907), p. 31.

[47] Charles Augustus Briggs, *American Presbyterianism, Its Origins and Early History* (New York, 1885), Appendix, p. xlvi.

[48] Letter from the Reverend Hugh Adams to his brother in Boston, printed in Samuel Sewall, *Diary*, Massachusetts Historical Society, *Collections*, 5th Ser., VI, 11–12.

[49] *The Scotch Nation . . . Biographical History of the People of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1880), II, 106–107; *Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford University Press, 1921–22), VI, 209.

of the organizers of the ill-fated Scottish settlement. The son of a Covenanter minister and himself a licensed minister in the Church of Scotland, this graduate of the University of Glasgow after the destruction of Stuart's Town in 1686 brought his little family to Charles Town. He quickly became a very active and prominent member of the community. Whether or not he had an organized church, Dunlop apparently performed the duties of a clergyman for four years until his return to Scotland. Back in his native land, he briefly held a pastorate at Ochiltree, but soon became principal of the University of Glasgow. Dunlop served the cause of Presbyterianism in many ways, being known for his public spiritedness and wide learning as well as for his singular piety; in addition, he was related by marriage to one of the most prominent Presbyterians of the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, the Reverend William Carstairs, the eminent Latin scholar who was chaplain to the Prince of Orange and later principal of the University of Edinburgh.

The Anabaptist minister who also reached South Carolina in the mid 1680's did not have Dunlop's reputation either as a scholar or as a well-connected leader of his sect; nevertheless, the Reverend William Screven[50] and his proselytizing ways proved to be a thorn in the side of his fellow dissenters around Charles Town. He had come to New England around 1672 from the town of Somerton, in Somerset. At this time he apparently was not an avowed Baptist. His conversion, however, may well have followed soon after, for by 1675 he was in trouble with the authorities for not attending church meetings. Despite this difficulty, he remained for some years in good standing as an active citizen

[50] Tupper, ed., *Two Centuries of the First Baptist Church of South Carolina, 1683–1883*, pp. 39–58; Joshua Millet, *A History of the Baptists in Maine* (Portland, 1845), pp. 24–28; Henry S. Burrage, "The Baptist Church in Kittery," Maine Historical Society, *Collections and Proceedings*, 2nd Ser., IX (1898), 382–391.

in the town of Kittery, Maine. Then, in 1681, he was licensed to preach by the Baptist church in Boston, and the following year he was jailed for denying that infant baptism was an ordinance of God. After a trial at York, he was ordered to conform or to leave, and he chose to leave. Nor did he go alone. With the aid of the Boston Baptist church, a small church was organized in Kittery with the idea of migration in mind. Some ten men entered into a covenant, with Screven as elder, Humphrey Churchyeard as deacon, and one Humphrey Axell—whose relationship to the Carolina Axtells is unknown if it existed—as one of the signers. Presumably they left Maine in the spring of 1684, to be joined in Carolina by sympathetic relatives during the next few years.

These New England Baptists were not going to an unfriendly reception. Among the dissenters who came from the west of England to Carolina in the early 1680's had been a number of Baptist sympathizers. The most prominent of these was Lady Axtell, who had married into the regicide's family, and her daughter, Mrs. Blake, wife of one of the most influential planters in the colony and its governor from 1694 to 1695, and from 1699 to 1700. With this powerful backing, Screven was able to establish himself and his companions on the Cooper River, at a place they called Somerton. Later, around 1693, the church moved to Charles Town, where Screven preached until the end of the century. Except for an interval during which he helped the Charles Town church while they were pastorless, he spent the last years of his life preaching in the district around the head of Winyaw Bay, now the site of Georgetown. Although Boston in 1706 sent a call for him, he felt his duty lay in South Carolina, and there he stayed until his death in 1713.

Energetic and ever willing to argue the point and contend

for parishioners, Screven was not always popular with his fellow ministers, and his fellow dissenters—Congregationalists or Independents with Harvard leadership—sometimes felt that he was encroaching upon their ground. The earliest of these South Carolina Congregational churches was at Charles Town, supposedly founded in the 1680's,[51] but with their first pastor of recorded name, the Reverend Benjamin Pierpont,[52] serving there in the 1690's. This young Harvard Master of Arts is thought to have brought with him in 1691 a number of settlers from Massachusetts to give the congregation new strength at this time. Following his death in 1698, the church was served briefly by another Harvard man, the Reverend Hugh Adams, who was succeeded in turn by still another, the Reverend John Cotton,[53] a son of the more famous minister of the same name. This second John Cotton was an experienced preacher, having had a pastorate at Plymouth for over thirty years, from 1666 to 1697. While he never approached his father in reputation, he was distinguished in his own day as an excellent preacher, a noted Biblical scholar, and an acknowledged authority on American Indian languages. After less than a year of active service in Charles Town, during which the fellowship grew to one hundred and fifteen, Cotton succumbed to a yellow-fever epidemic, in September, 1699.

And with the death of Cotton, the Charles Town Congregational Church temporarily passed from under the influence of Harvard, and turned toward Presbyterianism. The next pastor, the Reverend Archibald Stobo, was a Scot, a survivor of the unsuccessful Presbyterian colonizing of the

[51] George N. Edwards, *A History of the Independent or Congregational Church of Charleston South Carolina* (Boston, 1947), pp. 1, 4.

[52] John Langdon Sibley, *Biographical Sketches of Graduates of Harvard University* (Cambridge, 1873), III, 429; Edwards, *A History of the Independent or Congregational Church of Charleston*, pp. 8–9.

[53] Sibley, *Biographical Sketches of Graduates of Harvard University*, I, 496–508; Edwards, *A History of the Independent . . . Church of Charleston*, pp. 10–12.

Isthmus of Darien. Evidently the church and this graduate of the University of Edinburgh could not find sufficient common ground to make the arrangement permanent, for Stobo, eagerly welcomed in 1699, left in 1704 to found other Presbyterian churches. It has been presumed that the church's earlier Independent spirit was still evident, while the Reverend Mr. Stobo believed in strict compliance with the usages of the Church of Scotland; however, subsequent pastors were also Scotch Presbyterians.[54]

Carolina's Congregationalism—and the Harvard influence—was by no means limited to the immediate Charles Town vicinity. After Cotton took charge of this first church in the spring of 1699, the Reverend Hugh Adams[55] spent two years preaching at Wando River, thirteen miles from Charles Town. He then went to a section on the Ashley River, about sixteen miles from the capital; after another two years, he accepted a call to a settlement on the South Edisto River, fifty miles from his original Carolina church. In none of these places were the churches prosperous, for Adams was always in difficulties about collecting his salary. Nevertheless, there must have been Congregationalists in these outlying districts who felt the need of a pastor of their own faith or he would not have received these calls. Adams remained with his South Edisto parishioners until 1705, but he then returned to New England, to hold pastorates both in Massachusetts and New Hampshire.

There was a much stronger Congregational church established on the Ashley River, about twenty-six miles from Charles Town, at a place named by its Massachusetts settlers Dorchester. As in the case of the Somerton Baptists, the nucleus of this church came as a small covenanted group,

[54] Edwards, *History of the Independent . . . Church of Charleston*, pp. 15 ff.

[55] Clifford K. Shipton, *Biographical Sketches of Those Who Attended Harvard College* (Cambridge, 1933), IV, 320–336.

and the original members had their numbers supplemented by friends and relatives from New England. Their leaders were the Reverend Joseph Lord, a young minister who had received his Master of Arts degree from Harvard only a year before the migration, and Elder William Pratt, a more mature member of the church at Dorchester, Massachusetts, from which both men had been dismissed in order to establish a Carolina church. It is also to be noted that one participant in the venture, William Norman, had been in the newer colony as early as 1684. When the little group, apparently consisting of from four to eight families, arrived at Charles Town late in 1695, Lord and Pratt immediately sought aid from the Axtells and Landgrave Morton, then went to Governor Blake; either Norman acted as an intermediary in making these connections or Lord and Pratt knew the New England members of these families. Both links are, of course, possible. The church was soon established on the north bank of the Ashley River, near Newington, the Axtell-Blake plantation, and grew rapidly, with eager listeners coming as far as ten miles to hear Lord preach.[56]

Elder Pratt did not live many years in his new environment, but the Reverend Joseph Lord's influence was felt in Carolina for more than two decades. He was a man of varied interests, having considerable knowledge of law and medicine as well as a lively interest in natural history; later in life he had considerable reputation for his fervent and numerous writings against the Anabaptists. Except for a trip back to New England in 1698, he remained in Carolina until March of 1717; then his family connections—he was a son-in-law of Governor Thomas Hinckley of Plymouth Col-

[56] "Journal of Elder William Pratt 1695–1701," in Alexander S. Salley, ed., *Narratives of Early Carolina 1650–1708* (New York, 1911), pp. 189–220; Smith, "The Town of Dorchester, in South Carolina—a Sketch of its History," *South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine*, VI (1905), 62–95.

ony and a brother-in-law of the Reverend Nathaniel Stone of Harwich on Cape Cod in the same colony—induced him to accept a call to Cape Cod. Preaching at the towns of Eastham and Chatham, he made local church history by introducing the Half-Way Covenant into these congregations.[57]

While Lord was at Dorchester, the town and church grew steadily; by 1708 a current estimate reported that there were 350 residents in the district, but not all of these necessarily were members of the White Meeting House, as the Congregational church was called. After Lord's departure, this growth continued, and by the late 1730's overcrowding was such that some moved to Beech Hill, where another Congregational church was gathered; and by the 1750's there was a large exodus to Midway, Georgia. Induced by the hope of a more healthful region, the removal of Congregationalists was so complete that the White Meeting House was abandoned, and the town of Dorchester eventually disappeared almost completely.

Obviously, Scottish and New England church leadership played a large part in nonconformity in South Carolina. Then, too, in addition to English-speaking dissenting churches in the colony, there were in the 1690's four French Huguenot congregations,[58] all served by their own ministers. The Charles Town church, established by 1686, may have had as its first pastor the Reverend Florente Phillippe Trouillard. By 1687 the Reverend Elias Prioleau arrived from Pons, France, with part of his congregation, and he served the church until the end of the century, with Trouillard as his associate for part of this time. Sixty miles

[57] Shipton, *Biographical Sketches*, IV, 101–106; for some of Lord's letters from South Carolina, see *The South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine*, XXI (1920), 6–9, 50–51, and *The Hinckley Papers*, Massachusetts Historical Society, *Collections*, 4th Ser., V, 304–306.

[58] Arthur Henry Hirsch, *The Huguenots of Colonial South Carolina* (Durham, N. C., 1928), pp. 47–49.

north of Charles Town, on the Santee River, the Reverend Pierre Robert, a Swiss minister, had a pastorate, by 1690 consisting of eighty families. Northwest of Charles Town at Goose Creek, a tributary of the Cooper River, there was a smaller congregation, and on the East Branch of the same river was another and more substantial church in the section called Orange Quarter. According to an estimate made by one of their own number, these four churches had 438 members in all: 195 attending the church at Charles Town, 111 at Santee River, 31 at Goose Creek, and 101 at Orange Quarter.[59] There were other Huguenots in the colony, moreover, some living too far from these churches to become members.

All these Huguenot churches were originally Calvinistic in doctrine, with their articles of faith prepared under the Genevan's supervision in 1559; their service was liturgical, based on the Calvinistic service established in 1543. Although in organization the churches were presbyterial, each congregation had much the independence of Congregational polity.[60] For some years after their arrival there was much prejudice against the Huguenots, but this never seems to have been because of their religious beliefs. The old fear of France and of foreigners in general appears to have been the basis of the apparent distrust felt by most but not all of the English in the colony. Gradually the French became assimilated, and with Governor Blake's influence to aid them, were allowed in 1697 to become naturalized[61] and so to partake normally in the life of the province. In religious beliefs, too, many of them became anglicized; of the four original churches, only the one at Charles Town

[59] Rivers, *A Sketch of the History of South Carolina . . . With an Appendix Containing many Valuable Records hitherto Unpublished*, p. 447.

[60] Hirsch, *The Huguenots of Colonial South Carolina*, pp. 48–50.

[61] A. S. Salley, ed., *Journals of the Commons House of Assembly of South Carolina For the Two Sessions of 1697* (Columbia, S. C., 1913), pp. 11, 13, 15.

retained its identity as a Huguenot organization. The others shifted to the Church of England when the latter became the established church in 1706, and from then on their Huguenot influence could be felt only within the Established Church.

In contrast to their strength in North Carolina, the party of extreme dissent, the Quakers, were in South Carolina the weakest of all the nonconforming groups. A meeting seems to have been established by the 1670's,[62] and in 1681 George Fox urged the Friends of North and South Carolina to unite. His advice was never followed, and the Charles Town group considered itself allied only to the London Yearly Meeting and not to any other colonial meetings. The Charles Town Friends were few in number from the beginning, and not until the eighteenth century were traveling Friends able to include this territory in their itineraries and so add to the Society's numbers by convincements. Consequently, by the end of the century the meeting had practically died out, to be revived temporarily around 1719. Although according to their own records, all later in date, this meeting became so weak toward the end of the seventeenth century and in the first years of the eighteenth century as to have been almost non-existent, a 1710 estimate of the colony's population put the Quaker group at 150 or more; evidently there were Friends scattered through the more outlying districts. It should also be noted that early Quakers in the colony may have had an influential ally in one of the early governors, Joseph West, just as later members of the Society had the backing of Governor Archdale,

[62] A Book of Minnitts belonging to the Meeting of the peopal latter Called Quakers in Charlestown South Carolina 1719, pp. 1–3; Jonathan Evans, "A brief view of the Estate of Friends in Charleston, South Carolina," in Historical Sketch of the Origin, investment and continuance of the Trust of the Estate of Friends in Charleston South Carolina, with sundry facts and circumstances relating thereto down to 1826. Both the minutes and this manuscript account are in the Department of Friends Records, 302 Arch Street, Philadelphia.

the Quaker proprietor, in the 1690's. West succeeded Sayle as governor upon this Puritan's death and as his choice, serving from early in 1671 to April in the following year. After an interim during which Sir John Yeamans was governor, West again took office, this time for ten years, from 1674 to 1684. There is no hint in the records of West's Quaker sympathies, but at his death, which took place in New York late in 1691 or early in 1692, he left his property to the London Quakers, noting in what esteem he held these men.[63]

Until the very end of the century these dissenting groups—Presbyterian, Huguenot, Congregational, Baptist, and Quaker—were allowed to develop as they would, with no economic burden of taxation to support an established church. Although the principle of religious liberty was reaffirmed in 1697, the following year a first move was made to have the Church of England minister supported by all the colonists. In this step the dissenters concurred without protest, either out of respect for the minister in question or because they recognized the legality of the action. After this initial agreement, however, the new century brought much discord between conformists and nonconformists, as well as within the ranks of conformists or nominal conformists. In 1704 it was proposed that the Church of England be formally established with six parishes, that a lay board have the power to remove ministers that were objectionable to it, and that dissenters be disqualified from participating in the government. Many Anglicans objected violently to lay or political control of the clergy. Furthermore, the whole church question was complicated by political controversy, and the move to oust dissenters from office seems to have been motivated much less by antagonism to their beliefs

[63] Henry A. M. Smith, "Joseph West: Landgrave and Governor," *South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine*, XIX (1918), 192.

than by a desire to prevent them from investigating certain odd proceedings that had been going on in the management of the colony. Lord Granville's backing of any anti-dissent measures naturally gave the Church of England party powerful support; moreover, Church of England men were considered loyal supporters of the proprietors, while dissenters were doubtful radicals. Nevertheless, the act of 1704 which had been passed only by doubtful political maneuverings, was rescinded; the substitute one of 1706 established the Anglican church with ten parishes, but did not permit its ministers to be controlled by a lay board, nor were dissenters barred from holding office.

Among the controversial literature that this upset in Carolina affairs brought forth was a pamphlet, *The Case of Protestant Dissenters*, supposedly written by Defoe but with the facts supplied by John Archdale, lately governor of the Carolinas. As this wealthy Quaker had spent the last years of the seventeenth century in the Carolinas and mainly in Charles Town, he presumably knew conditions there. According to the Defoe-Archdale tract, it was a "notorious fact" that two-thirds of the people were dissenters.[64] There is one corroboration that this ratio of two-thirds nonconformists to one-third conformists was Archdale's considered observation, for in the latter's own account of his administration he noted, almost humorously, that he had found the best way to keep peace in the Governor's Council was to appoint one high Churchman for two moderate Churchmen.[65] He does not define his terms, nor does he specify whether he had formulated this policy because of the vociferous nature of high Churchmen, as opposed to gentle moderate Churchmen (or Presbyterians?) or because of

[64] Daniel Defoe, *The Case of Protestant Dissenters in Carolina* (London, 1706), pp. 12, 16, 17.

[65] Archdale, *A New Description of that Fertile and Pleasant Province of Carolina*, p. 117; also pp. 101, 113, *et al.*

desire on his part to have the people and their opinions honestly represented. More specifically, he claimed that so many men of estate—who by implication were dissenters—came over on his inducement that if they were removed South Carolina would be but a "thin" colony.

Archdale's estimation of the proportion of dissenters is supported by the statements of a number of Church of England clergymen who were in various parts of the colony during the first decade of the eighteenth century. The dissenters were called the soberest, the most numerous, and the richest people in the colony.[66] Presbyterians, Independents, and Anabaptists were in considerable strength throughout the territory. In the section around the branches of the Cooper River "many" Anabaptists lived, kept firm in their beliefs by their preachers.[67] Along the Ashley River, of 100 families, only 30 were Church of England, the rest Presbyterian and Anabaptist; in the Stono River district, 40 Anglican families had settled in the northern part of the parish, while 60 families in the southern part were Baptists and Presbyterians.[68] A report by a missionary settled in the Goose Creek region complained that the major part of the inhabitants were nonconformists, with their numbers increasing.[69] Another letter noted ruefully that most of the 50 families occupying James Island, to the south of Charles Town, were dissenters.[70] More definite was the analysis of the strength of religious factions in

[66] Briggs, *American Presbyterianism*, Appendix, p. lxvii. (The Reverend Edward Marston reporting, after a residence of five years in South Carolina).

[67] "Letters of Rev. Samuel Thomas, 1702–1710," *South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine*, IV (1903), 226.

[68] Samuel Thomas, "A Memorial relating to the State of the Church in the Province of South Carolina" (1706), *South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine*, V (1904), 31–34, 38.

[69] Briggs, *American Presbyterianism*, Appendix, p. lxviii. (The Reverend Robert Stevens reporting in 1708.)

[70] *Ibid.*, p. lxviii. (The Reverend Richard Marsden reporting in 1708.)

Charles Town itself: There were an estimated 150 Christian families living in and around the city. For purposes of calculation, two adults were said to be in each family. Of the 300 possible church members, only 80 could be regarded as potential Anglicans, with 24 actual communicants. This calculation left 220 nonconformists. Of the latter, 150 were Presbyterian in their beliefs, 40 Anabaptist, 8 Independent, 10 Quaker, and 12 uncertain.[71]

On the other hand, in some sections of the colony Anglicans seem to have been in the majority; or, at least, avowed nonconformists did not form the greater part of the population. The Church of England could claim most of the inhabitants settled around the Eastern Branch of the Cooper River; of 100 families, only 20 were said to be sectarians—17 Presbyterian, 2 Anabaptist, 1 Quaker. But in other dominantly Anglican areas, the dissenters formed a substantial minority: on the Western Branch of the Cooper River, of 70 families, 30 were nonconformists, mostly Anabaptist. On the Wando River, of 100 families, 40 were Presbyterian. It is to be noted also that the actual membership in the Established Church was admittedly small. Where 80 families were believed to be Church of England, there were only 45 communicants; similarly, of 40 families said to be Anglican, only 20 residents were actual communicants.[72]

Despite scattered reports that the number of dissenters was increasing, Churchmen and nonconformists were more evenly balanced in 1710 than they had been in some years. The Anabaptists seem to have lost ground around this time, the Presbyterians to have gained. Church of England adherents were still in the minority, forming 4¼ parts out of

[71] *Ibid.*, pp. lxviii-lxix. (The Reverend William Dunn reporting in 1708.)

[72] Thomas, "A Memorial relating to the State of the Church in the Province of South Carolina" (1706), *South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine*, V (1904), 31–34, 38.

10; Presbyterians (including Huguenots) 4½ parts; Anabaptists 1 part; and Quakers merely ¼ part.[73] By this time the majority of the Huguenots had conformed, at least nominally, to the Church of England, and this change may have influenced these figures; and by this time a number of Anglican missionaries had been active in many sections.[74] Nevertheless, according to this analysis of the situation and from other evidence, although the dissenters were temporarily losing ground, they were still in the majority, as they had been during the first forty years of the settlement of South Carolina.

Perhaps the strongest evidence of the numerical and political strength of nonconformity in South Carolina may be seen in the part that dissenters played in having the colony changed from its proprietary status to that of a Crown colony. After the 1704 threat to their political life—an attack that might have endangered their very survival—the dissenters felt it only wise to have one of their number in London to take care of their interests; officially, Mr. Joseph Boone represented the Assembly or Lower House. In the decade and a half that followed, dissatisfaction grew in the colony. Affairs of all sorts seemed mismanaged, while justice became a questionable factor in daily life and trade. Defense against the Indians and Spaniards as well as against pirates from New Providence and the West Indies proved to be inadequate; because the militia had to be called upon so frequently, economic conditions were bad. The original proprietors had died; the heirs and purchasers of shares, many of whom acted only through agents, lacked essential interest in the colony's well-being. As thoughts turned to the advantage of direct rule by the Crown, Boone

[73] Nairn, *A Letter from South Carolina*, pp. 41–42.

[74] Edward Marston, *To the Most Noble Prince Henry Duke of Beaumont . . . Palatine of the Province of South Carolina in America* (London, 1712), p. 10.

was able to present a petition for the change of government signed not only by all members of the Assembly but also by more than half of the adults in the province. The Revolution of 1719, the first major protest against unfair government since Maryland's 1689 rebellion, undoubtedly was the work of South Carolina's dissenters.

Strongly Puritan as they were, the Carolinas differed in a number of respects from the other continental colonies. Settled during the last decades of the seventeenth century, these plantations enjoyed during their formative years a general spirit of tolerance. This attitude was due partially to the time, for many men, both Puritans and Anglicans, were approaching the idea that there could be various ways of worshipping God. Then, too, the influence of such men as Shaftesbury, Locke, and Archdale, three of the most unprejudiced men of their age, was strong in both North and South Carolina for many years. Because tolerance was the chief point in the promotional literature that the Lords Proprietors had issued, the settlers themselves were men who had made up their minds to live in fair harmony with other men of a different way of thinking. Nor are geographic influences to be ignored. It was virtually impossible for individual churches to gain overwhelming strength; possible parishioners were too widely scattered. Similarly, churches survived more or less as separate units, unsupported and unaided by fellow sectarians.

Therefore, in contrast to the religious development of earlier Puritan colonies, one type of nonconformity did not dominate and try to exclude all other sects and groups. Presbyterians, Huguenots, Independents (or Congregationalists), Anabaptists, and Quakers managed to live together in reasonable concord; furthermore, these dissenters of various beliefs were willing to accept an Established Church, provided that the supporters of the latter did not

try to drive other churches and meeting houses out of existence. True, the picture of the early Carolinas as happy Edens of religious contentment should not be overdrawn. There was some resentment of the Anabaptists, but this objection was based on their proselytizing ways, not on their beliefs; and in comparison to the reaction elsewhere of more conservative Puritans to having Baptists in their midst, the protest in South Carolina was indeed mild. More positive was the objection to the Huguenots, but here the prejudice was against foreigners with other loyalties, rather than against believers in certain dogma. The fear of the French died hard in the Carolinas, as in other English colonies. In fact, it came to an end only with the Americanization of the French groups within the colonies.

Aided by the support of some of the Lords Proprietors and with sympathetic rulers in the colonies, the Quakers, so often the martyrs of the Puritan movement, suffered little in the Carolinas, and only when they seemed to be getting powerful. In South Carolina, where the Society was weak, its members were accepted without undue difficulty. In Albemarle's earlier years the same situation was true, but with attempts to establish the Anglican church prejudice sprang up, based on the ground that the Friends as an organized minority were trying to control the majority. (That the Anglicans themselves were an admitted minority did not deter them from making the charge.) How well the traveling Quaker ministers served to strengthen the Society may also be seen in the different history of the Friends in the two colonies: in North Carolina, included in the circuit of these itinerant visitors after 1676, Friends multiplied; in South Carolina, where the itinerant preachers did not penetrate until the next century and where the meetings, feeling that their ties were only with London, were cut off from others in America, the Society could barely maintain itself.

The Carolinas mark the beginning of a process that was long to be typical of America, for this was the first plantation to be largely settled from older colonies of different types. Men and women, too independent of soul to abide by the social and economic mores of older settlements, tried their fortune in this new frontier of opportunity. The dissatisfied of many colonies, the islands as well as the continental developments from Massachusetts to Virginia, found their way to the new territory. Consequently, in addition to the normal trade and shipping connections that tied colonial ports, the Carolinas had close relationships with other colonies; the New England and Barbadian influences were particularly obvious. Moreover, the adventurous men who left their earlier colonizing attempts to seek the advantages of the Carolinas were Puritans, many of them devoted to their religious beliefs, as were the dissenters who came directly from England so that they would not be hampered by the restrictions being forced upon them by the Restoration. And these Puritans, whether from Old England or New England or some other colony, were men who had tacitly agreed to respect their neighbors' ideas. If the seeds of democracy and of respect for individualism are to be found in the Puritan church or meeting house and in the spirit of the frontier, then the Carolinas have an old and worthy heritage.

Chapter VI

The West Indies and Bahamas: Puritanism in Conflict with Tropical Island Life

Any study of Puritanism as it manifested itself in the West Indies and Bahama Islands offers peculiar difficulties. There must have been many decent-living men and women in these plantations who were hungry for the solace of a positive and constructive faith, or the Quaker missionaries in the second half of the century would not have found such fertile ground for their labors. On the other hand, continental standards of Calvinistic behavior were more than occasionally sacrificed to circumstances. As has been pointed out by various writers (with some realization of the humor of the situation), not a few of the more conservative Puritans that emigrated to these island colonies managed to adapt themselves to buccaneering life with all its cruelties and injustices; certainly there was no prejudice against investing in such enterprises. Indeed, Calvinistic detestation of "popery" as well as common patriotism supplied cogent (if specious) reasons for attacks upon Catholic neighbors, both Spanish and French. The typical New England attitude, constantly fostered by a very able ministry, was that man's having the privilege of entering a covenant with Christ implied a certain standard of behavior on the part of anyone so favored; the Elect, being human, would sin, but at least they recognized they were upon their honor to try hard not to disgrace themselves. No such pressure to worthy, reproachless conduct was felt by many Calvinists residing, sometimes temporarily, in the tropical islands. Then, too, the "saints" of Massachusetts have often been accused by later, unsympathetic, critics of being sanctimonious church goers. No such charge could be

made against many of the Puritans who found refuge in the West Indies. Apparently only for the minority of islanders did the church hold the all important position that it possessed in the northern nonconformist colonies.

As one result of the anomalous position of the church, pastoral history that has survived is indeed scanty. Records frequently were not kept; sermons rarely were published; preachers never were eulogized in the New England manner. The contrast even with the southern colonies and with Bermuda is painful. Not only is the account meager for the sects, but for the Established Church, too, many essential details are lacking.

This paucity of information, however, is by no means to be ascribed solely to a lack of interest in matters of faith. Easily discernible are many of the reasons for the wide gaps in the story of the religious development of the various island colonies. First of all, the climate conspired against the preservation of memorabilia of all types. Not only was the humid heat a steadily destructive agent, but violent storms, tornadoes, and earthquakes also effaced much. Devastating fires and periods of pestilence more than occasionally interrupted any steady record keeping. In addition to purely physical causes of lacunae in the chronicle of any church's development, there were other reasons why the churches were not conscious of themselves as history-making forces, with interesting beginnings to be fully transcribed for their children and their children's children. Through no fault of their own, the island churches did not have the type of steady membership enjoyed at least to some extent by other colonial congregations.

The population of the island colonies was constantly shifting. Plantations started with high hopes, only to become rapidly overcrowded. Men migrated from island to island, or left the West Indies for the greater safety of the

continent. Each new development drew men from the earlier settlements. In the 1620's and 1630's the other Leeward Islands were largely settled from St. Christopher's; thirty years later Jamaica drew many from Barbados and the other colonies. Virginia and New England attracted many in the early part of the century; later years saw heavy migration to the Carolinas. As increasing numbers of slaves were imported to work in the tropical climate of the islands, white workers and small plantation owners were forced to move on. From time to time the French or Spanish gained temporary control of an island and quickly dispossessed the English population, some of whom would never re-establish their homes. Most of the Leeward Islands and the Bahamas at one time or another—for some months or years—fell into foreign hands. As a result of these economic and political conditions, island congregations were far from normally developing social units.

Undoubtedly, the greater part of the exploitation of the West Indies and neighboring islands was done with a purely profit-making purpose in mind. Nevertheless, three colonies—Providence, Eleuthera, and Jamaica—were avowedly Puritan experiments; a fourth island, New Providence, was taken over temporarily by a dissenting group. As Puritan strongholds, all these projects failed, for very different reasons.

The first of these attempts to offer conservative, hard-working Puritans a more attractive refuge than New England took place on a small island off the eastern coast of Nicaragua, upon the edge of the Moskito Bank; the place had been called Santa Catalina, but was renamed, it was hoped fittingly, Providence.[1] As this project interested the

[1] The Providence Island story is told in detail in Arthur Percival Newton, *The Colonizing Activities of the English Puritans* (New Haven, 1914). This colonizing project included the development of Henrietta (formerly San Andreas) and Association (Tortula); neither plantation was successful.

leading Puritans in England during the 1620's and 1630's, the Providence Company had among its more outstanding members the Earl of Warwick, John Pym, Sir Nathaniel Rich, Viscount Saye and Seal, Lord Brook, and John Hampden. Settlement started late in 1629, and by 1635 the hope of another Massachusetts Bay Colony—with the added advantage of a warm climate—had petered out. Although the colony survived until 1641, it served mostly as a pirate and trading base. Certainly its capture by the Spanish was no loss to Puritan prestige.

Fundamentally, the cause for the failure was simple. The colony's promoters labored in vain to attract a sufficient number of industrious middle-class Puritans, the type that made New England prosperous. Probably, men in a position to choose their haven were unwilling to risk the hazard of a small island colony, exposed as it was to Catholic enemies. Then, too, New England offered more economic freedom than its rival, governed by an English company that had religious and patriotic motives in financing the settlement but certainly was not adverse to having some returns on its investment. Because not enough Puritans were willing to accept the Providence Company's terms, other settlers were admitted. As a result, there was constant disagreement between the more rigid Puritan element and the free-living men who wanted only to prosper by trade with the Indians on the mainland, and by piracy whenever possible. The few ministers that reached the island only added to the discord. Soon the Puritan minority, regarded as fanatics by the rest of the settlers, lost out; as has been said, during its last years Providence was no better than a base for buccaneers, a place of extremely doubtful reputation.

The late 1640's saw another nonconformist attempt to found a colony, this time on one of the Bahama Islands. Although many of the men backing this experiment, too, were

prominent Puritans much concerned with the course of events in England during that eventful decade, most of the actual settlers came from Bermuda and many of them returned to that island upon the failure of the new colony; the whole Eleutheran venture was an outcome of the difficulties and schisms that the Bermuda church was having at the time.[2] Founded on broad theories of tolerance, this forward-looking attempt to create an ideal settlement for liberal Puritans was doomed to failure because the island itself did not have the soil to support a settlement. Of course, early disagreement among the first settlers, some of whom were strong individualists, may have been a contributing factor to the collapse of these Puritan plans. Many of the original Eleutherans left within the first decade of the colony's existence; some families lingered, and the last of these eventually migrated to Maine when the Spanish ravaged the Bahamas in 1684.

Even more ambitious than the settlement of Providence and Eleuthera was the capture of Jamaica with its subsequent establishment as an English colony. During the last years of the Commonwealth, this island was, as Samuel Sewall gently noted some years later, "the Protector's darling."[3] After the Penn-Venables expedition seized it from the Spanish, Cromwell and his immediate coterie entered into elaborate plans to secure settlers from the other islands, notably Barbados, and from New England. The attempt to entice men from Massachusetts and Connecticut, a project which Daniel Gookin endeavored to forward, largely fell through, except for about 300 that came at one time;[4] Jamaica's first English settlers came from England

[2] *Cf.* Bermuda chapter.

[3] Samuel Sewall, "Diary of," Massachusetts Historical Society, *Collections*, 5th Ser., V, 437.

[4] *Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series, America and West Indies* (London, 1860–1940), I, 429–430; IX, 97–98 (hereafter cited as *Calendar*); *To all Persons whom these may Concern* (Broadside); Edward Long, *The History of Jamaica* (London, 1774), I, 261–262.

and the other West Indies. The days of Cromwell and the Commonwealth proved to be numbered, of course, and with the change of regime in England came the end of the dream of establishing another Puritan plantation. The colony's beginnings, however, manifested themselves from time to time in its later history. For instance, it was one of Cromwell's early settlers, risen to be speaker of the assembly as well as chief justice, who led the protest in 1678 against the crown's usurping of powers that had belonged to the colonial assembly. For his courageous (and intelligent) struggle to preserve the right of the colony to initiate its own legislation, Colonel Samuel Long[5] became one of Jamaica's early heroes.

Jamaica's ecclesiastical history began unfortunately. All seven of the nonconformist chaplains that Cromwell sent out with the original conquerors and settlers died almost immediately, apparently the victims of disease. With the Restoration, a policy of liberty of conscience was adopted, but neither the Anglican nor the dissenting churches can be said to have flourished. During the rest of the century the Established Church was weakly supplied, despite constant requests to England for more ministers. In 1664 the governor reported five ministers on the island: one, Mr. George Johns, was not in orders but seems to have been preaching in one of the Anglican churches; two others, Henry Howser and John Zeller (Sellers, Cellier) were Swiss. Eleven years later there were only four ministers to serve the island's fifteen parishes; by 1677 three were left. In 1681 conditions had begun to change for the better, with eight officially recognized ministers, one of them a Scot, in the colony, and still later other ministers arrived.[6]

[5] *Calendar*, X, 442 *et seq.*; Robert Mowbray Howard, *Records and Letters of the Family of Longs of Longville, Jamaica* (London, 1925), I, 23–44; Agnes M. Whitson, *The Constitutional Development of Jamaica 1660–1729* (Manchester, England, 1929), pp. 49–50.

[6] *Calendar*, V, 42, 83, 108, 111, 113, 118, 183, 212, 237–238, 746; VII, 140, 305; X, 176, 190, 286; XI, 7, 313; *Journals of the Assembly of Jamaica* (Jamaica, 1811), I, 42; J. B. Ellis, *The Diocese of Jamaica* (London, 1913), pp. 31, 32.

There must have been a good many nonconformists in Jamaica throughout the century. Many of the original settlers may well have had Calvinistic leanings; refugee Cromwellians, including a number of regicides and families of regicides, soon added themselves to this group.[7] Immigration from New England, limited as it was, and the more numerous influx of Dutch, many of them coming from Surinam, must have added to the dissenting element. Scots came in considerable numbers,[8] being much in demand as servants and overseers, and in 1683 a group of Huguenots, presumably forty-odd families, arrived.[9] Except for one Huguenot pastor, Calvin Galpiné, there are few traces of the religious comfort that these people must have sought and to some extent found, whether in lay preachers or more professionally trained ministers. In 1671 the people were reported to be meeting in private houses, after the manner of primitive Christians;[10] in the early 1680's official and unofficial accounts[11] noted many sectarians and dissenters, especially among the merchants, mechanics and seamen at Port Royal. Most of these nonconformists were Quakers, Anabaptists, and Independents, the more diligent and prosperous supposedly the latter. There may have been some feeling of religious contention about this time, for in 1683 arose the question of changing the colony's frequently reiterated policy of freedom of worship.[12] The local assembly indignantly refused the proposal.[13]

[7] Bryan Edwards, *The History, Civil and Commercial, of the British Colonies in the West Indies* (Dublin, 1793), I, 161–162; Frank Cundall, *The Governors of Jamaica in the Seventeenth Century* (London, 1936), p. 6; Cundall, *Historic Jamaica* (London, 1915), p. 149.

[8] Long, *History of Jamaica*, I, 261.

[9] *Calendar*, XI, 367, 371; Ellis, *The Diocese of Jamaica*, p. 35; W. J. Gardner, *A History of Jamaica* (New York, 1909), p. 92.

[10] *Calendar*, VII, 305.

[11] *Ibid.*, XI, 314.

[12] *Ibid.*, V, 111; VII, 96; IX, 105; XI, 114; *The Laws of Jamaica* (London, 1684), p. ix; *Interesting Tracts, Relating to the Island of Jamaica* (St. Jago de la Vega, Jamaica, 1800), pp. 218–231; A. Caldecott, *The Church in the West Indies* (London, 1898), p. 45.

[13] *Calendar*, XI, 372.

From the 1680's, too, survive some traces of the Independent (or Congregational) churches and their activities. Independent lay preachers would take care of congregations over longish periods of time. Among the men who added these pastoral duties to their more worldly concerns were Colonel Samuel Bach, a planter of some wealth, and John Coad, exiled from England temporarily because of Monmouth's uprising.[14] In addition to such laymen as tried to the best of their ability to help their fellow dissenters, at least three Calvinistic ministers preached in Jamaica about this time. Two of these were university men of noted scholarship, ejected from their English livings. The Reverend Mr. Frances Crow[15] received his degrees from Edinburgh and then studied at Sédan under Pierre du Moulin (Molinaeus), the celebrated teacher and defender of the French Protestants. Ejected from his Suffolk living, Crow may not have reached Jamaica before 1686. A elderly man, he returned to England in 1690. A somewhat younger man, the Reverend Robert Speere[16] (Speare) was an Oxford Master of Arts who had been a Fellow of Lincoln College until 1662. He preached at Port Royal in the late 1680's, but may not have long survived the change of climate. These two men evidently were largely supported by a group of wealthy nonconformist planters, as was a third clergyman. The minister who had preceded Speere and Crow was the Reverend Thomas Bridges,[17] a well-liked preacher with a devoted congregation. In 1686, however, he emigrated

[14] John Coad, *A Memorandum of the Wonderful Providence of God to a poor Unworthy Creature, during the Time of the Duke of Monmouth's Rebellion* (London, 1849), pp. 45–46, 93.

[15] A. G. Matthews, *Calamy Revised* (Oxford, 1934), pp. 151–153; Gardner, *History of Jamaica*, p. 91.

[16] *Calamy Revised*, p. 454; Coad, *A Memorandum of the Wonderful Providences of God*, pp. 34, 97; Gardner, *History of Jamaica*, pp. 89–90.

[17] *Calendar*, XII, 275, 316, 319, 448, 570–571; Coad, *A Memorandum of the Wonderful Providences of God*, p. 97.

with a number of his followers to New Providence,[18] one of the Bahamas.

This island had been captured from its Spanish possessors in 1666 and subsequently settled by a number of men sent out by two Bermuda adventurers. The Spanish seized the Bahamas in 1684, driving off most of the settlers on both New Providence and its neighbor, Eleuthera. Taking advantage of the situation, Bridges first emigrated and then secured permission for the settlement from the Lords Proprietors of the Carolinas, under whose patent New Providence had been declared to fall. The little colony of families from Jamaica, supplemented by renewed emigration from Bermuda, organized itself with Bridges as mediator (or governor), a council to assist him, and an assembly. Within five years, nevertheless, their leader was either dead or gone, and the place lost its Puritan character. During the first years of the new century the French and Spanish combined to retake the island. Devastated again, New Providence served only as a pirate base for some years, not being reorganized as a colony in good repute until 1718.

Puritan development of colonies on the smaller islands of Providence, Eleuthera, and New Providence petered out with surprising rapidity. And despite its beginnings during a period of Puritan supremacy in England, Jamaica does not seem to have been more Calvinistic in its later years than other Caribbean colonies. Although the church history of the Leeward Islands is too scant for any clear picture of the situation to emerge, there are various indications of a wide range of belief in these smaller plantations. On those islands under British domain, the settlers were English, Irish, and Scottish, with a small Dutch

[18] *Calendar*, VII, 403, 122; IX, 147; W. Hubert Miller, "The Colonization of the Bahamas, 1647–1670," *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3d Ser., II (1945), 44–46; Harcourt Malcolm, comp., *Historical Documents relating to the Bahama Islands* (Nassau, 1910), pp. 14 ff.

minority; if there were Catholic and Anglican churches, there were also Anabaptist and Quaker meeting houses.[19] For one of the larger Caribbean colonies, however, records are somewhat more complete. Consequently, the eventful history of Barbados is suggestive of what took place, with variations, on the other West Indies.

Considering the merchants and other backers financially interested in the development of Barbados, the original rival settlements on the island should not have been unsympathetic to Puritanism. Actual colonization started in 1627, and the London-Middelburg trading company involved in the project had as its principals two merchants, Sir William and Sir Peter Courteen, both born in England but of Flemish descent and with the closest ties with Holland not only by trade but also by continued residence and marriage. With them in the enterprise were their brother-in-law, John Mounsey (Moncy), an English merchant, and the two Powell brothers, John and Henry. The latter, long active in the New England trade, did the actual transporting of the first 170 men and women. As soon as the Courteens realized that their possession of Barbados was going to be strongly contested, they sought the backing of the Earl of Pembroke; ten years later, in 1638, Pembroke transferred his claims to the island to the Earl of Warwick, the noted supporter of Puritan colonization. The rival claimant for the wealth of Barbados was the Earl of Carlisle, but he had little to do with the practical details of carrying out colonization plans. Carlisle leased the island to a company of London merchants operating under the leadership of Sir

[19] *Calendar*, VII, 84, 446; IX, 501–502; XI, 95. As evidence of nonconformity on the Leeward Islands, the following stray pieces may be cited as typical: The aged governor of Nevis was reported in 1655 to be having "Annebaptest" troubles (Vere Langford Oliver, *The History of the Island of Antigua* (London, 1894), I, xxv; twenty years later Quaker itinerants were disputing hotly with a nonconformist minister named John Lawson (Joseph Besse, *A Collection of the Sufferings of the People Called Quakers* (London, 1753), II, 357).

Marmaduke Royden (Rawden), and it was this London company that procured Carlisle's colonists and arranged for the second settlement made on the island. Although the Pembroke-Warwick faction did not give up hope but continued for many years to interfere in the colony's affairs, after 1629 the Carlisle group was virtually in control of the situation, both in England and on the island.[20]

Among the early settlers who came with Captain Henry Powell was Henry Winthrop,[21] the son of the future governor of Massachusetts. This young man stayed only two years before feeling that there were better fortune-making opportunities elsewhere, but he went on his way for this reason only. The youthful Henry, brought up in a strict Puritan household, apparently found his fellow venturers congenial enough; at least his letters showed no protest or shock at conditions in the infant colony. On the contrary, he was chosen to be assistant to Governor Charles Wolferstone, a Carlisle man who around 1628 temporarily had the support of both groups of settlers. In addition, Winthrop was appointed a justice of the peace. This small piece of evidence seems at least to indicate that a man's Puritanism was no handicap to him in the first days of the new colony.

In its seventeenth-century history subsequent to its troubled beginnings, Barbados had a surprisingly rapid but in many ways an uncertain and unhappy development. Men and women flocked to the island, hoping to make a fortune; others came less willingly, as indentured men and victims of England's civil wars. After the first necessarily limited efforts at colonization, an influx of settlers followed. By 1629, six parishes were established; the population then was around 1850. By 1637, the land was all occupied, with some 6000 settlers already there. By 1641, eleven parishes,

[20] Vincent T. Harlow, *A History of Barbados 1625–1685* (Oxford, 1926), pp. 3–13.

[21] *Winthrop Papers* (Boston, 1929–47), I, 338. 356 ff., 361 ff., 405 ff.

all smaller in territory than the original six, were felt to be necessary, and there were soon more than 37,000 white settlers. A few years later, what may have been an exaggerated estimate put the number of land owners at 11,200; by 1667, when plantations had grown larger and the number of slaves multiplied, there were more certainly 745 possessors of estates. In 1676, an official count of the population revealed that there were then 21,725 white people resident, and 32,473 negroes. In the 1680's the population again increased by about 12,000, with a total of 4150 families.[22]

If thousands of men came to seek their fortunes on the plantations of Barbados, many of them were quickly disappointed. There was every reason for men with limited financial backing to lose courage. Some authorities have put the height of the colony's prosperity as early as the 1650's, others as late as the 1680's or early 1690's; certainly between these two periods of relative affluence times were less promising. Barbados suffered from repeated catastrophes of earthquakes, tornadoes, and destructive fires. Plagues swept the island from time to time. Political intrigues more than occasionally led to bloodshed and to banishments. There were also a number of dangerous servant and slave uprisings. After the first few years, the colony's entire economy depended upon sugar, with the consequent uncertainties and misfortunes that one-crop plantations suffer; in addition, the devotion to sugar forced the small land owners out and vastly increased the slave population. Because of the Navigation Acts, trade conditions remained difficult during and after the Commonwealth period. When

[22] "An Account of His Majesty's Island of Barbados and Governmt Thereof," Sloan Mss. 2411, pp. 1–22, British Museum, c. 1684, Barbados Museum and Historical Society, *Journal*, III (1935), 48; *Calendar*, I, p. 240; Vol. VII, 495; Robert H. Schomburgk, *The History of Barbados* (London, 1848), pp. 79–82, 85–87, 141, 144, 147; Otis P. Starkey, *The Economic Geography of Barbados* (New York, 1939), p. 57.

the island became in 1663 a royal colony, a tax judged by many to be unfair hampered economic development and even drained off money needed for armaments to the extent of endangering the physical survival of the colony as an English possession, largely unprotected and open to attack as it was.[23]

In Barbados there was no steady progress, with the normal tribulations of a growing colony. Each new calamity or threatened calamity persuaded many to seek more propitious havens. The emigration rate from the island was always high. Records of those leaving are naturally incomplete, but occasionally figures and sometimes even names reveal this side of the picture. Between 1643 and 1647, 1200 left for New England; these quondam Barbadians must have felt that they would be at home in a strongly Calvinistic society. During the same period 600 went to Tobago and Trinidad, the latter another of the Earl of Warwick's patents. Following close upon the emigration in these two directions, 2400 went to Surinam and Virginia. In 1655 close to 4000 men (many accompanied by their families) joined the Penn-Venables expedition to Jamaica. Nine years later a smaller group of 800 went with Colonel Modiford to the same destination. All together, 12,000 are supposed to have left between 1643 and 1667. Nor did the exodus end then. Many continued to go to Jamaica, others to the Leeward Islands. During the 1660's and 1670's the migration to the Carolinas was also heavy. In three years, between 1668 and 1671, 4000 departed, with 2000 going in one year; fears, undoubtedly exaggerated, were expressed that the place would be depopulated. Still later, in 1679,

[23] *Great Newes from the Barbados* (London, 1676), pp. 4, 12–13; Richard Ligon, *A True & Exact History of the Island of Barbados* (London, 1657), p. 25; *A Continuation of the State of New-England . . . Together with an Account of the Intended Rebellion of the Negroes in the Barbadoes* (London, 1676), p. 20; Schomburgk, *History of the Barbados*, pp. 45, 68, 79, 689–690; Starkey, *Economic Geography of Barbados*, 25, 57, 75–77, 79 *et seq.*

nearly 600 men and their families thought that there were greater chances for prosperity elsewhere.[24]

This shifting population, indentured men whose time had run out and planters, was not all English. Scottish, Irish, Welsh, French, and Jewish settlers arrived. A 1673 estimate of conditions on the island came to the conclusion that not more than one-half the people were of English descent. Probably the Scottish proportion was high; many came involuntarily, having been transported after the battles of Dunbar and Worcester. The Irish (some of whom may have been Scotch-Irish) came as indentured men or were transported after Drogheda; apparently they formed but a minor part of the whole population. Contemporaries also speak of the Welsh, French, Dutch, and Jewish groups as small.[25] It is to be noted, however, that Dutch influences upon the colony were not restricted to the limited group of permanent or semi-permanent residents from the Low Countries. Dutch ships were constantly in the harbor, and the Barbadians had the friendliest of feelings for the Hollanders. This amicable relationship was natural, for the islanders depended for their exports and imports upon Dutch shipping and it was Dutch capital that started the profitable sugar industry.[26] Until well after this mid-century these foreign traders had only one rival in importance for the survival of the colony: trade connections with New England

[24] *Calendar*, V, 157, 161–162, 163, 166, 267–268, 270, 403, 529; VII, 184, 284, 295, 324, 386, 620; Historical Manuscript Commission, *Tenth Report*, Appendix, Part VI, p. 96; "List of Persons who left Barbados in the Year 1679" Barbados Museum and Historical Society, *Journal*, I (1934), 155–180; John Camden Hotten, ed., *The Original Lists of Persons of Quality Emigrants; Religious Exiles; Political Rebels . . . 1600–1700* (London, 1874), pp. 345–418; Schomburgk, *History of the Barbados*, p. 285; Starkey, *Economic Geography of Barbados*, p. 77.

[25] Richard Blome, *A Description of the Island of Jamaica, With the other Isles, viz. Barbadoes* (London, 1672), p. 83; T. Walduck, "Letters from Barbados, 1710," Barbados Museum and Historical Society, *Journal*, XV (1948), 137–149; *Calendar*, VII, 495.

[26] *A Declaration Set forth by the Lord Lieutenant Generall the Gentlemen of the Councill & Assembly* (Hague, 1651), *passim*.

also were active, and there was constant intercourse between Massachusetts and Barbados.

Not until the 1640's is there much indication of the part religion played in the life of Barbados' varied and changing population. (Although the Reverend Nicholas Leverton[27] was briefly resident on the island during its early development, at the time of his Barbados stay this young clergyman, who later became a prominent nonconformist, was still within the fold of the Church of England and had no influence on the colony's church history.) In 1641 Governor Philip Bell took office, although he did not gain full title until four years later. He was not inexperienced, for he had served in a similar capacity both in the Bermudas and Providence Island. A conservative Puritan and long a protégé of the Earl of Warwick, Bell evidently found supporters among his Barbados subjects. His point of view and that of many of the colony's leading citizens may be seen in the legislation passed during his regime. Among the acts that went into effect about 1647 was one commanding loyalty to the Church of England as it had been established by the English Parliament. Every householder was ordered to hold family prayers twice a day, morning and evening. Everyone within a two-mile radius of a church had to attend services twice every Sunday; more distant parishioners had to attend twice a month. Any infringement of the Sabbath regulations carried with it the penalty of a heavy fine or severe physical punishment.[28] This law evidently suited the temper of the more respectable and religious element in the colony, for the same act was again passed in 1655,[29] well after Bell's day.

[27] Newton, *The Colonizing Activities of the English Puritans*, pp. 254–258; Calamy, *Nonconformist Memorial*, I, 373.

[28] Richard Hall, ed., *Acts, Passed in the Island of Barbados. From 1643, to 1762, inclusive* (London, 1764), p. 4; James S. M. Anderson, *The History of the Church of England in the Colonies* (London, 1856), II, 57–60.

[29] *Acts of Assembly, Passed in the Island of Barbados, From 1648, to 1718.* (London, 1741), pp. 12–13.

Less successful was Bell's earlier attempt to secure New England ministers for the Barbados churches. To further this plan, he wrote to his friend, Governor Winthrop of Massachusetts Bay Colony, but got no immediate help in the matter.[30] Around 1646, however, the Reverend James Parker, "a godly man and a scholar,"[31] did leave his Portsmouth parish for the island, where he had relatives. Having ventured the change, Parker was welcomed and preached successfully for some years.

If there were in Barbados during the 1640's conservative Puritans who held themselves to be the true Church of England, the colony was not unbothered by more radical sectarians. The situation showed an interesting parallelism to affairs in Massachusetts. In the towns of the latter settlement, established Calvinism repeatedly had to meet the challenge of Antinomianism, the heresy of putting too much stress upon faith, too little on reasoned obedience to Biblical law. Occasionally, too, arose the closely allied and even more feared threat of Familism, an over-emphasis on love at the expense of doctrinal faith, with the accompanying tendency to accept spiritual rather than literal interpretation of Biblical texts. Consequently, the chief reason that the New England ministers hesitated to answer the call to Barbados lay in their detestation of Familism, which was admittedly rife on the island. Nor were these Congregationalists unjustified in their fears.

When the Reverend Mr. Parker did risk the uncertainties of Barbados, his only adverse critics proved to be Antinomians. He also sadly noted that Barbadians were afraid of permitting liberty of conscience to prevail because they had among their number many sectarians who might deny

[30] James Kendall Hosmer, ed., *Winthrop's Journal "History of New England" 1630–1649* (New York, 1908), II, 74, 142–143.

[31] Hosmer, ed., *Winthrop's Journal,* II, 89–90; *Winthrop Papers,* V, 83–85, 171–172, 267.

the value of ordinances.[32] Governor Bell moved against the "divers sects" of Familists that were springing up, having some whipped and some banished. By the end of the decade, nevertheless, the Barbados leftists, perhaps encouraged by the changing conditions in the mother country, had become so obnoxious that the severest laws were passed against them as "divers opinionated and self-conceited Persons" who had been holding conventicles.[33] Undoubtedly, Anglicans and conservative Puritans, whether or not the latter considered themselves members of the Church of England, found the more radical sectarians objectionable. On the other hand, the political situation entered into the question. As a way of weakening the Roundhead opposition, the Barbados royalists supported wholeheartedly any measures to have sectarians and nonconformists banished.

Politically, Barbadians did not escape the difficulties the 1640's presented to all Englishmen. One of the wealthiest and most prominent landowners, Sir James Drax,[34] was a Roundhead, and there were other men of large estate who favored the changes being executed in the home country; other well-to-do and active Barbadians were loyal to the old order. Under Bell, the various parties that reflected the rising revolution in England managed for some years to live together peacefully, despite considerable intrigue on both sides. This truce was the more surprising inasmuch as a number of royalist refugees arrived in 1645 and shortly thereafter. Older settlers felt some natural resentment of these newcomers who seemed to be trying to gain control of the colony. Conditions became more and more strained even while Bell was trying to hold a conciliatory balance

[32] *Winthrop's Journal* (Hosmer ed.), II, 142–143.

[33] Hall, *Acts, Passed in the Island of Barbados*, p. 4.

[34] *Calendar*, X, 110; Vincent T. Harlow, *Christopher Codrington 1668–1710* (Oxford, 1928), pp. 7–8.

between the parties, and matters became worse after he was succeeded in 1650 by the royalist Lord Willoughby, with the Commonwealth party proposing that Edward Winslow, a Puritan and a New Englander, be at the head of the government. In the inevitable conflict,[35] the royalists were at first victorious; nevertheless, the opposition showed considerable strength, although over a hundred of their more prominent members were deported. (Many of these political Puritans found their way back to the island shortly.) By 1652, the arrival of an avenging force sent out by The Council of State and under the command of Sir George Ayscue forced the Cavalier party to capitulate.

Perhaps the most important result of this whole Royalist-Commonwealth controversy, followed as it was by the submission of the colony to the demands of the Parliamentary emissaries, was the compromise drawn up by the two parties early in 1652.[36] The Articles of Agreement not only confirmed the right of the Barbadians to their own assembly but also provided in its very first clause for liberty of conscience,[37] with the usual seventeenth-century exceptions of atheists, blasphemers, scandalous livers, and opposers of civil government. This practical policy of almost unlimited religious liberty was carried out until the early 1680's, when a somewhat tyrannical governor, Sir Richard

[35] This period of Barbados history has been much commented upon, both by contemporaries and later writers. *Cf.* Nicholas Foster, *A Briefe Relation of the Late Horrid Rebellion Acted in the Island Barbadas* (London, 1650); *Bloudy Newes from the Barbadaes, Being a True Relation of a Great and Terrible Fight between the Parliaments Navie . . . and the King of Scots Forces* (London, 1652); *Mercurius Politicus. Comprising the Summe of all Intelligence*, No. 90 (February 19–26, 1652); Bulstrode Whitelock, *Memorials of the English Affairs* (London, 1732), p. 474; N. Darnell Davis, *The Cavaliers & Roundheads of Barbados 1650–1652* (Georgetown, British Guiana, 1887).

[36] E. M. Shilstone, "The Evolution of the General Assembly of Barbados," Barbados Museum and Historical Society, *Journal*, I (1934), pp. 187–191.

[37] *Articles of Agreements, made, and Concluded the 11th day of January, 1651. By and between the Commissioners of the Right Honourable, the Lord Willoughby of Parrham, on the one Part: And the Commissioners in the behalfe of the Common-Wealth of England, on the other Part* (London, 1652); John Scott, "The Description of Barbados, Sloane Ms. 3662," *The Weekly Argosy*, 17 August 1907.

Dutton, tried to impose complete uniformity of worship and to abolish all conventicles. Before Dutton's day, even attacks on the Quakers were put on civil and military grounds. Other sects, such as Anabaptist groups, seem to have been allowed to maintain themselves for some time without suffering active persecution, although after the Restoration there were determined efforts by the royal governors to see both that the Anglican church was supported financially and that its pulpits were not occupied by unordained ministers.

During the Interregnum, and while Barbados had as its governor Daniel Searle (one of the Puritan commissioners sent over to reduce the island), a number of nonconforming ministers must have emigrated to the colony. Immediately after the Restoration, ten of the eleven official churches on the island were manned by unordained ministers, with the eleventh pulpit temporarily unsupplied.[38] As late as 1669 a report to the king described the chief church as Presbyterian, while the Independents were holding conventicles.[39] Most of the dissenting ministers in the eleven officially recognized churches were gradually replaced by regular Church of England clergy, but at least one occupant does not seem to have been ejected. A Mr. Grey,[40] who had arrived around 1657, was still in office some twenty-four years later. At this time an attempt was made to oust him, but he had the loyal support of his vestry. Evidently Grey was but a mild dissenter or the years had softened his originally more decided nonconformity, for the vestry proposed sending him to England—with £500 for his expenses—so that he might be ordained. This plan fell through, but Grey lingered on for some years, a "well-

[38] *Calendar*, V, 29.
[39] *Ibid.*, XVII, 593.
[40] *Ibid.*, XI, 60–61, 148–149.

loved and orthodox" occupant of one of the island's pulpits. The whole incident shows plainly that conscientious ministers were so respected by their congregations that the latter were more than eager to keep such men with them; shades of belief did not seem to be the main question in the minds of vestrymen and parishioners.

Not all of the preachers who found their way to Barbados came from England. Harvard supplied a few dissenting ministers to help strengthen conservative nonconformist groups during the Restoration years. Two particularly outstanding graduates emigrated in their younger years to Barbados. The Reverend Solomon Stoddard,[41] a member of the class of 1662, interrupted his subsequent service as college librarian to spend a two-year period on the island. After this first pastorate, he returned to Massachusetts, to be called in 1672 to the Congregational church at Northampton. Here he had a long and distinguished career of more than fifty-six years. An influential preacher and publisher of many tracts on religious and political issues of the day, Stoddard is best remembered as the grandfather of Jonathan Edwards, with whom he shared his pulpit in the last years of his life. In contrast to the later views of his better-known grandson, Stoddard was a powerful advocate of the Halfway Covenant and a man who went so far as to believe the Lord's Supper to be a converting sacrament that should be partaken of by all decent-living baptized believers; few men had more effect upon the church history of New England.

Thirty years after Stoddard's service on Barbados, another Harvard man followed in his footsteps. The Reverend Nathanael Williams,[42] a member of the class of 1693

[41] J. L. Sibley, *Biographical Sketches of Graduates of Harvard University* (Cambridge, 1873–85), II, 112; *Dictionary of American Biography*, XVIII, 59–60.

[42] Sibley, *Biographical Sketches*, IV, 183; Thomas Prince, *Funeral Sermon on the Reverend Nathanael Williams* (Boston, 1738), p. 26; *Dictionary of National Biography*, XX, 283–284.

but not an ordained minister until five years later, held his first pastorate on the island. After two years, Williams returned to Massachusetts and he, too, had a noteworthy career in his native colony. Not only did he succeed Ezekiel Cheever in the very honorable position of master of the Boston Latin School but he also served as a pillar of the Old South Church, where he occasionally preached; in his later years he became a physician of some local note, especially in his advocacy of inoculation, that much disputed medical innovation of the day. Despite Stoddard's and Williams' comparatively short stays on the island, Harvard's reputation as a supplier of worthy preachers did not die out. When the Reverend John Barnard (Harvard 1700) visited Barbados in 1709, he was urged by a "small number of considerable and valuable gentlemen" to exercise his talents upon the Sabbath. Barnard, however, thought it prudent to refuse this invitation.[43]

Two other very different ministers, both mature men and each definitely Calvinistic in his thinking, also came to Barbados before the end of the century. The Reverend John Oxenbridge,[44] whose nonconformist influence had been so strong in Bermuda before the Interregnum, had held various positions in England during the Commonwealth days. Ejected in 1662, he had gone to Surinam; then from 1667 to 1671, when he left to become the sixth pastor of the First Church at Boston, he preached in Barbados. This well-known dissenter probably first thought in terms of Surinam and Barbados pulpits as an outlet for his talents because his son-in-law, Major Robert Scott, owned plantations in both colonies; in addition, Oxenbridge's brother-in-law was Thomas Parris, an active resident of Barbados.

[43] Massachusetts Historical Society, *Collections*, 3d Ser., V (1836), 187.

[44] Frank Cundall, "The Migration from Surinam to Jamaica," *Timehri*, 3d Ser., VI, 168; G. Andrews Moriarty, "More Notes on New England and Barbados," Barbados Museum and Historical Society, *Journal*, XV (1948), 135.

Some years after this Congregationalist minister's stay, another prominent Puritan preacher arrived in the colony. The Reverend Francis Makemie,[45] a Presbyterian who all his life had great hopes of convincing Anglicans that men of his way of thinking formed the true Church of England, began in the early 1690's to make trips to the island; he combined trade and missionary labors. For some two to three years, from 1696 to 1698, he seems to have been resident in the colony. His comparatively lengthy stay was partially due to the fact that his hopes were high for the religious future of Barbados. He expected that his missionary work would be continued by the Reverend Samuel Mather. This New Englander failed to arrive, and the disappointed Makemie returned anyway to his home on the Eastern Shore of Maryland.

As can be seen from the names of these men who saw fit to spend some years in Barbados, the colony during the second half of the seventeenth century enjoyed—only briefly and periodically, it is true—the preaching of some of the leading men in the conservative nonconformist churches. Stoddard, Williams, Oxenbridge, and Makemie were distinguished ministers, three of them among New England's most honored pastors and teachers. During these same years more radical Calvinistic groups continued to be active, as they had been during the mid-years of the century. There were repeated complaints by the authorities that Anabaptists were holding meetings.[46] The names of a few of their preachers have survived, but little about these men.

[45] I. Marshall Page, *The Life Story of Rev. Francis Makemie* (Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1938), pp. 101–102; Samuel McLanahan, "America's Pioneer Home Missionary, Francis Makemie, 1658–1708," *Home Mission Heroes* (New York, 1904), pp. 10–11; for Makemie's beliefs, see his *Truths In a True Light. Or, A Pastoral Letter, to the Reformed Protestants, in Barbados Vindicating the Non-Conformists . . . And, Demonstrating, that they are indeed the Truest and Soundest Part of the Church of England* (Edinburgh, 1699).

[46] *Calendar*, IX, 424; X, 63, 619; XI, 60, 72; "An Account of his Majesty's Island of Barbados," Barbados Museum and Historical Society, *Journal*, I, 50.

Thomas Hatchman[47] and Henry Byrch[48] were both preaching in the early 1670's; the latter deserted this service to become a member of the Society of Friends. Anabaptist teachers—or rather protests against Anabaptist teachers—also appear in the records occasionally. The sect, however, was never numerous, for the entire membership formed but a "small parcel" in the words of a contemporary aware of conditions. Nevertheless, their fervor and proselytizing were feared, and in the 1680's Governor Dutton took steps to have them deported. He does not seem to have succeeded completely, for there are traces of their activities after their supposed banishment by Dutton's order.

However widely they differed in theology, the Anabaptists and Anglicans shared one prejudice: they both objected to Quakers and to the spread of Fox's ideas. As the official church and the great majority, the Anglicans were in the stronger position, but some of the most violent objections met by Fox and his disciples came from Anabaptist preachers;[49] one can at least suspect that the latter saw an uncomfortable number of their parishioners taking this step to the left. But neither Anabaptist pulpit attacks and debates nor the punishments handed out by the island's authorities deterred the growth of the Society. Even the scanty and scattered surviving records indicate that many were convinced. The first few Quakers arrived in 1655 and rapidly succeeded in increasing their numbers. By 1664, despite the fact that Perrot's disrupting influence had been felt in the interim, the colony had three or four meetings. In a few years these could be described as "large" and "full." By 1671 three to four hundred men and women flocked to hear the Society's founder, George Fox, at each

[47] Norman Penney, ed., *The Journal of George Fox* (Cambridge, 1911), II, 252, 445.

[48] Alice Curwen, *A Relation of the Labour, Travail and Suffering of that faithful Servant of the Lord* (1680), pp. 33-34.

[49] Penney, *Journal of George Fox*, II, 196.

meeting he attended, and there were, as his companions could joyously report, "many large precious Meetings";[50] three thousand were supposed to have listened at one debate held a few years later.

Although by no means were all who heard the travelling Friends convinced, many undoubtedly did join the Society. Comments on the situation by the royal governors of course show the Anglican viewpoint, but they do indicate that the Friends admittedly formed no inconsiderable part of the population. Throughout the 1670's and 1680's official reports on conditions in Barbados complain that the Quakers not only were numerous but also had the unhappy faculty of increasing "daily" in number, subtlety, and perverseness; 400 to 600 used to attend a meeting, and there were some twenty Quaker families of sufficient wealth to surprise and annoy Governor Atkins.[51] Six women's meetings were thriving in 1677; situated in different parts of the colony, they were known as the Plantation, Thicketts and Clift, Windward, Bridge, Spring, and Champion Ground meetings. All together, at least 186 Quakeresses belonged to them.[52] Presumably parallel men's meetings existed. In 1683 Governor Atkins ordered the Bridgetown meeting house closed, but such was the political power of the Quakers that it was later reopened.[53] By the 1690's the ruling powers proved to be more tolerant. In 1696 members of the Society were permitted to substitute for the required oaths their affirmation in legal matters and thus were enabled to protect their estates in many ways.[54] At the end

[50] *Ibid.*, II, 192; William Edmundson, *A Journal of the Life, Travels, Sufferings and Labour of Love* (London, 1774), pp. 62, 64, 81, 82 ff.

[51] *Calendar*, VII, 506; IX, 349; X, 63; XII, 60, 72, 108; "An Account of His Majesty's Island of Barbados, Sloan Ms. 2411," in Barbados Museum and Historical Society, *Journal*, III (1935), 44–57.

[52] Henry J. Cadbury, "186 Barbados Quakeresses in 1677," *Ibid.*, IX (1942), 195–197.

[53] *Calendar*, XII, 208–209, 449.

[54] Penney, *Journal of George Fox*, II, 190–191, 221; Edmundson, *Journal*, p. 81.

of the century meetings were flourishing at Bridgetown, Speight's Town, Spring, Thickett, and Pumpkin Hill. Despite strong opposition, there were also Negro meetings, although attendance at these may well have been irregular. As early as the 1670's, however, eighty slaves were able to hear a travelling Friend; a little later, Negro meetings grew much larger, with two or three hundred gathering to hear visiting members of the Society.[55] In these years of growth, when white and Negro convincements were numerous, no fewer than five meeting houses were erected in various parts of the island.

This steady increase in numbers did not last. Membership went down in the first years of the eighteenth century, mostly because of the heavy mortality rate. (The island was suffering repeatedly from epidemics of pestilence and smallpox.) Still there were signs of continued strength. The Bridgetown meeting was divided, presumably because of its many members. Soon, however, admissions of decay start,[56] although there was life in the Society until well into the century.

If missionary zeal is at all effective, it is not surprising that the Friends found a strong anchorhold in Barbados.

[55] For the activities of Quaker itinerant preachers in the West Indies (and incidental comments on the state of the Society in the various colonies), see John Burnyeat, *The Truth Exalted* (London, 1691), pp. 32–40; Thomas Chalkley, *A Collection of the Works* (Philadelphia, 1754), I, 33–34, 55–57, 90; Josiah Coale, *Books and Divers Epistles* (1671), pp. 47–50; Alice Curwen, *Relation of the Labour* (1680), pp. 6, 7, 16, 24–26, 32, 42, 48, 49–50; Edmundson, *Journal* (London, 1774), pp. 60–65, 81–87, 125 ff.; John Fothergill, *Account of the Life* (London, 1753), pp. 51–53, 184; Fox, *Journal* (Penney ed.), *passim*, especially Vol. II; Thomas Story, *Journal* (Newcastle upon Tyne, 1741), pp. 433–441; John Taylor, *Memoir* (York, 1830), pp. 22–27, 32–39; John Whiting, *Persecution Expos'd* (London, 1715), pp. 80–81, 137, 170–171, 194–195; Robert Widders, *Life and Death* (London, 1688), *passim;* Thomas Wilson, *Brief Journal* (Dublin, 1728), p. 39.

[56] Besse, *A Collection of the Sufferings of the People Called Quakers, 1650–1689,* II, 278–351 (Barbados), 388–391 (Jamaica), 352–366 (Nevis); for Antigua sufferings, see Jonas Langford, *A Brief Account of the Sufferings of . . . Quakers . . . in the Island of Antegoa* (London, 1706). A further notice of persecution in Barbados is in *For the King and both Houses of Parliament. Being a Short Relation of the Sad Estate and Sufferings of the . . . Quakers* (London, 1661).

Practically every travelling Friend on his way to any of the other colonies stopped here first. No matter whether a man felt his call was to the other island plantations, to the hardships of New England, or to the long treks of the southern continental colonies, his first step was to get to Barbados and seek shipping from her port; returning to the British Isles, he as often as not revisited the same island. Mary Fisher and Ann Austin arrived in 1655, and after that date there was scarcely a year for more than three decades that did not see some of the "public" Friends working in the colony; well into the eighteenth century this activity, only slightly abated, continued.

To name the travelling Friends who spent some weeks or months in Barbados is almost tantamount to listing all the Quaker itinerants that felt a call to America. Following the first two women, came Henry Fell and John Stubbs in 1656, Anne Clayton in 1657, Sarah Gibbons in 1658, Richard Pinder and John Taylor in 1659, with William Brend (Brand) there probably the following year. In 1661 at least eight men and women arrived, including William Rofe, Josias Coale, and Jane Milner; the following year Taylor returned. In 1662, too, Perrot, the trouble maker, caused the usual dissension in Quaker circles. In 1664 John Burnyeat, one of the more noted laborers and organizers, made his first visit, finally leaving only to return in 1667 and 1670; he reported "blessed and comfortable Service among Friends" and "large and full" meetings. In 1667 Taylor was on a fourth visit to the islands, this time staying about eight years. In 1671 the Society's brightest stars were in Barbados for three months, among them George Fox, Robert Widders, Solomon Eccles, and Elizabeth Hooten; Stubbs and Pinder returned, and at one time fourteen or more itinerants were preaching in the colony or temporarily on Jamaica or one of the Leeward Islands. No other year

saw quite so much Quaker activity in Barbados, but Lydia Fell came in the early 1670's; Alice Curwen arrived in 1677, stayed for seven months, and discovered "great openness" among the colonists; Robert Rich labored in 1679; Eccles, having been banished in 1680, returned in 1681, and the same year Joan Vodkins held two or three meetings a day. Edmundson, having paid a second visit to the island in 1675, returned for a third long stay in 1683. Thomas Wilson spent eight months in the colony at the beginning of the next decade. Later in the 1690's Mary Rogers and Francis Musgrove arrived. In the early years of the eighteenth century three more distinguished Friends, Thomas Story, Thomas Chalkley, and John Fothergill, more than once broke their trips to the continental colonies by fairly lengthy stays on the island. And there were many others, less well known itinerants, who came for short or long periods of service.[57]

Although Barbados was the favorite stopping-off place between England and Maryland, many of the travelling preachers were not content with visiting only one of the West Indies. As early as 1658 Friends began to go to Jamaica. Taylor was there late in 1659; in 1661 Josiah Coale felt a call to the island; in 1662 Taylor was back to stay a year, and with him were Lydia Oates, Oswell Heritage, and Ann Robinson; in 1665 Perrot reached this colony also, still upsetting less radical Quakers; in 1666 Taylor returned for the third time. The early 1670's on this island too were a time of much proselytizing by the Society. James Lancaster, John Cartwright, and George Pattison, all members of the little group accompanying Fox on his travels, went on to Jamaica to prepare the ground while the rest remained in Barbados. Then Fox and most of his immediate travelling companions followed. After many of the party went on

[57] Edmundson, *Journal*, p. 62.

to Maryland, at least two prominent itinerants, Eccles and Cartwright, lingered on Jamaica; Cartwright died there in 1685. Among a good many other travelling Friends, John Veres, William Edmundson, George Coale, James Dickinson, and Robert Barrow spent fairly long periods on the island before the close of the century; in the early 1700's Fothergill, Chalkley, and Story carried on their work.[58]

In Jamaica, as in Barbados, Quakerism quickly took hold. Under the influence of Fox's visit, six or seven meetings were set up; those at Port Royal, Kingston, and Spanish Town lasted well into the next century. By the 1680's Jamaica Friends could report to their brethren at home that meetings were being held all over the island and that these gatherings were unhampered by the authorities. This prospering of the Quakers came to a sudden end in 1692 when an earthquake destroyed a great part of the colony. The Friends were particularly stricken as the calamity occurred on a meeting day. With two-thirds of their members killed, the meetings grew small, being further deleted by the epidemics that followed the sudden laying waste of Jamaica.[59]

The ardor of some of the journeying Friends did not limit itself to Barbados and Jamaica. Many of them took side trips to Antigua, Nevis, Montserrat, and less well settled islands. For some years there were at least two meetings on Nevis, and Quakers around St. John's on Antigua early had a meeting house. The size of the meetings in some places is doubtful, consisting perhaps of four or five families, but certainly most of the Caribbean Islands had Friends on them after 1660.

Reaction to Quaker doctrines and actions varied from island to island. Barbados records from 1660 through

[58] Henry J. Cadbury, "Barbados Quakers—1683 to 1761," Barbados Museum and Historical Society, *Journal*, IX (1941), 29–31.

[59] Penney, *Journal of George Fox*, II, 433–434; also II, 91, 197, 203, 207, 255, 376.

most of the 1680's are filled with notices of fines and imprisonments, mostly for refusals to join the militia; then the king interfered in behalf of members of the Society. Jamaica officials, on the other hand, at first received itinerants courteously, and the signs of making Friends pay for their beliefs begin only in the 1680's.[60] Antigua, too, seems to have shown less prejudice than most places; one of the colony's early governors, Samuel Winthrop of the noted New England family, was convinced. Nevis, however, on the other hand was most vigilant in its efforts to keep Friends out. This refusal to tolerate the principles of the Friends—and especially their pacifism—died out as the Society became weaker in the islands. By 1686 Nevis meetings reported to London they were no longer called upon to endure active persecution.[61] It is to be noted that in the sugar colonies the question was not only one of forcing the Quakers to join the militia or pay for substitutes; even the point of oath-taking became a minor one before the problem of Quaker insistence on convincing Negroes as well as whites. The difficulty resolved itself into whether or not the slaves should receive enough education to become Christians. Always afraid of Negro uprisings, plantation owners as the numerical minority in a colony such as Barbados objected violently to Negroes' congregating and to their receiving any instruction that would give them a common tongue and means of communication.

Whether persecuted for their beliefs or temporarily tolerated, the Friends multiplied in the island colonies. Early itinerants were turned away from Nevis on the practical ground that 700 of the Caribbean Islands' militia had already joined the Society;[62] if more were to be convinced,

[60] Besse, II, 388–391.

[61] Edmundson, p. 126.

[62] Edmundson, p. 62; also Besse, II, 353.

disaster would follow. Some 250 families on Barbados have been identified as suffering at one time or another for their Quaker beliefs.[63] In Jamaica one estimate gave 9,500 Friends at the end of the century. Actual membership in the Society at any one time is difficult to determine, but apparently during the last decades of the seventeenth century Friends far outnumbered conservative dissenters.

That the islands were the focal point for much missionary labor on the part of the Friends is only part of the reason for this state of affairs. The shifting population, both lay and cleric, undoubtedly affected the situation. The contrast with New England and even with some of the southern continental colonies is striking. Here were no beloved preachers instructing for long years men and women whose Biblical and general religious education had never been neglected. Preachers of moderate nonconformity usually served but briefly on the islands, seldom occupying a pulpit for more than a few years. (With few exceptions, good Anglicans scarcely lasted longer.) Even within the brief span of his service a minister might find his pastorate had changed considerably as his old charges migrated and new ones arrived. With no strong, steady opposition from more conservative church leaders to hinder them, the Quaker travelling ministry accomplished their ends, only to be defeated in turn by the loss of members through emigration and death. The victory, temporary though it may have been, was the more remarkable inasmuch as the Friends did not hesitate to try to save the souls of "Blacks" and "Tawnies." "Are they not men?"[64] George Fox asked the ministers of Barbados, and the whole problem of the moral justification of slavery was involved in the answer.

[63] Besse, II, 278–351.

[64] Fox, II, 190–191, 258; Curwen, p. 6; Edmundson, p. 81.

Chapter VII

Southern Puritanism and Its Successor, Methodism

The men and women of the southern and island colonies were closer spiritually and mentally to the Congregationalists of Massachusetts and Connecticut and to the Baptists, Seekers, and Quakers of little Rhode Island than many people have realized. This kinship is obvious in the case of the Calvinists who ventured to the islands of Providence, Eleuthera, and New Providence, all Puritan experiments, but it is equally true of a large proportion of the settlers in many other parts of the New World. Ideologically, Bermudians came nearest to the conservative Puritans of New England, but the settlers of Maryland and the Carolinas were also strongly Puritan, although in these three colonies no one sect dominated. In Virginia, the Anglicans were admittedly Low Church, another way of saying that they were Calvinistic in their approach to many religious questions, and their number included nominal conformists; Independents or Congregationalists and later Presbyterians composed a determined minority. In Barbados and Jamaica, too, conservative nonconformists formed a persistent minority, but the position of the Anglican churches is difficult to ascertain. In all these southern and island colonies, with the exception of Bermuda, the extremists of the seventeenth-century Puritan movement, the Anabaptists and Quakers, were far stronger and hence more influential than they were allowed to be in Massachusetts and Connecticut.

Nor did the men and women in the various colonies look upon their home settlements as isolated units. New England traders often served as connecting links and means of correspondence among ports. But the ties among Puritans

in the different settlements were numerous and on all levels, as might be expected when men have the common concerns not only of individual economic survival under trying new circumstances but also of the survival of their churches, with the whole question of the spiritual well-being of themselves and their children involved.

The compelling desire to find the ideal place to prosper economically even as they avoided religious persecution often spurred settlers of some wealth to secure holdings for themselves in more than one place. The second Daniel Gookin, for instance, with typical appreciation of the possibilities of the New World, owned three plantations, two in Virginia (one in Nansemond County and one on the Rappahannock River) and one in Maryland (on the South and Severn Rivers); a little later he transferred some of his investments to New England, where he served Massachusetts Bay Colony in various political capacities, and then he undertook to aid Cromwell in the development of Jamaica. Governors of colonies, too, were shifted from one place to another. Philip Bell, a conservative Puritan and friend of the Mathers, held office in Bermuda, Providence, and Barbados. William Sayle, theologically to the left of Bell, occupied the same post in Bermuda, Eleuthera, and South Carolina.

Not all the men who shifted from one colony to another were politically or socially important enough to be noted so specifically in history. But many other Puritans, dissatisfied for one reason or another with their first home in America, re-emigrated to another colony. There are numerous records or other indications of individuals shifting from New England to Virginia or Maryland or to the island colonies, from one island to another, from Bermuda to Massachusetts. More easily traced are the mass or group emigrations that took place: from Virginia to Maryland and

later to the Carolinas; from Barbados to New England and later to the Carolinas; from Bermuda to Eleuthera, New Providence, and South Carolina; from New England to South Carolina. Many a colonist had first-hand experience of conditions in two or more parts of the New World.

One more connecting bond among Puritans in different colonies should be noted. Dissenting ministers with some frequency served in a number of colonies. The Reverend Thomas James, one of the New England trio that in 1643 answered the call of Virginia's Puritan churches, preached in Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and New Haven before his brief Nansemond County stay; he returned to parishes in New Haven and England. A better known divine, the Reverend John Oxenbridge, held pastorates in Bermuda, Surinam, Barbados, and Massachusetts. Even more extensive was the experience of the Reverend Francis Doughty, who was active in Massachusetts and Rhode Island and on Long Island; then went to Virginia, temporarily served in Maryland, and returned to Virginia; he finally left for the island colonies. A more popular minister, the Reverend Francis Makemie, carried his Presbyterian message to Virginia, Maryland, Barbados, New York, and Pennsylvania. In the later years of the century, too, Harvard graduates could be found in the pulpits of such distant colonies as South Carolina, Bermuda, and Jamaica.

The most travelled of the conservative Puritan ministers, however, could not equal the records of the Quaker itinerants. These men—and occasionally women—regularly went from colony to colony. Within a ten-year period John Burnyeat felt a call to Barbados, Maryland, Virginia, back to Maryland, only to return to Virginia, then to New York, Barbados again, then to England; three years later he was again in Barbados, from there went to New York, Long Island, Maryland, Virginia, Delaware, Jersey, Long Island

again, Rhode Island, Maryland, and Virginia once more, and home to Ireland. Similarly in a series of journeys, William Edmundson in an eleven- or twelve-year period reached Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, New York, Jamaica, Antigua, Montserrat, and Barbados, laboring in most of these places a number of times, with each visit lasting for some weeks or months. These records are not extraordinary; dozens of other itinerants followed much the same self-imposed program—first feeling the call to Barbados, with Antigua, Jamaica, or Nevis visited for good measure, then on to Maryland and a trip through the northern colonies, with Massachusetts, Rhode Island, or Long Island the goal in mind, then south to Maryland and through Virginia to North Carolina, back once more to Maryland, finally home to England or Ireland or Wales, perhaps again by way of the islands.

Seventeenth-century Puritans, no matter what their geographic location, shared many basic concepts. Hence their approach to many problems of the day did not vary because they happened to be living in England or Massachusetts or Virginia. There were, however, decided differences between conservative Calvinists and radical Quakers. In the northern colonies Genevan influences were dominant; in the southern and island colonies many of the churches were Calvinistic, but left-wing Puritan ideas were also able to make themselves felt.

Viewed in the long perspective of the history of ideas, Puritanism lent its weight to the growing spirit of tolerance that was later to ripen in England and America. But during the seventeenth century considerable confusion of thought about the whole question was evident, with wide gaps between the teaching of certain idealists and the stand of the average Calvinist. Until after the Restoration, each of the more conservative nonconforming churches, whether in

England or her colonies, naturally wanted toleration of its own dogma, but saw no need for general lenity. Believing firmly that they had found the truth, men of one way of thinking also felt that to allow other sects to proselytize and so corrupt souls that might be saved, was indeed sinful. The whole concept of tolerance was long alien to the minds of most right-wing Puritans, as was the idea of separation of church and state. Civil authority, if it had no other purpose, was to be used to enforce the dicta of the church. Only Calvinists of the calibre of Milton and Roger Williams carried the arguments of individual judgment and the search for truth to their logical end. Such comparatively rare thinkers urged the adoption of as complete tolerance as was possible and allow tolerance to continue. In other words, Protestants were to live amicably together while they pursued by different paths their search for God, but Catholics were not to have similar liberty of worship, for fear that, given any privileges, they would usurp too much power.

Concerning this whole subject of freedom of conscience, the left-wing of Puritanism was always in advance of the more conservative right-wing. The radical sects, as was their way, allowed their concepts to approach logical conclusions; in fact, both doctrinally and practically, Seekers, Quakers, and similar extremists were early turned towards thoughts of tolerance. The more individual and personal the relationship between man and God was conceived to be, the less could any believer's conscience be forced. For the lesser sects, too, and for the Quakers, who did not at first regard themselves as a sect, there was no immediate hope of their establishing themselves as a national or even a dominant church. Toleration, therefore, was the only realistic approach to the problem of survival.

As the century went on, the spirit of tolerance grew for a number of reasons. The conservative sectarian's dream of

his beliefs conquering the world grew dim, and most of the dissenters of the Restoration period consequently were desirous of a general Protestant tolerance if it could be obtained without having the same liberty allowed the papists. Then again, there were observable examples of Puritans of various shades of belief cooperating or at least living side by side with fair content. As could be seen readily in various parts of the New World, even when the religious and political situation was complicated by Anglican and Catholic parties, peace did not have to be completely sacrificed. Colonies in Rhode Island, Maryland, Pennsylvania, and the Carolinas had been settled with more than one type of church and meeting house permitted, and people of different creeds managed to live together with surprisingly little friction. Nor was practicality the only reason for Puritanism's veering toward moderation. Cause and effect are traditionally difficult to separate, but one basis for the increasing tolerance in the attitude of many Puritans may be seen in a changing world. Religious fervor was weakening, and not only from a reaction to the rigors of Calvinistic asceticism. Trained to exercise his judgment and to devote himself seriously to knotty problems, many a man of a Puritan turn of mind allowed his mental energy to shift from polemics to the growing field of science. No one living in the seventeenth century can be accused of apathy in matters of religion; nevertheless, facing other tremendous intellectual challenges, even the sincerest Puritan began to feel that his fellow-man was entitled to follow the dictates of his reason in all matters, with his errors in church polity and even in theology not to be held as of vital importance. A shade of indifference has always been a powerful ally of tolerance.

Everything considered, the ideal of tolerance was undoubtedly strengthened by dissent. Similarly, again in the perspective of history, Puritanism served to further the cause

of democracy, although the average nonconformist was scarcely aware of the road he was taking. Generations of Sundays on which congregations heard that they were worthy of individual covenants with God could not help raising men in their own estimation, as did the constant implication that ordinary men and women and even children were capable of understanding the Bible and God's wishes for their behavior. No matter how often the minister might preach humility before God's unwarranted kindness to His chosen, how often he referred to himself as a silly worm or clod of dust, the inference of the importance of the individual and his relations with his Creator was still to be gathered from basic doctrine. Furthermore, if man's soul and its salvation were the vital points of existence, earthly fortune and social circumstance became less important. Obviously, God did not make his division of the saved and the damned on any class or property basis. Calvinism offered, it is true, a limited democracy, extending only to the Elect, but it was a step toward the concept of the equality of men. Narrow, too, was the experience of laymen in trying to erect and control their sectarian churches, but again an opening wedge to show men the possibilities—and difficulties—of self-government.

In the actual preaching of the seventeenth century, conservative Puritans showed themselves to be consciously trying to retain many of their old ideas of social and class distinctions. It was, they felt, an ordered universe, with distinctions even in heaven, although these certainly would be on a different basis from those on earth. The very fact that congregations had to be warned that working men and women should not ape their betters may, of course, be regarded as significant of social changes going on and soon to be accelerated. The very protest at the absurdity of having rulers and no one willing to be ruled suggests that the idea of

the government and the people being one was not far off. Nevertheless, only the extremists argued that the equality of men before God might be better reflected in everyday life. The Quakers contented themselves with doubting outward show of respect for authority, for who could be superior to the man guided by the Inner Light, God's true manifestation? The Diggers and the Levellers, far more radical, campaigned against all privilege, both social and legal; according to their arguments, neither property nor primogeniture should be considered as valid reasons for distinctions among men.

Concerning the immediate political dilemma of the age, the divine right of kings, the Puritan position inclined to show some confusion. The standard doctrine was that earthly kings, for all their undenied grandeur and privilege, were "born on a dung hill" in comparison to Jesus Christ. Therefore, if the magistrate's rulings and God's laws came into conflict, no one should hesitate to choose the larger obedience. On the other hand, the Puritan, Bible-bred, was in no frame of mind to flout authority or to deny that kings seemed to be part of the divine plan. Puritanism, thus, was divided politically. Cromwellians, often considered to be political Puritans, were usually nonconformists, but the reverse was not necessarily true. While many Puritans (using the word in its religious connotation) saw in the Commonwealth opportunities to advance their way of thinking, other Puritans, just as sincere and ardent, were faithful to the king. Many Presbyterians, as well as some more radical nonconformists, believed in monarchial government. Some Puritans were royalists out of loyalty to the Stuart cause; some, like the Fifth Monarchy Men, simply believed in the institution of kings. A small minority of extremists—the Levellers, for instance—found Cromwell and his ideas so objectionable that, by way of reaction, they

virtually became royalists. With all this variation of opinion on political policy and expediency, it is to be noted that one main issue, the questioning of authority, had been inevitably raised.

More open to question is the general effect of Puritanism upon economic thought. It is not to be denied that in its emphasis upon individualism Puritan thinking was conducive to capitalism, as was Calvinism's affirmation of the individual's contractual rights. The next step assumed by some modern theorists is the responsibility of Calvinism for the modern version of this economic system. Here is doubtful ground. A Calvinist, always God-conscious, might rejoice in his good fortune as a sign of his Creator's pleasure; he might strive for more signs of worldly prosperity to convince his neighbors that he was indeed one of the favored. Perhaps he was more aware than most men of a close relationship with God. Certainly he believed in a completely God-controlled world. But who knew better than he, as he looked up from his Bible, that God smites those He loves? The shift from thoughts of eternal glory to the desire for current wealth may well be considered a sign of the decline of true Calvinism and its pristine values.

Of economic theory as such, most seventeenth-century Puritans knew little. A few radicals, like the Diggers, rejected all principles of private property, but most nonconformists were content with ministerial interpretation of the Bible on immediate problems. Still in force was the scholastic idea that the principles of common morality could be used, without undue consideration, to control commercial activity. For instance, right-wing Puritans were instructed that the law of supply and demand should not alone control price. If a commodity was scarce through no fault of the merchant or of the community of which he was part, the price might be raised. A fair price for a commodity re-

mained the fair price, however, and no honest man could take advantage of another's necessity or ignorance. Nor should the honest man raise his prices to make up his losses due to his own want of skill or judgment. In fact, to do so would turn God's punishment to his advantage and make others suffer for his sin or weakness. Nor should the honest man raise his prices because time was allowed for payment, for an increase in price under these circumstances would be tantamount to charging interest.

This concept of business, basically medieval, but elaborated upon by such Puritan authorities as Luther and William Ames, was expounded by Calvinist preachers. To it the Quakers added the limitation that no one was ever justified in going into debt for any purpose of business or trade expansion. Borrowing and lending were in themselves evil, as they involved interest-taking; furthermore, with every indebtment there was tacit denial of God's provision for His own, as well as an implied sacrifice of individual liberty. Investments, accordingly, should never exceed the capital at hand.

On many topical problems of importance, such as tolerance, social democracy, the divine right of kings, and economic honesty, seventeenth-century settlers held, then, to general principles inculcated by their religious beliefs. Their ideas were not limited by the particular colony in which they were living. Although differences between right-wing and left-wing Puritan thought often overshadowed northern and southern contrasts, this mental consanguinity among the colonists necessarily had its limitations. Variant geographic and political circumstances made their very Puritan tenets lead northerners and southerners to divergent conclusions about some issues of importance.

In contrast with the situation in New England, during most of their existence Puritan churches in the southern

and island colonies had no close alliance with authority. While the Interregnum lasted, although affairs were confused, some nonconforming groups had either the support of the local administration or at least tacit acceptance by it. At times, too, in Bermuda and the Carolinas dissenting groups had the support of the governors and English proprietors. Nevertheless, for the greater part of their being, individual groups of Puritans, whether conservative Independents or more radical Anabaptists and Quakers, had to exist at best unaided by the magistracy, at worst despite it. This separation of church and state is theoretically fundamental to most Puritans as they believe in "gathered" churches of believers. In New England, however, church and state were closely allied, with church membership practically a requisite for prominence in the community; hence good Congregationalists grew to believe that one of the main purposes of lay authorities was to aid the church both by insisting upon attendance and by punishing its censurers. No such attitude could develop among southern and island Puritans even when they formed a majority of the population, for they were much divided among themselves. Consequently, a spirit of self-reliance and independence was fostered; moreover, in a colony with an Established Church, such as Virginia, dissenters must have early learned to accept their position of being outside the law. Long before the close of the seventeenth century rebellion against colonial authority was no new experience for many dissenters.

Again in contrast with the New England situation, radical Puritanism in the southern and island colonies was able to introduce effectively its viewpoint on some essential questions. Not only were these extremists devoted to the concept of individual churches and meeting houses of believers rather than a state church, but they also had very

decided ideas on two major issues: the justification of war and of slavery. Both Anabaptists and Quakers, the two types of left-wing dissenters most commonly met with in these colonies, were determined pacifists; indeed, most of the prejudice against men of both creeds arose from their refusal to serve in the local militias, apparently so necessary for the survival of the colonies. Members of the Society of Friends were particularly insistent in their protests against unfair fines for staying away from muster calls and against the resulting distrainments when they were unable to pay. Some of their major victories in the struggle for tolerance came in each colony as they succeeded in obtaining permission to pay moderate sums for substitutes. While it is doubtful whether many conservative Puritans and Anglicans were converted to pacifism, it is interesting to note that the doctrine was not unknown to southerners and islanders from almost the beginnings of the various plantations.

Wherever Quaker ideas penetrated, with them went the doubt of the institution of slavery. George Fox himself and his followers preached and wrote that the Gospel was meant for all men, regardless of race or color; according to Fox's advice to owners of slaves, God is "of the spirits of all flesh, and is no respecter of persons." Therefore, "every creature under heaven" has the right to hear the divine message. If all men potentially can be convinced of the Truth, then the right of one Christian to own another becomes a disturbing moral question. The solution might very well lie in limiting the term of servitude; a period of fourteen years was one suggestion. Fox and William Edmundson, two of the Society's most effectual preachers, and perhaps other itinerants as well, got as far in their thinking as to reject any system of lifelong bondage. Other Friends did not examine the institution of slavery, but no

intelligent member of the Society would have denied any Negro the right to a full Christian education. To grant slaves even this much humanity and this much equality before the Lord was a step in advance of the times; in fact, these seventeenth-century religious radicals raised an issue that has not been fully resolved to this day.

Southern and island Puritanism, with its diversity of churches that often gave way to Quakerism, left traces of its influence in one more way. During the first years of the eighteenth century dissent apparently lost strength. Many men were no longer as dominated by their religion as they had been; with little persecution to be endured, second and third generation apathy set in. At the same time the Established Church asserted itself, and the effect of Anglican missionary endeavors began to be felt. Within a few decades, however, an influx of German and Scotch-Irish nonconformists radically changed the religious picture. Baptist, Presbyterian, Lutheran, and Moravian churches sprang up, especially in the western counties of Maryland, Virginia, and the Carolinas, the section that was settled by these newcomers. After a few lesser revivals within these sects (and consequent redivision into smaller sects), the apostles of Methodism arrived. For some years Wesley's followers, like the Quakers before them, refused to see themselves as founders of a new denomination. Anglicans, Presbyterians, Baptists, and Quakers could remain within their churches and still join the movement, provided they had a real desire to save their souls. Most of the itinerant preachers considered themselves to be lay members in good standing of the Church of England—but members with an evangelical call. Although there were many complaints that the Anglican church was not adequately supplied with ministers of the right calibre to aid any general awakening of Southerners to religious life, any general acceptance of the idea

of a separate Methodist church came only after the Revolution.

The spread of Methodism was oddly reminiscent of the earlier religious history of the southern colonies. As the Quakers had done a hundred years previously (and had continued to do within the memory of many converts to Methodism), lay preachers travelled through the colonies, stopping with kindly settlers (more than occasionally Quakers) and preaching where they could until chapels were built. Under the persuasive powers of these itinerant missionaries, Methodism spread in the southern colonies with a rapidity that surprised the most enthusiastic believers. In 1765 there were only eight known Methodists in America. As late as 1773 circuit riders could report no more than 500 converts in Maryland and 100 in Virginia. Then the new movement suddenly gained force. Within a year the Maryland number had more than doubled, the Virginia number nearly tripled. Five years later Maryland could claim 1900 Methodists, Virginia 3800, and North Carolina 1500. In the Society's first fifteen years in America, from 1769 to 1784, 15,000 men and women joined, and over 13,000 of these converts were Southerners. (During the 1780's and 1790's Methodism also spread rapidly in the island colonies; the appeal of the new faith apparently was stronger for the Negroes than for the whites, although there were converts among the latter.)

Too often the remarkable growth of Methodism in the South has been attributed, with due allowance for the zeal of the circuit riders, to the combined circumstances of a decadent Established Church and the presence of many dissenters who had arrived in the eighteenth century. The story is not quite so simple as this explanation would indicate. As a matter of fact, Methodism took hold most thoroughly in those parts of the southern colonies that had

been first strongly Calvinistic and then became Quaker strongholds. At the yearly Conferences the boast could soon be made that there were Methodists in every county in Maryland, but the itinerants found especially fertile fields in Anne Arundel County and on the Eastern Shore; Kent County proved markedly receptive, with the Bohemia Manor area one of the earliest and most sweeping conquests.[1] In Virginia, the counties south of the James River were called the "hot bed" of Wesleyanism, with Norfolk serving as a hub for preaching expeditions; as in Maryland, Methodists were scattered through the colony, with noticeable concentration in Accomack and Northampton counties on the Eastern Shore.[2] In North Carolina, Joseph Pilmoor penetrated the Currituck area and made a beginning at Newbern as early as 1772, but for the next few years the Roanoke, Tar River, and New Hope circuits, all to the west of the original coastal colonization, received more attention. In 1782, however, the itinerants began to regard Edenton as a center for their activities and then developed a circuit through Pasquotank as far north as Norfolk County, Virginia; before long, nineteen meetings had been built up along the Pasquotank and Perquimana rivers.[3] In the early reports on progress in the southern colonies, the old Quaker meeting names crop out again and again: Annamessex, Tuckahoe, Gunpowder, Choptank, Sassafras once more were centers of religious activity.

That Methodism should not seem strange to the men and women of the old Puritan parts of the southern colonies is only natural. Wesleyanism has often been regarded as a pietistic movement within the Church of England. That the

[1] John Lednum, *A History of the Rise of Methodism in America* (Philadelphia, 1859), pp. 20, 21, 67, 70, 73, 79, 115, 117, 126, 162, 165, 189, 417.

[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 78, 171, 178, 341, 417.

[3] William Lee Grissom, *History of Methodism in North Carolina, from 1772 to the Present Time* (Nashville, Tenn., 1905), pp. 28, 34–36, 37–40, 48, 99, 100–103, 146.

new faith was strongly Calvinistic, its founders freely admitted. John Wesley at one time went so far as to describe himself as "on the very edge of Calvinism"; in other words, he accepted Calvin's doctrine of the fall of man and his consequent inability to save himself or do good without the Spirit of God to help him, but as a firm believer in the possibility of relative human perfection he rejected Calvin's teachings on predestination and limited grace. From their knowledge of Calvin and Luther and their dissenting background, the Wesleys took their belief in strict rules for Sabbath keeping as well as their more fundamental belief that man's sinful state had to be stressed doctrinally so that the proper emphasis on repentance would follow. Many a Methodist preacher, too, unconsciously repeated the strictures of earlier Calvinists as he discoursed on the worthlessness of good deeds before justification; a hundred years earlier the ancestors of many of his listeners had been hearing that the good deeds of the unsaved "stank in the nostrils of God."

The debt of the Wesleys to Moravianism has been acknowledged and much discussed, with some consideration of the theory that contact with Moravian missionaries probably only emphasized earlier pietistic ideas that the founders of Methodism had come across in their reading. All pietistic movements have much in common, and the parallels between Quaker beliefs and Methodist doctrines are many, extending from surface practices to fundamental concepts. Friends and early Methodists both tried to show their rejection of this world by wearing plain clothes, without ornamentation or jewelry. More important, the use of laymen to spread the Gospel and the belief in the value of an itinerant ministry had been part of the rebellion of Anabaptists, Quakers, and other radicals of the Puritan movement; the evils of a paid, secure, and professional clergy had for them loomed large when the example of Christ's

disciples came to mind. From its beginning, the Society of Friends also welcomed women preachers and encouraged women's meetings. Methodism's first circuit riders, mostly earnest souls with no professional training for the ministry, on occasion ran into abuse as their zealousness, cant, and mannerisms annoyed various people—or as their evangelical call attracted men and women from their work. But the idea of lay preachers seeking hospitality wherever they could find it and preaching in private homes, barns, and even fields was not shocking to many Southerners. Nor would families in which the old Quaker tradition or some remnant of it lingered be adverse to women being active participants in church affairs.

Quaker willingness to take care of their own has always been proverbial. Not only in sickness and want did the Friends try to help, but they also stepped in whenever any member had broken the Society's rules, or seemed about to do so. Meetings quickly offered advice and good counsel; delegated Friends called upon the sinners to remonstrate with them; the human failings of members were written into the Society's records. Early Methodists could offer no greater care of their Society's members, but their protective spirit also ran high. Congregations were broken into small groups or "classes," with one leader to visit and guide the others. Quarterly membership cards were issued to men and women who did not backslide or allow life's temptations to conquer them.

Similar ways of bringing the truth and salvation to worldly sinners and organized attempts to keep those already in the fold true to the best in themselves were but external indications of the more basic relationship of Quakerism and Methodism. If all religion—by common definition—is a combination of faith and reason, obviously both Quakers and Methodists as pietists tend to an emotional rather than intellectual approach to spiritual con-

cerns. With this attitude, their interest naturally has lain in religion rather than in theology. As an extension of this same feeling about this life and the hereafter, both groups turn to belief in the Inner Light: man has within him a power for goodness and truth that transcends both worldly knowledge and systematic theology.

Although most seventeenth-century Congregationalists and Friends would have become violently vituperative at the suggestion, conservative nonconformity and Quakerism were in one essential respect fundamentally in agreement, their difference only a matter of how far they were to allow their minds to accept a concept. Both groups believed earnestly in a spiritual Christianity that stressed the individual's relationship with God. This subjectivism rejected ecclesiastical objectivism and logically did away with a state church. "Gathered" congregations of the Elect or the saved or the convinced were the only possibility. In this spiritual, individualistic viewpoint that all Puritans more or less shared, Methodists concurred wholeheartedly.

The New England clergy were able to hold out against the Friends in the seventeenth century and against the Methodists in the eighteenth century; in both cases the victory was on the side of an intellectual faith that objected to an emotional approach to the very vital question of man's salvation; in both cases, too, a conservative majority was rejecting any threat to its own way of thinking. In the South, conservative Puritanism, which had been divided into minority sects all too often without strong leadership, in good part gave way to Quakerism; then dissent, both conservative and radical, lost some of its force and tended to conform to the Established Church. It remained for Methodism to win much of the South back to another form of dissent, a transformation made the easier because the new faith's doctrines combined the ideology of conservative Puritanism and Quakerism.

Bibliography

Manuscript depositories are indicated. Titles of earlier and so less easily located publications are followed by libraries in which copies may be found. (No attempt has been made to place all extant copies.)

ABBREVIATIONS USED

AAS	American Antiquarian Society
BCL	Boston College Library
BM	British Museum
BPL	Boston Public Library
CU	Columbia University
FL	Friends Library, Euston Road, London
HC	Harvard Library
Hav	Haverford College
Hunt	Huntington Library
JCB	John Carter Brown
MHS	Massachusetts Historical Society Library
NYPL	New York Public Library
Swth	Swarthmore College Library
Trin	Trinity College Library, Dublin
UTS	Union Theological Seminary
Y	Yale University

Contemporary and Nearly Contemporary Sources

VIRGINIA

I. Records

A. Colony Records

Hening, William Walker (ed.). *The Statutes at Large: being a Collection of all the Laws of Virginia, from the First Session of the Legislature, in the year 1619.* Richmond, Va., 1809.

Kingsbury, Susan M. (ed.). *The Records of the Virginia Company of London.* 4 vols., Washington, 1905.

McIlwaine, H. R. (ed.). *Executive Journals of the Council of Colonial Virginia.* Vol. I (June 11, 1680–June 22, 1699). Richmond, 1925.

Journals of the House of Burgesses of Virginia 1619–1775. Richmond, 1915.

Minutes of the Council and General Court of Colonial Virginia 1622–1632, 1670–1676. Richmond, 1924.

Palmer, William P. (ed.). *Calendar of Virginia State Papers and other Manuscripts, 1652–1781, Preserved in the Capitol at Richmond.* Richmond, 1875.

Strachey, William (compiler). *For the Colony in Virginea Britannia. Lawes Divine, Morall and Martiall.* London, 1612. (BM) In Peter Force, ed., *Tracts and other Papers*, III, No. 2.

Greer, George Cabell. *Early Virginia Immigrants 1623–1666.* Richmond, 1912.

Hotten, John Camden (ed.). *The Original Lists of Persons of Quality Emigrants, Religious Exiles, Political Rebels . . . Who Went from Great Britain to the American Plantations, 1600–1700.* London, 1874.

Nugent, Nell Marion (compiler). *Cavaliers and Pioneers; Abstracts of Virginia Land Patents and Grants 1623–1800.* Richmond, 1934.

B. County Records

1. Most of the extant manuscripts, photostatic copies, and transcripts are in the Virginia State Library, Richmond, Va.

2. Copies and extracts:

Accomack County: *Certificates and Rights . . . 1663–1709.* Compiled by Stratton Nottingham. Onancock, Va., 1929.

Accomac Tithables (Tax Lists) 1663–1695. Compiled by Stratton Nottingham. Onancock, Va., 1931.

Acchawmacke 1632–1637. Virginia Colonial Abstracts. Compiled by Beverley Fleet.

Wills and Administrations . . . 1663–1800. Compiled and Edited by Stratton Nottingham. 2 vols., Onancock, 1931.

Elizabeth City County: *Wills and Administrations of . . . and Other Genealogical and Historical Items 1610–1800.* Abstracted and Compiled by Blanche Adams Chapman. 1941.

Henrico County: *Extracts from the Records of . . . 1677–1771.* Edited by William G. Stanard. 1887.

Isle of Wight County: *Wills and Administrations of . . . 1647–1800.* Abstracted and Compiled by Blanche Adams Chapman. 1938.

King and Queen County: *Colonial Abstracts.* Compiled by Beverley Fleet. Richmond, 1946.

Lancaster County: *Record Book Number Two. 1654–1666.* Compiled by Beverley Fleet. Richmond, 1937.

Lower Norfolk County and Norfolk County: *Wills 1637–1710.* Abstracted by Charles Fleming McIntosh. Virginia, 1914.

Northumberland County: *Records. 1652–1655.* Compiled by Beverley Fleet. Richmond, 1938.

York County: Extracts from the Records of . . . with Notes and Index, 1633–1700. Compiled by W. G. Stanard, 2 vols., 1887–1889. Ms., Virginia State Library.

C. Parish Records

Bruton Parish: *Vestry Book*—surviving part edited by J. C. McCabe, *The Church Review and Ecclesiastical Register*, III (1855–1856).

Christ Church Parish: *The Vestry Book of Christ Church Parish, Middlesex County, Virginia 1663–1767.* Transcribed, Annotated and Indexed by C. G. Chamberlayne. Richmond, 1927.

Kingston Parish: *The Vestry Book of Kingston Parish, Mathews County, Virginia 1679–1796.* Transcribed, Annotated, and Indexed by C. G. Chamberlayne. Richmond, 1929.

Petsworth Parish: *The Vestry Book of . . . 1677–1793.* Edited by C. G. Chamberlayne. Richmond, 1933.

St. Peter's Parish: *The Vestry Book and Register of St. Peter's Parish, New Kent and James City Counties, Virginia 1684–1786.* Edited by C. G. Chamberlayne. Richmond, 1937.

D. Quaker Records

The Lower Virginia Monthly Meeting Minutes and Register of Births, Deaths, Marriages 1647–1756. Original manuscript, Homewood Friends Meeting House, Baltimore, Md. Copy by Mrs. Henry Dockery in Virginia State Library, Richmond, Va. Copy by Mr. Miles White, Jr., published as "Early Quaker Records in Virginia," in *Publications of the Southern Historical Association*, Vol. VI (1902), 220–231, 304–313, 408–414, 499–508; Vol. VII (1903), 17–24, 96–105, 207–213.

The Record Book Belonging to the Monthly Meeting of Friends in Henrico County beginning from the Year 1699 to the Year 1757 Inclusive. Homewood Friends Meeting House, Baltimore, Md.

II. DESCRIPTIVE AND HISTORICAL ACCOUNTS

A. Individual Accounts of Special Value

Berkeley, William. *A Discourse and View of Virginia* (London, 1663). Facsimile reprint, Norfolk, Conn., 1914.

A Perfect Description of Virginia: Being, a full and true Relation of the present State of the Plantation. London, 1649. (BM) In Peter Force, ed., *Tracts and other Papers*, II (1838), No. 8.

Beverley, Robert. *The History and Present State of Virginia.* London, 1705. (NYPL, Hunt, BM) Reprinted and edited with an Introduction by Louis B. Wright. Published for the Institute of Early American History and Culture. Chapel Hill, 1947.

Godwyn, Morgan. *The Negro's & Indians Advocate, Suing for their Admission into the Church . . . To which is added A Brief Account of Religion in Virginia.* London, 1680. (HC, JCB, NYPL, Y, BM)

Some Proposals Towards Promoting the Propagation of the Gospel in Our American Plantations. London, 1708. (BM)

R. G. [Robert Green]. *Virginia's Cure: Or, an Advisive Narrative Concerning Virginia: Discovering the true Ground of that Churches Un-*

happiness, and the Only True Remedy. London, 1662. (BM, HC, JCB, NYPL) In Peter Force, ed., *Tracts and other Papers*, III, No. 15.

Hamor, Ralph. *A True Discourse of the Present Estate of Virginia . . . till the 18 of June. 1614.* London, 1615. (JCB) Facsimile reprint, [Albany: J. Munsell, 1860].

Hartwell, Henry, James Blair, and Edward Chilton. *The Present State of Virginia, and the College.* 1727. (NYPL) Edited, with an Introduction by Hunter Dickinson Farish. Williamsburg, Va., 1940.

Jones, Hugh. *The Present State of Virginia.* London, 1724. (NYPL) Reprinted New York, 1865. (Sabin's Reprints, No. V.)

Keith, George. *A Journal of Travels from New Hampshire to Caratuck on the Continent of North America.* London, 1706. (NYPL) In *Collections of the Protestant Episcopal Society, for the year 1851.* New York, 1851.

Lawne, Christopher. *The Prophane Schisme of the Brownists or Separatists. With the Impietie, Dissensions, Lewd, And Abhominal Vices of that Impure Sect. Discovered by Christopher Lawne, John Fowler, Clement Sandus, Robert Bulward.* 1612. (UTS)

Strachey, William. *A True Reportory of the Wracke, and Redemption of Sir Thomas Gates . . . his Coming to Virginia, and the Estate of that Colonie then, and after, under the government of the Lord La Warre, July 15, 1610 . . . in Purchas His Pilgrimes*, Vol. XIX, 5–84.

Whitaker, Alexander. *Good Newes from Virginia.* London, 1613. (JCB). Facsimile reprint [New York, 1936].

III. COLLECTED REPRINTS OF SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY MATERIAL

Brock, R. A. (ed.). *Documents, Chiefly Unpublished, Relating to the Huguenot Emigration to Virginia . . .* Richmond, 1936.

Brown, Alexander. *The Genesis of the United States.* 2 vols., Boston and New York, 1891.

Force, Peter (ed.). *Tracts and Other Papers.* 4 vols., Washington, D.C., 1836–1846.

Lower Norfolk County Virginia Antiquary. 3 vols., Baltimore, 1897.

Perry, William Stevens (ed.). *Historical Collections relating to the American Colonial Church.* Hartford, Conn., 1870. Vol. I (Virginia).

Tyler, Lyon G. (ed.). *Narratives of Early Virginia 1606–1625.* New York, 1907.

Winthrop Papers . . . 1498–1649. 5 vols., Boston, 1929–1947.

Three periodicals have numerous reprints of early records as well as much other material pertaining to colonial Virginia:

Tyler's Quarterly Historical and Genealogical Magazine. Richmond, 1920–

The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography. Richmond, 1893–

The William and Mary Quarterly. Williamsburg, Va., 1892–

BERMUDA

I. RECORDS

Ancient Journals of the House of Assembly of Bermuda From 1691 to 1785. Bermuda, 1890.

Copy of a Petition from the Governor and Company of the Sommer Islands . . . presented to . . . the Councel of State July the 19th, 1651. London, 1651. (HC, JCB, NYPL)

"Minutes of His Majesty's Council of the Bermudas or Somer's Islands" (1684–1705), *Bermuda Historical Quarterly*, I (1944), 3–10, 47–61, 103–109, 157–168; II (1945), 4–19, 54–68, 112–128, 180–190; III (1946), 15–24, 63–73, 123–133, 189–201; IV (1947), 4–15, 46–57, 94–103, 140–153.

Orders and Constitutions, Partly Collected out of His Majesties Letters and Patents . . . . London, 1622. (NYPL)

Trott, Nicholas, ed. *The Laws of the British Plantations in America, Relating to the Church and the Clergy, Religion and Learning.* London, 1725.

II. DESCRIPTIVE AND HISTORICAL ACCOUNTS

Baylie, Robert. *A Dissuasive from the Errours Of the Time: Wherein the Tenets of the Principall Sects, Especially of the Independents, are Drawn together in one Map . . . and their Maine Principles are Examined by the Touch-stone of the Holy Scriptures.* London, 1646. (HC, JCB, NYPL, UTS)

Bond, Sampson. *A Publick Tryal of the Quakers in Barmudas Upon the first Day of May, 1678. Boston, 1682.* (HC, JCB, MHS, NYPL)

A Sermon Preached before the Reverend Committee of Divines, the 20th of May 1646. At their usuall Place of Meeting in Westminster. London, 1646. (BM, UTS, Y)

The Sincere Milk of the Word, For the Children of Barmuda. In A Short and Plain Catechism. Boston, 1699. (JCB)

Burrage, Champlin, ed. *John Pory's Lost Description of Plymouth Colony . . . Together with Contemporary Accounts of English Colonization elsewhere in New England and in the Bermudas.* Boston and New York, 1918.

Butler, Nathaniel. *The Historye of the Bermudaes or Summer Islands.* Edited, from a Ms. in the Sloane Collection, British Museum, by General Sir J. Henry Lefroy. London, 1882.

The Case and Grievance of divers Merchants and others of London, Members of the Bermuda Company, and of the Planters within the said Islands, Humbly offered to . . . Parliament. [n.d.] (BM)

Estlacke, Francis, William Wilkinson, R.R., and John Tysoe. *A Bermudas Preacher Proved a Persecutor Being a Just Tryal of Sampson Bond's Book, entituled, a Publick Tryal of the Quakers. . . . And that the True Christ is Owned by the People called Quakers, Plainly Made Manifest.* London, 1683. (JCB)

Fowle, John. *Deus Visibilis: or God, Manifested in the Flesh. Being a Discourse, Concerning the Fundamental and Essential Articles of the Christian Religion. . . .* Boston, 1704. (BPL, HC)

Goulding, William. *Servants on Horse-Back: Or, a Free-People bestrided in their persons and Liberties, by worthlesse men: being A Representation of the Dejected State of the Inhabitants of Summer Islands. Containing Short Illustrations upon a Petition Presented to the High Court of Parliament for Redress.* 1648. (JCB, NYPL)

Hughes, Lewis. *Certain Grievances, or, The Popish Errors and Ungodliness of the Service-Book Laid Open. . . .* [London.] 1642. (This is a much enlarged and changed edition of the following item.) (NYPL, UTS)

Certaine Grievances Well Worthy the Serious Consideration of the Right Honourable, and High Court of Parliament. 1640. (UTS)

The Errors of the Common Catechisme: Plainly laid open by way of a Dialogue between a Minister of Gods Word and a Country Gentleman. London, 1645. (AAS, HC, UTS, Y)

A Letter, Sent into England from the Summer Islands. London, 1615. (NYPL) Americana Photostat Series No. 168 (1926).

A Looking-Glasse for all True Hearted Christians. London, 1642. (BM)

A Plaine and True Relation of the Goodness of God towards the Sommer Islands, written by way of exhortation, to Stirre up the People there to Praise God. Whereunto are added Certaine Questions and answers Concerning the keeping Holy of the Saboth day. . . . London, 1621. (BM, Hunt) Americana Photostat Series No. 153 (1926).

To the Right Honourable, The Lords and others of his Majesties most Honourable privie Councell. [1625]. (BM) Americana Photostat Series No. 219 (1928).

Norwood, Richard. *The Journal of* . . . with Introductions by Wesley Frank Craven and Walter B. Hayward. Scholars' Facsimiles and Reprints. New York, 1945.

Pinder, Richard. *The Spirit of Error, Found, and Discovered, in the accounted Pastors and Teachers of the Island Bermuda, in the West Indies.* . . . London, 1660. (Hav)

Prynne, William. *A Fresh Discovery of some Prodigious and New Wandring-Blasing-Stars, & Firebrands, Stiling themselves New-Lights. . . . Whereunto is added some Letters, Papers, and a Petition lately sent from the Summer Islands.* The second edition. London, 1646. (Identical with the 1645 edition except for twelve additional pages of Bermuda material not included in the earlier volume.) (JCB)

Reighton, William. *The Disloyal Dealings of the Bermuda Company in London, By Their Keeping back a Petition.* 1678. (NYPL)

Strachey, William. *A True reportory of the wracke, and redemption of Sir Thomas Gates* . . . , in *Purchas His Pilgrimes*, Vol. XIX, 5–34.

White, Nathaniel. *The Pastors Charge and Cure. Or, A Sermon at First Preached in Latine at Oxford, and afterwards Translated by the Author. The Preaching of which Created the Author much Trouble, and in the Winding up of all, Suspension from his Ministery, and thereupon Inforcement to Leave his Native Countrey.* London, 1645. (Trin)

Truth gloriously appearing, From Under the Sad and Sable Cloud of Obloquie. Or, A Vindication of the Practice of the Church of Christ in the Summer-Islands, in an Apologetical Answer unto some Letters and Papers lately Sent from the Summer-Islands by Richard Beake and Mr. Norwood, lately Published by Master Prynne. . . . London, 1645. (JCB, UTS)

III. Collected Reprints of Seventeenth-Century Material (Official Records and Private Letters and Accounts)

Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series, America and West Indies, Vols. I, V, VII, IX-XVIII. London, 1860–1940.

Historical Manuscripts Commission, Series 1, Report VIII. London, 1881.

Lefroy, J. H. *Memorials of the Discovery and Early Settlement of the Bermudas or Somers Islands 1515–1685 Compiled from the Colonial Records and other original Sources.* 2 vols., London, 1877–79.

Winthrop Papers. The Massachusetts Historical Society. 5 vols., Boston, 1929–47.

MARYLAND

I. Records

A. Colony Records

Browne, William Hand, ed. *Archives of Maryland.* Baltimore, 1833.

Baldwin, Jane, ed. *The Maryland Calendar of Wills.* 2 vols., Baltimore, 1901.

B. County Records

1. Most of the extant manuscripts and transcripts are in the Hall of Records, Annapolis, Md.
2. Printed county court records

Pleasants, J. Hall and Scisco, Louis Dow, eds. *Proceedings of the County Court of Charles County, 1658–1666, and Manor Court of St. Clement's Manor, 1659–1668.* Baltimore, 1936. (*Archives of Maryland*, Vol. LIII).

Proceedings of the County Courts of Kent (1648–1676), Talbot (1662–1674), and Somerset (1665–1668) Counties. Baltimore, 1937. (*Archives of Maryland*, Vol. LIV.)

C. Parish Records

Allen, Ethan (compiler). Early Beginnings in Maryland. Ms. volume of source material, including parish records, Maryland Diocesan Library, Baltimore, Md.

Synodalia: or Records of Clergy Meetings in Maryland, between 1695–1773. Baltimore, 1864.

Inventory of Church Archives in the District of Columbia. The Protestant Episcopal Church Diocese of Washington. Prepared by District of Columbia Historical Records Survey. Washington, D.C., 1940.

II. DESCRIPTIVE AND HISTORICAL ACCOUNTS

A. Individual Accounts of Especial Value

Alsop, George. *A Character of the Province of Maryland.* London, 1666. (HC, JCB) Reprinted Baltimore, 1880; Cleveland, 1902. In C.C.Hall, ed., *Narratives of Early Maryland.* New York, 1910.

Bray, Thomas. *A Memorial Representing the Present State of Religion, on the Continent of North-America.* London, 1700. (BM)

[Calvert, Cecil, 2d Baron Baltimore]. *A Relation of Maryland.* [London], 1635. Reprinted, Francis L. Hawks, ed., New York, 1865. In Hall, *Narratives*, pp. 63–112.

Calvert, Philip. *A Letter from the Chancellour of Maryland, to Col. Henry Meese, Merchant in London: Concerning the Late Troubles in Mary-Land.* London, 1682. (JCB)

Cook, Ebenezer. *The Sot-Weed Factor: Or a Voyage to Maryland. A Satyr.* London, 1708. (NYPL) In Bernard C. Steiner, ed., *The Works of Ebenezer Cook.* Maryland Historical Society, *Fund Publication*, No. 36 (Baltimore, 1900).

Danckaerts, Jasper. *Journal of . . . 1679–1680.* Bartlett Burleigh James, J. Franklin Jameson, eds. *Original Narratives of Early American History.* New York, 1913.

The Declaration of the Reasons and Motives for the Present Appearing in Arms of their Majesties Protestant Subjects in the Province of Maryland. [London, 1689]. (BM, JCB) In Charles M. Andrews, ed., *Narratives of the Insurrections 1675–1690.* New York, 1915.

Hammond, John. *Hammond Versus Heamans. Or, An Answer To an audacious Pamphlet, published by . . . Roger Heamans, ...* London, n.d. [1655]. (BM, JCB) Massachusetts Historical Society Photostat, Americana Series, No. 24 (Boston, 1920). In *Maryland Historical Magazine*, IV (1909), 236–251.

Leah and Rachel, or, the Two Fruitfull Sisters Virginia, and Mary-Land. . . . London, 1656. (HC, JCB) In Peter Force, ed., *Tracts and Other Papers*, III, no. 14; also Hall, *Narratives*, pp. 277–308.

Heaman, Roger. *An Additional Brief Narrative Of a late and Bloody Design Against The Protestants in Ann Arundel County, Severn, in Maryland. . . .* (BM) London, 1655. Massachusetts Historical Society Photostat, Americana Series, No. 23. In *Maryland Historical Magazine*, IV (1909), 140–153.

Keith, George. *A Journal of Travels from New Hampshire to Caratuck on the Continent of North-America.* London, 1706. (NYPL) In Protestant Episcopal Society, *Collections for the Year 1851.* New York, 1851.

Langford, John. *A Just and Cleere Refutation of a False and Scandalous Pamphlet Entituled Babylons Fall in Maryland. . . .* London, 1655. (BM, JCB) In *Maryland Historical Magazine*, IV (1909), 42–64; also Hall, *Narratives*, pp. 247–276.

Lawrence, Thomas. *The Present State of the Protestant Religion in Mary-Land.* 1696. (JCB) In Bernard C. Steiner, ed., *Rev. Thomas Bray. His Life and Selected Works Relating to Maryland.* Maryland Historical Society, *Fund Publication*, No. 37 (Baltimore, 1901).

The Lord Baltemore's Case, Concerning the Province of Maryland. London, 1653. (NYPL) In Hall, *Narratives*, pp. 161–180.

"Mariland's Grevances Wiy The Have Taken Op Arms," Beverley McAnear, ed., in the *Journal of Southern History*, VIII (1942), 392–409.

A Moderate and Safe Expedient to Remove Jealousies and Feares, of any Danger, or Prejudice to this State. 1646. (JCB, UTS)

Shrigley, Nathaniel. *A True Relation of Virginia and Maryland. . . .* [London, 1669] (Hunt; photostat NYPL)

Strong, Leonard. *Babylon's Fall in Maryland. A fair Warning to Lord Baltamore.* [London], 1655. (Hunt; photostat at NYPL) In *Maryland Historical Magazine*, III (1908), 228–240; also Hall, *Narratives*, pp. 231–246.

Virginia and Maryland. Or, The Lord Baltamore's printed Case, uncased and answered. . . . Also, A short Relation of the Papists late Rebellion against . . . the Lord Protector. . . . To which is added, a brief Account of the Commissioners proceedings in the reducing of Maryland. . . . London, 1655. Massachusetts Historical Society Photostat, Americana Series, No. 137 (Boston, 1925). In Force, *Tracts*, II, No. 9; also Hall, *Narratives*, pp. 181–230.

[Andrew White?] *A Declaration of the Lord Baltemore's Plantation in Maryland, nigh upon Virginia.* London, 1633. (JCB) Facsimile, Lawrence C. Wroth, ed., 1929.

Wyeth, Joseph. *An Answer to a Letter from Dr. Bray.* London, 1700. In Bernard C. Steiner, ed., *Rev. Thomas Bray. His Life and Selected Works relating to Maryland.* Maryland Historical Society, *Fund Publication*, No. 37 (Baltimore, 1901).

B. Collected Reprints of Seventeenth-Century Material

Force, Peter, ed. *Tracts and Other Papers.* 4 vols., Washington, D. C., 1836–1846.

Hall, Clayton Colman, ed. *Narratives of Early Maryland.* New York, 1910.

Two periodicals have numerous reprints of early records as well as much other material pertaining to colonial Maryland:

Maryland Historical Magazine. Baltimore, 1906–

The William and Mary Quarterly. Williamsburg, Va., 1892–

QUAKER SOURCES

A. Advices (Discipline)

Advices (Discipline) London Yearly Meeting 1672–1775. "Extracts as appears, or else the original Discipline and organization of the Yearly Meeting of London, Commencing with the Year 1672." Vol. CCXVII, Friends School Library, Baltimore, Maryland.

A Collection of Christian & Brotherly Advices Given forth from time to time By the Yearly Meetings of Friends For Pennsylvania & New Jersey Held alternately at Burlington & Philadelphia, 1681–1777. Vol. XXVIII, Friends School Library, Baltimore. The Philadelphia Yearly Meeting included northern Maryland.

Epistles from the Yearly Meeting . . . Quakers . . . 1675, to 1759, inclusive. London: Samuel Clark, 1760.

B. Records

Baltimore Monthly Meeting Record of deceased members 1674–1895. Vol. 99D, Friends School Library, Baltimore.

Baltimore Yearly Meeting and Miscellaneous Book and Advices 1681–1824. Vol. VIII, Friends School Library, Baltimore.

Cecil Monthly Meeting Minutes 1698–1779. Friends Library, Swarthmore College, Pennsylvania.

Half Years Meeting Women 1677–1790 [West River]. Homewood Friends Library, Baltimore.

Marriage Certificates of West River, Herring Creek and Indian Spring Meetings 1682–1824. Vol. CXVI, Friends School Library, Baltimore.

Minutes of Monthly Meeting held at Clifts, Herring Creek, West River and Indian Spring 1677–1771. Vol. 113A, Friends School Library, Baltimore.

Minutes of Particular Meeting held at the house of Richard Harrison [Patuxent] 1699–1716. Vol. XXXIV, Friends School Library, Baltimore.

Nottingham Monthly Meeting 1691–1883 Births and Deaths. Vol. CCL, Friends School Library, Baltimore. Included northern Maryland.

Records of Baltimore Quarterly, Half-Yearly and Yearly Meetings. Minutes of Meeting held at West River 1680–1688. Vol. XXXIII, Friends School Library, Baltimore.

Records of Baltimore Yearly Meeting. Minutes of Meeting held at West River & Third Haven from 1677–1758. Vol. I, Friends School Library, Baltimore.

Records of the West River Monthly Meeting Minutes 1698–1759. Vol. CXII, Friends School Library, Baltimore.

Register of Births and Deaths 1662–1782 (Clifts, Joffa, Deer Creek, Patuxent, Herring Creek, West River). Vol. XXXI, Friends School Library, Baltimore.

Third Haven Monthly Meeting: Marriages 1668–1755; Births and deaths 1665–c. 1755. Friends Library, Swarthmore College.

Third Haven Monthly Minutes 1676–1871. Four volumes. Microfilm, Friends Library, Swarthmore College.

C. Appeals (Sufferings)

For the King and both Houses of Parliament. For You (who have known Sufferings) . . . to Read Over and Consider these Sufferings of the People of God in Scorn called Quakers. London, 1660. (BPL)

CAROLINAS

I. RECORDS

A. Colony Records

Cheves, Langdon, ed. *The Shaftesbury Papers and Other Records relating to Carolina and the First Settlement on Ashley River Prior to the Year 1676.* South Carolina Historical Society, *Collections*, V (1897).

Grimes, J. Bryan, ed. *Abstract of North Carolina Wills compiled from Original and Recorded Wills in the Office of the Secretary of State.* Raleigh, 1910.

North Carolina Wills and Inventories. Raleigh, 1912.

Hathaway, J. R. B., ed. *The North Carolina Historical and Genealogical Register.* 3 vols., Edenton, N. C., 1900–03.

North Carolina Province Papers 1694–1705. Item 1268, Historical Papers of the Trinity College Historical Society, Duke University Library. (Microfilm).

Salley, Alexander S., ed. *Journal of the Commons House of Assembly of South Carolina For the Session Beginning September 20, 1692, and Ending October 15, 1692.* Columbia, 1907.

Journals of the Commons House of Assembly of South Carolina for the Four Sessions of 1693. Columbia, 1907.

Journal of the Commons House of Assembly of South Carolina For the Session Beginning January 30, 1696 and Ending March 17, 1696. Columbia, 1908.

Journals of the Commons House of Assembly of South Carolina For the Two Sessions of 1697. Columbia, 1913.

Journals of the Commons House of Assembly of South Carolina For the Two Sessions of 1698. Columbia, 1914.

Journal of the Grand Council of South Carolina August 25, 1671–June 24, 1680. Columbia, 1907.

Journal of the Grand Council of South Carolina April 11, 1692–September 26, 1692. Columbia, 1907.

Journal of the Grand Council of South Carolina For the Session Beginning November 24, 1696–December 5, 1696. Columbia, 1912.

Saunders, William L., ed. *The Colonial Records of North Carolina.* Raleigh, 1886.

B. Quaker Records

A Book of Minitts belonging to the Meeting of the peopel latter Called Quakers in Charlestown So. Carolina 1719. Ms., Department of Records, 302 Arch Street, Philadelphia.

II. DESCRIPTIVE AND HISTORICAL ACCOUNTS

A. Individual Accounts of Especial Value

Archdale, John. *A New Description of that Fertile and Pleasant Province of Carolina: With a Brief Account of its Discovery, Settling, and the Government Thereof to This Time.* London, 1707. (JCB, NYPL) In Alexander S. Salley, ed., *Narratives of Early Carolina 1650–1708* (New York, 1911), pp. 277–312.

Ash, Thomas (supposed author). *Carolina: or a Description of the Present State of that Country, and the Natural Excellencies Thereof. . . . Published by T. A., Gent.* London, 1682. (HC, JCB, NYPL) In Salley, *Narratives*, pp. 135–160.

Blair, John. "Rev. John Blair's Mission to North Carolina 1704," in Salley, *Narratives*, pp. 211–218.

A Brief Description of the Province of Carolina, on the Coasts of Floreda. . . . London: Printed for Robert Horne, 1666. (JCB, NYPL) Facsimile reproduction, Charlottesville, Va., 1944; also in Salley, *Narratives*, pp. 63–74.

The Currant Intelligence, or an Impartial Account of Transactions both Foraign and Domestick. No. 3 (February 17–21); No. 11 (March 16–20, 1679/80). (NYPL)

[Defoe, Daniel]. *The Case of Protestant Dissenters in Carolina. . . .* London, 1706. (JCB)

Party-Tyranny: Or, An Occasional Bill in Miniature; As now Practised in Carolina. Humbly Offered to the Consideration of both Houses of Parliament. London, 1705. (JCB)

The Humble Address of the Right Honourable the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, In Parliament Assembled, Presented to Her Majesty On Wednesday the Thirteenth Day of March, 1705. Relating to the Province of Carolina, And the Petition therein mentioned. With Her Majesties Most Gracious Answer thereunto. London, 1705. (BM, JCB)

Lawson, John. *Lawson's History of North Carolina.* London, 1714. (NYPL) Reprint, Richmond, Va., 1937.

Marston, Edward. *To the Most Noble Prince Henry Duke of Beaumont. . . . Palatine of the Province of South Carolina in America.* [London], 1712. (HC)

A Sermon of Simonry and Sacriledge. London, 1699. (BM)

Nairn, Thomas. *A Letter from South Carolina; Giving an Account of the . . . Government, Laws, Religion, People. . . .* London, 1718, 2d ed. (NYPL)

Oldmixon, John. *The British Empire in America, containing the History of the Discovery, Settlement, Progress and Present State of all the British Colonies on the Continent and Islands of America.* London, 1708. (NYPL) Carolina section in Salley, *Narratives*, pp. 313–373.

Pratt, William, "Journal of Elder William Pratt, 1695–1701," in Salley, *Narratives*, pp. 189–200.

Randolph, Edward. "Letter of . . . to the Board of Trade 1699," in Salley, *Narratives*, pp. 201–210.

Thomas, Samuel. "A Memorial relating to the State of the Church of England in the Province of South Carolina," *South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine*, V (1904), 21–55.

Wilson, Samuel. *An Account of the Province of Carolina, in America: together with an Abstract of the Patent, and several other Necessary and Useful Particulars. . . .* London, 1682. (JCB, NYPL). In Salley, *Narratives*, pp. 161–176.

III. COLLECTED REPRINTS OF SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY MATERIAL

Carroll, B. R., ed. *Historical Collections of South Carolina; Embracing many Rare and Valuable Pamphlets, and Other Documents, Relating to the History of that State, From its first Discovery to its Independence, in the Year 1776.* 2 vols., New York, 1836.

Hawks, Francis L. *History of North Carolina; with Maps and Illustrations. Vol. II. Embracing the Period of the Proprietary Government.* Fayetteville, N. C., 1858.

Lefler, Hugh Talmadge, ed. *North Carolina History told by Contemporaries.* Chapel Hill, 1948 (2nd ed.).

Rivers, William James. *A Sketch of the History of South Carolina to the Close of the Proprietary Government by the Revolution of 1719. With an Appendix Containing many Valuable Records hitherto Unpublished.* Charleston, 1856.

Salley, Alexander S., ed. *Narratives of Early Carolina 1650–1708.* New York, 1911.

Saunders, William L., ed. *The Colonial Records of North Carolina.* Raleigh, 1886.

BAHAMA ISLANDS

I. RECORDS

Articles and Orders, made and agreed upon the 9th Day of July, 1647 . . . by the Company of Adventurers for the Plantation of the Islands called Bahama in America. . . . [London, 1647.] (BM)

Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series, America and West Indies. London, 1860–1940.

Malcolm, Harcourt, compiler. *Historical Documents relating to the Bahama Islands.* Nassau, 1910.

II. DESCRIPTIVE AND HISTORICAL ACCOUNTS

Graves, John. *A Memorial; Or, a Short Account of the Bahama-Islands.* [London, 1708.] (NYPL)

BARBADOS

I. RECORDS

A. Colony Records

"An Account of His Majesty's Island of Barbados and the Governmt Thereof. Sloan Mss. 2441, pp. 1–22, British Museum c. 1684," *The Journal of the Barbados Museum and Historical Society*, III (1935), 44–57.

Acts of Assembly, Passed in the Island of Barbadoes, From 1648, to 1718. London, 1721. (NYPL)

Articles of Agreements, Made, and Concluded the 11th day of January, 1651. By and between the Commissioners of the Right Honourable, the Lord Willoughby of Parrham, on the one Part: And the Commissioners in the behalfe of the Common-Wealth of England, on the other Part. London, 1652. (JCB)

A Declaration Set forth by the Lord Lieutenant Generall the Gentlemen of the Councill & Assembly occasioned from the view of a printed paper. Entituled. An Act Prohibiting trade with Barbados, Virginea, Bermudes and Antegoe. Hague, 1651. (BM; photostat NYPL)

Hall, Richard, ed. *Acts, Passed in the Island of Barbados. From 1643, to 1762, inclusive; Carefully revised, innumerable Errors corrected. . . .* London, 1764. (BM)

Trott, Nicholas (ed.) *The Laws of the British Plantations in America, Relating to the Church and the Clergy, Religion and Learning.* London, 1725. (NYPL)

B. Parish Records

"Records of the Vestry of St. Michael," *The Journal of the Barbados Museum and Historical Society*, XIV (1947), 123–138, 173–180; XV (1948), 89–102, 201–215; XVI (1949), 194–207.

C. Quaker Records

A Record of Certificates of Removal received by Philadelphie Mo. Mtg. 1681 to 1758. Copy, Ms., Department of Friends Records, 302 Arch Street, Philadelphia. (Has lists of Friends in Barbados and Jamaica.)

II. DESCRIPTIVE AND HISTORICAL ACCOUNTS

A.B. *A Brief Relation of the Beginning and Ending of the Troubles of the Barbados, With the True Causes thereof.* London, 1653. (BM)

Besse, Joseph. *A Collection of the Sufferings Of the People Called Quakers. . . . 1650 . . . 1689.* 2 vols., London, 1753.

Blome, Richard. *A Description of the Island of Jamaica; With the other Isles and Territories in America, to which the English are Related, viz. Barbadoes, St. Christopher. . . .* London, 1672. (HC, JCB)

Curwen, Alice. *A Relation of the Labour, Travail and Suffering of the Faithful Servant of the Lord.* 1680. (BPL)

[Dalby, Thomas.] *An Historical Account of the Rise and Growth of the West-India Colonies. . . .* London, 1690. Reprinted *The Harleian Miscellany*, IX (1810), 43–45.

Davies, John. *The History of the Caribby-Islands, viz. Barbados, St. Christophers. . . .* London, 1666. (NYPL)

[Duke, William.] *Some Memoirs of the first Settlement of the Island of Barbados and other Caribbee Islands. . . . Extracted from Antient Records, Papers, and Accounts taken from Mr. William Arnold, Mr. Samuel Bulkly, and Mr. John Summers, some of the first Settlers. . . . Also some Remarks on the Laws and Constitution of Barbados.* Barbados, 1741. (BM, MHS) Americana Photostat No. 95 (1939).

Fell, Lydia. *A Testimony and Warning Given forth in the love of Truth, and is for the Governour, Magistrates & People inhabiting on the Island of Barbadoes; which is a Call to turn to the Lord.* N.d., n.p. [London?, 1676] (JCB, Hav, Swth, Y)

For the King And both Houses of Parliament. Being A Short Relation of the Sad Estate and Sufferings of the Innocent People of God, Called Quakers. London, 1661. (BPL)

Foster, Nicholas. *A Briefe Relation of the late Horrid Rebellion Acted in the Island Barbadas, In the West-Indies.* London, 1650. (AAS, HC, JCB, NYPL)

Fox, George. *Gospel Family-Order, Being a Short Discourse Concerning the Ordering of Families, Both of Whites, Blacks and Indians.* 1676. (FL)

To the Ministers, Teachers, and Priests (So called, and so Stiling your selves) in Barbadoes. 1672. (FL, Hav, JCB)

Great Newes from the Barbadoes. Or, A True and Faithful Account of the Grand Conspiracy of the Negroes against the English. . . . With a short Description of that Plantation. London, 1676. (JCB, BM)

Hosmer, James Kendall, ed. *Winthrop's Journal "History of New England" 1630–1649.* 2 vols., New York, 1908.

Ligon, Richard. *A True & Exact History of the Island of Barbados.* London, 1657. (HC, JCB, NYPL, Y)

Makemie, Francis. *Truths In a True Light. Or, A Pastoral Letter, to the Reformed Protestants, in Barbados Vindicating the Non-Conformists, from the Misrepresentations, commonly made of them, in that Island, and in other places: And, Demonstrating, that they are indeed the Truest and Soundest Part of the Church of England.* Edinburgh, 1699. (HC, UTS)

Pinder, Richard. *Bowells of Compassion toward the Scattered Seed.* London, 1659. (Hav)

A Loving Invitation (to Repentance and Amendment of life) Unto all the Inhabitants of the Island Barbados. London, 1660. (Hav)

Pitman, Henry. *A Relation of the Great Sufferings and Strange Adventures of . . . .* London, 1689. (NYPL)

Scott, John. "The Description of Barbados, Sloane Ms. 3662, British Museum," *The Weekly Argosy*, August 17, 1907. (JCB)

A Short Account of the Manifest Hand of God That hath Fallen upon Several Marshals and their Deputies, Who have made Great Spoil and Havock of the Goods of the People of God called Quakers, in the Island of Barbadoes, For their Testimony against Going or Sending to the Militia. . . . Together with an Abstract of their Sufferings. London, 1696. (FL, BM)

Walduck, T. "Letters from Barbados, 1710," *The Journal of the Barbados Museum and Historical Society*, XV (1947), 27–51, 137–149.

Whitelock, Bulstrode. *Memorials of the English Affairs: Or, An Historical Account . . . from the Beginning of the Reign of King Charles the First, to . . . the . . . Restauration.* London, 1732. (NYPL)

III. COLLECTED REPRINTS OF SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY MATERIAL (OFFICIAL RECORDS AND PRIVATE LETTERS AND ACCOUNTS)

Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series, America and West Indies. London, 1860–1940.

Historical Manuscripts Commission, Eighth Report.

Winthrop Papers. The Massachusetts Historical Society. 5 vols., Boston, 1929–47.

JAMAICA

I. COLONY RECORDS

Acts of Assembly, Passed in the Island of Jamaica; From 1681, to 1754, inclusive. London, 1756. (BM, NYPL, BCL)

Journals of the Assembly of Jamaica. Vol. I (1663/4 to 1709). Jamaica, 1811.

The Laws of Jamaica, Passed by the Assembly, And Confirmed by His Majesty in Council, Feb. 23, 1683. To which is added, A short Account of the Island and Government thereof. London, 1683. (NYPL)

The Laws of Jamaica, Passed by the Assembly, And Confirmed by His Majesty in Council, April 17, 1684. To which is added, The State of Jamaica, As it is now under the Government of Sir Thomas Lynch. London, 1684. (NYPL)

The Laws of Jamaica: Comprehending All the Acts in Force. 3 vols., St. Jago de la Vega, Jamaica, 1792. (BM, NYPL)

Trott, Nicholas, ed. *The Laws of the British Plantations in America, Relating to the Church and Clergy, Religion and Learning.* London, 1725. (NYPL)

II. DESCRIPTIVE AND HISTORICAL ACCOUNTS

Andrews, Evangeline Walker and Charles McLean, eds. *Jonathan Dickinson's Journal or God's Protecting Providence. Being the Narra-*

tive of a Journey from Port Royal in Jamaica to Philadelphia between August 23, 1696 and April 1, 1697. New Haven, Conn., 1925. (1698 ed. HC, NYPL, Y)

Besse, Joseph. *A Collection of the Sufferings of the People Called Quakers . . . 1650 . . . 1689.* 2 vols., London, 1753.

Blome, Richard. *A Description Of the Island of Jamaica; With the Other Isles and Territories in America.* London, 1672. (BCL, HC, JCB)

Coad, John. *A Memorandum of the Wonderful Providences of God to a poor unworthy Creature, during the time of the Duke of Monmouth's Revolution in 1688.* London, 1849.

Houser, Henry. *An Exact Model or Platform of Good Magistracy: Or a Sermon Preached before the Governour, Council, and Assembly, at their first Meeting at Saint Jago de la Vega, in Jamaica, Feb. 1, 1671.* London, 1673. (MHS) Photostat Americana, 2d Ser., No. 156 (1942).

The Present State of Jamaica. With the Life of the Great Columbus the first Discoverer. London, 1683. (BCL, BM, JCB, NYPL)

To all Persons whom these may Concern. Broadside, 1656. (JCB)

III. Collected Reprints of Seventeenth-Century Material

Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series, America and West Indies, Vol. I, London, 1860–1940.

Interesting Tracts, Relating to the Island of Jamaica, consisting of Curious State-Papers . . . Letters, Petitions, Narratives, &c. Which Throw Great Light on the History of that Island, from its Conquest, down to the year 1702. St. Jago de la Vega, Jamaica, 1800. (BCL, BM, NYPL)

LEEWARD ISLANDS

I. Records

Acts of Assembly, Passed in the Charibbee Leeward Islands, From 1690, to 1705. London, 1740. (NYPL, BM)

Acts of Assembly, Passed in the Island of Montserrat; From 1668, to 1740, Inclusive. London, 1740. (NYPL)

Acts of Assembly, Passed in the Island of Nevis, From 1664, to 1739, Inclusive. London, 1740. (NYPL)

Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series, America and West Indies. London, 1860–1940.

Trott, Nicholas, ed. *The Laws of the British Plantations in America, Relating to the Church and Clergy, Religion and Learning.* London, 1725. (NYPL)

II. DESCRIPTIVE AND HISTORICAL ACCOUNTS

Besse, Joseph. *A Collection of the Sufferings of the People Called Quakers . . . 1650 . . . 1689.* 2 vols., London, 1753.

Crouch, Nathaniel. *The English Empire in America; or a Prospect of His Majesties Dominions in the West Indies.* London, 1685. (CU, HC, JCB, NYPL)

Langford, Jonas. *A Brief Account of the Sufferings of the Servants of the Lord called Quakers: From their first Arrival in the Island of Antegoa . . . 1660, to 1695.* London, 1706. (BM)

Winthrop, Samuel. "Letters of," Massachusetts Historical Society, *Collections,* 5 Ser., VIII (Boston, 1882), 234–265.

QUAKER EPISTLES AND JOURNALS

(SEVENTEENTH CENTURY AND EARLY EIGHTEENTH CENTURY)

Boweter, John. *Christian Epistles, Travels and Sufferings, of that Antient Servant of Christ . . . Who departed this Life, the 16th of the 11th Month, 1704. Aged about 75.* London, 1705. (Pa. Hist. Soc.)

Bownas, Samuel. Original Manuscript including his Journal of Travels in America—4 vols., Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Pa. Printed in part as *An Account of the Life, Travels, and Christian Experiences in the Work of the Ministry of. . . .* London, 1756.

Burnyeat, John. *The Truth Exalted in the Writings of that Eminent and Faithful Servant of Christ. . . .* London, 1691. (HC, Hav, JCB, NYPL, UTS)

Chalkley, Thomas. *A Journal, or, Historical Account of the Life, Travels, and Christian Experiences, of. . . .* Philadelphia, 1749.

Coale, Josiah. *The Books And Divers Epistles of the Faithful Servant of the Lord . . . Collected and Published as it was Desired by him the Day of his Departure of this Life.* 1671. (JCB, NYPL, UTS, Y)

Curwen, Alice. *A Relation of the Labour, Travail and Suffering Of that Faithful Servant of the Lord . . . Who departed this Life . . . 7th Day . . . 6 Moneth,* 1679. 1680. (BPL)

Dickinson, James. *Journal of the Life, Travels and . . . Work of the Ministry of. . . .* London, 1730. (NYPL). London, 1745.

Edmundson, William. *A Journal of the Life, Travels, Sufferings and Labour of Love in the Work of the Ministry, of . . . .* (London, 1713) London, 1774.

Ellis, William and Alice. *The Life and Correspondence of. . . .* Second edition, revised and corrected. Philadelphia, 1850.

Epistles Received 1683–1706, Vols. I, II. Friends Library, Euston Road, London.

Farmer, John. "John Farmer's First American Journey 1711–1714," ed. by Henry J. Cadbury, American Antiquarian Society, *Proceedings*, 1943; reprinted separately by the Society 1944.

Fothergill, John. *An Account of the Life and Travels in the Work of the Ministry of . . . .* London, 1753.

Fox, George. *The Journal of . . . .* ed. by Norman Penney. 2 vols., Cambridge, England, 1911.

Letters and Documents of Early Friends, copied from the original which were preserved at Swarthmore Hall, Vols. I–IV. Friends Library, Euston Road, London.

Richardson, John. *An Account of the Life of that Antient Servant of Jesus Christ. . . .* (London, 1757) Philadelphia, 1759.

Story, Thomas. *A Journal of the Life of . . . his Travels and Labours in the Service of the Gospel.* Newcastle Upon Tyne, 1747.

Taylor, John. *Memoir of John Taylor of the City of New York.* (1710) York, 1830. (UTS)

Whiting, John. *Persecution Expos'd in some Memoirs relating to the Sufferings of . . . And many others of the People called Quakers.* London, 1715. (Includes accounts of George Coale, Thomas Briggs, Robert Widders, Roger Longworth, Joan Vokins, and John Burnyeat, all of whom travelled in the colonies.) (JCB)

Widders, Robert. *The Life and Death, Travels and Sufferings of . . . .* London, 1688. (HC, Hav, JCB)

Wilson, Thomas. *A Brief Journal of the Life, Travels and Labours of Love, in the Work of the Ministry of. . . .* Dublin, 1728. (Swth)

[Portfolio Volume XVII, No. 2, Friends Library, Euston Road, London, has lists of Friends who visited the West Indies in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Material taken from Besse and various journals.]

Copyright of Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society is the property of American Antiquarian Society and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.