6-1985

Maypoles and Misfits : A Study of Puritan Orthodoxy and Anglican Heterodoxy in Seventeenth Century Massachusetts

Sarah V. Miller

ABSTRACT

MAYPOLES AND MISFITS: A STUDY OF PURITAN ORTHODOXY AND ANGLICAN HETERODOXY IN SEVENTEENTH CENTURY MASSACHUSETTS

by

Sarah V. Miller

The particular ideas and history of Puritanism in America has been the focus of historians of many different persuasions for diverse purposes. The relationship between Puritanism in England and the evolution of Puritanism in America, as it relates to the history of Anglicanism and American independence has not been a major concern of most historians, however.

The two biographical studies contained in this paper, one of Thomas Morton and one of Sir Edmund Andros, are linked in history on several levels. The superficial similarities between the two men were a contributing factor to the choice of topic in this paper. In a deeper sense, as one studies the similarities and differences between both men, however, a picture of religious and ideological independence emerges, which leads the student of the seventeenth century to wonder

how much an influence on American independence the Puritans had. The continuing disagreement as to the true causes behind the American War for Independence arouses curiosity as to whether the roots of this war lay in independence of religious experience or whether or entirely in the mercantilism of the Mother Country.

Secondary sources for this paper were found at the Loma Linda University Library, while primary sources were available at the Huntington Library and the library of the University of California at Riverside, where an emphasis has been made to collect such sources on church history. The information found in these sources enable one to determine, in a small way, at least, how American Puritanism, in relationship to Anglicanism, developed, and what the true causes of the American War for Independence were.

LOMA LINDA UNIVERSITY

Gradutate School

MAYPOLES AND MISFITS: A STUDY OF PURITAN ORTHODOXY AND ANGLICAN HETERODOXY IN SEVENTEENTH CENTURY MASSACHUSETTS

by

Sarah V. Miller

A Thesis in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree Master of Arts in History

June, 1985

Each person whose signature appears below certifies that this thesis in his opinion is adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree Master of Arts.

Wilfred J. Airey, Professor of History, Chairman

Walter Mackett, Professor of History

Jonathan Butler, Professor of History

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Maypoles and Misfits: A Study of Puritan Orthodoxy and Anglican Heterodoxy in Seventeenth Century Massachusetts

In any study of Anglicanism in Puritan Massachusetts, three patterns of equal importance and significance emerge. These patterns comprise the major elements of Puritan/Anglican relations in the colonies. The first factor deals with the role of Puritans in the Mother Country and in Massachusetts; while Anglicanism was dominant in England, maintaining the orthodox, majority position, the Puritan and Separatist elements had been forced into an undesirable role of heterodox minority. The founding of the colonies in the New World, particularly in Plymouth, Salem, and Massachusetts Bay, pushed each faction into opposite roles,[1] and this switch necessarily dominated the relationship between the established and non-conformist groups: the Puritans relished their new power, and resented any attempts--real or imagined--on the part of the Church of England to revert them to their accustomed position on the other side of the Atlantic.

It is not difficult, under the circumstances, to understand Puritan suspicions. To a certain extent, the second pattern stems from the first and is closely related to it; specifically, it concerns the effect of the New World on

the differences between Separatist and Puritan polity. While the former advocated separation from the Church of England and the formation of a non-established, purified church, the latter urged working for a purification within the established ecclesiastical structure. Episcopal organization and the cold repetition of the Book of Common Prayer were too reminiscent of Papism for both groups, and both valued a personal experience of conversion as well as predestinarian Calvinistic doctrines. There was, therefore, much in common between the two groups; the methodology of reform kept them at odds until their establishment in the New World, where it became rapidly apparent that they must hang together or most assuredly they would hang separately.

One thus witnesses a merging of the Separatists of Plymouth Colony and the Puritans of the Massachusetts Bay Colony.[2] Forms of worship and negative attitudes toward the Anglican forms of worship came to resemble the model set up at Plymouth; both became, in essence, Separatist colonies. Together, they forged a powerful, orthodox majority in church and government, working jointly against Anglican intrusions into their Zion in the wilderness.

The third pattern is complex and was to some extent also a product of the first pattern. It can actually be seen as the interaction of two simultaneous movements. First, it was the entrenchment of Puritan orthodox beliefs. When

Thomas Morton was ousted from the Puritan environment, it was only a partial victory for the Puritans, and revealed that the Separatists were not sure enough of their power to make the triumph final. Edmund Andros, on the other hand, was overthrown--as governor, from a much more exalted position than the lawyer of Clifford's Inn--thus showing that Puritan power was entrenched enough to secure a complete victory. Andros returned as governor to the New World but maintained a discreet, non-threatening distance in Virginia, while Morton returned successfully to taunt the erstwhile victors. Secondly, religious motivation for each action differed in degree as time went on. The first consideration in the arrest and deportation of Morton was predominantly economic and military. The Puritans kept their distance until their fur-trading interests were threatened and the safety of their settlements was uncertain. While Sir Edmund Andros' administration aroused much political agitation, the real irritant was his religious policies. Thus, through the decades of colonization in the seventeenth century, Puritan orthodoxy took priority over other considerations, and became more and more powerful.

These three somewhat complex political and religious patterns are not only important for revealing the basis for Anglican/Puritan relations; they also express the basic separation between the heterodox and the orthodox, the

established and the non-established elements of colonial society. It is possible to see a connection between the trends delineated above and the spirit of separation from England that sparked the eventual War for Independence.[3]

In a small way, this study contributes to the theory that Alan Heimert introduces in his Religion and the American Mind from the Great Awakening to the Revolution. In this work, the Great Awakening is seen as the great divisive force which brought about the rift between the Mother Country and the colonies, and between loyalists and rebels. Thus, the background for the split becomes a religious, as opposed to a political or mercantile issue, both of which are the basis for the arguments used by those who disagree with the former theory. Heimert writes:

> It is my conclusion . . . that Liberalism was profoundly conservative, politically as well as socially, and that its leaders, insofar as they did in fact embrace the Revolution, were the most reluctant of rebels. Conversely, "evangelical" religion, which had as its most notable formal expression the "Calvinism" of Jonathan Edwards, was not the retrograde philosophy that many historians rejoice to see confounded in America's Age of Reason. Rather Calvinism, and Edwards, provided pre-Revolutionary America with a radical, even democratic, social and political ideology, and evangelical religion embodied, and inspired, a thrust toward American Nationalism.[4]

Heimert's views are mainly restricted to the generation just preceding the War for Independence, which saw the Great Awakening and was most influenced by the divisions in religious principles that arose from it.[5]

Heimert does not, however, explore the early years of colonization or the religious developments of the seventeenth century. These years were also crucial to the eventual rift between England and the New World. As Heimert holds, religion has been neglected in the study of causes for the colonies' rebellion, but the religious reasons extend back to that first act of separation by the Pilgrims when they established a new home in the wilderness of America. It is the purpose of this paper to show how the political, social and religious repercussions of this break and the increase of power among the Puritans fed the spirit of independence.

CHAPTER 1

The Establishment of Puritan Colonies

The history of Puritanism actually begins with the Reformation in England. Henry VIII broke with Rome in 1531, but there were few changes in polity or doctrine, as Henry's reasons for the separation were dynastic and political rather than theological. Doctrinal changes did gradually come about, but in the eyes of some men the reforms did not go nearly far enough. By the middle of the sixteenth century the established church--to accommodate these men--issued the Thirty-Nine Articles, which purposely generalized the terms of church doctrine in the hopes that everyone would accept them. The Articles succeeded--temporarily. Church polity was a different matter, however. An increasing number of Anglicans desired to purge the established church of all "papist trappings" and hierarchy. By 1582 the group had found a leader in Thomas Cartwright, and the struggle between conformist and non-conformist was joined in earnest. Most Puritans though it better to work for reform within the existing structure and framework of the Church, but a few abandoned Anglican corruptions altogether, forming the so-called separating churches. Elder William Brewster founded a separatist church at Scrooby early in the seventeenth century.[1]

With a group comprised of such religious elements, it has always been easy to assume that the Pilgrims departed from England as a result of persecution in that country. Historians have revised this American myth: Louis B. Wright, in his Atlantic Frontier: Colonial American Civilization, 1697-1763, notes that a great deal of stress has been laid on religious discrimination as the reason the Pilgrims fled. Certainly, religion was a motivating force, but not as the result of persecution as such. Indeed, at that time, under the Stuarts, there was less ill-treatment of heretics than students of that period have been led to think. The "refugees" supposedly fleeing from it themselves were unlikely to tolerate other religious groups, as witnessed from their first years on American shores. In addition, England's church-related problems were relatively few, even under Archbishop Laud, compared to the rest of Europe. Only Holland excelled Britain in religious freedom, and the liberties enjoyed in England would have been considered nothing short of license in Italy or Spain.[2]

There seems to have been, therefore, an animosity--as opposed to actual persecution--in the relationship between the two church groups, in England at any rate. Another popular myth that must be dispelled is the composition of the passenger list of the Mayflower. School children romantically envision a cohesive, homogeneous group of Separatists,

dedicated to the ideal of building up a Zion in the wilderness. This picture is undoubtedly pleasing, but the Pilgrims themselves would have dismissed the notion in the name of "ye trueth." Of the hundred and two passengers packing the Mayflower to the gunwales, only three were from Scrooby: William and Mary Brewster, and William Bradford. A little more than a third--forty-one, to be exact--came from Leyden. The others were for the most part "strangers," or non-Separatists, largely from southeastern England and London. They were neither Separatists nor Brownists, but were, rather, good members of the Church of England, "not from reasoned choice or any strong conviction perhaps, but simply because they had been born and baptized in that faith. They were content . . . to accept the beliefs handed down to them by their fathers."[3] A few belonged, it seems, to the Puritan branch of the church, but "most of them were as orthodox in their uncritical way as any Anglican bishop."[4] They had no intention of breaking away from their cultural and religious background; they sought instead a new life of opportunity and for a while successfully resisted the attempts made to convert them to "the truth." As for the Leyden group, the minority in power, they made no secret of their firm resolve to impose their religious views on the others. The resulting explosions and collisions of opinion almost wrecked New Plymouth.[4]

Although economic and political motives for emigration were important for most of the less pious majority, for the Separatist, religion was paramount. Therefore, it is profitable to study the ideology surrounding their transition from heterodox to orthodox in the New World. Their Calvinism was naturally at odds with the Church of England's "papacy,"[5] but the most significant factor was not exactly what they believed, but how they went about believing it and acting on it. Charles Andrews notes succinctly that:

> The Pilgrims were concerned for the preservation of their peculiar form of ecclesiastical piety and the maintenance of their own way of life, both of which they believed to be sanctioned by the Bible and good in the sight of God. For this they had crossed the ocean, had endured hardships, and suffered sickness and death. They believed it a sin to allow their effort to be frustrated and brought to nought by those who did not think as they did.[6]

Moving from England did not reduce their hardship: many on board the Mayflower from London proved mutinous and hard to handle, a situation that did not ease upon arrival in the New World.[7]

Part of the discontent arose not from the Separatists' control over political matters--although that was bad enough--but from their use of this power to prevent other groups from practicing a belief of their own choosing. This, from the point of view of non-Separatists in New Plymouth, denied them the accustomed comforts of home at the very least and salvation at the most.[8] In this way the Separatists sought to gain religious, as well as political,

power, the first step in transforming themselves into an orthodox majority.

Actually, members of the Church of England were scattered throughout the colonies. In Maryland, the number increased steadily but did not exceed the number of Catholics during the seventeenth century. South Carolina's earliest settlers, both from the Mother Country and Barbados, were Anglicans,[9] especially strong in Berkeley County and along the Ashley and Cooper Rivers. A few of the emigrants from Virginia into North Carolina may have been of that faith, but no records remain as there was no Anglican Church in that area during the seventeenth century. In Pennsylvania and West Jersey, Anglicans seem to have been practically non-existent, while in East Jersey the only Anglicans in early times were those connected directly with the governor's family, along with other proprietary officials. It was not until 1698 that an Anglican clergyman was settled in that colony. The Episcopalian element was somewhat stronger in New York, but again it was mainly concerned with governmental circles in New York City, and later Westchester County. "It is stated that in 1680 Bishop Compton could find only four ministers of the Church of England in North America, and that of these only one or two had been regularly sent over."[10] Compared to these statistics, then, Virginia was a veritable stronghold of the Church of

England; nor was it shabbily represented in New England, all circumstances considered.

In 1624, even the Separatists could not boast of having their own pastor, and the Anglicans certainly did not have one. Therefore, when a certain Anglican clergyman by the name of John Lyford arrived at Plymouth in that year, the air was charged with controversy, and it needed only this spark to explode the situation into the first showdown in the conflicting political and religious spheres of interest in the colony of New Plymouth. Reverend Lyford had been sent to the colony by the merchant adventurers in response to complaints from those who felt themselves religiously disenfranchised. A peculiar situation developed subsequent to Lyford's arrival. In the first place, Elder Brewster had not been permitted to administer the sacraments of marriage, baptism, and communion. The first had been performed by civil authorities while the second had been omitted entirely. Those who felt that marriage was a sacrament and baptism necessary--namely the Anglicans--viewed Lyford as a veritable savior. He responded by braving the wrath of Bradford and others to administer communion and conduct service according to the Book of Common Prayer, and to baptize at least one child.[11] Because of these faux pas--although for a time Lyford professed Separatism--and some incriminating letters written by Lyford to the authorities in England

complaining of Pilgrim leadership and power, he was driven from Plymouth as an exile, as was John Oldham, member of the Council at Plymouth and suspected representative of the London merchant backers, a partner to Lyford in this "treason."[12]

Unfortunately for the Separatists, individual challenges to their power were not the least of their worries or fears. Three expeditions served to show them that there might eventually be whole groups of Anglicans to contend with, a struggle made especially difficult by the fact that these new colonists were not under the Saints' territorial jurisdiction as contained in the terms of the limits placed on them by their merchant backers.

The first such group of intruders was an expedition led by Thomas Weston, which settled at Wessagusset. Weston's venture was one of trading; it had little connection with earlier or later events.[13] The two subsequent settlements were just the opposite.

In June of 1623, the territories being colonized by the British in New England were divided between twenty shareholders in an audience with King James I. Five weeks later, Robert Gorges, son of the loyal and adventurous Sir Ferdinando Gorges, sailed for the New World holding the governor generalship over all this territory for the King's Council. He was accompanied by a council to assist him in his administration, and he had been granted authority by a special

commission over civil and criminal matters. Mechanics, farmers and traders were also part of the venture, which included Anglican clergymen.[14] "These were people of a very different class from those who had preceded them. Among them were men of education, and some of them were married and had brought their wives."[15] Bradford was to be deprived of office, although he was to serve for a while as one of the assistants.[16] The Gorges group settled into the buildings recently abandoned by Weston. The colony, though, had in it the seeds of failure: those in authority were absurdly inadequate to the task of enforcing their policies on the scattered settlers and elusive fishermen. Gorges stayed one winter--he had arrived in the autumn--and left in disgust the following spring. He had accomplished only one thing of significance: he had brought Weston into submission, after the latter had been charged with fraudulently exporting to the Continent a quantity of arms and ammunition procured under the pretense that they were for use in his American colony, and had spent some months as a fugitive. After Gorges left, most of the settlers abandoned Wessagusset.[17]

The third settlement, that of Captain Wollaston,[18] was the most serious threat to the Pilgrim oligarchy and proved to be a most disruptive influence, as Thomas Morton, Wollaston's successor, provided unforeseen discomfort for those in power at Plymouth.[19]

A fourth settlement near Plymouth was, refreshingly enough, not a threat to the Separatists. It consisted of a group of Puritans, who were not quite so ideologically alienated from the Saints at Plymouth as the previous three had been. Charles Andrews again provides a valuable summary of the developing relationship between the two religious groups:

> Neither the newcomers nor the Old Planters were Separatists. They were non-Conformists who had no desire to separate from the Church of England, but who disliked many of the forms and practices of the church, which they characterized as accretions and corruptions. They were of the same mind as those who left England a year later, participants in a greater migration, who declared at the time of their departure that their intentions had been misunderstood and that both the leaders and the generality of the company counted it an honor to call the church of England their "dear Mother," the ceremonies of which they spurned and the errors of which they abjured, but whose welfare they desired and would always pray for.[20]

This description contains the essence of Puritan attitudes, yet there was little opportunity to enforce their particular form of polity. When the second influx of Puritans arrived in Massachusetts Bay, they discovered that the trend to become more like the Separatists was already in full swing, under the influence of one Dr. Samuel Fuller.[21]

In 1628, when the Abigail dropped anchor at Naumkeg, near Plymouth, the leader of the colonists on board, Captain John Endecott,[22] was seriously alarmed by the settlers' state of health. At sea, the main foes had been scurvy and infectious fever; on shore, disease cut the Puritan vanguard

in half and claimed a good many other colonists under Roger Conant as well. In desperation, and having heard that one of the Plymouth Separatists had skill in the cure of disease, Endecott appealed to the older settlement for help. The Pilgrims sent Dr. Samuel Fuller. "It was a momentous visit, for Deacon-Doctor Fuller tended not only to the ailing bodies but the troubled souls of his patients."[23] While the Puritans had become more and more critical of Anglican polity, they had, before this, hesitated to go their separate way, partly because they had ideological objections to schism. They were also deterred by fear of heavy-handed bishops and magistrates. With that pressure removed, Fuller had no difficulty in converting them to a Separatist way of life, while they feebly protested that they separated not from the Church of England itself, but from its "corruptions."[24] Endecott, quoted in George F. Willison's Saints and Strangers, sheds the best light on the change:

> "God's people are all marked with one and ye same marke, and sealed with one and ye same seale, and have for ye mayne one & ye same hart, guided by one & ye same spirite of truth; and where this is, there can be no discorde; nay, here must needs be sweet harmonie," Endecott wrote Bradford. "I acknowledge myselfe much bound to you for your kind love and care in sending Mr. Fuller among us, and rejoyce much that I am by him satisfied touching your judgments of ye outward forme of God's worshipe. It is, as farr as evidence of truth, . . . being farr from ye commone reporte that hath been spread of you touching that particular."[25]

John Endecott, once decided on a course of action, was unyielding and stern, and determined to carry out his plans

despite rigorous opposition. The Old Planters, most of whom were Anglicans, of course, who insisted on service according to the Book of Common Prayer, considered themselves slaves under this type of rule, and much preferred the more relaxed government of Roger Conant, a man chosen from among themselves, and usually a less forcible, more amiable man.[26]

This joining together of the Pilgrim and Puritan ideology was not mere capitulation to the inevitable on the side of the latter. The difference between separating and non-separating groups had seemed fundamental in England, but on the shores of the Americas it seemed less important. Thus the Pilgrims (as Separatists) felt it possible to follow the advice of John Robinson, their pastor in Leyden, to become closer to the Puritans. Robinson's guidance had earlier begun to bring them closer to other godly men, so the move closer to the Puritans was actually the culmination of an earlier trend. When they began to continue this shift, they in effect renounced their Separatist heritage.[27] On one hand, the Puritans began to follow more closely the church polity of their Separatist neighbors, while the latter in turn relaxed some of the rigidity of their attitude and began associating with some established groups. For the Anglicans, the most important, and most keenly felt, result was that the two groups agreed, albeit tacitly, on the matter of suppressing the active practice of Anglicanism.

The Separatists and Puritans felt a certain kinship in doctrines and were joined together for worship. This church was a model, not for a reformed Church of England in the colonies, but rather for all the other churches in Massachusetts and Connecticut. It became the "New England Way," a compromise between the two extremes, which had an influence even on ecclesiastical organization in England during the minority rule of the Puritans during the Interregnum.[28]

The Company in London, along with others with an interest is the Massachusetts plantation, were nonplussed at this change in religious affairs. With large sums of money at stake, the backers did not welcome a second Pilgrim (Separatist) colony in America and feared that public opinion would be influenced if reports of what had been done leaked out, injuring the cause they had at heart.[29]

The situation became acute when John Endecott began to take stringent measures against John and Samuel Browne, high-placed freemen of the Company and members of Endecott's council at Salem. These two men were endeavoring to keep the Church of England's traditional liturgy and sacraments alive in the colony, a serious infringement of de facto Separatist regulations, for which they were shipped unceremoniously home to England. "New England," said John Endecott, "was no place for such as they." In the subsequent debates, it was disclosed that there were two parties in formation:

the "merchants," representative of the more moderate Puritan views; and the religious extremists, hardly yet in command but rapidly gaining a more influential position month by month. Just as the Pilgrim leaders had opened the aforementioned letters of John Lyford, which complained of Pilgrim leadership and hinted at treason on the part of the worthies at Plymouth, the decision was reached to open letters written by the Brownes to friends in England to see if they had written of the extremist group's acquisition of power. "But at this time the company went no further than to warn Endecott not to [take matters into his own hands] again, lest it get them into trouble with the authorities."[30] Endecott's use of power in the case of the Brownes was, however, a warning of conflicts to come, namely of that between Thomas Morton and the colonists.

Although the Salem church provided a model for local churches throughout Massachusetts--due to the liberty which circumstances offered[31]--in Salem, as in Plymouth, there were some--namely the Old Planters--who preferred the liturgy and polity of the Church of England, and who thus remained outside the covenant. "Salem was far from being a homogenous religious community . . . ."[32] The idea of covenant, however, was a necessary and essential basis for government on the Massachusetts Bay, and it governed their daily integration of living and the Word. Sidney Mead

details the concept of government as it related to religion among the Massachusetts Separatists:

> They accepted without question what was then almost universally conceded in their England, that all government must be by the consent of the governed--a concept which they subsumed under the traditional Jewish-Christian image of the covenant of God with His peculiar people. In their transitional conceptual order they merged the idea of the Church as tribal cult with that of the Church as a gathered and covenanted people and attempted to incarnate and preserve the idea in practice by the simple expedient of ruling that only church members could vote in the election of civil magistrates, who in turn were chosen only from among the Saints. Thus the gathered church was co-extensive with the actual state, the laws of which, it was supposed, coincided with the laws of God. Hence outward obedience to the laws of the commonwealth, whether consciously and willingly as by the Saints or reluctantly as by the unregenerate, was by definition outward conformity to the laws of God.[33]

The Anglicans, therefore, had to deal with the antagonism of two kinds: one active--as in the case of the Brownes--when rules according to the Saints were openly broken by those who flaunted their practices; and a second passive--the assumption that one would obey the covenant in a civil, if not a religious sense. The catch was that, for the Puritans, civil authority was also religious authority. Anglicans were, so to speak, between a rock and a hard place.

John Oldham, Roger Conant and Edward Hilton, early colonists and grantees from the original New England company, as well as others who played a fairly conspicuous role in the New England of the seventeenth century, were Church of England men. It is probable that the force of their

religious convictions rested but lightly on them, but they were the type who would easily take offense at the narrow, sectarian attitude of Bradford and the other Separatists. The Pilgrims and Puritans were not the only groups living along the New England coast, but their strength lay in their unity, their compact religious communities, and in their "uncompromising attitude toward all other forms of religious belief." The others were "isolated, individualistic, and nomadic," for whom religion was not the chief end of existence. "Hence the eventual victory lay with less tolerant and more highly organized religious groups."[34]

Separatist activities, both religious and economic, were watched with lively interest on the other side of the Atlantic, and, of course, there was controversy over the rules and regulations surrounding the transatlantic migration. There were proposals to recall the charter,[35] but there was enough accumulated evidence in favor of the Massachusetts Bay Colony that the proposition opposing the charter was dropped.[36] For the next few months, more pressure was brought to bear, and in 1633, the same committee that had reviewed the issue before met to analyze the situation again--this time under Laud, Archbishop of Canterbury. "This committee must have set on foot a searching inquiry into the whole subject of colonial migration, for at the beginning of the next year the Privy Council ordered the

Marshal of the Admiralty to hold up all vessels in the Thames bound for New England until further instructions should be prepared." These instructions, issued on February 12, 1634, required the Masters of the Vessels to administer the Oath of Allegiance and Supremacy to all persons going to New England, also making sure that the emigrants held service on board according to the Book of Common Prayer, and refrained from blasphemy or profaning the name of God."[37]

Thus, there were countermeasures in England for the anti-Anglican sentiment in the colonies--a strong restatement of Anglicanism's superior position in the Mother Country as opposed to Puritanism's strength in the colonies. The new stringent measures were actually little threat to the later emigrants. Even Winthrop, along with others, signed a paper declaring that they had no intention of becoming Separatists. Undoubtedly, they sincerely believed it at the time; they simply desired to set up a purified Church of England in the New World.[38] The change came, not before they left England, but when they reached New England and colonial conditions, along with physical distance from the ecclesiastical authority, altered the ideological theories held by Puritan leaders. Even large Anglican communities in Virginia felt the effects of this distance,[39] and suffered accordingly. It was therefore fruitless to try to enforce--via the Oath of Allegiance and Supremacy--the rules

in England which the authorities planned to be obeyed in the colonies; the Oath of Allegiance could be administered in the Mother Country but it had little control over religious activities in the Americas.

The appearance of cooperation with and loyalty to the Church of England did not come to an abrupt end, no matter how easily the ties may have been broken in actuality. "The majority of the Massachusetts Puritans continued for a time to affirm, especially in their writings and on public occasions, that they still held communion with the Church of England."[40] The pretense continued on more levels than one:

> Frequently the elders, in explaining or defending their course to English critics, repeat the statement that they have separated only from the "corruptions" of the English Church, meaning its polity and ritual; but they could listen to the preaching of the gospel by its clergy. New England clergymen, when revisiting England, doubtless did this. It was stated, probably with truth, that those who believed in episcopacy as the only true system attended the churches of New England without molestation so long as they kept their opinions to themselves. It was only occasionally insisted by a congregation that a candidate for its pulpit should renounce his orders."[41]

As time passed, on the other hand, actual communion with the Church of England ceased. Undoubtedly, this state of affairs stemmed from the fact that, from the first, New England Puritans had renounced two of the most essential points of the Anglican system: the episcopacy and ritual. As the Civil War progressed it became unnecessary to keep up a pretense of communion for political motives, and soon afterwards, with the completion of the New England church

system, references to the Church of England disappear, toward the middle of the seventeenth century, except in connection with it as a rival or hostile body. New England thus became, in the domain of religion at least, independent of the Mother Country.[42] The steps leading to the War for Independence can be traced back to this period.

The slowly deteriorating relationship between Anglican and government authorities in England and the Puritan Separatist theocracy expressed itself most logically and completely in the local government of Massachusetts Bay. It was here that each step of the ideological separation was made complete by equal action from the Puritan government. In this body, John Winthrop led the vanguard as leader of Massachusetts Bay, the largest and most influential of the colonies. Under his leadership and the guidance of others, Massachusetts became an almost self-governing state.[43] The seeds of independence were becoming evident.

Because there were those already living on the Bay when the Puritans arrived, and even some who came under its auspices who were not as interested in becoming part of the Bible commonwealth, certain governmental steps were taken to preserve community for those who did desire to live the laws of God. Their first step was protection against those hostile and indifferent to their cause. Settlement was thus limited to those "allowed by some of the magistrates." Then

suffrage was restricted. "The very small number of freemen, or fully qualified voters . . . had to be increased, but not so far as to endanger the objectives of the promoters." Accordingly, the voting privilege was limited to Church members. While this does not sound drastic, it was, in actuality, a very exacting regulation:

> The full effect of this restriction can be understood only if it is remembered that Puritan tests for Church membership were so exacting that many religious persons, even among those in general sympathy with the doctrine and discipline of the Congregational Churches, remained, voluntarily or otherwise, outside the fold.[44]

What evolved as a result was an intense concentration of power.

John Winthrop was no believer in popular government, and he kept it centralized for a longer period than was stipulated in the Charter. He was, however, forced to comply with the Charter's instructions to hold general meetings, or courts, every three months. For this he needed "freemen" who at this time--around 1630--were non-existent and had to be created. An invitation was therefore extended to those who desired to become freemen to hand in their names. Over a hundred men responded, and of these a majority had been residents of the region before Winthrop arrived, men such as Graves, Conant, Blaxton, and others. Winthrop wished to bring them into the Puritan fold while enlisting them to support that cause. Most of these men, particularly those from Salem and Dorchester, were Church of

England men. No qualifications were applied to freemanship at this time--possibly to insure stability in that first year of illness and death. Within seven months, however, Winthrop confronted the freemen with an ironclad oath: "Noe man shalbe [sic] admitted to the freedom of this body politicke, but such as are members of some of the Churches within the same."[45]

This action, if enforced, would both inhibit the freedom of other types of churches to worship, and ensure a firm grasp of the state by religious government. After centuries of experiencing the separation of church and state, this type of policy is foreign to most citizens of the United States, but it must be realized that the Puritans' actions were not only accepted, but expected as well. "Generally speaking, in colonial America it was the accepted duty of state to foster not merely religion in general, or Christianity in general, but a particular form of Christian faith and polity."[46] The action had a deeper significance as well:

> The infringement of the Charter by the adoption of such a restriction upon freemanship at once placed the central government of the colony upon a religious foundation where it intended to be, for the Massachusetts Bay settlement had now become no ordinary offshoot of English colonization. It formed an exception to every known condition governing England's expansion beyond the seas, for it was called into being for divine, not human ends. The question naturally arises as to how broad was the religious base upon which the government of the colony rested.[47]

In time, four classes emerged in the Massachusetts Bay colony: freemen, always a minority, who voted for the governor, magistrates, and deputies, representing only themselves; church members who had never offered themselves for freemanship, of whom there were quite a few; inhabitants who were neither freemen nor church members but who were in accord with the aims of the colony and had therefore taken the oath of fidelity; and lastly, those who were neither freemen nor church members, legally in the colony but not of it, and the loyalty of whom the Puritans no doubt severely questioned. The relative sizes of these groups, though, are impossible to estimate.[48]

By the late 1650's, especially at Boston under John Endecott, stringent measures had become laws against "heretics." For Quakers, there was banishment and then death if exile was not effective enough. Baptists were subject to strict persecution as well, as they had been successful with several converts to their beliefs and therefore posed a threat to Separatist religious domination. The workhouse was always a suitable place for such as dared air their dissatisfaction with the Puritan system. "And to keep Anglicans in their place, it was now a crime--previously it had been only a social error though serious enough--to celebrate Christmas by 'forbearing labor, feasting, or in any other way.'"[49] In this way, " a body of strong-minded clergymen

in Massachusetts Bay saw to it that the Church as they interpreted it in New England was vastly different from the Church over which Laud presided."[50] In theory, the Puritans acknowledged the overlordship of the Anglican church, but in actuality their only authority was that of God and the Bible. Membership in the true Church was not permitted until one had shown proof of election: convincing testimony before the whole congregation that he or she had received personal conviction of salvation and a personal conversion. Even during such a religious age, such assurance was granted to but few, who became the elite. "Upon church members the unconverted could look with envy and yearning because they enjoyed special benefits on earth as well as the prospect of heaven."[51] Thus the church, with its privileges for a certain elite, contained in it the seeds of intolerance--so keenly felt by Anglicans and "heretics" of other persuasions, and also the seeds of rigorous independence as keenly felt a century later by the Mother Country.

Inevitably, there were immediate consequences stemming from this policy. Some of the Anglican planters at Plymouth were so disgusted with the general attitudes against those who adhered to the beliefs of the Church of England that they eventually decided to move elsewhere to start settlements more conducive to the practices o the Church of England. Matthew Craddock and others formed individual

plantations in Connecticut; Sir Richard Saltonstall of the Massachusetts Bay Company began one near what is now Medford, Connecticut, which subsequently became a center for agriculture and trade. There were, because of Craddock's high standing with the Massachusetts Bay Colony, many hard feelings as a result of their discrimination against him. His plantation amounted to little in itself.[52]

The two outstanding examples of the Saints' actions against Anglicans, however, were the cases of Thomas Morton and, later, Sir Edmund Andros.

CHAPTER 2

Thomas Morton and His Maypole at Merrymount

Inevitably, the severities instituted by the Pilgrims and Puritans were resented by many who did not approve of those in power and also whose opinions were severly reprobated. The essence of the question of power was whether the dissenting minority or the representatives of the majority should prevail. The magistrates from both Plymouth and Boston represented the public opinion of their respective settlements. The century was one of strong opinion, tenaciously held, and there was no middle ground.[1] Thomas Morton was one extreme against which these authorities fought.

Morton was a prime example of the "victimization" practiced by the Puritans. It is wise to study his activities with both reserve and enthusiasm: reserve judgment while enjoying his escapades. There is a cloudy area in the relations between Morton and the Separatists and Puritans. It has been assumed that, on one hand, Morton was held in disgrace in the Massachusetts Bay settlements because of his pagan behavior. On the other hand, it has been equally easy to assume that he was exiled from his beloved New England for reasons of military defense only. The lines between the two may not be clear, and each motive may have been employed at some time or another during this long struggle; nor is it as easy to assume that the differences were not ideological.

A decision as to why Morton was persecuted can be reached only after careful analysis is completed. One matter alone is clear: "There is to the student of early New England history no more engaging or diverting character than this gentleman-lawyer of Clifford's Inn, whose whimsical career amid the encircling gloom of the Pilgrim and Puritan surroundings lends color and vivacity to the scene."[2]

Mystery surrounds Morton's earlier years. Even the year of his birth is uncertain. He was a gentleman by birth, of the propertied class and held the lawful right to bear a coat of arms.[3] The most evidence concerning his life in England is that surrounding the chancery suit, which Morton handled for one Dame Alice Miller, a wealthy widow about his own age.[4] Her eldest son, a "ruffian" according to more quaint accounts,[5] began suing Dame Alice for control of the estate. Morton was hired as her lawyer and five years later, in 1621, he married the widow and became a member of the family, making matters even more complicated. Despite the cupidity of the heir-at-law, the case was decided against Morton in June of 1623, probably more by default than by right: Morton disappeared in February and had not been seen[6] until he surfaced in New England.

Initial impressions may be gained of Morton's character and learning by perusing Bradford's History of the Plymouth

Plantation and Morton's own New England Canaan. According to the former, Thomas Morton's status was questionable, as his origins were of Furnival's Inn,[7] the least reputable of inns and a questionable place in which to be trained as a lawyer. In reality, "he [Morton] was a man of some learning, of equal wit, and of an exceedingly jovial disposition."[8] With this learning and wit he burst upon the New England scene and wreaked such havoc that the Puritans barely survived, literally.

There is some confusion about the date that Morton came to the New World. The years 1622 and 1624 are the two controversial dates; the latter seems to be the most accurate.[9] In the year 1624, then, Morton accompanied a group of men led by Captain Wollaston, who proceeded to abandon the colony of Mount Wollaston in favor of Virginia. Many of the men in the group were indentured servants, some of whom stayed with Morton,[10] while others were taken to be sold in Virginia. "Thomas Morton . . . now proceeded to take control of the situation in a manner entirely satisfactory to himself, the rest of the stranded Quincy band [those who had been abandoned by Wollaston] and, it was darkly rumored, the less virtuous of the Indian squaws."[11]

Morton was a busy man in the New World, and New England Canaan reveals that he often wandered far afield from Merry Mount--the renamed Mount Wollaston--sailing up and down the

coast and penetrating deep into the interior in search of furs, even as far as the Kennebec River in Maine.[12] No early English settler was more delighted with New England than was Thomas Morton. He had none of the "dour misgivings" of Bradford and the other Pilgrims. He was entranced with the Indians, the wildlife, and the beauty of the New World. Only Captain John Smith left a more complete record of its resources.[13] Morton was a thorough sportsman and loved outdoor life passionately. He became a great favorite of the Indians, and trade was brisk.[14] His interests were prompted in part, at least, by a "realistic evaluation of the gain to be taken from the resources of the region."[15] Morton says, ". . . and while our houses were building, I did endeavor to take a survey of the Country: the more I looked, the more I liked it."[16] This affection shows itself in the most poetic description of New England found in the New England Canaan:

> For so many goodly groves of trees; dainty fine round rising hillocks: delicate faire large plaines, sweet cristall fountaines, and cleare running streames, that twine in fine meanders through the meads, making so sweete a murmering noise to heare, as would even lull the sences with delight a sleepe, so pleasantly doe they glide upon the pebble stones, jetting most jocundly where they doe meete; and hand in hand runne downe to Neptune's court, to pay the yearly tribute, which they owe to him as sovereigne Lord of all the springs. Contained within the volume of the Land, Fowles in abundance, Fish in multitude, and discovered besides. Millions of Turtledoves one [sic] the greene boughes: which sate pecking, of the full ripe pleasant grapes, that were supported by the lusty trees, whose fruitfull loade did

> cause the arms to bend, which here and there dispersed (you might see) Lillies of the Daphnean-tree, which made the Land to mee seeme paradice, for in mine eie, t'was Natures Masterpeece: Her Cheifest Magazine of all where lives here store: if this Land be not rich, then is the whole World poore.[17]

Morton did not spend all his time exploring, however. He set about to make Merry Mount--a suitable mispronunciation of Ma-re Mount, the Indian name for the locale and the name Morton chose to replace Mount Wollaston--a center for robust Elizabethan living. The more conservative historians agree that "Merry-Mount was unquestionably, so far as temperence and morality were concerned, by no means a commendable place."[18] Morton even won his support at Merry Mount in his own inimitable style: "having more craft than honesty," as Bradford alleges,[19] Morton plied his fellow colonists with liquor and feasting, and, when they were in no condition to object, made the indentured servants agree to being set free and setting up their own settlement under his direction. He also made them partners with him.[20] Generous offers such as these probably needed little coercion to achieve cooperation. Apparently, there were about seven who had remained with Morton.[21] One of these, Bagnall, lived alone in the years after Merry Mount--Winthrop called him a "wicked fellow," who had "much wronged the Indians." He met a much deserved fate at the hands of an Indian sagamore.[22]

The change of name for the settlement, of course, called for a celebration, which was conducted in conjunction

with May Day. Morton himself describes the merriment, which as planned after the "old Enlish Custome" with maypole--over eighty feet high--a barrel of beer and other types of liquor, and plenty of good company. A song[23] was specially written by the host of Merry Mount, as was a poem to adorn the pole, accompanied by a pair of antlers. ". . . It stood as a faire sea marke for directions, how to finde out the way to mine Host of Ma-re Mount."[24] "Here was a breath of the English Renaissance come to America."[25]

There was also a serious side to the settlement: trading; and related to this activity was Morton's ability to appreciate the Indians without trying to civilize them.[26] Morton, in fact, understood the Indians much better than his disapproving neighbors, and his method of dealing with them made their contact both profitable and enjoyable. "No Pilgrim could compete with an Indian as a trapper and none could equal Morton in his ability to get on with the redmen and to obtain their confidence and their furs."[27] This talent led to later friction with the Puritans and Pilgrims, who were already disturbed with his lifestyle.

Morton's religious status was also a matter of interest for the Saints. On his first visit, he showed little evidence of any particular affiliation except with those who disliked Pilgrim prejudice and rules. His second visit, however, was one of spite and he appeared, as he claimed, as

a representative of the Church of England in a "crusade against Puritan intolerance." His religious duties, naturally, had little effect on his secular activities.[28] Morton says:

> . . . and the rather because mine host was a man that indeavoured to advaunce the dignity of the Church of England; which they, (on the contrary part), would laboure to vilifie with uncivile termes: enveying against the sacred booke of common prayer, and mine host that used it in a laudable manner amongst his family, as a practise of piety.[29]

Morton himself had little reverence and respect for the Puritan view:

> The harmles mirth made by younge men . . . was much distasted, of the precise Separatists: that keepe much a doe, about the tyth of muit and cummin, troubling their braines more then reason would require about things that are indifferent: and from that time sought occasion against my honest Host of Ma-re Mount to overthrow his ondertakings and to destroy his plantation quite and clean.[30]

According to "mine Host," the "precise Separatists" did not appreciate the jollity nearby, and threatened to make it a "woefull Mount," instead of a "Merry Mount."[31] The poem on the maypole was a riddle to the Pilgrims, and even Morton confessed that it was somewhat "enigmaticall," and he claimed that this was part of the reason for their "consuming rage against him."[32] Bradford's famous paragraph summarizes the loathing felt for Morton at Plymouth:

> They then fell to utter licentiousness, and led a dissolute and profane life. Morton became the Lord of Misrule, and maintained, as it were, a school of atheism. As soon as they acquired some

> by trading with the Indians, they spent it in drinking wine, and strong drinks to great excess--as some reported, £10 worth, in a morning! They set up a maypole, drinking and dancing about it for several days at a time, inviting the Indian women for their consorts, dancing and frolicking together like so many fairies--or furies rather, to say nothing of worse practices. It was as if they had revived the celebrated feasts of the Roman goddess Flora, or the beastly practices of the mad Bacchanalians, Morton, to show his poetry, composed sundry verses and rhymes, some tending to lasciviousness and others to the detraction and scandal of some persons, affixing them to his idle, or idole maypole. They changed the name of the place, and instead of calling it Mount Wollaston, they called it Marry Mount, as if this jollity would last forever.[33]

Less documented, but as valid a reason for Pilgrim discontent, was competition in the beaver and fur trade. Morton was not merely a carousing idler befuddled with drink; he was also a shrewd hunter with a "genial humanity wide enough to include the Indians as members of the human race."[34] The competition extended to Maine: Morton followed the Pilgrims there in 1625, and when they returned to the Kennebec the following year they found that Morton had anticipated them by picking up almost everything of value. Morton claimed that his men made £1,000 over a few years, a profit that would have paid half the Pilgrims' bills and bought needed supplies. These "interlopers" were "snatching bread right out of Plymouth's mouth."[35] Important in the decision to expel Morton, though not publicized, was the fact that he was paying a higher price for the furs than were the Pilgrim traders.[36] The trading in Merry Mount

"bred a kinde of hart burning in the Plimmouth Planters who after sought occasion against mine Host to overthrowe his undertakings, and to destroy his Plantation, whome they accoumpted a maine enemy to their Church and State."[37] As usual, Morton was astute in guessing the motives of his dour neighbors.

Fortunately for the Pilgrims' records--for justifying themselves, that is--a new problem arose which made it imperative to rid themselves of this scamp from Merry Mount. They now had substantial cause to vindicate their own position: rival traffic in furs, and the accompanying frolics, had earned little but remonstrances from the Pilgrims, but when Merry Mount became a center for the trade in guns, powder, and molds for shot, as well as lessons in the use thereof, a decision was crucial. They reminded Morton of a royal proclamation against selling firearms to the Indians, whereupon Morton replied that the proclamation did not stand as law. They would, moreover, find it hard on themselves if they came to molest him. Further action was entrusted to Miles Standish, defender of Plymouth.

Morton gives an engaging account of the next segment of his history. He still insists that it was because of their jealousy over his success in the beaver, not gun, trade which made them furious.

> Many threatening speeches were given out both against his person and his Habitation, which they divulged should be consumed with fire: And taking advantage of the time when his company (which seemed little to regard, their threats) were gone up into the Islands, to trade with the Salvages for Beaver.
>
> They set upon my honest host at a place, called Wessaguscus, where (by accident) they found him. The inhabitants there were in good hope, of the subvertion of the plantation at Mare Mount, (which they principally aymed at;) and the rather, because mine Host was a man that indeavoured to advaunce the dignity of the Church of England . . . .[38]

While Morton carefully avoided the mention of gun trading, Bradford was most emphatic about this point. "Hitherto the Indians round here had no guns or other arms but their bows and arrows, nor for many years after. They scarcely dared handle guns, they were so afraid of them; and the very sight of one, though out of kilter, was a terror to them."[39] Bradford also alleges that Morton was not content to sell the guns and ammunition; he also taught them how to use the weapons, and gave them, in addition, molds to make shot of all kinds. In fact, "it is well-known that they often have powder and shot when the English lack it and cannot get it, it having been bought up and sold to the Indians at a schilling per pound--for they will buy it at any price."[40] The normally staid William Bradford lost his temper at the thought of such injustice: "Oh, the horror of this villainy! How many Dutch and English have lately been killed by Indians, thus furnished! and no remedy is provided--nay, the evil has increased."[41] An additional complaint was the

matter of Morton's sale of alcohol to the Indians, a charge which he largely denied.[42]

The incident at Wessagusset--or Wessaguscus--was the Pilgrims' first attempt to provide a remedy. Morton recounts that "the Conspirators sported themselves at my honest host . . . & were so jocund that they feasted their bodies, and fell to tippeling, as if they had obtained a great prize--like the Trojans when they had the custody of Hippeus' pinetree horse."[43] In the meantime, Morton refused food and drink to keep his wits sharp, and when his captors were dull and drowsy with drink, he slipped out of their jail. He could not resist slamming the second door, which woke those in charge of his keeping, who cried "O he's gon, he's gon, what shall wee doe he's gon?"[44] Miles Standish was so angry, Morton reports, that "Captain Shrimp" tore his clothes. "The rest were eager to have torne theire haire from theire heads, but it was so short, that it would give them no hold; . . . ."[46]

Apparently, by this time several other scattered settlements were adding their complaints to those of the Pilgrims. They protested twice to Morton, but received flippant answers.[46] In June of 1628, Captain Standish was sent to Merry Mount, to order Morton to surrender. Bradford maintains that the inhabitants were too drunk to defend themselves, but defense was stiff nonetheless. "And

if they had not been overarmed with drink, more harm might have been done."[47] Bradford's classic account of the "battle" provides as much humor as Morton's writings:

> They [the Pilgrim troop] summoned him to yield, but they got nothing but scoffs from him. At length, fearing they would wreck the house, some of his crew came out--intending not to yield, but to shoot, but they were so drunk that their guns were too heavy for them. He himself with a carbine overcharged and almost half-filled with powder and shot, tried to shoot Captain Standish, but he stepped up to him and put aside his gun and took him. No harm was done on either side, except that one of his men was so drunk that he ran his nose upon the point of a sword that someone held in front of him on entering the house; but all he lost was a little of his hot blood.[48]

With Morton safely in captivity, it now remained only to make a decision about his fate. Execution may have been considered, but was rejected due to Morton's status and powerful friends in England. Exile did not work effectively in so large an environment--he could easily settle again into his bad habits elsewhere. Thus a decision was made to send him back to England, feasible only when they could find a man willing to take him on board.

Meanwhile,

> . . . These worthies set mine Host upon an Island, without gunne, powther, or shot, or dogge, or so much as a knife, to get anythinge to feede upon or any other cloathes to shelter him with at winter then a thin suite which hee had on at that time. Home hee could not get to Ma-re Mount upon this Island. Hee stayed a moneth at least, and was releeved by the Salvages that tooke notice that Mine Host was a Sachem of Pessonagessit, and would bring bottles of strong liquor to him and unite themselves into a league of brotherhood with mine host, so full of humanity are these infidels before these Christians.[49]

At length a Captain was found to carry him to England, where little of significance took place regarding the charges made against him. Some of his followers reunited after his expulsion and carried on as before, inviting the wrath of the recently-arrived John Endecott.[50] Salem, closer to Merry Mount than Plymouth was, began to take an active interest in the rebels at that place, and its jurisdiction over Merry Mount would later lead to friction between their respective leaders.

For a while, even though they had exiled their thorn in the flesh, the Pilgrims experienced much loss, adversity and illness. In the midst of these trials, they received an unexpected visit. "They could not have been more surprised if Satan himself had come to jeer at their reverses and mock them in their grief." It was almost impossible to believe; but Thomas Morton's leer was, if subdued, still recognizable.[51] This time, he not only stood as friend to powerful men in England but had also become an agent of several of these Lords with vast properties in New England. Reluctantly, Bradford and the others advised Morton that he could stay the winter at Plymouth, if he would leave "as soon as winter breaks up." Standish was offended with this decision and threatened to shoot Morton. In the meantime, Morton spent his time trying to recruit settlers and annoying Standish. The former effort, though accompanied by promises

of large grants of land at New Haven, was scorned by everyone, Winslow was pleased to report. He persuaded only one man to go with him but it was no loss to Plymouth, as he was "old, weake, & decreped, a very athiest, & fitt companion for him."[52]

Since the coming of the Puritans, Merrymount had become a part of the jurisdiction of the Massachusetts Bay Company,[53] and it was with the authorities there that Morton now had to deal, for he returned to his old haunt[54] and soon experienced a repetition of what had happened earlier. In this case, there were other curious elements as well. James Truslow Adams holds that there were indeed valid reasons for Morton's arrest, but when this was accomplished, the grounds bore a "curiously trumped up appearance." No crime was mentioned in the order for arrest, and only a vague reference was made to the "many wrongs" he had done the Indians, along with the theft of a canoe. Adams holds that

> . . . it was not likely that, from their standpoint, there had been any very serious crime committed against them [the Indians] by a man living almost isolated in their midst, and whose sole business was trading with them. The convenient, but apparently unfounded, suspicions of a murder committed by him in England, and a warrant procured from the Chief Justice for his shipment thither, could not well have served as a basis for any sentence inflicted in Massachusetts.[55]

The Puritans therefore may have merely wanted to teach the "old planters" a lesson, for which Morton was the most convenient victim. They may also have suspected that he was in

secret communication with Gorges--fears that proved to be correct.[56]

During Morton's second stay in New England, his main foe, dubbed irreverently "a great swelling fellow" and "Littleworth," was John Endecott, who had recently arrived in Salem armed with a patent for all Massachusetts. Endecott, in "his progress to and froe," used the patent, locked up in a covered case, as an emblem of authority, which vulgar people took to be "some instrument of musick," and "this man of littleworth . . . a fiddler." He forced everyone to accept his "articles of government," drawn up by himself and the Salem minister" on threat of exile. Morton, wary and independent, declared it a "mousetrap" and refused to comply with the order to put all his goods in the general stock, to be handled by an organization headed, of course, by Endecott. A year of this system resulted in disaster: the colonies had run out of corn--it had all been traded off--while sickness compounded the situation. More than half the people died. Morton showed a profit of six- or seven-fold. Endecott then ordered Morton's grain seized, which bothered Morton very little; he laughed at Endecott and sent word that he was getting along with game and venison--the grain was not needed.[57] He evaded arrest for the winter, but Winthrop finally succeeded in capturing him, and subsequently reported that Morton returned to England, where

he posed as a Church of England martyr and wrote the New England Canaan.[58] The actual sentence was unusually severe:[59]

> It is ordered . . . that Thomas Morton, of Mount Wolliston, shall presently be sett into the billbowes, & after sent into England, by the shipp called the Gifte . . .; that all his goods shalbe seazed upon to defray the charge of his transportacon, payment of his debts, & give satisfaccon to the Indians for a canoe hee uniustly took away from them & that his house . . . shalbe burnt for their satisfaccon, for many wrongs hee had done them from tyme to tyme.[60]

There is no wonder why Morton wrote, "And therefore I cannot chuse, but conclude, that these Separatists have speciall gifts: for they are given to envy, and malice extremely."[61]

Little did the Puritans suspect the harvest they would reap from their actions toward Morton: upon his arrival in England an embittered "mine Host" launched a two-fold attack on the Massachusetts colony.

Having been earlier in communication with Ferdinando Gorges, Morton made his grievances known to his old friend and Gorges' partner, John Mason. This was the first method of attack. He was joined by two notable malcontents of New England, Christopher Gardiner and Philip Ratcliffe. "This development was the prelude to a dramatic conflict for control of the plantations in New England which lasted more than ten years."[62] As a result, a new inquiry was raised to investigate the Massachusetts Bay Company in 1632.[63]

The main character in England was this man, Sir Ferdinando Gorges, a doughty veteran of the military and leader in attempts to colonize New England for commercial profit. He

had arranged the granting of large tracts of land to prominent members of government and had sent his son Robert to secure their own shares, a mission which largely failed. The Massachusetts Bay Company Charter had ruined many of his hopes and he attempted to reverse the situation through his influence. Adams again summarizes the situation:

> Gorges had no enmity toward the Puritans and did not wish to remove them in a bodily sense from New England, but he did wish to effect the annulment of their Charter, in order to bring them under control of the Council and of himself as the governor general of New England that he hoped to be.[64]

In the Privy Council he was supported by Archbishop Laud of Canterbury, whose objections to the Puritan colony were on a religious basis. Gardiner, Ratcliffe and Morton played admirably into the hands of Gorges, Mason and Laud as strong witnesses against the Puritans, for they were not only discontented but had come straight from New England and knew the situation through personal acquaintance with it. Moreover, "whatever his shortcomings may have been, [Morton] was a lawyer of no mean ability, and the ferreting of a lawyer of parts into the circumstances of the passing of the Charter and its transfer to America was something the Puritan leaders would have been quite willing to prevent."[65] According to Bradford the complaints Morton raised were "trumped-up,"[66] a natural disclaimer on the part of the colonists.

The accusations issued by Gorges with the aid of Morton were that: the colonists were intending rebellion and

casting off their allegiance to England; they were attempting to become wholly separate from the Church of England and its laws; and the ministers and people of the colony were known to be railing against the state, the church, the bishops, and so on. A petition against Massachusetts Bay Colony was duly drawn up,[67] and in December of 1632 it was presented to the Privy Council. Winthrop provides a succinct account:

> By this ship we had intelligence from our friends in England, that Sir Ferdinando Gorges and Capt. Mason (upon the instigation of Sir Christoper Gardiner, Morton, and Ratcliffe) had preferred a petition to to the Lords of the Privy Council against us, charging us with many false accusations; but . . . their malicious practice took not effect. The principle matter they had against us was, the letters of some indiscreet persons among us, who had written against Church government in England etc. which had been intercepted.[68]

This decision of the Privy Council to support the colonists surprised everyone; more so, because the Council went on to offer them further support. On the one hand, they felt that they could not discourage a colony that was of "potential value" to the nation, and, on the other hand, the witnesses in the case were not very respectable. Gorges' first attempt to "assert the general rights of the New England Council" was, at least for a while, blocked.[69] There were other struggles that dragged on, but the story was nearly always the same.

Morton now turned to his second method of retribution, one that had been used with success by various other men anxious to advertise their grievances: he wrote a book. On

the surface, it was a glowing account of the resources and beauty of New England. It is also a poorly-concealed attempt to discredit his enemies in Plymouth and Massachusetts Bay. Directly related to his account, entitled New England Canaan, is the notion of a chosen land for believers, a distinctly religious proposition, although applied in a sarcastic sense by its author. Larzer Ziff explains further:

> The most typical Puritan colonial appeal spoke centrally of the probability of the settler's improving himself materially, and surrounded this attractive proposition with a justification of the legality of migration. The justification went first to the Bible. . . . America was a lawful place for settlement not because it was a promised land, but, on the contrary, because there no longer was such a particular locale--neither England nor America nor Canaan--and therefore all places were suitable for the elect, provided the law of nations was not violated in their taking them up. . . . [America's] discovery and development at just that point in history did argue that it was providentially provided . . . .[70]

It is Ziff who points out that "the term 'New English Canaan' would receive its first prominent use not from the Puritans but from Thomas Morton, . . . and it would be applied ironically."[71]

New England Canaan is divided into three books, the first of which contains a description of the geography, flora and fauna of the region, the second a picture of the natives and their customs, and the third an account of the doings at Merrymount. The book is designed to be a report for the Privy Council but there is no mention of it in the proceedings of that body. The outcome of the struggle in

favor of the Puritans seems to point to its having little or no influence at all. The work does have significance for it contains a record of events which would have been lost otherwise. Moreover, it is one of the most charming and entertaining pieces of propaganda surrounding the colonization of New England. "This work gives us the first gleam," Channing notes, "of that particular humor which now seems indigenous to the American soil."[72]

Among the more humorous aspects of New England Canaan is Morton's treatment of those who opposed him. His "portrait of the Saints contains as much truth--and as little--as theirs of him. Both are caricatures. Between them there is nothing to choose--except, perhaps, that his is etched with a more practised hand . . . than Bradford's."[73] Bradford recorded his reaction to Morton's work: "But he got free again and wrote an infamous and scurilous book full of lies and slanders against many godly men of the country in high position, and of profane calumnies against their names and persons, and the ways of God."[74]

The weight of historical opinion has generally been against acceptance of Morton's report, yet there may be general truth in the charges he leveled against the Puritans. In the particulars of his report, however, one must always question whether he is accurate or whether he has juggled the details to strengthen his case before the Privy

Council. These problems are complicated by the semi-fictional nature of Morton's narrative and by the lack of clarity in his language.[75] "There is . . . a curious mixture of fact, fiction, and forensic force in Morton's book. History, drama, poetry, and propaganda are so closely joined together that it is often difficult to distinguish one element from another."[76]

Nonetheless, his book stands out among those written by his contemporaries for two reasons: first, there is an emphasis on the "resources and products of the land as commodities" and a careful consideration of possibilities of exploration; and second, there is an appeal to the imagination, "which is the result of his efforts to poetize the scene."[77] The book was popular because of its comedy, a result of Morton's wit and adroit references to classical and Biblical literature as well as his introduction of incongruity and intrigue. This comedy was sharpened by his lampooning of prominent New England leaders with ludicrous names such as "Radamanthus," "Captain Shrimp," "Dr. Noddy," and "Captain Littleworth." Most popular was his description of his capture by the "'Nine Worthies' of Plymouth and his trial before three judges from the 'infernal regions.'"[78]

Donald F. Connors, Morton's biographer, notes that the third portion of New England Canaan is far different from the lighthearted sections preceding it. The New World is

anything but a paradise: instead, it is a "dark land, a Stygian country," although there is plenty of comedy. The third section contains the inherant clash between Merrymount and the Puritan settlements, not only in the areas of religion and politics, but in the entertainment and imagery as well. The central symbol stands as the maypole, "multifoliate image and symbol, festooned with light and dark colors, and surrounded by the festival spirit of Elizabethan holidays and faint memories of Bacchic orgies, mysterious cults, and fertility rites of the past."[79] The central concept was the clash between Morton and his neighbors.

Whatever the symbolism and significance of the work as it stands today, when it was published it represented the documentation of the ongoing, deep-seated struggle between Morton and the Puritan leaders, between Anglican and Separatist, and stands as an expression of the latter's attempt to become orthodox in the New World.

Eventually, Morton was dismissed from Gorges' service because of the former's association with one George Cleeve, who had obtained a title to property in Maine from Gorges but had proceeded to disrupt the peace there and flout Gorges' authority. This dismissal, however, did not sever relations between Gorges and Morton on a personal level. Later, in 1643, Morton returned to the New World himself. "What induced him to go is hard to say, but there is reason

to think that he was engaging in an effort to investigate, look after or secure title to properties located in different parts of the country."[80] He may have been acting as an agent for others.[81] He wintered, with permission from the authorities, at Plymouth, and went into the wilderness in the Spring. His activities there are still a mystery.[82]

By September, 1644 he was once again the prisoner of the Boston authorities. He had been watched carefully by Endecott since his arrival and when Morton went before the magistrates, the charges consisted of his behavior when in England.[83] Connors adds further insight:

> Morton came to New England again in 1643, when this letter [See appendix 3] and a book he had wrote, full of invectives, were produced against him. He was truly called the accuser of the brethren. [He came first to New Haven and bro't letters from the Earl of Carlisle and Mr. Rigby which did not protect him. He went from thence to Boston [where] the court fined him £100. He was . . . unable to pay it. Nothing but his age saved him from the whipping post.[84]

Morton denied the charges, and even when they "produced the copy of the bill exhibited by Sir Christopher Gardiner, etc.,"[85] in which the Puritans were charged with treason and rebellion and in which Morton was named as a party, Morton insisted that he had merely been called as a witness. The authorities then produced further proof implicating Morton as an instigator of the petition against them.[86]

Morton was in jail for about a year while the authorities awaited further evidence from England. Winthrop concluded his concern with the affair by saying, "He was a

charge to the country, for he had nothing, and we thought it not fit to inflict corporal punishment upon him, being old and crazy, but thought better to fine him and give him his liberty."[87]

The old "Host of Ma-re Mount" went to Gorges' settlement at Agamenticus in Maine, later called York, where he died about two years after his trial.[88] The English West Country ways of the men there--more rough and relaxed than those at Plymouth--were more congenial to his own habits.[89]

His existence in New England was not without significance:

> For all his waywardness, pedantry and bitterness, he shines like a single bright gem from out the dourness and solemnity of early settlement with its prevailing intolerance and persecution, soon to be challenged by far abler men such as Roger Williams and Thomas Hooker. Even before the Saints broke Morton's spirit, there in the tight little circle of the "Blue Hills of Massachusetts," voices were already demanding democratic expression, free government, free enterprise and religious tolerance.[90]

Perhaps, most importantly, Morton had documented the shift from Puritan heterodox minority to orthodox majority in their position in the New World: " . . . for they had resolved what hee [sic] should suffer, because (as they boasted) they were now become the greater number: they had shaked of [sic] their shackles of servitude, and were become Masters, and a masterless people."[91]

What must be noted is that Morton's suffering at the hands of the Pilgrims and Puritans was not solely on

religious grounds. Although he claimed to be a martyr for the Anglican Church, and took his stand as a representative of the Church of England, there is little doubt that this self-designated position was one of convenience and not one of real conviction. One cannot help but consider that his disclaimers in New England Canaan were calculated to help his own cause as a witness for Gorges' case and to vindicate his involvement in an undesirable feud. There were two important reasons for his being a threat to the Saints in both colonies: his superior trading techniques resulted in their jealousy and became a danger to their economy, and his freedom in bestowing guns and related equipment on the savages wreaked havoc on their worst fears for defense.

Yet religion did play an important part in the episode, to the extent that almost all the activites of the Pilgrims and Puritans were motivated by piety and religious fervor. This inspiration perhaps provided a blanket, under which all other actions could fit with the just explanation that it was "God's will" that it should be done that certain way.

Morton was, perhaps unjustly, a victim of this devout society's desire to set up a kingdom of God on earth, a place where His elect could be safe from "persecutions" of the Anglican Church. The distance of history allows the observer to see both sides of the question, and although circumstances are sometimes clouded by faulty records and

overbearing prejudice, it is possible to understand the position of each party and sympathize with the difficulties they faced.

CHAPTER 3

Edmund Andros and His Anglican Government

The colonies continued to prosper and grow in an independent manner. As New England's prosperity increased, society became less austere and the larger towns lost their rustic simplicity: there were coaches and periwigs for the men, and silk petticoats, gold brooches, earrings and similar baubles for the women, both godly and ungodly. Anglican clergymen were more numerous and there was even a court party composed of supporters of the royal governor--mainly merchants, Anglicans and wealthy, privileged folk who had distrusted the pious Puritans in smaller towns. "The old order was changing."[1]

So, too, was the attitude of the crown toward the wayward colonies changing. In 1676 the Lords of Trade, realizing that not all was well in the affairs of New England, sent an agent, Edward Randolph, to look into the situation. This worthy gentleman immediately became a nuisance to the Massachusetts Bay authorities. A loyal servant of the king and devout communicant of the Anglican Church, Randolph could see nothing good in the independence of Massachusetts Bay. However, "biased as were Randoph's reports, they contained much truth and confirmed suspicions . . . held by the Lords of Trade."[2]

In 1684, the King declared the Charter null and void, and the deputies' and magistrates' worst fears materialized. "Now the devil and all his hosts even to the surpliced priests of Church of England might be expected on their sacred soil."[3]

In addition, plans began to take form for a confederation of New England. It was not the first of such ideas: Sir Ferdinando Gorges had originally designed settlements to be set up in New England under a "common central government," with a governor general heading it. Andrews describes Gorges' idea:

> The erection of such a government and appointment of a governor over all was in the mind of Gorges from the beginning, and was an ever present reality to the people settled in the various plantations in New England, until the coming of Andros, an appointee not of the Council but of the crown, marked the first attempt to carry out the plan. But by that time Massachusetts Bay had become too powerful and the attempt was a failure.[4]

The man chosen to implement the plan of confederation was Edmund Andros, mentioned in the above quote, and most of the reasons for its failure were the religious differences between the governor and the governed.

Henry Ferguson, in Essays in American History, provides a biography of Andros' life. He was born in London on December 6, 1637, to a family prominent among the adherents to Charles I. His father, Amias Andros, possessed an estate on the island of Guernsey and was royal bailiff of the island and Marshal of Ceremonies for the King at the time of Edmund's birth. His mother was Elizabeth Stone. Edmund's own career was military: he helped his father defend the Castle Cornet against Parliament during the Civil War, and after its surrender went to Holland where he took lessons in the field under Prince Henry of Nassau. He was restored to his home at the age of twenty-three.

Promotions came quickly; his uncle was in the household service of the Queen of Bohemia and Andros was made gentleman-in-ordinary in the same household, a post he held for two years, from 1660 to 1662. The part he played in the war with the Dutch earned him further distinction, and in 1671 he married a kinswoman of the Earl of Craven. The marriage was a rather high one, and it served to detach him from his soldier's life. At this point he began to take an interest in American affairs. In addition, his father died in 1674, and Edmund inherited some of the duties formerly held by his father.[5]

At the end of the Second Dutch War, his regiment was mustered out of service and he was selected to accept the surrender of New York and its dependencies. He was subsequently appointed Lieutenant Governor of that province, where he acted as confidential agent to the Duke of York. "His treatment of the conquered Dutch was marked with great tact and judgment, and rarely had the transfer of a colony of one nation to the rule of another been effected with so little friction or disturbance."[6]

Religious issues were to play a large role in the Andros method of administration and in the reasons for his overthrow. This importance was seen early in his gubernatorial career in New York. There were three cases in which religion was involved.

The first case concerned a proclamation of 1675 requiring the Dutch to take an oath of allegiance. A question was raised as to religious freedom, and the Dutch asked Andros if he would confirm their religious freedom and assure them that in time of war they would not be pressed into service. "But Andros ordered the oath to be taken without qualification or explanation."[7] As Richard Nicolls, a previous deputy governor--who had obtained the surrender of Peter Stuyvessant--had earlier guaranteed religious freedom, eight prominent burghers, including Steenwyck, Van Brugh, De Peyster and Bayard, petitioned Andros to be allowed to take the oath as Nicolls had revised it. The petition was not only rejected but the men were thrown into prison as well for being factious and trying to raise a disturbance against the government. In addition, Bayard's lands and goods were forfeited to the King. Understandably upset, the Dutch ambassadors brought the matter to the attention of the Duke of York and "Andros was reminded of the desire of the proprietor that the Dutch should be treated with all the gentleness which was consistent with honor and safety." Andros apparently recognized the hint and the case was not pressed against the accused.[8]

The second event of an ecclesiastical nature involved an attempt by Andros to exercise the right of induction to a living in the Dutch Church. Nicholas van Rensselaer, a

younger son of the first patroon, had been attached to the Stuarts since the days of their exile. He had returned to the New World with Andros, having been ordained in the Church of England--and possibly in the Netherlands also. The Duke of York recommended him to be made minister to one of the Dutch churches in New York, and in 1675 Andros duly inducted him into a living at Albany as an assistant to one Dominie Schaats. This action had been taken without the recognition by the Classis of Amsterdam, the administrative body of the Dutch Reformed Church, and as a result, van Rensselaer was forbidden to baptize and the legality of his induction was refused. Van Rensselaer had apparently not sworn fidelity to the Reformed Church; when he promised to conduct his services according to that Church, he was accepted and the induction was allowed to stand.

Andros' third act connected with religion, in 1679, was to procure the confirmation of ordination of one Peter Teschenmaker, through both the Classis of the province and of Amsterdam. Teschenmaker worked along the Delaware River in a missionary and pastoring capacity. The act of such induction was unique, and was not repeated in New York as a colony. Moreover, a similar occurrence does not seem to have taken place in any other province, and, consequently, "it cannot be regarded as indicating in any special way a tendency of the civil power under Andros to encroach on the liberties of the church."[10]

"Encroaching" or not, these three cases indicate Andros' interest in regulating the religious affairs of the colony under his jurisdiction. Despite the conflicts aroused over these matters, his administration of government in New York can be considered successful: the country remained at peace--indeed, its quiet contrasted strongly with unrest in New England--and the revenues of the colony were "honestly collected and wisely administered."[11]

From November of 1677 to May of 1678, Andros took a leave of absence from the administration of New York and returned to England, where the honor of knighthood was conferred upon him. His last two years, 1679-1680, in New York were vexed with disagreements with merchants. He was openly accused by them of mismanagement of revenues. He was once again summoned home, in the early 1680's, this time to answer the charges. Although the special commissioner took the side of the merchants in the initial investigation, Andros was able to explain matters to the commissioner's satisfaction, and Andros was proclaimed innocent of the charges.[12]

The accession of James II--formerly the Duke of York--made it likely that Andros would again be employed in government service. The King duly gave him the task of consolidating New England.[13] After five years of living quietly on his Guernsey estate, Andros was again to be plunged into the turmoil of politics in the New World.[14] According to

Hutchinson, he was known to have an "arbitrary disposition;" the colonists heard that he kept a "correspondence with the colony, whilst he was governor of New York. His letters discovered much of the dictator."[15] He landed at Boston on December 20, 1685; his commission was published the same day.[16]

The Dominion of New England had already been planned: Rhode Island and Connecticut were asked to give up their charters--later both had to be forced into this action, and Connecticut, as one story goes, even hid hers in a hollow tree, but it was a mere fiction of independence--while New York and the Jerseys were next in line for incorporation. The decision was not merely for the inconvenience of the colonists and ease of administration; it also presented a great unified dominion opposite French territory to the North.[17] The first reactions to the unification were mixed:

> Some New Englanders preferred the Dominion government to the four independent governments which had existed before; but many did not. To the bureaucrat settled comfortably in Whitehall, the centralization of government at Boston and the replacement of cumbersome democracy by a governor and a council loyal to the crown seemed efficient and practical. To many inhabitants of Plymouth Colony, "efficiency" and "practicality" brought unwanted complications and hardships into their lives. For not only was the right of representative self-government now taken from them but the center of government for all New England was established at Boston.[18]

Despite fear of the drawbacks inherent in the arrangement, the beginning of Andros' administration gave hope of better things to come. He declared his high regard for the "public good and welfare" of the people, merchants and

planters alike, and directed the judges to dispense justice according to existing customs rather than by new rules, and ordered existing laws to be observed. Rates and taxes, and any colony laws "not inconsistent with his commission" were to be in force.[19] His council--men "more willow than oak in their constitutions"--was made up of moderates.[20] The powers granted him, with the consent of the council, were in keeping with the "grandeur" of the domain he controlled. The commission allowed him to make laws, levy taxes and rates and administer justice. Appeals proceeded from provincial court decisions to the king in council if it involved £300 or more. In addition, Andros became Commander-in-Chief of all the armed forces in the Dominion of New England, which consisted of both soldiers he had brought with him and local troops. Over all, he was to take all possible care to "discountenance vice and encourage virtue," and ". . . to see to it that 'liberty of conscience be allowed to all persons and that such specially as shall be comformable to the rites of the Church of England and be particularly countenanced and encouraged.'"[21]

As Andros' territory increased, the number of councillors grew as well, beginning with twenty-seven and finally expanding to forty-two. Many times, only five or ten members were present at council meetings. In fact, out of the records of eighty-four meetings, fifty-three were conducted with ten or less members present, sometimes with as few as

five.[22] This rapidly became a bone of contention in the minds of the colonists:

> Old factional differences in Massachusetts were soon buried in a common animosity for the lordly Andros who governed . . . with little reference to either the interests or feelings of the only men who might have been expected to support his regime . . . .[23]

There were valid reasons why so few sat in so many of the meetings. They could not be expected to remain permanently in Boston, nor could they continually make the long journey back and forth, in order to attend the meetings of a body whose only powers were those of advice and veto, and those none too strong. During the brief rule of Andros, therefore, the natural tendency was for the actual conduct of affairs to be guided by his own will and that of a "clique" among the councillors. Attendance steadily dwindled.[24] A tax was levied without a formal vote although there had been a heated debate over it. In addition, an order restraining emigration from the Dominion was passed at a slimly-attended meeting in New York, supposedly because a favorable vote could not be gotten at Boston. Grants of land were made to Edward Randolph and other favorites, and in meetings of eight members or less, sentences of fines and imprisonment were meted out.[25]

In June of 1686, additional powers and instructions were given to Andros, allowing him to request the charters of Rhode Island and Connecticut be given up to him.[26] A paramount and chronic complaint concerning Andros was his

lack of tact, yet, in this instance, he was gentlemanly and courteous, as seen in a letter from Andros to W. Clark, then governor of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations:

> Sir,
>
> This is to acquaint you that his majesty having been pleased to send me to the government of New England, of which you are a part, I arrived here the 20th instant where I found all very well disposed to his majesty's service: And his majesty's letter patent to me for the said government, being then published, were received with suitable demonstrations.
>
> I am commanded and authorized by his majesty, at my arrival in these parts, to receive in his name the surrender of the charter, if tendered by you, and to take you into my present care and charge, as other parts of the government, assuring his majesty's good subjects of his countenance and protection in all things relating to his service and their welfare.
>
> I have only to add, that I shall be ready and glad to do my duty accordingly, and therefore desire to hear from you as soon as may be, and remain
>
> Your very affectionate friend,
> E. Andros[27]

Despite the diplomacy and grace of this communication, neither of the two independent colonies were cooperative in Andros' attempts to do his duty. He proceeded to go to Connecticut to take the first step in consolidating the colonies,[28] and in January of 1687, he dissolved Rhode Island's government and broke its seal. Five Rhode Island citizens were added to Andros' council and a commission, irresponsible to the people, was substituted for the government.[29] Rhode Island had done its share of procrastinating, even insisting that the charter was at the governor's home and would have to be fetched, through bad weather, in order to

satisfy Andros. Connecticut fared little better.[30] Autumn of 1687 saw Governor Andros' campaign to gain control of the Connecticut government; for a time, however, the charter disappeared--presumably taking refuge in that hollow oak. Finally, the colonists submitted, "yet their consciences were afterwards 'troubled at their hasty surrender.'"[31] Even after this episode, discontent ran deep against Andros. Yet this was only one of several irritants.

The major concerns of the society were separated into varied components: merchants and farmers were polarized, and the ministry's influence was vastly reduced from leadership to the mere interpretation of events, through maintaining a sense of divine drama in daily life, lamenting rather than opposing the direction it was taking. Despite these concerns, the citizens could still find comfort in the thought that New England was still a "special place."[32]

The area of discontent most keenly felt was in the realm of religion. Friction was virtually inevitable as Andros and his supporters were Church of England men, and almost all the rest were Puritans who had, moreover, successfully kept pressures from England at bay, becoming more and more independent as the years went by. It was naturally expected that the new governor would "countenance and encourage" the establishment and expansion of his church. The irritation did not arise from that aspect of his administration until later. Yet the people were made to feel menaced,

believing that their meeting houses would be taken from them.[33] Such pressures could be easily ignored or repulsed when the Atlantic Ocean separated the colonies in the New World from England, but suddenly the threat was very present, and defenses were up in no time.

There were two immediate problems for the colonists: one was Andros' attitude, and the other was the presence in his retinue of one Mr. Robert Ratcliffe, an Episcopal minister. The Governor considered Congregational ministers as mere laymen--a condescension that contributed largely to the friction that followed: mere laymen had no authority in spiritual matters, and their wishes could therefore be ignored or tossed aside as whims. Ratcliffe's position close to Andros would naturally lend itself to great influence in religious matters. He made his position clear from the very first when he wrote: "I press for able and sober ministers, and we will contribute largely to their maintenance; but one thing will mainly help, when no marriages shall here after be allowed lawful but such as are made by the ministers of the Church of England."[34] Ratcliffe's concerns for the New World were not arbitrary or self-serving, however, as can be seen upon his return to England after the Revolution, where he actively solicited aid for the Anglican church in Boston.[35] His concerns, therefore, were genuine. He was, moreover, not the main problem.

Andros himself introduced his religious attitudes quite forcefully. His "Episcopalian zeal brought him into conflict with the Bostonians before he had been on dry land three full hours."[36] The ministers, always leaders in the community, gave a luncheon in Andros' honor, and during this meal he demanded the use of one of their meetinghouses for the purposes of holding services with Mr. Ratcliffe. Then he graciously amended that, if this were impossible, the two groups could both use a meetinghouse consecutively on Sunday mornings. Subsequently, the ministers and four members of each congregation met, and their decision was not favorable to the Governor. Mr. Ratcliffe thus held services in the town house for a time.[37]

A second offense occurred a few days later: Andros called for a celebration of Christmas. The Governor himself attended services both morning and afternoon.[38] The Puritans did not set aside the day in any special form of observance, and they viewed Andros' example with strong distaste. Between Christmas and spring there were few active moves made by the Governor that were noted.[39]

In the spring of 1687, Andros committed his third breach of religious etiquette against the Congregational Church members when he proclaimed a celebration of the anniversary of the King's coronation. It was, moreover, "Sabbath night" and there were bonfires and fireworks. Four days after there was public fencing on stage, "and that

immediately after the lecture," or midweek service. A mere four days after that a may pole was set up in Charlestown, and "the Devil," according to Increase Mather, "had begun his march of triumph."[40]

There were many other minor irritations that added to the general discontent. For instance, they were compelled to kiss the Book when taking oath in court instead of holding up their hand. No one could be married except by Episcopalian services unless bonds were given, which could be forfeited should any legal technicality go awry. No one could teach school without Andros' permission. Even worse, shops were ordered closed on the anniversary of the beheading of Charles I, and the Governor proclaimed a holiday in thanksgiving for the birth of the Pretender.[41] An yet

> Arbitrary and unnecessarily irritating as was the Governor's course in the matter, it must be confessed to have been a very mild form of religious tyranny, as compared with that customarily indulged in by the Puritans themselves. But in various minor ways he gave offense to the clergy and more bigoted laymen, whose Puritanism had at this time reached its narrowest point.[42]

In addition, Governor Andros did serve to bring about certain changes in both Puritan policy and attitude, which was to change the course of protest, and thus history, in a certain sense:

> As Andros' administration took hold . . . the New Englanders began to abandon arguments drawn from their own history, however much that history actually fed their resistance, and to concentrate on arguments drawn from the rights they possessed as Englishmen rather than New Englanders. With the accession of the Roman Catholic James and the

> resumption in France of the persecution of the Protestants in 1685, they could, they felt, make common cause with those in England who proclaimed English rights and liberties, and they did not hesitate to couple their dislike of Andros' administration with a distrust of the encroachment of Papism.[43]

Less than a century later in their protests to the Crown, the Revolutionaries would also utilize similar arguments as Englishmen. The development of and precedent for this type of protest was formed by the discontented under Andros.

The "encroachment" of Papism was a fear fanned by rumors spread concerning Andros' connection with the Roman Catholic monarch. Just as James was an ally of the French King, as the tales went, so was the Governor scheming with the French and Indians in Canada to ruin Massachusetts. The New Englanders also saw royal interest in Maine and New Hampshire as an aspect of an "anti-protestant" conspiracy. "Rabble-rousing rhetoric coupled Indian alarms with papal policy and Massachusetts with the Magna Charta [sic]."[44]

Perhaps, in the last analysis, the clearest-cut of all the problems was the element of heterodoxy and orthodoxy. In England, Puritans had been in opposition, and in America, they had been the government. Under Andros, they were once again in opposition, "and it is instructive to note in how many particulars they again proclaimed as tyranny what they themselves had been practising."[45] For example, Andros attempted to enforce laws preventing emigration from the colony without consent of the government. When this measure was enacted, the Puritans whined that they had always been

able to move about freely, and now they must be limited, ignoring the fact that there had always been such laws enacted and enforced by the Puritans themselves.[46]

In the meantime, Andros continued in his desire to have a regular meeting place for his own favorite form of worship.

> Reduced to plain statements, the personal charges against Andros seem to be, first a zeal for Episcopacy, which led him to insist upon having a place for church services in one of the Boston meetinghouses for a time; and secondly a rude or insolent carriage toward his disaffected subjects."[47]

In March of 1687, Andros sent his favorite, Randolph, to demand the keys to the South meetinghouse. When this failed, they frightened the sexton into giving them up. Subsequently a compromise was reached, the agreement being that the Anglicans and the Congregationalists should hold service in succession on Sundays. That this arrangement, virtually inevitably, soon led to friction,[48] was rather natural, considering the two parties involved. "Andros and Randolph promised fair enough, but the Episcopalian minister did not always stop at the appointed moment, neither did Parson Willard for that matter."[49] When complaints arose, Andros lost his temper and threatened to defend his position with his soldiers and counter-attacked the Puritans' arguments by reminding them that they would not give money toward a separate building for the Anglican services. Finally, they became so desperate that, with the consent of the council, Andros seized a small lot of town land upon which was begun

the constructions of King's Chapel, the first of three such sanctuaries. Andros and Randolph were deposed before construction was completed.[50] In the meantime, "nothing more clearly symbolized the collapse of the Puritan commonwealth than the Anglican prayers read from the pulpit of South Church."[51]

Andros' designs for religious oppression, as it was viewed by the Puritans, were foiled by King James' gracious declaration for freedom of conscience, but apparently it had little effect on the Governor's real attitude: the people wanted some days of thanksgiving to celebrate the proclamation, but "the governor forbade them." The reason "is not mentioned. It must be supposed to have been this, that he looked upon it to be royal prerogative to appoint such days." He threatened that they should meet at their own peril, and that soldiers would be guarding the meeting house.[52]

To complicate the matter of religion, it was rumored that Andros was a Roman Catholic, just as earlier it had been spread about that he was planning to ruin Massachusetts by scheming with the French in Canada. In the first place, he was the devoted public servant of a Roman Catholic monarch, possibly enough proof for some, and certainly a natural assumption, taken by itself. In addition, an Indian spread the story that Andros had given him a book "containing a picture of the Virgin Mary," which the governor had

supposedly said was "better than the Bible."[53] Moreover, there was the matter of St. Castine, an intruding French trader, who was living within Andros' jurisdiction as a half-savage with an assortment of Indian women, "more notable for number than virtue."[54] In 1688, Andros, aboard the frigate Rose, put into Penobscot in pursuit of St. Castine. Finding that the Frenchman had fled, Andros entered his house and seized the quantity of arms, ammunition, and goods which were stored there. However, an altar with pictures and other ornaments he left intact. "This might cause suspicions of his being a favorer of popes, but a good protestant would not have been culpable for the same tenderness."[55] When viewing his actions concerning the meeting-house and other matters, there is little doubt of his Anglican sympathies.[56]

The matter of religion involved practical aspects as well as spiritual ones. For instance, in 1685, it was made illegal to collect a clergyman's rate forcibly.[57] Even this measure was flouted by the Puritans:

> Scituate [a town north of Duxbury and Plymouth] chose not to observe the freedom of conscience granted by Andros and [its leaders] attempted to collect the minister's salary as before through a tax upon all the inhabitants, including several who were Quakers. The Governor's Council intervened and put an end to proceedings against Edward Wanton, a Quaker who refused to pay. Edward Randolph wrote Hinckley suggesting it was perhaps as reasonable that Congregationalists be taxed to support the Church of England.[58]

Thus there were inconsistencies on both sides of the religious and financial coins.

In both matters spiritual and practical, however, "it is a curious fact, that both in Virginia and in New England Andros failed to please the ecclesiastics, different as they were . . . ."[59] Perhaps "curious" is the wrong term: Andros' interest in regulating religion, in New York and in the Dominion, as well as later in Virginia, would naturally lead to clergymen's resistance, no matter how much they agreed on doctrine. It is also a sensitive matter of power, both secular and clerical.

Eventually, the Congregationalists were so discontented that a list of grievances was drawn up and sent with a representative, to be presented to the King, but the effort was not a success. Andros was carrying out His Majesty's policies and continued to earn the favor of his employer.[60] The fidelity Andros had shown to King James, which had won him knighthood along with the criticism of New England's citizens,[61] was not doubted now. What Andros maintained in one area of favor, he lost in others. "All of Andros' conferences with the people ended in displays of anger on his part. When tact and patience were needed, there was threatening and loss of temper; when quiet, strong action was required, there was vacillation and weakness."[62] It was during one of these crises, when the people had been particularly aroused to high indignation, that news came of the landing of William of Orange on the cost of England on the anniversary of Guy Fawkes Day, November 5, 1688.[63]

The "Declaration" William issued on undertaking this invasion was brought to Boston from the West Indies by John Winslow. Andros immediately threw him into prison, without bail, and seized his papers. Yet his efforts were for nought: soon after Winslow's imprisonment the terms of the Declaration were known, and the people were inflamed to action.[64] Adding to the people's indignation were vicious rumors. In the words of Nathaniel Byfield, an observer of these events,

> The tales and Scandalous storys answered the end for which they were invented, and highly inraged the minds of the people against the Governour, insomuch that on his return they were so far from welcoming him home for his good Services, that they were rather for tearing him to pieces.[65]

Most importantly, whether the mongers of this current gossip believed the stories they spread or not, ". . . they undoubtedly realized that the readiest way to organize a revolution against Andros would be by religious prejudice."[66]

Andros found it necessary to seek refuge in the fort, where Randolph and his other supporters joined him. A Declaration was produced and a letter sent to Andros, advising him to surrender, upon which he, according to one historian, tried to flee to a frigate where the militia caught him.[67] Another historian says: "That he was no coward is shown by the fact that he abandoned the shelter of the fort, and made his way through the tumultous streets to a personal conference with the revolutionary leaders gathered in the Council Chamber."[68]

In any case, he surrendered and was kept in jail,[69] after this message had been sent to him:

> At the town-house in Boston, April 18, 1689.
> Sir,
>
> Ourselves and many others, the inhabitants of this town and places adjacent being surprized with the people's sudden taking of arms, in the first motion whereof we were wholly ignorant, being driven to it by the present accident, are necessitated to acquaint your excellency that, for the quieting and securing the people inhabiting this country from the iminent danger they many ways lie open and exposed to, and tendering your own safety, we judge it necessary, that you forthwith deliver up the government and fortifications, to be preserved and disposed according to order and direction of the crown of England, which suddenly is expected may arrive, promising all security from violence to yourself, or any of your gentlemen or soldiers, in person or estate, otherwise, we are assured, they will endeavor the taking of the fortifications by storm, if any opposition be made.
>
> To Sir Edmund Andros, Knight.
>
> William Stoughton
> Thomas Danforth
> S. Bradstreet
> John Richards
> Elisha Cooke
> Is. Addington
> John Foster
> Peter Serjeant
> David Waterhouse
> Adam Winthrop
> J. Nelson
> Wait Winthrop
> Sam. Shrimpton
> Wm. Browne
> Barth. Gedney[70]

In the meantime, the country people had swarmed to Boston; they disliked Andros more intensely than did the townsfolk, because he had sought to deprive them of their lands, while the latter had at least profited from the expenditures of the Governor and his retinue. The countrymen demanded to see Andros in chains and were quieted only by being allowed to escort him back to the fort, where he appeared more as a

prisoner than he had while living in custody in a private home. He tried again to escape, dressed as a woman, but was detected by the size and shape of his boots. Later he got free, but was captured at Newport and returned to Boston.[71]

Andros and a few others were not released, as some had been, after the revolt. The remaining men had been voted "unbailable" by the people--Mr. Dudley, for instance, for certain correspondence with Randolph concerning a presidency, and Andros because of his "covetousness." Thomas Danforth, one of the leaders of the Puritan opposition, wrote, "I am deeply sensible that we have a wolfe by the ears."[72] Not all observers, however, were happy about the recent turn of events; some witnesses to these events reacted on the basis of honor, instead of politics or religion, and to them, the Puritans did not seem so pious. For example, Nathaniel Byfield wrote:

> Who should have thought that in a land of Righteousness (as the Massachusetts would be accounted), men should work wickedness and that Professors of the greatest sanctity should have anything to doe with plots and Conspiracys; yet, alas! this wild design I must lay at the doors of the Preachers and their Adherents, and it is too notorious, that some who had sworne to maintaine the Governm't and discover all Plotts and Conspiracys against the same ought to bee reckoned amongst the Principall Conspirators. For this was not of sudden heat, or violent passion of the Rabelle, but a long contrived piece of wickedness. A great while travailed they in mischief, ere that detestable monster came forth.[73]

According to this observer, then, who was not necessarily a supporter of Andros, by the way, not only had the revolt

been planned for a long while but it had been led by clergymen. This evidence alone would seem to point to the important role of religion in the administration and overthrow of Andros.

By June, Massachusetts had resumed its former way of government, and all the other colonies had wiped out the vestiges of Andros' regime. To their surprise, however, King William was not all that pleased about the fate of that government. He needed the union of the colonies, just as James II had, for defense against the French to the North of New England.[74] Despite the colonists' delusions about religious and political aspects of the reasons for forming the Dominion, it was primarily useful to the government in England as a sound union for defense.

William did not, however, try to replace Andros or send Andros back to continue the governorship. Nor did he attempt to form another union of colonies, as colonies separate but at peace were more valuable than colonies united in revolt. Andros himself recognized the particular independence of the New Englanders in his description of them:

> I doe not find but the generality of the magistrates and people are well affected to ye King and Kingdome, but most, knowing noe government then [sic] their owne, think it best, and are wedded and oppiniate for it. And ye magistrates & others in place, chosen by the people, think that they are obliged to assert & maintain sd Government all they cann, and are Church members, and like so to be, Chosen, and continue without any considerable altercacon and change there, and depend upon the people to justifie them in their actings.[75]

For a devoted member of the Church of England and loyal servant to the autocratic Stuarts, this description is remarkably charitable and mild, and the polemics of which Andros was often accused are absent.

Historians have found it impossible to come to a consensus about Andros, and it has been just as difficult to find a fair and balanced view of him in their works. "New England historians have always found it difficult to admit that there could be any good in a man who adhered to the fortunes of the Stuarts, or who worshipped in the Church over which Laud had been primate."[76] Those who did recognize the good in Andros painted regrettably rosy pictures of him, which turn some works into veritable hagiographies, rendering them less than accurate. The contemporary views of Andros follow the same patterns. Danforth provides a contemporary analysis:

> The exercise of Sir Edmund's commission, so contrarie to the Magna Charta, is surely enough to call him to account by his superiours . . .; and for others of them, may we be quit of them, as we hope for no good from them, so we are farr from desiring revenge ourselves upon them, lest what they have met with be a warning to others how they essay to oppress their Majesties good subjects any more in that kind.[77]

Others, such as John Gorham Palfrey, author of The History of New England, in their writings, confirm that Andros has received less than justice from the Massachusetts historians.[78]

Before condemning or exonerating Andros, it is necessary to analyze his situation and form an opinion accordingly.

The territory over which he had authority was vast and possessed a "wholly inadequate" system of communication. It also embraced a variety of religious, economic and social communities. These difficulties were virtually insuperable in the seventeenth century. Moreover, the task of ruling this territory was rendered hopeless from the very beginning by the united opposition of the colonies involved and was complicated by a lack of properly trained men to administer the government, "as well as by those faults of the Stuarts which, it was now evident, could be counted upon to wreck any administrative policy."[79] In addition, it was a "paper realm," and Andros had no adequate colonial service, hardly more than a corporal's troop with almost no military equipment and few funds.[80] With these obstacles to overcome, Andros' seemingly arbitrary actions may not seem so extreme.[81] Instead, they become evidence of an attempt to replace the usual channels of administration, unavailable to him, with the force of personality, as though he could use his manners to bluff the colonials into cooperation.

Modern historians still tend to take sides on this issue, which makes for interesting, if not exactly accurate, reading. Edward Channing holds that "It is difficult to see how Andros' administration can be viewed in any other light than as an illegal despotism, especially when one remembers that the commission itself was contrary to the laws of England, according to the opinion of the law officers of the

Crown."[82] Obviously, Andros' administration left much to be desired, both from the standpoint of his personal characteristics[83] and his political tendencies. Yet there are factors which point favorably to his abilities. For instance, his appointment marked a distinct advance in the quality of royal officials: he was a type far superior to the previous governors, including Edward Randolph. His previous service naturally recommended him for the difficult task of consolidating New England.[84] Andros' dealings with the Indians, although subject to criticism and rumors of alliance with France,[85] were also notably successful, as George Bancroft affirms:

> After several fruitless attempts at treaties, peace was finally established by Edmund Andros as the Duke of York's governor of his province beyond the Kennebec. The terms seemed to acknowledge the superiority of the Indians: on their part, the restoration of prisoners and the security of English towns were stipulated; in return, the English were to pay annually, as a quit-rent, a peck of corn for every English family.[86]

A further mark of Andros' ability, and the esteem in which he was held by the Crown, was the fact that he was sent as governor to Virginia after he returned from New England; he was recalled from the position in Virginia in 1698.[87]

It would have been easy, on the other hand, for Andros to have made his an arbitrary administration. In regard to justice, revenue, and legislation, he was left responsible only to his own conscience and his employer. He was, indeed, instructed by King James II to display all the humanity and gentleness that could be consistent with arbitrary

power, and to use punishments as instruments of terror--to induce obedience--and not as willful cruelty.[88] It seems that his choice to govern without representative assemblies, which made his rule seem arbitrary, was not his own: he had been commanded to govern that way.[89] At any rate, men like Andros and his employer, in all probability, did not understand the importance of democracy to the colonials, especially as it was related to Church polity in New England. That particular form of popular rule was, after all, a recent development in religious and political ideology, and it had, moreover, failed in its infancy in England, whereas England and the rest of Europe had been ruled successfully for centuries on the principles of autocracy and state churches. Democracy was therefore an unfamiliar and unsuccessful form of government to these men, and Andros was trained for other methods. While this problem does not exonerate Andros' stubborness completely, it does provide a means for understanding it. As a public servant, he was well-qualified to serve as he did, but government officials for the most part have not been known for flexibility. There are two descriptions of Andros that are, perhaps, more balanced and fair than those of other historians. James Truslow Adams feels that

> The choice of Andros . . . as the man to be entrusted with bringing about the enormous changes incident to the new policy, while not altogether happy, was probably as good as the circumstances of the case allowed. . . . In an exceedingly difficult position, which his choice of subordinates mainly limited to greedy place-seekers from home and honestly disaffected colonials, Andros seems

> to have carried out his orders with loyalty and probity, though not always with tact or discretion.[90]

And, finally, Larzer Ziff provides a final insight:

> Andros was an experienced and efficient administrator who even after the Glorious Revolution was to continue in posts of royal trust . . .and his immense unpopularity was the result of measures that were, in terms of his charge, entirely legal. He insisted that the Navigation Acts be observed, that all landholders pay quit rents, that his government be supported by property taxes, even though the taxed were no longer assessed by an assembly of those they elected, that religious toleration be instituted, that the South Church provide accomodation for the Chruch of England congregation until it could build for itself . . . . Andros did not seek to compromise with the more democratic habits of the people he governed because those habits, in his . . . view, simply were not conducive to the success of his mission, and he boldly moved to check them wherever they appeared in institutions. He ruled without legislatures, reduced town meetings to once a year, cancelled the compulsory religious education requirements because they did not include compulsory religious training in the established Church in agreement with English law, and appointed the officers of the militia rather than permitting them to remain elective. While countering the popular party in this way, he welcomed into his circle any moderates who were willing to assist his administration and encouraged in Massachusetts the development of a native group composed of those who could serve as executors of royal policy.[91]

In short, according to Ziff, he was a brilliant politician and strategist, who saw his duty and executed it. He undoubtedly had a quarrelsome nature, and disagreements of one sort or another cropped up all through his period of service. One such argument, with a man named Blair, resulted in his removal from office in the Maryland-Virginia government, and he spent the rest of his life quietly, dying peacefully in 1713 or 1714, at the age of seventy-six.[92]

CHAPTER 4

An Analysis of the Growth of Religious Independence

Through the careers of Thomas Morton and Edmund Andros in New England can be seen the Puritan attitude toward the Church of England. In certain ways, the two men were similar; for instance, they each claimed to be representatives of the Church of England, and as such were persecuted by the Puritans. They were both possessors of strong characters, and this made them implacable in their dealings with the Saints. The force of their personalities made the problems they faced and the disagreements they had with others seem larger than they would have, perhaps, had they not possessed the ability to take extreme measures.

Their differences are more pointed. Andros was a man in a position of authority over the whole of several colonies, a trained civil servant, while Morton was a trader, whose sole control was over a handful of "ruffians" who were as fun-loving and rebellious has himself. In addition, Morton was not very devoted to the lifestyle of a missionary and martyr, although he claimed to be one for the cause of the Church of England, and he did little to promote that branch of the Christian Church in the New World. Andros was the opposite, and even used his authority to encourage and establish Anglican chapels in New England. His efforts did

not end when he retired; he became a prominent member of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts. These basic differences serve to illustrate that the Puritans paid little heed to station in life or level of devotion when reacting to the threat of encroachment by the Church of England.

Perhaps the most basic difference between the two cases, however, is the amount religion came into play as a reason for their respective exiles. In Thomas Morton's conflicts with the authorities, religion was a relatively minor concern. While the Separatists and Puritans deplored his social activities at Merrymount, their real concern was a result of his trading practices. Moreover, the Congregationalists were just beginning to succeed in their colonization efforts, and they were still thinking in terms of their position as subjects of the English Crown. By Andros's time, their orthodoxy had become entrenched, as had their society and their political system. England had also experienced several years of parliamentary government under the Puritan Cromwell, and their confidence in their majority position had increased. Therefore, religion became a major component in their dealings with the Governor. In him they met a more implacable enemy of their polity than they had met in Thomas Morton.

A very clear trend can also be seen in the change of roles provided by the change of location. In England--in the role of opposition to the establishment--they would not have dared to take such vigorous action against those who did not conform to their beliefs, as they did with both Morton and Andros. In the New World, they suddenly found themselves in a position of control, and their behavior was altered accordingly; they now felt free to assert their religious authority when they felt it was threatened by the established church.

Thirdly, the trend toward unification of the Separatists and Puritans can be seen clearly, especially in the episode of Thomas Morton. Their common dislike and united, or duplicate, action was in many ways a symbol of their growing commonality. By Andros' period, there were no longer two divisions of the Puritan belief with which to contend; they were united under the Congregational banner, with their hatred of the established Church to bind them further together.

Finally, both Morton and Andros served to point up an element in the relations between the colonies of Massachusetts and the Mother Country: a disturbing and growing independence, founded in the religious orthodoxy nurtured by the distance from England. Alan Heimert's attempt to define the origins of independence is supported by the three trends delineated above. Morton's fate was one of their first

experiments in the exercise of this waywardness, a trial of their new wings as it were. Morton, perhaps more astute than he has been credited as being, recognized it when he wrote: ". . . for they had resolved what hee should suffer, because (as they boasted) they were now become the greater number: they had shaked of their shackles of servitude, and were become master, and masterles people."[1] Andros, as well, was a victim of this independence, well entrenched by the time he arrived in New England. His fate was a preview of what would happen almost a century later in the War for Independence. Nor was religion a mere incidental element in the early conflicts: it played a major role in the reasons for colonization, and it was a large consideration in the Puritan feeling of independence from the Mother Country. The seeds of separation were therefore present in the earliest days of the Massachusetts colonies, and the ability of Puritans to become an orthodox majority allowed the seeds to become full-fledged trees by the eighteenth century. The most substantial nourishment of this growth was independence in the area of religion, as described in the three trends seen in the lives of Thomas Morton and Edmund Andros.

Appendix I

The Poem--afterwards nailed to the Maypole at Merry Mount

Rise Oedipus, and if Thou canst unfold,
What means Caribdis underneath the mould,
When Scilla solitary on the ground,
(Sitting in forme of Niobe) was found;
Till Amphitrites Darling did acquaint,
Grim Neptune with the Tenor of her plaint,
And caused him send forth Triton with the sound,
Of Trumpet lowd, at which the Seas were found,
So full of Protean formes, that the bold shore,
Presented Scilla with new Parramore,
So strange as Sampson and so patient,
As Job himself, directed thus, by fate,
To comfort Scilla so unfortunate.
I doe professe by Cupids beautious Mother,
Heres Scogans choise for Scilla, and none other;
Though Scilla's sick with greife because no signe,
Can there be found of vertue masculine.
Escalapius come, I know right well
His laboure's lost when you may ring her knell,
Nor Cithereas powre, who poynts to land,
With proclamation that the first of May,
At Ma-re Mount shall be kept hollyday.*

*Thomas Morton, New England Canaan, page 90.

Appendix II

The Songe

Drinke and be merry, merry merry boyes,
Let all your delight be in the Humens ioyes,
Jo to Hymen now the day is come,
About the merry maypole take a Roome.
Make greene garlons, bring bottles out;
And fill sweet Nectar, freely about,
Uncover they head, and fear no harme,
For hers good liquor to keepe it warme.
Then Drinke and be merry, &c.
Io to Hymen, &c.
Nectar is a thing assign'd,
By the Deities owne minde,
To cure the hart opprest with greife,
And of good liquors is the cheife,
Then drinke, &c.
Io to Hymen, &c.
Give to the mellancolly man,
A cup or two oft now and than.
This physick will soone revive his bloud,
And make him be of a merrier moode.
Then drinke, &c.
Io to Hymen, &c.
Give to the Nymphe thats free from scorne,
No Irish; stuff nor Scotch overworne,
Lasses in beaver coats come away,
Yee shall be welcome to us night and day.
To drinke and be merry, &c.
Jo to Hymen, &c.*

*Thomas Morton, New England Canaan, page 91.

Appendix III

The Separatists called him a seven-headed hydra monster--he had seven men--and in return he called them the Nine Worthies--Captaine Shrimpe had nine men. He composed a poem in their honor:

I sing th'adventures of mine worthy wights,
And pitty 'tis I cannot call them knights,
Since they ad brawne and braine and were right able
To be installed of Prince Arthures table,
Yet all of them wer Squires of low degree,
As did appeare by rules of heraldry,
The Magi tould of a prodigious birth,
That shortly would be found on earth,
By Archimedes art, which they misconster,
Unto their Land would proove a hiddeus monster,
Seven heads it had, and twice as many feet,
Arguing the body to be wondrous greate,
Besides a forked taile heav'd upon highe,
As if it threaten'd battele to the skie,
The Rumor of this fearfule prodigy,
Did cause th'effeminate multitude to cry,
For want of great Alcides aide and stood,
Like Peopel that have seene Medusa's head,
Great was the griefe of hart great was the mone,
And great feare conceaved by everyone,
Of Hydras hiddeus forme and dreadfull powre,
Doubting in time this monster would devoure,
All their best flocks whose dainty wolle consorts,
Itselfe with Scarlet in all Princes Courts,
Not Jason nor the adventurous youths of Greece,
Did bring from Colcos any richer Fleece,
In Emulation of the Gretian force,
These Worthies Nine prepar'd a woodden horse,
And prick'd with pride of like success devise,
How they may purchase glory by this prize,
And if they give to Hydras head the fall,
It will remaine a platforme unto all,
Their brave atchivements, and in time to comme,
Per fas aut nef as they's erect a throne;
Clouks are turn'd trumps: so now the lott is caste,
With fire and sword, to Hidras dent hey haste,
Mares in th'assendant, Soll in Canan now,
And Lerna Lake to Plutos Court must bow,
What though they rebuk'd by thundering Jove,
T'is neither Gods nor men that can remove,
Their mindes from making this a dismall day,
These nine will new be actors in this play,
And sumon Hidra to appeare anon,
Before their witles combination,

But his undaunted spirit nursed with meate,
Such as the Cecrops gave their babe to eate,
Scorn'd their base accons, for with Cecrops charme,
Hee knew he could defend hemself frome harme,
Of Minos, Eacus, and Radamand,
Princes of Limbo, who must out of hand,
Consult bout Hidra what must now be done,
Who having sate in Counsell one by one,
Retorne this answere to the Stiggean feinds,
And first grim Minos spake: Most loving friends,
Hidra prognisticks ruine to our state,
And that our Kingdome will grow desolate,
But if one head from thence be torne away,
The Body and the members will decay,
To take in Hand, what Eacus this taske,
I such as barebrained Phaeton did aske,
Of Phebus to begird the world about,
Which graunted put the Netherlands to rout
Presumptious foole learne wit at too much cost,
For life and laboure both at once hee lost,
Sterne Radamantus being last to speake,
Made a great hum and thus did silence breake,
What if with rattling chaines or Iron bands,
Hidra be bound either by feet or hands,
And after being lashed with smarting rodds,
Hee be conveyed by Stix unto the godds,
To be accused on the upper ground,
Of Lesae Majestatis this crime found,
T'will be impossible from thence I trowe,
Hidra shall come to trouble us below,
This sentence pleased the friends exceedingly,
That up they tost their bonnets and did cry,
Long live our Court in great prosperity.
The Sessions ended some did straight devise,
Court Revells antiques and a world of joyes.
Brave Christmas gambals, there was open hail,
Kept to the full: and sport the Devill and all,
Laboures despised the loomes are laid away,
And this proclaim'd the Stigean Holliday,
In came grim Mino with his motly beard,
And brought a distillation well prepar'd,
And Eacus who is a suer as text,
Came in with his preporatives the next,
Then Radamantus last and principall,
Feasted the worthies in his sumptuous hall,
There Caron Cerperous and the rout of friends,
Had lap enough and so their pastime ends.*

*Thomas Morton, New England Canaan, pp. 98-99.

Appendix IV

"A letter was delivered to Mr. Winthrop by Mr. Jeffery, an old planter, written to him from Morton, wherein he related, how he had obtained his long suit, and that a commission was granted for a general governor to be sent over with many railing speeches and threats against this plantation, and Mr. Winthrop in particular."

--John Winthrop*

*Winthrop, Journals, Vol. I, p. 130.

My very good gossip!

If I should commend myself to you, you would reply with this proverb, propria laus sordet in ore, but to leave impertinent salutes and really proceed, you shall hereby understand, that altho' when I was first sent to England, to make complaint against Ananias and the brethren, I affected the business but superficially (thro' the brevity of time) I have at this time taken deliberation, and brought the matter to a better pass, and it is brought about, that the King hath taken the matter into his own hands. The Massachusetts patent, by an order of council, was brought in view, the privileges therein granted well-scanned, and at the council board, in presence of Sir R. Saltonstall and the rest, it was declared, for manifold abuses therein discovered, to be void. The King hath re-assumed the whole business into his own hands, and given order, for a general governor for the whole territory, to be sent over. The commission is passed the privy seal, I saw it, and the same was sent to my Lord Keeper, to have it pass the great seal, and I now stay to return with the governor, by whom all complainants shall have relief. So that now, Jonas being sent ashore, may safely cry, Repent ye cruel schismaticks, repent there are yet but 40 days. If Jove vouchsafe to thunder, the Charter and the Kingdom of the separatists will fall asunder.--My Lord of Canterbury, with my lord privy seal, having caused all Mr. Craddock's letters to be viewed and his apology for the brethren particularly heard, protested against him and Mr. Humfries that they were a couple of imposturous knaves, so that, for all their great friends, they departed the council chamber in our view with a pair of cold shoulders. I have staid long, yet have not lost my labour. The brethren have found themselves frustrated, and I shall see my desire upon mine enemies.--of these things I thought good, by so convenient a messenger, to give you notice, lest you should think I died in obscurity, as the brethren vainly intended I should. As for Ratcliffe, he was comforted by their lordships with the cropping of Mr. Winthrop's ears, which shews what opinion is held, amongst them of King Winthrop with all his inventions and other abusive ceremonies, which exemplify his detestation of the Church of

England, and contempt of his majesty's authority and wholsome laws. I rest your loving friend,

Thomas Morton*

*Hutchinson, History, Vol. I. p. 29

ENDNOTES

Introduction

[1]Francis J. Bremer, The Puritan Experiment: New England Society from Bradford to Edwards (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1976), p. 58. Bremer says, "From the very beginning of the colony's history those who differed from the Puritan majority were encouraged to exercise their liberty to live elsewhere." (p. 58). Such power could only belong to the orthodox. The change in position was a process of months, but over the years it grew more entrenched. See also James Truslow Adams, The Founding of New England (Boston: An Atlantic Monthly Press Book, Little Brown, and Company, 1921), p. 922.

[2]Reputable historians note this trend as being the most obvious. See Herbert L. Osgood, The American Colonies in the Seventeenth Century, vol. 1: The Proprietary Colonies in the Earliest Form, the Corporate Colonies of New England (New York: Columbia University Press, 1904), p. 207; Charles M. Andrews, The Colonial Period of American History, vol. 1: The Settlements (New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1934), pp. 370, 377, and 381; George D. Langdon, Jr., Pilgrim Colony: A Histry of New Plymouth, 1620-1691 (New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1966), p. 101; and George Findlay Willison, Saints and Strangers (New York: Reynal & Hitchcock, 1945), p. 270.

[3]While the connection may not be direct, it can be seen that the conflicts surrounding the War for Independence were the outcome of an earlier spirit of dissension: the break was not sudden nor was it made possible merely by the interference of the Atlantic Ocean.

[4]Alan Heimert, Religion and the American Mind from the Great Awakening to the Revolution (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1966), p. viii.

[5]Ibid., p. 1.

Chapter 1: The Establishment of Puritan Colonies

[1]George D. Langdon, Jr., Pilgrim Colony: A History of New Plymouth, 1620-1691 (New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1966), p. 3.

[2]Louis B. Wright, The Atlantic Frontier: Colonial American Civilization, 1607-1763 (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1947), p. 44.

[3]George Findlay Willison, Saints and Strangers (New York: Reynal & Hitchcock, 1945), pp. 129-130. Charles M. Andrews, in The Colonial Period of American History, vol. 1: The Settlements (New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1934), p. 268, also provides statistics: the number of Pilgrims is unknown, but has been estimated at about 80 who went aboard at London--added to about 30 who came from Leyden. Of those 80, "only one among them, Christopher Martin of Billaricay in Essex, can be identified as a Separatist. The others were hired by Weston and the merchant adventurers as laborers in the colony and were Church of England men and women, if they professed any faith."

[4]Willison, Saints, pp. 129-130.

[5]Ibid.

[6]Andrews, Colonial Period, I:277.

[7]Ibid., p. 276.

[8]Herbert L. Osgood, The American Colonies in the Seventeenth Century, vol. 2: The Proprietary Province in Its Later Forms (New York: Columbia University Press, 1904), p. 311.

[9]Andrews, Colonial Period, I:276.

[10]Ibid.

[11]Lyford was a graduate of Magdalen College, Oxford, a married man with five children. He was in his late forties, and had spent many years ministering to small parishes in England and Ireland. Associations with Oldham and his trials before the Saints--who had searched the Charity for letters from Lyford to England and opened them, discovering plots--is described in Willison, Saints, pp. 244-252.

[12]Ibid.

[13]Charles Francis Adams, Introduction to The New English Canaan by Thomas Morton (Boston: Published by the Prince Society, 1883), pp. 2-3. "From the start the Pilgrims had looked upon Wessagusset with a jaundiced eye. It lay uncomfortably close to Plymouth, and they feared it as a rival in the Indian trade. They equally feared it as a source for moral and spiritual contagion, for Weston's men--so far as they were religious at all--professed the Anglican creed. They were 'not fitt for an honest man's company,' so one of the adventurers had said, and even Weston granted that they were 'rude fellows.' But he hoped, he said, 'not only to reclaime them from ye profanenes . . ., but by degrees to draw them to Got, &c.' Little came of this pious hope . . . and

it was reported--'how truly I know not,' said Bradford, hastening as always to pass along a salacious and damaging bit of gossip--that their governor was 'keeping Indean women.' Even worse, he had 'wasted' supplies on them. See Willison, Saints, pp. 214-215.

[14]Osgood, American Colonies, vol. 1: The Proprietary Province in Its Earliest Form, the Corporate Colonies of New England, p. 121. William Morrell, a man of "fine classical taste," was one of these ministers. What worried the Separatists was that he came armed with authority of superintendence over all the churches in New England. "Here was the intervention that had long been feared." See Willison, Saints, pp. 238-239.

[15]Adams, Introduction to New English Canaan, pp. 3-4.

[16]Willison, Saints, p. 238.

[17]Osgood, American Colonies, I:121-122. Osgood goes on to note that they settled in more favorable areas around Massachusetts Bay, where they were found four or five years later by the Puritans. Adams, in his introduction to Morton's New English Canaan (pp. 3-4), views the settlement as a permanent one. Some, he notes, did return to England with Gorges; others went to Virginia to find a more favorable climate and soil. "A few, however, remained at Wessagusset, and are repeatedly referred to by Morton in the New Canaan as his neighbors at the place."

[18]Wollaston's first name is unrecorded; only his minor role in Massachusetts history is known. His origins, background and eventual fate are not noted by any contemporary or modern historian.

[19]In tandem with this development was the disquieting effect of Ferdinando Gorges' increasing illwill toward the Pilgrim, and later Puritan leaders. Gorges, although a staunch supporter of the Church of England, was friendly toward and had business dealings with Puritan leaders, and there was no real hostility before 1632. He and his son, Robert, had specified certain lands as their own before granting the Charter. The grantees of this Charter denied the legality and the rights of Gorges, and claimed the land as their own. A quarrel was inevitable. ". . . and the Puritans, it must be confessed, had little respect for legality themselves; they could, when need required, be counted on to take such steps as they might see fit to oppose any action of Gorges." See James Truslow Adams, The Founding of New England (Boston: An Atlantic Monthly Press Book, Little, Brown, and Company, 1921), p. 149.

[20]Andrews, Colonial Period, I:377.

[21]Ibid., p. 378. Willison, in Saints, p. 270, states, "Morton evidently met the good deacon [Dr. Fuller] and was not impressed with him either as a Saint or a surgeon, remarking that he wore a longe beard and a Garment like the Greeke, that begged in Paul's Church [St. Paul's, London]. Properly enough, Fuller had been bred a butcher and was always ready to practice his trade upon the unsuspecting. . .. 'He takes a patient and the urinall, eyes the state there, findes the Crasis Symptomes and attominatantes, and tells the patient that his disease was winde, which hee had taken by gapering feasting overboard at sea.' In short, he was seasick. Still, Fuller had worked a marvelous cure for Endecott, . . . the cow keeper of Salem.' He [Fuller] had 'cured him of a disease called a wife, and yet I hope this man maybe forgiven if she were made a fitting plant for heaven.' The 'Quicksalver' then treated other ailing Saints, some forty in all, who had no complaints to make, for all went promptly to heaven." See p. 283.

[22]There are various spellings for John Endecott's name, such as Endicott, or even Endecot or Endicot in older histories. Most historians favor Endecott or Endicott. For this paper, the former one has been chosen as his descendants chose this spelling of it.

[23]Willison, Saints, p. 270.

[24]Ibid. Andrews notes that "A few, notably the Brownes, were attached to the Church of England, . . . and they . . . greeted with disapproval the later trend toward separatism in the colony." See Colonial Period, I:370.

[25]Andrews, Colonial Period, I:361. "Endecott's later career discloses his attitude toward those who differed with him--the heathen Indian, the Quaker, the prisoner . . ., and the Brownes and other upholders of the Anglican service who were disaffected with the Puritan government. It also shows his dislike of forms and devices that offended him--the Book of Common Prayer, the Cross of St. George, and the maypole." See pp. 361-362.

[26]Langdon, Pilgrim Colony, p. 101. For a short biography of Roger Conant, see Samuel Elliot Morison's Builders of the Bay Colony (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1930), pp. 28-30.

[27]Andrews, Colonial Period, I:381.

[28]Ibid. Osgood notes that "because of certain doings of the ministers . . . which they considered irregular, John and Samuel Brown, members of the council and men of standing among the colonists . . . gathered a company apart and had

the Book of Common Prayer read to them." It had not been used in Salem Church services. Osgood concludes that "the expulsion of the Browns proves that Endicott . . . intended that the newly organized church should not be disturbed by any Anglican rival." American Colonies, I:204-205.

[29]Andrews, Colonial Period, I:381.

[30]Osgood, American Colonies, I:206.

[31]Andrews, Colonial Period, I:378-379.

[32]Sidney E. Mead, "The Nation with the Soul of a Church," Church History 36 (September 1967):267.

[33]Andrews, Colonial Period, I:267-277.

[34]Andrews, Colonial Period, I:409. The report of the Committee of Council, appointed in December of 1632 to look into the matter, upheld the colony as beneficial to the Kingdom and profitable to those who had vested interest in the undertaking. "The Privy Council approved the report and promised that the King would not only maintain the privileges of Massachusetts Bay but would also supply anything further that might tend to the good government of the peace and prosperity and comfort of the people. It expressed its belief that the colony might be actually beneficial to the realm in furnishing naval stores, should the Danish Sound ever be closed to English ships." Ibid., p. 409-410.

[35]See below, Chapter 3. The efforts were notably led by Sir Ferdinando.

[36]Ibid., p. 410. "The inquiries instituted by the committee of 1633 . . . were carried on during the first half of that year and for the first time brought into view the whole situation. The efforts of Gorges and his associates were bearing fruit and the charges against the Massachusetts Bay Company were opening up the whole question of emigration to America as a phase of national policy. Men and women of rank and respectability were going to Plymouth, Massachusetts, Bermuda, and the West Indies, Old Providence and Maryland. Many thoughtful men . . . were expressing the opinion that this was injurious to the best interests of the Kingdom as well as contrary to the well-being of the Anglican Church. Archbishop Laud, in his desire to check the movement . . . was not alone in his opposition; there were others also who disliked the movement as taking from England hundreds of her most useful people . . . from the middle and laboring classes and draining her gold and silver and other parts of her national stock. The movement was

believed to be economically harmful by those who were already beginning to think in terms of mercantilism." p. 411.

[37]Wright, Atlantic Frontier, p. 116.

[38]Ibid.

[39]Osgood, American Colonies, I:207.

[40]Ibid., p. 208. "When Winthrop and his fellow-voyagers left England, more formal . . . expression was given to the affection with which the Mother Church was regarded . . . . 'We desire . . . you would be pleased to take notice of the principals and body of our Company, as those who esteem it our honor to call the Church of England, from whence we rise, our dear Mother: . . . ever acknowledging that such hope . . . as we have obtained in the common salvation, we have received in her bosom and sucked it from her breasts.' A fervent desire for her welfare . . . was expressed, while her prayers were sought on behalf of the enterprise which the colonists had undertaken. Of the sincerity of this utterance we have no reason to doubt . . . ." Ibid., p. 205.

[41]Ibid., p. 208.

[42]Evarts B. Greene, Religion and the State: The Making and Testing of an American Tradition (Ithaca, New York: Great Seal Books, a Division of Cornell University Press, 1941), pp. 37-38.

[43]Ibid., p. 39.

[44]Andrews, Colonial Period, I:434-435.

[45]Greene, Religion, p. 46.

[46]Andrews, Colonial Period, I:437.

[47]Ibid.

[48]Ibid. In the fourth class were "many . . . of the servants and apprentices who had come over with the Puritans in considerable numbers and who at the beginning certainly could have little sympathy for Puritan ideals . . . . In 1634 and again in 1652 all settled inhabitants were required to take the oath of fidelity, because it was found that among those who had not done so were many who were disposed to utter offensive remarks about the government. This requirement . . . could have eliminated the fourth class, but that it was not enforced and that this class continued to exist is unquestionably true." Ibid., I:437-438.

[49]Willison, Saints, p. 377.

[50]Ibid.

[51]Wright, Atlantic Frontier, p. 117.

[52]Andrews, Colonial Period, I:364.

Chapter 2: Thomas Morton and His Maypole at Merrymount

[1]Edward Channing, A History of the United States, vol. 1: The Planting of a Nation in the New World: 1000-1660 (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1905), p. 356.

[2]Charles M. Andrews, The Colonial Period of American History, vol. 1: The Settlements (New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1934), p. 332. Other authors employ the same imagery in connection with Morton: ". . . against the somber background of traditional New England his gaieties almost glitter." Louis B. Write, The Atlantic Frontier: Colonial American Civilization, 1607-1763 (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1947), p. 100. Most of the historians who write in this manner are depending on the "glacial age" interpretation of the Puritan dominance in New England. This theory is disputed and nicknamed by Samuel Eliot Morison in his histories of New England Civilization.

[3]Andrews, Colonial Period, I:332.

[4]Ibid. There are many accounts of this case, some more accurate than others. Morton himself did not speak of it; the records alone allow historians to piece together this segment of Morton's life.

[5]Namely that of Henry Beston, The Book of Gallant Vagabonds (New York: George H. Doran Company, 1925), pp. 140-142. This highly romantic interpretation of history is buried deep in the rare book collection at the Huntington Library, seemingly for no other reason than that it was dedicated to Colonel Theodore Roosevelt and his wife.

[6]Andrews, Colonial Period, I:332. He was charged with having sold his wife's apparel and "with declining to obey the court's decree 'endeavouring to find out holes whereby to elude performance of these things.'" See p. 333.

[7]Donald F. Connors, Thomas Morton (New York: Twayne Publishers, Inc., 1969), pp. 17-18. Actually, Morton hailed from the more respectable Clifford's Inn. Willison, in his introduction to the 1948 edition of Bradford's History of the Plymouth Colony, says, "And his characterization of Thomas Morton of Merry Mount must be taken with more than a grain of salt. It is simply not true, as Bradford declared, that Morton was locked up for months . . . on suspicion of murder." See William Bradford, The History of the Plymouth Colony (Toronto: D. Van Nostrand Company, Inc., 1948), p. xv.

[8]Channing, A History, I:358.

[9]Andrews, Colonial Period, I:332. Adams notes, in his introduction to Morton's New English Canaan, that "in all probability this was not Morton's first visit to Massachusetts Bay. Indeed, he was comparatively familiar with it, having already passed one season on its shores." See Charles Francis Adams, Introduction to The New English Canaan by Thomas Morton (Boston: Published by the Prince Society, 1883), p. 6. Morton himself says, "In the yeare . . . 1662, it was my chance to be landed in the parts of New England, where I found two sortes of people . . .." New English Canaan, p. 15. Connors, in his monograph on Morton, concurs with Adams on this point (Thomas Morton, p. 19), as does Norman Foerster, ed., American Poetry and Prose (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin Company, 1934). Adams also notes that there was but one ship which arrived in New England in June, 1622--the Charity, which brought Weston's party, which settled at Wessagusset, answering the description Morton gave of the party he accompanied. See p. 7 of James Truslow Adams' The Founding of New England (Boston: An Atlantic Monthly Press Book, Little, Brown, and Company, 1921).

[10]Max Savelle and Darold D. Wax, A History of Colonial America, 3rd. ed. (Hinsdale, Illinois: Dryden Press, 1973), p. 150.

[11]Adams, Founding, p. 110.

[12]Connors, Thomas Morton, p. 23.

[13]Carlton Beals, "The Rebels of Merrymount," American Heritage 4 (June 1955):56.

[14]Adams, Founding, p. 110. Morison says, "Morton was quick to improve the sporting possibilities of the neighborhood . . .. When not engaged in dickering with Indians whom he had previously well primed with lusty liquor, or playing 'Mine host of Ma-re Mount' . . . he roamed the forest with

dog and gun, or sailed about the bay, fishing and shooting waterfowl. White men and Indians alike found good cheer at Merrymount. Young squaws were particularly welcome, and young Pilgrims probably found an occasional surreptitious visit to Merrymount as stimulating, and ultimately as exhausting as their descendants do a trip to New York." Samuel Eliot Morison, Builders of the Bay Colony (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin Company, 1930), p. 14.

[15]Connors, Thomas Morton, p. 61.

[16]Thomas Morton, "New England Canaan," in Tracts and Other Papers, Relating Principally to the Origin, Settlement, and Progress of the Colonies in North America, From the Discovery of the Country to the Year 1776, ed. Peter Force (Washington: By the editor, 1838), p. 41.

[17]Ibid., pp. 41-42.

[18]Adams, Introduction to Morton's New English Canaan, p. 17.

[19]Bradford, Plymouth Colony, pp. 244-245.

[20]Andrews, Colonial Period, I:333. Andrews' treatment of Morton is particularly harsh: "[He] was a bohemian, a humorist, a scoffer, and a libertine, with no moral standards of thought or conduct." p. 333.

[21]Ibid., p. 363. When Miles Standish came to capture Morton, five of the latter's men were out hunting, a fact which puts Standish's bravery during the episode into perspective.

[22]J. Franklin Jameson, gen. ed., Original Narratives of Early American History (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1915), Winthrop's Journal, "History of New England", vols. 1 and 2, ed. by James Kendall Hosmer, I:69.

[23]See Appendix II.

[24]Morton, "New England Canaan," p. 89.

[25]Savelle and Wax, Colonial America, p. 150.

[26]Morison, Builders, p. 289. "Morton of Merrymount thought the Indians were splendid fellows, and recorded an instance of their humanity to a crack-brained preacher benighted in the woods; but Morton was a fur-trader, and history has not yet recorded a fur-trader converting the natives." Ibid., p. 289.

[27]Andrews, Colonial Period, I:363.

[28]Foerster, Poetry and Prose, p. 25.

[29]Morton, "New England Canaan," p. 26. There is some evidence, according to Andrews, pointing to the possibility that Morton was a Catholic: "'You may be interested to know that I have acquired further documents about Morton--one from the Diocesan Registry at Wells, a suit in the Ecclesiastical Court (Bishop's Consistory) based on an allegation of slander or blasphemy--the interesting point of which is Morton's remark on 'going to church' and his statement that he had a 'pectoral cross,' which he wore as a souvenir of a friend. This was in 1619 when he was living in Axbridge Co. Somerset. Morton was perhaps a Catholic.'" Andrews here quotes from a letter he received from one Dr. Banks, author of The History of York, found in the Massachusetts Historical Society Proceedings. See Colonial Period, I:332. These points are far from conclusive and are further confused by the similarity between high church Anglican and Catholic practices. In this case, it is probably safe to accept Morton's own word on the subject.

[30]Morton, "New England Canaan," p. 26.

[31]Ibid., p. 90.

[32]George Findlay Willison, Saints and Strangers (New York: Reynal & Hitchcock, 1945), p. 276.

[33]Bradford, Plymouth Colony, p. 245. Rowse claims that Puritan objections were on the phallic/sexual grounds rather than on the religious basis of the maypole as a pagan rite. The latter may be a more accurate view. See A. L. Rowse, The Elizabethans and America: The Trevelyan Lectures at Cambridge, 1958 (New York: Harper Colophon Books, Harper & Row, 1959), p. 139.

[34]Beston, Book of Gallant Vagabonds, p. 153.

[35]Willison, Saints, p. 277.

[36]Oscar Theodore Barck, Jr., and Hugh Talmadge Lefler, Colonial America, 2nd ed. (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1968), p. 96.

[37]Morton, "New England Canaan," p. 100.

[38]Channing, A History, I:359.

[39]Morton, "New England Canaan," p. 93.

[40]Bradford, Plymouth Colony, p. 243. The Indians farther east acquired guns from the French and the Englishmen who fished off Newfoundland, but when Morton came on the scene, the Indians around Massachusetts Bay were unarmed.

[41]Bradford, Plymouth Colony, pp. 246-247.

[42]Ibid., p. 247.

[43]Morton, "New England Canaan," p. 38.

[44]Ibid., p. 94.

[45]Ibid.

[46]Ibid.

[47]Savelle and Wax, Colonial America, p. 151.

[48]Bradford, Plymouth Colony, pp. 248-249.

[49]Ibid. Willison notes that Miles Standish had fought with the English armies in Flanders. He became acquainted with the Pilgrims in Leyden and attached himself to them, although he did not share their religious beliefs and never became a member of the church. He was promptly selected as military leader, a post he filled with exceptional courage. See Plymouth Colony, p. 88.

[50]Morton, "New England Canaan," p. 97. Osgood compares such methods to those used by the Star Chamber. Herbert L. Osgood, The American Colonies in the Seventeenth Century, vol. 1: The Proprietary Province in Its Earliest Form, The Corporate Colonies of New England (New York: Columbia University Press, 1904), p. 185.

[51]Francis J. Bremer, The Puritan Experiment: New England's Society from Bradford to Edwards (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1976), p. 58.

[52]Morton had returned in the company of Mr. Allerton, the agent for Plymouth Company, who thus gravely offended the Pilgrims. Moreover, Allerton lodged Morton in his own house and hired him as secretary, until he was forced to send him away. See Bradford, Plymouth Colony, p. 258.

[53]Willison, Saints, pp. 330-331.

[54]Channing, A History, I:359.

[55]Bradford, Plymouth Colony, p. 258.

[56]Adams, Founding, p. 148.

[57]Ibid., p. 149.

[58]Beals, "Rebels," p. 59. Morton's relations with Endecott did not get off to a promising start: Endecott had demolished the maypole at Merry Mount before Morton returned. The feud intensified when Morton was arrested and tried in September of 1630. See Connors, Thomas Morton, p. 22.

[59]Hosmer, Winthrop's Journal, I:53.

[60]Adams, Founding, p. 149.

[61]Nathaniel B. Shurtleff, ed., Records of the Governor and Company of the Massachusetts Bay in New England, vol. 1: 1628-1641 (Boston: From the Press of William White, 1853), p. 75. Beston's account, the most quaint of Thomas Morton's biographies, says, "Nothing can excuse this brutal, inhuman, and lawless condemnation. Now comes a typical Puritan touch of vindictiveness. His persecutors waited till the vessel carrying Morton to England came in sight of Merry Mount, and then set the house at the Mount afire, so that their victim might see the destruction of his property. 'That the habitation of the wicked appear no more in Israel,' wrote Winthrop sententiously. Was there anything more heartless?" See Beston's Book of Gallant Vagabonds, p. 166. The Captain of the Gift was unwilling to take Morton, so he returned to England on the Handmaid, as noted by Connors in Thomas Morton, p. 23.

[62]Morton, "New England Canaan," p. 121.

[63]Connors, Thomas Morton, pp. 23-24.

[64]Savelle and Wax, Colonial America, p. 163.

[65]Andrews, Colonial Period, I:405-406.

[66]Ibid., p. 406.

[67]Bradford, Plymouth Colony, p. 328.

[68]Hosmer, Winthrop's Journals, I:100-101.

[69]Ibid., p. 99. Morison provides interesting sidelights on the case. For instance, Morton posed before Archbishop Laud's committee and the Privy Council as an Anglican martyr, and "was comforted by their lordships with the cropping of Mr. Winthrop's ears," an item which interested that person when a letter from Morton [See Appendix IV] was intercepted. Moreover, Morison says that Morton "had high hopes of returning to New England in the company of Church and King men,

to destroy the Bible Commonwealth and assume the government of Massachusetts in the King's name." Morison is the only historian to express this theory--none of the contemporary sources mention this idea. Gorges would undoubtedly have been Governor General. See Morison, Builders, p. 17.

[70]Rowse, Elizabethans, p. 117.

[71]Larzer Ziff, Puritanism in America: New Culture in a New World (New York: The Viking Press, 1973), p. 41.

[72]Channing, A History, I:360.

[73]Willison, Saints, p. 284.

[74]Bradford, Plymouth Colony, p. 259.

[75]Connors, Thomas Morton, p. 82.

[76]Ibid., p. 51.

[77]Ibid., p. 79.

[78]Ibid., p. 122. See Appendix III.

[79]Ibid., pp. 103-104.

[80]Ibid., p. 27.

[81]Ibid.

[82]Ibid. Connors is the best source for a study of New England Canaan and the later period of Morton's life.

[83]Ibid., p. 28.

[84]Lawrence Shaw Mayo, ed., Thomas Hutchinson's "The History of the Colony and Province of Massachusetts Bay," 3 vols. (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1936), I:29.

[85]Hosmer, Winthrop's Journal, I:194.

[86]Ibid., p. 194.

[87]Connors, Thomas Morton, p. 28.

[88]Ibid., p. 29.

[89]Ibid., p. 27.

[90]Beals, "Rebels," p. 101.

[91]Morton, "New England Canaan," pp. 93-94.

Chapter 3: Edmund Andros and His Anglican Government

[1]Louis B. Wright, The Atlantic Frontier: Colonial American Civilization, 1607-1763 (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1947), p. 44.

[2]Ibid., p. 143.

[3]Ibid., pp. 143-144.

[4]Charles M. Andrews, The Colonial Period of American History, vol. 1: The Settlements (New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1934), p. 292.

[5]Henry Ferguson, Essays in American History (no place: no publisher, 1894; reprint edition, Port Washington, New York: Kennikat Press, 1969), pp. 116-122.

[6]Ibid., p. 122.

[7]Herbert L. Osgood, The American Colonies in the Seventeenth Century, vol. 1: The Proprietary Province in Its Earliest Form, The Corporate Colonies of New England (New York: Columbia University Press, 1904), and vol. 2: The Proprietary Province in Its Later Forms, p. 339.

[8]Ibid., II:339-340.

[9]Ibid., II:340. Later, van Renssalaer was arrested by Jacob Leissler for "dubious" words in a sermon. It was a confusing case, sent back and forth between magistrates. ". . . Andros was forced to suspend his protege because of his evil and scandalous life. The first attempt of an English governor to induct a pastor in the Dutch Church thus resulted . . . ultimately in failure." See p. 341.

[10]Osgood, American Colonies, II:341.

[11]Ferguson, Essays, p. 128. Ferguson claims that Andros tried to persuade the Duke of York to allow representative assembly.

[12]Ibid., pp. 128-131.

[13]Wright, Atlantic Frontier, pp. 144-145.

[14]George D. Langdon, Pilgrim Colony: A History of New Plymouth, 1620-1691 (New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1966), p. 214.

[15]Lawrence Shaw Mayo, ed., Thomas Hutchinson's "The History of the Colony and Province of Massachusetts Bay," 3 vols. (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1936), I:33.

[16]Ibid.

[17]Langdon, Pilgrim Colony, p. 214.

[18]Ibid.

[19]Mayo, Hutchinson's "History," I:33.

[20]Ibid. Hutchinson suggests that if they had been less pliable, they would have been displaced, and others more sympathetic to Andros appointed in their stead." See p. 300.

[21]Edward Channing, A History of the United States, vol. 2: A Century of Colonial History, 1660-1760 (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1905), pp. 178-179.

[22]Ibid., p. 179. These figures are confirmed by W. H. Whitmore, ed., The Andros Tracts: Being a Collection of Pamphlets and Official Papers Issued during the Period between the Overthrow of the Andros Government and the Establishment of the Second Charter of Massachusetts, 3 vols. (Boston: Published by the Prince Society, 1868).

[23]William Wright Abbot, The Colonial Origins of the United States: 1607-1763 (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1975), p. 74. Foster holds that "Edmund Andros in his reign and ruin both had made important contributions to Massachusetts political life: 'anarchy' and 'liberty,' 'mob' and 'despot,' now had all the meaning a compelling experience could give them." See Stephen Foster, Their Solitary Way: The Puritan Social Ethic in the First Century of Settlement in New England (New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1971), p. 92.

[24]James Truslow Adams, The Founding of New England (Boston: An Atlantic Monthly Press Book, Little, Brown, and Company, 1921), p. 416.

[25]Channing, A History, II:179-180. Adams believes that the taxation question would have ruined Andros' administration, even without the Revolution. Popular assemblies had been forbidden; Andros had no choice but to levy taxes without the consent of the people. See Adams' Founding, p. 424.

[26]George Bancroft, History of the United States of America from the Discovery of the Continent, vols. 1 and 2, rev. ed. (Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1876), II:158.

[27]Massachusetts Historical Society Collection, Series 2 (New York: Johnson Reprint Corporation, 1968), p. 180.

[28]Bancroft, History, II:137-138.

[29]Ibid., p. 158. "Upon Mr. Stoughton's saying that Road Island [sic] was not mentioned in his [majesty's] commission to his Exce. his Exc. produced an Order . . . upon the Surrender of the Charter to take the colony of R. Island under his government . . .." Robert Noxon Toppan, Andros Records (Worcester: American Antiquarian Society, 1901), p. 240.

[30]Toppan, Andros Records, pp. 221-242.

[31]Bancroft, History, II:159.

[32]Larzer Ziff, Puritanism in America: New Culture in a New World (New York: The Viking Press, 1973), p. 227.

[33]Mayo, Hutchinson's "History," I:303.

[34]Ibid., p. 302.

[35]J. Franklin Jameson, gen. ed., Original Narratives of Early American History (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1915), Narratives of the Insurrections, 1675-1690, edited by Charles M. Andrews, p. 193.

[36]Channing, A History, II:174.

[37]Ibid.

[38]Ibid.

[39]Ibid., pp. 174-175.

[40]Ibid.

[41]Ibid.

[42]Adams, Founding, pp. 421-422.

[43]Ziff, Puritanism, p. 222.

[44]Ibid.

[45]Adams, Founding, p. 422.

[46]Ibid. Adams also notes that "In view of the continuous refusal of the Puritan government . . . to permit any dissatisfied citizen to go to England to lodge complaint against their arbitrary acts . . . the complaints against Andros in

the matter are an amusing instance of immediate change of feeling upon discovering whose ox was being gored. There is nothing to indicate that Andros had any intention of preventing anyone from carrying an appeal; but the same writer [who complained of the act restricting movement among the colonies] goes on to say . . . 'how should any dissatisfied persons ever obtain liberty to go to England to complain of their being oppressed by Arbitrary Governours?' . . . dissatisfied persons now possessed that liberty for the first time in the history of Massachusetts." See Founding, p. 423.

[47]Whitmore, Andros Tracts, I:25.

[48]Channing, A History, II:175.

[49]Ibid.

[50]Ibid. In addition, Sewell, one of the main leaders in the opposition against sharing the meetinghouse, also refused to sell the Governor the land for a separate church. He refused to set up what the Puritans had fled England to avoid. See Adams, Founding, p. 421. Ferguson feels that Andros' actions in asking for services of the English Church in Boston may be considered creditable, and exhibit the character of the man. He risked offending the King, and offended the Puritans in order to show respect to his own church, which King and Puritan alike desired to overthrow." Essays, p. 142. A description of the first chapel erected in Boston is contained in the Massachusetts Historical Society Collection, Series 1, p. 259: "1688 [sic]. The First Episcopal Church erected in the town, was a wooden building in Tremont-Street . . . . The society was formed in the year 1686. The Episcopalians at first met in Mr. Ratcliffe their minister's house, and at the library chamber in the Townhouse. In Sir Edmund Andros's time, he attended the Episcopal service in the First Congregational meeting-house, performed in it . . . . If this liberty had not been granted, he threatened to shut up the doors of the meeting-house. The old chapel was taken down, and an edifice of hewn stone set up on the same spot with enlargement. The cornerstone was laid by Governour Shirley, the 11th of August, 1749."

[51]Wright, Atlantic Frontier, p. 144.

[52]Mayo, Hutchinson's "History," I:304.

[53]Channing, A History, II:198.

[54]Adams, Founding, p. 426.

[55]Mayo, Hutchinson's "History," II:237.

[56]"He was a steadfast son of the Established Church and may have been sent across the Atlantic that he might be out of the way while English institutions . . . were being remodelled or twisted for the benefit of Roman Catholics." See Channing, A History, II:173. As Morton's "Catholic" tendencies can be explained by the similarity between high church Episcopal and Catholic, so Andros' actions can be compared to Anglicanism, as well as to "papism."

[57]Langdon, Pilgrim Colony, p. 122.

[58]Ibid., p. 221.

[59]Ferguson, Essays, p. 112.

[60]Mayo, Hutchinson's "History," I:311.

[61]Osgood, American Colonies, II:130.

[62]Channing, A History, II:185.

[63]Ibid.

[64]Ibid., p. 199.

[65]Andrews, Narratives, pp. 198-199.

[66]Adams, Founding, p. 428.

[67]Channing, A History, II:199-200.

[68]Adams, Founding, p. 430.

[69]Channing, A History, II:200.

[70]Mayo, Hutchinson's "History," I:320-321.

[71]Channing, A History, II:201-202.

[72]Albert Bushnell Hart, ed., American History Told by Contemporaries, vol. 1: Era of Colonization, 1492-1689 (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1931), p. 464.

[73]Andrews, Narratives, p. 196.

[74]Wright, Atlantic Frontier, p. 145.

[75]Ferguson, Essays, p. 129.

[76]Ibid., p. 115.

[77]Hart, American History, I:465.

[78]Whitmore, Andros Tracts, I:23.

[79]Adams, Founding, p. 413.

[80]Wright, Atlantic Frontier, p. 145.

[81]Soon after Andros took over as governor following the reoccupation of New York by the Dutch he was met by a demand for an assembly, and it came from the Long Island towns. "The governor discouraged the movement and for this action received the approval of the duke." Osgood, American Colonies, II:162. From all reports, it seems that this attitude was taken by Andros throughout his career.

[82]Channing, A History, II:180.

[83]See Osgood, American Colonies, II:129.

[84]Adams, Founding, p. 411.

[85]Ibid., p. 427.

[86]Bancroft, History, I:466.

[87]Ferguson, Essays, p. 111.

[88]Bancroft, History, II:137.

[89]Wright, Atlantic Frontier, p. 145.

[90]Adams, Founding, pp. 413-414.

[91]Ziff, Puritanism, p. 221.

[92]Ferguson, Essays, pp. 147-148.

Chapter 4: An Analysis of the Growth of Religious Independence

[1]Thomas Morton, "New England Canaan," in Tracts and Other Papers, Relating Principally to the Origin, Settlement, and Progress of the Colonies in North America, From the Discovery of the Country to the Year 1776, ed. Peter Force (Washington: By the editor, 1838), pp. 93-94.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources:

Bradford, William. The History of Plymouth Colony. Toronto: D. Van Nostrand Company, Inc., 1948.

Emerson, Everett, ed. Letters from New England: The Massachusetts Bay Colony, 1629-1638. Amherst, Massachusetts: University of Massachusetts Press, The Commonwealth Series, 1976.

Hart, Albert Bushnell, ed. American History Told by Contemporaries. Vol. 1: Era of Colonization, 1492-1689. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1931.

Jameson, J. Franklin, Jr., gen. ed. Original Narratives of Early American History. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1915. Narratives of the Insurrections, 1675-1690, ed. by Charles M. Andrews.

Jameson, J. Franklin, Jr., gen. ed. Original Narratives of Early American History. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1915. Winthrop's Journal "History of New England, 1630-1649," Vols. 1 and 2, ed. by James Kendall Hosmer.

Morton, Thomas. New English Canaan, in American Poetry and Prose, ed. by Norman Foerster. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1934.

Morton, Thomas. "New England Canaan" in Tracts and Other Papers, Relating Principally to the Origin, Settlement and Progress of the Colonies in North America, From the Discovery of the Country to the Year 1776, edited by Peter Force. Washington: By the editor, 1838.

Massachusetts Historical Society Collection, Series 1 and 2. New York: Johnson Reprint Corporation, 1968.

Shurtleff, Nathaniel B., ed. Records of the Governor and Company of the Massachusetts Bay in New England. Vol. 1: 1628-1641. Boston: From the Press of William White, 1853.

Toppan, Robert Noxon. Andros Records. Worcester: American Antiquarian Society, 1901.

Whitmore, W. H., ed. The Andros Tracts: Being a Collection of Pamphlets and Official Papers Issued during the Period between the Overthrow of the Andros Government and the Establishment of the Second Charter of Massachusetts. 3 Vols. Boston: Published by the Prince Society, 1868.

Secondary Sources:

Abbot, William Wright. The Colonial Origins of the United States: 1607-1763. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1975.

Adams, Charles Francis. Introduction to New English Canaan by Thomas Morton. Boston: Published by the Prince Society, 1883.

Adams, Charles Francis. Three Episodes of Massachusetts History. Vol. 1. Rev. Ed. New York: Russell & Russell, 1965.

Adams, James Truslow. The Founding of New England. Boston: An Atlantic Monthly Press Book, Little, Brown, and Company, 1921.

Andrews, Charles M. The Colonial Period of American History. Vol. 1: The Settlements. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1934.

Aptheker, Herbert. A History of the American People: The Colonial Period. 2nd ed. New York: International Publishers, 1966.

Bancroft, George. History of the United States of America from the Discovery of the Continent. Vols. 1 and 2. Revised Ed. Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1876.

Barck, Oscar Theodore, Jr., and Hugh Talmadge Lefler. Colonial America. 2nd ed. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1927.

Beard, Charles A. and Mary R. Beard. The Rise of American Civilization. Rev. ed. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1927.

Beston, Henry. The Book of Gallant Vagabonds. New York: George H. Doran Company, 1925.

Breen, T. H. Puritans and Adventurers: Change and Persistence in Early America. New York: Oxford University Press, 1980.

Bremer, Francis J. The Puritan Experiment: New England Society from Bradford to Edwards. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1976.

Channing, Edward. A History of the United States. Vol. 1: The Planting of a Nation in the New World: 1000-1660. Vol. 2: A Century of Colonial History: 1660-1760. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1905.

Coleman, R. V. The First Frontier. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1948.

Connors, Donald F. Thomas Morton. New York: Twayne Publishers, Inc., 1969.

Ellis, George E. The Puritan Age and Rule in the Colony of Massachusetts Bay, 1629-1685. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin and Company, 1888.

Ferguson, Henry. Essays in American History. No place: No publisher, 1894. Reprint Edition: Port Washington, New York: Kennikat Press, 1969.

Foster, Stephen. Their Solitary Way: The Puritan Social Ethic in the First Century of Settlement in New England. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1971.

Greene, Evarts B. Religion and the State: The Making and Testing of an American Tradition. Ithaca, New York: Great Seal Books, a Division of Cornell University Press, 1941.

Heimert, Alan. Religion and the American Mind from the Great Awakening to the Revolution. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1966.

Langdon, George D., Jr. Pilgrim Colony: A History of New Plymouth, 1620-1691. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1966.

Lawrence, Henry W. The Not-Quite Puritans: Some Genial Follies and Peculiar Frailties of our Revered New England Ancestors. Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1928.

Mayo, Lawrence Shaw. John Endicott, A Biography. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1936; reprint ed., St. Clair Shores, Michigan: Scholarly Press, Inc., 1971.

Mayo, Lawrence Shaw, ed. Thomas Hutchinson's The History of The Colony and Provice of Massachusetts Bay. 3 vols. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1936.

Miller, Perry. The New England Mind in the Seventeenth Century. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1963.

Miller, Perry. Orthodoxy in Massachusetts, 1630-1650. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1933. Reprint ed., Gloucester, Massachusetts: Peter Smith, 1965.

Morison, Samuel Eliot. Builders of the Bay Colony. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin Company, 1930.

Morison, Samuel Eliot. The Intellectual Life of Colonial New England. Washington Square, New York: New York University Press, 1956.

Notestein, Wallace. The English People on the Eve of Colonization, 1603-1630. The American Nation Series. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 1954.

Osgood, Herbert L. The American Colonies in the Seventeenth Century. Vol. 1: The Proprietary Province in Its Earliest Form, The Corporate Colonies of New England. Vol. 2: The Proprietary Province in Its Later Forms. New York: Columbia University Press, 1904.

Rowse, A. L. The Elizabethans and America: The Trevelyan Lectures at Cambridge, 1958. New York: Harper Colophon Books, Harper & Row, Publishers, 1959.

Savelle, Max, and Darold D. Wax. A History of Colonial America. 3rd ed. Hinsdale, Illinois: Dryden Press, 1973.

Starkey, Marion L. Land Where Our Fathers Died: The Settling of Eastern Shores, 1607-1735. London: Constable and Company, Ltd., 1964.

Temple, Oliver Perry. The Covenanter, the Cavalier, and the Puritan. Cincinnati: The Robert Clarke Company, 1897.

Willison, George Findlay. Saints and Strangers. New York: Reynal & Hitchcock, 1945.

Wright, Louis B. The Atlantic Frontier: Colonial American Civilization, 1607-1763. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1947.

Ziff, Larzer. Puritanism in America: New Culture in a New World. New York: The Viking Press, 1973.

Journal Articles:

Beals, Carlton. "The Rebels of Merrymount." American Heritage 4 (June 1955):55-59, 101.

Mead, Sidney E. "The Nation with the Soul of a Church." Church History 36 (September 1967):262-283.