

33119

SAMUEL SEWALL: A SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY MAN'S VIEWS
ON WOMEN

Zorianna Dombchewsky

AN ORIGINAL ESSAY

in

The Department

of

History

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Master of Arts at
Concordia University
Montréal, Québec, Canada

September, 1976

• Zorianna Dombchewsky 1977

ZORIANNA DOMBCHESKY

SAMUEL SEWALL: A SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY MAN'S VIEWS

ON WOMEN

ABSTRACT

Samuel Sewall lived in a time when many aspects of life were changing and New England in general was undergoing a period of transition. Reared amid strong, Puritan traditions, Sewall successfully fulfilled his role in society predominantly as an upholder of precedent set. In accordance with the times, Sewall complied with the concept that all things had their proper place and function as designated by the Almighty. The whole of society performed like an organism. It functioned smoothly when its integral parts successfully completed their individual tasks and thereby contributed to the well-being of the whole.

Society was organized on many levels. Each had a hierarchical structure, the most basic design being one of command and obedience. The most fundamental society or "government" was that of the family. Here, as in the greater scheme of things, a certain hierarchical order prevailed. Each member was charged with certain duties as well as rights--according to one's place. Thus women, like men, were also heirs to life everlasting; and when their spiritual equality and rights came under attack, Sewall championed their rightful place as sanctioned by the Holy Word, in the Puritan tradition.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	iii
CHAPTER	
I. PURITANISM.....	1
II. PURITAN WOMAN--CO-PILOT.....	23
III. SAMUEL SEWALL AND A WOMAN'S ESTATE.....	63
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	89

CHAPTER I

PURITANISM

Samuel Sewall began his American experience in 1661, when at the age of nine he arrived at Boston Harbour with his mother, two brothers and two sisters. It was also a time of reunion. His father, Henry Sewall, Jr., had been working for almost two years, building and making numerous arrangements for his family's new life in New England. His task completed, he summoned and waited for his family's arrival, ready to carry them to their new home in Newbury.

Although born in Bishop Stoke, England, on March 28, 1652, Samuel Sewall was raised in New England, in the Puritan tradition; consequently, he can be claimed as a second generation, American Puritan. He was young enough to have his roots firmly transplanted in New England soil and to develop into a "Right New England Man," recalling his English beginnings only as a distant memory. By this time, however, most of the first generation settlers of the Massachusetts Bay Colony had passed on, leaving behind a new generation to take over and continue their heritage--the task of preserving a society of God's visible saints.

Sewall's own writings--principally, his Diary, which covered his day-to-day life for nearly fifty-six years; his

Letter Book; one of his commonplace books, a personal journal into which he wrote sermon notes, literary excerpts and comments that particularly appealed to him and a draft of his "Talitha Cumi"--are the main sources of information concerning his convictions and actions. In addition, there are the numerous secondary sources and studies done on Samuel Sewall and the Puritans.¹

In his multiple roles, among them, student, writer, husband, father, judge, widower and wooer, Sewall supplies ample evidence on the direction of his thought and actions. By examining his mode of life, particularly his writings, and comparing it with his contemporaneity, one finds just to what extent he did in fact mirror his times.

More specifically, this study will establish that Samuel Sewall was very much a man of his day in the area of "women's rights," contrary to the views of Mary Alden Ward, who states, "We must not fail to credit him with being ahead of his age on...the women question."² She arrives at this conclusion

¹The Diary of Samuel Sewall, 1674-1729, ed. M. Halsey Thomas (New York, 1973), 2 vols. All citations in subsequent footnotes to the diary will be to this edition. The following have also been consulted: Samuel Sewall, The Letter Book, in Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society, 6th series (Boston, 1886-1888), 2 vols.; MS. Diary and Commonplace book of Samuel Sewall, which includes the "Talitha Cumi," deposited at the Mass. Hist. Soc. For up-to-date biographical accounts on Sewall see: Ola Elizabeth Winslow, Samuel Sewall of Boston (New York, 1964); T.B. Strandness, Samuel Sewall: A Puritan Portrait (East Lansing, 1967).

²Mary Alden Ward, Old Colony Days (Boston, 1897), p. 162.

largely on the basis of Sewall's treatise, "Talitha Cumi: Or an Invitation to Women to Look after their Inheritance in the Heavenly Mansions," in which he argues and champions women's equal and rightful place in heaven. This thesis will prove such a line of reasoning inaccurate.

However, one cannot deem Samuel Sewall to be representative of his society or his day by simply studying him in isolation; but rather, one must view his society and his times in general and his relationship to his milieu and era.

To date, there is no one uniform definition of Puritanism and perhaps this task of definition is impossible. The Puritan movement was quite complex and perhaps the problem of definition is exacerbated by the changing nature of the word Puritanism. That is, it did not always mean the same thing to everyone at the same time. Furthermore, data, whether new or old, approached with different questions and from different perspectives will continue to render different interpretations and conclusions. Consequently there exists a divergence of views, both favorable and unfavorable, toward Puritanism; and as previously mentioned, there is no agreement among historians on one definition of Puritanism.

This study does not intend nor will attempt to formulate a precise definition of Puritanism for it is not the main objective of this essay. Nevertheless, a general, but balanced, description of Puritanism is necessary in order to grasp and understand the times. It is also necessary to know where it came from in order to observe its lines of

4
development and the kind of mental framework within which certain Puritans operated.

The list of descriptive terms is endless when the words Puritan and Puritanism are used. Often, they are loosely used to encompass a wide area of meanings and the resulting implications are numberless, sometimes even conflicting. The terms' range can cover and vary from such diverse poles as: theocracy--democracy, freedom--intolerance, Godliness--Bigotry, radical--reactionary, "liquid" spirits--temperance, and so forth.

One must be aware that generalizations, by the mere fact that they are sweeping and indefinite, can be misleading and should be used with caution. They may obscure or omit subtle variances which are perhaps important and which could subsequently belie the entire illustration. For example, Rev. N.H. Chamberlain views Puritanism as radical Protestantism and "at its core is the apotheosis of individualism, and the most relentless of democracies."¹ Formerly, man existed for church and state, however, Chamberlain continues to say that "now it was demanded that church and state should exist for man."² True, the Reformation was an endeavor to radically change the relationship between the individual and human society, but it did not advocate a democracy nor did it promote individualism. To the Puritans democracy was anathema

¹Rev. N.H. Chamberlain, Samuel Sewall and the World He Lived In (New York, 1897), p. 15.

²Ibid.

and implied anarchy; it went against their idea of an orderly and stratified society, where everyone kept to his proper station and performed his duties.¹

On the other hand, there are the sharp rebuttals like those of Charles Francis Adams, who sees Puritanism as a repressive and destructive system--intellectually barren. It produced narrow conformism and a thoroughly morbid general condition. In sum, it was a "theologico-glacial period" whose single redeeming feature in which was that beneath the chilling and killing superincumbent mass of theology, superstition and intolerance ran the strong, vivifying current of political opposition and life.²

In general, historians agree that Puritanism was an offspring, whether stunted or not is yet another matter, of the Protestant Reformation. As previously mentioned, Puritanism has had various meanings at different times.

Samuel Eliot Morison traces it as a nickname puritani used during the theological contentions of the late Roman Empire.³ During the reign of Queen Elizabeth, the term was

¹Robert Emmet Wall, Jr., Massachusetts Bay: The Crucial Decade, 1640-1650 (New Haven, 1972), pp. 18, 22, 59, 61, 62; Perry Miller and Thomas H. Johnson, eds., The Puritans (New York, rev. ed., 1963), pp. 14-19, 61 [hereafter cited as Miller and Johnson]; Michael Walzer, The Revolution of the Saints: A Study in the Origins of Radical Politics (Cambridge, Mass., 1965), pp. 6, 7, 8, 14, 82, 111, 149, 171-177, 180-181. Walzer also shows that in time, in England, the idea of body politic or the organic analogy became inconvenient and incompatible with the needs of revolution and war. He shows how the rhetoric sought new expression and moved from the organic analogy to that of ship of state.

²Charles Francis Adams, as quoted in Puritanism in Early America, ed. by George M. Waller (Boston, 1950), pp. 55, 54.

³Samuel Eliot Morison, Builders of the Bay (Boston, 2nd ed. rev., 1958), p. 55.

resurrected and liberally applied to Englishmen who advocated further "purification" within the Church of England. They believed that many abuses still remained and needed correction. Further reform meant cleansing the Church of England of forms and ceremonies that had no basis in the Bible and purging it of papist residues. For them, the Reformation did not end with the enthronement of Queen Elizabeth.¹

At that time the Puritans did not make up a distinct sect or denomination, nor was anyone certain how far this "purification" was to go. To add to the confusion, the term puritan was sometimes extended to those outside the Church of England--to the separatists, like the Pilgrims.²

Michael Walzer, describing Puritanism as the earliest form of political radicalism states:

The case for Puritan radicalism...must be made with the Disciplinarians of Elizabethan times and the Presbyterians and Congregationalists of the Stuart period, that is, with the Puritan mainstream, the true English Calvinists.³

He continues to argue that although these groups did diverge on various points and altered with the passage of time:

all of them all the time shared certain key ideas incompatible with the traditional system in church and state,

¹Ibid., pp. 54-55; Samuel Eliot Morison, The Intellectual Life of Colonial New England (Ithaca, [1967]), chap. 1; Miller and Johnson, 1: 5-6, 7-8; Edmund S. Morgan, Visible Saints: The History of a Puritan Idea (Ithaca, 1963), chap. 1.

²Morison, Builders, p. 55; Miller and Johnson, 1: 6-7.

³Walzer, Revolution of the Saints, p. viii.

ideas which tended continually to produce radical and innovative political activity.¹

Perry Miller stresses the fact that at that time the Puritan was also an Englishman. Though the contentions in England were multiple, underneath there was a "vast substratum of agreement" between the Puritan and his fellow-Englishman; and because the Puritan was an Englishman, he held many of the so-called normal English attitudes towards life. By looking at the Puritan culture as a whole, Miller finds "that about ninety percent of the intellectual life, scientific knowledge, morality, manners and customs, notions and prejudices, was that of all Englishmen."²

Broadly speaking, the Puritan and his fellow-opponents held much in common. They were heirs to the same medieval legacy, that is, they held a very traditional image of society--the organic concept of society. All aspects of life had a schematic organization, a certain hierarchical structure. Society functioned like an organism, segmented, with every member fixed in a certain order and coupled with a particular function. Each element acted as an integral part of the whole. It was required to fulfill its designated task and not only contribute but also subordinate itself to the harmony and well-

¹Ibid.

²Miller and Johnson, 1: 7-10.

being of the entire organ.¹

Furthermore, both Puritans and Anglicans were basically Protestants and agreed that men were saved by their faith and not by their good works. The two rejected papal supremacy and agreed that Scripture was the revealed Word of God. They recognized the necessity of preaching the Word and they concurred on sacramental doctrine and man's need of God's grace for redemption, as he was helpless and bound in sin. Some historians argue that there were no doctrinal differences between the two. According to Perry Miller, "in its major aspects the religious creed of Puritanism was neither peculiar to the Puritans nor different from that of the Anglicans," for even the Puritans themselves asserted the fact that "they could subscribe the doctrinal articles of the Church of England."² As a result the Puritans, unlike the separatists, acknowledged the Church of England as a true church though corrupt, and maintained, therefore, that salvation was possible even for the members of the Church of England.

¹For a more detailed discussion on the organic analogy see: Perry Miller, The New England Mind: From Colony to Province (Cambridge, Mass., 1953); Miller and Johnson, 1: 10; Walzer, Revolution of the Saints; Bernard Bailyn, New England Merchants in the Seventeenth Century (New York, 1955), espec. pp. 19, 20, 41; Richard L. Bushman, From Puritan to Yankee: Character and the Social Order in Connecticut, 1690-1768 (Cambridge, Mass., 1967).

²Miller and Johnson, 1: 6-14, 23-26, 30-37, 39-58; Morgan, Visible Saints, espec. pp. 42-58, where he deals with the developments of the idea of church membership and its admission procedures. Charles H. George and Katherine George, The Protestant Mind of the English Reformation, 1570-1640 (Princeton, 1961) maintain that "in the basic Christian doctrines... the significance of sin in human nature and of man's faith and God's will in salvation, the English pulpit has on the

Unlike the Anglicans, the Puritans maximized the importance of the Scriptures, the Holy Word of God. For them the Bible was the source, the answer, to all of man's questions concerning his being, his existence. They attributed absolute authority to scriptures. As the revelation of God's will, the Bible was the revealed law of God providing the direction for the most minute aspect of life. The Anglicans on the other hand maintained that the Bible was God's revealed word only on general and major tenets of the Christian religion. In other matters, that is, within worldly bounds, man, through reason which God instilled in him and through the law which governs nature, could learn and establish rules to govern himself by. The Anglicans charged the Puritans of narrow-minded literalism for extending the authority of scriptures to the point of its being the only existing, absolute law and

whole exhibited remarkable consistency" (p. 70); any antagonistic argument pertaining to sin, faith, and predestination, which the authors consider the "core of the creed" was primarily directed at Roman Catholicism, radical sects and to Arminianism" (p. 71). On the other hand, John F. H. New in Anglican and Puritan: The Basis of their Opposition, 1558-1640 (Stanford, 1964) argues that significant differences between Anglicans and Puritans in the Elizabethan and early Stuart England over government and rituals existed; and the dispute over the authority of the Scripture "is generally accepted as the critical point of a long controversy, clearly the point was determined by the intersection of two differing concepts of human nature" (p. 28). He thus asserts that irreconcilable theological differences between Anglicans and the Puritans did in fact exist and they were the very essence of the conflict. He states that these doctrinal differences involved the most fundamental questions of theology on man, the universe, God, and the Church (p. 103). He arrives at this conclusion by examining man, the Church, sacramental faith and human destiny (103-105).

thereby eliminating and making useless the laws of nature and the law of reason. Both believed that God's will was manifested in the laws of nature and in the processes of right reason in human intellect, but according to the Puritans, for man to correctly perceive it, insight provided by God's grace was needed. Though Anglican and Puritan alike believed in man's reason and his ability to distinguish good from evil, the differences between the two factions lie predominately in their view toward man, his natural reason, his faith and subsequently their application and connection to the Scriptures. Since the fall of man his reason was corrupted by sin, consequently, the Puritans argued natural reason could not be trusted. The Anglicans, in turn, frequently stressed and had placed more trust in the rational capacity of fallen man. True, the Bible was primarily a matter of faith, however, the Anglicans asserted that there existed some rational testimonies or arguments, such as the traditions of the Church, writings of other ages like those of the early Church fathers or civil law, that could be used to help convince men that the Bible was divinely inspired. The Puritans obviously did not begrudge rational arguments, and the like, however, they countered with the argument that man's reason, like his nature, was corrupt, untrustworthy and incapable without God's grace, which restored and strengthened his faith, to correctly perceive the truth which was in the Bible. The two "heirs" may have overlapped and held beliefs in common, especially the doctrine of predestination, but the

similarity soon ends.¹

It should be mentioned at this point that Puritanism was not equivalent to Calvinism.² Over the years Puritan divines developed and elaborated their own theology, drawing their ideas primarily from the Bible. The Puritans evolved what was called the "Covenant Theology" or "Federal Theology." Its development was quite complex and intricate and at times it appeared to border on contradiction.³

The main covenant was the Covenant of Grace, a personal covenant, contracted between God and the individual. From this covenant a series of social covenants stemmed and grew from the Covenant of Grace, though they were always dependant on it. These social covenants will be discussed in greater detail in the following chapter.

The Puritans maintained that God had first contracted a Covenant of Works with Adam. In his agreement, Adam was

¹New, Anglican and Puritan; George and George, Protestant Mind; Miller and Johnson, 1: 23-63.

²Miller and Johnson, 1: 32-33, 57-58; Morison, Builders, pp. 57, 128; Morison, Intellectual Life, pp. 159-161, where he states that "the source of the New England ideology is not Calvin, but England, or more accurately the Bible as it was read in England, not in Geneva."

³For a detailed discussion of covenant theology see: Miller, From Colony to Province; Morgan, Visible Saints; Walzer, Revolution of the Saints, espec. pp. 55-57, 148-198, 212-215, 221, 261. Due to the intricacies of the covenant system, it was conducive to confusion and disagreements which in turn produced various interpretations, some of which were judged as heresy. See Emery Battis, Saints and Sectaries: Anne Hutchinson and the Antinomian Controversy in the Massachusetts Bay Colony (Chapel Hill, 1962) and Charles Francis Adams, Three Episodes of Massachusetts History (Cambridge, Mass., 1894), 2 vols.

promised salvation in return for his obedience to God and His divine law. The covenant was broken with the fall of Adam. God, however, in His infinite Mercy offered man, through Abraham, the Covenant of Grace. Again, He voluntarily initiated and pledged Himself to abide by these new terms and conditions for salvation. Here, He demanded faith in the coming of Christ as man's Redeemer; for this act of faith God gave man His saving grace, the Divine Spirit. This saving grace regenerated and strengthened the believer and thereby facilitated man's fulfillment of the Covenant of Works. From that time on, God distributed this act of faith for those whom He had elected. A covenant of grace existed then between the Supreme Sovereign and His obedient believers. God did not totally relinquish the believer from the Covenant of Works. The Puritans were quick to point out that though the Saint was no longer "technically" bound to the earlier compact, God had meticulously included the Covenant of Works within the Covenant of Grace. Furthermore, though it may appear to be in contradiction with the doctrine of predestination man was responsible for his acceptance or rejection of saving grace, for the Puritans believed that it was an act of the will.¹

Thus one was justified by faith and sanctification was a consequence of justification rather than the origin of it.

¹Battis, Saints and Sectaries, pp. 21-26, and chap. 3; Morgan, Visible Saints, pp. 14, 55-56, 83-87, 96-97, 102-104; Walzer, Revolution of the Saints, pp. 50-57, 167-171, 212-215, 261; Miller, Colony to Province, espec. pp. 11-12, 14, 21, 44, 59, 466; Miller and Johnson, 1: 55-57.

Sanctification was also a good sign of salvation; that is, the presence and the detection of saving grace was a good indication that one might be saved. However, the real problem and source of anxiety was to discern whether or not one genuinely possessed saving faith. This question produced the Puritan's incessant and often tortuous self-examination and never-ending search of the conscience.¹ It is from this intense quest that this picture of the anxious and oft guilt-ridden figure trying to live every phase of life according to the Book, arises; and inspite of all his efforts, the Saint never really knows for certain, whether or not he is elected for salvation.

Thus Puritanism was not only a religious creed but also an explicit philosophy of life. "This philosophy defined man's place in the world...it told him who he was and what he might become; and it told him what God expected of him."² The Puritan knew that some people were predestined for salvation and others for damnation, "but if man's fate was clear, the fate of individuals was not."³

¹Morgan, Visible Saints, pp. 67-73; Battis, Saints and Sectaries, pp. 24-35; Miller and Johnson, 1: 57-61; and Robert Middlekauff, The Mathers: Three Generations of Puritan Intellectuals, 1596-1728 (New York, 1971) which is an excellent account describing men who "were fascinated by their own mental states; and this absorption with themselves yielded great uneasiness." Although Middlekauff uses three Puritan ministers who were intellectuals and men of intense piety, this account describes not only what the Mathers themselves underwent but also gives a good indication of the Puritan's general state of mind; for as effective ministers, these men had to be sensitive to the people's needs and shifts in culture which were reflected in their preachings.

²Middlekauff, Three Generations, p. 4.

³Ibid.

In the words of Perry Miller, "Puritanism may perhaps best be described as that point of view, that philosophy of life, that code of values, which was carried to New England by the first settlers in the early seventeenth century."¹

For certain Puritans, further reformation within the Church of England appeared bleak, so dismal in fact that they saw their only hope for salvation by migrating and establishing their settlements according to God's prescriptions and organizing their own "visible church."²

In the early part of the seventeenth century, New England Puritanism remained fairly constant and infallible, but in time, it too was to undergo a period of transition. Many of its concerns shifted its focus from religion to those of a more worldly interest. These changes were to develop as a result of forces, from within and outside of their environment, unforeseen by the founders.³

It is necessary to understand the over-all framework of Puritan thought carried to America for it expressed the period and clearly influenced the way of life. As mentioned above, over the years, portions of it underwent certain alterations and adjustments while other sectors of thought remained

¹Miller and Johnson, 1: 1.

²Morgan, Visible Saints, pp. 5, 13-32.

³Bushman, From Puritan to Yankee; Miller, From Colony to Province; Middlekauff, Three Generations; and Michael Zuckerman, Peaceable Kingdoms: New England Towns in the Eighteenth Century (New York, 1970).

fairly intact.¹ The most notable idea, one that characterized the era, was the idea of the covenant.

The conception of the covenant was the "master idea" that domineered and guided the age, especially for the New England Puritans.² It was used to provide explanations and solutions to problems ranging from a theological nature to political and social ones. The idea of the covenant was the groundwork for the structure of church polity and social theory. It helped form the development of institutions and traditions from the beginning.

Along with the Covenant of Grace, a social covenant was formulated to guide the saints as a collective group in their everyday life.

Starting from the premise that a regenerate person, entering the Covenant of Grace, is taken into legal compact with God (this being available to him because God and Christ had, in a previous compact between themselves, the Covenant of Redemption, provided the foundation), federal theologians worked out a corollary that God likewise enters into covenant with a group as a unit. The two covenants--personal and public--were 'branches' of the same, and yet distinct: saints dwelling alone may be in the Covenant of Grace without participating in a pledged society; a society may achieve this honour even though many (or most) of its citizens are not

¹There are various studies centering on the local level. These accounts employed specific towns and analyzed individual town growth and development, the changes in the distribution of civil, economic, and ecclesiastical power and the existence of various patterns of family life in the different towns. See: John Demos, A Little Commonwealth: Family Life in Plymouth Colony (New York, 1970); Philip Greven, Jr., Four Generations: Population, Land, and Family in Colonial Andover, Massachusetts (Ithaca, 1970); Kenneth A. Lockridge, A New England Town: The First Hundred Years, Dedham, Massachusetts, 1636-1736 (New York, 1970)

²Miller, From Colony to Province, p. 21.

gracious. Over and above His contracts with persons, God settles the social terms with a band of men, which thereupon becomes committed, as a political entity, to a specifically enunciated political program.¹

The relationship of God to the community was external or federal in the sense that the ends were external. Salvation could not be earned through good works but God's divine favours and prosperities in return for obedience could be. In order to belong in the group, "the prerequisite is not, cannot be, a flawless sanctity of all citizens, but a deliberate dedication of the community to a communal decision, like a declaration of war."² Thus when the covenant was applied to a unit, it became a public or social covenant; although its origin was in the personal covenant, the social covenant was different. Its terms were different and the name varied according to the group it was applied to, be it a family covenant, a church covenant, and so forth. Under national covenant, the New England settlers if obedient to God's laws, they would prosper and thrive; if not, they would have to face "Old Deluder" and the wrath of God. In a sense, the terms of these compacts were acknowledged patterns of behavior to be followed both by ruler and ruled. This was a principal part of the intellectual baggage brought to America by those Puritans who settled New England.³

¹Ibid.

²Ibid.

³Miller, From Colony to Province, espec. pp. 14, 21-27; Wall, Crucial Decade, p. 2; Morgan, Visible Saints, p. 29; Morgan, Puritan Family; Religion and Domestic Relations in Seventeenth-Century New England, (New York, revised and enlarged, 1966), pp. 6-12.

It was established through the covenants that in society some men were sanctioned by God to rule while others were to obey, but in the end, all were to be obedient and held accountable to God by reason of their covenant with Him. The Puritans affirmed that as civil government originated in a compact so must the church and the family. The magistrates, the clergy, and the fathers of families were to be the heads, the rulers, while the remaining body was to be ruled, under their government.¹

To an important extent, the conception of a covenant introduced new elements into the Puritan's image of an ordered and organic nature of society. As mentioned before, this organic analogy was a medieval legacy. Of old, one's personal status and position in power was determined by one's connections and particularly by one's birth--by being. One passively submitted to one's station in life. The saints struck at the old hierarchy of status on the grounds that no man had a hereditary claim to his place or power. For unlike the medieval men and their passive resignations to their roles in life, the Puritans were responsible for their world, for their improvement of it and voluntarily so. Just as men were responsible for their acceptance or rejection of God's saving grace and therefore their salvation in their personal covenant, so too were they responsible for their response and consent to God's will in their public covenant. The Saint was called to be a consenting servant and soldier of God; man's obedience was an act of the

¹Morgan, Puritan Family, pp. 6-12.

will. The saint's religious life and political activity were not separate but were part of each other, which is reflected in the analogous relation between private and public covenants, both being inextricably woven together. All was done for a definite purpose; the goal was to be for the glory of God. Essentially, men were responsible for their actions, which were deliberate, and their status was more the result of their behavior rather than being.¹

Even in the doctrine of predestination, the Puritans attempted to counter any possible resigned passivity by maintaining that man's obedience and his conduct was an act of the will. However, theirs was a precarious situation involving a delicate balance. For man to have a will implied a certain degree of freedom of choice and self-determination. The idea that man had some control over his destiny appeared dangerously inconsistent with the belief that man was predestined either as one of God's elect or an unregenerate. Nonetheless, most Puritan divines would have agreed with Increase Mather's reply that although "Sinners cannot Convert themselves, but their Cannot is a wilful Cannot. They will not come."²

The Puritans viewed man's relationships to God and with one another in the context of covenants. The covenant idea manifested the position and duties of both, the ruler

¹Walzer, Revolution of the Saints, espec. pp. 2-4, 10-12, 64, 166-170; Miller and Johnson, 1: 12-13; Miller, From Colony to Province, pp. 281-290.

²Increase Mather, Awakening Truths Tending To Conversion (Boston, 1710), pp. 67-69, quoted in Middlekauff, Three Generations, p. 5; also see Ibid., pp. 66-68, 173.

and the ruled. The bond between the two is best expressed by the theologian William Perkins:

Persons are distinguished by order, whereby God hath appointed, that in every society one person should bee above or under another; not making all equall, as though the bodie should bee all Head and nothing else; but even in degree and order, hee hath set a distinction of men, partly in respect of gifts, partly, in respect of order, come personal callings. For if all men had the same gifts, and all were in the same degree and order, then should all have one and the same calling; but inasmuch as God giveth diversitie of gifts inwardly, and distinction of order outwardly, hence proceede diversitie of personall callings, and therefore I added, that personal calling arise from that distinction which God maketh, betweene man and man in every societie.¹

Thus the Puritans believed that one's position and place in life was perpetuated and directed by one's personal calling bestowed upon man by God. It was this, the principle of divine calling that drove them into action and designated their purpose and place in life. Man was to voluntarily submit and work diligently in his calling in order to secure not only personal benefits and possible salvation but also to insure a disciplined and harmonious working of the social order. Again, man's submission to God and to each other was an act of the will, a voluntary act.²

The importance of the recurrent belief that some were to command and others to obey cannot be stressed enough. This scheme of command and obedience pervaded every aspect of

¹William Perkins, The Works of That Famous and Worthy Minister of Christ in the Universitie of Cambridge, Mr. William Perkins (London, 1626-31), 2: 155, quoted in Wall, Crucial Decade, pp. 2-3.

²Miller, From Colony to Province, p. 7; Wall, Crucial Decade, pp. 18, 80; Walzer, Revolution of the Saints, pp. 43, 166-170, 210-219.

life and began most importantly in the smallest of governments--"the family well-ordered."¹ It was also entered upon consent as required by all covenants.

The word government was applied to the church and to the family as well as to civil authority--"to all the authoritative external restraints on the human will."² Through various methods these institutions indoctrinated social values and aimed to maintain order, peace and harmony. Particularly in New England's formative years, the enforcement of social order by civil authority was of a "coercive nature" and over the years it evolved into one of "accommodation."³

Submission to authority was considered of the utmost necessity for the welfare of each individual and of society--the fountain of "true liberty." John Winthrop, a founding father of New England, accurately portrayed the concept of liberty and authority when he wrote:

This liberty is maintained and exercised in the way of subjection to authority; it is the same kind of liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free. The woman's own choice makes such a man her husband; yet being so chosen, he is her lord, and she is to be subject to him, yet in a way of liberty, not of bondage; and a true wife accounts her subjection her honor and freedom, and would not think her condition safe and free, but in her subjection to her husband's authority. Such is the liberty of the church under the authority of Christ, her king and hus-

¹The phrase quoted is taken from the title of Cotton Mather's work, The Family Well-Ordered: Or an Essay to Render Parents and Children Happy in One Another (Boston, 1699).

²Bushman, From Puritan to Yankee, pp. 13-14.

³Bushman, From Puritan to Yankee; Zuckerman, Peaceable Kingdoms, pp. 7-8. On the themes of concord and consensus see also the town studies of Demos, Greven and Lockridge.

band. Even so, brethren, it will be between you and your magistrates.¹

The Puritans were very aware that the success of civil authority depended on the other controlling and reinforcing agencies, primarily, that of the family. The family was the foundation on which the rest of society was built, for "well ordered Families naturally produce a good Order in other Societies."² It is here that patterns of social behavior, attitudes, and human relations in general have their beginning. If the pattern of submission is correctly learned and applied first in the home, then the proper attitude and respect toward authority in general is shaped and formed for life.³

The figure used to represent authority was that of the father. Even in civil power, the magistrates were referred to as the fathers of their people and the biblical commandment to honor parents was expanded to include all rulers. The church also exercised its ecclesiastical authority in upholding social order through such means as public censures, sermons, jeremiads, the assignment of pews according to rank, and so forth. The minister, in his role as head of his church, entreated his followers to always obey and submit to "government," thereby reinforcing the "father's" authority in the home as well as in civil government. All these agencies in conjunction with the idea of social hierarchy endeavored to maintain social order

¹Winthrop's Journal "History of New England" 1630-1649, ed. James Kendall Hosmer (New York, 1946), 2: 239.

²Cotton Mather, The Family Well-Ordered, p. 4.

³Bushman, From Puritan to Yankee, p. 14.

and reinforce governing authority.¹ The opposing tendencies to submit and to domineer were compatible with the ideal of government, each man deferred to his superiors and ruled his inferiors."²

¹Ibid., pp. 13-18.

²Ibid., p. 14.

CHAPTER II

PURITAN WOMAN--CO-PILOT

Since the Puritans had no thought of separating into distinct churches, they did not see themselves as "separatists." Their churches were, they asserted, a part of the Church of England. Although they did maintain that the Church of England was corrupt, they nonetheless acknowledged its validity. The Church of England they reasoned was a true church; it was not a church of the Antichrist as was the one of Rome. Consequently, the Puritans argued that they were not separating from the Church of England itself, but rather from its corruption and disorders.¹

In many ways, New England was an extension and a re-establishment of Old England, particularly for the founding settlers. They persisted in identifying with Old England and they were tied to it in various ways. They continued to view themselves as Englishmen and emphatically asserted themselves as loyal subjects of the crown. Frequently they referred to England as home. Their customs and traditions were those of England and their laws were basically English laws. In spite of the successful transference of lifestyles, the founders

¹Miller and Johnson, 1: 5-10; Morgan, Visible Saints; Middlekauff, The Mathers, pp. 25-26.

were not attached to New England in the manner that they were to England. New England was merely the location of their mission--to preserve the true Church and to perhaps save their England. For them any other place would have been perfectly acceptable had it been advantageous and agreeable to carrying out their task. They admitted that true Churches existed in many places, yet they came to New England where they patterned their lives after those of England.¹

It was not in the first generation but rather in the second generation that a sentiment toward New England, or more accurately, the idea of being a people of New England, took hold. The second generation inherited the task of preserving the Church and, as a result, their task was done with a different temperament. The sense of immediacy was not the same. They were not the generation that had undergone, first hand, the struggles and bitter experiences of the Reformation in England, nor of the Great Migration in the 1630's, as their fathers had done. They were further removed in time and place. They were the generation whose struggles were experienced against a New England background. Consequently, they perceived their lives and experiences in terms of New England and they began to identify themselves as true New Englanders. In their eyes, the Church became identified with New England as a people, and as a result, the second generation expanded the task of preserving the true Church to "include the preservation, at

¹Middlekauff, The Mathers, pp. 25-26, 96-98 and chap. 2; Miller and Johnson, vol. 1.

least temporarily, of an entire people.¹

Furthermore, their sense of identity arose not from achievement but rather from an inventory of failures and a feeling that they were failing God and not fully serving Him in New England. It is only with the passing of the first generation, that one can "find something that really is colonial in thought or provincial in undertaking."²

Nonetheless, the task of preserving the true Church and of transmitting social values remained. The Puritans were aware and well informed of the family's potential, if not its indispensibility, in maintaining and perpetuating a strong social order. The family was a fundamental vehicle for transferring culture and upholding the social order. The Puritans greatly valued and depended upon the successful government of the family.

A Household is as it were a little Commonwealth, by the good government whereof, Gods glorie may be advanced, the Common wealth which standeth of severall families, benefited, and all that live in that familie receive much comfort and commoditie.³

The family was commonly likened to a government or to that of a commonwealth. Puritan ministers continually warned their flocks that

Without Family care the labour of Magistrates and Ministers for Reformation and Propagating Religion, is likely to be in a great measure unsuccessful. It's much to be fear'd, Young Persons wont much mind what's said

¹Middlekauff, The Mathers, p. 99, chap. 6.

²Miller, From Colony to Province, p. 15; Middlekauff, The Mathers, chap. 6.

³Robert Cleaver, A Godly Form of Household Government (London, 1603) p. 13.

by Ministers in Publick, if they are not Instructed at home: nor will they much regard good Laws made by Civil Authority, if they are not well counsel'd and governed at home.¹

The Puritan's belief in the sacredness and importance of family government was successfully transported to New England without change. That oft quoted conviction that all governments were "in vaine, and to no purpose, unless they will begin this most necessarie discipline in reforming their own houses" was wholeheartedly embraced by New England Puritans.¹ The family remained "the very First Society" in which God chose "to lay the foundations both of State and Church," and "out of which both those swarms of State and Church, issued forth."³ As joint governors, parents were always exhorted to be exemplary and to provide not only for temporal needs, but spiritual needs as well. They were to rule with a "Sweet Authority," that is, "Our Authority should be so Tempered with Kindness, and Meekness, and Loving Tenderness, that our Children may Fear us with Delight."⁴ In the family, as in other governments, a scheme of command and obedience was applied. Ultimate authority was vested in the father. He was designated as the qualified head, the ruler, while the rest of the household were to be obedient

¹Benjamin Wadsworth, The Well-Ordered Family (Boston, 1712), p. 84, quoted in Morgan, Visible Saints, p. 139.

²Cleaver, Godly Form, p. A₃

³Thomas Cobbett, Fruitful and Usefull Discourse touching the Honour due from Children to Parents and the Duty of Parents towards their Children (London, 1656), p. A₃, quoted in Morgan, Puritan Family, pp. 133-134.

⁴Cotton Mather, The Family Well-Ordered, p. 22.

and willingly subject themselves to his rule. The Puritans asserted that the husband's authoritative position as the head of the household was established primarily on the basis of the Bible, for "The Lord in his Word calls him the Head."¹ Thus the pattern of command and obedience in the family was in accordance with the hierarchical structure of values that the society in general possessed. Everyone was assigned to a place with a purpose and function to fulfill.

Marriage and the family were acknowledged as necessary to society and honorable in the eyes of the Lord. To the Puritans wedlock was,

a lawful knot, and unto God an acceptable a. Yoking and joining together of b. one man, and one woman, with the good consent of them both, to the ende that they may dwell together in friendship and honestie, one helping and comforting the other, eschewing whoredome, and all uncleannesse, bringing up their children in the feare of God; Or it is a coupling together of two persons into one flesh, according unto the ordinance of God, not to be broken, but to continue during the life of either of them.²

The author of marriage was God and He had established the terms of the marriage covenant. Thus when a couple married, they agreed to obey those rules and "When husband and wife neglect their duties they not only wrong each other, but they provoke God by breaking his law."³

¹William Whately, A Bride-Bush: Or a Wedding Sermon (London, 1617), p. 19.

²Cleaver, Godly Form, p. 98.

³Wadsworth, The Well-Ordered Family, p. 40, quoted in Morgan, Visible Saints, p. 30.

The Puritans viewed the state of matrimony in a relatively positive light when compared with the Roman Catholic attitude, exemplified by the writings of Church Fathers such as St. Augustine and St. Thomas Aquinas. Although the purity of the marriage institution was acknowledged by early Church Fathers, it was done somewhat reluctantly, if not condescendingly. With their increasingly deprecatory attitude toward marriage, especially as the spirit of asceticism gave rise to the veneration of virginity and celibacy, Church leaders and writers ultimately relegated the state of matrimony to a rather subordinate station in life. The lamentably low opinion of marriage was perhaps due in part to the paradoxical duality--the contradiction of divine and human elements--that existed in their view of marriage. Marriage was at once divine, a sacrament, and yet it was also a worldly affair resting on a human contract. Wedlock, with its sacramental character on one hand and its temporal aspects on the other, was considered with growing ambivalence. This incompatibility of divine and human elements appeared irreconcilable and the matrimonial state was eventually perceived as an inferior condition of life. Supposed sinfulness beclouded and trailed marital intercourse, for marriage was not truly considered pure but rather a compromise with human concupiscence. Here, lust was commuted. Sexual appetites were "remedied" and in a certain measure justified. Propagation was, after all, necessary. But to abstain from such human weaknesses was considered a holier and a superior act. It was tantamount to a most pure condition. Only

a "select-few" could hope to aspire to sustain this purer atmosphere--unsullied and unpolluted by human weaknesses. The "commonality" was urged to marry if they were incapable of maintaining the superior state of virginity or continence. The words of St. Paul served as a reminder that one could do worse than marry. His dictum that it would be better to marry than to burn strongly underscored and verified the insidious attitude of inferiority directed toward matrimony. The hypocrisy connected with the sacred image of wedlock can be further demonstrated by the declarations of the Council of Trent. While it voiced its disapproval of all who questioned the sacredness and the sacramental character of marriage, the Council, at the same time, vehemently disparaged not only those who claimed that there was no greater degree of purity or superiority involved in either condition--married or celibate--but particularly those who dared to favor marriage above that state of virginity or celibacy. In the eyes of the Roman Catholic Church, marriage furnished the remedial services for carnal passions and the certainty of the Church's proliferation. Ecclesiastics recognized women as instruments of carnal desires and a necessary evil for human reproduction. A married man's sexual desires were "excusable" and even tolerated, for after all, what else could be expected while in the presence of a "natural temptation." Hence, in Roman Catholicism, it appears that, for the most part, marriage miserably assumed notably negative attributes at

that time.¹

In the Puritan community, the institution of matrimony held a comparatively esteemed position. It was not simply a legitimate medium for the release of man's "irrational heat"--to borrow a phrase from John Milton--for merely for the perpetuation of the human race. The ends of wedlock were manifold. When a man and a woman entered the state of matrimony they became "one flesh" in order--

that they may bee the chiefe of a new family, and begetting children, (and trayning them up together with servants, according to their place) [and that they] may store the world with people, and provide plants, as it were, for the Church, Gods own Vineyard.²

Through marriage, husband and wife were able not only "to procreate cities of God" and "to avoid fornication," but also, and significantly, "to be a mutuall comfort and help to one another."³ This is not to say that the marital ends, reproduction and the avoidance of carnal sin, assumed secondary ranks, or that companionship and mutual affection took priority. Rather, it was believed that the inclusion, the combination, of all these elements created conjugal success. Friendship and mutual respect were increasingly recognized as important and necessary ingredients for a harmonious and affectionate union.

¹For a more detailed history on the growth of ecclesiastical control over marriage and the development of Christian thought on marriage, see George E. Howard, A History of Matrimonial Institutions (New York, 1904), 1: chaps. 8, 9; George and George, Protestant Mind, pp. 259-270; Chilton L. Powell, English Domestic Relations 1487-1653 (New York, 1917), pp. 2-3, 119-123, 147-151.

²Whately, Bride-Bush, p. 14.

³William Gouge, Of Domestical Duties (London, 2nd ed., 1626), p. 22.

It is unfortunate that these aspects of marriage appear to have been long ignored and neglected in other times.¹ The Puritans consistently returned to the themes of conjugal harmony and happiness. More and more, matrimony was approached as a conjugal society of peace and well-being. Though traditional views of marital duties were not forgotten, the Puritans ostensibly gave more emphasis to positive aspects of marriage, such as happiness, mutual affection and respect, rather than the more negative, and burdensome ones. Although they believed that a woman was subject to man by her nature, man was reminded "that he hath not taken her for a slave or servant, but for a fellow and companion of his life."²

The union of husband and wife constituted a legitimate and a natural society. Those who entered the marriage state were but following an honorable calling of God.³ Accordingly, the Reformation fathers saw no discrepancy between sanctity and matrimony. The physical aspects of marriage did not diminish the sanctity of marriage. In fact, Reformation fathers were quick to criticize their Roman Catholic opponents for their

¹George and George, Protestant Mind, pp. 261-269, contend that any companionable aspect of marriage was virtually curtailed in Roman Catholicism, for in keeping with Thomistic tradition, the woman was created to serve as man's helpmate in only one vital capacity--that of reproduction. It is also noteworthy to mention that men were considered to make fitter and better companions than women. See also Powell, English Domestic Relations, pp. 120-123, 170-171.

²Cleaver, A Godly Form, p. 149.

³George and George, Protestant Mind, pp. 127, 264, 265. For a brief discussion on married clergy, see Howard, Matrimonial Institutions, 1: 388-389, 390, 393-394; and Powell, English Domestic Relations, pp. 120-122.

canting dialogue concerning their dogma on marriage and its sacred image. They did not mark any dichotomy between chastity and marriage; and John Donne in all probability expressed the general Protestant conviction that Catholic ecclesiastics "injure the whole state of Christianity, when they oppose marriage and chastity as though they were incompatible, and might not consist together."¹

Aware that sexual intercourse was natural and a human necessity, the Puritans did not shy from issues concerning sex. Sexual satisfaction was to be enjoyed only in marriage and in moderation. "...frequent Osculations amongst those that are not in any Conjugal Relation..." could only but draw condemnation from the likes of Increase Mather.² Everything had to be placed in a proper perspective. One was never to lose sight of one's true purpose and end on earth--to give glory to God! Joy in one's spouse was at no time to take precedence over one's relationship with God.³ Nothing was to interfere with one's religion nor contribute to one's neglect of God.³ Sexual relations outside the bounds of matrimony were reprimanded and punished according to the gravity of the transgression.⁴

¹John Donne as quoted in Powell, English Domestic Relations, p. 122.

²Increase Mather, An Arrow Against Profane and Promiscuous Dancing (Boston, 1684), p. 15.

³Edmund Morgan, "The Puritans and Sex," New England Quarterly, 15 (December, 1942), 592-594; Morgan, Puritan Family, pp. 46-54; Middlekauff, "Piety and Intellect in Puritanism," William and Mary Quarterly, 3rd ser., 22 (1965), 470.

⁴Howard, Matrimonial Institutions, 2: 169-170, 180.

Contracted to God as a group, as already noted, the Puritans could let nothing go unnoticed or any offense unpunished. For the transgression of one individual, all would suffer divine wrath. It was every Puritan's obligation therefore to enforce good behavior in others, in all aspects of life beginning with that of the family.

Self-control, modesty and moderation were extolled virtues. The oft quoted Pauline statement that "If they cannot containe, let them marry: for it is better to marry then to burne" was strongly adhered to by the Puritans.¹ The dictums of St. Paul were quite popular and commonly quoted in Puritan literature. The Puritans, in their frequent and persistent use of this Pauline sentiment and many others of a similar nature, betray a duality of their own in their attitudes toward sex and marriage. Although they extolled the virtues of matrimony and somewhat elevated its position in society, the Puritans nonetheless possessed their share of certain contradictory and negatory opinions on marriage. Hangovers from preceeding centuries, which viewed wedlock as a work of the

Various punishments were administered for sexual deviations, such as adultery, rape, and "unnatural abuses" which were punishable by death. The Colonial Laws of Massachusetts, ed. William Whitmore (Boston, 1889), pp. 14, 15, 28, 55, 128. Furthermore, it appears that the death penalty was carried out only three times during Massachusetts's early colonial period and so, parties guilty of unchastity were usually whipped, branded, imprisoned, condemned to wear a scarlet letter or suffer a "symbolic execution" on the gallows instead. See Howard, Matrimonial Institutions, 2: 169-171, 174, 177-180. Moreover, couples betrothed suffered lesser penalties for incontinence with each other, though the culpable party was sentenced to stiffer penalties for adultery, as though married.

¹ 1 Cor. 7:9-10.

flesh and in terms of remedial purposes were by no means totally absent. Generally speaking, their negatory views on wedlock were not as extreme nor stated as emphatically as those of their Roman Catholic opponents. If anything, they endeavored to initiate more positive changes regarding the family and waged a war against the contempt and mockery that challenged the dignity of the family.¹ Yet Reformers were not always in complete agreement nor consistent. The most obvious evidence that manifested their backsliding emerged through their view on the family and their attitudes towards women--the weaker vessels and subordinate beings. This was the order of things.

As mentioned above, self-restraint and moderateness were qualities not to be perverted. The "gift of continency" and chastity were considered esteemed virtues, in their own right. Celibacy, however, that "impure and tyrannical restraint of the Church of Rome, where all that enter into any of their holy orders, are kept from marriage," was definitely viewed with disfavor, for it conflicted with one of the main ends of marriage--the purpose of procreation.² "That Popish conceit of the Excellency of Virginity" was not heartily embraced in Puritan circles.³ Unlike their opponents, the Puritans championed marriage for their clergy. It was only fitting that wedlock, being a holy institution and divinely ordained by God for all people, be an

¹Howard, Matrimonial Institutions, 1: chaps. 9, 10; Powell, English Domestic Relations, pp. 119-128, 147-171; George and George, Protestant Mind, pp. 259-341 and chap 7.

²Gouge, Of Domestic Duties, pp. 106-107.

³Samuel Willard, A Compleat Body of Divinity (Boston, 1726),

honorable state and calling for a clergyman also.

For the most part, the Puritans were opposed to any avoidance of the marriage-bed. Sex was a human necessity and marriage was the sanctioned supply for it. To deny conjugal fellowship to one's spouse was frowned upon, and not only once was redress sought from civil authorities.¹ One consistently finds in Puritan literature, particularly in domestic conduct books, that couples are repeatedly reminded of their special duties.² Withdrawal from sexual intercourse in marriage thwarted not only the ends of marriage and therefore those of the community but it was, above all, a breach of God's command. Sexual union was an obligation, a condition of marriage, as was the duty of mutual love.

To love one's spouse was a duty, in fact, it was the main duty of a husband and wife. The Puritan ideal of love was not particularly of the passionate or rather, the romantic genre. Theirs was a rational and a deliberate love, one that came from the will as directed by reason.³ Puritan love was, for the most part, a desired outcome of wedlock rather than

p. 128, quoted in Morgan "The Puritan and Sex," New England Quarterly, 15 (December, 1942), 591-592.

¹Morgan, "Puritan and Sex," New England Quarterly, 15 (December, 1942), 592, 593 n. 5, 594; Morgan, Puritan Family, pp. 34, 39, 41-42, 47-48, 50, 54, 62-63; Howard, Matrimonial Institutions, 2: 62-63, 159-160, 336-337.

²Gouge, Of Domestical Duties; Whately, Bride-Bush; Cleaver, A Godly Form.

³Middlekauff, "Piety and Intellect in Puritanism," William and Mary Quarterly, 3rd ser., 22 (1965), 457-470; Morgan, Puritan Family, pp. 47, 52-53.

the motive for it. Love was a duty and an obligation which one undertook after the decision to marry and a suitable choice was made. One labored and cultured love. True, Puritan, love was to increasingly develop with time and mature with experience. The fruits of the couple's efforts were not only beneficial to themselves but also in accordance with God's ordinance. It was not, however, considered the sole, nor a sufficient reason to marry.¹ Again, this is not to say that their marriages were devoid of emotion. Aware that a successful marriage was also an affectionate one, they emphasized the necessity "Of that mutuall liking which must passe betwixt marriageable persons before they bee married;" and "As for love, it is the life, the soule of marriage."² The Puritans stressed the need for both spiritual and matrimonial love.

Customarily, one married according to one's social and economic standing. Unfortunately, due to the prominence that financial considerations took part in Puritan match-making, the harshness attributed to their marriages is often overstated.

¹Morgan, Puritan Family, pp. 55-59; Walzer, Revolution of the Saints, pp. 193-197, posits that the "dangers" of romance entered Puritan marriage when the idea of marriage as a voluntary agreement between two individuals developed. As with all true covenants, the element of willing consent was required. And so, no longer a sacrament, but a civil contract and therefore a voluntary agreement between two people, this "voluntary marriage shortly enough produced the romance of married love." cf. Morgan, Puritan Family, pp. 47-48, 55-59.

²Gouge, Of Domestical Duties, p. 114; Whately, Bride-Bush, p. 7; Morgan, Puritan Family, p. 54, points out that couples were not advised "not [to] marry unless they love each other but that they should not marry unless they can love each other."

They are frequently viewed as cold and calculated, business transactions. This attitude is understandable in view of the business-like spirit under which these arrangements were conducted. The parental negotiating and bargaining over the marriage portions of their children were commonly pursued with inordinate vigor, if not with voracity.¹ Nonetheless, it can not be said that Puritan marriages were without affection, as already proven, nor forced unions for that matter. Although parents and guardians were responsible for arranging the marriages of their offspring, the final approval or veto belonged to the intended parties themselves.²

Regrettably, what strikes one with a peculiar force was the inconsistency and the completely chaotic condition of English marriage law. Lack of a uniform and comprehensive system of codes, as well as clear designations of jurisdiction in matrimonial matters for ecclesiastical and civil courts resulted in flagrant abuses and maladministration of matrimonial law. In the practice of law, theory and reality did not dovetail. A disordered state was blatantly evident in the area of divorce. Matrimonial dissolutions were inconsistently and haphazardly dealt with by English law and the English spiritual courts. The fact that both church and state employed disci-

¹Morgan, Puritan Family, pp. 55-59; Howard, Matrimonial Institutions, 2: 203, 164-169; Willystine Goodsell, A History of the Family as a Social and Educational Institution (New York, 1915), pp. 252-255, 316.

²Walzer, Revolution of the Saints, pp. 193-194; Morgan, Puritan Family, pp. 83-88; Howard, Matrimonial Institutions, 2: 162-163, 202.

plinary actions greatly compounded the situation. Although the church could dispense a "divorce," yet it appears that either church or magistrate could authorize the right to remarry. To further complicate matters, the term divorce was ambiguous and loosely used for it frequently meant any type of dissolution; that is, it could mean either an annulment or a separation of sorts. The chaos and the accompanying abuses obviously had far-reaching effects and invariably disastrous ones. The whole issue of "divorce" raised vital and complicated questions affecting: the rights of the parties involved; the grounds and types of dissolution, which in turn determined such matters as financial settlements and the legitimacy of offspring; and of course the problem of jurisdiction between church and state. True to form, reformers found grounds for dissolutions in the Bible. Inexpediently, the passages in the New Testament were disjointed and inconsistent in their details.¹ This, plus further discrepancies and ambiguities found in the writings of early church fathers promoted only more confusion and turmoil. The reformers were not entirely in harmony. While debates raged with divergent interpretations and immoral practices flourished, the canonical conception of matrimony remained virtually unaltered during that time. Thus theoretically, marriage was indissoluble. However, this stumbling block did

¹For the principal passages see Howard, Matrimonial Institutions, 2: 19 n. 2. Howard stated that many important problems and questions concerning divorce were either passed over or so vaguely treated that divergent doctrines and additional controversies could only be expected.

not entirely preclude the possibility of obtaining some form of "divorce." Depending on one's political influence, social rank and most notably one's pecuniary generosity to the courts, one could obtain one's liberty. As a last resort, one might even have a special act of Parliament passed. This means of escape, unfortunately, was only open to the influential and to those who could afford it. Since absolute divorce, that is, divorce in the modern sense with the right to remarry, was theoretically unavailable, other means had to be devised, and not infrequently fabricated, in order to circumvent this loophole of indissolubility. Annulments and separations presented the available avenues for parting. Various types of separations and annulments, each based on its respective set of causes or reason, were granted. In the case of separations, the marital bond was not severed completely. The couple, though separated, remained as husband and wife and as a result could not remarry. In the instance of annulment, the union was declared null and void from its very beginning, thereby permitting both parties the right to remarry. It is fairly obvious why the latter method of dissolution was more desirable and therefore more frequently pursued. The narrow latitude given for divorce inevitably encouraged abuse. Patently, it did not restrain evils nor did it necessarily diminish the number of divorces as hoped. People went to outrageous and scandalous lengths to search out the required grounds or impediments for a dissolution. Perjury and fraud were rampant. Flimsy allegations such as pretext of pre-contract or trumped

up charges of affinity were commonplace in order to secure a "divorce." The unintelligible hairsplitting, the opaque and the inconsistent distinctions drawn between void and voidable contract, or the validity and the legality of a marriage further contributed to the corruption and the mockery of any justice. In view of the entangled networks of casuistry, legislations and actual practice, it is impossible to accurately ascertain the actual conditions of divorce legislation. Ironically and regrettably, the advent of the Reformation never clearly resolved the questions and issues surrounding the subject of divorce.¹ In a certain measure, consistency was established and some of the abuses in the marriage laws were reformed with Cromwell's marriage act of 1653.² Yet inspite of his civil-marriage act, where matters of divorce and nullity were to be delegated to the temporal courts, it appears that no such action, no attempt to form a system of legal codes dealing with such controversis, was taken or recorded.³

Though the Puritan statute-book did not provide for the

¹For a detailed history of divorce, see Howard, Matrimonial Institutions, 2: 56-117; Powell, English Domestic Relations, pp. 61-100; Goodsell, History of the Family, pp. 171-176.

²The act provided that the marriage ceremony be performed by a local justice of the peace, after proper publications of the banns and a certificate was obtained from the parish register. Furthermore, controversis concerning the marriage contract were to be referred to the justice of the peace or to persons appointed by parliament. See Howard, Matrimonial Institutions, 1: 418-419.

³Howard, Matrimonial Institutions, 2: 86; Powell, English Domestic Relations, pp. 99-100.

right to divorce, Puritan thought certainly did. In their drive for reforms, they very strongly advocated the right to repudiation. This is not startling but consistent and in line with their principles of mutual help, peace and harmony as being a part of the matrimonial state. Condemning the excessibilities of divorce and the mockery made of the marriage state in the previous times, the Puritans nonetheless denounced the theory of absolute indissolubility. Puritan divine William Perkins, in his Christian Oeconomie, gives a good indication as to the permissive direction which Puritan thought took, though it was double-edged.

Now in the requiring of a divorce, there is an equal right and power in both parties, so as the woman may require it as well as the man....The reason is, because they are equally bound each to other, provided alwaie, that the man is to maintaine his superioritie, and the woman to observe that modestie which beseemeth her towards the man.¹

Henry Smith vividly expressed the Puritan's favorable attitude toward divorce when he criticized the English Church for not allowing the innocent party remarriage after separation. In his opinion, adultery was the disease of marriage and divorce was its cure.

If they might be seperated for discord, some would make a comodotie of strife; but nowe they are not best to

¹William Perkins, Christian Oeconomie (London, 1609), p. 120, quoted in Powell, English Domestic Relations, p. 80. In view of the fact that reformers dwelled over matters as mutual affection, peace and happiness in a conjugal unit, it would seem logical for them to extend equal divorce rights to women. Yet it appears that this sentiment did not find expression in the law nor were reformers in complete agreement on this matter. This is demonstrated by the trial of John Hooper, who propounded equal divorce privileges for women. See Howard, Matrimonial Institutions, 2: 73, 74 n. 1 and 2.

be contentius, for this Law will holde their noses together, til wearines make them leave struggling, like two spaniels which are coupled in a chain, at last they learne to goe together, because they may not goe a sunder.¹

Another Puritan divine, John Milton, who was perhaps the most prolific writer and staunchest advocate of the right to divorce, accurately captured and reflected the theological issues and debates of the day. In his debates with those who opposed divorce, Milton countered that "the restraint whereof, who is not too thick-sighted, may see how hurtful and destructive it is to the house, the church and the commonwealth."² He contended that just grounds for divorce other than adultery and desertion did indeed exist. Divorce was not only necessary at times but morally right as well. Arguing that the soul had been neglected and abused in the marriage state, Milton underscored the indispensableness of mental and spiritual solace that formerly went unattended in the conjugal societies. In the belief that the carnal aspects of wedlock had overshadowed too long matrimony's spiritual comforts and needs, Milton exalted the marriage state, uplifting its spiritual side to respectable heights. In the absence of companionship and mutual affections, Milton contended that wedlock became a mockery and an unbearable trap. Without the requisites of compatibility and love, he urged that the union be dissolved. To constrain a comfortless or irrecon-

¹Henry Smith, A Preparative to Mariage (London, 1591), pp. 90-91.

²John Milton, "Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce," quoted in Howard, Matrimonial Institutions, 2: 87. For the references to his principal works dealing with divorce, see Howard, Matrimonial Institutes, 2: 86 n.2.

cilable couple only defeated the ends of marriage. Liberal in admitting grounds for divorce, he incorporated "indisposition, unfitness, or contrariety of mind, arising from a course in nature unchangeable, hindering and ever likely to hinder the main benefits of conjugal society, which are solace and peace."¹ In sum, it is in a similar vein of thought that the Puritans in general stressed the necessity and the right of compatibility and spiritual satisfaction in marriage, as well as the physical benefits of it; and on such grounds they opposed the constraining of an ill-matched couple in the name of religion, for it was impious to God and detrimental to society.

As already noted, the sacredness and the importance of the family were successfully transplanted in New England. The situation regarding matrimonial laws, however, progressed somewhat differently. According to Howard, "civil rites, civil registration, and uniform theory of marriage tend at once to prevent the manifold evils growing out of a lax or an uncertain

¹In the opinion of Howard, Milton had "a very low opinion of womanhood." He calls attention to several of Milton's inconsistencies and discriminatory views regarding divorce rights for women. He points out that while Milton wholeheartedly agreed with the Puritan ideal of marriage as a conjugal society of peace and happiness, it is questionable whether he would have allowed the wife to initiate proceedings, private or public, or to divorce her husband even for adultery against his will, let alone for incompatibilities. Milton leaves no room for doubt in his belief that woman was created for man's benefit. Howard also brings attention to the fact that Milton almost invariably emphasizes male grievances and prerogatives. In his quest for domestic tranquility, Milton does so, often, at the expense of the woman. Howard further supports his statement by noting that Milton, rejecting all civil and ecclesiastical interference in matters of divorce, advocated the ancient principle of self-divorce, where the marriage bond was severed by mutual consent or solely by that of the husband. (Italics are mine) See Howard, Matrimonial Institution, 2: 85-92. cf. Powell, English Domestic Relations, espec. p. 96 n. 1.

law."¹ From New England's genesis, civil ceremonies were in evidence. The conception of wedlock as a civil contract-- a voluntary action between two parties--in which the services of a priest were unnecessary and inappropriate was applied from the outset. The custom of performing the marriage, as a civil ceremony, however, appears to have existed before it was legally established.²

In Massachusetts, the code of 1646 provided that, "As the Ordinance of Marriage is honorable amongst all, so it should be accordingly solemnized," and the statute further proclaimed:

that no person whatsoever in their Jurisdiction, shall joyne any persons together in Marriage, but the Magistrate, or such other as the General Court, or Court of Assistants, shal Authorize in such place, where no Magistrate is near.³

The reason for the delay in adopting a formal, legal code concerning civil-marriage in New England has been suggested by John Winthrop when he wrote:

For that it would professedly transgress the limits of our charter, which provide, we shall make no laws repugnant to the laws of England, and that we were assured we must do. But to raise up laws by practice and custom had been no transgression; as in our church discipline, and in matters of marriage, to make a law, that marriages

¹Howard, Matrimonial Institutions, 2: 127.

²In Massachusetts, for example, the earliest statute was in 1646, though civil ceremonies had been recorded previous to this date. For a discussion of the possible origins and some of the direct influences which determined the establishment of civil ceremonies in the New England colonies, see Ibid., 2: 127-134; and Powell, English Domestic Relations, pp. 37-44, 51-54, 58.

³Colonial Laws, ed. Whitmore, pp. 72, 102.

should not be solemnized by ministers, is repugnant to the laws of England; but to bring it to a custom by practice for the magistrates to perform it, is no law made repugnant, etc. ¹

Broadly speaking, early colonial laws required that marriage ceremonies be performed by a justice of the peace or a magistrate, and, in essence, the enforcement of matrimonial laws became the responsibility of local government. ² The required publications, registration and parental consent were the concerns of local government and officers of the town executed these laws as part of their routine duties. ³ Furthermore, parental responsibility and voice in marital arrangements were legally recognized and reinforced. Thus in 1647, a law was passed establishing the necessity and propriety of parental consent:

And whereas God hath committed the care and power into the hand of Parents for the disposing their Children in Marriage, so that it is against Rule to seek to drag away the affections of young Maidens, under pretence of purpose of Marriage, before their Parents have given way and allowance in that respect. ⁴

Aware that family government was basic and necessary to

¹Winthrop's Journal, 1: 324.

²Though no longer a sacrament, the religious significance of matrimony was not lost, for it was something higher than a mere contract. By the end of the seventeenth century, the hostility against marriages solemnized by clergy had subsided considerably, so that in 1686, no strong opposition confronted the order of council issued by Dudley authorizing ministers as well as justices of the peace to solemnize marriages. Howard, Matrimonial Institutions, 2: 135-138; Goodsell, History of the Family, p. 374.

³Colonial Laws, ed. Whitmore, pp. 51, 52, 101; Howard, Matrimonial Institutions, 2: 145-147.

⁴Colonial Laws, ed. Whitmore, pp. 101, 172.

the functioning of a strong and efficient civil government, the Puritans insisted that everyone be a part of a household and therefore be subject to the domestic government of its head. In this manner, a vital aspect of social discipline was secured. Single persons were compelled to enter other families either as servants or borders if they had none of their own. If they were not able to select a family, the selectmen of the town would choose one for them.¹ Even married couples were under the watchful eye of civil authority. Prolonged absence from one's spouse was viewed with suspicion and not uncommonly looked into by authorities. Evidences of discord and improper behavior, such as living apart from one's proper spouse, were to be accounted for to civil authorities. Both single women and wives were forbidden "to entertain or lodge an In-mate or Sojourner" without the consent of selectmen or magistrates.²

As mentioned above, the Puritans stated that one of the ends of marriage was the prevention of fornication. Thus they reasoned that a forced, unhappy union was only conducive to committing other breaches against God's ordinances such as the sins of adultery or bigamy. To prevent such a state of affairs, the Puritans considered divorce as a possible cure for some of

¹The granting of maid-lotts to single women in the early days of Salem was quickly abandoned. It was feared that such precedence would establish an unwelcome custom. An established practice of allowing women "not properly disposed of" land and with it independence and freedom from domestic government as they defined it, was unacceptable. The Puritans saw only the potential for unruliness and the danger of undermining their social structure. See Alice Morse Earle, Colonial Dames and Good Wives (Cambridge, Mass., 1895) pp. 50-51.

²Colonial Laws, ed. Whitmore, p. 216.

the matrimonial ills. With irreconcilable differences and marital benefits no longer fulfilled and no longer "mutual" a dissolution of the civil covenant was in order. At this point, the couple's voluntary consent--a requisite to contracting any social compact--to remain united was undoubtedly no longer present. Hence, divorce like marriage, was placed under the jurisdiction of the civil courts and legislature.¹ This was not an unusual development in view of the fact that the New England Puritans celebrated marriage as a civil affair. Annulments and absolute divorce were granted whereas permanent separations which did not allow for remarriage were not dispensed. The prevailing opinion was undoubtedly that separation was a popish invention. It was contrary to God's design of a matrimonial union for it disallowed the parties, particularly the innocent one, "to use the benefit of marriage."² In divorce as well as in the case of civil marriage, measures were passed to secure reform against the forms and abuses of previous times and systems. The most common grounds for divorce were desertion, adultery, cruelty and the absence of a spouse for a length of time to be determined by the civil government.³

¹Dissolutions were granted when either spouse could prove that their partner had been derelict of a "fundamental duty." Abuses or non-performance of duties ranged from bigamy, impotency to desertions and adultery. Colonial Laws, ed. Whitmore, pp. 36, 143; Morgan, Puritan Family, pp. 34-38.

²Gouge, Of Domestic Duties, p. 109.

³Morgan, Puritan Family, pp. 34-38; Howard, Matrimonial Institutions, 2: 330-353.

The Puritans set much store on the relation between a man and a woman for it was considered the highest relationship between mortals, and even "greater, then between the children and parents."¹ And yet, though they attempted to institute various reforms and salutary attitudes concerning marriage and the family, the outlook on the nature of women basically maintained its course--the same direction of subordination. The woman remained a subordinate being, the common epithet being the "weaker vessel." Her proper place was in the domestic sphere in the capacity of a dutifull wife, mother or daughter, and always under the rule of her husband, the lord and master of the household. The woman "is subordinate to her husband, and must so rule others as she be subject to her husband."² The Puritans continued to give credence to the ancient view that women were an inherently inferior order of beings who needed to be held in check, for everyone's benefit. The Puritans found an abundance of evidence to support this belief in the Bible, and particularly in the writings of St. Paul, and other early church fathers.³

The tone generally set was one of women's submission and inferiority:

Let the woman learn in silence with all subjection.

¹Morgan, Puritan Family, p. 162; Cleaver, A Godly Form, p. 17.

²Gouge, Of Domestical Duties, p. 152.

³St. Paul expressed the earliest authoritative opinions of church leaders on the status of women and regrettably many early church fathers wrote in like vein. St. Paul tremendously influenced the reactionary tendency among Christians toward

But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp the authority over the man, but to be in silence. For Adam was first formed, then Eve. And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression. Yet women will be saved by child-bearing.¹

The charge laid was unmistakably clear, "Let wives be subject to their husbands" for "a husband is head of the wife."²

Moreover, as an essentially inferior being, she was to carry herself humbly, "with shamefacedness and sobriety," with her head covered or shorn.

For a man indeed ought not to cover his head, forasmuch as he is the image and glory of God: but the woman is the glory of man. For the man is not of the woman; but the woman of the man. Neither was the man created for the woman, but the woman for the man.³

A good wife remained in the seclusion of her home and engaged in housewifely duties and in prayer. According to St. Clement, physical exercise for a woman took the form of "spinning and weaving, and superintending the cooking if necessary," and she was "not to be encouraged to engage in wrestling or running;" yet, "The virtue of man and woman is the same. And those whose life is common have common graces and a common training."⁴

women and he was effective in strictly confining the life of women to the home and Church. See Goodsell, History of the Family, pp. 160-164.

¹ 1 Tim. 2:11-15.

² Ephes. 5:22-24. For similar expressions of St. Peter, see First Epistle General 3:1-3.

³ 1 Tim. 2:14; 1 Cor. 11:7-9.

⁴ Clement of Alexandria, Pedagogous or The Instructor, quoted in Goodsell, History of the Family, p. 163.

In the end, St. Clement regresses again and sounds the negative resonances of St. Paul and writes, "But above all, it seems right that we turn away from the sight of women. For it is sin not only to touch, but to look; and he who is rightly trained must especially avoid her."¹ In spite of her spiritual equality with man she is "the devil's gateway," the daughter of Eve and the seducer of man. She was continually made to bear the responsibility for the fall of "God's image, man," even the death of His Son.² It is unfortunate that their deprecatory views on the female sex furnished the standards that determined the status of women under Christianity for so many centuries.

It is even more unfortunate that the Puritans faithfully reiterated many of those depreciative sentiments. The concepts of woman's traditional intellectual, social and legal inferiority were carried over with the Puritans and were perpetuated and continually reinforced by the social, religious and civil agencies of the Puritan era.

In their sermons and descriptions of marital ethics, ministers and writers of domestic conduct books were quite instructive on the attitudes towards women. For the most part, concerned with giving practical advice, especially for those who "now finde it a little Hell," they were informative and a good indication of the practices and thoughts of the time.³

¹Ibid.

²Tertullian, "On Female Dress," quoted in Goodsell, History of the Family, p. 163.

³Whately, Bride-Bush, title page.

Moreover, ministers, though not allowed to hold public offices nonetheless were able to exert a tremendous influence on their flocks from the pulpit and over the magistrates with their consultations.

And so, in exact keeping with the ancient tradition, the role of the woman was a submissive one--she was a helpmeet, for the man. There was no doubt that the woman's place was in the home, and that "it was the end of her creation to be a helper;" whereas the husband, as "the master demands obedience, reverence, faithfulness, and that dutifulness which of right they ought to have."¹ In a sense, her status in the family was elevated somewhat by the fact that she was a "joint governour with her husband over the children and servants" and therefore she was to partake in the "joint care in governing of the Family."² However, although

the husband and wife are equall, in that which is the chiefest, that is to say, in that gracious and free benefit, whereby they have everlasting life given them, though otherwise I confess unequall, as touching the governance and conversation at Home; the wife is not to be despised, although she be weake.³

Again, the spiritual equality of a man and a woman are recognized and yet, the Puritans emphatically believed that the man was definitely the stronger and a superior being, both mentally and physically. Consequently, he was

to be a guide, and good example to his wife, hee is

¹ Ibid, p. 11; Cleaver, A Godly Form, p. A₃

² Gouge, Of Domestical Duties, pp. 176-177, 150.

³ Cleaver, A Godly Form, pp. 162-163.

to dwell with her according to knowledge. Neglect of duty in him is more dishonourable unto God, because by vertue of his place he is the Image and glory of God, and more pernicious not to his wife only, but also to the whole family, because of that power and authority hee hath, which hee may abuse to the maintenance of his wickedness, having in the house no superior power to restrain his fury.¹

And so, the husband and wife were to be "the Governours of a Family" deriving their authority in the family from God's ordinances and yet "not all in the family were to be governed alike. There is one rule to govern the wife by, another for the children, another for the servants."² In keeping with the need for social order, a pattern of command and obedience was designed for the family. Although the two were charged to "be good rulers at home," the Puritans emphatically denied any possibility of a harmonious government if "there be more than one upon whom the charge of government lyeth;" and therefore, they employed a hierarchy of authority where the husband was designated the head--"The governours of families are, first the Chiefe governour, which is the Husband, secondly, a fellow helper, which is the Wife."³

The Puritans reiterated and continually laid emphasis on the superior position of the man and the subordinate one of

¹Gouge, Of Domestical Duties, p. 202. Earlier in his tract (p. 152), Gouge stipulated that the woman was not "to command anything against his command (provided that his command be not against the Lord, and his word)." In New England, the husband's power over the wife was not unlimited. In fact, by law, both husband and wife were forbidden to strike each other and in general "ill usage" of one's spouse was punishable by civil authorities. Likewise, he could not command her to do anything "contrary to the laws of God, laws which were explicitly defined in the civil codes." Morgan, Puritan Family, p. 45.

²Cleaver, A Godly Form, pp. 15, 17.

³Ibid., p. 19.

the woman. Man, according to the Puritans derived his status in the family from God as evidenced in the Bible, for "The Lord in his Word calls him the head; hee must not stand lower than the shoulder."¹ It was not considered humility but a sin to step out of one's appointed place, let alone to stoop lower than where God had designated one. It was "baseness to be ruled by her whom he should rule," for "man was Gods immediate officer, and the King in his family" whereas the woman was "the Deputie subordinate, and associate to him, but not altogether equall; and both in their order must governe."²

As a yoke-fellow, the wife was a helpmeet in the ordering of household affairs. It was her duty to "keep at home, educating her children, keeping and improving what is got by the industry of the man."³ Women were not to teach in "publicke assemblies, or churches," but they were encouraged "to be teachers of good things and that they instruct the "young" as well as the servants in religion and the reading of Scriptures."⁴ Though a "weaker vessel," she was to function in the full capacity of a "ruler," and to act "as a Deputy Husband, for the maintaining of all Good order in the House" only in the absence of her husband.⁵ The ultimate decision making was delegated to

¹Whately, Bride-Bush, p. 98.

²Cleaver, A Godly Form, pp. 19, 16.

³John Cotton, A Meet Help (Boston, 1699), p. 21.

⁴Gouge, Of Domestical Duties, p. 151; Cleaver, A Godly Form, p. 60; Whately, Bride-Bush, p. 16.

⁵Cotton Mather, Ornaments for the Daughters of Zion (Cambridge, Mass., 1691), p. 101; cf. Cleaver, A Godly Form, pp. 60, 162.

the husband, nor could she dispose anything of significant value on her own without his knowledge and consent.

The rhetoric employed and directed toward women was poignant and bludgeoning in its emphasis on the women's subordinate status. It was her duty to recognize her inferiority and to conduct herself accordingly.

First then the wives judgements must be convinced, that she is not her husbands equall, yea that her husband is her better by farre; else there can be no contentment, either in her heart, or in her house.¹

Any conduct to the contrary would be considered "out of place, out of peace. And woe to these miserable aspiring shoulders."²

The point is further driven home,

For the wife is as much despised for taking rule over her husband, as he for yeilding it unto her. Therefore, one saith, that a mankind woman is a monster, that is, halfe a woman, and halfe a man.³

The attack on her sexuality is self-evident. She was to openly acknowledge and respect her husband as her superior. To think otherwise would be "monstrous self-conceit, and intolerable arrogance, as if shee her selfe were above her owne sex, and more than a woman."⁴ She was to exhibit "her inferiority in a Christian manner by practising those two vertues of reverence and obedience...this reverence must be inwards and outwards."⁵ Interestingly enough, the wife's inward fear of her husband

¹Whately, Bride-Bush, p. 36.

²Ibid.

³Cleaver, A Godly Form, p. 223.

⁴Gouge, Of Domestical Duties, p. 160.

⁵Whately, Bride-Bush, p. 37.

was to be a "loving fear" and not a "slavish one," and she was to "speake little and lowe" and express reverence in her speech to her husband, both privately and publically.¹ In general, she was exhorted to be mild, courteous, meek, obedient, modest in speech and appearance and industrious in the affairs of the home. This was obviously an era which did not encourage the woman's development outside the necessary household skills, nor did it promote in any way the public speech or public appearance of women.

Women are Creatures with which there is no comfortable Living for man: it is true of them what is wont to be said of Governments, That bad ones are better than none: They are a sort of Blasphemers then who dispise and decry them, and call them a necessary Evil, for they are a necessary Good.²

Womankind's prevailing second-rate status in life was treated benevolently for "Tho' you are of the Female Sex, yet God has taken you;" the condescension is transparent.³ Any possibility for her betterment or self-development and self-determination was precluded by the lack of opportunity of any type of an extensive, formal education. In general, any instruction that she obtained was towards preserving her perpetual dependency and subserviency and deterring her attempts at sovereignty. This is not to say that a "higher education" would have solved her problems and aided her in advancement, but rather, it makes the fact obvious that she was considered weak in other ways than just physical and that the intellectual

¹Ibid., p. 39.

²John Cotton, A Meete Help, pp. 14-15.

³Cotton Mather, Marah Spoken to: A Brief Essay to do Good Unto the Widow (Boston, 2nd ed., 1721), p. 13.

education of a girl was deemed of vastly less importance than that of a boy's, nor was any varied knowledge thought to be desirable in her. Aside from her physical inferiority, much of her second-rateness was undeniably due to the conviction of her mental and moral inferiority. After all, was she not created after Adam, who was created from divine particles and she but from a rib; was she not responsible for the evils of the world and did she not play a role in the downfall of God's image, man? The answers at that time to these queries were firmly in the affirmative. To unleash her intellectual capacities with Old Deluder around and waiting for the weak creatures might bring about more evils and calamities and perhaps the final demise of mankind.¹ Formal education for women was scant, for her calling, she learned at a very early age, was limited to domestic management and anything more was considered unnecessary and improper. Though the intellectual life of New England was limited to those belonging to society's upper strata, intellectual education for women was grossly neglected. The predominate conviction that her mental prowess was not on a par with that of men can be demonstrated by Governor Winthrop's comments. In the case of Mistress Hopkins, he viewed her as:

a godly young Woman of special parts, but who was fallen into sad infirmity, the loss of her understanding and

¹Goodsell, History of the Family, p. 306. Goodsell suggests that the Puritans did not recommend nor support women's education to the same extent as men's education "because he [the Puritan] harked back to the conception of the early Church Fathers of woman as the cause of the original sin, therefore a creature to be kept under strict government."

reason, which had been growing upon her divers years, by occasion of giving herself wholly to reading and writing, and had written many books. Her husband, being very loving and tender of her, was loath to grieve her; but he saw his error, when it was too late. For if she had attended her household affairs, and such things as belong to women, and not gone out of her way and calling to meddle in such things as are proper for men, whose minds are stronger, etc., she had kept her wits, and might have improved them usefully and honorably in the place God had set her.¹

According to Winthrop, such was the lot of those who did not perform according to their "calling" from God. Another woman who had met a calamitous end by stepping out of the women's sphere too much was Anne Hutchinson. While he described her as "a woman of a ready wit and bold spirit," he saw her husband as a man incapable of controlling his wife; William Hutchinson was "a man of a very mild temper and weak parts, and wholly guided by his wife."² From such words it would appear that intelligence was a masculine endowment and of which by right males should have had a monopoly. Little provision was made for the girl's education outside the home. If there were dame schools in the town, little girls went there to learn to read, sew, spin and knit. Writing was not always taught. In Massachusetts, girls were allowed to attend the town elementary schools only at hours when the boys were not using the building which was early in the morning and late in the afternoon. Moreover, this was only during summer months for when winter approached the permission was withdrawn on the pretext of "female health."³

¹Winthrop's Journal, 2: 225.

²Ibid., 1: 195, 299.

³Goodsell, History of the Family, pp. 403-404, Earle, Child Life, pp. 90-97; Morison, Intellectual Life, pp. 77-78.

Parents were not compelled by law to send their children to school though they were charged with the responsibility of seeing that all household members learned to read, were versed in the principles of religion, understood the Capital Laws and were placed "in some honest, lawfull Calling, Labour or Employment."¹ In the custom of "putting-forth" children, girls went to learn housewifery, needlework, and other tasks. The work was given in payment for their board and tuition.²

In many cases, women were almost completely "unschooled" as it were, in the three R's; yet it appears that no stigma or embarrassment accompanied a woman's lack of a formal education, mainly due to the fact the education was not looked upon as desirable for women. A woman was ready for her calling, marriage, when she was well versed in the necessary household duties, such as making and mending clothes, cooking and brewing, tending the sick, and other tasks relating to domestic management.³

Cotton Mather summarily described a woman's place:

Such is her Industry, that she betimes applies her self to Learn all the Affairs of Housewifry....a good skill at her Needle, as well as in the Kitchen, she acquaints her self with Arithmetick and Accomptantship (perhaps also Chirurgery) and such other Arts relating to Business, as may Enable her to do the Man whom she may hereafter have, Good and not Evil all the Days of her life....In every Lawful thing, she submits her Will and Sense to his...she acts as if there were but one Mind in Two Bodies.⁴

¹Colonial Laws, ed., Whitmore, p. 287.

²Earle, Child Life, p. 81.

³Goodsell, History of the Family, pp. 289-299.

⁴Mather, Ornaments, pp. 74, 79.

He had a slightly more charitable view on education for women.

They should Read, and Write, and Cyphar, and be put unto some Agreeable Calling; and not only our Sons, but our Daughters also should be taught such Things as will afterwards make them Useful in their places.¹

For a woman to further fulfill her calling in life, she also had to satisfy the requirements of motherhood in addition to those of wifhood. Failing to do so, a woman became barren of purpose. On the whole, barrenness was considered a calamity, a punishment, for it took away a woman's chance to redeem herself as well as it was a sign of possible disfavor in the eyes of the Lord.

The Hazards and Hardships undergone by the Travailing Daughters of Eve, make a Considerable Article of the Curse, which the Transgression whereinto she was Deceived, has brought upon the miserable World.²

According to Cotton Mather and the popular sentiment of that time, it was the grace of God that turned this "curse" into a blessing, thereby permitting women salvation by taking away this reproach.

Accompanying pregnancy was the ever-present threat of death. Mather sounds the warning voice,

For ought you know, your Death has entered into you, and you may have conceived that which determines but about Nine Months more at the most, for you to Live in the World....The Terrors of Child-bearing which are now upon you, do very properly lead you to bewail your Share in the Sin of your First Parents.³

¹Mather, Family Well-Ordered, p. 18.

²Cotton Mather, Elizabeth in Her Holy Retirement: An Essay to Prepare a Pious Woman for Her Lying-In (Boston, 1710), p. 2.

³Ibid., pp. 6-7, 9-10.

The reproach for making the world miserable fell on her shoulders, again. For the woman, it became a time of serious self-examination and repentance and a preparation for death. After being reminded of her corrupt nature and iniquity, she is then instructed to:

Let no Apprehension of your own Vileness make you despair to find Acceptance with Him; Nor let any Good in yourselves Embolden you Hope and Plea, that you may be Accepted.¹

Upon marriage, husband and wife functioned as one person, and this one person was the husband, especially in the eyes of the law. The legal existence of women was almost obliterated for she was sub potestate viri--under the power of the husband, both in person and in property. In general, English private law became the common law for the most part. Almost everything, her chattels and earnings became his absolute property on marriage. Even clothing and ornaments of a married woman were under the direction of the husband. She could not own or sell any property, and although a wife could inherit property from a third person, the control was passed over to the husband immediately. Yet, some measures were taken in New England to protect the right and the person of the woman. The signing of pre-nuptial agreements, where specific allowances for personal use were settled, helped to slightly relieve her financial dependence on the man. In the case of a widow, she would usually specify that she should retain the title to any part of her former husband's estate that descended to her by will, with the right to dispose of it by a last will of her own.

¹Ibid., p. 11.

Widows were frequently courted and wooed for they inherited a life estate in at least a third of all the land which her husband had owned during their marriage. Furthermore, by law the husband was to support her and maintain her according to his means regardless whether she brought him property or not. The responsibility for any debts that she had contracted previous to the wedding were assumed by him. Lawfully, as stated earlier, neither spouse was allowed to strike the other and suit against the culpable party often found its way to the courts.¹

Although attempts were made to bring both parties on an equal basis before the law in divorce matters, the endeavor failed. Governor Hutchinson wrote,

Female adultery was never doubted to have been sufficient cause; but male adultery, after some debate and consultation with the elders, was judged not sufficient. Desertion on a year or two, when there was evidence of a determined design not to return, was always good cause; so was cruel usage of the husband. Consanguinity they settled in the same degree as it is settled in England and in the levitical laws.²

Briefly then, although the Puritans extolled the virtues of matrimony and gave rise to new and more positive attitudes towards matrimony, they too were guilty of various paradoxes and inconsistencies. The mutual benefits and blessings of marriage, of which they so fondly and in great length and detail dwelled upon, appeared in the end to be mainly male prerogatives. The Ideal Marriage, where the company of husband and wife was

¹Morgan, Puritan Family, pp. 40, 42, 58-59, 163; Goodsell, History of the Family, pp. 345-349.

²Howard, Matrimonial Institutions, 2: 203, 330-348; Governor Hutchinson, History of Massachusetts (Salem, 1795), 1: 393, quoted in Howard, Matrimonial Institutions, 2: 331.

to be amiable, sweet and comfortable was perhaps obtained, but at the expense of subordinating the woman. The opportunity for her intellectual development and self-assertion was not within her reach, nor was it encouraged. "Patterns of humility" did not "make Noise" but were to keep silent and bear their sufferings and curse without complaint.¹ Stronger and superior male minds would pilot and control her existence and person, but with "kindness and honor." To aspire to things not fitting for her sex were discouraged. She was constantly reminded of her inferiority and moral weakness and subservience. The blame for the woes of the world were sometimes shifted to her supposed evil nature. She was to be held under strict supervision and never given rein to test her capabilities, for what unknown evils would then be unleashed, one could only surmise. Her submission was to elicit in her a reverence and a loving fear for her master, for she would always be guided and protected. Even in the so-called woman's domain of housewifery, she was always under the authority and direction of her husband--for she was but a Deputy. Her mental and moral weaknesses were never lost sight of; at worst, she was a "necessary evil," and at best, "a necessary good."

¹For more "laudable virtues" see Cotton Mather's, Awakening Thoughts on the Sleep of Death (Boston, 1712), pp. i-viii.

CHAPTER III

SAMUEL SEWALL AND A WOMAN'S ESTATE

Samuel Sewall, reared amid the authoritative traditions of the Puritans, was a mild tempered, conventional man. His own schooling conformed to the English ideal of an education befitting a gentleman, and more. The rudiments of his training undoubtedly began at home where, as a son of a short-term minister, the neglect of religion was inconceivable. Religion and reading continued to go hand in hand at a private dame school which made him eligible for entry at a grammar school. In all probability Sewall learned his ABC's, like so many others, from a hornbook which also contained a copy of the Lord's Prayer. Spelling books, primers and catechisms accompanied hornbooks on the elementary school's book list. Grammar school, fundamentally a preparation for university, stressed the mastery of Latin which was a university's language of instruction, and of most of the textbooks. In Newbury, Sewall was placed under the tutelage of Mr. Thomas Parker who continued to prepare him for Harvard College. He initiated and instilled in Sewall a lifelong devotion to biblical prophecy by strictly literal interpretation and to composing both Latin and English verse. Here, Sewall was drilled and solidly secured the learning of conduct and thought that bore scriptural sanction. Having passed the university's

entrance exam, at the age of fifteen, Sewall was then enrolled at Harvard College.¹

Although a religious spirit permeated the institution, it was not a theological seminary turning out candidates for the pulpit; but rather, an institution of learning, designed to soundly educate the Christian layman. Nonetheless, the impact of the religious atmosphere and the curriculum, such as the study of the Old and New Testaments in their original tongues, and selected classics, unquestionably helped sustain and direct the righteous on the right path to God. The comprehensive study of the Biblical Word--keeping in mind that it was the mandate for living--undeniably helped foster and mold Sewall's tastes in reading and attitudes on life, including those on women. After his four years of study as an undergraduate, Sewall remained to pursue his second degree for another three years. It is at this point that the professional study of theology began, indicating that Sewall was thus destined for the sacred calling of the ministry. Hence, the theological influence, the imprint of his Harvard training remained indelible.²

His way to the pulpit, however, appears to have been somewhat detoured by one of Boston's wealthiest heiresses, Hannah Hull. In a letter to his son, Samuel Sewall, Jr.,

¹Winslow, Samuel Sewall, chaps. 1-3; Strandness, Puritan Portrait, pp. 1-19.

²For a general history on the development of the educational system of New England and the curriculum of Harvard College, see Morison, Intellectual Life; for information specifically dealing with Sewall's education, see Winslow, Samuel Sewall, chap. 3, and Strandness, Puritan Portrait, pp. 11-46.

Sewall, Sr., related the events as follows:

In 1674 I took my 2^d Degree and Mrs. Hannah Hull, my dear Wife, your honoured Mother, was invited by the Dr. [Leonard Hoar] and his Lady to be with them a while at Cambridge. She saw me when I took my Degree and set her Affection on me, though I Knew nothing of it till after our Marriage, which was February 28th. 1675/6.¹

In the interim, a request for a minister came from Woodbridge, New Jersey--an offer which he did not accept. Instead, the prudent marriage to Hannah Hull ultimately directed his attention to more secular pursuits such as merchandising and public office. This prosperous alliance, for Hannah was a well-dowered maiden, thus also was a gateway to many new vistas in society, without which admittance for a layman to the upper social stratas might have been impossible.² Yet, despite his entry into the various secular occupations, Sewall's religiosity did not suffer. He did not deem it irreligious to meditate upon the ways of the Lord while feeding the chickens but he was just as serious and pious then as when alone with his Lord during a private day of prayer and fasting. He would contemplate "...what need I stood in of spiritual food, and that I should not nauseate daily duties of Prayer, etc...." and he gave God his thanksgiving and

¹Autobiographical Letter to Samuel Sewall, Jr., Diary, 1: xxxii.

²Winslow, Samuel Sewall, pp. 52-55; Strandness, Puritan Portrait, p. 34; Diary, 1: 14-15. Moreover, Strandness, (pp. 34-35), asserts that Sewall inherited Hull's wealth as well as his responsibilities, that is, he was Hull's political, religious, social and financial heir. It was only with the death of Hull, that Sewall was elected to the empty seat in the Court of Assistants. Strandness claims that with the exception of Sewall's career on the bench, his public life was not of his own creation but rather that he "entered on its duties."

and humbly "I pray'd God to Accept me...:" and "asked the Lord to Perfect what is lacking in my Faith, and in the faith of my dear Yokefellow."¹ Religion was stability and security to Sewall, for it was absolute and the injunctions of the Holy Word were clear and to be obeyed.

His love for the Bible and the reading thereof was always well tended to--as amply evidenced in the Diary by the numerous and consistent family bible-readings, catechizings and Psalm singing.² The time for writing tracts, composing verses, and obviously for his Diary was always found. His reliance on the authority of the Scriptures and his strict interpretations of it are reflected in the reasonings set forth in his own writings and actions. Furthermore, his persistent appeal to authority, be it biblical or classical, was an indication that his reasoning was not "his own," or more precisely, that it was not original nor unique. Almost invariably, behind a thought or an act, lurked a Biblical verse to confirm or condemn matters. Deviations from traditional manners and customs he frowned upon. Untried and unproven ways were to be mistrusted, for there was no basis for their existence.

And therefore I am against entering into a way never yet gon in, not beaten, and therefore not likely to be the King's Highway. Innovations are to be suspected, and avoided.³

¹Diary, 13 Jan. 1676/8, 1: 33; 12 Feb. 1707/8, 10 Feb. 1707/8, 1: 589. Not infrequently, Sewall would enter "...at prayer with my Wife in the Chamber, was wofully drowsy and stupid," or "I prayed not with my Servant, being weary." Ibid., 1: 334, 543.

²Diary, vols. 1, 2, passim.

³Letter Book, 5 Sept. 1724, 2: 173.

Hence, Mary Alden Ward's statement, "We must not fail to credit him with being ahead of his age on...the women question," deserves further examination. As mentioned in chapter one, Ward based her declaration largely on Sewall's treatise, "Talitha Cumi." Closer scrutiny of the tract as well as Sewall's writings is indeed needed.

The tract was written in response to the "surprising Question: Is there now, or will there be at the Resurrection, any Females in Heaven, Since there seems to be no need of them there?"¹

Sewall's exasperation at the audacity of the question is communicated in his rejoinder:

This Malapert Question had not the Patience to stay for an Answer, as appears by the Conclusion of it--since there seems to be no need of them there. Tis most certain there will be no needless impertinent persons or things in Heaven.²

Sewall goes on to say that "Since God is their Father, & therefore Heaven is their Country: Ubi Pater Ubi Patria."³ Sewall's grounds for pleading women's rightful place in heaven were not new nor unique to him nor to his time. The question was old as were the varied replies. His arguments defending women as joint heirs to the "heavenly Mansion" rested on the arguments of previous ages. His persistent appeal to authority to support

¹The British Apollo: Containing about Two Thousand Answers to Curious Questions in most Arts & Sciences, Serious Comical, & Humorous (London, 1712) 1: 200.

²Samuel Sewall, "Talitha Cumi," MS, in Diary and Common-place Book. Hereafter cited as "Talitha Cumi."

³Ibid.

his contention rather than any original reasoning or new conclusions of his own demonstrates that he was but merely following a precedent set, and a fact that was already established and in the mainstream of not only Puritan thought, but Christian thought in general. In a true Puritan manner, he based his arguments primarily on the Bible and the writings of early Christian fathers.

...the most learned and best Expositors conclude that the words are a plain and undeniable Proof that Women have an Equal Share in the Resurrection unto Eternal Life & heavenly glory.¹

Further on he asserted that even "Modern testimonies may be added to the Ancients."²

As already noted, women's spiritual equality was recognized and even at the Council of Macon in 585, factions favoring the case wherein it was argued that women did indeed possess souls prevailed; furthermore, with regards to the debate whether or not a woman should be even considered a "homo," they "allowed women to remain human beings in the eyes of the clergy, even though considered very weak and bad ones."³

Yet inspite of even these decrees, it appears that not all were convinced for the decisions were challenged, if not derided, and questions on the issue continued to be raised.

In Sewall's opinion, no amount of questioning would change the ways of the Lord, "some too curiously dispute"

¹Ibid.

²Ibid.

³Matilda Gage, Women, Church and State (Chicago, 1893), p. 56, quoted in Powell, English Domestic Relations, p. 150; see also Howard, Matrimonial Institutions, 1: 331 n. 2.

what, as far as he was concerned, by now had been settled.

...there be too much Curiosity employed in maintaining the Words & Works of God, & in preserving the beautiful Variety with which He has been pleased to adorn them.-- As God is Almighty, so He is Eternal & Unchangeable. And He will have Sons & Daughters as like Himself as can be. &c.¹

For it was written in the Holy Scriptures that EVE, the Mother of all living; SARAH, the Mother of the Fruitfull; and MARY, the Mother of our Lord," shall rise again; "And if these three rise again without doubt all will."² Sewall's repartee to the "Objection" that "The Ancients are divided in their Opinions about it--whether there will be a distinction or no" was, "but if we should wait till all the Ancients are agreed in their Opinions, neither Men nor Women would ever get to Heaven."³

For Sewall, the situation was clear:

...if any Controversy shall be moved injurious to the Right of Women before ancient or modern Men, in my opinion their safest & surest way is to plead, that they are Coram non iudice. 'Tis not what ancient & modern Divines or learned & Philosophical men say concerning the Freehold of the Moiety of Mankind but what God says....And it is no small Injury to have the Title to this Inheritance defamed or questioned. But seeing all is to be Tried & decided by the WORD of GOD, they need not be afraid with any amazement.⁴

Thus Sewall gallantly defended and reaffirmed women's acknowledged and rightful station in Eden.

Subsequently upon the descent to earth, however, Sewall reminds the reader that although "Saving Faith" and "Salvation

¹"Talitha Cumi."

²Ibid.

³Ibid.

⁴Ibid.

is just" and "not proper to one sex...the woman indeed was the first that brought in sinne;" and as a result "they might think themselves forsaken of God for their Fault"(Italics mine).¹

Hence in the earthly domain, the woman was relegated to her "rightful" place. Sewall had some definite views on this and continued to reveal his bent of mind in his Proposals:

Amongst all the Ornaments wherewith the Chaste Mother is enriched, there is none more constantly worn, or more adorning than that of the Peremptory desire of her husband's Presence. This causes her to record the time of his departure, keep an exact reckoning of his absence; and with frequent Calculations and Enquiries, to long and look for the appointed Season of his Expected Return.²

Sewall must have wholeheartedly subscribed to the arguments of Nicholas Noyes in "For the Reasons Against Wearing of Periwigs" for he neatly copied them into his commonplace book.³ These arguments are quite instructive for they disclose some curious and many interesting reasonings behind the hostility towards "periwigs," and in a roundabout manner, they reveal the Puritan outlook on women. According to the author, it

¹"Talitha Cumi." Sewall's arguments in this tract are sometimes inconsistent. While consistently championing women as rightful heirs to heaven and everlasting life, he loses the distinction when dealing with the subject of resurrection and the distinction of the sexes. In order to support his main contention, women's rightful admittance to heaven, he states in one place, "There is neither Male nor Female; for ye are all One in Christ Jesus;" yet in another instance, he mentions "that in the Resurrection World, Mary shall enjoy her own Body, & John shall enjoy his;" and finally Sewall quotes the Bible, "Til we all com in the Unity of the Faith--unto a Perfect Man, &c." Ephes. 4:13.

²Sewall, Proposals Touching The Accomplishments of Prophecies (Boston, 1713), p. 1.

³Nicholas Noyes, "The Reasons Against Wearing of Periwigs" is quoted in Sewall's MS. diary & commonplace book. Sewall had a lifelong battle against the wearing of wigs.

would have been considered less offensive if men wore wigs that had been made from their own hair than from that of the opposite sex. The reasoning is significant for the "subtelty" of it accents the accepted inferiority of women, for it simply would not be proper "to covet Womens hair; which is a token of Womens Subjection, when they wear it themselves for a covering; to have it cut off, a token of Immodesty.¹ To act otherwise was viewed with disfavor for it stripped the significance and the traditional meaning of this "covering."

Womens hair when on their own heads, is a token of subjection....It was made for a token of subjection in the wearer, and is no more a token of Superiority in Men; than wearing the Breeches is a token of Subjection in Women.²

Sewall applied the scheme of command and obedience in his own family, where everyone kept to their place and fulfilled their callings, in the true Puritan fashion. His marriage to Hannah Hull was a congenial one, in fact, one finds it almost peculiar, and perhaps a bit suspect, that the diarist never recorded a disagreement or a quarrelsome dispute with his spouse. This is not to say that episodes of domestic discord did not occur in the rest of the household, particularly with the children. They were sufficiently recorded and conveyed much about Sewall--a gentle, but firm father. Even in his public life as magistrate, for instance, Sewall consistently remained firm but a fair man with respect to the standards of his times.

¹Ibid.

²Ibid. Another interesting distinction between the sexes detailed by Noyes is that, "The Hair of Women being suitable to their soft, moist, Constitution; but not to the Masculine hot & Dry Constitution."

In addition to his Diary, his Letter Book and commonplace book, from which additional information is gleaned about his public activities and thoughts, portray a busy and honorable man whose actions, in a great measure, would definitely receive scriptural sanction.

In keeping with the manner of the times, he allowed Hannah to share in the supervision of financial matters,

...and give my Wife the rest of the cash... 4.3-8, and tell her she, shall now keep the Cash; if I want I will borrow of her. She has a better faculty than I at managing Affairs....¹

Yet this is not unusual, nor did it mean that Sewall was relinquishing control of the purse strings, but rather that he was acting to the prescribed ways of domestic management. Women were urged to aid in the keeping of household affairs and its economy. This did not give her autonomy for, in the end, the final decision rested with the husband and as Sewall later stated, "I will assist her."²

The union was a tender one and Sewall made countless affectionate references about his wife. She was to him a

¹Diary, 24 Jan. 1703/4, 1: 496.

²Diary, 24 Jan. 1703/4, 1: 496; 10 Aug. 1689, 1: 234. Although Sewall was the head of his family, in one sense, the situation was somewhat complicated by the fact that he resided with his in-laws; consequently, deference to his father-in-law, John Hull, as the head of the household was in order. Being in such close proximity and constant interaction, it was inevitable that at some point occasions of tension and ill-feelings would occur between the two. See Diary, 1: 35 n.5. Moreover, Strandness in Puritan Portrait, p. 46 n.2, noted that upon the death of John Hull in 1683, "Sewall's sorrow could hardly have been unmixed with relief. He was at the time thirty-one years old, a father of four, yet he was still 'son Sewall'."

"most Constant Loyer, my most laborious Nurse."¹ He always expressed concern for her "Travails and on one particularly difficult delivery he wrote:

The Mercy is the more surprising, because my wife had two such hazardous travails before; and her Pains and Sickness and Maladies so numerous, her fear and misgivings of heart so much, that we were ready to succumb and rather expect her Funeral than Delivery, she being Almost all along in doubt whether she were with child or no.²

Sewall would record her progress, noting with relief, "My Wife goes to Meeting, which is the first time since her Lying-in," or "After long Restrain" she took the Lord's Supper.³ On occasions of illness, he would dutifully seek the services of a minister for her and

I humbly desire your Remembrance of my dear Wife, born in This Town, last February was Two and Fifty years. She has brought forth fourteen Children, and is depress'd with chronical Infirmities and Diseases.⁴

Upon her recovery, he tended to the task of securing her place in the church again telling Mr. Goose that "his wife could not conveniently sit any longer in my wives Pue, and therefore desired her to look out another place."⁵

¹Samuel Sewall to Cotton Mather, 29 Oct. 1717, Letter Book, 2: 73-74.

²Samuel Sewall to Jeremiah Dummer, 12 March 1701/2, Letter Book, 1: 267-268.

³Diary, Sabbath-day Afternoon, 1: 92; 22 Feb. 1701/2, 1: 462; 13 Feb. [1715], 2: 786.

⁴Samuel Sewall to Rev. Increase Mather, 16 March 1709/10, Letter Book, 1: 390.

⁵Diary, 15 July 1693, 1: 311. Interestingly enough, Sewall makes no mention of when his wife became a member of the South Church.

That they spent much of their leisure time together is shown in the numerous outings that they took:

Carried Wife to Dorchester to eat Cherries, Rasberries, chiefly to ride and take the Air: the Time my Wife and Mrs. Flint spent in the Orchard, I spent in Mr. Flint's Study, reading Calvin on the Psalms, &c. 45. 68. 14.1

Sometimes their excursions were of a more serious nature:

"Carried my Wife to Cambridge-Lecture; mr. Willard preached..."²

Dreams were of importance and had their effects. After one disturbing dream in which Hannah died while he was gone on a business trip little Elisabeth "whispered that the death had occurred in part because of my neglect and want of love. When I shook off sleep, I embraced my wife for joy as if I had newly married her."³ During his voyage to England he, "Dream'd much of my wife last night;" and on one "night dreamed of the death of my dear Wife, which made me very heavy."⁴ That he was homesick and missed his wife was evident. "Ait my wives Pastry, the

¹Diary, Satterday, P.M. 1685, #: 67. It was not infrequent that the Sewalls pleasantly amused themselves with such other outings as picnics, corn husking, nutting, or simply visiting friends and relations. See Diary, 1: 79, 109, 151, 166, 374. Trips including the children were not uncommon. See Diary, 1: 121, 182, 377-378, 475.

²Diary, 24 June 1685, 1: 68. Sewall himself dutifully attended Harvard Commencements and occasionally Hannah accompanied him there or to a fast in another town. See Diary, 1: 181, 375; 2: 626.

³Diary, 3 June 1685, 1: 65.

⁴Diary, 16 Dec. 1688, 1: 186; 16 June 1689, 1: 129.

remembrance of whom is ready to cut me to the heart. The Lord pardon and help me."¹ "Letters from my dear wife" and news of home were more than welcome.²

That she was diligent in executing her duties as a mother, tending to the welfare and future of their offspring he noted throughout with approval; and that Hannah was "fruitful" there can be no doubt. On the birth of their last child, Sewall pensively wrote:

Note. This is the Thirteenth Child that I have offered up to God in Baptisme; my wife having born me Seven Sons and Seven Daughters. I have named this little Daughter Judith, in Remembrance of her honoured and beloved Grandmother Mrs. Judith Hull. And it may be my dear wife may now leave off bearing.³

The sudden death, "the sore Trial of the mortal Sickness of my dear Wife," was "the more Shocking because the Sickness was so sudden and vehement, when we reckoned upon Recovery from former Indisposition." The loss of his wife who was "most constant in her Love to me a most tender Mother and Laborious Nurse," was a painful loss.⁴ "In Remembrance of Hannah his Loving Wife, the Wife of his youth," he made a donation to the South End School which had brought to his mind a Mr. John Sanford, "whose Scholar the said Hannah was, and of whom, with pleasure, she

¹Diary, 27 Nov. 1688, 1: 184.

²Diary, 25 Feb. 1688/9, 1: 197; 20 May 1689, 1: 217;
31 May [1689], 1: 218.

³Diary, Note in the Memorandum, 1: 460.

⁴Samuel Sewall to Gurdon Saltonstall, Letter Book, 2: 82; Sewall to Jeremiah Dummer, 15 Jan. 1717/18, Letter Book, 2: 83-84.

frequently mentioned."¹

Sewall was both a devoted husband and father. He dutifully recorded the births of his children with joy, noting the hearty "treats" for the midwives. Each birth was greeted with an enthusiasm consistent all the way through, to the very last one, at which time he wrote "It hath pleased God to make this fiftieth year of my age a Jubilee to me in giving me a daughter."²

An indication of what a model daughter should be is reflected in his statement upon the baptism of one of his daughters:

The Lord...help her to speak the Jews Language and to forget that of Ashdod. Nehem. 13. 24. And that she may follow her Grandmother Hull, as she follows Christ, being not slothfull in Business, fervent in Spirit, serving the Lord.³

In the religious training of his household Sewall was zealous. He assiduously assumed the responsibility in the "catechising" of all members of the household.

It falls to my Daughter Elisabeth's share to read the 14. of Isaiah, which she doth with many Tears...and the Contents of the Chapter, and the Sympathy with her draw Tears from me also.⁴

Not infrequently these bible-readings were scenes of emotional outbursts where the children's terror of death and punishment erupted.

When I came in, past 7. at night, my wife met in the entry and told me Betty had surprised them. I was surprised with

¹Letter Book, 2: 134-135.

²Samuel Sewall to Jeremiah Dummer, 12 March 1701/2, Letter Book, 1: 267.

³Diary, Sabbath-day, August the four and twentieth, 1690, 1: 264-265.

⁴Diary, 10 Jan. 1689/90, 1: 249.

the abruptness of the Relation. It seems Betty Sewall had given some signs of dejection and sorrow; but a little after dinner she burst out into an amazing cry, which caus'd all the family to cry too....she was afraid she should go to Hell....¹

On such occasions he prayed with them or "discoursed" with them.

Feb. 22. 1695/6 Betty comes into me almost as soon as I was up and tells me the disquiet she had when waked; told me was afraid should go to hell...I answer'd her Fears as well as I could, and Pray'd with many Tears on either part; hope God heard us.²

Scripture reading and psalm singing was a constant family affair:

This morning we read in the course the 141 151 and 16th Psalms....took occasion to dehort mine from Christmas keeping and charged them to forbear..)

Sewall makes no mention of their intellectual training, and their formal education was not extensive, though he does make several statements about his daughters going to school.

The girls went to dame schools and private schools:

Mary goes to Mrs. Thairs to learn to Read & Knit.

.....
Little Hannah going to School in the morn....

.....
This day Dame Walker is taken so ill that she sends home my Daughters, not being able to teach them.⁴

He was proud of his daughter when he wrote:

She can Read, and Spin passing well. Things (Me saltem

¹Diary, 13 Jan. 1695/6, 1: 345-346. For examples of similar "disquiets" and terrors of death, see entries: Sabbath, 3 May 1696, 1: 349; 30 Dec. 1708, 1: 612.

²Diary, 22 Feb. 1695/6, 1: 348. Such behavior was not peculiar to Betty for on 25 October 1713 Sewall records: "In the Night after 12. Susan [a domestic servant] comes, and knocks at our chamber door, said she could not sleep, was afraid she should dye," Diary, 2: 731.

³Diary, Seventh-day, 25 Dec. 1697, 1: 384.

⁴Diary, 2 Nov. 1696, 1: 358; 16 Oct. 1688, 1: 180; 7 Jan. 1686/7, 1: 130.

Judice) very desirable in a woman. She read through one Volume [of] the Book of Martyrs, in three Months space, improving only leisure times [at] Night.¹

He even took on the responsibility for the education of his granddaughters Mary and Jane Hirst upon the death of their parents.

The custom of "putting forth" or "placing out" of children with relatives was practiced by Sewall in order to avoid "cockering." Parting was sometimes a trying experience as Sewall related, "Rid home, having much adoe to pacify my dear daughter, she weeping and pleading to go with me."²

His fervor in overseeing his daughters' courtships and effecting prudent alliances remained unflagging. He faithfully recorded the suitors and the progress of things throughout. In accordance with custom, permission to court his daughters were of course first secured from him and if all went well, the two sets of parents then met to settle the marriage portions. The choice of spouses did not go without the consent of his daughters, though sometimes undesired courtly calls from potential suitors did have traumatic effects, as with Elisabeth and Judith.

[January 4, 1698/9] About 11m. Daughter Elisabeth reads to me the second of Genesis in course. In the evening between seven and eight Capt. Zech. Tuthill speaks with her.

[January] At night Capt. Tuthill comes to speak with Betty,

¹Samuel Sewall to Daniel Gookin, Letter Book, 1: 19.

²Diary, 13 Oct. 1693, 1: 314. See also Diary, 1: 34 n. 4; 16 July 1694, 1: 319; 24 Aug. 1696, 1: 355; 27 April 1704, 1: 502; 5 Sept. 1720, 2: 954; 20 Sept. 1721, 2: 982.

who hid her self all alone in the coach for several hours till he was gon, so that we sought at several houses, til at last come in of her self, and look'd very wild.

January 9 Speaks with her in my presence.

January 10, at night sent Mr. Tuthill away, because company was here, and told him was willing to know her mind better.¹

Grove Hirst almost suffered a similar fate had it not been for the push and persuasion that Betty received from her father

when he wrote:

Elisabeth,--Mr. Hirst waits on you once more to see if you can bid him welcome. It ought to be seriously considered, that your drawing back from him after all that has passed between you, will be to your Prejudice; and will tend to discourage persons of worth from making their Court to you. And you had need well to consider whether you be able to bear his final Leaving of you, howsoever it may seem gratefull to you at present. When persons come toward us, we are apt to look upon their Undesirable Circumstances mostly; and thereupon to shun them. But when persons retire from us for good and all, we are in danger of looking only on that which is desirable in them, to our woful Disquiet. Whereas tis the property of a good Balance to turn where the most weight is, though there be some also in the other Scale. I do not see but the Match is well liked by judicious persons, and such as are your Cordial Friends, and mine also.

Yet notwithstanding, if you find in yourself an immovable, incurable Aversion from him, and cannot love, and honour, and obey him, I shall say no more, nor give you any further trouble in this matter. It had better be off than on. So praying to God to pardon us, and pity our Undeserving and to direct and strengthen and settle you in making a right judgment, and giving a right Answer, I take leave, who am, Dear Child,

Your loving father

Your mother remembers to you.²

The letter was stern, to say the least, though it ostensibly

¹Diary, 1: 406. Capt. Turner was also spurned in a fashion which "surprised" Sewall, Diary, 1: 407.

²Letter Book, 1: 213.

allowed her an alternative failing a positive decision. In a year's time the couple was married.

Judith also came under seige.

Mr. Prince came to my house, just sat down with me, and desired to be excused, went through the Kitchen...was knocking and pleading a long time at the door before they would let him in; Judith trembled much, and is more and more alienated from him by his rough upbraiding Carriage towards her. The Lord be mercifull to her and me, pardon our Sins, and guide us: ¹

It seems that Judith had no inclination to resort to any evasion tactics with William Cooper, judging by the speed with which he secured Sewall's "Consent for Judith's Company, which I freely grant him."²

That Sewall could be sympathetic to his daughter's pain and awkward situation is further exemplified by this entry:

Friday, Feb. 25. [1709] Madam Winthrop, Oliver, and Mico visit my wife. In the evening S. Gerrish comes not; we expected him, Mary dress'd her self: it was a painfull disgracefull disappointment.³

From the beginning, the Sewalls were not too pleased about Mr. Gerrish's attentions to Mary, after hearing reports that he courted or was courting Sarah Coney, which made Sewall "uneasy." After the matter was settled to Sewall's satisfaction,

¹Diary, 19 March 1719, 2: 919. Col. William Dudley had also asked Sewall's leave to wait on Judith though it appears that Sewall was not too eager and was elusive in his reply, already having one uneasy liason with a Dudley in the family. Even when Governor Dudley finally spoke in behalf of the Colonel, Sewall replied "it was a weighty matter. I would consider of it. &c." Diary, 13 Oct. 1719, 2: 931.

²Diary, 7 Dec. 1719, 2: 935; Sewall himself performed the ceremony. For a brief description, see Diary, 12 May 1720, 2: 948-949.

³Diary, 2: 615.

the courtship resumed, the couple being married August 24, 1709.¹

Not infrequently do Samuel Sewall, Sr. and Hannah appear in the numerous domestic unrests between his son Samuel Sewall, Jr. and Rebeckah Dudley (daughter of Governor Dudley). Often Samuel Jr. ran to his paternal home, and "informs my wife of his very uncomfortable Circumstances and of the Necessity of fetching him to Boston."²

On one occasion, the elder Sewall wrote to his daughter-in-law:

Dear Child,--I have sent you another Motto: Florent Concordia Regna: Agreement makes Kingdoms flourish, you may do what you will with the gold, only keep the Motto, it being all I have. And indeed if I had more I could not send you a better; for even a Family is a little Kingdom.³

That harmony did not prevail is evident from a subsequent entry:

Friday, Feb. 13 [1713] When my daughter alone, I ask'd her what might be the cause of my Son's Indisposition, are you so kindly affectioned one towards another as you should be? She answer'd I do my Duty. I said no more.⁴

¹Diary, 24 Feb. 1709; 2: 615; 2: 624. Mary died in child-bed 17 Nov. 1709--she was then nineteen years of age. Samuel Gerrish later remarried, his second wife being Sarah Coney, Diary, 2: 688 n. 26.

²Diary, 12 Feb. [1713] 2: 705. Apparently Sewall, Jr. had a penchant for taverns, an eye for the maidens and at the same time was cuckolded by his wife. During one of their longer separations, Rebeckah bore an illegitimate child. After much negotiating an agreement was reached and the couple was reconciled, with son Sewall insisting that the child be not "chargeable to his estate." The matter evidently was kept out of the courts and Rebeckah never suffered any of the prescribed penalties for adultery. For a brief version of Sewall, Jr.'s woes see Diary, 2: 705 n. 5.

³Samuel Sewall to Rebeckah Sewall, 4 March 1702/3, Letter Book, 1: 278.

⁴Diary, 2: 706.

To his own mother and sisters, his disposition was one of tender respect, and most commonly he described them in terms of "fruitful vines." On the death of his mother in Newbury, Sewall in his eulogy wrote:

She Liv'd commendably.... She was a true and constant Lover of Gods Words, Worship, and Saints: And she always, with a patient cheerfulness, submitted to the divine Decree of providing Bread for her self and others in the sweat of her Brows.²

On the death of a sister, he lamented the loss of "a noble Spring of Love and Respect."³

Sewall was not to endure the state of widowhood for very long, for soon friends and acquaintances beleaguered him, "laying out" lists of widows as potential brides--nor did Sewall rebuff the onslaught: "This morning wandering in my mind whether to live a Single or a Married life...."⁴ The spirit of Protestantism almost "required" him to remarry rather than lead a single life.

Dr. Mather sends me his Marah in a Letter in which is the expression, 'But your Honor will allow me now at length, to offer you my Opinion, that all the Regards are not yet paid; which you owe unto the Widow, and which are expected from you.'⁵

Sewall ponders on the subject, again, after the death of his second wife, Abigail Tilley.

The truth is, I have little Occasion for a Wife, but for the sake of Modesty, and to cherish me in my advanced years... Me thinks I could venture to lay my Weary head in her Lap, if it might be brought to pass upon Honest Con-

¹Diary, 2: 706. ²Diary, 14 Jan. 1700/01, 1: 443-444.

³Letter Book, 1: 274. ⁴Diary, 6 Feb. [1718], 2: 882.

⁵Diary, 17 March [1718], 2: 890.

ditions.¹

Sewall had girded himself for battle with an armada of sweets, bottles of Canary, news-letters, Psalm Books, sermons, books and other impressive gifts to persuade his widows toward a more positive bent of mind.²

The first widow to succumb, though their union was truly very brief, was the Widow Tilly, whom he described as a "Gentlewoman" who "carries it tenderly, and is very helpfull to me, my Children, and Grand-Children."³ That she more than adequately fulfilled her duties in the supervision of domestic affairs, such as arranging his daughter's future well-being, there can be no doubt, for Sewall wrote:

...my loving Wife, who was a promoter of the Match, [between Judith and William Cooper] and an industrious Contriver of my daughter's Comfortable Settlement, was taken from me by an awfully sudden Death...and that He would yet again provide such a good Wife for me, that I may be able to say, I have obtained Favour of the Lord....⁴

And so once again, banns were published by the aged wooer.

¹Samuel Sewall to Rev. Timothy Woodbridge, 1 June 1721, Letter Book, 2: 133.

²The details of Sewall's numerous courtships, his affairs of the heart in his later years, are much too lengthly to be recorded here. Their progress, the cooling-off and warming-up periods in the Winthrop courtship, the coy-fencing indulged in by everyone, the higgling and blatant bargaining over dowries--"I told her 'twas time now to finish our Business"--with all his widows ought not to be missed, but read in their entirety. For the purposes of this essay, enough be said that upon the passing away of each wife, his musings "to marry or no" inevitably led him to cast his eyes towards the widows' pew in church.

³Samuel Sewall to John Storke, 20 Feb. 1719/20, Letter Book, 2: 108; Samuel Sewall to Rev. Timothy Woodbridge, 1 Feb. 1719/20, Letter Book, 2: 103-104.

⁴Samuel Sewall to Jeremiah Dummer, 13 Dec. 1720, Letter Book, 2: 122-123.

With his last wife, who outlived him, he had a congenial and warm relationship. She did not fail his expectations, for he announced, "I am happy in a third Wife, Mrs, Mary Gibbs."¹ That she was painstaking in her housewifely duties is certainly revealed in Sewall's appreciative attitude:

God in his Goodness had made my wife a great Blessing to me and my family. My dâter Hañah under her Chronical Disease of her Left-Legg, could hardly Subsist without Her.

.....
The Necessary services of my wife, especially for me, and my dâter Hañah, whose Leggs she dress'd once a day at Least, to do which required a great deal of diligence, Skill, and Courage.²

Concerning matrimonial affections in general, Sewall was obviously of a positive opinion.

The Conjugal Love is Honourable in itself; and Christ has ennobled it, by speaking to his Church, in Phrases taken from it: My Sister! My Spouse!

Sewall, as magistrate and therefore as an agent of God, performed countless ceremonies, marrying some of his own children, and even being married by his son Joseph, and his son-in-law, Mr. Cooper.⁴ That it was a solemn state, worthy of respect in every aspect is further shown by his attempts to make various changes in the law with regards to the bill of 1705, prohibiting

¹Samuel Sewall to Jeremiah Dummer, 20 Nov. 1722, Letter Book, 2: 146.

²Samuel Sewall to Mr. Johnathan Dickinson, 22 Feb. 1723/4; Letter Book, 2: 160; Samuel Sewall to Rev. Mr. Solomon Stoddard, 14 March 1723/4, Letter Book, 2: 162.

³Samuel Sewall, Proposals Touching the Accomplishment of Prophecies (Boston, 1713), p. 1.

⁴On 4 Nov. 1692 Sewall recorded that a law had been passed allowing both ministers and justices of the peace to perform marriage ceremonies, Diary, 1:300. As mentioned above, he himself was married by ministers. See Diary, 29 Oct. 1719, 2: 932-933; 29 March 1722, 2: 993 and 1: 260 n. 22.

the marriage of white men with Indians or Negroes:

If it be pass'd I fear twill be an Oppression provoking to God....I have got the Indians out of the Bill, and some mitigation for them [the Negroes] left in it, and the clause about their Masters not(denying their Marriage).¹

Sewall did not view women as a vanity or a snare to the soul. That he enjoyed the company of a lady was certain, and that he was capable of cultivating their friendships was also evident. Their deaths he lamented:

...my old cordial Christian dear Friend, Mrs. Sarah Noyes, Expires. She was Laborious, Constant at Privat Meeting, Lecture, Lords-Day. I am much afflicted for the Loss of her.²

That he faithfully followed decorum and exhibited respect towards women, he gave ample evidence of; and even took it upon himself to chastize others for their improper conduct. "I send for Edw. Cowel and blame him for his ill carriage at Richd. White's Wedding."³ His strong sense of propriety further manifested itself in his letter to:

Mrs. Martha Oakes.. Not finding opportunity to speak with you at your house, nor at my own, I write, to persuade you to be sensible that your striking your daughter-in-law before me, twas not a small fault....As for New England, It was a cleaner country than ever you were in before, and, therefore, with disdain to term it filthy, is a sort of Blasphamie, which by proceeding out of your mouth, hath defiled you. I write not this to upbraid, but to admonish you, with whom I sympathize under your extraordinary pro-

¹Diary, 1 Dec. 1705, 1: 532 and n. 33. See also 26 Sept. 1700, 1: 435. Sewall is also credited with having written the first anti-slavery tract in America, The Selling of Joseph (Boston, 1700)

²Diary, 19 March 1707/8, 1: 591.

³Diary, 20 Feb. 1686/7, 1: 97.

vocations and pressures; and pray God command you free from them.

Samuel Sewall¹

In another case, concerning the welfare and the maintenance of Elisabeth Thurston and her illegitimate son, Sewall, in no uncertain terms, made clear his thoughts to Nathaniel Coddington with regard to his son, William Coddington.

6 To have to do with a woman not ones wife, is unchristian, But to desert ones own child so begotten is worse than pagan, and an Instance of the most vile Injustice both towards Mother and Son, and a Token of the greatest contempt of God, the Creator of all....²

With a note of disdain and even righteousness he recorded such incidents as the following:

Thursday, Feb. 24, 1680-1 This morn, the Wife of Mr. Elias Row is found dead in her bed,...she and her Husband seldom lay together; she was given to Drink and quarrelling. Her death puts in mind of the Proverb wherein we say such an one hath drunk more than he hath bled today.³

In the eyes of Sewall, "modesty" in a woman was paramount--

Midweek, sentenced a woman that had whip'd a Man, to be whip'd; said a woman that had lost her Modesty, was like Salt that had lost its savor; good for nothing but to be cast to the Dunghill....⁴

Caution was to be exercised in order not to marry within the

¹Diary, 10 Sept 1696, 1: 355.

²Samuel Sewall to Nathaniel Coddington, 18 March 1701/2. Letter Book, 1: 270. Although Sewall was acting in the capacity of magistrate, his sense of duty and justice as well as his personal concern was thus conveyed in his letter in behalf of his former servant.

³Diary, 1: 48.

⁴This quotation is an interesting revelation of how Sewall viewed "modesty" in a woman. It is part of a narration where a woman attempts to revenge herself with her husband for "carrying it harshly to her." Diary, 10 Sept. 1707, 1: 572.

the forbidden degrees of relationships. Like the Mathers, Sewall saw such unions as incestuous, and sounded an ominous tone, foreboding an evil end as with Catherine Howard, first cousin to Anne Boleyn, "They that will, from this Example, be fond of Marrying Cousin-Germans, Let 'em!"¹

Thus, Sewall was a pious and cautious man--a product of his times--who advocated nothing that could not be proved scriptural. In decrying the attack on "women's rights to heaven," he was not a man ahead of his age as a defender of women's rights, but rather he was a man of his age. Sewall was a pillar of society, an upholder of the Church, he was not one to disrupt tradition. Nor was he an original thinker, but rather, he was a follower, in his own right, obeying precedent set. His thought flowed in conjunction with the main currents of thought in his contemporaneity. Sewall wholeheartedly supported unconditional, celestial equality, a predominately accepted concept, though his terrestrial equality also took the form as propounded by Puritan thought. With everyone in their properly designated place, the unity of the family functioned under the main government of the father, aided by the mother, who in turn, with the remainder of the household was to willingly and unquestioningly subject herself to the authority and will of the head--obviously at the expense of her individual self, but for the benefit of the "whole."

¹Letter Book, 2: 19; 1: 17, 351-353, 369, 370. see also the entry 14 June 1695 on the Bill against incest, Diary, 1: 333 and n. 8 for more details, and Diary, 29 March 1711, 2: 657 and 13 April 1711, 2: 658.

Sewall did not argue and set forth demands for full human equality, but merely reaffirmed what already was, and corrected those who did not conform. The woman was to remain, though she was charged to be efficient, in the domestic sphere, yet once again, even here she was under the authority of her husband. That Sewall approved and supported the structure of such an existence is further confirmed by his tastes in gifts to his wife--"Ornaments for the daughters of Zion, it being designed for the female sex."¹ And so to this end, that it

is her industry, that she betimes applies her self to learn all the affairs of Housewifry...and such other Arts relating to Business, as may Enable her to do the man whom she may hereafter have, Good and not Evil all the Days of her life.

.....
Though she be...a Mistress; yet she owns that she ha's, a Master....²

And this was the order of things.

¹Diary, 21 Sept. [1719], 2: 929; Letter Book, 9 Jan. 1691/2, 1: 127.

²Cotton Mather, Ornaments, pp. 74, 80.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY SOURCES

Cleaver, Robert. A Godly Form of Household Government. London, 1603.

Gouge, William. Of Domestical Duties. London, 2nd edition, 1626.

Hull, John. Diary of John Hull, 1624-1633. Transactions of the American Antiquarian Society. vol. 3. 1857.

Mather, Cotton. Awakening Thoughts on the Sleep of Death. Boston, 1712.

_____. Elizabeth in Her Holy Retirement: An Essay to Prepare a Pious Woman for Her Lying-In. Boston, 1710.

_____. The Family Well-Ordered: Or an Essay to Render Parents and Children Happy in One Another. Boston, 1699.

_____. Marah Spoken to: A Brief Essay to do Good Unto the Widow. Boston, 2nd edition, 1721.

_____. Ornaments for the Daughters of Zion. Cambridge, Mass., 1691.

Mather, Increase. An Arrow Against Profane and Promiscuous Dancing. Boston, 1684.

_____. The Folly of Sinning, Opened and Applied. Boston, 1699.

_____. Ichabod. Boston, 1702.

_____. Testimony Against Several Profane and Superstitious Customs. London, 1687.

Samuel Sewall. Diary of Samuel Sewall, 1674-1729. Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society. 5th series. Boston, 1886-1888.

_____. The Diary of Samuel Sewall, 1674-1729. Edited by M. Halsey Thomas. 2 vols. New York, 1973.

MS. Diary and Commonplace Book. On deposit at the Massachusetts Historical Society. It includes the "Talitha Cumi: Or an Invitation to Women to Look after their Inheritance in the Heavenly Mansions," and Nichola Noyes' "Reasons Against Wearing of Periwigs."

Early Piety; Exemplified in Elizabeth Butcher. Boston, 1718. The authorship is disputed though the work is listed under Sewall at the Massachusetts Historical Society.

The Letter Book. Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society. 6th series, vols. 1-2. Boston, 1886-1888.

Phaenomena quaedam Apocalyptica ad Aspectum Novi Orbis configurata. Boston, 1697.

Proposals Touching the Accomplishment of Prophecies. Boston, 1713.

Smith Henry. A Preparative to Mariage. London, 1591.

Whately, William. A Bride-Bush: Or a Wedding Sermon. London, 1617.

Winthrop, John. Winthrop's Journal "History of New England" 1630-1649. Edited by James Kendall Hosmer. 2 vols. New York, 1946.

SECONDARY SOURCES

Adams, Charles Francis. Three Episodes of Massachusetts History. Cambridge, Mass., revised edition, 1894.

Bailyn, Bernard. Education in the Forming of American Society. New York, 1960.

New England Merchants in the Seventeenth Century. New York, 1955.

Battis, Emery. Saints and Sectaries: Anne Hutchinson and the Antinomian Controversy in the Massachusetts Bay Colony. Chapel Hill, 1962.

Bruce, H. Addington. Woman in the Making of America. Boston, 1912.

Bushman, Richard. From Puritan to Yankee: Character and the Social Order in Connecticut, 1690-1768. Cambridge, Mass., 1967.

- Chamberlain, N.H. Samuel Sewall and the World He Lived In. New York, 1897.
- Demos, John. A Little Commonwealth: Family Life in Plymouth Colony. New York, 1970.
- Doten, Dana. The Art of Bundling. New York, 1938.
- Dow, George Francis. Domestic Life in New England in the Seventeenth Century. Topsfield, Mass., 1925.
- Earle, Alice Morse. Child Life in Colonial Days. New York, 1899.
- _____. Colonial Dames and Good Wives. Cambridge, Mass., 1895.
- _____. Home Life in Colonial Days. New York, 1898.
- Ellis, George E. An Address on the Life and Character of Chief Justice Samuel Sewall. Boston, 1885.
- George, Charles H. and Katherine George. The Protestant Mind of the English Reformation, 1570-1640. Princeton, 1691.
- Goodsell, Willystine. A History of the Family as a Social and Educational Institution. New York, 1915.
- Greven, Philip, J. Jr. Four Generations: Population, Land, and Family in Colonial Andover, Massachusetts. Ithaca, 1970.
- Howard, George Elliott. A History of Matrimonial Institutions. 3 vols. New York, 1904.
- Lockridge, Kenneth A. A New England Town: The First Hundred Years, Dedham, Massachusetts, 1636-1736. New York, 1970.
- Middlekauff, Robert. The Mathers: Three Generations of Puritan Intellectuals, 1596-1728. New York, 1971.
- Miller, Perry. The New England Mind: From Colony to Province. Cambridge, Mass., 1953.
- _____. and Thomas H. Johnson, editors. The Puritans. 2 vols. New York, revised edition, 1963.
- Morgan, Edmund S. The Puritan Family: Religion and Domestic Relations in Seventeenth Century New England. New York, revised edition and enlarged, 1966.
- _____. Visible Saints: The History of a Puritan Idea. Ithaca, 1963.

Morison, Samuel Eloit. Builders of the Bay Colony. Boston, 2nd edition, revised, 1953.

_____. The Intellectual Life of Colonial New England. Ithaca, 1967.

New, John F.H. Anglican and Puritan: The Basis of Their Opposition, 1558-1640. Stanford, 1964.

Powell, Chilton Latham. English Domestic Relations, 1487-1653. New York, 1917.

Strandness, T.B. Samuel Sewall: A Puritan Portrait. East Lansing, 1967.

Wall, Robert Emmet, Jr. Massachusetts Bay: The Crucial Decade, 1640-1650. New Haven, 1972.

Waller, George M. ed. Puritanism in Early America. Boston, 1950.

Walzer, Michael. The Revolution of the Saints: A Study in the Origins of Radical Politics. Cambridge, Mass., 1965.

Ward, Mary Alden. Old Colony Days. Boston, 1897.

Winslow, Ola Elizabeth. Samuel Sewall of Boston. New York, 1964.

Winthrop, Robert C., Jr. A Few Words in Defense of an Eldery Lady. Boston, 1885.

Zuckerman, Michael. Peaceable Kingdoms: New England Towns in the Eighteenth Century. New York, 1970.

JOURNALS AND PROCEEDINGS

Ellis, George E. "Selections from the Letter Book of Samuel Sewall," Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society, vol. 12, 1871-1873, 358-385.

Howe, Estes, "The Abode of John Hull and Samuel Sewall," Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society, 2nd series, vol. 1, 312-326.

Middlekauff, Robert, "Piety and Intellect in Puritanism," William and Mary Quarterly, 3rd series, vol. 22, 1965, 457-470.

Morgan, Edmund S., "The Puritans and Sex," New England Quarterly, 15 (December, 1942), 591-607.

Tilden, Freeman, "Four Widows and One Judge," American Heritage
(Spring, 1954), 3-5, 1951-1954.

Winship, George Parker, "Samuel Sewall and the New England
Company," Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical
Society, vol 67, 1941-1944, 55-110.