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New England Order

A Discourse of the Society that Developed in the Massachusetts Bay Colony

Christopher Malmberg
The discovery and settlement of the Americas is a continual source of debate and confusion. Apart from the Spanish and Portuguese, the English laid claim to the new frontier and immediately attempted to create a colony in Jamestown in 1609; most historians now agree that it was a complete failure. Nineteen years after the founding of Jamestown, the governor of the Massachusetts Bay Company, Matthew Cradock, wrote to his cousin John Endicott in Massachusetts: “Our countrymen have suffered by theire too much confidence in Virginea. Let vs by theire harmes learne to beware; and as wee are commanded to be innocent as doves, soe wth all wee are enjoined to be wise as serpents.”¹ A year after the writing of this letter, the Great Migration under the governorship of John Winthrop left England to sail to New England wherein they would help in establishing the Massachusetts Bay Colony. This colony by comparison thrived; however, it was not because of a different location of settling, nor was it because of the strict religious beliefs among the Massachusetts Bay Colony, but because of the rigid order and structure that the leaders of the Massachusetts Bay Colony put in place. Their inflexible order in society can be seen as a result of the knowledge they held of Jamestown, which resulted in the letter quoted. This paper will examine the order that evolved in the Massachusetts Bay Colony with the failure of Jamestown in mind so as to show that the rigid society created in New England was not due purely to religious reasons, but that it was due to the need to survive; furthermore, I will argue that the order that evolved in New England came from the Puritans inherited idea of the Great Chain of Being mixed with the reformed notion of the body politic, both of which is embodied in the covenant.

The colony of Jamestown was founded by a royal charter from James I of England on May 14, 1607, and was the first permanent English settlement in the Americas. The first ten years of the colony were precarious at best as the settlers were immediately challenged to survive in an environment entirely different from their homes back in England. This is most evident in the vast difference in flora and fauna, which has been discussed in great detail by Alfred Crosby in his 1972 book *The Columbian Exchange*:

The contrast between the Old and New World fauna has impressed everyone who has ever crossed the Atlantic...the Precolumbian agriculturalists developed the American food plants from an assemblage of wild plants which was very different from that which the inventors of agriculture in the Old World had. Even the most optimistic of the early colonists of Virginia had to admit the flora was alien more often than it was familiar.²

It is difficult for our modern globalized mind to imagine the intensity of entering a wilderness where nothing is familiar or readily edible; however, this was the reality of the Jamestown settlers. In entering a new world full of different plants and animals, the only way in which the colonists could have survived would have been through hard labor in developing food to survive the winter, but this did not happen.

It is estimated that of the 104 original settlers, only 38 were alive at the end of the first year³; furthermore, evidence shows that thousands of immigrants came to Virginia in “its first decade, but, in 1619, there were only about 700 people left...between 1619 and 1622 some 3750 migrants set off for Virginia. Yet, in 1622, the population remained at about 700.”⁴ The reasons behind the large death toll are as numerous as the number of dead; however, it seems that a lack of order within the Jamestown settlement in the first decade as well as a general

---

laziness by the first settlers are the main reasons behind the failure of the Jamestown colony. Eric Nellis points to this in his book on early colonial British America “The absence of any social or economic cooperation, the misplaced ‘gentlemen’ who could not and would not labor, and the laborers who lacked direction created a desperate atmosphere. There was dissension at the top, no consistent leadership, and depression throughout.”

Information surrounding the early years of Jamestown points to the background of the first Jamestown settlers as the reason behind the lack of order within the society, and thus a lack of labor in the new colony. The settlers who arrived in Virginia consisted mainly of noblemen, titled English gentry, and their servants. This meant that there was a lack of a laboring class, as the gentlemen had no idea how to perform physical labor, nor did their servants. Jamestown not only lacked a person who knew how to run a plough, it also lacked a person who knew how to build one. The renowned historian, Edward Morgan, looked at the founders of Jamestown and came to a conclusion on why, even when suffering from starvation, they still did not work: “The England that Englishmen were saddled with as a model for new commonwealths abroad was a highly complex society in which the governing consideration in accomplishing a particular piece of work was not how to do it efficiently but who had the right or the duty to do it, by custom, law, or privilege.” In other words, the Jamestown settlers lacked efficiency and order as before accomplishing anything they had to first figure out who had the right, due to their birth status, to do it. One can imagine the chaos that ensued from this group of people thrown into an unknown wilderness, and arguing over who should do what

---

5 Eric Nellis, 103.
7 Edmund Morgan, “The Labor Problem at Jamestown,” 609.
with no agreement coming from any side due to the “genetic” makeup of the group; furthermore, the Jamestown example shows how engrained the hierarchy was in society due to the large death toll. The gentlemen in Jamestown, however, descended from a complex system of hierarchy called the Great Chain of Being. The Chain commanded that a strict hierarchy be enforced within society, but with the majority of those within Jamestown coming from the same privileged background, it became impossible for them to work together as a unit in order to survive.

From our modern perspective it seems absurd that these Englishmen would have come across the Atlantic and settled in Jamestown without any stable labor force; however, they had heard reports from Spanish merchants and gentlemen that the New World was abundant in gold and riches. In 1590 Master John Wattes intercepted letters coming from the New World to Spain, which were then translated and published in Hakluyt’s *English Voyages*. Many of the letters speak of the large quantities of gold and silver being found and the amount of money one could earn from trading New World products back in Europe. One of the letters intercepted was written by the licentiate John de Labera, who wrote “The marchants lade the canoas backe againe from thence with great store of silver and golde which is gotten out of the mines.”

Beginning in the 1590s, Spanish stories began flooding into the ears of Englishmen about the city of El Dorado and the unending source of Gold within it. These stories began through, once again, the English capture of Spanish ships containing letters, such as one taken by Captain George Popham in 1594: “There have bene certain letters received here of late, of a land newly discovered called Nuevo Dorado...they write of wonderful riches to be found in the said Dorado,

---

and that golde there is in great abundance...there is godle in such abundance, as the like hath
not bene heard of.” These are only two examples out of hundreds that made their way back
to England concerning the vast amount of riches to be had in the New World. It is at this time,
interestingly, that the English began looking at creating permanent settlements in the Americas
instead of continuing their pirateering against Spanish ships.

The lack of a labor force within the Jamestown colony is unsurprising as well when one
acknowledges the way in which the English settlers were attempting to copy the Spanish and
Portuguese. Edmund Morgan deals extensively with this topic and claims that this pattern of
copying the Spanish emerged as early as 1572 with Francis Drake’s journey to Panama. Morgan
asserts that “Spanish experience had shown that Europeans could thrive in the New
World without undue effort by exploiting the natives. With a mere handful of men the Spanish
had conquered an enormous population of Indians in the Caribbean, Mexico, and Peru and had
put them to work.” In the chronicles of Peter Martyr Englishmen learned how it was done.”

With this in mind it is of no surprise that a group of noblemen figured they could sail across the
Atlantic, round up natives for labor, and extract vast quantities of gold from the continent, with
the end result of returning to England with riches. Unfortunately for the Jamestown colonists,
they chose an area to settle that had a strong, united and powerful native tribe and were “thus
deprived of their anticipated native labor.”

---

9Alonso Sapata, letter to Marchants of Sant Lucar and his Majestie, in Richard Hakluyt, The English
10Edward Morgan, “The Labor Problem at Jamestown”, 598.
11Italics added by myself for emphasis
The first ten years of the Jamestown settlement, therefore, show a colony that was constantly refilled by new migrants, the death of the majority of the population, and lazy noblemen. It was not until the settlement realized the fortune it could possess with tobacco that it was incited to work; moreover, a new labor force began to be used by the Spanish and Portuguese that the Jamestown settlers could also use, African slaves. Once Africans began to be brought to the New World in large numbers Jamestown was finally able to find the labor force it so desperately needed to survive.14 News of the extreme failure and chaos of Jamestown, however, had already traveled back to England, and the fear of repeating Jamestown’s disasters led the Massachusetts Bay Colony to create a rigid society with strict order and laws, thus making the Massachusetts Bay Colony the only group that could effectively create a permanent settlement in the New World.

To understand the success of the Massachusetts Bay Colony it is imperative to first understand the ideological and cultural background from which they came, that is to say England in the 16th century, for a society does not arise from thin air, but develops based on previous experience. The members of the Massachusetts Bay Colony have come down through American history as “The Puritans” or, erroneously, as “The Pilgrims”. It is easy for history to group many individuals under such terms; however, it is not always beneficial or accurate to events. The group that founded the Massachusetts Bay Colony did come from an ideological background now called “Puritanism”; however, they were far different from those Puritans who remained in England as well as other groups of Puritans that had dispersed to other parts of the globe in the 16th and 17th centuries. Moreover, Referring to the Massachusetts Bay Colony as

pilgrims is completely inept, as that was a term coined and used by the members of Plymouth colony under William Bradford in 1620, a settlement that would later be absorbed into the Massachusetts Bay Colony. The greatest difference for this paper is that the Massachusetts Bay Colonists were not separatist, meaning that they had no wish to completely separate themselves from the Church of England, which was the main goal of the Plymouth group; however, they did hold the same goals of wishing to purge the Anglican Church of England of its popish tendencies. The members of the Massachusetts Bay Colony believed in creating congregations of churches that would rule themselves, which they believed would eliminate the problem of the popish hierarchy that they witnessed in the Church of England. This differentiated them from some of the Puritans back in England, who were Presbyterians. The Presbyterians replaced the Church of England’s episcopal hierarchy with different governing bodies, with a head body called the National Assembly. The Congregationalists, on the other hand, wished to allow individual congregations to choose their own preachers, religious rules, laws, and forms of worship under a covenanted body.\footnote{For a complete discussion of the differences within Puritanism see Diarmaid MacCulloch, \textit{The Reformation: A History}, (New York: Viking, 2003).} As the renowned Reformation scholar, Diarmaid MacCulloch puts it “Among the English Puritans who sailed across the Atlantic to found a new, purer version of Protestant Europe, the covenant became a central, comforting, and strengthening ideal in the midst of dangers and struggles.”\footnote{Diarmaid MacCulloch, \textit{The Reformation}, 380.} The background the Massachusetts Bay Colony was coming from was the idea of the Great Chain of Being. However, throughout the Reformation, this idea was attacked by reformers, who replaced it with the notion of the body politic. The members of the Massachusetts Bay Colony, however, seem to
have combined the idea of the Great Chain of Being and the body politic, which they then termed “the covenant”. To understand this connection it is important to look at the idea of the Great Chain of Being and how it was viewed by reformers throughout Europe.

The entire notion of order and an ordered society drastically changed in Europe during and after the European Reformation (1517-1648). Previous to the works of Martin Luther (b.1483-d.1546) and others, the Catholic Church had full control over all of Christendom. This control was not something implemented by the people themselves, but was rather an order that the Church claimed came directly from God. Medieval Europe did not view the world as it is viewed today, but instead viewed the world in terms of a duality: one world was the spiritual realm, and the other was the temporal realm. These two realms coexisted simultaneously; however, it was the spiritual realm that was the superior. The spiritual realm was headed and guarded by the Church with the Pope at its head, who claimed authority through the succession of St. Peter. The temporal realm was led by the Holy Roman Emperor, albeit in a subordinate position compared to that of the Pope who shepherded the spiritual and eternal welfare of Christendom. Following the Donation of Constantine (4th century AD), however, the Church assumed responsibility for the temporal realm as well as the spiritual realm. The successors to St. Peter were not only responsible for the souls of all of Christendom, but were responsible for their temporal lives as well.

Against this backdrop of politics and control the Church adopted the ancient idea of the Great Chain of Being, which claimed direct order from God. Within this chain a strict hierarchy was enforced, wherein individuals held a subordinate status to all those above them. The strict

\[17\] The European Reformation is usually described as beginning in 1517 when Luther published his theses to and ending in 1648 with the Treaty of Westphalia.
hierarchy existed within every layer of the universe, and at the top, closest to God, was the Pope. The adoption of the chain, therefore, gave the Pope a God ordained right to rule over all of Christendom. The Catholic Church, to this day, maintains the hierarchy that Martin Luther, as well as later reformers, railed against. The New Catholic Encyclopedia acknowledges that the word “hierarchy” does not exist within the Bible; however, it maintains that in both the Old Testament and the New Testament there was “A body of religious rulers consisting of various ranks, each subordinate to the one above it.”18 The word “hierarchy” is also important as it comes from the Greek word “ἱερὰ ἀρχή” meaning sacral government;19 therefore, the term “hierarchy” and “rule of hierarchy” is sacred. The New Catholic Encyclopedia also describes the difference between the Catholic Church’s use of the word and form of government, and the Protestant form of government, stating that the Protestant churches believe that it is up to the Christian community itself to govern, with the ability to change the powers and rights of leaders within the church. The Catholic Church contends that the offices and powers of the individuals in the government have been determined by God, and therefore cannot be changed or altered.20 The Encyclopedia documents as well the origin of the Pope’s power and the power of the bishops: Catholics believe that as the Pope is the successor to St. Peter, who was chosen by Christ, he is in charge of everything including legislative authority, judicial authority, and executive authority.21 The bishops, who are the successors of the apostles, are next in the hierarchy, followed by priests. Under the Great Chain of Being, therefore the hierarchy of the Catholic Church existed, as well as a hierarchy that permeated throughout the universe.

---

18 The New Catholic Encyclopedia, s.v. “Hierarchy.”
19 The New Catholic Encyclopedia, s.v. “Hierarchy.”
20 The New Catholic Encyclopedia, s.v. “Hierarchy.”
21 The New Catholic Encyclopedia, s.v. “Canon Law of Hierarchy”
The idea of the Great Chain of Being can be easily seen throughout artistic representations such as the one below, taken from Didacus Valades *Rhetorica Christiana* of 1579:

At the very top is God followed by a descent through the universe, with the bottom being Hell. As is depicted, on the right side of the illustration, angels are falling from the heavens. As they pass by each level, the angel becomes less majestic, and more deformed, until it lands at the bottom and takes the shape of a devil. The angels’ transformation represents the degradation and distance from God that occurs as one descends down the chain. This hierarchy, believed to

---

come from God, ordered European society throughout history until it came into question during the European Reformation.

When Martin Luther dramatically nailed his ninety-five theses to the Castle Church at Wittenberg he had no intention, nor idea, of the profound effect his arguments would have on the social order of society. Three years after writing his theses (1520), Luther wrote a work entitled *To the Christian Nobility of the German Nation Concerning the Reform of the Christian Estate*, wherein he believed he had systematically destroyed the Great Chain of Being by claiming that it had no basis in scripture. In this treatise, Luther claims that the Churches power is built with three walls: the first being that the spiritual realm and power is above the temporal power, the second that only the pope can interpret scriptures, and the third that no one may summon a council but the Pope.  

These three walls, therefore, effectively make it impossible for the Pope to ever be questioned. The destruction of all three walls is not as important to this study as the destruction to the first wall. Luther writes:

> Through canon law the Romanists have almost destroyed and made unknown the wondrous grace and authority of baptism and justification. In times gone by Christians used to choose their bishops and priests in this way from among their own number, and they were confined in their office by other bishops without all the fuss that goes on nowadays...Since those who exercise secular authority have been baptized with the same baptism, and have the same faith and the same gospel as the rest of us, we must admit that they are priests and bishops and we must regard their office as one which has a proper and useful place in the Christian community...therefore a priest in Christendom is nothing more than an officeholder...It follows from this argument that there is no true, basic difference between religious and secular, except for the sake of office and work, but not for the sake of status. They are all of the spiritual estate, all are truly priests, bishops, and popes. But they do not all have the same work to do...Christ does not have two different bodies, one temporal, the other spiritual. There is but one head and one body...Further, everyone must benefit and serve every other by means of his own work or office so that in this way many kinds of work may be done for the

---

bodily and spiritual welfare of the community, just as all members of the body serve one another.  

In this passage Luther has not only torn down the wall, but has gone even further and blown up the foundation the wall supported itself on. The adaptation of the Great Chain of Being by the Church rested on the assumption that the spiritual and the temporal are separate bodies from each other; furthermore, it relied on a suppressive hierarchy that could not be found in the scriptures. The last portion of the passage from Luther's treatise shows what he had in mind for order within society. Instead of a hierarchy, Luther proposed that the scriptures argued for a “body politic” wherein all members of society are reliant on each other. This order did not get rid of stations within life; in fact, it held strong that some are born to rule while others are born to be ruled, but it did get rid of a notion that the world existed in dual form with the Pope at the head of both. This shows how the Reformation thinkers wanted to change society, but were not willing to change so much that chaos and disorder would occur.

Here it is important to expound on the notion behind the body politic. Around the same time the Puritans in England were beginning to form a voice, Thomas Starkey, a political theorist and humanist in England, wrote a treatise entitled *A Dialogue Between Pole and Lupset* wherein he gives voice to the exact meaning of a body politic:

> First, this is certain: that like as in every man there is a body and also a soul, in whose flourishing and prosperous state both together standeth the weal and felicity of man: so likewise there is in every commonalty, city, and country, as it were, a politic body...this body is nothing else but the multitude of people...the thing which is resembled the soul is civil order and politic law, administered by officers and rulers...This strength standeth in this point chiefly: so as to keep and maintain every part of this body, that they promptly and readily may do that thing which is required to the health of the whole...as the heart is then strong when he, as fountain of all natural powers, ministereth them with due order to all other; and they then be strong when they be apt to receive their

---

24Martin Luther, “To the Christian Nobility”, 127-130.
power of the heart and can use it according to the order of nature, as, the eye to see, the ear to hear, the foot to go, and hand to hold and reach...The heart thereof is the king, prince and ruler of the state, whethersoever it be one or many, according to the governance of the commonality and politic state...He or they which have authority upon the whole state right well may be resembled to the heart. For like as all wit, reason, and sense, feeling, life, and all other natural power, springeth out of the heart, so from the princes and rulers of the state cometh all laws, order and policy, all justice, virtue and honesty, to the rest of this politic body. To the head...resembled may be right well the under-officers by princes appointed...To the hands are resembled both craftsman and warriors which defend the rest of the body from injury of enemies outward, and work and make things necessary to the same. To the feet, the ploughmen and tillers of the ground, because they, by their labour, sustain and support the rest of the body...the strength of these parts altogether is of necessity required, without the which the health of the whole cannot long be maintained.²⁵

A body politic, therefore, is a system of governance in which all members of the society must work together for the betterment of the whole; however, it also means that everyone within the body politic has a specific duty as well as occupies a specific place in society.

Moreover, in a body politic for the first time an individual could be both loyal to his fellow countrymen while being loyal to his religion, and at the same time know that s/he held a place in society that, although lesser to some others, was vital for the survival of the community. Luther’s ideas were the basis for Calvin’s theological discourses, and it is Calvin that the Puritan reformers in England stemmed from²⁶. Thus, Luther’s work on order within society proves to have direct effect on the Puritan reformers in England. This being said, it is important to remember that not all of the Puritans were the same, as noted previously, and the Congregationalists that sailed to New England needed a system of order that would be unsinkable. For example, Luther’s changes within society resulted in peasant revolts across

---


²⁶For a in depth analysis of Calvin and order within the church see Benjamin Kaplan, Calvinites and Libertines: Confession and Community in Utrecht 1578-1620, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995), 28-68.
Europe and individuals attempting to climb the social ladder, both of which would be detrimental to a group of individuals attempting to create a society in a new and unfriendly world. The Puritans that founded the Massachusetts Bay Colony, the society that developed, therefore, was a mixture of Luther’s reforms around the idea of a body politic and the traditional concept of the Great Chain of Being, embodied in the Puritans idea of the covenant.

The idea of a covenant with God had its’ roots in the bible; however, the Puritans of the Massachusetts Bay Colony developed the concept far beyond the biblical Arc of the Covenant. The covenant did not simply exist on a piece of paper with the members’ signatures, but was the essence of the Puritans in the Massachusetts Bay Colony essence of being. The covenant governed every aspect of existence, and at its core was the community; in other words, the communities life force was the covenant, and the covenants liquor of life was the community.

The most important concept to the colonies notion of the covenant in regards to this study is its voluntary nature. No individual was forced to enter into a covenant; in fact, membership was extremely selective. The process in which an individual had to go through to enter the covenant was long, tedious, and examined every faction of the individual’s life and actions. Once entered into, however, abandoning the covenant was difficult, as well as perilous. For example, if a member decided to leave the covenant, all of their possessions would be confiscated. They would no longer be allowed to live in the vicinity, and would therefore be left to the wilderness’ protection. Like the Great Chain of Being, a break in the covenant was an open stance against God, as the covenant was not only a contract between individuals in the society, but a contract with God between the individual and the community as a whole. This reinforced the notion that
only as a whole can the community be successful.\textsuperscript{27} The selectivity of entering the covenant, as well as the punishments if broken, also show the Massachusetts Bay Colony’s intense fear of failure, stemming, in part, to previous examples such as the Jamestown Colony.

The colonists that made up the Massachusetts Bay Colony faced more than a wilderness upon arriving on the Atlantic shore. With the separation of church and state, the Puritans of the Massachusetts Bay Colony had to come up with a new system of governing and authority. As Harry Stout says in his groundbreaking work on colonial New England, “Once formed into autonomous local churches, congregations still faced the problem of maintaining internal order and discipline...A church gathered in submission to God’s word meant little if there was no living voice to explain and apply that word...they could not be a complete organism until they ordained ruling officers.”\textsuperscript{28}

One such office was the ruling elder, upon which Increase Mather expounds in great detail. Increase Mather’s \textit{A Vindication of the Divine Authority of Ruling Elders} (1649) was written in response to an objection being heard throughout New England in which members of the society claimed that ruling elders had no business being in existence, as their role could not be found in scriptures.\textsuperscript{29} Mather first tackles his meaning of a Ruling-Elder, or Governor, wherein he states “And when persons are duly chosen from amongst the people to be Governours in the Church, as such, they are no longer Lay-men, but Ecclesiastical persons...they ought to be called either Governours in the Church or Ruling Elders as not because their Office is

\textsuperscript{29}Increase Mather, \textit{A Vindication of the Divine Authority of Ruling Elders, &c. In Answer asserted by the ministers and elders, met together in a provincial assembly, Novemb. 2d. 1649, Reprinted for Publick good} (Boston: 1716), 1. Microfiche
to rule alone (for the Teaching-Elder is a Ruler also,) but because their Office is only to rule.”

He continues to assert their divine authority when he claims “That this Church-Governor is seated by God in his Church; It is a plant of God’s own planting, and therefore shall stand firm, maugre all opposition. For it is expressly said, God hath let some in his Church, first Apostles, &c. then helps, then Governments.” Mather continues for a few pages expressing the importance of having Ruling-Elders in the society comparing them to a pilot of a ship, a magistrate of a kingdom, and the sun of a world. As he begins to present his evidence for Ruling-Elders, the metaphor of a body politic arises:

By the scope of the whole Chapter, which is to set down different gifts and offices in different subjects; it is said, verse, 8, 9, To one is given by the Spirit, the word of wisdom, to another, the word of knowledge by the same Spirit; to another, faith, &c. And for this purpose, the Apostle draweth a simile from the members of man’s body: As there are different members in man’s body, and every member hath its different office, and every member stands in need one of another; the Eye cannot say to the Hand, I have no need of thee; nor again, the head to the foot, I have no need of thee &c. So it is in the Church Ministerial, which is the Body of Christ. God hath different Officers in his Church; so ordinary and perpetual; some extraordinary and temporary… The Teacher cannot say to the Deacon, I have no need of thee; nor to the Church-Governour, I have no need of thee… But now God hath so set the Members in his Body, which is His Church, that every member stands in need one of another’s help and support.

When one compares the above passage with the passage given by Thomas Starkey on the body politic, it almost looks as if Mather was using it as a source for his inspiration. This passage not only helps Mather vindicate the office of Ruling-Elder, but also reminds people within the society that God has ordained everyone to be in a certain position, and only in that position can society function as a whole.

---

30 Increase Mather, A Vindication, 3.
31 Increase Mather, A Vindication, 7.
32 Increase Mather, A Vindication, 9-10.
Mather continues to state that the elders should be given double the honor\textsuperscript{33} as it commands in I Timothy: “Let the elders that rule well be counted worthy of double honour, especially they who labour in the word and doctrine.”\textsuperscript{34} At the end of his \textit{Vindication} is an article that the elders and messengers of the churches signed in Boston, in which any denial of the divine authority of the Ruling-Elder is considered to be heresy: “The Lord Christ would not have instituted Pastors, Teachers, Ruling Elders if he had not seen there was need of them for the good of his People; and therefore for men to think they can do without them, is both to break the second Commandment, and to reflect upon the wisdom of Christ, as if he did appoint unnecessary Officers in his Church.”\textsuperscript{35} The reason, therefore, that going against a Ruling-Elder would be heresy is that you would be breaking a commandment, but more importantly, you would be questioning the perfection of Christ and therefore God. Mather’s use of the term “divine authority” is initially resonant as it was the divine authority of kings and the Pope that the Great Chain of Being reinforced; however, when one acknowledges the combination of the reformed body politic and the Great Chain of Being in the order in the Massachusetts Bay Colony, the use of the term divine authority is not puzzling.

The creation of a class of Ruling-Elders reinforced the hierarchy that some individuals in the Massachusetts Bay Colony had believed they left behind them in England. Contemporary to Increase Mather, Edward Johnson, who came to New England during the Great Migration with Governor Winthrop, wrote his history of New England entitled \textit{Wonder-Working Providence of Sion’s Savior}. Johnson also speaks to the position of the Ruling-Elder that Increase Mather had

\textsuperscript{33} Increase Mather, \textit{A Vindication}, 15.  
\textsuperscript{34} 1 Tim. 5:17  
\textsuperscript{35} Increase Mather, \textit{A Vindication}, 20-21.
initiated wherein he repeats the necessity of having Elders, claiming that they are ordered by God to exist, and only with the Elders can their society be able to survive.³⁶ He continues to state that what the Elders say comes directly from Christ and thus going against their decisions and word will prove to be a disaster for the colony. Apart from stressing the importance of the Elders, Johnson goes further than Mather did by demanding that “You are not to put them [the Elders] upon anxious cares for their daily bread” and to “Let not Satan delude you by persuading their learned skill is unnecessary.”³⁷ These demands by Johnson are putting all those below the Elders as the keepers of them as it is the responsibility of the other members of the society to feed them; therefore, the notion of both a body politic and the Great Chain of Being are being reinforced.

Increase Mather and Edward Johnson are not the only members of the Massachusetts Bay Colony that expressed such thoughts. In July of 1645 John Winthrop gave a speech to the General Court. Winthrop lectured the court after he had been put on trial due to complaints that he was not fulfilling his role. He was acquitted of all charges, but felt it necessary to remind the colonists that:

The great questions that have troubled the country, are about the authority of the magistrates and the liberty of the people. It is yourselves who have called us to this office, and being called by you, we have authority from GOD³⁸ ...The covenant between you and us is the oath you have taken of us, which is to his purpose, that we shall govern you and judge your causes by the rules of God’s laws and our own...liberty is maintained and exercised in a way of subjection to authority...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...but if you will be satisfied to enjoy such civil and lawful liberties, such as Christ allows you, then will you quietly and

³⁶ Edward Johnson, Wonder-Working Providence of Sion’s Savior (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1910), 215-217
³⁸ Emphasis is my own addition
cheerfully submit unto that authority which is set over you, in all the administrations of it, for your good.  

In this speech, Winthrop is reminding those within the covenant that they cannot go against the ruling of an officer, an officer that holds direct “authority from God”. Winthrop acknowledges that human beings have liberty; however, he states that the liberty that allows men to go against authority is the natural liberty, which is corrupt as human beings and our nature is naturally corrupt. That liberty, however, allows the men within the covenant to choose their rulers, just as a wife chooses her husband; however, once chosen the ruler, or husband, has divine authority from God to do whatever they see fit. Winthrop even goes so far to say that a wife should even see the sweetness and love in her husband whether he “embraceth her in his arms, or whether he frowns, or rebukes, or smites her” and that only with the yoke of subjection to authority can individuals in a society be content and happy. In the choice of rulers one can see the idea of the body politic, in that every member of society must work together to achieve harmony; however, the hierarchy of the Great Chain of Being is also explicitly stated in the way in which individuals were expected to succumb to their authorities, who, once chosen, carried out God’s laws.

Members of a congregation elected the ruling elders as well as other church officers and civil magistrates; however, once elected they were expected to obey them in all matters due to the covenant that was created when officers were chosen. The covenant went beyond a civil
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agreement between the congregation and the church officers; instead, it was the covenant that bound together the society. According to Harry Stout, nonseparatists back in England became wary of the congregational covenant system in New England, as they believed that without a “national center” or “established uniformity,” New England would fall into complete anarchy.  

Those back in England came to this conclusion because they did not fully understand the concept of the covenant, or the role of the church within society. The founders of the Massachusetts Bay Colony believed in Congregational independence; however, they did not conceive of a society where the government did not care about the “religious life of its people.” All individuals within a town were living amongst each other bound by a covenant that they voluntarily entered. These covenants, although comprised of different wording in each town, held that all members of the town would live in unified harmony. This can be seen in the covenant formed in the Massachusetts town of Dedham (circa. 1636), in which all those that joined the town had to sign a covenant that read:

> We whose names are here unto subscribed do, in the fear and reverence of our Almighty God, mutually and severally promise amongst ourselves and each other to profess and practice one truth according to that most perfect rule, the foundation whereof is everlasting love.

As Kenneth Lockridge points out on his commentary of this covenant, “The Covenant began by binding every man to each of his fellows before God in a pledge to practice Christian love in their daily lives.” This first portion of the covenant is not meant for the foundation of a religious church but instead pledging every individual in the secular society to a Christian life.
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Here the members of Dedham can be seen, like all the other towns throughout Massachusetts, to be creating a town, wherein to be a member of the secular side, you must also be a follower of the religious side, much like medieval society under the Great Chain of Being.

The remaining portions of the covenant, which are somewhat lengthy, need to be looked at, for the way they further connect the idea of the body politic with the idea of the Great Chain of Being:

That we shall by all means labor to keep off from us all such as are contrary minded, and receive only such unto us as may be probably of one heart with us, [and such] as that we either know or may well and truly be informed to walk in a peaceable conversation with all meekness of spirit, [this] for the edification of each other in the knowledge and faith of the Lord Jesus, and the mutual encouragement unto all temporal comforts in all things, seeking the good of each other, out of which may be derived true peace. That if at any time differences shall arise between parties of our said town, that then such party or parties shall presently refer all such differences unto some one, two, or three others of our said society to be fully accorded and determined without any further delay, if it possibly may be. That every man...that shall have lots [land] in our said town shall pay his share in all such...charges as shall be imposed on him..., as also become freely subject unto all such orders and constitutions as shall be...made now or at any time hereafter from this day forward, as well for loving and comfortable society in our said town as also for the prosperous and thriving condition of our said fellowship, especially respecting the fear of God, in which we desire to begin and continue whatsoever we shall by his loving favor take into hand. And for the better manifestation of our true resolution herein, every man so received [into the town is] to subscribe hereunto his name, thereby obliging both himself and his successors after him for ever, as we have done. 47

The remaining portion of the covenant shows how each member of the society was expected to be in complete uniformity, not only in religious matters, but also in secular matters. Anyone who did not agree with the covenant would have to find somewhere else to live. This was the pattern that emerged throughout all of the Massachusetts Bay Colony.

The above covenant also mentions that everyone holding land must pay their dues. Inherent in the system in which land was granted throughout the towns of the Massachusetts Bay Colony was a system of hierarchy. As Kenneth Lockridge points out, “Christian love toward all men does not have to imply absolute human equality...it was foreordained by God that some men should have both greater capabilities and virtues than others and should rise and prosper...nor was this without its social purpose, since obedience to men of high rank was the cement of an orderly society.” When deciding how much land a man or family was to get, therefore, those of higher rank were given larger parcels of land. When gathering together at the meetinghouse, the social rank of individuals was displayed for all those in the society to see through the use of seating arrangement; therefore, it become apparent that the towns in the Massachusetts Bay Colony were not ready to create a democratic society where equality was shared by all.

The example of Dedham is replicated throughout all of the Massachusetts Bay Colony, for the idea of hierarchy and subjection to superiors began before the first ships of the Great Migration left England. While aboard the ship to the New World, Winthrop gave a sermon in which he reasoned: “God Almighty in His most holy and wise providence hath so disposed of the condition of mankind as in all times some must be rich, some poor; some high and eminent in power and dignity, others mean and in subjection.” In this Winthrop is clearly reinforcing to those aboard the ship that God has ordained an order in society, in which some rule while others obey. Winthrop continues to give reasons why God has done this: “to hold conformity
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with the rest of His works, being delighted to show forth the glory of His wisdom in the variety and difference of the creatures and the glory of His power.” In this statement Winthrop is clearly talking about all the creatures in society, and the hierarchies that God has placed in each. Also relevant to this portion of Winthrop’s sermon is the Great Chain of Being’s tenet that only in all the various creatures that God has created, as well as the level they inhabit in the chain, can God’s perfection be seen. Arthur Lovejoy, who is the definitive author on The Great Chain of Being, quotes Cardinal Bellarmino (1542-1621) as a sixteenth century expression of this idea:

God willed that man should in some measure know him through his creatures, and because no single created thing could fitly represent the infinite perfection of the Creator, he multiplied creatures, and bestowed on each a certain degree of goodness and perfection, that from these we might form some idea of the goodness and perfection of the Creator, who, in one most simple and perfect essence, contains infinite perfections. The above quote is one example of a Catholic response to the justification for a hierarchical universe, a sentiment that many Puritan writers, such as Winthrop, agreed with. The Puritan naturalist, John Ray, in his discussion on the universe contended that the first chapter of Genesis

Saith, not that God created all things in an instant in their full state and Perfection, but that He proceeded gradually and in Order, from imperfect to more perfect Beings, first beginning with the Earth, that is, the Terraqueous Globe, which was made without form, and...then He created out of the Land and Water, first Plants, and then animals, Fishes, Birds, Beasts, in Order, and last of all formed the Body of Man of the Dust of the Earth.

In this, a Puritan naturalist is arguing what the Great Chain of Being held to be true, that God created a hierarchical world. Winthrop, however, did not believe that those in subjection are
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54 John Ray, Three Physico-Theological Discourses Concerning the Primitive Chaos, and Creation of the World, the General Deluge, its causes and Effects, the Dissolution of the World and future Conflagration (London: William Innys, 1692), microfilm.
less in important to society as a whole; rather, the Great Chain of Being clearly states that everything is in existence to show God’s full perfection. The idea of the body politic believes that all those in society should help one another, which is also present in Winthrop’s canonical sermon aboard the ship, “A Model of Christian Charity.”

Winthrop continues “That He might have the more occasion to manifest the work of His spirit: first, upon the wicked in moderating and restraining them, so that the rich and mighty should not eat up the poor, nor the poor and despised rise up against their superiors,” which commands for everyone to remain in the stations God has put them in. His third reason is:

That every man might have need of other, and from hence they might be all knit more nearly together in the bond of brotherly affection...All men being thus (by divine providence) ranked into two sorts, rich and poor, under the first are comprehended all such as are able to live comfortably by their own means duly improved, and all others are poor, according to the former distribution.

In his third reason the Law of Nature is evidently clear, in that he is reminding everyone, both rich and poor, that they must function together in order to be successful. This same philosophy is seen by the metaphor of the body politic. Darrett Rutman, an eminent Puritan scholar, wrote that “In the New World...men argued over the rich land and the truth of God; Boston’s developing land policy increasingly acknowledged the necessity of giving opportunity for fulfillment of personal aspirations.” Later in Winthrop’s sermon, he gives another warning to everyone aboard that “Whatsoever we did or ought to have done when we lived in England, the same must we do, and the more also where we go.” This warning is understandable, as Winthrop, like other colonists, as Rutman pointed out, were wary of anyone leaving England in
order to improve their place in society; thus, he is telling them that moving away from what they did in England, their God ordained vocation, will not be tolerated. Here we find a leader of one of the Puritan groups reinforcing from the very beginning that the society in which they are going to create is going to be well ordered and strict to the law of nature. Winthrop does not leave any room for individuals to be individuals in the new landscape they were entering. From this it is most evident that the covenant that bound the members of the Great Migration was an intellectual and political blend of the Great Chain of Being as well as of the body politic.

Further evidence of the way in which the rulers of the Massachusetts Bay Colony wanted to maintain a strict order can be seen in the laws that they created, such as laws regarding clothes, which was something not uncommon throughout medieval Europe. John Demos has done an excellent study of family life in Plymouth Colony in his book *A Little Commonwealth: Family Life in Plymouth Colony*, where he looks at things such as housing, furniture, and clothing in colonial life. Demos asserts that with little money in circulation throughout the beginning stages of the colony, objects such as clothing defined wealth and status in an individual, citing that people like William Bradford had large quantities of clothes in their wardrobes. 59 This is evident in the laws set in place by the government of the Massachusetts Bay Colony in 1634 in which any individual of the “ordinary” class had rules set in place on what they could buy and wear:

> The Court, takeing into consideracon the greate, supfluons, & vnnecessary expences occaconed by reason of some newe & immodest fashions, as also the ordinary wearing of silver, golde, & silke, or lynnen, with any lace on it, silver, golde, silke, or threed, vnder the penalty of forefecture of such clothes, &c. Also, that noe pson, either men or woman, shall make or buy any slashed clothes, other then one slashe in each sleeue,
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and another in the backe; also, all cutworks, imbroidered or needle worke capps, bands, & rayles, are forbidden hereafter to be made and worn, vnder the aforesaid penalty; also, all golde or silver girdles, hatbands, belts, ruffs, beaver hats, are prohibited to be bought and worn hearafter, vnder the aforesa

This law required that anyone of the lower classes not be allowed to partake in any of the fashions current at the time, or even fashions that may evolve. Interestingly enough, a similar law can be seen in Tudor society in Henry VIII Act Against Wearing of Costly Apparel, which was put into law in 1510:

Forasmuch as the great and costly array and apparel used within this realm contrary to good statues thereof made hath been the occasion of great impoverishing of divers of the king’s subjects and provoked many of them to rob and to do extortion and other unlawful deeds to maintain thereby their costly array...be it ordained by the authority of this present parliament that no person of what estate condition or degree that he be use in his apparel any cloth of gold of purple colour or silk... The law, like its New England counterpart, claims that it is to save the people money, for if no one is able to partake in the fashions, then no one has the need to waste money on them. Interestingly enough, Increase Mather’s wife was considered to be extremely fashionable in her day, which shows that members of the ruling class were able to wear fashionable clothing. This can be seen in the journal of John Winthrop in his entry on September 25, 1638:

The Court, taking into consideration the great disorder general through the country in costliness of apparel, and following new fashions, sent for the elders of the churches, and conferred with them about it, and laid it upon them, as belonging to them, to redress it, by urging it upon the consciences of their people, which they promised to do.
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But little was done about it; for divers of the elders’ wives, etc., were in some measure partners in this general disorder.\(^{62}\)

The problem can still be seen three years later in another journal entry of Winthrop’s on April 13, 1641, in which he talks about a woman of the church of Boston and a piece of “very fine linen of great value” that she brought with her from London. The woman, according to Winthrop, liked the linen too much, and it is because she liked it too much that it burned. The positive outcome of the loss of the linen was that it took her mind off of worldly goods, but more heavily the destruction of it worked “in preparing her for a far greater affliction by the untimely death of her husband, who was slain not long after at Isle of Providence.”\(^{63}\) This example of a sumptuary law in the Massachusetts Bay Colony is further evidence that the society that was created was hierarchical, and that the rulers within it wanted the members of the town to remember that it was so.

A Monday morning Puritan prayer of the 17\(^{th}\) century ended with “May the Holy Scriptures govern every part of our lives, and regulate the discharge of all our duties, so that we may adorn thy doctrine in all things.”\(^{64}\) The society that developed in the Massachusetts Bay Colony has long been looked at as a society suffering from rigid laws and punishments, which has been dramatized by popular culture through movies on the Salem Witch Trials and canonical literary works such as The Crucible and The Scarlett Letter. What few people question is the reasoning why the individuals that landed in Massachusetts developed the society that they did. It becomes easy to judge people in the past and proscribe images of them. The


\(^{63}\)John Winthrop, Journal, 41.

“Puritans” that settled in the Americas have, by some, become one of the many American founding myths in which the Puritans, all grouped together under one term regardless of the vast differences between them all, became the founders of an American democracy and equality for all. The evidence that the early colonists have left behind contradict this notion, perhaps none more explicitly than John Cotton when he wrote “Democracy, I do not conceyve that ever God did ordeyne as a fitt government eyther for church or commonwealth. If the people be governors, who shall be governed? As for the monarchy, and aristocracy, they are both of them clearly approved, and directed in scripture.”  

The years of the Reformation throughout Europe had altered the state of society across Europe. For centuries the medieval idea of the Great Chain of Being had effectively run society so that order prevailed. Throughout the Reformation the reformers brought the Great Chain of Being into question and attempted to overthrow it. In replacement the idea of an organic body politic formed, wherein all members of the society worked together to benefit the whole. The 1620s-30s in England witnessed a great amount of social unrest due to the increasing lack of order that the abandonment of the Great Chain of Being had created. With this unrest going on in England, as well as peasant revolts across Europe, scholar Phillip Round sees evidence that “On the eve of New England settlement, ordinary English men and women had just begun to reassert long-established discourses of family and village order...For many, emigration to New England appeared to offer an excellent opportunity for a return to traditional family and village values, even for those who were trying to reform aspects of village tradition that seemed like “papist”
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superstition or “idle” pastime.” Round continues to argue that “Views of Winthrop’s covenantal rhetoric, previously cited as a source for the “theocratic” nature of New England’s settled communities, have recently been reconsidered. Seen from this new perspective, it instead appears as a discursive mode that actually served to mediate between two models of contract—one featuring the organic principles of a hierarchical society and another based on the contractualism of a mechanistic and nonhierarchical world.” In this, Round seems to be suggesting what I have argued, that the members of the Massachusetts Bay Colony created a society that combined the new model of a body politic with the time-tested model of the Great Chain of Being. This is further evident by the fact that the notion of a society bound by a covenant had never before been thought of or created, most especially not by reformers such as Luther and Calvin. However, the members of the Massachusetts Bay Colony had heard of what a society without order in the New World meant. The colony of Jamestown in the beginning of the seventeenth century showed those back in England that the New World was a hostile environment. The colonists of Jamestown had succumbed to the environment due to a complete lack of order within their society, and as a result, most of the colonists died. Civil unrest throughout Europe, as well as in England, further showed the New England colonists that the reformed order of society did not work; it led to revolts.

If the body politic could not be successful in a society in which civilization already flourished, how could it work with a group of individuals entering a virgin territory? These fears and experiences meant that the Massachusetts Bay Colonists needed to come up with a design

---

for society that would ensure their survival. The answer to their question came from an obscure biblical passage which read: “Come, and let us cleave unto the Lord in a perpetual and everlasting covenant which shall never be forgotten.” The creation of a covenant that bound together all members of a town into a secular as well as religious contract between each other and God was the result. The Massachusetts Bay Colony, like other Puritan groups, believed that only a separation of church and state could solve the conflicts inherent in a religion run by humans; furthermore, the Massachusetts Bay Colony were non-separatist Congregationalist, which meant that they believed every church should be independent. The problem arose of how could any authority and uniformity exist without state influence and with independent congregations. This problem had never arisen in the Great Chain of Being, as offices were God-ordained to perform certain functions. In a covenanted society all members of a town were bound to follow the agreed upon rules and laws, as well as to submit to the authorities in both civil and religious matters; therefore, the covenant is the Massachusetts Bay Colony’s way of reuniting the traditional form of a hierarchical society with the reformed notion of a body politic or, as Lockridge effectively summarizes, “The plan of the society Winthrop hoped to construct in Massachusetts was...a holy covenanted corporation mixing mutuality with hierarchy and Christian love with exclusiveness.” It is this system, created in response to a heightened fear of failure and disorder, that made the Massachusetts Bay Colony the only group that could effectively create a permanent colony in the harsh New World.

---
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