

ABSTRACT

Title of Document: AN ENLIGHTENED AMERICAN: THE POLITICAL
IDEOLOGY OF THOMAS HUTCHINSON ON THE EVE
OF THE REVOLUTIONARY CRISIS

Shannon E. Duffy, Doctor of Philosophy, 2008

Directed By: Professor Alison G. Olson, Professor Emeritus
Department of History

This dissertation examines the political, social and philosophical views of Massachusetts' last royal governor, Thomas Hutchinson, as expressed in his 1764-1773 work, the *History of Massachusetts-Bay*. It is my contention that this work provides unique insights into the ideology of this important eighteenth century figure, and the values that would motivate him during the Revolutionary crisis.

Years before the turmoil of the Revolutionary crisis began, Hutchinson had already given deep reflection to many of the same political and philosophical issues that would resurface in the imperial struggle. Hutchinson's historical work, written for both colonial and English audiences, provides significant insight into Hutchinson's political ideology and value system as that struggle opened. I will concentrate my analysis on Volume One, the part of Hutchinson's work written before 1765. This thesis will focus on three issues covered in the first volume: Massachusetts' struggle for religious orthodoxy in the seventeenth century, the

colony's early Indian wars and relations with the Indians, and the colonists' century-long struggle with England over their original charter.

My dissertation will demonstrate that Hutchinson's worldview was, no less than many of his adversaries in the Revolution Crisis, that of a man of the Enlightenment, and an American with both deep roots and great pride in his native land. Throughout Volume One of the *History*, Hutchinson stressed the importance of balanced government, the necessity of a just and impartial rule of law, the need for moderation and republican virtue in government, and the dangers of prejudice and popular passion. His views on a wide variety of issues grew, at least in part, out of his understanding of Massachusetts' colonial past, and his immersion in the literature of the American Enlightenment. These views were clearly revealed in the *History*, a work which has until now been under-utilized as a key into the man's ideology.

AN ENLIGHTENED AMERICAN: THE POLITICAL IDEOLOGY OF THOMAS
HUTCHINSON ON THE EVE OF THE REVOLUTIONARY CRISIS

By

Shannon E. Duffy

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of the
University of Maryland, College Park, in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
2008

Advisory Committee:
Professor Alison Olson, Chair
Professor Herman Belz
Professor Arthur Eckstein
Professor Whitman Ridgway
Professor Nancy Struna

© Copyright by
Shannon E. Duffy
2008

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This dissertation would not have been possible without the work of Dr. Alison Olson, my advisor, who has not only reviewed endless drafts of this work, but has also been a constant source of support and encouragement. I am also deeply indebted to Dr. Warren Billings, my Master's thesis advisor, for his ruthless but cogent editorial help. Dr. Kenneth Margerison at Texas State University provided invaluable aid in the revision process. Dr. Arthur Eckstein did me a tremendous favor by agreeing to join the defense committee on extremely short notice, despite the topic being entirely out of his field, when another committee member discovered a scheduling conflict. I am extremely grateful for his willingness to do this for me. I have benefitted from the wisdom of Dr. Herman Belz, who reviewed an earlier version of my introduction and chapter one and enunciated, in approximately fifteen minutes, a thesis statement that had eluded me for five years. I would also like to thank Dr. Mary Brennan of Texas State, who also reviewed chapter one of this work, and Mr. Charles Settle, P. E., who reviewed an earlier draft of chapter four.

This dissertation would not have come about without the significant financial support I received throughout the research and writing process. The H. B. Earhart foundation gave me monetary support for several years during my research. I was able to spend summers working in the Boston-area archives with the aid of funding from the Massachusetts Historical Society's Andrew Mellon Summer Research Fellowship and the University of Maryland's Hearst Summer Fellowship.

I am also quite indebted to the archivists at the Massachusetts Historical Society, the Boston Public Library's Rare Books Room, the New England Historical

and Genealogical Society, the Boston Athenæum, and the Library of Congress. Peter Drummey, the Stephen T. Riley Librarian at the MHS, spent numerous hours helping me locate records. Dr. Malcolm Freiberg was an enormous help, not only by securing funding for my research and by helping me navigate the MHS holdings, but also by allowing me to see his unpublished manuscript biography of Thomas Hutchinson. Ms. Mary E. Fabiszewski, the Senior Cataloger at the MHS, went above the call of duty in helping me replace manuscript records that I had previously copied, after they were destroyed when my New Orleans office was flooded in Hurricane Katrina.

I would also like to thank the CSM Graduate Colloquium and the MHS Colloquium for allowing me to present early versions of my research at their symposia, Loyola University history chair Dr. David Moore for granting me office space and library privileges after Katrina furloughed my job, and Texas State history chair Dr. Frank de la Teja for his support and encouragement in the final phases of this project. I am indebted to Dr. John Ferling, Dr. Joseph Ellis, Dr. Bernard Bailyn, and Dr. Mary Beth Norton for their advice when I met with them in Boston.

My dissertation committee, Dr. Nancy Struna, Dr. Whitman Ridgway, Dr. Herman Belz, and Dr. Arthur Eckstein, provided me with invaluable comments and suggestions. My friend Dr. Paul Burton and Dr. Leo Nicoll, Loyola University's resident medievalist, helped me with translations of the governor's Latin quotations, while Dr. Sara Butler helped me with the French quotations.

Finally, I would like to thank my parents, Jill and Charley Duffy, for the innumerable hours they spent copy-editing and reviewing drafts of this work, and my sister, Erin Duffy, for just being there with constant words of encouragement.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	ii
Table of Contents	iv
List of Abbreviations	v
Chapter 1: Introduction	1
Chapter 2: A Man of the American Enlightenment	25
Chapter 3: The Religious Schisms	59
Chapter 4: Indian Affairs	110
Chapter 5: The Charter Struggles	145
Chapter 6: Conclusion.....	180
Note on Sources	188
Select Bibliography	195

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

<i>AHR</i>	<i>American Historical Review</i>
AAS	American Antiquarian Society
<i>AAS Proc.</i>	<i>Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society</i>
BPL	Boston Public Library
CSM	Colonial Society of Massachusetts
<i>CSM Pub.</i>	<i>Colonial Society of Massachusetts Publications</i>
Eg.	Egerton Manuscript Collection, British Museum
<i>Eng. Hist. Rev.</i>	<i>English Historical Review</i>
HMSO	Her Majesty's Stationary Office
<i>JAH</i>	<i>Journal of American History</i>
<i>JBS</i>	<i>Journal of British Studies</i>
<i>JER</i>	<i>Journal of the Early Republic</i>
<i>JMH</i>	<i>Journal of Modern History</i>
Mass. Arch.	Massachusetts Archives
<i>MHS Coll.</i>	<i>Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society</i>
<i>MHS Proc.</i>	<i>Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society</i>
MHS	Massachusetts Historical Society
<i>NEHGR</i>	<i>New England Historical and Genealogical Register</i>
NEHGS	New England Historical and Genealogical Society
<i>NEQ</i>	<i>New England Quarterly</i>
PRO	Public Record Office, London, England
NYHS	New York Historical Society
RIHS	Rhode Island Historical Society
<i>WMQ</i>	<i>William and Mary Quarterly</i> , 3 rd Series

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Thomas Hutchinson was the last royal governor of Massachusetts and a Loyalist who died an exile in England in 1780. Unlike other leading Loyalists, Hutchinson came from an old-line Massachusetts family, which had been in the province almost from its inception, and had played key roles in its government throughout its history.¹ As governor of America's most turbulent province,

¹ The Hutchinsons arrived in colonial Massachusetts in September 1634, in the persons of Mistress Anne Hutchinson (1591-1643) and her husband, William (1586-1642). Puritan followers of the preacher John Cotton, Anne and William were already fairly wealthy upon their arrival in the New World, and were assigned one of Boston's most valuable plots of land. (Thwing Manuscript Filing Index, based on *Suffolk Deeds* and *Boston Town Records*, MHS). William prospered in business, and Anne grew popular as a midwife and informal preacher. A scant three years later, however, the couple was banished from the colony for religious heresy during the Antinomian Controversy.

The consequences of the Antinomian crisis scattered the Hutchinson family across both New England and the wider British Empire, but the family quickly rebounded both in wealth and political influence. Son Edward Hutchinson (1613-1675) returned to Boston some time before 1637. He became a successful merchant, working with his cousin Richard Hutchinson in London and his in-laws the Sanfords in Portsmouth and Barbados to create a sprawling commercial trading empire. Edward served in the Boston town government and Massachusetts Council, and died in an ambush while attempting to mediate a truce during the early part of King Philip's War.

During the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, the Hutchinson family grew more secular and more closely tied to English commercial and political interests. Edward's son Elisha Hutchinson (1641-1717) was a town representative and provincial leader throughout his adult life. Colonel Thomas Hutchinson (1674/5-1739), Thomas Hutchinson's father, also worked in government at both the local and provincial level, and was a prominent supporter of charitable and religious organizations. It was during the Colonel's early career that the Hutchinson family achieved the level of social eminence that they held by his son's time. The Hutchinsons' business interests and their political clout were heavily intertwined, in keeping with the generally personal nature of eighteenth century business and colonial politics. The families for whom the Hutchinsons signed bonds, witnessed wills, and pledged capital became the families with whom they intermarried and subsequently the core of the conservative faction that eventually stood by Hutchinson during the Revolutionary crisis.

Thomas Hutchinson's rapid rise in both business and Massachusetts politics bore clear witness to the advantages of being born not only to a wealthy colonial family but one with deep roots in the community. Hutchinson was born in 1711. The son and nephew of prominent politicians, he entered politics at a young age, even by the standards of the day. After graduating from Harvard at 15, he was elected as a Boston selectman and a Boston Representative in 1737, at the age of 25. Like his father and uncle, Hutchinson pursued a public career at the same time as a mercantile one. The Hutchinson family owned several wharves and warehouses in Boston, and had a significant interest in the import business, of which the tea trade was an important part. In 1749, Hutchinson was elected to the Massachusetts Council. He was appointed as a Judge Probate and Justice of Common Pleas for Suffolk County in 1752, and rose to the position of Lieutenant Governor in 1758. He served several times as mediator for Massachusetts' border disputes, represented the colony at the Albany Congress in 1754, and helped organize the colony's defense during the French and Indian War. In 1760, he attained the rank of Chief Justice at the same time that he was sitting on the Council and serving as Lt.

Hutchinson played a crucial role in the Revolutionary crisis and he was arguably the most important representative of the Loyalist position. Both contemporaries and modern historians note that Hutchinson was possibly the one person whose actions might have averted the war, had he behaved differently.² Hence, it is important to understand why he thought as he did.

Governor. Appointed acting governor in 1769, in the midst of the Revolutionary crisis, he was officially appointed the governor in 1770.

The records of Hutchinson's early political career are in the *Boston Town Records, 1631-1822* (Boston: Municipal Printing Office, 1881-1906); the *Boston Selectman's Records, 1634-1822* (Waltham: Graphic Microfilm of New England, 1881-1906); and the *Journals of the House of Representatives of Massachusetts, 1715-1755*, ed. Worthington C. Ford (Boston: MHS, 1919). Malcolm Freiberg, "Thomas Hutchinson: The First Fifty Years (1711-1761)," *WMQ* 15, no. 1 (Jan. 1958): 35-55, contains the best summary of Hutchinson's early career. Thwing's manuscript index, in the MHS, lists the Hutchinson properties and their locations. The complete holdings of the family as of 1773 (the time of the banishment), along with their estimated values, are listed in the 1778 confiscation orders against Thomas Hutchinson, his brother Foster, and the other Hutchinson family members: *The Diary and Letters of His Excellency Thomas Hutchinson Captain-General and Governor-in-Chief of His Late Majesty's Province of Massachusetts Bay*, ed. Peter O. Hutchinson (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin, 1886; New York: AMS Press, 1973), 2: 271. Hutchinson's correspondence with Israel Williams and Hutchinson's correspondence in the Massachusetts Archives give a plethora of information on his business dealings. Hutchinson in 1765 was worth over 15,000 pounds, and was one of richest men in Boston: Audit Office Documents, PRO, cited in Zobel, *Boston Massacre*, 320, footnote 17.

² Bailyn said of Hutchinson: "If there was one person in America whose actions might have altered the outcome, given the set of circumstances that existed in the early 1770s, it was he." (Bernard Bailyn, *Faces of Revolution, Personalities and Themes in the Struggle for American Independence* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1990), 98. See also Bailyn, "Thomas Hutchinson in Context: *The Ordeal Revisited*," *AAS Proc.* 114, no. 2 (2004): 282. Bailyn noted that Hutchinson was vilified far more vehemently than any of the British ministers, or even George III, and that the personal nature of hatred against the man could be seen in the fact that his portrait at Milton had its eyes stabbed out. Bailyn, *Faces of Revolution*, 42, 44.

John Adams, Benjamin Franklin, Mercy Otis Warren and Josiah Quincy all lay much of the blame for the entire Revolutionary crisis on Hutchinson's shoulders, suggesting that the Parliamentary innovations had been attempted at his suggestion. Adams wrote in one of his *Novanglus* newspaper articles: "I am very sorry that I cannot stir a single step in developing the causes of my country's miseries, without stumbling upon this gentleman...there is great cause of jealousy, if not a violent presumption, that he was at the bottom of all this business, that he had plann'd it, in his confidential letters with Bernard, and both of them joined in suggesting and recommending it to the ministry." Adams also noted in his diary that, despite Hutchinson's disavowal of the Stamp Act, the behavior of Hutchinson and his allies justified the "suspicions among the Vulgar, that all these Gentlemen were in a Combination, to favour the Measures of the Ministry," a secret cabal that Adams suspected had long worked to subvert the province's constitution. Franklin claimed in 1774 that he was hearing from members of the British ministry that Hutchinson was the prime culprit behind the tax measures: "[t]he Ministry begin to disavow individually the late Measures, and to accuse Mr. Hutchinson as to Instigator of the whole." Quincy also wrote his wife from London in 1774 that he had heard these same rumors, and that local gossip claimed that Hutchinson and Bernard had been the instigators of all of the objectionable Parliamentary acts since the Stamp Act. Warren claimed in her history that Hutchinson

Despite having been studied for two centuries, Thomas Hutchinson today remains an enigma. Hutchinson's actions during the Revolutionary crisis demonstrated that he had the courage of his convictions. However, the actual structure of his beliefs and their sources is still open to debate. This dissertation will argue that Hutchinson had a fully-formed set of political beliefs before 1765 that guided his actions after the Revolutionary crisis began, and that the best source for understanding those beliefs is Hutchinson's three-volume history of Massachusetts, *The History of the Colony of Massachusetts-Bay*.³ It will focus largely on the first

not only was responsible for suggesting the new Parliamentary acts, but that he welcomed the violence and chaos that resulted as an excuse for introducing enacting more despotic governmental measures. Adams, Novanglus Letter 6, Feb 20, 1775, in John Adams and Daniel Leonard, *The American Colonial Crisis: The Daniel Leonard-John Adams Letters to the Press 1774-1775*, ed. Bernard Mason (New York: Harper & Row, 1972), 179; Adams, Diary entry for August 15, 1765, *The Diary and Autobiography of John Adams*, ed. Lyman Butterfield et al. (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1961), 1; Franklin, "Extract of a Letter from a Gentleman in London, Dec. 24, 1774, to a friend in this Town," in *Benjamin Franklin's Letters to the Press, 1758-1775*, ed. Verner Crane (Chapel Hill: UNC Press, 1950), 279; Quincy, Letters to Abigail Quincy, 24-27 Nov. 1774, and Dec. 7, 1774, in *Portrait of a Patriot: The Major Political and Legal Papers of Josiah Quincy Junior*, ed. Daniel R. Coquillette and Neil L. York (Boston: CSM, 2005): 40, footnote 67; Warren, *History of the Rise, Progress, and Termination of the American Revolution* (Boston, 1805), new edition ed. Lester H. Cohen (Indianapolis: Liberty Classics, 1988), 1: 78-84.

³ Hutchinson began writing his history around 1763 (*History* 1, preface, xiii-xvi). The first volume was first printed in Boston in 1764, and reprinted in London in 1765, as *The History of the Colony and Province of the Massachusetts-Bay*. The second volume was written in the midst of the Revolutionary crisis. By the summer of 1765, Hutchinson had completed about two-thirds of this volume, advancing the story to the 1730s. Hutchinson said in the preface of the second volume that this work advanced his history to the year 1750, but that his coverage of the last twenty years was less comprehensive, "being deprived of some papers which would have enabled me to render it more particular and circumstantial." *History* 2, Preface, x. Volume Two came out in Boston in 1767, and was reprinted in London in 1768. While Hutchinson left no notes to indicate when precisely the work was interrupted, there is textual evidence (notably a striking paucity of footnotes after chapter 4, page 290, discussing the Land Bank crisis), which can be used to tentatively suggest the point at which the August riot that resulted in the burning of his home deprived Hutchinson of his records.

Hutchinson completed the manuscript of Volume Three, which dealt mainly with the Revolutionary crisis, in Oct. 22, 1778, and sent a copy to Lord Hardwicke a year later (*Diary and Letters* 2: 178, 216-17). This volume was not published in Hutchinson's lifetime. It was edited by his grandson and first published in London in 1828. The third volume was issued in two forms: one for American readers, and in a separate edition for the British market. The third volume's separate title in England was *The History of the Province of Massachusetts Bay, from 1749 to 1774*, ed. John Hutchinson (London, J. Murray, 1828).

Jeremiah Condry was Hutchinson's publisher for the first two volumes of the history. Hutchinson's correspondence with him in the Massachusetts Archives reveals that the first two

volume of Hutchinson's *History*, which took the colonial narrative up to 1691. Volume One was written in a twelve-month period between 1763 and 1764, and appeared among the Boston booksellers' wares in late 1764.⁴ It thus represents Hutchinson's views, before the Revolutionary crisis forever altered his perspective.

Hutchinson's *History* demonstrated that Hutchinson had already thought deeply about many important political issues, such as the constitutional status of Massachusetts and the dangers to the state of emotionalism and demagoguery, before the Revolutionary crisis appeared on the horizon. By 1765, Hutchinson possessed a sophisticated political ideology that he had developed over a lifetime of study and experience. These political and ideological views, which can be clearly seen in the first volume of his *History*, would remain consistent throughout the remainder of his life, and would later guide his behavior during the imperial crisis.

volumes sold well, even despite Hutchinson's drop in personal popularity after 1765. Hutchinson's printers for all three works were Thomas & John Fleet, the publishers of the *Boston Evening Post*: Albert Matthews, "Bibliographical Notes on Boston Newspapers, 1704-1780," *CSM Publications* 9 (Cambridge: John Wilson & Son, 1907).

The only modern edition of Hutchinson's work was edited by Lawrence S. Mayo, and released in 1936. Before Mayo's edition, there were three editions of the first and second volumes, and one (1828) edition of the third volume. Mayo's edition was based on Hutchinson's own copies of volumes one and two (London, 1765 and 1768, respectively), and the original manuscript of Volume Three, and included the handwritten corrections and additions Hutchinson made in his own copies of the work. Subsequent to Mayo's edition, a handwritten earlier draft of the first third of Volume Three came to light. It contained material on the Revolutionary crisis which Hutchinson had excised in his final manuscript. This material has been published separately, as "Additions to Thomas Hutchinson's 'History of Massachusetts Bay,'" ed. Catherine B. Mayo (Worcester: AAS, 1949). Charles Deane, "Governor Hutchinson's Historical Publications," *MHS Proc.* [vol. 3] (1855): 134-50, gives the complete publishing history of the *History of Massachusetts-Bay*.

For Hutchinson's methods of researching, see *History* 1, Preface, xxvii-xxix. Hutchinson noted in a letter to Richard Jackson that he had spent over thirty years combing the province for the records used in writing the *History*: Hutchinson to Jackson, Aug. 30, 1765; printed in James K. Hosmer, *The Life of Thomas Hutchinson, Royal Governor of the Province of Massachusetts Bay* (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin, & Co., 1896), 93.

⁴ *History* 1, Introduction, xiii-xiv.

The *History*, from its first volume onward, stressed the importance of both a properly balanced structure of government and rational, independent-minded and enlightened leaders. Hutchinson pulled from history numerous heroes and villains to demonstrate to the colonists of eighteenth century Massachusetts the proper path to a virtuous society. He used the *History* to celebrate the values of his eighteenth century present over the irrationality of the past.

In addition to being a profoundly political and ideological work, the *History of Massachusetts-Bay* was very much a product of the American Enlightenment.

Hutchinson shared many of the same ideals as the men who would lead the American Revolution. Looking through Massachusetts' history for the sources of corruption and political instability, Hutchinson found them in nearly every instance in the triumph of raw emotion, ignorance and prejudice over reason, rationality and the rule of law.

At a primal level, Hutchinson identified with America, not Britain—indeed, his first loyalty was to Massachusetts. His values, rather than being reactionary, were actually quite in keeping with the ideals of the American Enlightenment. He showed, throughout the *History*, a great faith in the rule of law, in a “government of laws not of men” as John Adams would later put it. An important lesson in the *History of Massachusetts-Bay* for Hutchinson's countrymen was that many of the problems the early Massachusetts settlers encountered were of their own making. Massachusetts' government was subverted by its citizens' religious intolerance, by their unfairness in government, by a court system biased against religious minorities and Indians, and by a lack of balance and respect for the law.

CONTRIBUTION TO EXISTING LITERATURE

The *History* is recognized as a key historical document for Massachusetts' colonial period, but its historical methodology and the author's motivation are still largely unexplored. Recognition of the *History*'s political agenda and its place within Enlightenment thought would alter the view of Hutchinson both as an historian and as America's foremost Loyalist. Modern historians have become more sympathetic to Hutchinson personally, but their interpretations depict him as a pragmatist largely bewildered by changing times, or as the product of an archaic mentality that the American Revolution was destined to overthrow.

Assuredly, Hutchinson's political philosophy has presented a challenge to generations of historians.⁵ The dominant historiographic interpretation of Hutchinson

⁵ Significant historical writings on Thomas Hutchinson include Lorenzo Sabine, "Thomas Hutchinson," in *Biographical Sketches of Loyalists of the American Revolution, with an Historical Essay*, (Port Washington: Kennikat Press, 1864; 1966), 1: 558-60; Clifford Shipton, "Thomas Hutchinson," in *Sibley's Harvard Graduates* (Boston, 1873), 8:150-215; George E. Ellis, "Governor Thomas Hutchinson," *Atlantic Monthly* 53, no. 319 (May 1884): 662-76; James K. Hosmer, *The Life of Thomas Hutchinson, Royal Governor of the Province of Massachusetts Bay* (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin, 1896), and "The Debt of Massachusetts to Thomas Hutchinson," *CSM Publications, Transactions* 12 (Feb. 1909): 238-50; John Fiske, "Thomas Hutchinson, Last Royal Governor of Massachusetts," in *Essays Historical and Literary* (New York: MacMillan Co., 1925), 1-51; Malcolm Freiberg, "Thomas Hutchinson: The First Fifty Years (1711-1760)," *WMQ* 15, no. 1 (Jan. 1958): 35-55, and "How to Become a Colonial Governor: Thomas Hutchinson of Massachusetts," *Review of Politics* 21 (Oct. 1959): 646-56; John J. Waters and John A. Schutz, "Patterns of Massachusetts Colonial Politics: The Writs of Assistance and the Rivalry between the Otis and Hutchinson Families," *WMQ* 24, no. 4 (Oct. 1967): 543-67; Bernard Bailyn, "Between King and Country: The Ordeal of Thomas Hutchinson," *American Heritage* 25, no. 3 (Apr. 1974): 4-07, 88-96, and *The Ordeal of Thomas Hutchinson, The Ordeal of Thomas Hutchinson* (Cambridge: Belknap Press, 1974); John R. Galvin, *Three Men of Boston* (New York: T. Y. Crowell, 1976); William Pencak, *America's Burke: The Mind of Thomas Hutchinson*. Washington, DC: University Press of America, 1982, and "The Martyrology of Thomas Hutchinson: Family and Public Life," *NEHGR* 136 (Oct. 1982): 279-93; Malcolm Freiberg, *Prelude to Purgatory: Thomas Hutchinson in Provincial Massachusetts Politics, 1760-1770* (New York: Garland, 1990); Philip J. McFarland, *The Brave Bostonians: Hutchinson, Quincy, Franklin, and the Coming of the American Revolution* (Boulder: Westview Press, 1998); Andrew S. Walmsley, *Thomas Hutchinson and the Origins of the American Revolution* (New York: New York UP, 1999); and Bernard Bailyn, "Thomas Hutchinson in Context: *The Ordeal* Revisited," *AAS Proc.* 114, no. 2 (2004): 281-300.

Among the main modern historians investigating Hutchinson's life—William Freiberg, Bernard Bailyn, William Pencak, and Andrew Walmsley—only Pencak has used Hutchinson's *History* to explore Hutchinson's ideology in an extended fashion. Freiberg, Bailyn, and Walmsley have all

for much of the nineteenth century was that of a craven, greedy opportunist. For example, in a review of James Hosmer's biography of Hutchinson, Abner Goodell charged that a man like Hutchinson needed no further investigation, as the motivations behind his actions were obvious: "[h]e resisted zealously, though sometimes covertly, every suggestion for relaxing the rigor of imperial control and every protest against British interference, and he was astute in finding some ground for sneering at, or disparaging, every aspirant to larger liberty."⁶ John Adams' grandson Charles Francis Adams also described Hutchinson as having a "grasping disposition", noting that "[h]e was compelled to choose between his offices on the one side, and his hardly-earned popularity on the other."⁷ An early twentieth century historian even blamed Hutchinson personally for the Boston Massacre. Mary Marks suggested that Hutchinson was secretly happy about the bloodshed: "'obstinate rather

utilized Hutchinson's third volume for biographical details on the man's life, but all three generally described the *History* itself as essentially non-ideological.

Pencak's *America's Burke*, however, treated the *History* as an ideological work, and was unusual in discussing Hutchinson's views of Puritan Massachusetts, as well as his own time. Pencak also recognized the importance of Hutchinson's historical research in shaping his political views, and the significance of the *History* as an expression of those views. However, Pencak ultimately saw Hutchinson's political ideology as misguided and delusional. Pencak attributed Hutchinson's historical interpretations primarily to his own pathology: "one plausible explanation of his balanced portrait of the Puritans and their adversaries was his need to populate the past with prototypes of himself." (Ibid. 70). In Pencak's interpretation, Hutchinson's political ideology was at its base the product of a dysfunctional personality and upbringing. Pencak's main thesis was that Hutchinson throughout his life sequestered himself with his kin, and refused to judge his behavior by any standards except those of his own family, who for him "existed as projections of his own identity." (Pencak, *America's Burke*, p. 2). My work will take a substantially different approach to Pencak's, as I believe Hutchinson was both more liberal and less pathological than Pencak presents him. William Pencak, *America's Burke: The Mind of Thomas Hutchinson* (Washington, DC: University Press of America, 1982).

⁶ Abner Goodell, Jr., review of *Life of Hutchinson*, by Hosmer, *AHR* 2, no. 1 (Oct. 1896): 167.

⁷ Charles F. Adams, "Hutchinson's Third Volume," (review of *History of Massachusetts-Bay, Volume Three*, ed. John Hutchinson), *North American Review*, 38, no. 82 (Jan. 1834): 135-36. Adams did not even accord Hutchinson the dignity of having chosen greed boldly, but said that he "endeavored to temporize by sacrificing principle at the shrine of expediency" (136).

than firm...he quailed before the storm he himself had raised....It would perhaps be unjust to say that he wished for a collision as an excuse for more extreme measures.”⁸

Such historical opinions persist today. Thus, Jon Butler, in a recent work, implicitly assumed that the Loyalist political position maintained by Hutchinson and other royal official-holders was guided primarily by personal greed and desire for advancement: “[t]his eighteenth-century dependency and cronyism cut a wide swath and involved men who found it difficult to surrender its prerequisites.”⁹ John Schutz, who has studied the Hutchinson and Otis families in depth, also rejected a sympathetic interpretation of Hutchinson: “Could Hutchinson ever have risen from his provinciality to be molder of revolutionary opinion? From first to last he used public office to favor relatives and friends, creating a monopoly of office power unique in the colonies. His political vision was narrow, personal, and local.”¹⁰

For historians not convinced of Hutchinson’s essential duplicity, two interpretations compete in the literature. Hutchinson is often presented as a hapless pragmatist, with no coherent ideology of his own, who struggled blindly against new ideological forces that he could not comprehend.¹¹ Alternately, other authors accept

⁸ Mary A Marks, *England and America, 1763 to 1783: The History of a Reaction* (1908); remark quoted in William Hunt review, *Eng. Hist. Rev.* 23, no. 91 (Jul. 1908): 591. See Jesse Lemisch, “A Radical Plot in Boston (1770): A Study in the Use of Evidence (review of *The Boston Massacre*, by Hiller Zobel), *Harvard Law Review* 84, no. 2 (Dec. 1970): 494, 502, for evidence that the presentation of Hutchinson as the scheming destroyer of his province’s liberties is still around today.

⁹ Butler, *Becoming American: The Revolution Before 1776* (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 2000): 232.

¹⁰ Schutz, review of *Ordeal of Thomas Hutchinson*, by Bailyn, *JAH* 61, no. 3 (Dec. 1974): 771.

¹¹ This interpretation was established primarily by Bailyn’s landmark biography. In *The Ordeal of Thomas Hutchinson*, the first significant full-length work on Hutchinson since the nineteenth century, Bailyn described Hutchinson as a non-ideological realist bewildered by Revolutionary ideology. Despite being highly sympathetic to Hutchinson, Malcolm Freiberg also depicted

Hutchinson as having a strong ideology of his own, but they see him as the product of an older, outdated mentality. In this assessment, Hutchinson is characterized as a reactionary goaded by pessimism and fearfulness.¹²

Hutchinson in fact often appears in historical studies as the perfect summation of the older, pre-Enlightenment mentality that the winds of change were rapidly blowing away. He is portrayed as representing a more aristocratic and deferential world, one that could not understand the new forces stirring in Revolutionary politics. While such a man could be a sympathetic figure, in my opinion, this interpretation makes his ideology essentially irrelevant to an understanding of Revolutionary

Hutchinson as essentially reactive. Freiberg's Hutchinson spent his career responding to crises as they arrived with few ideological convictions of his own, save to be a good civil servant. Robert Calhoon also saw Hutchinson as displaying a "benumbed and powerless response to new ideological and psychological circumstances." Bailyn, *Ordeal*, *Ordeal in Context*," Freiberg, *Prelude to Purgatory*, and "Thomas Hutchinson: The First Fifty Years"; Robert M. Calhoon, "Loyalist Studies at the Advent of the Loyalist Papers Project," (review of *The British Americans*, by Mary Beth Norton), *NEQ* 46, no. 2 (Jun. 1973): 284.

¹² John Ferling described Hutchinson's political philosophy as "classical conservatism. John Adams was a conservative in that he favored constitutional stability. Hutchinson was a conservative because he believed that divine interest and conscience governed society." Lester Cohen agreed with this assessment, referring to Hutchinson as "the deeply conservative, anti-republican governor of Massachusetts." And William Benton, whose definition of "Whig-Loyalism" actually encompassed many of Hutchinson's own values, drew a sharp distinction between his Whig Loyalists and "Tories" like Hutchinson: "To the Tories, such as Thomas Hutchinson, any idea of local autonomy for the colonies was abhorrent." John E. Ferling, review of *America's Burke*, by William Pencak, *WMQ* 41, no. 1 (Jan. 1984): 162; Lester Cohen, review of *America's Burke*, *AHR* 89, no. 1 (Feb. 1984): 195; William A. Benton, *Whig-Loyalism: An Aspect of Political Ideology in the American Revolutionary Era* (Rutherford: Fairleigh Dickinson UP, 1969), 176.

The opening line in the introduction to a collection of Loyalists writings, *The American Tory*, presented one common assumption about the Loyalists, including Hutchinson: "[t]he conservative is by nature fearful." Leonard Labaree, in his study of American conservatism, found a "common Tory mind" which was more conservative and appreciative of tradition, and more fearful of its own society. Janice Potter also saw Loyalists as having a pessimistic sense of human nature, and being strongly influenced by fears of democracy and the ascendancy of the lower classes. According to Potter, the Loyalists' mindset saw social order as precarious; stability could only be protected from above, by Great Britain. *The American Tory*, ed. Morton Borden and Penn Borden (Englewood Cliff, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1972), 1; Leonard Labaree, "Nature of Am. Loyalism," in *Conservatism in America*, 304; Janice Potter, *The Liberty We Seek: Loyalist Ideology in Colonial New York and Massachusetts* (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1983).

America, as he is presented as mentally incapable of appreciating the Patriots' viewpoints.¹³

One sign of the continuing dominance of the Patriot interpretation of the Revolution may be the extent to which a Loyalist like Hutchinson remains actually incomprehensible even to the scholars who study him. John P. Reid, the editor of Hutchinson's 1773 constitutional debates with the Massachusetts General Court¹⁴ found Hutchinson's values inexplicable:

¹³ This impression of Hutchinson as fundamentally outdated and irrelevant to American ideology has been shared by several of the historians studying Hutchinson. Andrew Walmsley, who accepted that Hutchinson's opposition was often motivated by personal jealousy, still painted Hutchinson as the product of an older time, unable to appreciate the new forces stirring politically, a "gentleman-politician schooled in the arts of deference, humility, and compromise" (Walmsley, *Thomas Hutchinson*, 101). D. K. Fieldhouse also saw Hutchinson as a tragic figure because he was "a victim of the clash of two ideologies, his own archaic and static, that of his opponents contemporary and dynamic": D. K. Fieldhouse, review of *Ordeal*, *Eng. Hist. Rev.* 91, no. 361 (Oct. 1976): 918.

Bailyn seems to be moving from his 1970s-era depiction of Hutchinson as a bewildered pragmatist to depicting him more as the product of a fundamentally different, pre-Enlightenment mentality. Bailyn's 2006 article, reflecting on the *Ordeal*, described Hutchinson's mindset as part of the older worldview that was destroyed by the forces of the Enlightenment. Bailyn noted the 1776 publication of the works of Adam Smith, Edward Gibbon and Thomas Paine as emblematic of the winds of change blowing Hutchinson's older philosophies away: "[t]he ideas of the Enlightenment, the maturing of colonial societies, and the emergence of industrial economics were eroding the foundations not only of Europe's *ancien régime* but of the western hemisphere's establishments as well." Bailyn, "Thomas Hutchinson in Context: The *Ordeal* Revisited," *AAS Proc.* 114, no. 2 (2004): 298.

¹⁴ *The Briefs of the American Revolution: Constitutional Arguments between Thomas Hutchinson, Governor of Massachusetts Bay, and James Bowdoin for the Council and John Adams for the House of Representatives*, ed. John P. Reid (New York: New York UP, 1981). Reid, a constitutional historian who has written, among other works, a four-volume *Constitutional History of the American Revolution* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1986), ultimately concluded that eighteenth century Americans understood English history and the English constitution better than the English themselves understood it, a conclusion that seems to give precious little credit to a century and a half of English legal and constitutional debate on the nature of their own constitution since 1689. Reid dismissed Hutchinson's understanding of constitutional principles with the same reasoning—Hutchinson, in following the English understanding of the English constitution, made a grave error. Reid also saw Hutchinson as typical of the Loyalists undervaluing liberty due to his fears of anarchy. Hutchinson was "the most tory of Americans...Faced with a choice between whig liberty and tory order, Thomas Hutchinson had no doubt where his duty lay." Reid, introduction, in *Briefs*, 12-13. Admittedly, Hutchinson did fear anarchy—as did many of his more thoughtful opponents. However, a main reason for that fear of anarchy was precisely *because* Hutchinson believed that there could be no personal liberty without a stable rule of law.

“Today it is difficult to appreciate the depths of Governor Hutchinson’s confidence that he could terminate the prerevolutionary controversy by clarifying the principles of the constitution. Our problem is to understand how he, a student of English history knowledgeable about the causes of the English revolution and the Glorious Revolution, could have been so obtuse to the substance and merits of the American Whigs’ constitutional argument.”¹⁵

The metaphor of blindness is often used in discussions of Hutchinson’s beliefs, as though the virtues of the Patriot position should have been crystal clear to anyone with sight. Thus, John Ferling saw Hutchinson’s career as illustrating the “fate that sometimes befalls a self-contained governing class that endeavors to understand sweeping changes by harkening to traditional beliefs and values, and, for its obdurate myopia, crumbles in the ensuing upheaval.”¹⁶ Bernard Sheehan also described Hutchinson as blinded by “ideological myopia,” and unable to appreciate Patriot arguments, and further remarked that the man “represented an antique world that deserved to die.”¹⁷

Hutchinson’s *History* has provoked far less controversy than the man himself, but, in my view, mainly because its political agenda and underlying ideology have

¹⁵ *Briefs of the American Revolution*, ed. Reid, 14. John Schutz also found Hutchinson’s political value system inexplicable: “How a man of such great experience in government, a native American, and an acquaintance of John and Samuel Adams, Hawley, and Bowdoin could have so misunderstood the issues of the Revolution is incomprehensible to historians...” (Schutz, review of *Ordeal*, 771).

This interpretation is shared by other historians of colonial and Revolutionary Massachusetts. Charles P. Hanson charged of Hutchinson: “[h]ere is a man who called American independence an insane idea while energetically defending press censorship and arbitrary search and seizure.” John Catanzariti found it “profoundly ironic that Hutchinson, who knew more than any other contemporary about Massachusetts, its history, and its people, should have demonstrated such fundamentally unsound judgment during his administration.” Charles P. Hanson, review of *Thomas Hutchinson and the Origins of the American Revolution*, by Andrew Walmsley, *AHR* 105, no. 3 (Jun. 2000): 922; and John Catanzariti, review of *Ordeal*, *NEQ* 47, no. 3 (Sept. 1974): 461.

¹⁶ John Ferling, review of *The Liberty We Seek*, by Janice Potter, *AHR* 89, no. 2 (Apr. 1984): 514.

¹⁷ Bernard W. Sheehan, review of *Ordeal*, *AHR* 82, no. 3 (Jun. 1977): 735-36.

been overlooked entirely. Modern historians generally recognize the worth of the *History*. Philip McFarland, one of Hutchinson's recent biographers, remarked, "No one knew more than Thomas Hutchinson—no one before or since has ever known as much—about the history of Massachusetts Bay." Bernard Bailyn concurred with this view, noting a shorter work on Hutchinson that the lieutenant governor knew Massachusetts history "better than any man alive."¹⁸ However, few authors have remarked on the history's overall political and philosophical views.¹⁹ Some historians have examined Volume Three, Hutchinson's account of the Revolutionary crisis, for insights into his views. However, Hutchinson's treatment of Massachusetts' earlier history, the bulk of his work, has been neglected. The most common assessment made concerning the *History* is that it is an essentially apolitical work.²⁰

Modern scholars have not recognized the unique character of the *History*. While there are other histories written by Loyalists, these generally focused on the Revolutionary period, and were written at the time of the Revolution or immediately

¹⁸ Philip McFarland, *The Brave Bostonians*, 4; Bailyn, *Faces of Revolution*, 60.

¹⁹ Recognition of the political significance behind Hutchinson's presentation of Massachusetts' earlier history has generally been limited to occasional comments, as when Michael Kraus and Davis Joyce noted that Hutchinson, in his coverage of the Quaker controversy, "could occasionally be critical of his native province," or when Edmund Morgan noted that Hutchinson, in his coverage of the seventeenth century charter struggles, unwittingly provided the Patriots with political ammunition. Michael Kraus and Davis D. Joyce, "The Growing National Spirit," in *The Writing of American History* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1985), 53; Edmund Morgan, "Historians of Early New England," in *The Reinterpretation of Early American History: Essays in Honor of John Edwin Pomfret*, ed. Ray Billington (San Marino: Huntington, 1966), 41-65.

²⁰ Bailyn described Hutchinson's coverage of the Revolutionary crisis as "one of the most impersonal, bland, and circumspect accounts of revolutionary events ever written by a participant." Bailyn, *Faces of Revolution*, 55. See also Lawrence H. Gipson, "The Imperial Approach to Early American History," in *The Reinterpretation of Early American History*, ed. Billington, 185-200. Kraus and Joyce were also impressed by the judicial tone of even the third volume: "The judicial temper of Hutchinson's mind remained unruffled; his portraits of some political adversaries, though unflattering, were largely true...His analysis of the Revolutionary controversy showed greater objectivity and was nearer the truth than that of any succeeding historian for almost a century." Kraus and Joyce, "The Growing National Spirit," 54-55.

afterwards. Hutchinson's first volume, however, predated the Revolutionary crisis, and was originally conceived of as wholly colonial—it was initially meant to end at 1691. While there were other historians of colonial New England in the late eighteenth century (notably Thomas Prince and Jeremy Belknap), Hutchinson's study is unique in its scholarship, its breadth of coverage, and the prominent role its author took in the province's affairs.

Those who have studied the ideology of the *History* generally fall into two camps. Historians studying the work of the Loyalists often remark upon Hutchinson's tone of overall objectivity. By contrast, scholars examining the *History* in comparison to the works of other colonial or early national historians often use Hutchinson's work as an example of an older, pre-Enlightenment mentality.²¹ Hutchinson's

²¹ For some of the important works looking at the *History* as a representative of Loyalist thought, see Leonard W. Labaree, "The Nature of American Loyalism," *AAS Proc.*, new ser., 54 (Apr. 1944): 15-58, and *Conservatism in Early American History* (New York: New York UP, 1948); William H. Nelson, *The American Tory* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961); Wallace Brown, *The Good Americans: The Loyalists in the American Revolution* (New York: Morrow, 1969), and "The View at Two Hundred Years: The Loyalists of the American Revolution," *AAS Proc.*, 80 (1970): 25-47; Lawrence Leder, *The Colonial Legacy, Vol. 1: The Loyalist Historians* (New York: Harper & Row, 1971); Mary Beth Norton, "The Loyalists' Image of England: Ideal and Reality," *Albion* 3, no. 2 (Sum. 1971): 62-71, and "Loyalist Critique of the Revolution" in *The Development of a Revolutionary Mentality: Library of Congress Symposia on the American Revolution*, ed. Henry S. Commager, et al. (Washington, DC: Library of Congress, 1972), 127-50; George A. Billias, "The First Un-Americans: The Loyalists in American Historiography," in *Perspectives on Early American History: Essays in Honor of Richard B. Morris*, ed. Alden T. Vaughan and George A. Billias (New York: Harper & Row, 1973), 282-324; Jeffrey M. Nelson, "Ideology in Search of a Context: Eighteenth-Century British Political Thought and the Loyalists of the American Revolution," *Historical Journal* 20, no. 3 (1977): 741-49; Janice Potter and Robert Calhoun, "The Character and Coherence of the Loyalist Press," in *The Press and the American Revolution*, ed. Bernard Bailyn and John B. Hench (Boston: Northeastern UP, 1981), 229-72; Janice Potter, *The Liberty We Seek: Loyalist Ideology in Colonial New York and Massachusetts* (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1983); Robert M. Calhoun, "The Reintegration of the Loyalists and the Disaffected," in *The American Revolution: Its Character and Limits*, ed. Jack Greene (New York: New York UP, 1987), 51-74, and *The Loyalist Perception and Other Essays* (Columbia: USC Press, 1989); and Eileen Ka-May Cheng, "American Historical Writers and the Loyalists, 1788-1856: Dissent, Consensus, and American Nationality," *JER* 23, no. 4 (Win. 2003): 491-519.

For works dealing with the *History of Massachusetts-Bay* within American historical writing traditions, see David D. Van Tassel, "The Heritage of Localism, 1680-1776," in *Recording America's Past: An Interpretation of the Development of Historical Studies in America 1607-1884* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960), 19-30; Harvey Wish, "The Enlightenment: Hutchinson and the Tory Emphasis," in *The American Historian: A Social-Intellectual History of the Writing of the*

presumed pessimism is compared to the more optimistic outlook of the Patriot histories of the eighteenth century or the early national writers of the nineteenth century.²²

In addition to being seen as the product of an outdated mentality, the *History* is often assumed to be the product of an *English* mind. To George Billias, the most important questions was “[t]o what were the Loyalists loyal?” Possible answers for him included the British nation as a whole, the Crown, and the Parliament. Harry

American Past (New York: Oxford UP, 1960), 22-38; Edmund Morgan, “Historians of Early New England,” and Merrill Jensen, “Historians and the Nature of the American Revolution,” in *The Reinterpretation of Early American History*, ed. Ray Billington (San Marino: Huntington, 1966), 41-65, 101-23; Merle Curti, “The Limitations of Man’s Capacities,” in *Human Nature in American Historical Thought* (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1968), 3-36; Harry Ward, “The Search for American Identity: Early Historians of New England,” in *Perspectives on Early American History*, ed. Vaughan and Billias (New York: Harper & Row, 1973), 40-62; Arthur H. Shaffer, *The Politics of History: Writing the History of the American Revolution, 1783-1815* (Chicago: Precedent Publishing, 1975); Kraus and Joyce, “The Growing National Spirit,” in *The Writing of American History* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1985), 48-75; Lester Cohen, “Creating a Usable Future: The Revolutionary Historians and the National Past,” in *The American Revolution: Its Character and Limits*, ed. Jack Greene (New York: New York UP, 1987), 309-30; and Thomas P. Cole, “History and Historical Consciousness in Colonial British America: A Study in the Construction of Provincial Cultures” (PhD diss., Johns Hopkins University, 1993).

²² Despite praise for Hutchinson’s overall tone of objectivity, Kraus and Joyce spied in Hutchinson’s writing something that they saw as a common affliction of Loyalist historians: “The tone of their works was conservative, and their concern was generally to justify the established order” (p. 52). Potter and Calhoun also saw the Loyalists historians as focusing on the limitations of human nature, that “most people were unfit for political responsibility,” while the Whig historians of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century demonstrated a more positive view of human potential: Potter and Calhoun, “The Character and Coherence of the Loyalist Press,” in *The Press and the American Revolution*, 241.

Merle Curti categorized Hutchinson along with other earlier colonial writers as examples of historians emphasizing man’s limitations, with a worldview emanating from a Puritan, theologically-derived understanding of the world. Curti saw this mindset as basically medieval and pre-Enlightenment: “[u]ntil Descartes and Locke forced a revision of accepted views, New England’s intellectual leaders generally subscribed to the medieval synthesis of the nature of human nature.” Curti compared this first group to authors he considered more representative of Enlightenment ideals, including the Patriot writers. The difference between these two groups, according to Curti, was that the first emphasized the limits of human understanding and potential, while the second put much greater faith in human reason and capacity for progress. Curti, “The Limitations of Man’s Capacities,” 10.

Harry Ward, looking at five generations of New England colonial historians, including Hutchinson, also placed Hutchinson within an older historiographic framework, as one of the historians for whom Divine Providence provided the guiding force in history. Lester Cohen saw the *History* in a similar light: “Creating a Usable Future: The Revolutionary Historians and the National Past,” 309-30.

Ward also depicted Hutchinson's viewpoint as that of an Englishman's: "[t]o most Puritan historians, the founding of New England was largely a religious fulfillment; to Hutchinson it was an extension of the English experience." Arthur Shaffer, explaining the emotional distance between the colonial historians and the first generation of United States writers, also described Hutchinson as primarily an Englishman: "Thomas Hutchinson's *History of Massachusetts Bay* (1765) was for him an account of transplanted Englishmen, an element of a larger drama."²³

THE HISTORY OF MASSACHUSETTS-BAY: AN IDEOLOGICAL INTERPRETATION

Departing from conventional wisdom, I argue that Hutchinson's *History of Massachusetts-Bay* is a profoundly ideological work with a complex message. The book marshaled an impressive array of knowledge of colonial history to promote specific political and constitutional positions. Hutchinson protested repeatedly and disingenuously that his history had modest goals, to preserve the records of Massachusetts' ancestors for the entertainment of their descendants,²⁴ but I believe he

²³ Billias, "The First Un-Americans," 323; Ward, "Early Historians of New England," 44; Shaffer, *The Politics of History*, 8.

²⁴ Early in the *History*, Hutchinson apologized that his history might bore those outside his colony: "It cannot be expected that the affairs of a colony should afford much matter, interesting or entertaining to the world in general. I write for the sake of my own countrymen, and even to many of them I expect some facts will be thought of too little importance; and yet I have omitted many such as have been judged proper for the press by former historians. In general, we are fond of knowing the *minutiae* which relate to our own ancestors. There are other facts, which, from the nature of them, will afford but a dull and heavy narration. My chief design is to save them from oblivion." *History* 1, preface, xxix. This demurrer is, however, somewhat disingenuous. Both Volume One and Volume Two appeared in separate English editions, with new dedication and title pages, a year after the Boston editions, and Hutchinson's personal correspondence shows that he anticipated both an English and an American audience. See for example Hutchinson to Hardwick, Oct. 22, 1778, in *Diary and Letters*, vol. 2, 216-18, and his letter to _____, Sept. 28, 1778, cited in Malcolm Freiberg review Mayo, Catherine B., *Additions to Thomas Hutchinson's "History of Massachusetts Bay"* in *WMQ* 7, no. 2 (Apr. 1950): 330-31.

had much more ambitious objectives in mind. His political beliefs were influenced by his study of the history of his own colony, an understanding that he wished to promote to his readers. The *History* subtly made a case for his own political philosophy, a philosophy that had guided his actions throughout his lifetime. Accordingly, the *History* reveals the qualities Hutchinson considered important in good leadership, the dangers inherent in an unbalanced or irrational state and the importance of the rule of law.

Hutchinson's political message was complicated by the fact that he addressed his work to two separate audiences. The *History* was a carefully drafted ideological piece. It held a dual purpose: to present, through the course of Massachusetts history, Hutchinson's views on government, freedom, and law to his own people, and secondly, to present to British readers his own colony's worth to the empire.

Hutchinson's primary target audience was the New Englanders. The author was generally quite respectful toward his Puritan forebears, though he warned against the excesses Puritan culture had produced—his countrymen's zealotry, their stiff necked pride and stubbornness, their determination to set themselves apart, their bigotry, and their occasional surrender to rank emotionalism and "enthusiasm." New Englanders had always had an especially strong sense of their own past. Hutchinson knew that Puritan Massachusetts had been idealized by many in his own time. His *History* served both to praise the colony's founders and to point up the deficiencies in their culture that made it inferior to the present age.

At the same time, the *History* was also addressed to a second audience—those still living in the mother country. As a colonial official, Hutchinson often attempted

to mediate between the colonials and the Crown, by explaining America to England and England to America.²⁵ Hutchinson's *History* can be viewed as another example of this effort. Hutchinson spent considerable time explaining Massachusetts' contentious religious history and its past persecutions of religious undesirables, which he knew still troubled many in Great Britain.²⁶ He also stressed not only the rewards and advantages Massachusetts had gained by being in the empire, but also the rewards and advantages which Massachusetts and New England generally had brought to Great Britain. Hutchinson's dual political purpose meant that he often walked a fine line, condemning the excesses of Massachusetts' past while still celebrating her overall accomplishments.

²⁵ Pencak ascribes this habit to Hutchinson's pathological need to be all things to all people. Bailyn and Freiberg, less critically, attribute it to Hutchinson's peacemaking tendencies and to his own view of the role of the colonial official as mediator. All three historians, however, noted that Hutchinson's attempts to mediate between the two sides tended to make him unpopular with, and mistrusted by, both. For a prime example of Hutchinson attempting to explain the Crown's position to colonials, see his ill-fated 1773 debates with the House and Council, published in *Briefs of the Revolution*, ed. Reid. For an example of his attempting to explain the colonial position to the Crown, see his position paper on the Stamp Act, sent secretly to England shortly before 1765, and published by Edmund Morgan as "Thomas Hutchinson and the Stamp Act" *NEQ* 21, no. 4 (Dec. 1948): 459-92. Neither of these attempts ended well. Hutchinson's attempt to chart a middle course in 1765, by trying to soften the Patriots' angry protests while quietly appealing to London, had no luck in swaying Parliamentary opinion, and in Massachusetts it led to the widespread assumption that Hutchinson was a Stamp Act supporter, even its author. This led to the destruction of his home by mob violence in August, 1765. For his efforts in the 1773 debate, Hutchinson was chastised by the Crown for making matters worse. Benjamin Franklin, in London at the time, reported that the ministry was aggravated with Hutchinson for reopening an ugly dispute they had intended to let die down: "If he intended, by reviving that Dispute, to recommend himself here, he has greatly missed his Aim; for the Administration are chagrin'd with his Officiousness, their Intention having been to let all Contention subside...They are now embarrass'd by his Proceedings." Albert H., Smyth, ed., *The Writings of Benjamin Franklin* (New York, Haskell House, 1907, 1970), 48-49; quoted Walmsley, *Hutchinson*, 142.

²⁶ In 1768, Anglican Tory polemicist "A Whip for the American Whig" reminded his readers of Massachusetts' long history of dangerous radicalism, noting that it was they who hanged the "poor, harmless, inoffensive Quakers...": *New-York Mercury*, Apr. 25, 1768, cited in Potter and Calhoun, "The Character and Coherence of the Loyalist Press," 247. William Gribbin's work on early nineteenth century children's textbooks shows that the legacy of the Quaker executions and witch trials still posed an image problem for New England into the 1820s: "A Mirror to New England: The Compendious History of Jedidiah Morse and Elijah Parish." *NEQ* 45, no. 3 (Sep. 1972): 340-54.

I contend that, from the first volume of the *History*, Hutchinson identified with not only Massachusetts, but also with America as a whole; he was proud to be a colonial.²⁷ A point Hutchinson repeatedly emphasized was the importance of Massachusetts' settlement to the overall British Empire and the crucial role the colony had played in the development of the whole of British North America. Hutchinson described Massachusetts (not Plymouth) as the fountainhead from which flowed the rest of New England, and he argued that all of the colonies, from Virginia to the Caribbean plantations, might very well have failed if not for the settlement of Massachusetts, which supplied their needed timber and other raw materials.²⁸ Without Massachusetts, the Crown would have likely lost claim to the entire northern part of the continent:

It appears that the Massachusetts people took possession of the country at a very critical time. Richlieu, in all probability, would have planted his colony nearer the sun, if he could have found any place vacant...Had they once gained footing there, they would have prevented the English. The frenchified court of King Charles the first would, at the treaty of Saint Germain, have given up any claim to Massachusetts bay as readily as they did to Acadie...The little plantation at New-Plimouth would have been no greater bar to the French...If they had done it, the late contest for the

²⁷ Judith Wilson argued that while American historians were writing histories celebrating their own particular colony from practically the first generation, these works rarely broke past the boundaries of each individual colony. While Hutchinson's stated topic was Massachusetts, the work not only covered the whole of New England, but also displayed a good deal of knowledge about the provinces outside New England, commenting frequently on the histories and internal affairs of the more southern colonies. See for example his comments on the establishment and early government of Virginia and Maryland, *History* 1, ch. 1: 83, footnote † (cross), vol. 1, ch. 1: 117, footnote *, and vol. 1, ch. 1: 166; on Pennsylvania, vol. 1, ch. 5: 370, footnote *, vol. 2, ch. 2: 132, footnote *; and on New York, vol. 1, ch. 2: 200, footnote *, vol. 1, ch. 2: 204, footnote *, vol. 1, ch. 2: 332, footnote † (cross), vol. 1, ch. 2: 301, footnote *, vol. 1, ch. 2: 326, footnote *, and vol. 2, ch. 3: 185, footnote *.

Donald Meyer noted that it was rare for colonists to use the phrase "Americans" before mid-eighteenth century, as Hutchinson did frequently in both his *History* and his correspondence. Judith Wilson, "My Country is My Colony: A Study in Anglo-American Patriotism, 1739-1760," *Historian* 30, no. 3 (May 1968): 333-49; Donald Meyer, "Uniqueness of the America Enlightenment," *American Quarterly* 28, no. 2 (Sum. 1976): 172.

²⁸ *History*, preface, xxix; vol. 1, ch. 1: 3. See also vol. 1, ch. 1: 96, where Hutchinson gave Massachusetts credit for protecting the rest of New England.

dominion of North America would have been between France and Holland, and the commerce of England would have borne a very different proportion to that of the rest of Europe from what it does at present.²⁹

Some historians assume that the Loyalists sided with the imperial government because they were more pessimistic about the strength of their colonies, and less attached patriotically to their colony than to the imperial government.³⁰ However, Hutchinson's views displayed throughout the *History* showed that he viewed himself as both a New-England man and an American. He referred repeatedly to Massachusetts as his "country," and its citizens as his "country-men," but he also referred to himself as an "American," and was clearly accustomed to thinking of the colonies and their needs in the aggregate.³¹ Hutchinson believed that America, because of its growth and prosperity, would naturally one day become independent, though he did not expect it in his lifetime: "The natural increase of people upon the British continent is so great as to make it highly probable that in a few generations more a mighty Empire will be formed there."³² Hutchinson identified emotionally

²⁹ *History* 1, ch. 1: 28-29. See also ch. 1: 99-100, footnote || (parallel lines): noting a 1642 resolve from the British House of Commons, which praised Massachusetts' flourishing state for increasing the wealth of England without any help from the home government, Hutchinson remarked, "The merit of our ancestors, many of whom were personally known to the principal members of parliament, was fresh in their remembrance. Length of time has not lessened the merit. Consequences so advantageous to the nation have followed it, that in reason it ought to strike stronger now than it did then."

³⁰ Marc Egnal, *A Mighty Empire: The Origins of the American Revolution* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell UP, 1988), for example, saw more pessimistic and fearful attitudes toward America's future as the deciding factor in explaining why some colonial merchants sided with the Loyalist cause rather than the Patriot side.

³¹ *History* 1, preface, xxviii, xxix, ix, vol. 2, preface, ix-xi. Hutchinson calling America his country and identifying himself as an American: *History* 2, ch. 4: 299, vol. 2, Preface, ix, vol. 2, ch. 4: 299. He also described himself as an "American" throughout his diary, both before and after his exile: *Diary and Letters*, *passim*.

³² Hutchinson's original 1769 preface, in *The Hutchinson Papers*, ed. William Whitmore, *et al.* (Albany: J. Munsell, 1865), i. At the end of the second volume of his *History*, he went into great detail concerning its produce and trade potential, and even his opinion that Massachusetts would

with both Massachusetts and America—like Jefferson, he praised local produce and beauty, took great pride in America’s contributions to the British Empire, and held great hopes for America’s future.³³

In the conclusion to his preface to Volume One, Hutchinson noted:

The addition of wealth and power to Great Britain, in consequence of this first emigration of our ancestors, exceeds all expectations. They left their native country with the strongest assurances that they and their posterity should enjoy the privileges of free natural born English subjects. May the wealth and power of Britain still increase, in proportion to the increase of her colonies; may those privileges never be abused; may they be preserved inviolate to the latest posterity.³⁴

This paragraph summed up Hutchinson’s vision of America and its relationship with England, and went to the heart of the history’s political purpose. The passage is all the more striking in that it was written before any hint of the coming Revolutionary crisis could have influenced the author’s views. Hutchinson valued the society that Massachusetts’ past had created, and believed eighteenth century Massachusetts was overall a just and an Enlightened society with a proud history and a promising future.

always prosper, despite attempted encroachments by the French, because one Massachusetts fisherman could catch as many cod as ten Frenchmen, and bigger and tastier ones, too: *History* 2, ch. 4: 341. Hutchinson’s assessment of America’s place in the Empire was initially quite similar to Franklin’s, even down to their similar focus on America’s booming population. For Franklin’s vision of America before his transformation into ardent Patriot, see Drew R. McCoy, “Benjamin Franklin’s Vision of a Republican Political Economy for America,” *WMQ* 35, no. 4 (Oct. 1978): 605-28, Benjamin Franklin, Letter to Lord Kames, 3 Jan. 1760, in *The Political Thought of Benjamin Franklin*, ed. Ralph Ketcham (Indianapolis: Hackett Pub. Co., 1965; 2003), 149-50, and William Clarke to Benjamin Franklin, Boston, Feb. 3, 1755, *MHS Coll.* 1st ser., 4 (1795): 85-86, on the Albany Plan of Union.

³³ In the preface to Volume One, Hutchinson proudly estimated the current population of New England at around 500,000, and argued that his province should be viewed as the parent and protector of all the other mainland colonies. He also noted that in addition to their protection of the other New England colonies, Massachusetts furnished supplies to the English Caribbean, and the whole of the rest of the colonies: *History* 1, Preface, xxix. For Jefferson, see Thomas Jefferson, *Notes on the State of Virginia*, ed. Frank Shuffelton (New York: Penguin Books, 1999).

³⁴ *History* 1, preface, xxix.

In addition to presenting Hutchinson's work as a political document, I argue that the *History* also expresses views very much in keeping with the American Enlightenment. Rather than being "the most tory of Americans," as Reid would have it,³⁵ Hutchinson shared many of the same Enlightenment ideals as the men who would lead America as a new nation. His views on religious toleration, fair treatment of minorities, the importance of a rule of law and balanced government and the value of enlightened and virtuous leadership remained unchanged throughout his life.

Hutchinson used the *History* to celebrate the values of his eighteenth century present over the irrationality of the past. Looking through Massachusetts' history for the sources of corruption and political instability, Hutchinson found them in nearly every instance in the triumph of heedless emotion and prejudice over reason, precedent and the rule of law. An important lesson in the *History of Massachusetts-Bay* for Hutchinson's countrymen was that many of the problems encountered by Massachusetts in its early years were brought on by themselves. Massachusetts' government was subverted by its citizens' religious intolerance, by their unfairness in government, by a court system biased against religious dissenters and Indians, and by a lack of balance and respect for the law in government and society.

Even at the conclusion of Hutchinson's life, with American independence becoming a distinct possibility, Hutchinson never deviated from his earlier value system, a value system rooted in the American Enlightenment of the eighteenth century. In my opinion, both Hutchinson's background as an American with deep

³⁵ Reid, introduction, in *Briefs*, 12.

roots in the colony, and his immersion in the works of the American Enlightenment, strongly influenced the values that he promoted in his *History*.

STRUCTURE OF THESIS

Chapter two of this dissertation will lay out the basic framework of Hutchinson's philosophy and political ideology, and its connection to the American Enlightenment. Subsequent chapters will examine that ideology in the context of Hutchinson's presentation of early Massachusetts history. These chapters will concentrate on the first volume of Hutchinson's *History*, which took the colonial narrative up to 1691. I will examine Hutchinson's coverage of three general issues from Massachusetts' seventeenth century past. They represent the three salient challenges the colony faced in its first century of existence. They are the religious struggles over orthodoxy and religious identity, Indian affairs, including the two major Indian wars of the seventeenth century, and the century-long struggle with the imperial government over Massachusetts' charter.

I will be looking at these events from two perspectives. First, in terms of Hutchinson's political ideology, how does Hutchinson use these specific events to illustrate larger lessons concerning good governorship and virtuous citizenship, and the proper balance in a well-ordered society? That is, how does Hutchinson shape his narrative to fit his dual agenda of presenting an acceptable interpretation of Massachusetts' own past to his fellow New Englanders, while at the same time presenting a plausibly sympathetic view of Massachusetts to Britain? Secondly, how

does Hutchinson's historical account display his basic philosophy and Enlightenment principles?

Chapter three will focus on Hutchinson's account of the religious struggles of the seventeenth century. Massachusetts' early religious policies, particularly her refusal to grant religious liberty and the franchise to non-Puritans, were the prime cause for the loss of the colony's original charter in the 1680s, and a constant source of tension between the colony and others both in America and England. Even in the eighteenth century, Massachusetts' religious past was an exasperating subject for many outside the province. Hutchinson's work presented these schisms and persecutions as fundamentally the product of a less enlightened age, rather than unique to Puritan Massachusetts.

Chapter four will focus on Hutchinson's presentation of Indian affairs, particularly the seventeenth century wars against the Pequots and the Indian chieftain known as King Philip. New England's struggles with her Indian neighbors would remain a key concern throughout the seventeenth century. The chapter will also examine Hutchinson's more general views regarding the Indian nations, as a clue to both his racial views and his understanding of human nature and conceptions of sovereignty. Finally, the chapter will investigate how Hutchinson's interpretation of the Indian wars fit into his larger portrayal of Massachusetts' place within the empire.

Chapter five will focus on the charter struggles of the seventeenth century, from the Crown's earliest challenges to Massachusetts' original 1629 charter in the 1630s, through revocation of this charter in 1684, and the negotiation of the second charter in 1691. It is my contention that these events may have represented the key

development in Massachusetts' history for Hutchinson when he initially conceived of writing the *History*, and that much of his basic political philosophy can be most clearly seen in his treatment of this time period.

As Massachusetts' most prominent Loyalist, Hutchinson played a preeminent role in the Revolutionary Crisis. I argue that the *History* provides one possible key to understanding his much misunderstood political ideology. Historians have been grappling unsuccessfully with a variety of explanations of Hutchinson's political actions while ignoring or denying the existence of his political ideology. The importance of the *History* lies in its ability to manifestly reveal that ideology. The *History* is as much an overt political document and a statement of Hutchinson's vision of the future of America within the empire, as Joseph Galloway's proposals for reorganizing the empire into a commonwealth-style government.³⁶ I will strive to show in this paper that an analytical examination of the *History* will largely demystify the Hutchinson *persona* that has so baffled generations of historians.

³⁶ For Joseph Galloway's proposals for reorganizing the American colonies, and historical work, see Joseph Galloway, *A Candid Examination of the Mutual Claims of Great Britain, and the Colonies: With a Plan of Accommodation, on Constitutional Principles* (New York, 1775), and *Historical and Political Reflections on the Rise and Progress of the American Rebellion...* (London, 1780). For an analysis of his thought, see Ernest H. Baldwin, "Joseph Galloway, The Loyalist Politician," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 26 (Jan. 1902): 161-91, 289-321, 417-42; Julian P. Boyd, *Anglo-American Union; Joseph Galloway's Plans to Preserve the British Empire, 1774-1788* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1941); and John E. Ferling, "Joseph Galloway and the Philosophy of Loyalism" (PhD diss., West Virginia University, 1971) and *The Loyalist Mind: Joseph Galloway and the American Revolution* (University Park: Pennsylvania State UP, 1977).

CHAPTER 2: A MAN OF THE AMERICAN ENLIGHTENMENT

*“The Law will have its course; I will live and die by the Law”*³⁷

*“Libertatem colo Licentiam Detestor”*³⁸

To understand Thomas Hutchinson, one must recognize that *History of Massachusetts-Bay* was a product of the American Enlightenment and that Hutchinson embraced the assumptions and goals of that movement. . Hutchinson, to a degree not generally acknowledged, was very much a representative of Enlightenment thought, particularly as it flourished in eighteenth century America. His enlightened outlook provided the framework for his conceptualization of his colony’s past, and the lessons that the past provided for the future. The *History* reveals Hutchinson’s adherence to the eighteenth century virtues of reason, balance, and the rule of law over the Puritan ideals of religious purity and zealotry. In this chapter I will first define the intellectual assumptions and values that made up the American Enlightenment. I will then illustrate five aspects of Hutchinson’s thought

³⁷ Quote attributed by witnesses to Thomas Hutchinson, from his speech from the State House balcony the night of the Boston Massacre, as he attempted to calm the crowd: “Testimony of Richard Palmes of Boston,” *Rex. v. Preston*, 1770, in *The Legal Papers of John Adams*, ed. Hiller Zobel and Kinvin L. Wroth (Cambridge: Belknap Press, 1965), 3: 69, footnote 62. The Massacre witness testimony is contained in “No. 63, *Rex v. Preston*, 1770,” and “No. 64. *Rex. v. Wemms*, 1770,” in *Legal Papers of John Adams*, 3: 46-314, *passim*.

³⁸ Motto added by Thomas Hutchinson to the Hutchinson family crest. Peter O. Hutchinson notes that the Hutchinson coat of arms pictured on front of his book, *The Diary and Letters of his Excellency Thomas Hutchinson, Esq.* (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin, 1884) was taken from a wax impression on a letter sent by Thomas Hutchinson, dated February 6, 1774. However, an old painting of the family arms on vellum in the Hutchinson family’s possession has no motto. Thomas Hutchinson seems to have added it, possibly during the Revolutionary crisis. The motto roughly translates as “I love liberty, but I detest licentiousness.” See Peter O. Hutchinson, *Diary and Letters*, preface, ii-iv. The Latin translation is by Dr. Paul Burton.

that demonstrated his basic philosophical allegiance to the tenets of the American Enlightenment.

THE AMERICAN ENLIGHTENMENT

As one significant focus of this dissertation will be the place of Hutchinson's *History* within the intellectual traditions of the American Enlightenment, a general definition of this movement is necessary. The eighteenth century Enlightenment has been particularly difficult for historians to define.³⁹ Older views of the Enlightenment tended to describe it as a unitary phenomenon, a set of values generally held in common. Peter Gay defined the Enlightenment as a "family of intellectuals united by

³⁹ For general works on the Enlightenment, see Ernst F. Cassirer, *C. A. Koelnn and J. P. Pettegrove, The Philosophy of the Enlightenment* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1951); Isaiah Berlin, *The Age of Enlightenment: The Eighteenth Century Philosophers* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1956); Alfred Cobban, *In Search of Humanity: The Role of the Enlightenment in Modern History*. (New York, G. Braziller, 1960); Peter Gay, *The Enlightenment: An Interpretation: The Rise of Modern Paganism* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1967); Robert Darnton, "The High Enlightenment and the Low-Life of Literature in Pre-Revolutionary France," *Past and Present* 51 (May 1971): 81-115, "In Search of the Enlightenment: Recent Attempts to Create a Social History of Ideas," *JMH* 43, no. 1 (Mar. 1971): 113-32; John Redwood, *Reason, Ridicule, and Religion: The Age of Enlightenment in England, 1660-1750* (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1976); Lester G. Crocker, "Interpreting the Enlightenment: A Political Approach," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 46, no. 2 (Apr. 1985): 211-30; Dena Goodman, *Criticism in Action: Enlightenment Experiments in Political Writing* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1989), and *The Republic of Letters: A Cultural History of French Enlightenment* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1994); Ralph Lerner, *Revolutions Revisited: Two Faces of the Politics of Enlightenment* (Chapel Hill: UNC Press, 1994); Dorinda Outram, *The Enlightenment* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1995); James Schmidt, ed., *What is Enlightenment?: Eighteenth-Century Answers and Twentieth-Century Questions* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996); Linda Kirk, "The Matter of Enlightenment," *Historical Journal* 43, no. 4 (Dec. 2000): 1129-43; Thomas Munck, *The Enlightenment: A Comparative Social History 1721-1794* (London: Arnold, 2000); Louis Dupré, *The Enlightenment and the Intellectual Foundations of Modern Culture* (New Haven: Yale UP, 2004); Dena Goodman and Kathleen Wellman, eds., *The Enlightenment* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 2004); and Gertrude Himmelfarb, *The Roads to Modernity: The British, French, and American Enlightenments* (New York: Knopf, 2004).

Defining the Enlightenment is a problem as old as the movement itself. The works of Kevin L. Cope and Rudier Ahrens and Dorinda Outram both note that the members of the "Republic of Letters" themselves spent a great deal of time attempting to define the movement. Rather than a neat definition, Outram believes "it is more helpful to think of Enlightenment as a series of problems or debates, of 'flash-points', characteristic of the eighteenth century, or of 'pockets' where projects of intellectual expansion impacted upon and changed the nature of developments in society and government on a world-wide basis." Kevin L. Cope and Rudier Ahrens, eds. *Talking Forward, Talking Back. Critical Dialogues with the Enlightenment* (New York: AMS Press, 2000); Dorinda Outram, "What is Enlightenment?" in *The Enlightenment* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1995), 3.

a single style of thinking.”⁴⁰ For Gay, the Enlightenment meant a demand for rational organization of government, the rejection of religious fanaticism, a respect for individual liberty, and some sense of sympathy for minorities and the downtrodden. Gay denied that there were different Enlightenments in different countries or time periods: “[t]he Enlightenment...was a single army with a single banner, with a large central corps, a right and left wing, daring scouts, and lame stragglers.”⁴¹

Recent work on the Enlightenment tends to describe it more as an ongoing conversation, complete with contradictions and variations. It took the form of a group of people, in Europe, Britain and America, corresponding with each other and reading one another’s work, creating in the process the “republic of letters.” They had, in Robert Darnton’s phrase, a “sense of participation in a secular crusade.”⁴² Henry May also emphasized this common sense of participation in a new, more hopeful phase of history: “let us say that the Enlightenment consists of all those who believe in two propositions: first, that the present age is more enlightened than the past; and second, that we understand nature and man best through the use of our natural facilities.”⁴³ In May’s view, while there were many strains of Enlightenment thought, they were united by their acceptance of reason, rather than revelation, as the primary guide of human activity.

⁴⁰ Betty Behrens, review of *The Enlightenment*, by Gay, *JMH* 11, no. 1 (1968): 190.

⁴¹ Gay, *The Enlightenment*, 1: 8. See also Cassirer, *The Philosophy of the Enlightenment* for a similar approach.

⁴² Robert Darnton, *George Washington’s False Teeth: An Unconventional Guide to the Eighteenth Century* (New York: W.W. Norton, 2003): 5.

⁴³ Henry F. May, *The Enlightenment in America* (New York: Oxford UP, 1976), xiv.

Today, the general consensus on the Enlightenment describes it as an intellectual movement that grew out of the re-introduction of classical texts into Europe during the Renaissance and the development of empirical reasoning methods during the Scientific Revolution of the seventeenth century. It dominated thought roughly from 1670-1800, reaching its zenith at different times and in different places. Enlightenment thinkers generally shared a core set of values that were secular, reformist, and optimistic in nature. Its proponents celebrated rationalism and religious tolerance, held superstition and religious zealotry up to scorn, demonstrated a willingness to question authority and past truisms, and stressed a scientific, empirical approach to problem solving. The Enlightenment broke sharply with past intellectual traditions in its optimism and in its celebration of human potential.

The Enlightenment as it appeared in eighteenth century America⁴⁴ differed in key ways from its counterpart in Europe. Joseph Ellis noted that Peter Gay's paradigm of the Enlightenment as primarily a struggle between the forces of faith and reason, which was the dominant *motif* of the French Enlightenment, applied less well in Protestant America. The leading American thinkers were also generally religious, and organized religion was not seen as the implacable foe that the Roman Catholic Church represented to French intellectuals. The American Enlightenment according to Ellis was more focused on political questions than religious ones, and less committed to enunciations of abstract principles than to addressing practical solutions to problems.⁴⁵

⁴⁴ For works specifically on the American Enlightenment, see Adrienne Koch, *Power, Morals, and the Founding Fathers: Essays in Interpretation of the American Enlightenment* (Ithaca: Great Seal Books, 1961), and "Pragmatic Wisdom and the American Enlightenment," *WMQ* 18, no. 3 (Jul. 1961): 313-29; Bernard Bailyn, "Political Experience and Enlightenment Ideas in Eighteenth Century America," *AHR* 67, no. 2 (Jan. 1962): 339-51; Koch, *The American Enlightenment: The Shaping of the American Experiment and a Free Society* (New York: Braziller, 1965); Ernest Cassara, *The Enlightenment in America* (New York: Twayne, 1975); Joseph Ellis, "Habits of Mind and an American Enlightenment," *American Quarterly* 28, no. 2 (Sum. 1976): 150-164; David Lundberg and Henry May, "The Enlightened Reader in America," *American Quarterly* 28, no. 2 (Sum. 1976): 262-93; Henry F. May, *The Enlightenment in America* (New York: Oxford UP, 1976); Donald H. Meyer, *The Democratic Enlightenment* (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1976), and "The Uniqueness of the American Enlightenment," *American Quarterly* 28, no. 2 (Sum. 1976): 165-86; Henry S. Commager, "America and the Enlightenment," in *The Development of a Revolutionary Mentality: Papers Presented at the First Symposium, May 5 and 6th, 1972* (Washington: LOC, 1972), 7-30, and *The Empire of Reason: How Europe Imagined and America Realized the Enlightenment* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1977); Daniel W. Howe, "European Sources of Political Ideas in Jeffersonian America," *Reviews in American History* 10, no. 4 (Dec. 1982): 28-44; Donald S. Lutz, "The Relative Influence of European Writers on Late Eighteenth-Century American Political Thought," *American Political Science Review* 78, no. 1 (Mar. 1984): 189-97; Paul M. Spurlin, *The French Enlightenment in America: Essays on the Times of the Founding Fathers* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1984); Richard B. Sher, and Jeffrey R. Smitten, eds., *Scotland and America in the Age of the Enlightenment* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1990); Henry F. May, *The Divided Heart: Essays on Protestantism and the Enlightenment in America* (New York: Oxford UP, 1991), William M. Shea, and Peter A. Huff, eds., *Knowledge and Belief in America: Enlightenment Traditions and Modern Religious Thought* (New York: Cambridge UP, 1995); Susan Dunn, "Revolutionary Men of Letters and the Pursuit of Radical Change: The Views of Burke, Tocqueville, Adams, Madison, and Jefferson," *WMQ* 53, no. 4 (Oct. 1996): 729-54; Robert A. Ferguson, *The American Enlightenment, 1750-1820* (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1997); and Gary McDowell, and Jonathan O'Neill, eds., *America and Enlightenment Constitutionalism* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006).

⁴⁵ Joseph Ellis, "Habits of Mind and an American Enlightenment," 158, 163-64.

Henry May's *The Enlightenment in America* was the first work to attempt a full study of the American Enlightenment. May emphasized that to take root in America, Enlightenment ideas had to be remolded to accommodate Protestant Christianity. May's article "The Enlightened Reader in America" set out a four-part definition of the American Enlightenment which May would later expand upon in his book. Although Thomas Hutchinson was never mentioned by May in either work, by both chronology and beliefs Hutchinson would best fit into the first category, the "Rational" or "Moderate" Enlightenment.

As Henry May described it, the Moderate Enlightenment was primarily an English and American phenomenon that grew out of Britain's Glorious Revolution. Its three greatest ideals were balance, order, and rationality, and its central conceptualization of the proper state was an idealized vision of the post-1689 British government. It was strongly influenced by the empirical reasoning method of the Scientific Revolution, and was hostile to fanaticism and enthusiasm of all sorts: "Roman infallibility and inner-light enthusiasm were often condemned together, and a modern, rational alternative to both was constantly demanded."⁴⁶ The most influential works of this period, which he dated from about 1688 to 1787, were generally English rather than French authors, with the exceptions of Montesquieu and Voltaire. Moderate Enlightenment thinkers "emphasized balance and moderation in all things, often balancing reason against revelation as a source or knowledge, reason against passion in their account of human nature, monarchy against aristocracy and

⁴⁶ May, *The Enlightenment in America*, 10.

democracy in their theory of government.”⁴⁷ Of the four phases of Enlightenment that May saw operating in eighteenth-century America, he presented this period as having the most lasting effect, shaping both America’s political institutions and its mentality well into the nineteenth century.⁴⁸

The intellectual world of the American Enlightenment was fed by many different philosophic traditions. One of the dominant influences came from the colonials’ immersion in the writings of Ancient Greece and Rome due to their classically-oriented educational system.⁴⁹ Classical history taught colonial Americans

⁴⁷ May, “The Enlightened Reader in America,” 265. See also May, “The Moderate Enlightenment,” in *The Enlightenment in America*, 1-104.

⁴⁸ The second phase of the American Enlightenment in May’s schema was the Skeptical Enlightenment of the mid-eighteenth century, in which French authors, particularly Voltaire, predominated. The third phase was the Revolutionary Enlightenment, lasting from the 1780s to the early nineteenth century, the age of Rousseau and Thomas Paine. This period, which he described as brilliant but brief, differed from previous eras in its belief that the world could be entirely reshaped in one man’s lifetime. The fourth phase, which he called the Didactic Enlightenment, was the age of Scottish thinkers. It was opposed to both skeptics and revolutionaries, and in some ways harkened back to first phase.

⁴⁹ Some historians see the recourse to ancient authorities by colonial Americans as more an elite affectation than a genuine intellectual inheritance. But the ideas of the classical world, as Charles Mullett pointed out, reinforced other Enlightenment values. Mullett argued that classical authors stressed an appreciation for balanced government, religious tolerance, and a skeptical but optimistic approach to human nature. The classical world also furnished support for resistance to bad government. Greek and Roman heroes, even more so than English ones, were often celebrated for defending the state against tyranny. Classical historians and their modern English translators generally did not like Athenian-style democracy, seeing it as too unrestrained. Their ideal was Republican Rome, whose government was properly balanced by its three branches of government.

As both Paul Rahe and Meyer Reinhold have recognized, the dominant eighteenth century interpretation of many ancient Greek and Roman authors often considerably underestimated the degree of conservatism actually present in their writings. Eighteenth century Whig translators in England and America celebrated such ancient authors as Polybius and Cicero for their opposition to “tyranny” and their defense of balanced governments, but often underestimated the aristocratic bias present in these works.

For the influence of the classical tradition in America, see Richard Gummere, *The American Colonial Mind and the Classical Tradition* (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1963); Peter Gay, “The First Enlightenment,” in *The Enlightenment: An Interpretation. The Rise of Modern Paganism* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1967), 72-126; Patrick Cruttwell, “The Eighteenth Century: A Classical Age?” *Arion: A Journal of the Humanities and the Classics* 7, no. 1 (Spr. 1968): 110-32; Henry S. Commager, “The American Enlightenment and the Ancient World: A Study in Paradox,” *MHS Proc.* 83 (1971): 3-15; Edmund B. Hunt, “The Rebels and the Ancients: The Use of Ancient Classics in American Polemical Literature, 1763-1776” (PhD diss., Ohio State, 1974); Edwin A. Miles, “The

to value balanced government, rotation in office, and an active and informed citizenry.⁵⁰ It also taught Americans to fear military might and the corrupting power of wealth. The importance of moderation in government and the rule of law were stressed both by the ancient authors and their modern translators and popularizers. As Black noted about eighteenth century Roman historian Edward Gibbon, “[t]he Roman genius for toleration, law, and order, the complete absence of fanaticism, the *Pax Romana* which safeguarded the world...this was conceived by Gibbon as the normal and necessary basis of civil society in the world, departure from which spells disaster

Young American Nation and the Classical World,” *Journal of the History of Ideas* 35, No. 2 (Apr. 1974): 259-74; Meyer Reinhold, ed., *The Classick Pages: Classical Reading of Eighteenth-Century Americans* (University Park: Pennsylvania State UP, 1975), and “The Quest for ‘Useful Knowledge’ in Eighteenth-Century America,” *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 199, no. 2 (Apr. 1975): 108-32; John W. Eadie, ed., *Classical Traditions in Early America* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1976); Paul MacKendrick, “This Rich Source of Delight: The Classics and the Founding Fathers,” *Classical Journal* 72 (1977): 97-106; Susan F. Wiltshire, ed., *The Usefulness of Classical Learning in the Eighteenth Century* (University Park, PA: American Philological Association, 1977); Louis Cohn-Haft, “The Founding Fathers and Antiquity: A Selective Passion,” *Smith College Studies in History* 66 (1980): 137-53; Frank M. Turner, “British Politics and the Demise of the Roman Republic: 1700-1939,” *Historical Journal* 29, no. 3 (Sept. 1986): 577-99; Paul Rahe, *Republics Ancient and Modern: Classical Republicanism and the American Revolution* (Chapel Hill: UNC Press, 1992); Susan F. Wiltshire, *Greece, Rome, and the Bill of Rights* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1992); Carl J. Richard, *The Founders and the Classics: Greece, Rome, and the American Enlightenment* (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1994); Stanley M. Burnstein, “The Classics and the American Republic,” *History Teacher* 30, no. 1 (Nov. 1996): 29-44; and Eran Shalev, “Ancient Masks, American Fathers: Classical Pseudonyms during the American Revolution and Early Republic,” *JER* 23, no. 2 (Sum. 2003): 151-72, and “Rome on Western Shores: Classical Antiquity and Revolutionary America’s Quarrel with Time, 1756-1788” (PhD diss., Johns Hopkins University, 2005).

⁵⁰ The ancient writers of Greece and Rome provided the basis of the American educational system in this period. The classical world contributed a pantheon of heroes and villains who may have been more vividly alive to eighteenth century Americans than the characters from English history. Carl Richard described the eighteenth century educational system in America as “classical conditioning” that provided Colonial Americans with a “common vocabulary.” According to Richard, classical works particularly influenced colonial American thought in the realm of politics, providing arguments for checks and balances, natural law, safeguards against tyranny, and a conception of public virtue. Richard, *The Founders and the Classics: Greece, Rome, and the American Enlightenment*. Meyer Reinhold showed that classical authors continued to dominate American education to end of the eighteenth century, despite some criticism on both religious and utilitarian grounds: Reinhold, “The Quest for ‘Useful Knowledge’ in Eighteenth-Century America,” 108-32.

to the body politic of mankind.”⁵¹ Classical authors generally disliked the ancient democracies, which they saw as too unrestrained and prone to manipulation. Their ideal was Republican Rome, with its government balanced between the consuls, representing the monarchical aspects of society, the Senate, representing the aristocratic elements, and the Assembly, representing the free people at large.

A second important source of the American Enlightenment ideals was the Radical Whig writers of England’s Commonwealth period and late seventeenth century. This intellectual heritage, of Algernon Sidney and John Locke, was kept alive in England and America by the radical English Whig writers of the eighteenth century.⁵² English Whig writings stressed the need for constant vigilance on the part of citizenry to ensure that their government did not grow arbitrary or corrupt. The Whig writers believed a republic could not survive without virtuous citizens, and virtue was measured by the active participation of its citizenry in the promotion of the public welfare. The Radical Whigs’ ideological views supported their reform agenda

⁵¹ Black, *Art of History*, 164.

⁵² For the formation of English Whig thought, see principally Caroline Robbins, *The Eighteenth-Century Commonwealthmen. Studies in the Transmission, Development and Circumstances of English Liberal Thought from the Restoration of Charles II until the War with the Thirteen Colonies* (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1959); H. Trevor Colbourn, *The Lamp of Experience: Whig History and the Intellectual Origins of the American Revolution* (Chapel Hill: UNC Press, 1965); J. G. A. Pocock, “Machiavelli, Harrington and English Political Ideologies in the Eighteenth Century,” *WMQ* 22, no. 4 (Oct. 1965): 549-83; Bernard Bailyn, *Ideological Origins of the American Revolution* (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1967); 567-81; Pocock, *The Machiavellian Moment: Florentine Political Thought and the Atlantic Republican Tradition* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1975); Richard Ashcraft and M. M. Goldsmith, “Locke, Revolution Principles, and the Formation of Whig Ideology,” *Historical Journal* 26, no. 4 (Dec. 1983): 773-800; Isaac Kramnick, *Republicanism and Bourgeois Radicalism: Political Ideology in Late Eighteenth-Century England and America* (London: Cornell UP, 1990); and John P. Reid, *The Ancient Constitution and the Origins of Anglo-American Liberty* (DeKalb: Northern Illinois UP, 2005).

Trevor Colbourn notes that Radical Whig views were sharply influenced by the Glorious Revolution of 1688. All English Whig writers celebrated the initial event, but radical Whig historians painted a picture of a promising beginning quickly sunk into decline, due to Parliamentary corruption and general English decadence: Colbourn, “The Colonial Perspective: Tudors, Stuarts, and Hanoverians,” in *Lamp of Experience*, 40-58.

for England, which including a greater rotation in office, franchise reform, religious tolerance for dissenters, and an end to clerical oversight of the education system. The Radical Whigs' influence was limited in eighteenth-century Britain, but had great appeal in America.

A third intellectual source for the American Enlightenment came from the writers of contemporary Europe. Paul Rahe noted that there was a small pantheon of British and European authors who held near-sacred authority on political matters in eighteenth century America. Citations to Montesquieu, Blackstone, Locke and Hume predominated in American debates on political literature in the period from 1760 to 1805. In Rahe's view, these authors held unquestionable authority to Americans on the subject of political liberty, particularly Montesquieu: "[n]o one did more to shape American thinking with respect to the constitution of liberty in modern times." Montesquieu's largest contributions to American thought were the concepts of moderation in government, and the proper separations of powers. Montesquieu stressed limitations on the powers of each branch of a government, as the best means to keep each from growing too dominant and thus threatening the liberty of the citizens. According to the *Spirit of the Laws*, if "the power of judging" were not somehow "kept separate from the legislative power and the executive power, there is no liberty."⁵³

⁵³ Paul Rahe, "Montesquieu and the Constitution of Liberty," in *America and Enlightenment Constitutionalism*, ed. Gary L. McDowell and Jonathan O'Neill (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006), 125, 136, 139. Paul Spurlin also cited Montesquieu's *Spirit of the Laws* as the most influential work of the American Enlightenment, with Rollin and Voltaire dominating in history: Paul M. Spurlin, *The French Enlightenment in America: Essays on the Times of the Founding Fathers* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1984), and *Montesquieu in America, 1760-1801* (Baton Rouge: LSU Press, 1940).

As Carl Richard noted, these intellectual traditions generally reinforced one another, as they taught similar values: accountability in government, the need for virtuous leadership, the importance of religious tolerance, and the power of human reason as an instrument to reform society. According to Richard, “[t]here was but one worthy tradition, the tradition of liberty.”⁵⁴ Richard argued that the debate over whether the dominant ideology of Colonial America was more nostalgic and “republican” or more forward-looking and “liberal” misses the point, as the political worldview of eighteenth century America contained aspects of both mentalities, and was perfectly capable of sustaining intellectual contradictions and differing emphases within it.

⁵⁴ Richard, *The Founders and the Classics*, 183. Note, for example, John Adams’ *Novanglus* letter of Jan. 23, 1775, which mixes English, classical and European Enlightenment authors together indiscriminately: “These are what are called revolution principles. They are the principles of Aristotle and Plato, of Livy and Cicero, of Sidney, Harrington, and Locke. The principles of nature and eternal reasons. The principles on which the whole government over us now stands.” John Adams and Daniel Leonard, *The American Colonial Crisis: The Daniel Leonard-John Adams Letters to the Press 1774-1775*, ed. Bernard Mason (New York: Harper & Row, 1972), 103.

For some of the historiography in the debate over whether the dominant ideology of Colonial America was “republican,” meaning backward-looking, communal, and obsessed with concepts of virtue, or “liberal,” meaning forward-looking, individualistic, and capitalist, see Robert E. Shalhope, “Toward a Republican Synthesis: The Emergence of an Understanding of Republicanism in American Historiography,” *WMQ* 29, no. 1 (Jan. 1972): 49-80; Joyce Appleby, “Liberalism and the American Revolution,” *NEQ* 49, no. 1 (Mar. 1976): 3-26; Isaac Kramnick, “Republican Revisionism Revisited,” *AHR* 87, no. 3 (Jun. 1982): 629-64; Robert E. Shalhope, “Republicanism and Early American Historiography,” *WMQ* 39, no. 2 (Apr. 1982): 334-56; Appleby, “Republicanism and Ideology,” *American Quarterly* 37, no. 4 (Aut. 1985): 461-73; Linda K. Kerber, “The Republican Ideology of the Revolutionary Generation,” *American Quarterly* 37, no. 4 (Aut. 1985): 474-95; Cathy Matson, and Peter Onuf, “Toward a Republican Empire: Interest and Ideology in Revolutionary America,” *American Quarterly* 37, no. 4 (Aut. 1985): 496-531; Appleby, “Republicanism in Old and New Contexts,” *WMQ* 43, no. 1 (Jan. 1986): 20-34; T. H. Breen, “‘Baubles of Britain’: The American and Consumer Revolutions of the Eighteenth Century,” *Past and Present* 119 (May 1988): 73-104; Appleby, *Liberalism and Republicanism in the Historical Imagination* (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1992); Richard R. Beeman, “Deference, Republicanism, and the Emergence of Popular Politics in Eighteenth-Century America,” *WMQ* 49, no. 3 (Jul. 1992): 401-30; Daniel T. Rogers, “Republicanism: The Career of a Concept,” *JAH* 79, no. 1 (Jun. 1992): 11-38; Breen, “Narrative of Commercial Life: Consumption, Ideology, and Community on the Eve of the American Revolution,” *WMQ* 50, no. 3 (Jul. 1993): 471-501; and Breen, “Ideology and Nationalism on the Eve of the American Revolution: Revisions *Once More* in Need of Revising,” *JAH* 84, no. 1 (Jun. 1997): 13-39.

Within the American Enlightenment tradition, the enlightened historian fulfilled a crucial role.⁵⁵ A key belief among eighteenth century thinkers was that history had its value largely in teaching moral lessons from the past, as “philosophic history.”⁵⁶ The Enlightenment generally accepted a classical view of mankind that saw human nature as fundamentally unchanging. Thus, one could observe in history weaknesses that destroyed governments, and qualities that made leaders great or poor, and apply them to the present.⁵⁷ Philosophic history rejected the older, religiously-oriented “Golden Age” view of history, which generally depicted history in terms of a

⁵⁵ Trevor Colbourn noted in his investigation of colonial libraries that history was one of largest category of books collected by mid-eighteenth century Americans: “History and the Eighteenth-Century Colonist,” in *Lamp of Experience*, 20. For works examining the role of history in Enlightenment thought, see J. B. Black, *The Art of History: A Study of Four Great Historians of the Eighteenth Century* (New York: Russell & Russell, 1926; 1965); Carl Becker, “The New History: Philosophy Teaching by Example,” in *The Heavenly City of the Eighteenth-Century Philosophers* (New Haven: Yale UP, 1932), 71-118; Fredrick Engel-Janosi, “Politics and History in the Age of the Enlightenment,” *Journal of Politics* 5, no. 4 (Nov. 1943): 363-90; Stow Persons, “The Cyclical Theory of History in Eighteenth Century America,” *American Quarterly* 6, no. 2 (Sum. 1954): 147-63; H. Trevor Colbourn, “Jefferson’s Use of the Past,” *WMQ* 15 (1958): 56-70, and “John Dickinson, Historical Revolutionary,” *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 82 (1959): 271-92; Alfred Cobban, “The Historiography of the Enlightenment,” in *In Search of Humanity: The Role of the Enlightenment in Modern History* (New York, G. Braziller, 1960), 105-12; Allan Megill, “Aesthetic Theory and Historical Consciousness in the Eighteenth Century,” *History and Theory* 17, no. 1 (Feb. 1978): 29-62; David Carrithers, “Montesquieu’s Philosophy of History,” *Journal of the History of Ideas* 47, no. 1 (Jan. 1986): 61-80; Karen O’Brien, *Narratives of Enlightenment: Cosmopolitan History from Voltaire to Gibbon* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1997); and Clare Jackson, “Progress and Optimism,” and Johnson K. Wright, “Historical Writing in the Enlightenment World,” in *The Enlightenment World*, ed. Martin Fitzpatrick (London: Routledge, 2004), 177-93, 207-16.

⁵⁶ Carl Becker, “New History: Philosophy Teaching by Example,” in *The Heavenly City of the Eighteenth-Century Philosophers* (New Haven: Yale UP, 1932), 71-119. William Sloane called Hutchinson the “first philosophic American historian”: William M. Sloane, “History and Democracy,” *AHR* 1, no. 1 (Oct. 1895): 20.

⁵⁷ Douglass Adair noted that John Dickinson’s famous quote, “Experience must be our only guide. Reason may mislead us” has been often misunderstood as suggesting that colonial Americans favored practical experience over the lessons of history. To eighteenth century men, the historical events of the past were seen as “experience” no less than current events. It was abstract theory and philosophy, not history, which Dickinson was warning about. Adair, “Experience must be our Only Guide,” in *Fame and the Founding Fathers*, ed. Trevor Colbourn (New York: W. W. Norton, 1974), 109-11.

moral decline from a simpler and more virtuous past.⁵⁸ Philosophic historians assumed that the present was better than the past, and that the future would be better still. Thus, enlightened historians had no difficulties applying their own value systems to the men and governments of former ages, and using history as “philosophy teaching by examples.”⁵⁹

HUTCHINSON’S ENLIGHTENMENT PRINCIPLES

Hutchinson had a clear familiarity with the main works of the American Enlightenment. While no account exists of the books contained in Hutchinson’s library, there are numerous classical and Enlightenment citations scattered throughout the *History*.⁶⁰ A 1768 essay Hutchinson wrote during the turmoil of the Townshend Duties protests, “Dialogue between an American and a European Englishman” is in some ways an extended commentary on Locke’s *Second Treatise on Government*.

⁵⁸ Stow Persons argued there were three distinct theories of history in the time period of American Enlightenment, which he dated 1740s-1812. The first was a religious or supernatural interpretation of history, where events were tied to the will of Divine Providence. These histories tended to glorify the earliest period of settlement as a time of greatest moral purpose. The second, which shared the declension pattern of the first, was the cyclical theory of history, which was closely tied to ideas of moral corruption. In this interpretation, civilizations resembled biological organisms, and inevitably decayed over time. The third concept was that of progress. Stow saw the first two types of historical frameworks dominating in the American colonial period, and dated the advent of the third phase to the period after the American Revolution. I argue by contrast that Hutchinson’s overall conceptualization of history was closer to a progress story than a tale of declension. Stow Persons, “The Cyclical Theory of History in Eighteenth Century America,” *American Quarterly* 6, no. 2 (Summer 1954): 147-63.

⁵⁹ The expression “history is philosophy teaching by examples” is Bolingbroke’s: Henry St. John, Viscount Bolingbroke, *Letters on the Study and Use of History* (London, 1752), 14, quoted by Colbourn, *Lamp of Experience*, p. 5.

⁶⁰ Locke, Montesquieu and Voltaire predominate among the Enlightenment authors cited in Hutchinson’s *History*. Among classical authors cited by Hutchinson, Cicero, Plutarch, Livy and Tacitus predominate. Hutchinson frequently quoted his classical sources in Latin in his footnotes, and Montesquieu and Voltaire in French. See for example his quotation of Cicero on standards of good leadership, *History* 1, ch. 2: 275, footnote *, and on the importance of ancestry, vol. 2, ch. 1: 11; and his quotations of Montesquieu on the duty of the state to ensure religious toleration, vol. 1, ch. 2: 190, footnote *, and the proper contributions of the clergy to the state, vol. 1, ch. 5: 377, footnote † (cross).

This work examined Locke's theories on the contractual nature of government and the right of resistance from both the Patriot and Loyalist perspectives.⁶¹ Hutchinson's overarching philosophy in the *History* showed an allegiance to the main ideals of what May described as the Moderate Enlightenment. Five of the most important of these were religious toleration, rationality, a classical republican conception of virtuous leadership, the importance of a rational balance of power in government, and an abiding respect for the rule of law. These are the ideals I will examine in the remainder of this chapter.

1. RELIGIOUS TOLERATION

One great gulf separating Hutchinson from his Puritan ancestors (and also from much of his source material) was Hutchinson's acceptance of the propriety of a complete separation of church and state, and the ideal of religious toleration. For Hutchinson, the early Puritans' dedication to religious orthodoxy was not a virtue, but rather a species of intolerant narrow-mindedness and ignorance that led them to persecute minorities and that sowed dissention within their communities. Hutchinson regretted that his ancestors had ever attempted to "make windows into men's souls."

Hutchinson was particularly uncomfortable with the theocratic nature of seventeenth century Massachusetts government and the power held by the ministers over the secular government. Regarding the Puritan restriction of the franchise to full church members, he noted that such a law would have been seen as despotic if

⁶¹ A modern edition of the dialogue has been published as "Dialogue between an American and a European Englishman," ed. Bernard Bailyn, *Perspectives in American History* 9 (1975): 343-411. In 1772, Hutchinson wrote that he had first read Locke's essay on religious toleration in college and immediately agreed with it: TH to ___, Aug. 27, 1772, Mass. Archives 27, p. 377.

imposed by the English king. Commenting on the franchise restriction, he remarked, “[t]his was a most extraordinary order or law...Had they been deprived of their civil privileges in England by an act of parliament, unless they would join in communion with the churches there, it might very well have been the first in the roll of grievances.”⁶² Hutchinson went on to add that the restriction was made more onerous by the difficult requirement for full membership in the Congregational churches.

Hutchinson bemoaned his ancestors’ determination to pry into personal religious beliefs. In discussing fast days, Hutchinson recognized the usefulness of such communal events, but regretted the law that made church attendance compulsory: “[i]t would have been as well, perhaps, if this provision had been omitted.”⁶³ Hutchinson blamed government-mandated participation in religious ceremonies with encouraging hypocrisy, by forcing citizens to maintain an outward show of piety regardless of personal beliefs. Such government interference in what should be private matters corrupted both church and state.

Hutchinson also demonstrated his Enlightenment rationality in his lack of patience with all accounts of miraculous wonders. Unlike the seventeenth century historians of Massachusetts, and even contemporary historians Daniel Neal and Thomas Prince, Hutchinson’s ascribed to a wholly secular understanding of causation. Divine Providence played little to no role in the progress of Massachusetts history. Hutchinson had particular scorn for historians who attributed any event, large or small, to the will of the divine. Hutchinson mocked one colonial superstition that

⁶² *History* 1, ch. 1: 25.

⁶³ *History* 1, ch. 4: 362-63.

attributed bad harvests to curses placed on the colony by the Quaker martyrs: “an idle opinion obtained among the vulgar, that since the execution of the Quakers, about a century past, wheat has always blasted.” Hutchinson noted that the problem was rather that the farmers were not sowing their crops soon enough.⁶⁴ Acceptance of miracles and other superstitious beliefs, to Hutchinson, was proof of ignorance and lack of rationality. That such supernatural explanations for events were accepted even by colonial leaders was proof, for Hutchinson, of the general ignorance of the age.

Hutchinson saw religious zeal as a failing that had led even some of Puritan Massachusetts’ best leaders into unjust invasions of liberty: “[o]ur best men have sometimes exceeded in their zeal for particular systems, and have endeavored to promote religion by invading natural and civil rights.”⁶⁵ Hutchinson was quick, however, to refute any suggestion that seventeenth century New Englanders had been more credulous or ignorant than their contemporaries in Europe and England. If Massachusetts’ reliance on Divine Providence seemed extreme, it was only because of the difficult circumstances in the new colony. Discussing the prevalence of miraculous explanations in William Hubbard’s history, Hutchinson noted “[t]his turn of mind was not peculiar, at this time, to the people of New England. It was prevalent in England. If the New-Englanders exceeded, the new scenes they had just entered

⁶⁴ *History* 1, ch. 5: 406, footnote *. Regarding the interpretations assigned to the death of Winslow’s horse by the Remonstrance petitioners opposing Massachusetts in the 1640s, Hutchinson remarked, “When party spirit or bigotry prevails, common accidents are often construed extraordinary interpositions of Providence.” *Ibid.*, 126, footnote † (cross).

⁶⁵ In his assessment of many of the early Puritan founders, Hutchinson praised those few leaders who had managed to rise above the general bigotry of their times. See for example his obituary footnote for John Stoddard, 1748, *History* 2, ch. 4: 330, footnote † (cross). See also Hutchinson’s comments on Richard Saltonstall, *Hutchinson Papers*, ed. Whitmore and Appleton, 2: 127, footnote 98; John Cotton, *Hutchinson Papers*, ed. Whitmore and Appleton, 2: 129, footnote 99; and John Stoddard, *History* 2, ch. 4: 330, footnote † (cross).

upon, may in some measure account for it.”⁶⁶ The distinction was not between a credulous province and a more sophisticated metropole, but rather a between a more generally ignorant past and the more rational present.

2. RATIONALITY AND DISTRUST OF ENTHUSIASM

A second major premise of the *History* was the importance of reason and moderation in government, and the danger of succumbing to irrationality. The *History* provided numerous examples of the tragedies that occurred when societies and their leaders allowed themselves to be swept away by prejudice and untrammelled emotion. Religious enthusiasm was one common source for “enthusiasm,” as Hutchinson termed it, but not the sole one. The forces of anger, fear and racial prejudice could also cause a normally rational people and its leaders to take leave of their senses.

Massachusetts’ early history, particularly its religious struggles and the Salem witch trials, presented Hutchinson with strong proof of the dangers of allowing politics to be led by popular passion rather than by reason. Repeatedly in his *History*, Hutchinson explicitly blamed Massachusetts’ worst miscarriages of justice on popular hysteria and emotional prejudices, particularly in cases where a generally competent leadership was overwhelmed by the intemperate passions of the people. Hutchinson pleaded that rational government needed to be protected from both impulsive passions and unthinking prejudices.

For Hutchinson, the events at Salem in 1692 would cast a long shadow over Massachusetts history.⁶⁷ Hutchinson found the entire episode shocking and

⁶⁶ Ibid., 109-10, footnote *.

incredible. The “tragical scene”⁶⁸ had a profound impact on his overall understanding of human nature. Hutchinson described the Salem outbreak as “as strange an infatuation as any people were ever under. A considerable number of innocent persons were sacrificed to the distempered imagination, or perhaps wicked hearts, of such as pretended to be bewitched.”⁶⁹ Salem demonstrated, in a graphic manner, many of the elements Hutchinson feared most in society: the power of emotionalism run rampant and unrestrained by law, the danger of religious prejudice, ignorance and zealotry, and the contagious nature of “enthusiasm.”

Hutchinson was disgusted both by the credulity of the populace in accepting the witchcraft accusations, and the insensate cruelty shown towards the victims. Discussing the case of Giles Corey, the only person pressed to death in New England’s history, Hutchinson remarked that such atrocities resulted from prejudice and religious zealotry: “[I]n all ages of the world superstitious credulity has produced greater cruelty than is practised among the Hottentots, or other nations, whose belief

⁶⁷ The Salem witchcraft panic of 1692 is, of course, one of the most studied episodes in colonial American history. For some of the recent works on the Salem witchcraft trials, see Marc Mappen, ed., *Witches and Historians: Interpretations of Salem* (Huntington, NY: R. E. Krieger Pub. Co., 1980); John P. Demos, *Entertaining Satan: Witchcraft and the Culture of Early New England* (New York: Oxford UP, 1982); Carol F. Karlsen, *The Devil in the Shape of a Woman: Witchcraft in Colonial New England* (New York: Norton, 1987); Richard Godbeer, *The Devil’s Dominion: Magic and Religion in Early New England* (New York: Cambridge UP, 1992); Larry Gragg, *The Salem Witch Crisis* (Westport: Praeger, 1992); Bernard Rosenthal, *Salem Story: Reading the Witch Trials of 1692* (New York: Cambridge UP, 1993); Elaine G. Breslaw, *Tituba: Reluctant Witch of Salem: Devilish Indians and Puritan Fantasies* (New York: NYUP, 1996); Peter C. Hoffer, *The Devil’s Disciples: Makers of the Salem Witchcraft Trials* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1996); Elizabeth Reis, *Damned Women: Sinners and Witches in Puritan New England* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1997); and Mary Beth Norton, *In the Devil’s Snare: The Salem Witchcraft Crisis of 1692* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2002). Hutchinson’s interpretation of the Salem outbreak anticipated the main thesis of Norton’s recent work—that the chaos of King Philip’s War helped lead to the Salem trials. Hutchinson blamed the Salem trials on the chaos produced both by the continuing Indian frontier wars and the unsettled state of Massachusetts government in 1692 due to the charter crisis.

⁶⁸ *History* 2, ch. 1: 17.

⁶⁹ *History* 1, ch. 2: 351.

of a deity is called in question.”⁷⁰ The eighteenth century author could not fathom how the accusers could possibly be believed by rational humans: “[i]s it possible the mind of man should be capable of such strong prejudices as that a suspicion of fraud should not immediately arise? But attachments to modes and forms in religion had such force, that some of these circumstances seem rather to have confirmed the credit of the children.”⁷¹ Hutchinson went on to note, however, that his province was not unique in accepting such beliefs in this time period: Hutchinson remarked that similar beliefs in witchcraft and other superstitions guided the leadership even in England in this time period: “[s]hall we wonder at the New-England magistrates, when we find such characters as Lord Chief Justice Hale &c. soon after chargeable with as great delusion?”⁷²

The smallpox epidemic of 1720 presented Hutchinson with another example of the dangers that irrationality and popular enthusiasm posed to society and government.⁷³ During this outbreak, inoculations were introduced into the province for the first time. Despite the support of Cotton Mather, as well as the foremost doctor of Boston, Zabdiel Boylston, popular suspicion of the procedure almost prevented its implementation, and the proponents of inoculation were harassed and threatened in the streets. Mather was physically assaulted, and someone lobbed an incendiary

⁷⁰ *History* 2, ch. 1: 44-45.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 15.

⁷² *Ibid.*, 129. See also *History* 1, ch. 2: 191, footnote *.

⁷³ Coverage of the smallpox inoculation hysteria is in the *History* 2, ch. 3: 205-08. John B Blake, “The Inoculation Controversy in Boston: 1721-1722,” *NEQ* 25, no. 4 (Dec. 1952): 489-506, has a good overview of the crisis.

device into his nephew's sickroom.⁷⁴ Eventually the Massachusetts House, seized by hysteria, moved to condemn inoculation, but was fortunately overridden by the wiser heads of the Council.

As Hutchinson presented the smallpox inoculation crisis, fear of the new medical procedure was tied not only to general ignorance but also to lingering religious credulity, even in the early eighteenth century. Opponents of inoculation urged “that the practice was to be condemned as trusting more to the machination of men, than to the all wise providence of God in the ordinary course of nature.”⁷⁵ Hutchinson noted in relation to the tumult: “SUCH is the force of prejudice.—all orders of men, in that day, in greater or lesser proportion, condemned a practice which is now generally approved and to which many thousands owe the preservation of their lives.”⁷⁶

Hutchinson also had experienced the effect of popular “enthusiasm” personally at several points in his earlier career. The Knowles impressment riot of 1747 happened while Hutchinson was Speaker of the Massachusetts House. An attempt by a British press gang to seize men from the Boston waterfront caused a riot which lasted for days. The rioting sailors eventually took several British officers hostage. While generally sympathetic (for a time, Hutchinson acted as a mediator between the mob leaders and the military commanders), Hutchinson noted that the rioting crowd was unpredictable and hence dangerous, and tended not to discriminate

⁷⁴ *History* 2, ch. 3: 207.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 207.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, 208.

between its victims. Hutchinson claimed that while “all orders resented” the impressment efforts, “the lower class were beyond measure enraged and soon assembled with sticks, clubs, pitchmops &c.” While they had legitimate grievance, according to Hutchinson, they also attacked an “innocent lieutenant” who was uninvolved in the proceedings, and a deputy sheriff, who was attempting to restore order.⁷⁷ Hutchinson noted his approval of the behavior of the Massachusetts General Court and the Boston town leadership in this crisis. Both governmental agencies ultimately rejected the behavior of the crowd, although they shared similar concerns about the press gangs. Hutchinson remarked with regard to Boston’s town government: “the town, although they expressed their sense of the great insult and injury by the impress, condemned the tumultuous riotous acts of such as had insulted the governor and the other branches of the legislature and committed many other heinous offences.”⁷⁸

3. THE CLASSICAL IDEAL OF VIRTUOUS LEADERSHIP

Hutchinson saw the events of 1692, 1720 and 1747 as all showing both the dangers of popular enthusiasm, and the importance of independent-minded leadership, even if it needed to stand against the weight of popular opinion. A third Enlightenment value that strongly influenced Hutchinson’s work was the republican ideal of the virtuous, disinterested statesman. The figure of the one man standing bravely alone against the prejudices of the mob was a motif that ran throughout

⁷⁷ *History* 2, ch. 4: 330. Hutchinson’s coverage of the Knowles riot is 330-33.

⁷⁸ *History* 2, ch. 3: 333.

Enlightenment works, and was ultimately derived from classical literature.⁷⁹ It was an ideal that clearly resonated with Hutchinson and a concept that surfaced repeatedly in his work.

Several of Hutchinson's own ancestors exemplified this trait of courageous independence for the author. During his coverage of the religious schisms of the

⁷⁹ The influence of civic republicanism in Revolutionary America has been hotly debated. For key works in on the republican mentality in colonial America, see H. Trevor Colbourn, *The Lamp of Experience: Whig History and the Intellectual Origins of the American Revolution* (New York, Norton, 1965); Bernard Bailyn, *Ideological Origins of the American Revolution* (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1967); Gordon Wood, *The Creation of the American Republic, 1776-1789* (New York: Norton, 1969); J. G. A. Pocock, *The Machiavellian Moment: Florentine Political Thought and the Atlantic Republican Tradition* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1975), and *Virtue, Commerce, and History: Essays on Political Thought and History, Chiefly in the Eighteenth Century* (New York: Cambridge UP, 1985); T. H. Breen, "'Baubles of Britain': The American and Consumer Revolutions of the Eighteenth Century," *Past and Present* 119 (May 1988): 73-104; Isaac Kramnick, *Republicanism and Bourgeois Radicalism: Political Ideology in Late Eighteenth-Century England and America* (London: Cornell UP, 1990); Milton M. Klein, Richard D. Brown, and John B. Hench, eds. *The Republican Synthesis Revisited: Essays in Honor of George Athan Billias* (Worcester: AAS, 1992); Wood, *The Radicalism of the American Revolution* (New York: A. A. Knopf, 1992); Breen, "Narrative of Commercial Life: Consumption, Ideology, and Community on the Eve of the American Revolution," *WMQ* 50, no. 3 (Jul. 1993): 471-501; J. C. D. Clark, *The Language of Liberty, 1660-1832: Political Discourse and Social Dynamics in the Anglo-American World* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1994); and Michael Zuckert, *P. Natural Rights and the New Republicanism* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1994).

For the historiographic debate on the relative influence of civic republicanism at the time of the Revolutionary crisis, see Isaac Kramnick, "Republican Revisionism Revisited," *AHR* 87, no. 3 (Jun. 1982): 629-64; Linda K. Kerber, "The Republican Ideology of the Revolutionary Generation," *American Quarterly* 37, no. 4 (Aut. 1985): 474-95; Jack N. Rakove, "Gordon S. Wood, the 'Republican Synthesis,' and the Path Not Taken," *WMQ* 44, no. 3 (Jul. 1987): 617-22; Joyce Appleby, *Liberalism and Republicanism in the Historical Imagination* (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1992); and Richard R. Beeman, "Deference, Republicanism, and the Emergence of Popular Politics in Eighteenth-Century America," *WMQ* 49, no. 3 (Jul. 1992): 401-30.

Drew McCoy argued that civic republicanism was a fundamental mode of thought for most Eighteenth-Century Americans that continued to shape their response to political events well into the Early National period: Drew R. McCoy, *The Elusive Republic: Political Economy in Jeffersonian America* (Chapel Hill: UNC Press, 1980).

For further information on the classical ideal of independent leadership in Greek and Roman literature, see Arthur M. Eckstein, *Moral Vision in the Histories of Polybius* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994), and F. W. Walbank, "Polybius' Perception of the One and the Many," in *Leaders and Masses in the Roman World: Studies in Honor of Zvi Yavetz*, ed. I. Malkin and Z. W. Rubensohn (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1995): 201-22. Walbank remarked that Polybius saw "'the one' as an element dialectically engaged in various political constellations with 'the many.'" In Walbank's interpretation of Polybius, "[t]he people...do not normally assume the initiative. They are there to be played on, easily swayed, liable to lawless passions, irrational rage and violent anger": Walbank, "Polybius' Perception of the One and the Many," 206, 203. Eckstein noted that Polybius's obituaries of Scipio Africanus and Hannibal illustrated how the ancient historian's ideal of honorable conduct was principally that of a statesman above partisanship: Eckstein, *Moral Vision*, 273.

seventeenth century, Hutchinson noted the dissent of his great-grandfather, Captain Edward Hutchinson. Captain Hutchinson was a prominent member of the Massachusetts General Court in the 1650s and 1660s. As such, he spoke out on several occasions, when Massachusetts began passing legislation against the new religious sects of the mid-seventeenth century, particularly the Quakers and the Baptists.⁸⁰ When Massachusetts in 1661 decided to ban Quakers from the province upon pain of death, he and two other members of the General Court insisted on having their dissent noted in the decree. Edward Hutchinson later protested colonial laws that fined, imprisoned, and banished citizens for avowing Baptist beliefs. Edward Hutchinson signed several petitions on behalf of individual Baptists imprisoned by the state, an action which led him to be fined and rebuked by the General Court.⁸¹ In his coverage of the events in question, Hutchinson refrained from noting his own relationship to the man, but Edward Hutchinson's actions were repeatedly presented as examples of responsible behavior on the part of a Massachusetts magistrate.

In Hutchinson's view, brave and independent-minded leaders were particularly needed to protect the rights of minorities, either religious or ethnic, whose rights would otherwise be trampled by popular prejudice. In his coverage of the colony's Indian wars, Hutchinson took repeated notice of Daniel Gookin, the Indian Commissioner, who during King Philip's War stood almost alone in campaigning for

⁸⁰ Edward Hutchinson's petitions are logged in the Boston Town House records at the Boston Public Library. See also Hutchinson, *History* 1, ch. 1:169, and ch. 2: 196.

⁸¹ *History* 1, ch. 2: 196. For Edward Hutchinson's petition, see "Deposition of Edward Hutchinson," MHS Photostat, March 25, 1661.

fair treatment for the Christian Indians. Hutchinson noted that at times Gookin's detested opinions made him deeply unpopular in his province: "[h]e seems to have been the only magistrate who a few years before opposed the people in their rage against the Indians, friends and enemies without distinction"⁸² Gookin's actions as Commissioner exposed him to both ridicule from his colleagues in government, and threats of violence in the streets.

Hutchinson's acceptance of the classical republican ideal of leadership was demonstrated particularly in his presentation of his own father. Colonel Thomas Hutchinson might be the closest thing to a perfect hero in the *History*, and he is presented as very much a leader in the classical republican mode. Every time he appears in the narrative, his unselfish service, charitable impulses, and statesmanlike independence are stressed. In Colonel Hutchinson's death notice, his son eulogized him in terms that quite clearly evoke this ideal—an impartial and disinterested man, motivated by public virtue to serve his country, and unaffected by any desire for popularity or the passions of the "crowd." Hutchinson claimed the Colonel sacrificed his personal wealth to the public good, neglecting his commercial interests for his civic responsibilities. In politics, he was also not afraid to stand against the crowd: Of his father, Hutchinson wrote, "I wish that many of his posterity may so justly deserve the character of true friends to their country. Regardless of the frowns of a governor or the threats of the people he spoke and voted according to his judgment, attaching

⁸² *History* 1, ch. 2: 280. Gookin's account of King Philip's War was the only one of the more than twenty contemporary accounts published about the conflict to demonstrate sympathy for the Christian Indians; it remained unpublished until the nineteenth century. Daniel Gookin, *An Historical Account of the Doings and Sufferings of the Christian Indians in New England, in the Years 1675, 1676, 1677* (London, 1836; New York: Arno Press, 1972).

himself to no party any further than he found their measures tended to promote the public interest.”⁸³

That such disinterested behavior would garner no popularity was expected in classical republican thinking. One important attribute of a virtuous leader was that he would not sacrifice his judgment to the whims of the crowd. Hutchinson later in his career quoted his father as advising him: “[d]epend upon it...if you serve your Country faithfully you will be reproached and reviled for doing it.”⁸⁴

Hutchinson presented his father’s republican leadership most notably in his depiction of the campaign over Massachusetts’ currency reform. Massachusetts began having problems with inflation in 1720, due to the issuance of paper money during their frontier wars. For the next several decades, the province debated various methods of improving the currency.⁸⁵ Colonel Hutchinson led the most conservative (and minority) party, which was dedicated to returning Massachusetts to a gold and silver standard. His son was quite succinct in explaining why currency was a

⁸³ *History 2*, ch. 4: 297, footnote *. See also Thomas Hutchinson to John Hely Hutchinson, Boston, Jan. 14, 1772, Mass. Archives 27: 299.

⁸⁴ Hutchinson to Israel Williams, Boston, Oct. 30, 1773; Israel Williams Papers, MHS, vol. 2, p. 171. Richard Beeman gave a succinct definition of the Classical republican ideal of leadership, as the eighteenth century understood it: “the difference between rightful, virtuous rulers and unworthy parvenus was the ability to subordinate private interest to the common good.” Beeman noted that this value system had contradictions within it, as it had both a “libertarian” side, stressing limitations on central authority, particularly royal officials, and an “elitist, virtue-oriented side,” which bemoaned populist politicking. Richard Beeman, “Deference, Republicanism, and the Emergence of Popular Politics in Eighteenth-Century America,” *WMQ* 49, no. 3 (Jul. 1992): 401-30, quotation p. 401. See also *The Varieties of Political Experience in Eighteenth-Century America* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004), which accords a central role to republican ideals of leadership.

⁸⁵ The records of the Massachusetts currency controversies are in the *Acts and Resolves, Public and Private, of the Province of the Massachusetts Bay*, Vol. 2 (Boston, 1874): 875-76; and *Journals of the House of Representatives of Massachusetts, 1738-1739* (Boston, 1935). Hutchinson’s coverage of the currency controversies begins in *History 2*, ch. 2: 154-56, and runs intermittently through the remainder of Volume Two.

particularly difficult issue to resolve by democratic means: “the number of debtors is always more than the number of creditors.”⁸⁶

Currency reform, for both Colonel Hutchinson and his son, was not merely a financial issue, but a moral one. The lieutenant governor argued that an inflationary currency actually harmed society’s most vulnerable members—widows and orphans living on interest, and the ministers, who had set allowances—and also damaged respect for the government behind it. “The influence a bad currency has upon the morals of the people is greater than is generally imagined” as it also eventually caused a desperate people to resort to numerous ill-thought-out schemes to rectify it.⁸⁷ Furthermore, inflationary currency weakened the state’s overall moral authority. It lessened respect for a government that would issue fraudulent tender, and ultimately undercut respect for all government. Hutchinson cited his father’s lifelong opposition to inflationary currency as an example of virtuous statesmanship standing upon principle despite overwhelming popular opposition: “He was an enemy, all his life, to a depreciating currency, upon a principle very ancient, but too seldom practiced upon, *nil utile quod non honestum*.”⁸⁸

4. GOVERNMENTAL BALANCE OF POWER

A key focus of much Enlightenment writing was the search for a rational, just form of government. This was generally expressed as a proper balance of the natural orders of society in the branches of their government. Hutchinson was an adherent of

⁸⁶ *History 2*, ch. 3: 325.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, 174-75, quote p. 174.

⁸⁸ “Nothing is useful which is not honest”—translation mine. *History 2*, ch. 2: 155.

classical balance-of-power theories; he quoted Montesquieu at several points in his *History*.⁸⁹ The author's distaste for popular tumult and his stress on the "rule of law" did not mean that he favored an absolutist system of government where the king (or his governor) could do no wrong. What he wished to see functioning in Massachusetts was a properly balanced three-part governmental system, where the governor, Council, and House of Representatives were each independent enough to act as a check on the others.

In Volume Two of the *History*, Hutchinson described at great length the battles between the early royal governors and the House over their respective privileges. Hutchinson faulted the Massachusetts Assemblymen for their refusal to recognize the governor's authority under the new charter. Hutchinson particularly disapproved of the House's determination to use the governor's salary to control his actions. For Hutchinson, the issue was not merely about respect for royal authority, it was also about maintaining a proper balance of power: "to compel the governor to any particular measure, by making his support, in whole or in part, depend upon it, is said to be inconsistent with that freedom of judgment, in each branch of the legislature, which is the glory of the English constitution."⁹⁰ Hutchinson also chastised Shute's House of Representatives for their attempt to usurp the governor's handling of military matters related to the ongoing frontier wars: "[t]his was unprecedented...it was an assuming the power given to one branch only, the governor, and then devolving it to a few of their own number. Such innovations are

⁸⁹ See for example *History* 1, ch. 1: 13, footnote *, and ch. 1:190, footnote *.

⁹⁰ *History* 2, ch. 3: 192.

dangerous. They may be improved to serve the purposes of an arbitrary prince or governor, as well as those of a popular faction.”⁹¹

Hutchinson noted with irritation that the Shute House, embroiled in this and other disputes over the governor’s authority, became so antagonistic toward the governor that in protest they neglected most other business for two years. Hutchinson saw this as an abdication of the representatives’ responsibility as leaders, noting that they were doing this in the midst of an Indian war in Maine, problems with the French, a smallpox epidemic, runaway inflation, and a trade recession.⁹² Hutchinson was particularly struck by the House’s refusal to move to Cambridge as directed in the midst of the smallpox epidemic: “[t]here was a quorum...who chose to risque their lives rather than concede that the governor had power, by his own act, to remove the court from Boston.”⁹³ By contrast, Hutchinson praised Shute’s Council, which refused to become embroiled in the battle of wills and attempted to mediate between the two sides. Hutchinson saw their behavior as an excellent example of independent behavior by one branch of the government to correct the excesses of other two: “[t]his was an instance of public spirit worthy of imitation.”⁹⁴

While Hutchinson’s criticisms of Massachusetts government in the *History* were most often fixed on the behavior of the legislature, in his analysis of

⁹¹ Ibid., 214. Hutchinson in a footnote further remarked that such innovations could be used by any of the branches to improve their own power, noting as an example Richard II’s changes in Parliamentary procedure to pack the legislature with his supporters: 214, footnote *.

⁹² *History* 2, ch. 3: 182-96.

⁹³ Ibid., 201. Like the governor’s salary issue, the Massachusetts governor’s right to relocate the General Court was a matter which would haunt Hutchinson in his own administration. Hutchinson’s writing on the Shute and Burnet administrations predates his own experiences in the Revolutionary crisis.

⁹⁴ *History* 2, ch. 3: 227.

Massachusetts' history, all three branches of the government could and did exceed their authority at times. Hutchinson censored both Shute and his successor William Burnet for their high-handedness in dealing with their legislatures. Hutchinson noted Shute's refusal to allow a remonstrance from the General Court to be printed: "[h]e made a very great mistake and told the committee, that his majesty had given him the power of the press and he would not suffer it to be printed. This doctrine would have done well enough in the reigns of the Stuarts. In the present age it is justly exceptionable"⁹⁵ Hutchinson also objected to Shute's attempt to order Maine residents to remain in their homes in the face of an Indian attack in order to guard the territory: "[n]o wonder the proclamation was not obeyed. I know no authority he had to require them to remain."⁹⁶ Of Burnet, governor in the 1720s, Hutchinson remarked that many of his problems as governor stemmed from his arrogant treatment of the other two branches of government: "[h]e did not know the temper of the people of New-England. They have a strong sense of liberty and are more easily drawn than driven."⁹⁷

5. THE RULE OF LAW

Hutchinson's Enlightenment values reinforced one another at many points. Hutchinson's emphasis on independent leadership was reinforced by his fear of irrationality and popular hysteria, and his belief in the rule of law was fed by many of the same fears. Only a strong and just legal system could protect the individual liberty

⁹⁵ Ibid., 174.

⁹⁶ Ibid., 196.

⁹⁷ Ibid., 276, 277.

of its citizens. A weak or unstable government meant that leaders could not act as restraints on the populace at large in times of crisis. The situation at Salem in 1692 fully proved this point to him. Salem in 1692 was a perfect storm for Hutchinson: a populace seized by hysteria, a government in disarray due to uncertainties over the Massachusetts charter, a leadership abdicating their role as a restraint on popular passions, and most seriously, the complete breakdown of the court system and the abandonment of a fair and impartial rule of law.

The Salem trials demonstrated what happened when government allowed itself to yield to popular pressure, and political and judicial systems were corrupted by pressure from the people at large. Throughout New England's earlier period, there had been few successful witchcraft convictions, despite overwhelming popular belief in witches and frequent accusations. The moderating influence was the colonial court system, which restrained the populace in times of panic.⁹⁸

Hutchinsons' coverage of the events at the Salem trials was his most detailed coverage of any particular event until the Revolutionary crisis of his own time. Stylistically, it presents a striking break in the work. Hutchinson discussed the Salem trials as if he were counsel for the defense. For over thirty pages, he broke off the flow of his narrative to point up the bad law, gaps in evidence and logical absurdities of the trials one by one.⁹⁹

⁹⁸ Hutchinson did note that the system had broken down occasionally in the past, when popular fears overshot the magistrates' ability to control them. Describing such a case, the 1655 trial of Ann Hibbins, where popular pressure forced the hand of the General Court, Hutchinson remarked, "[t]he jury brought her in guilty, but the magistrates refused to accept the verdict; so the cause came to the general court, where the popular clamour prevailed against her, and the miserable old woman was condemned and executed": *History* 1, ch. 1: 160.

⁹⁹ *History* 2, ch. 1: 12-47. For the irregularity of the Salem trials, even by seventeenth-century legal standards, see Sanford J. Fox, *Science and Justice: The Massachusetts Witchcraft Trials*

As Hutchinson presented it, the confusion of government in the inter-charter period immediately previous to the outbreak had weakened respect for the law, as well as causing confusion in court jurisdiction at the time of the trials. This weakness led to a lamentable absence of checks and balances in the system set up to try the cases. Hutchinson was not certain if the new court of Oyer and Terminer that assumed responsibility for the Salem trials was even legal under the new charter. The fact that this new institution of dubious legality presided over cases of life and death was incredible to him.¹⁰⁰

Hutchinson noted other departures from customary legal procedure. Like other eighteenth century commentators, Hutchinson objected to the Salem court's acceptance of spectral evidence, a type of "proof" never before accepted in colonial witchcraft cases.¹⁰¹ Hutchinson's biggest condemnation, however, was not for the admission of spectral evidence, but rather for the flagrant witness tampering evident in the trial records. Hutchinson went into considerable detail in citing the coaching of witnesses by examiners, and the evidence of false or contradictory witness statements: "[i]nstead of suspecting and sifting the witnesses, and suffering them to be cross examined, the authorities, to say no more, were imprudent in making use of leading questions, and thereby putting words into their mouths or suffering others to

(Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1968); David Levin, "Did the Mathers Disagree about the Salem Witch Trials?" *AAS Proc.* 95, no. 1 (1985): 19-37; Daniel G. Payne, "Defending against the Indefensible: Spectral Evidence at the Salem Witchcraft Trials," *Essex Institute Historical Collections* 129, no. 1 (1993): 62-83; Wendel D. Craker, "Spectral Evidence, Non-Spectral Acts of Witchcraft, and Confession at Salem in 1692," *Historical Journal* 40, no. 2 (Jun. 1997): 331-58; and Peter C. Hoffer, *The Salem Witchcraft Trials: A Legal History* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1997).

¹⁰⁰ *History* 2, ch. 1: 37.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*, 44.

do it.”¹⁰² The lieutenant governor’s account detailed at length the travesties of justice presided over by the Salem judges.

While Hutchinson himself clearly found the entire question of witchcraft ridiculous,¹⁰³ what happened in Salem was doubly troubling for him because the legal system failed to adhere even to the procedures accepted at the time. Their abdication of responsibility resulted not only in flagrant miscarriages of justice for the victims, but a general breakdown in social protections: “[n]o wonder the whole country was in consternation, when persons of sober lives and unblemished characters, were committed to prison upon such sort of evidence.”¹⁰⁴ The consequence of such a failure of government was a terrible period of fear and injustice:

“[t]he minds of people in general were seized with gloom and horror. The greater part were credulous and believed all they heard...the few, who believed the whole to be an imposture or delusion, were afraid to discover their sentiments, lest some who pretended to be bewitched should accuse them.”¹⁰⁵

Hutchinson took pains; however, to argue that the Salem outbreak was not due to the particular culture or religion of New England, but rather to emotionalism and credulity that people everywhere can fall victim to, and to the generally superstitious and credulous nature of the age.

“The great noise which the New England witchcrafts made throughout the English dominions, proceeded more from the general panick with which all sorts of persons were seized...than from the number of persons who were executed, more having been put to death in a single county in England, in a short space of time,

¹⁰² Ibid., 21.

¹⁰³ Hutchinson made a rare sarcastic remark concerning a debate over venue in one case. No one was certain where to try the case, the accused’s body “being in Middlesex at the same time that her spectre and the body of the afflicted persons were in Essex.” *History* 2, ch. 1: 36.

¹⁰⁴ *History* 2, ch. 1: 23.

¹⁰⁵ Ibid., 9.

than have suffered in all New England from the first settlement until the present time.”¹⁰⁶

Hutchinson reminded his readers that even the most venerable of English jurists had composed anti-witchcraft legislation: “lawyers, then of the first character, who lay down rules of conviction, as absurd and dangerous as any which were practiced in New-England.”¹⁰⁷ Hutchinson mentioned in a footnote that the Scottish court had executed seven people for witchcraft in 1697, upon the testimony of a seven-year-old girl.¹⁰⁸ To the extent that particular conditions in New England contributed to the Salem hysteria, it was the unsettled nature of the government due to the transitional period between the two charters, which prevented the government and the court system from acting as a proper bulwark against enthusiasm and injustice.

Religious persecution, witch hunts and the frenzies of mob violence all stemmed from the same sources, in Hutchinson’s view—a society’s surrender to untrammelled enthusiasm and bigotry, and the abandonment of rationality, moderation and the rule of law. Both Hutchinson’s study of history and his general education taught him that the people at large were too often led astray, at least temporarily, by rank emotion, and too often acted out of ignorance. Moderation in government, virtuous, independent leadership, and a proper respect for the rule of law and the balance of powers was necessary to protect liberties, particularly those of religious or ethnic minorities, who were the most vulnerable members of society. Hutchinson’s intellectual background taught him to fear above all lawlessness, ignorance, and

¹⁰⁶ Ibid., 12.

¹⁰⁷ Ibid., 18.

¹⁰⁸ Ibid., 18, footnote *.

irrationality, the forces which had made the past an unpleasant place in which to live.

CHAPTER 3: THE RELIGIOUS SCHISMS

PURITAN MASSACHUSETTS, THE “CITY ON A HILL”

The colony of Massachusetts was settled in the early 1630s by a branch of English Calvinists who generally referred to themselves as “Reformed,” although their opponents would later dub them the “Puritans.”¹⁰⁹ Less radical than the Separatist sect that founded nearby Plymouth, the Puritans were not convinced of the utter depravity of the Church of England, but they wanted to see the English church “purified” of all remaining taint of Roman Catholicism. They were particularly opposed to the Church of England’s “high” church rituals, the hierarchy of bishops and archbishops, and to some elements of Anglican theology. Puritans insisted upon a “Doctrine of Grace,” which stressed salvation as an unmerited gift from God, rather than a “Doctrine of Works,” which held that an individual could in some manner earn salvation through a godly life. As staunch followers of Calvin’s Doctrine of Predestination, they believed that the Anglicans leaned too close to an Arminian understanding of grace, in which an individual could aid in his own salvation. In

¹⁰⁹ For some key works on the tenets of Puritanism, and the structure of early Puritan Massachusetts, see Perry Miller, *Orthodoxy in Massachusetts, 1630-1650: A Genetic Study* (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1933), *The New England Mind: The Seventeenth Century*, (New York: Macmillan, 1939), and *Errand into the Wilderness* (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1956); Edmund S. Morgan, “New England Puritanism: Another Approach,” *WMQ* 18, no. 2 (Apr. 1961): 236-42; David D. Hall, ed., *Puritanism in Seventeenth-Century Massachusetts* (New York: Holt Rinehart & Winston, 1968); Stephen Foster, *Their Solitary Way: The Puritan Social Ethic in the First Century of Settlement in New England* (New Haven: Yale UP, 1971); Sacvan Bercovitch, ed., *The American Puritan Imagination: Essays in Revaluation* (New York: Cambridge UP, 1974); James W. Jones, *The Shattered Synthesis: New England Puritanism before the Great Awakening* (New Haven: Yale UP, 1973); Philip F. Gura, *A Glimpse of Zion’s Glory: Puritan Radicalism in New England, 1620-1660* (Middletown: Wesleyan UP, 1984); Theodore D. Bozeman, *To Live Ancient Lives: The Primitivist Dimension in Puritanism* (Chapel Hill: UNC Press, 1988); Andrew Delbanco, *The Puritan Ordeal* (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1989); Stephen Foster, *The Long Argument: English Puritanism and the Shaping of New England Culture, 1570-1700* (Chapel Hill: UNC Press, 1991); Janice Knight, *Orthodoxies in Massachusetts: Rereading American Puritanism* (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1994); and James F. Cooper, Jr., *Tenacious of Their Liberties: The Congregationalists in Colonial Massachusetts* (New York: Oxford UP, 1999).

terms of organization, the Puritans insisted upon a simple Congregational framework of church government, without bishops, in which each minister was elected and supported by his own congregation.

The Puritans established religious goals for the Massachusetts settlement at the very outset. The settlers, who were leaving England to escape increasing pressure from the Anglican hierarchy under Archbishop Laud, hoped to establish in America the type of society they could not create in England. While their eighteenth-century descendants would later blur the point, the original settlers were in no manner believers in religious toleration or pluralism. They hoped to create a religiously pure and orthodox community that would run under more stringent regulations than were permissible back home. Massachusetts was to be a “Citty on a Hill,”¹¹⁰ an example of a true Christian community guided by Old Testament Biblical law and Calvinist doctrine.

The founders of Massachusetts held a clear vision of the type of society they wished to create. It was to be a covenanted society, guided by communitarian ideals, in which those individuals who could demonstrate proof of individual salvation wielded enormous power. These “Saints” or “Elect,” who had made public witness of their personal experience of God’s presence, were assumed to be a small minority of the general population. Within the Puritan faith, only those who had given accounts of their personal conversion experiences before their entire congregations and had been witnessed by their ministers were considered full church members.

¹¹⁰ The term originated in leader John Winthrop sermon, “A Modell of Christian Charity,” which was written onboard the *Arabella* en route to Massachusetts in 1630. For more information on this sermon’s impact, see Edmund S. Morgan, “John Winthrop’s ‘Modell of Christian Charity’ in a Wider Context,” *Huntington Library Quarterly* 50, no. 2 (Spr. 1987): 145-51.

The government established by the Puritans reflected their belief and the religious goals of the settlement. Early Massachusetts was not officially a theocracy, in that ministers were prohibited from holding civil office, but the ministry held a great deal of informal power. Furthermore, only those certified as full church members had the right to vote, hold office and serve on juries. Puritan society was organized around the churches, with the ministers maintained by required monetary contributions, and the establishment of new churches and new towns requiring the consent of existing congregations. Puritans accepted a hierarchical nature of society as part of their God's purpose, and enforced outward displays of rank and status. Preachers were expected to be well educated, and Harvard College was established within a few years of settlement for this purpose.

THE PROBLEM OF THE HERETICS

Throughout the better part of the seventeenth century, Massachusetts' history was shaped by its leaders' determination to maintain religious orthodoxy and govern according to scripture. From its earliest decade onward, the colony's theological struggles disrupted its government and damaged its relationship with neighboring colonies and England.¹¹¹ Religious schisms raged in Massachusetts for most of her first century of existence, and provided the Bay Colony with a steadily accumulating collection of enemies. In 1635, during the first decade of settlement, Salem minister Roger Williams became the first person banished for heretical opinions. Three years later, the Antinomian Crisis split the colony apart. Finally, in the 1650s and 1660s, the

¹¹¹ Kai Erikson, in a study of deviance in New England, argues that Massachusetts experienced three "crime waves" in the first six decades of its existence: the Antinomians, the Quakers, and the Salem witches: Kai Erikson, "The Antinomian Controversy," in *Wayward Puritans: A Study in the Sociology of Deviance* (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1966), 71-106.

appearance of the Quaker and Baptist sects and disputes within the Puritan ministry over the Half-Way Covenant created lasting schisms in both churches and communities. Massachusetts' religious battles would not end until the 1680s, when the colony's quest for orthodox purity was finally ended from without, by the power of the English government.

Massachusetts' early history presented quite a challenge for Thomas Hutchinson as a historian, in terms of contemporary politics. The province's "Citty on a Hill" past was still a contentious topic in Hutchinson's time. Massachusetts' theocratic roots had left a strong imprint on its eighteenth century culture. Many people within Hutchinson's province idealized the early days of settlement, and saw the founding era as a time of clearer purpose and community.¹¹² Eighteenth century ministers as well as some of Hutchinson's contemporary historians bemoaned the passing of the Puritan era. They recalled the first decades of settlement as a time of religious purity and communal values, less corrupt than the more secular and capitalistic age that followed.¹¹³ At the same time, Massachusetts' seventeenth-

¹¹² Both Edmund Morgan and David M. Scobey see Massachusetts' fixation on its own history as a phenomenon unique among the American colonies. According to Morgan, a sense of its own history was central to the New England mindset since its founding, and came out of the Puritan tradition of Massachusetts being the new Canaan. Scobey also claimed that New England's retelling of its past—and hence its formation of its separate, American identity—began as early as the colony's first and second generation. The works written by Winthrop and others of the founding generation established the initial justification for the New England colonies, and their place in the world and God's providence. By the second generation, however, these initial views had already taken several blows, due to events both in England and America. By the 1660s, New England's history and identity was already being rewritten, to accommodate the changing circumstances. Alienation from their past and guilt led the second generation to idealize the founders. Edmund Morgan, "Historians of Early New England," in Ray Billington, ed., *The Reinterpretation of Early American History: Essays by Ten Leading Historians of Colonial America* (New York, 1968): 41-63; David M. Scobey, "Revising the Errand: New England's Ways and the Puritan Sense of the Past," *WMQ* 41, no. 1 (Jan. 1984): 3-31.

¹¹³ See for example the work of eighteenth century historians Thomas Prince, Daniel Neal, and Samuel Niles: Thomas Prince, *A Chronological History of New-England in the Form of Annals: Being a Summary and Exact Account of the Most Material Transactions and Occurrences Relating to This Country...* 2 vols. (Boston: Kneeland & Green, 1736-1755); Daniel Neal, *The History of New-England:*

century history had many detractors. To many outside the province, the colony had been founded by men of dubious English loyalty, whose religious enthusiasm had led to arbitrary government at home, and treasonable actions against their mother country.

Hutchinson's own religious and moral values were vastly different from those held by his ancestors. While the lieutenant governor admired many aspects of Puritan Massachusetts, he saw their theocratic government as a violation of just precepts of law and liberty. Puritan ministers wielded much power within the colony's civil government, and the exclusion of non-Congregationalists from the franchise and from government and court systems violated precepts of just government. For Hutchinson, the religious schisms and persecutions that repeatedly beset the colony were too often fueled by emotion and prejudice. Religious quarrels led to violations of basic rights and sometimes to violence and bloodshed. Hutchinson took pains to demonstrate that the Puritans' insistence on religious orthodoxy caused dangerous, unnecessary disruptions to Massachusetts at a critical time in her development. Religious intolerance damaged the necessary social cohesion of the colony, and caused fractures in her communities. He presented the colony's strict orthodoxy as a leading cause of problems with England, which created significant ill will toward the colony.

Containing an Impartial Account of the Civil and Ecclesiastical Affairs of the Country, to the year of Our Lord, 1700 (London: A. Ward, 1747); Samuel Niles, "A Summary Historical Narrative of the Wars in New-England with the French and Indians, in the Several Parts of the Country," reprinted in *MHS Collections*, 3rd ser. 6 (1837): 154-279. This view of the founding era as a more virtuous age than succeeding generations lived on into the early nineteenth century for some New Englanders, as can be seen in John Davis' "Discourse before the Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston Dec. 22, 1813, at their Anniversary Commemoration of the First Landing of our Ancestors at Plymouth, in 1620," *MHS Collections* 2nd ser., 1 (1814): i-xxxi.

Hutchinson's *History* granted the founding generation credit for creating a stable society that flourished against overwhelming odds. He noted that many of their early critics were motivated by personal agendas, and exaggerated the failings of the colony to further their own goals. While he rejected the image of Puritan Massachusetts as the province's finest hour, he did credit the colonists with creating a settlement that ultimately had enriched the empire as a whole. To Hutchinson, the excesses of Puritan Massachusetts were not produced by something unique to the Congregational faith or Puritan society. They were simply the typical product of a more credulous and less enlightened age, and the difficulties of settlement in a forbidding land.

THE GREAT MIGRATION

Hutchinson's careful rehabilitation of the more troublesome aspects of the Puritans' reputation outside New England began with his explanation of the Great Migration that settled the colony in the 1630s. He painted a detailed picture of the settlers who left England in the decade before the English Civil War, the quality of the lives they had left behind in England, and the hardships they faced in the new world. The first settlers of New England were people of means and wealth, who for reasons of genuine spiritual conviction left their old lives behind and willingly took on a near-impossible task. Through detailed analysis of every one of the assistants and early magistrates that he could trace, Hutchinson reiterated that these were

respectable men, not “adventurers,”¹¹⁴ who hardly needed to remove to a new colony to find financial success.

Hutchinson stressed that, despite their religious concerns, the New England founders were loyal Englishmen from the very beginning—an important consideration, as several of these men would later return to England to fight against the king in the Civil War, and might thus be regarded by ministry officials in Hutchinson’s time as less than solid citizens. In describing the Plymouth settlers, he stressed that in their initial planning, they first rejected an overture from the Dutch to settle in the Hudson Valley because “they had not lost their affection for the English, and chose to be under their government and protection.”¹¹⁵

¹¹⁴ *History* 1, ch. 1: 3, footnote ‡ (double cross), and 7, footnote *. For the footnote biographies of the original settlers, see vol. 1, ch. 1: 14-17, footnote *. Hutchinson disapproved of men he regarded as “adventurers,” who he felt were often temperamentally unqualified to establish new settlements.

¹¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 3-4. Hutchinson also argued that it was the specific harassment by Archbishop Laud and not a more basic dislike of the Anglican Church that caused the Puritans’ departure: The [Episcopalian] form of government in the church, was not a general subject of complaint.... had they remained in England, and the church been governed with the wisdom and of the present day, they would have remained, to use their own expression, ‘in the bosom of that church.’ *Ibid.*, 4. Hutchinson insisted that only resistance to the church ceremonies and hierarchy, rather than doctrinal points, separated the Congregationalists from the Church of England. In 1775, Hutchinson jotted down on a fly-leaf near the end of his diary: “the Puritans in England did not separate upon Doctrinal points: it was the government by Bishops they were sollicitious about. The ceremonies were said to be scrupled, but they were scrupled, not so much as being in themselves unlawful, but as being enjoined, when they were in their nature indifferent.” (*Diary* 1: 510). See also *History* 1, ch. 4: 353.

This seems to minimize the very real theological differences separating Congregationalists and Anglicans in the seventeenth century. In Hutchinson’s own time, one of the suspicions of him was that he privately leaned Episcopalian in his religious beliefs—like a good politician, he alternated attending weekly services at the main Congregational Church and the Episcopal Church. In an interview with King George right after he had arrived in exile, His Majesty asked Hutchinson what his own ancestors were, in terms of their sectarian beliefs. Hutchinson replied “on the whole, dissenters.” Considering that Hutchinson was descended wholly and directly from the Great Migration and was related to some of the colony’s most famous Puritan preachers, his response verged on a lack of candor. *Diary* 1: 168.

Hutchinson credited the religious commitment of these first Puritan settlers with the success they experienced in Massachusetts, a land where previous settlements had failed. He admired both their faith and their perseverance.

It shows some little fortitude, in a man in health and vigour, who goes through the fatigues of a long voyage, and spends but a few months in a wilderness, among Savages, and in a climate more severe than he had ever experienced. What must we think, then, of persons of rank and good circumstances in life bidding a final adieu to all the conveniences and delights of England, their native country, and exposing themselves, their wives and children, to inevitable hardships and sufferings, in a long voyage across the Atlantick, to land upon a most inhospitable shore...¹¹⁶

Hutchinson argued that religious scruples provided the only possible reason why successful, established men in the middle of their lives would suddenly wish to transplant themselves and their families and begin anew. Winthrop and other “gentlemen of figure and estate...who were dissatisfied with the arbitrary proceedings both in church and state, pleased themselves with the prospect of liberty in both, to be enjoyed in America.”¹¹⁷ Their venture was an admirable one—their only motivation was to establish a society where they might live by God’s law as they understood it.¹¹⁸

Hutchinson also noted that, while the original circumstances of the Great Migration might be bemoaned, the resulting society proved a blessing to both America and England. The religious convictions of the early settlers gave them the perseverance to survive in a difficult environment, where few others would want to venture, and to create a flourishing and stable society there.

¹¹⁶ *History*. 1, ch. 1: 18.

¹¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 130.

¹¹⁸ *History* 1, ch. 4: 352.

[W]ho would remove, and settle in so remote and uncultivated a part of the globe, if he could live tolerably at home? The country would afford no immediate subsistence, and therefore was not fit for indigent persons. Particular persons or companies would have been discouraged from supporting a colony, by the long continued expense and outset, without any return. No encouragement could be expected from the public. The advantages of commerce from the colonies were not then foreseen, but have been since learned by experience... God in his providence bringeth good out of evil. Bigotry and blind zeal prevailed, among christians of every sect or profession. Each denied to the other, what all had a right to enjoy, liberty of conscience. To this we must ascribe, if not the settlement, yet at least the present flourishing state of North america.¹¹⁹

Hutchinson contrasted the success of the Puritan settlement with the failures of the earlier, non-Puritan attempts at settling New England. He maintained that many of Massachusetts' early critics were motivated by jealousy of the colony's success, and hid their own failures behind complaints of religious persecution.¹²⁰ Of Thomas Morton, one of Massachusetts' most prominent seventeenth century critics, Hutchinson noted that his own efforts in the colony failed due to his irresponsible lifestyle: "he lived a life of dissipation, until all the stock, intended for trade, was consumed."¹²¹ He remarked of Morton's notorious book, "New England Canaan," "[he] was truly called the accuser of the brethren" and when he was fool enough to return to New England after its publication, poor and friendless, "[n]othing but his age saved him from the whipping-post."¹²² He also highlighted the repeated failures

¹¹⁹ *History* 1, ch. 1: 3.

¹²⁰ As for example, in *History* 1, ch. 1: 44-48, their grand scheme, in the 1630s, to vacate the charters of all of New-England and have Gorges made governor-general of the lot.

¹²¹ *Ibid.*, 9. Thomas Morton's "New English Canaan" was a scathing attack on the Massachusetts colony. Thomas Morton, "New English Canaan" (Amsterdam: Theatrum Orbis Terrarum, 1637), new edition edited by Jack Dempsey (Stoneham, MA: J. Dempsey, 1999).

¹²² *History* 1, ch. 1: 29, footnote *. Morton, a constant critic of Massachusetts from early on, wrote his correspondent Jeffries in 1634 that through his efforts he had gotten the king to review Massachusetts' charter. He called John Winthrop "King Winthrop" and claimed that his report proved

of Sir Fernando Gorges and Thomas Mason, two of Massachusetts' perennial critics, to organize their own settlement, remarking, "[t]hey were a dissolute crew, soon brought themselves to poverty, then robbed the Indians and offered other abuses to them."¹²³ Hutchinson claimed these two "beheld the Massachusetts with an envious eye," and thus joined with other failed adventurers like Morton to seek revenge on the colony, a cause that would lead them to exaggerate the province's failings abroad..¹²⁴

PURITAN SOCIETY

Hutchinson devoted a great deal of time analyzing the strengths and defects of the society and government established in Puritan Massachusetts. Despite his discomfort with the power of the ministers in early New England, he gave them credit for maintaining a stable, generally harmonious society under extremely difficult conditions: "we shall seldom meet with an instance where there has been so steady and so general an adherence to the principles upon which it was founded, and so much harmony subsisting, not only in particular churches, but between one church and another, for fifty years together."¹²⁵ Hutchinson attributed Puritan Massachusetts' overall stability not only to the colonies' leaders, but also to the generally rational behavior of the citizens as a whole.¹²⁶

the colony's "detestation of the church of England, and contempt of his Majesty's authority and wholesome laws": Morton to Jeffries, May 1, 1634, quoted in *History* 1, ch. 1: 29, footnote *.

¹²³ *History* 1, ch. 1: 6.

¹²⁴ *Ibid.*, 29.

¹²⁵ *History* 1, ch. 4: 38-59.

¹²⁶ Discussing an early political controversy over settlement in the Connecticut Valley, where the lower house and the magistrates were on opposite sides, Hutchinson commented, "Here was a crisis, when the patricians, if I may so stile them, were in danger of losing a great part of their weight in the government..." However, after consideration and a day of fasting, the lower house yielded the

Hutchinson defended the strict laws of the colony in its early years as necessary in so unsettled a state, however harsh they might appear to a later age.

The magistrates and executive courts were vigilant in suppressing all offences against the authority of Government. Persons were tried and punished every term for disrespectful words of particular magistrates as well as of the legislative and executive courts...This looks like severity, though it seems necessary and that they count not otherwise have supported their authority.¹²⁷

He stressed that while it might not have been the choice that his own generation would make, it worked well for half a century.

[T]his constitution of church government was adapted to the constitution of civil government, both as popular as can well be conceived, and notwithstanding an acknowledgment or declaration from both, of separate and distinct rights, yet each was aiding and assisting to the other.¹²⁸

Hutchinson's also admired the Founders' religious commitment, which he saw as both admirable and sincere: "[t]hey professed a sacred regard to the word of God, in the old and new testament, as a sufficient rule of conduct, and that they were obliged to follow it."¹²⁹

Despite his defense of Puritan New England's society and laws, there were clearly elements of the Puritan state that made Hutchinson uncomfortable. These were most notably their religious intolerance and zealotry, and the power wielded by the church in civic affairs. I believe that his discomfort with the Puritan's theocratic state

point for the sake of unity. "There was no occasion for prodigies or other arts of the priests of old Rome. A judicious discourse from a well chosen text was more rational, and had a more lasting effect." Ibid., 41. Hutchinson's concern here seemed not to have been that the lower classes were having a voice in government, but rather than they might be gaining too much power. Hutchinson was particularly pleased that the lower house did not turn to "demagoguery" to strengthen its position in this struggle. Hutchinson was pleased to see that the proper balance of power between the legislative branches was preserved in this early incident.

¹²⁷ *History* 1, ch. 1: 123-24.

¹²⁸ *History* 1, ch. 4: 356.

¹²⁹ *History* 1, ch. 5: 369.

was partly a product of the importance he attached to a fair political and legal system. This, for Hutchinson, included equality of treatment under the law, access to a jury of one's peers, and reasonable requirements for the franchise.

Hutchinson was particularly uncomfortable with the requirement of church membership for political participation, which remained on the books in Massachusetts until the Restoration. He called it "a most extraordinary order or law." He said of the test for church membership, "[h]e that did not conform, was deprived of more civil privileges than a nonconformist is deprived of, by the test in England. Both the one and the other must have occasioned much formality and hypocrisy."¹³⁰ The impact this rule would have on fairness in the courts particularly concerned him, although he put his criticism into the mouth of another author, quoting Thomas Lechford:

Now the most of the persons at New-England are not admitted of their church, and therefore are not freemen; and when they come to be tried there, be it for life or limb, name or estate, or whatsoever, they must be tried and judged too by those of the church who are, in a sort, their adversaries. How equal that hath been or may be, some by experience do know, others may judge.¹³¹

Hutchinson was also disturbed by the power held by the ministry in the Puritan State. Hutchinson pointed out that not only did they wield considerable influence over civil government through their periodic synods, but their role in certifying new church members meant that they were implicitly in charge of terming who gained full citizenship rights as well, since the franchise was tied to church

¹³⁰ *History* 1, ch. 4: 363-64.

¹³¹ *History*, vol. 1, ch. 1: 25, footnote *, quoting Lechford. Thomas Lechford, "Plain Dealing: or, Nevves from New-England: A Short View of New-Englands Present Government, both Ecclesiasticall and Civil" (London: W. E. & I. G., 1642).

membership.¹³² He noted that the ministry enforced their views through censorship of the press, and that their religious requirements may have cost the colony settlers.¹³³

Hutchinson was struck by the irony that men who had fled England to escape religious persecution turned to religious discrimination in their own government.

“The persecution of the episcopalians by the prevailing powers in England, was evidently from revenge for the persecution they had suffered themselves...in New England, it must be confessed, that bigotry and cruel zeal prevailed, and to that degree, that no opinions but their own could be tolerated. There were sincere, but mistaken in their principles; and absurd as it is, it is too evident, they believed it to be for the glory of God to take away the lives of his creatures for maintaining tenets contrary to what they professed themselves.”¹³⁴

Quoting Montesquieu’s *Spirit of the Laws* in his objections to the colony’s religious persecutions, Hutchinson noted the French philosopher’s observation that religious persecution leads only to hypocrisy and dissention. Such behavior generally

¹³² *History* 1, ch. 4: 38-9. Commenting on a document relative to the Antinomian Crisis in his edited collection of papers, Hutchinson remarked about this gate-keeping power: “[t]his must needs render the influence of the Clergy very great under the old Constitution. No body could be proposed to the Church for a member unless the Minister allowed it. No body could be admitted a Freeman unless be [sic] was a Member of the Church.” Hutchinson, ed., *A Collection of Original Papers Relative to the History of the Colony of Massachusetts Bay* (Boston: Thomas Hutchinson & John Fleet, 1769), new edition ed. William H. Whitmore and William S. Appleton (Albany: Prince Society, 1865; New York: B. Franklin, 1967), 1: 101, footnote 85. For the power of the ministry in seventeenth century Massachusetts, see particularly James F. Cooper, Jr., “Higher Law, Free Consent, Limited Authority: Church Government and Political Culture in Seventeenth-Century Massachusetts,” *NEQ* 69, no. 2 (Jun. 1996): 201-22.

¹³³ Noting in 1668 the General Court’s intercession to stop a local printer from printing Thomas à Kempis’s *Imitatio Christi*, Hutchinson remarked, “[i]n a constitution less popular this would have been thought too great an abridgment of the subject’s liberty.” *History* 1, ch. 2: 221. Hutchinson also noted that the colony’s insistence on grilling all potential settlers on their religious orthodoxy rendered it a less attractive destination as the century wore on: “[a]s good, if not better lands than any in the colony lay contiguous to it, and men, of different opinions, chose to remove where they might enjoy both civil and religious liberty, rather than remain and be deprived of either.” *History* 1, ch. 4: 364.

¹³⁴ *History* 1, ch. 1: 162-63. Hutchinson also pointed up this irony in his edited papers, noting Richard Saltonstall’s wish that his fellow citizens would not “practice those courses in a wilderness, which you went so farre to prevent.” Richard Saltonstall to Cotton Mather and John Wilson, undated, in *Hutchinson Papers*, ed. Whitmore and Appleton, 2: 128. Hutchinson remarked upon Saltonstall’s letter, “[i]t discovers a good deal of that catholic spirit which too many of our first settlers were destitute of...” *Hutchinson Papers*, ed. Whitmore and Appleton, 2: 127, footnote 98.

breeds only more persecution, as the persecuted sects, once in power themselves, apply the lessons learned to other dissenters: “[i]t is a principle, that every religion which is persecuted, becomes itself persecuting; for as soon as, by some accidental turn, it arises from persecution, it attacks the religion which persecuted it.”¹³⁵

ROGER WILLIAMS

Throughout the better part of its first century of settlement, Massachusetts’ history was shaped by its determination to maintain religious orthodoxy and govern according to Biblical scripture. Massachusetts’ religious schisms began within a few years of its settlement. In 1635, Roger Williams¹³⁶ became the first person banished

¹³⁵ *History* 1, ch. 1: 13, footnote *.

¹³⁶ Glenn W. LaFantasie noted that more books have been written about Roger Williams than any American colonial figure before Benjamin Franklin—and that this is striking particularly given how little is known about the man: LaFantasie, review of *Liberty of Conscience: Roger Williams in America*, by Edwin S. Gaustad, *WMQ* 49, no. 3 (Jul. 1992): 535. For background on the theology and career of Roger Williams, see Henry M. Dexter, *As to Roger Williams, and his ‘Banishment’ from the Massachusetts Plantation; with a few further words concerning the Baptists, the Quakers, and Religious Liberty* (Boston: Congregational Pub. Soc., 1876); George A. Stead, “Roger Williams and the Massachusetts-Bay,” *NEQ* 7, no. 2 (Jun. 1934): 235-57; Perry Miller, *Roger Williams: His Contribution to the American Tradition* (Indianapolis: Bobbs Merrill Company, 1953); Ola E. Winslow, *Master Roger Williams* (New York: Macmillan, 1957); Cyclone Covey, *The Gentle Radical: Roger Williams* (New York: Macmillan Co., 1966); James W. Reed, “The Rhetoric of a Colonial Controversy: Roger Williams versus the Massachusetts Bay Colony” (Ph.D. diss., Ohio State University, 1966); Edmund S. Morgan, *Roger Williams: The Church and the State* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1967); Irwin H. Polishook, *Roger Williams, John Cotton and Religious Freedom: A Controversy in New and Old England* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967); Hugh Spurgin, *Roger Williams and Puritan Radicalism in the English Separatist Tradition* (Lewiston: E. Mellon Press, 1989); Christopher D. Felker, “Roger William’s Uses of Legal Discourse: Testing Authority in Early New England,” *NEQ* 63, no. 4 (Dec. 1990): 624-48; Edwin S. Gaustad, *Liberty of Conscience: Roger Williams in America* (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1991); and Timothy L. Hall, *Separating Church and State: Roger Williams and Religious Liberty* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1998). Most modern historians depict Williams as governed largely by theological, even millennial concerns; the exception is Morgan, who saw him as a much more pragmatic, political figure. Gaustad in his final chapter showed how Williams’ importance was rediscovered around Hutchinson’s time, as his (inaccurate) transformation into a defender of religious toleration began. For overview of Roger Williams’ changing historiographic reputation, see LeRoy Moore, Jr., “Roger Williams and the Historians,” *Church History* 32, no. 4 (1963): 432-51.

Roger Williams’ correspondence concerning his banishment and other religious quarrels have been published by Glenn W. LaFantasie as *The Correspondence of Roger Williams*, 2 vols. (Hanover: Brown UP, 1988), 1: 1629-1653. Williams’ writings are contained in *The Complete Works of Roger Williams*, 7 vols. (New York: Russell & Russell, 1963).

from Massachusetts for heretical opinions. Williams, one of the original Massachusetts Company planners, arrived in New England in 1631, and after a brief stay in Plymouth, took the position of minister for the Salem congregation. By 1635, his unique religious and political views were causing a rift between Salem and the rest of the settlement.

An extreme Separatist, Williams wanted a complete separation from the churches of England. He refused to have any intercourse with the other New England churches because they refused to accept this premise. During Williams' tenure as Salem minister the Massachusetts General Court frequently reprimanded him for expressing these views, which they feared would antagonize even the colony's sympathizers back in England. When reprimands failed, the General Court penalized his congregation by withholding land grants and the right for Salem's deputies to attend the General Court. On Oct. 9, 1636, Roger Williams was ordered banished by General Court; he left for Rhode Island, outside Massachusetts' jurisdiction, Jan. 8, 1636.¹³⁷

Contemporary accounts of the Williams banishment all stressed that he was exiled for religious reasons. William Bradford called Roger Williams "a man godly

¹³⁷ Contemporary and near-contemporary accounts of the Williams controversy include Thomas Lechford's "Plain Dealings" "Plain Dealing: or, Nevves from New-England: A Short View of New-Englands Present Government, both Ecclesiasticall and Civil..." (London: W. E. & I. G., 1642); Samuell Gorton's "Simplicities Defence against Seven-Headed Policy" (London: J. Macock, 1646); William Bradford's *Of Plymouth Plantation, 1620-1647*, ed. Samuel E. Morison (New York: A. A. Knopf, 2001); John Winthrop's journal, *The Journal of John Winthrop, 1630-1649*, ed. Richard S. Dunn, James Savage and Laetitia Yeandle (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1996); Ferdinando Gorges, "A Briefe Narration of the Original Undertakings of the Advancement of Plantations into the Parts of America," (London: E. Brudenell, 1658), reprinted in *MHS Coll.*, 2nd ser. 10 (1823): 1-25; and Joshua Scottow, "A Narrative of the Planting of the Massachusetts Colony Anno 1628: With the Lord's Signal Presence the First Thirty Years" (Boston: Benjamin Harris, 1694; reprinted *MHS Coll.*, 4th ser. 4 (1858): 279-332. Gorton, a perennial Massachusetts critic, accused Massachusetts of throwing an ill old man out in the middle of winter.

and zealous, having many precious parts but very unsettled in judgment.” Bradford claimed that Williams fell into “strange opinions,” adding that the particulars of the controversy “are too well known now to all...he is to be pitied and prayed for.”¹³⁸ John Winthrop also described his banishment as motivated by his heretical tenets—Williams was banished because he was “full of anti-christian pollution.”¹³⁹ A letter included by Hutchinson in a footnote also shows that Williams’ banishment was for heresy.¹⁴⁰

Hutchinson’s short account of the Roger Williams controversy noted that Williams, as minister, “advanced divers singular opinions, in which he did not meet with a concurrence.”¹⁴¹ Hutchinson took note of the rigidity of some of Williams’ theological views, in that he noted that Williams first insisted his Salem church have no communication with the other New England churches, because they had not wholly abandoned the Church of England, and then he turned on the Salem church as well: “he separated from them; and, to make compleat work of it, he separated from his own wife, and would neither ask a blessing nor give thanks at his meals if his wife was present, because she attended the publick worship in the church of Salem.”¹⁴²

While Hutchinson clearly found such extreme religious scruples ridiculous, he did not, however, see them as the true motive behind Williams’ banishment. In his

¹³⁸ Bradford, *Of Plymouth Plantation*, 257. Bradford’s coverage of the Williams banishment is very short, only one page.

¹³⁹ Winthrop, *Journal*, ed. Dunn, 158, entry for August 1635.

¹⁴⁰ *History* 1, ch. 4: 355, footnote *.

¹⁴¹ *History* 1, ch. 1: 34.

¹⁴² *Ibid.*, 34, 35.

opinion, “what gave just occasion to the civil power to interpose” was Williams’ threat to the state; specifically, his cutting the cross out of the English flag as a “relique of anti-christian superstition.”¹⁴³ Hutchinson pointed out the danger of this act—that many in England would regard it as a rejection of the political power of the British Crown. “A writer of the history of those times questions whether his zeal would have carried him so far, as to refuse to receive the King’s coin because of the cross upon it.”¹⁴⁴

Hutchinson did not approve of the Williams banishment, as he regarded Williams as a worthy settler and an upright leader despite his unorthodox view.¹⁴⁵ He did, however, show more sympathy for the General Court’s decision in this incident than he would show for subsequent banishments. He stressed that Roger William’s actions came at a very dangerous time for Massachusetts, as the colony in the 1630s seemed close to losing its charter to a hostile British government, and with its charter not only its form of government, but also all legal titles to colonial property. In a footnote, Hutchinson expanded upon the turbulence Williams’ act caused, noting that many of the militia refused to train under the mangled flag.¹⁴⁶ He also stressed that

¹⁴³ Ibid., 35.

¹⁴⁴ Ibid., 34-35. This method of subtle criticism, putting harsh comments into the mouths of others, as quotations from his source material, is a common one for Hutchinson throughout the *History*.

¹⁴⁵ At the end of his account of the Williams controversy, Hutchinson noted that Williams, instead of becoming a vengeful enemy of the Massachusetts Bay after his exile, became in subsequent decades an important ally of theirs: “it ought for ever to be remembered to his honor, that, for forty years after...he seems to have been continually employed in acts of kindness and benevolence” by notifying the Bay of possible threats against them on the part of both the Indians and the ministry. *History* 1, ch. 1: 35-36.

¹⁴⁶ *History* 1, ch. 1: 35, footnote ‡ (double cross). While Winthrop also discussed Williams’ flag-dismembering, he placed far less stress on it, and implied that he himself, as well as many other leaders, were in sympathy with Williams on this issue. Winthrop explained that the cross was popularly thought to be an emblem given to the English king by the pope, and thus a “relique of

the authorities attempted to reason with Williams repeatedly before banishing him, a remark he would repeat in discussing later religious schisms.¹⁴⁷

THE ANTINOMIANS

The Antinomian Crisis of 1636-1637¹⁴⁸ presented Hutchinson with a unique challenge of objectivity, as it revolved around his own great-great grandmother, Anne

antichriste.” (Winthrop, *Journal*, 132 (Nov. 1634). See also page 136 (Nov. 1634). Hutchinson’s “writer of these times,” not identified in this place, was William Hubbard.

¹⁴⁷ *History* 1, ch. 1: 45.

¹⁴⁸ Anne Hutchinson and the Antinomian crisis was a defining early moment for New England, and Anne has generated a great deal more press than even her Loyalist great-great grandson. The field is generally divided into four camps: feminist works that stress the challenges Anne Hutchinson posed to gender categories in patriarchal Puritan Massachusetts, legal works studying Hutchinson’s trial as an early example of the colonial legal system, theological works examining the place of Antinomianism within American Protestant theology, and works looking at the Antinomian crisis primarily as a political power struggle.

For works focusing on the gendered component to the Antinomian controversy, see Ben Barker-Benfield, “Anne Hutchinson and the Puritan Attitude toward Women,” *Feminist Studies* 1, no. 2 (Fall 1972): 65-96; Lyle Koehler, “The Case of the American Jezebels: Anne Hutchinson and Female Agitation during the Years of Antinomian Turmoil, 1636-1640,” *WMQ* 31, no. 1 (Jan. 1974): 55-78, and *A Search for Power: The “Weaker Sex” in Seventeenth-Century New England* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1980); Selma Williams, *Divine Rebel: The Life of Anne Marbury Hutchinson* (New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, 1981); and Lad Tobin, “A Radically Different Voice: Gender and Language in the Trials of Anne Hutchinson,” *Early American Literature* 25, no. 3 (1990): 253-70.

Theologically-oriented works on the Antinomian crisis include Stephen Foster, “New England and the Challenge of Heresy, 1630 to 1660: The Puritan Crisis in Transatlantic Perspective,” *WMQ* 38, no. 4 (Oct. 1981): 224-60; J. F. Maclear, “Anne Hutchison and the Mortalist Heresy,” *NEQ* 54, no. 1 (Mar. 1981): 74-103; Elaine C. Huber, “Women and the Authority of Inspiration: A Reexamination of Two Prophetic Movements from a Christian Feminist Perspective” (Ph.D. diss., Graduate Theological Union, 1984); Amy S. Lang, *Prophetic Woman: Anne Hutchinson and the Problem of Dissent in the Literature of New England* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987); Marilyn J. Westerkamp, “Anne Hutchinson, Sectarian Mysticism, and the Puritan Order,” *Church History* 59, no. 4 (1990): 482-96; Janice Knight, *Orthodoxies in Massachusetts: Rereading American Puritanism* (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1994); Michael G. Ditmore, “A Prophetess in Her Own Country: An Exegesis of Anne Hutchinson’s ‘Immediate Revelation,’” *WMQ* 57, no. 2 (Apr. 2000): 349-92; and Michael P. Winship, *Making Heretics: Militant Protestantism and Free Grace in Massachusetts, 1636-1641* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2002);

Legal interpretations, which focus mainly on the General Court’s civil trial, include Richard B. Morris, “Jezebel before the Judges,” in *Fair Trial: Fourteen who Stood Accused, from Anne Hutchinson to Alger Hiss* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1952), 3-32; Wellington Newcomb, “Anne Hutchinson Versus Massachusetts,” *American Heritage* 25, no. 4 (Jun. 1974): 12-15, 78-81; Ann F. Withington and Jack Schwartz, “The Political Trial of Anne Hutchinson,” *NEQ* 51, no. 2 (1978): 226-40; Jean E. Cameron, *Anne Hutchinson: Guilty or Not?: A Closer Look at her Trials* (New York: P. Lang, 1994); and Elizabeth Dale, “Debating-and Creating-Authority: A Legal History of the Trial of Anne Hutchinson, November, 1637” (Ph.D. diss., University of Chicago, 1995).

Hutchinson.¹⁴⁹ Anne Hutchinson had immigrated with her husband William to Massachusetts in 1634. In the spring of 1635, she began preaching her own version of Puritan doctrine in home meetings, an interpretation that clashed with the doctrine of Massachusetts' ministerial leaders.

Anne Hutchinson's challenge to the colony was a serious one, in that it was rooted in a tension that was at the heart of Calvinist doctrine. Calvinists, including the Massachusetts Puritans, believed that a minority of humanity was predestined for salvation, and that this choice was wholly a "gift" from God—their own actions played no part in their salvation, as God's grace could never be earned. The fundamental problem at the root of Puritanism was in determining the identities of the "saved." As Massachusetts' government was established on the premise that its leaders should always been God's chosen,¹⁵⁰ this was a political as well as a theological concern.

Finally, interpretations of the Antinomian crisis stressing the political nature of the struggle include Edmund S. Morgan, "The Case against Anne Hutchinson," *NEQ* 10, no. 4 (Dec. 1937): 675-97; Bernard Bailyn, *The New England Merchants in the Seventeenth Century* (Cambridge, Mass., Harvard UP, 1964, 1980); Ronald D. Cohen, "Church and State in Seventeenth-Century Massachusetts: Another Look at the Antinomian Controversy," *Journal of Church and State* 12 (1970): 475-94; Francis Bremer, "Introduction," in *Anne Hutchinson: Troubler of the Puritan Zion* (Huntington, NY, R. E. Krieger Pub. Co., 1981), 1-08, and James F. Cooper, Jr., "Anne Hutchinson and the 'Lay Rebellion' against the Clergy," *NEQ* 61, no. 3 (Sept. 1988): 381-97.

¹⁴⁹ Hutchinson in his *History* described Anne Hutchinson as his "great-grandmother," In a 1773 letter to one of the Irish Hutchinson family line, discussing genealogy, Hutchinson admitted that he had been off by one remove: Anne was actually his great-great-grandmother: Hutchinson to John Hely Hutchinson, Boston, Feb. 14, 1772, in Mass. Archives manuscripts, vol. 27: 299.

¹⁵⁰ This was the position of Massachusetts' leaders from the outset, and an issue which they saw as crucial to their goals, despite the clear discomfort it created in England almost from the colony's inception. In answer to 1636 query made by ministry officials regarding how Massachusetts citizenship would be determined, the colony's leaders asserted that only church membership, rather than property, would be a consideration. The magistrates argued that "carnal" men, despite other worthy attributes, could not be trusted with government, and that it was one thing for religious men to submit to such rule under an established regime, but another to deliberately set up a government contrary to God's laws, as Massachusetts would be if "worldly" men were given power. "Proposals

Anne Hutchinson challenged the standard methods Massachusetts had come to employ to determine who was “saved” and hence eligible for full church membership and full citizenship rights. Massachusetts’ ministry had relied on both the personal conversion narrative, delivered before the congregation and backed by evidence of a “godly walk,” or righteous living. The final determinant in this process was, of course, the ministers, who certified the elect.

Anne Hutchinson challenged not only the assumption that ministers could determine a person’s spiritual status, but ultimately the ministry’s usefulness altogether. She emphasized that salvation resulted from the spirit of God coming to dwell within a person, and that this inner sense of grace was the only valid proof of “election”—that a person was going to be saved from damnation after death, and was therefore one of God’s chosen “elect.” She declared that those who were saved would not have any doubt about their salvation, and that any misgivings on this score were actually proof that grace had not yet been achieved.¹⁵¹ This, in her view, called into question the godly status of most of the ministers themselves, as many of the

made by Lord Say, Lord Brooke, and others, as conditions of their removing to New England, with the answers (1636),” in *History* 1, appendix no. 2: 410-13.

¹⁵¹ Anne and her followers were called both “Antinomians” and “Familists.” In seventeenth century theological disputes, terms derived from the European religious schisms were bandied about rather indiscriminately. Antinomianism, which literally meant “outside the law,” was a term applied to those who believed that saints (those having assurance of salvation) were above the moral law of men, since they were under a law of grace. The true European Antinomians were followers of John Agricola, a tailor born in 1492 who became a university scholar and preacher. Familism was the familiar name of the Family of Love, a sixteenth century European sect founded by Dutch mystic Hendrik Niclaes, which was incorrectly thought to have engaged in free love (and possibly orgies). Norman Pettit, “Cotton’s Dilemma: Another Look at the Antinomian Controversy,” in *Sibley’s Heir: A Volume in Memory of Clifford Kenyon Shipton* (Boston: CSM, 1982), 393-413.

Most modern historians agree that Anne Hutchinson and her followers were definitely not Familists, and may not have been Antinomians. Hall notes that the Anne Hutchinson’s followers did not call themselves Antinomians; in the seventeenth century the term was strictly pejorative. (Hall, *Antinomian Controversy*, Introduction, 3). “Familists” was the epitaph most commonly applied to Anne Hutchinson’s followers during the controversy; “Antinomian” became the dominant epitaph in the following decade.

orthodox preachers had informed their congregations that they themselves were uncertain of God's grace.

Anne Hutchinson's meetings grew in popularity eventually including the bulk of the Boston merchant class and a significant portion of the city's leadership.¹⁵² Her prestige was heightened when she gained the support of Henry Vane, a well-connected young nobleman who arrived in Massachusetts in November of 1635 and less than a year later was elected governor.¹⁵³ Her followers began clashing with the regular ministry, criticizing them for an overemphasis on works and eventually decrying most of the orthodox ministers as preaching false dogma. By late 1636, the Boston church was largely under Anne Hutchinson's influence, although the surrounding countryside generally sided with her opponents.

The Antinomians threatened Puritan authorities on several levels. By claiming unique ability to judge the saved from the unregenerate, Anne Hutchinson challenged the leadership of the ministry both in their churches and in the government. The Antinomians flatly rejected the role of the ministers in determining a person's state of salvation. This threatened the structure of the civil government as well, since the ministers' certification of their members was the basis for civil rights. Anne Hutchinson's gender added additional discomfort to the hierarchy, who remarked at length on the inappropriateness of her behavior.¹⁵⁴ Theologically, her doctrine of

¹⁵² Winthrop, "Short Story," in Hall, ed., *The Antinomian Controversy*, 207.

¹⁵³ Vane was chosen as governor May 25, 1636: he was 23 and had been in the colony seven months: *History* 1, ch. 1: 48.

¹⁵⁴ Despite Thomas Hutchinson's avoidance of the issue, the gender/sexual aspect of the Antinomian Crisis was clearly present in his sources. Michael Colacurcio noted that sexual accusations were prominent in most of the hostile accounts of the Antinomian crisis. Anne Hutchinson was troubling because she was a powerful woman with "seductive" doctrines challenging a profoundly

inner grace also seemed to the Puritan leadership to threaten the very legitimacy of all government. Church officials felt that those who saw themselves as guided by an inner light would consider themselves above the ordinary laws of society, particularly if those laws were passed by men they considered unregenerate.¹⁵⁵

patriarchal society: Michael Colacurcio, "Footsteps of Anne Hutchinson: The Contest of the Scarlett Letter," *ELH* 39 (1972): 459-94. John Winthrop's "Short History of the Rise, Reign, and Ruine of the Antinomians," the first work printed concerning the Antinomians, called Anne Hutchinson an "American Jesabel" who was "more bold than a man": Winthrop: A Short Story of the Rise, Reign, and Ruine of the Antinomians, Familists & Libertines, that Infected the Churches of New-England," 3rd ed. (London, 1646), 263, 293. Edward Johnson and John both insinuated that Anne Hutchinson must have been sexually promiscuous as well as theologically inconstant. They reproached her for threatening the family as well as the state in Massachusetts, claiming that she was causing wives to abandon their husbands. Both men gloated over Hutchinson's eventual miscarriage as proof of her crimes, and an obvious consequence of her promiscuity, both theologically and presumable sexually: Edward Johnson, *Wonder-Working Providence of Sions Saviour in New England* (1654; reprinted Delmar, N.Y., Scholars' Facsimiles & Reprints, 1974), 132; John Underhill, "Newes from America," reprinted *MHS Coll.* 3rd ser., 6 (Boston, 1837), 51.

Thomas Hutchinson generally ignored these remarks concerning his ancestor's moral character, which appeared in nearly all of the earlier accounts of the crisis, including the eighteenth century ones. However, his own coverage of the affair demonstrated that he was not without his own chauvinism, seeing Anne as a ridiculous figure, and most likely guided by a man behind the scenes. This may well have been a factor in his decision to focus on Henry Vane as the true architect of the controversy.

¹⁵⁵ The Antinomian controversy raised a great hue and cry at the time, both in America and England, and the debate over it continued for decades after the main participants were banished. The first works stressed the complete social chaos threatened by Antinomian tenets. The most famous of these was the first, John Winthrop's tract, first published anonymously in London as "Antinomians and Familists Condemned" (London, 1644) and later reprinted under its better-known title, "A Short Story of the Rise, Reign, and Ruine of the Antinomians, Familists & Libertines, that Infected the Churches of New-England," 3rd ed. (London, 1646). Another view of the controversy from the orthodox perspective can be found in Thomas Shepard's journal, reprinted as Michael McGiffert, ed., *God's Plot: The Paradoxes of Puritan Piety, Being the Autobiography and Journal of Thomas Shepard* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1972). Other anti-Antinomian tracts included Richard Mather, "An Apology of the Churches of New England" (London, 1643); Robert Baillie, "The Dissuasive from the Errors of the Time" (London: Samuel Gellibrand, 1645); John Norton, "The Heart of New England Rent at the Blasphemies of the Present Generation" (Cambridge, MA: 1659); and Nathaniel Morton, "New Englands Memoriall: or, A Brief Relation of the Most Memorable and Remarkable Passages of the Providence of God, Manifested to the Planters of New England in America" (Cambridge: S. G. & M. J., 1669; New York, 1937). Edward Johnson's *The Wonder-Working Providence* presented the Antinomians as agents sent by Satan to test the Puritan colony.

Anne Hutchinson's main defender immediately after the trials was John Wheelwright, who continued to defend the position of the Antinomians. Wheelwright, unlike Cotton, never did back off of his earlier views, although he did soften his tone in later writings: "John Wheelwright's Forgotten Apology: The Last Word in the Antinomian Controversy." *NEQ* 64, no. 1 (Mar. 1991): 22-45, and "Revising what we have done amisse": John Cotton and John Wheelwright, 1640," *WMQ* 45, no. 4 (Oct. 1988): 733-50. William Clarke's "Ill Newes from New-England" (London, 1637), was another early anti-Massachusetts diatribe written by one of Anne Hutchinson's followers who accompanied her to Aquidneck.

The tide began to turn against the Antinomians in the spring of 1637, when the General Election, which had been transferred from Boston to Newtown, returned government to Anne Hutchinson's opponents. In August 1637, a synod called to establish orthodoxy found eighty-two of her opinions erroneous or blasphemous. Anne Hutchinson, Wheelwright and their supporters were disenfranchised, and moved on to the territories of Rhode Island.

Later in his life, during the Revolutionary crisis, Thomas Hutchinson compared his own sorry situation to that of his "pious great-grandmother" in a way that implied that he disapproved of her banishment, and saw it as a rash act brought on by popular frenzy.¹⁵⁶ However, in Volume One of his *History*, Hutchinson's overall attitude toward his ancestor was one of quiet contempt. He saw her as woman puffed up by others, calling her "vain" twice.¹⁵⁷ Hutchinson saw the entire quarrel as unnecessary, a tempest in a teapot that nevertheless could have easily destroyed the young state: "the town and country were distracted with these subtleties, and every man and woman who had brains enough to form some imperfect conceptions of them, inferred and maintained some other point...The fear of God and Love of our neighbor seemed to be laid by and out of the question"¹⁵⁸ It was not the theology of the

¹⁵⁶ Hutchinson to William Parker, 26 Aug. 1770, quoted in Hosmer, *Life of Hutchinson*, 195.

¹⁵⁷ Hutchinson's discussion of Anne Hutchinson and the Antinomian crisis appears sporadically from pages 49-72, interwoven with discussion of the Pequot War. An earlier surviving draft of the narrative, published as "Anne Hutchinson of Massachusetts" (Boston: Directors of the Old South Work, 1907), is more or less the same as the published version except for minor typographical details. Hutchinson's account of the Antinomian Crisis in his more personal "Hutchinsons in America" memoir, intended for his family was somewhat more critical of his ancestor: "Hutchinsons in America," British Library, Egerton MS 2664: pages 12-17; microfilm MHS. Hutchinson's private opinion of Anne Hutchinson was that she was a shrew: *Diary* 2, 461.

¹⁵⁸ *History* 1, ch. 1: 51.

“Opinionists” that Hutchinson objected to, although he did think it made no sense theologically. He objected to the effect they had on the colony’s stability. He described the controversy as ultimately pitting most of Boston on one side and the rest of Massachusetts on the other.¹⁵⁹

However, Hutchinson also found the Massachusetts government’s response an overreaction. He rejected the Puritan argument that the Antinomians’ unorthodox religious views would translate into irresponsible behavior: “[m]any of them were afterwards employed in posts of honour and trust, were exemplary in their lives and conversations...and with the name of antinomians paid the strictest regard to moral virtue.”¹⁶⁰ In this Hutchinson was departing not only from earlier writers like Bradford, Winthrop and Hubbard, but even from earlier eighteenth century writers like Mather and Prince, who still insisted that the Antinomians’ religious tenets were so extreme that they posed a danger not only to the church but to the state.¹⁶¹

One thing that particularly disturbed Hutchinson about the Antinomian Crisis was that it was an unnecessary distraction during an already dangerous time. The Pequot War, the colony’s first major Indian conflict, erupted in the midst of the dispute, and adversely affected Massachusetts’ ability to make military

¹⁵⁹ Ibid.

¹⁶⁰ Ibid., 66.

¹⁶¹ An argument also made long after Thomas Hutchinson’s time. Samuel E. Morrison, writing in 1930, argued that Anne Hutchinson was not only a danger in her own time, but would have been an intolerable threat even to modern society: “to duplicate the situation of 1636, one would have to imagine a woman preacher gifted with the eloquence of Maude Royden, and the ‘pep’ of Lady Astor, preaching communism and free love, attacking the churches, the constitution, and the courts, and enthusiastically followed by four-fifths of the million or so people in greater Boston. Can there be any doubt what would happen to her?” S. E. Morison, review of *Anne Hutchinson: A Biography*, by Edith Curtis; *Unafraid: A Life of Anne Hutchinson*, by Winifred Rugg; and *An American Jezebel: The Life of Anne Hutchinson*, by Helen Augur, *NEQ* 3, no. 2 (Apr. 1930): 360-61.

preparations.¹⁶² In May of 1637, in the midst of the controversy, the Winthrop-controlled Massachusetts General Court appointed Antinomian opponent John Wilson as military chaplain. In response, Anne Hutchinson and her followers, who still dominated Boston government, refused to support the Pequot War, declining to send money, soldiers, or supplies.¹⁶³ Fortunately, the troops were not needed, as the Connecticut forces already assembled dealt the Pequots a crushing blow in mid-May.

Hutchinson faulted both the Massachusetts government and the Antinomians for allowing the religious dispute to grow to hysteria. While he faulted the Massachusetts orthodox leaders for their determination to crush the heretical sect, he also criticized the Antinomian leaders for worsening the situation. Hutchinson's coverage of the Antinomian crisis fit well into one theme of Hutchinson's overarching concern: the importance of good leaders to a community, and the character traits that make up a good leader. In his coverage of the Antinomian crisis, Hutchinson drew a striking contrast between the two colonial leaders of the time, Antinomian opponent John Winthrop and Sir Henry Vane, the young nobleman and Antinomian supporter who served briefly as governor during the crisis.

Hutchinson was unusual in targeting Governor Henry Vane, rather than Anne Hutchinson, as the major cause of the Antinomian Crisis.¹⁶⁴ In Hutchinson's view, his

¹⁶² *History* 1, ch. 1: 67.

¹⁶³ Governor Winthrop, resuming power towards the end of the conflict, blamed the Antinomian Conflict for the lack of cooperation: Boston, under Antinomian control, had contributed few soldiers and those "of the most refuse sort." John Winthrop, "*Short Story*," in Hall, ed., *Antinomian Controversy*, 253. For further information, see Cohen, "Church and State in Seventeenth-Century Massachusetts." Winthrop saw Boston's inaction as revenge for his election as governor, the new alien exclusion act, and the appointment of Rev. Wilson as military chaplain to the troops.

¹⁶⁴ Most contemporary descriptions of the Antinomian Crisis, both friendly and unfriendly, depicted the controversy in such a way as to minimize the young nobleman's involvement. Michael

great-great-grandmother was merely a pawn used by others for political purposes. He saw her as a woman whose “natural vanity” was played upon by others for their own purposes, to the detriment of the entire colony: “[c]ountenanced and encouraged by Mr. Vane and Mr. Cotton, she advanced doctrines and opinions which involved the colony in disputes and contentions; and being improved, to civil as well as religious purposes, had like to have produced ruin both to church and state.”¹⁶⁵ Hutchinson argued that Anne Hutchinson had been led astray by her emotional “enthusiasm,” and “perhaps, as many other enthusiasts have done, she considered herself divinely commissioned for some great purpose...No wonder she was immoderately vain, when she found magistrates and ministers embracing the novelties advanced by her.”¹⁶⁶

Hutchinson presented Vane as having orchestrated the entire Antinomian crisis behind the scenes, to further his own ambitions. Without Vane, in Hutchinson’s view, the entire Antinomian crisis would not have occurred: “it is highly probable that if Mr. Vane had remained in England, or had not craftily made use of the party which maintained these peculiar opinions in religion, to bring him into civil power and authority,”¹⁶⁷ the issue would have eventually dissipated on its own, with less damage

Winship is rare among modern historians in agreeing with Hutchinson’s take on controversy, arguing that the theological tension that produced the Antinomian crisis was inherent in Puritan theology, but that it took “interested persons” to stir it up—Vane and Shepard. Winship notes that most contemporary accounts of controversy went to great lengths to protect Cotton and Vane—one of the reasons the onus landed on Anne Hutchinson. Michael P. Winship, “‘The Most Glorious Church in the World’: The Unity of the Godly in Boston, Massachusetts in the 1630s,” *JBS* 39, no. 1 (Jan. 2000): 71-98.

¹⁶⁵ *History* 1, ch. 1: 50.

¹⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 62-63.

¹⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 64.

to the colony, “and posterity would not have known that such a woman as Mrs. Hutchinson ever existed.”¹⁶⁸ In this description, Vane appeared much like the Patriot leaders of the Revolutionary crisis would later appear—as an unprincipled aspirant to power who used appeals to emotion to elevate himself at the expense of causing unnecessary turmoil for the province.

Hutchinson was particularly critical of Vane’s seven-month governorship during the Antinomian crisis. Vane, in Hutchinson’s opinion, proved inept partly due to his age and inexperience, but primarily due to of his own religious fervor. Hutchinson attributed Vane’s high regard among the colonists to this zealotry, noting that the colonists “were easily captivated with the appearance of wisdom and piety, professions of a regard to liberty and of a strong attachment to the public interest.”¹⁶⁹ He described Vane’s governorship in a way that stressed his emotional response to events. Describing one early instant, when the assistants took issue with one of his decisions, Hutchinson depicted Vane as bursting into tears and threatening to quit, only to retreat from this threat when it appeared that his resignation would be cheerfully accepted. Hutchinson judged Vane to be a quite immature young man with a heightened opinion of himself.¹⁷⁰ In his portrayal, Vane allowed himself to be

¹⁶⁸ Ibid.

¹⁶⁹ Ibid. 48.

¹⁷⁰ Ibid., 48-49. This incident is also covered in Winthrop’s *Journal*, where Vane sounded less pathetic—Vane in Winthrop’s version seemed to be motivated by a genuine need to return to England on family business, but agreed not to leave Massachusetts due to the lack of clear succession in government at the time. *Journal*, ed. Dunn, 201-02 (Nov.-Dec. 1636). Winthrop treated both Vane and Cotton gently in both his journal and the “Short Story,” blaming the crisis largely on Anne Hutchinson and John Wheelwright.

guided by his passions—and for Hutchinson, this was one of the worst traits for a leader.

Hutchinson utilized an unidentified letter written at the time of Vane's departure to present his harshest criticism of the Vane administration. This letter emphasized the danger that Vane's tenure had created, coming so early into the colony's settlement: "[d]ivisions are always dangerous, never safe, never more dangerous than in a new settled government."¹⁷¹ According to the letter-writer, Vane subjected the infant state to a crisis that could have destroyed it: "this man, altogether ignorant of the art of government, thinks it not enough to set the house on fire, but must add oil to the flame..."¹⁷² The writer went on to bemoan that, because of Vane's actions, Massachusetts was forced to take actions that would forever leave a 'blemish' on the colony, proving 'that all men are not fit for government, and none so dangerous, when he is up, as one that makes his affection his rule.'¹⁷³

By contrast, as Hutchinson described him, John Winthrop in many ways the model of an ideal ruler. Hutchinson held him up for praise despite his participation in the Antinomian controversy and later persecutions of religious dissenters, failings which the eighteenth century author saw as deeply regrettable but products of his age.¹⁷⁴ Hutchinson described Winthrop as "exemplary for his polite as well as grave

¹⁷¹ *History* 1, ch. 1: 58.

¹⁷² *Ibid.*

¹⁷³ *Ibid.*

¹⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, 14, footnote *. Hutchinson, summing up Winthrop's career at his death in 1649, used many of the same adjectives he would later use in praising his own father, "He spent his estate and his bodily strength in the public service, although he was remarkable for his temperance, frugality and œconomy. His virtues were many, his errors few, and yet he could not escape calumny and detraction,

and christian deportment” and a man who “spent his whole estate in the public service.” Praising Winthrop’s calm presiding over the April 1636 synod, which hammered out the orthodox position of the churches, Hutchinson quoted an anonymous manuscript,

therein was the wisdom and excellent spirit of the governor seen, silencing passionate and impertinent speeches as another Constantine...adjourning the assembly when he saw heat and passion, so that, through the blessing of God, the assembly is dissolved, and jarring and dissonant opinions, if not reconciled, yet are covered; and they who came together with minds exasperated, by this means depart in peace...¹⁷⁵

Hutchinson disapproved of Winthrop’s participation in the Antinomian trials, and his willingness to enforce the legal penalties that resulted from them, but on the whole Hutchinson saw the old governor as one who was working to restore order and moderation during the troubled period. Winthrop’s failure to win re-election in 1635, because of the excitement stirred up by the Antinomian schism, demonstrated for Hutchinson how democratic governments can be led astray when they surrender to their emotional and impetuous natures. He found Winthrop’s defeat by inexperienced newcomer Vane inexplicable:

Mr. Winthrop’s conduct had been such, from his first associated with the company in England until his being dropped this year from his place of governor, that unless the ostracism of the ancient Greeks had been revived in this new commonwealth, it was reasonable to expect that he should be out of all danger of so much as the least thought to his prejudice, as yet he had a little taste of

which would sometimes make too great an impression upon him.” Hutchinson faults Winthrop only for his overly enthusiastic pursuit of the religious dissenters. *History* 1, ch. 1: 129.

¹⁷⁵ *History* 1, ch. 1:61. It’s interesting to note that one strategy of Winthrop’s that Hutchinson praises, that of moving the General Court to the calmer climate of Cambridge, and then adjourning them whenever they seem in danger of spiraling out of control, is what Hutchinson himself also later did during the Revolutionary crisis. Here, according to Hutchinson Winthrop was acting not so much to win his own position (although he did that too, by winning re-election) as to preserve the sense of community of the colony.

what, in many other popular governments, their greatest benefactors have taken in large portion.¹⁷⁶

Describing Winthrop's dignified response to this in a footnote, Hutchinson

further added,

He might have torn his book of accounts, as Scipio Africanus did, and given the ungrateful populace this answer. A colony, now in a flourishing estate, has been led out and settled under my direction. My own substance is consumed. Spend no more time in harangues, but give thanks to God.¹⁷⁷

The entire lesson of the political contest between Winthrop and Vane, whose administration lasted barely a year, was made fairly clear in Hutchinson's narrative.

The state temporarily put itself in grave danger by ruling with its heart rather than its mind, but the situation was also self-correcting, as the people soon came to realize their mistake and returned to reason: "[t]he administration of a young and unexperienced, but obstinate and self-sufficient, governor, could not but be disliked by the major part of the people."¹⁷⁸ He concluded his discussion of the contest between Winthrop and Vane by noting that Winthrop, once reelected, was able to put aside personal feelings to help restore order.

For Hutchinson, the Antinomian crisis differed from other heretical movements in that it was not a persecution of a few hapless heretics, but rather a

¹⁷⁶ *History* 1, ch. 1: 37.

¹⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, footnote *. The ancient Greeks practiced ostracism—expelling one person by popular vote for a period of years—not just against bad rulers, but also against beloved leaders, who it was feared might be becoming too powerful and hence a danger to the democracy. Many of their best statesmen were temporarily banished at some point in their careers. After serving a term in the Roman government, elected officials had to sit through a Senatorial review of everything they did wrong. Scipio was one of the eighteenth century's favorite Roman heroes, and another leader who went against the popular politics of his day.

¹⁷⁸ *History* 1, ch. 1: 57, and 57, footnote ‡ (double cross). Hutchinson further claimed that the fallout from Vane's administration was such that a law was passed saying that those standing for governor had to have resided in the colony for at least a year. Hutchinson noted that he could find this law on the books, but was taking Hubbard's word for it, as Hubbard was there.

major tumult that ultimately divided the entire government and much of the populace. Hutchinson faulted both sides for it; the Antinomians for raising emotions to a fever pitch over an unnecessary quarrel, and the Winthrop faction for contributing to the turmoil as well, and ultimately for taking legal action against people for their religious beliefs. Ultimately, however, the lieutenant governor was more disapproving of the Antinomians than of Winthrop's faction. In my opinion, the key difference for Hutchinson lay not in the differing theological views. Winthrop's group seemed to him to have acted in a more restrained manner overall, and regained their reason more quickly. However, Hutchinson did not hold Winthrop blameless, and later held up Winthrop insistence on religious uniformity, in this and subsequent incidents, as his main flaw as a leader.¹⁷⁹

In his recounting of the Antinomian crisis' conclusion, Hutchinson rejected the justifications all the parties involved had given to defend their actions:

the opinionists were punished for being deluded enthusiasts. The other side were deluded also by a fond opinion that the honour of God required them to punish his creatures for differing from themselves. It is evident...that inquisition was made into men's private judgments as well as into their declarations and practice. Toleration was preached against as a sin in rulers which would bring down the judgments of heaven upon the land.¹⁸⁰

The Antinomian crisis, like the other religious persecutions that Hutchinson would detail in Volume One of the *History*, showed Hutchinson the folly of the Puritans' quest for religious orthodoxy. Because of their determination to maintain

¹⁷⁹ Summing the Winthrop's career in on the occasion of his death in 1649, Hutchinson noted: "his virtues were many, his errors few...He was of a more catholic spirit than some of his brethren, before he left England, but afterwards he grew more contracted, and was disposed to lay too great stress upon indifferent matters." Noted a story that Winthrop, when pressed, on his deathbed, to sign a religious banishment order, declined, saying "he had done too much of that work already." *History* 1, ch. 1: 129.

¹⁸⁰ Ibid., 66-67.

religious orthodoxy, the citizens of Massachusetts allowed themselves to become distracted in the midst of a dangerous Indian war, to elect a wholly unsuitable leader, and ultimately to fracture their community at a critical time. Hutchinson noted in a footnote that this attitude of religious intolerance continued in Massachusetts until the orthodox party found themselves once again on the receiving end of religious discrimination, at the hands of the Restored Stuarts.¹⁸¹

THE QUAKERS

The Quaker persecutions, which occurred a couple of decades after the Antinomian crisis, presented Hutchinson with possibly his greatest diplomatic challenges as a historian.¹⁸² The first Quakers arrived in Massachusetts in 1656, in the persons of Mary Fisher and Anne Austin from Barbados. The women were arrested,

¹⁸¹ Ibid., 67, footnote *.

¹⁸² Like the Salem witchcraft trials at the end of the century, Massachusetts' mistreatment of the Quakers was infamous by Hutchinson's time. Josiah Quincy noted in his diary in 1773 that the Pennsylvania Quakers still harbored distrust of Massachusetts for her past: "There is a general disliking, not to say antipathy among the Quakers, against N[ew] England, and this aversion has its influence in their judgment on the men and things of that country, and especially in their opinions concerning the public transactions of the Massachusetts Bay. They are frequently calling to mind and often relating little anecdotes of the severities used towards their ancestors in that province. No doubt the story is exaggerated, but they give it credit, and feel accordingly": "Journal of Josiah Quincy, Jr., 1773," ed. Mark Antony De Wolfe Howe, *MHS Proc.* 49 (1915): 477. Voltaire, in an early history of Massachusetts, severely criticized the colony's mistreatment of the Quakers, accusing them of attacking the inoffensive Quaker pacifists in Pennsylvania without cause: C. F. Adams, "Remarks on a Curious Misstatement by Voltaire with Regard to Massachusetts and the Quakers," *MHS Proc.*, 2nd ser. 13 (1899-1900): 156-61. Charles F. Adams noted that this remark showed some ignorance of American geography on Voltaire's part. Voltaire seems to have thought American Quakers lived only in Pennsylvania, didn't realize that Pennsylvania was not near New England, and apparently imagined a state of perpetual warfare between Puritan Massachusetts and neighboring Quaker Pennsylvania, New York and New Jersey having disappeared from the map.

The Quakers were still raging about their martyrs into the early eighteenth century. For examples, see the pamphlets of Daniel Gould, "A Brief Narration of the Sufferings of the People Called Quakers, who were put to Death at Boston in New England" (Philadelphia, 1700); and John Whiting, "Truth and Innocency Defended; Against Falshood and Envy: and the Martyrs of Jesus, and Sufferers for his Sake, Vindicated. In Answer to Cotton Mather (A Priest of Boston), his Calumnies, Lyes and Abuses of the People called Quakers, in his late Church-History of New-England..." (London: T. Sowle, 1702). For the Quakers' general victory in the battle over memory by the late eighteenth century, both in America and England, see Carla G. Pestana, "The Quaker Executions as Myth and History," *JAH* 80, no. 2 (Sept. 1993): 441-69.

inspected for witchcraft teats, imprisoned, and then shipped out again as quickly as could be arranged. Their arrival marked the beginning of the “Quaker invasion” of Massachusetts. A few days later, eight more Quakers arrived, and Massachusetts began passing laws against them. From 1656 to 1661, at least forty Quakers appeared in Massachusetts, and anti-Quaker laws were written in every session of the General Court. Massachusetts’ war against the Quakers did not end until the 1670s, when the colony was ordered by London to remove their legal ascriptions against the Quakers from their criminal codes.¹⁸³

¹⁸³ A complete history of Massachusetts’s struggle with the Quakers, complete with the text of all of the laws passed by the Massachusetts General Court against the Quakers, and the petitions of individual Quakers, is in Joseph Besse, ed., *A Collection of the Sufferings of the People called Quakers, for the Testimony of a Good Conscience...* (London, 1753), Ch. 5, “New-England,” 177-278. Hugh Barbour, and Arthur O. Roberts’ collection of Quaker documents also includes a selection written by the Quakers ministering in New England, and their English defenders in “The Visitation of Massachusetts (1656-61),” in *Early Quaker Writings, 1650-1700* (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1973), 116-39. For the political battle for Parliament’s attention between the Quakers and Massachusetts-Bay, see The Massachusetts State Papers Series, vol. 1, in the F. L. Gay Manuscripts, MHS, 52-65.

Both Quakers and Puritans published their versions of the Quaker trials and executions, and the battle continued in the historiography for the next 250 years. The Massachusetts martyrs developed into a potent weapon for the Society of Friends—and a dangerous topic for Massachusetts’ relationship with the Crown. Pro-Quaker accounts of the Massachusetts persecutions included Francis Howgill, “The Popish Inquisition Newly Erected in New-England,” and “The Heart of New-England Hardened Through Wickedness” (both published London, 1659); Stephenson Marmaduke, “A Call from Death to Life” (1660) (written as he awaited hanging on Boston Common); Edward Burrough, “A Declaration of the Sad and Great Persecution and Martyrdom of the People of God, called Quakers, in New-England” (London, 1660); George Bishop, “New England Judged, Not by Man’s, but by the Spirit of the Lord (London, 1661); and “New England Judged: The Second Part” (London, 1667); George Fox, “Cain Against Abel, Representing New-England’s Church Hierarchy in Opposition to her Christian Protestant Dissenters” ([London], 1675); Joy George, “Innocency’s Complaint Against the Tyrannical Court Faction in New England” (1677?); and George Keith, “A Serious Appeal to all the more Sober Impartial & Judicial People in New England” (Philadelphia, 1692). Anti-Quaker pamphlets included John Norton’s “The Heart of New England Rent at the Blasphemes of the Present Generation” (Cambridge, MA, 1659; London, 1660), the official Massachusetts defense of their legal policies against the Quakers, and Thomas Underhill, “Hell Broke Loose: or an History of the Quakers both Old and New” (London, 1660). For general information on the pile of correspondence, treatises and pamphlets generated by the Quakers’ Puritan proselytizing missions, see Pestana, “Manuscripts in the MHS Collections relating to Dissenters,” *MHS Proc.* 102 (1990): 148-64.

The Quakers gained a good deal of press in Hutchinson’s time, and this trend continues today. The leading authority on Massachusetts’ Puritan-Quaker relations is Carla Pestana. See “The City upon a Hill under Siege: The Puritan Perception of the Quaker Threat to Massachusetts Bay, 1656-1661,” *NEQ* 56, no. 3 (Sept. 1983): 323-53, *Quakers and Baptists in Colonial Massachusetts* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1991), and “The Quaker Executions as Myth and History,” *JAH* 80, no. 2 (Sept. 1993):

Puritan Massachusetts found the Quakers a far more frightening specter than previous heretical sects. The early Quaker missionaries who arrived in Massachusetts held many beliefs in common with the earlier Antinomians. The Quakers preached that God manifested his presence through the sense of an “inner light,” and that this was the only true evidence of grace. The Quaker missionaries, however, went further than the Antinomians in rejecting the need for separate, educated clergy. They believed that anyone with grace could preach the gospel, including women and members of the lower classes. Early Quakerism had strong millennial and proselytizing aspects. The Quakers saw Congregational ministers as purveyors of false dogma, and went to great lengths to mock the ministry and disrupt services. Early Quakerism was also radically egalitarian, and rejected courtesies such as doffing hats and formal modes of address that distinguished social rank in Puritan society.

441-69. See also Charles E. Park, “Puritans and Quakers,” *NEQ* 27, no. 1 (Mar. 1954): 53-74; Stephen Foster, “New England and the Challenge of Heresy, 1630 to 1660: The Puritan Crisis in Transatlantic Perspective,” *WMQ* 38, no. 4 (Oct. 1981): 224-60; Michael Heyd, “The Reaction to Enthusiasm in the Seventeenth Century: Towards an Integrative Approach,” *JMH* 53, no. 2 (Jun. 1981): 258-80; Hugh Barbour, *The Quakers in Puritan England* (Richmond, IN: Friends United Press, 1985); Jonathan M. Chu, *Neighbors, Friends, or Madmen: The Puritan Adjustment to Quakerism in Seventeenth-Century Massachusetts Bay* (Westport, CN: Greenwood Press, 1985); Philip Ranlet, *Enemies of the Bay Colony* (New York: P. Lang, 1995); and Timothy L. Wood, “Agents of Wrath, Sowers of Discord: Authority and Dissent in Puritan Massachusetts, 1630-1655” (Ph.D. diss., Marquette University, 2002);

David Lovejoy notes the particular menace the Quaker missionaries seemed to present to Massachusetts authorities. The Quakers had a penchant for taking off their clothes (this inevitably attracted attention), and talking about “goods in common” which their enemies expected to be followed by “wives in common.” They also insulted the educational pretensions of the Puritan ministry with great glee, rejected scholarly training as a prerequisite for preaching. David S. Lovejoy, *Religious Enthusiasm in the New World: Heresy to Revolution* (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1985).

Carla Pestana believes that modern historians fail to appreciate the anarchic nature of early Quakerism. The earlier Quaker movement was, in Pestana’s description, “[u]norganized, enthusiastic, and millennial; it lacked definitive leadership, a well-articulated theology, and even a name.” By the end of the seventeenth century, this sort of Quaker had ceased to exist, as the religious movement became better organized and more politically astute. Pestana, “City on a Hill under Siege,” 328. For information on the changing view of the Quaker martyrs, see also Anne G. Myles, “From Monster to Martyr: Re-Presenting Mary Dyer,” *Early American Literature* 36, no. 1 (2001): 1-30.

Both the Quaker theology, which stressed a direct emotional connection to the divine, and the Quakers' rejection of outward symbols of rank and hierarchy seemed terrifying to Massachusetts authorities. Puritan ministers and magistrates saw this new sect as a potential source of utter chaos. The religious leaders argued that someone lost to Quakerism would be taken over by his own pride and depravity, and fight against all things godly, including the civil government. The popularity of Quaker tenets among the poor and vagabond also alarmed Puritans.

Puritans were particularly disturbed by the Quaker tendency to interrupt religious meetings. Quakers (including women) stripped naked in the streets and in meetinghouses, yelled down Congregational ministers during meetings, and proclaimed dire judgments against the colony. The refusal of the banished to stay banished also seemed a blatant disregard of the General Court's authority—banishment had been a common penalty since earliest settlement days, and the Quakers' deviance of it seemed to threaten the magistrates' control over their own population.

Fears of the Quakers led to far more brutal attempts to suppress the sect than had been used against earlier heretical movements, and these penalties grew more extreme as they failed to work. In 1658, Massachusetts's laws were changed so that banished Quakers were forbidden to return to the colony under pain of death. By 1661, four Quakers had been hanged for proselytizing, and the Boston jail was full of Quakers awaiting execution. Other punishments were also generally extreme—severe whippings, brandings, boring holes through the tongue, banishments in the dead of winter, and imprisonment in brutal conditions. The General Court refused to

recognize that Quakers were even Christian, noting in an answer to the Privy Council with regard to the Quakers, “the latter wee cannot account amongst the number of Christians, haveing denyed the Faith and Lord, Jesus Christ to bee the Savior of mankine and by their tenents overthrowing all the fundamentall points of Christian Religion.”¹⁸⁴ Despite harassment from the ministry, Massachusetts continued to keep their anti-Quaker legislation on the books until 1681.

Hutchinson began his coverage of the Quaker persecutions in 1656.¹⁸⁵ His main source for his coverage of the Quaker persecutions, other than official records of Massachusetts and Rhode Island, was George Bishop’s “New England Judged,” a pro-Quaker writing. While Hutchinson generally sided with Bishop in his condemnation of the treatment of the Quakers, he stressed both the reluctance of the Massachusetts authorities to resort to extreme measures, and the genuine fear that the sect engendered.

Hutchinson described the first Quakers as abusive and disruptive, and the Massachusetts authorities as initially patient with them. For Mary Price, one of the first Quakers arrested in 1656, he described the governor and several ministers trying to sway her. They “with much moderation and tenderness endeavoured to convince her of her errors, to which she returned the grossest railings, reproaching them as hirelings, deceivers of the people, Baal’s priests, the seed of the serpent, of the brood

¹⁸⁴ “An Answer of the Governor of his Majesties Colony of the Massachusetts in New-England to severall heads of Inquiry pursuant to the Order of the Right Hon^{ble} the Lords of his Majesties Privy Council, appointed a Comittee for trade and Forreign Plantations.” From the Colonial Papers, vol. 44, no. 61, microfilm in the F. L. Gay Collection, State Papers, vol. 5, 65-78.

¹⁸⁵ *History* 1, ch. 1: 167.

of Ishmael and the like.”¹⁸⁶ Hutchinson stressed throughout his account that the magistrates of Massachusetts attempted to reason with the Quakers, to avoid putting their harshest penalties into effect, but with little success. William Leddra, the last Quaker executed by the General Court, was told he could have his life and liberty if he would just leave the jurisdiction; he refused. Hutchinson noted “the court took great pains to persuade him to leave the country, but to no purpose.”¹⁸⁷

Hutchinson’s Quaker zealots appeared in his narrative as mentally deranged, and thus necessarily in need of governmental interference, although not to the extent that Massachusetts took it: “Deborah Wilson went through the streets of Salem, naked as she came into the world, for which she was well whipped. For these and such like disturbances, they might be deemed proper subjects either of a mad-house or house of correction, and it is to be lamented that any greater severities were made use of.”¹⁸⁸

Hutchinson portrayed these religious “enthusiasts” as mentally unbalanced: “[o]ne Faubord, of Grindleton, carried his enthusiasm still higher, and was sacrificing his son in imitation of Abraham, but the neighbour’s hearing the lad cry, broke open the house and happily prevented it.”¹⁸⁹ These descriptions, while not excusing the Massachusetts General Court’s laws and behavior, went some distance toward explaining to Hutchinson’s audience why the sect was regarded so fearfully in its earliest days and why the persecution of the Quakers was ineffective. Hutchinson also noted that “it was a characteristick of this sect, at the beginning of it, to court

¹⁸⁶ Ibid., 168.

¹⁸⁷ Ibid., 173.

¹⁸⁸ Ibid., 174.

¹⁸⁹ Ibid., 174, footnote † (cross).

persecution, and to submit to death, with an infatuation equal to that of some roman catholic priests carrying their religion into China or Tartary.”¹⁹⁰

While Hutchinson saw the Quaker missionaries as highly disruptive, he did not ultimately believe their conduct justified the actions that the Massachusetts government took against them, as “such sanguinary laws against particular doctrines or tenets in religion are not to be defended.”¹⁹¹ Describing the trial of Patience Scot, an 11-year-old Quaker who arrived in Boston unescorted, Hutchinson was relieved to note that the court decided not to take action against her, “Captain Hutchinson undertaking to send her home.” He went on to comment, “Strange, such a child should be imprisoned! It would have been horrible if there had been any further severity.”¹⁹²

With less evidence, Hutchinson argued that the General Court’s prosecution of the Quakers was not supported by popular opinion. In his view, a minority driven by religious fears perpetrated this persecution so that “it was with reluctance that these unnatural laws were carried into execution.”¹⁹³ In one account of a group of jailed Quakers, he suggested that the populace was generally sympathetic, so much so

¹⁹⁰ Ibid., 169, footnote *. Hutchinson also quoted Wendlock Christopherson, a would-be Massachusetts martyr whose sentence was not carried out, as claiming that the executions would only breed more missionaries “for the last man (says he) that was put to death here, are five come in his room...” *History* 1, ch 1: 172.

¹⁹¹ *History* 1, ch. 1: 169.

¹⁹² Ibid., 170. Hutchinson was generally appalled by the severity of penalties meted out to the Quakers. Noting one case, where the General Court ordered two Quakers sold into slavery in the Caribbean or Virginia, because they refused to pay their fines, he commented, “[h]apply the sentence was not carried out.” *History* 1, ch. 1: 172.

¹⁹³ *History* 1, ch. 1: 169. Pestana disagrees, arguing that the Quakers were widely feared, and that their banishment and persecution had widespread approval in the colony: Pestana, “The City upon a Hill under Siege,” *Quakers and Baptists in Massachusetts*.

that the magistrates had to post watch over the jails: “the compassion of the people was moved, and many resorted to the prison day and night, and upon a representation of the keeper, a constant watch was kept round the prison to keep people off.”¹⁹⁴

Hutchinson also noted with regard to the capital law against the Quakers, that “great opposition was made to this law, the magistrates were the most zealous, and in general for it; but it was rejected at first by the deputies....Capt. Edward Hutchinson and Capt. Thomas Clark, two of the court, desired leave to enter their dissent against this law.”¹⁹⁵

Hutchinson treated the Quaker persecutions as a brief aberration in the history of the colony. Massachusetts had resorted to extreme measures against the Quakers reluctantly, only when no other option seemed available to them. In the end, however, Hutchinson could not excuse his countrymen for their treatment of the Quakers. In his concluding remarks on the Quaker controversy, he ultimately concluded that Massachusetts erred in its behavior in this period:

I know of nothing which can be urged, in any wise tending to excuse the severity of this law, unless it be human infirmity, and the many instances in history of persons, of every religion, being fully persuaded that the indulgence of any other was a toleration of impiety, and brought down the judgments of heaven, and therefore justified persecution.¹⁹⁶

For Hutchinson, the Quaker persecutions of the seventeenth century showed how far the colony had come in its justice and respect for individual liberties.

¹⁹⁴ *History* 1, ch. 1: 172.

¹⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, 169, footnote † (cross). Actually, these two were the only ones who went on record against this law among the magistrates, supporting Pestana’s contention that the anti-Quaker laws had broad support both among the populace and in the General Court. Edward Hutchinson’s Nov. 12 1658 protest against the anti-Quaker decree of Nov. 11, 1658 and the decree itself are in the MHS Misc. Photostats, arranged by date.

¹⁹⁶ *History* 1, ch. 2: 270-71.

Ultimately, the episode provided yet another example of the damage emotional overreaction could cause in a state. He noted that like the Antinomians, the Quakers eventually proved themselves to be both useful and law-abiding citizens, showing the earlier reaction against them to be quite overwrought. After the 1660s, Massachusetts confined its laws against the Quakers to whipping, but they hardly needed even these laws, as

after these first excursions they became in general an orderly people, submitting to the laws, except such as relate to the militia and the support of the ministry, and in their scruples as to those, they have, from time to time, been indulged. At present they are esteemed as being of good morals, friendly and benevolent in their disposition, and I hope will never meet with any further persecution on account of their peculiar tenets or customs.¹⁹⁷

Hutchinson also noted the legacy that the Quaker persecutions would have for the colony's later relations with the English ministry. He maintained that Massachusetts' anti-Quaker laws played a major role in the colony's later political problems with England. The Puritan authorities' refusal to cease persecuting this sect when ordered to do so in 1661 frustrated the English ministry and lessened political support for the colony in Parliament. It left the colony with a reputation for brutality and a lack of respect for individual liberty. In particular, regarding English opinion on the capital anti-Quaker legislation, he remarked: "[t]his law lost the colony many friends."¹⁹⁸ Hutchinson quoted in his marginalia a letter from the Lord Say & Seale in 1661 telling the magistrates that the colony's friends at court found it difficult to counter the bad impression created by Massachusetts' "cruelty against the

¹⁹⁷ *History* 1, ch. 1: 175.

¹⁹⁸ *History* 1, ch. 2: 271.

quakers.”¹⁹⁹ He added another hint that the Quaker persecutions cost the colony credibility with the home government: “[t]he agents then in England complain of it and know not what answer to give when inquired of nor how to quiet the clamour raised against the Colony for so unreasonable an act of persecution.”²⁰⁰

Hutchinson could excuse Massachusetts’ behavior with regard to the Quakers only with a plea that the young settlement was still in a fragile state, and the observation that such a lack of tolerance was a general characteristic in this time period. He acknowledged that Massachusetts’ conduct with regard to the Quakers was indefensible, but noted that Massachusetts was little different from other areas during this time period in its surrender to prejudice and intolerance. The persecutions of the Quakers were less a symptom of the religious extremism of Massachusetts than of the religious intolerance of the seventeenth century generally, an attribute of a more barbarous age that had thankfully passed on: “they followed the example of the authorities in most other states and in most ages of the world, who, with the like absurdity, have supposed every person could and ought to think as they did, and [with] the like cruelty have punished such as appeared to differ from them.”²⁰¹

¹⁹⁹ W. Say & Seale to?, London, 10 July 1661, quoted *History* 1, ch. 2: 189, footnote ‡ (double cross).

²⁰⁰ *History* 1, ch. 2: 271.

²⁰¹ *Ibid.*, 169. In a footnote, Hutchinson quoted an unnamed author of an account of the European settlements in North-America, “Such is the manner of proceeding of religious parties towards each other; and in this respect, the New-England people are not worse than the rest of mankind, nor was their severity any just matter of reflection upon that mode of religion which they profess. No religion whatsoever, true or false, can excuse its own members, or accuse those of any other upon the score of persecution.” *History*, 1, ch. 1: 175-76, footnote *.

Henry Dexter agreed with this assessment, arguing that the Quakers were actually treated better in Massachusetts than elsewhere at the time. He cited Quaker author Joseph Besse’s own figures to show that in New England, four were hanged, 22 banished, and 25 suffered lesser penalties, while in England, Scotland, and Ireland for the same time period, 13,258 were persecuted, and 360 killed. Dexter, *As to Roger Williams*, 175.

THE BAPTISTS

The Massachusetts Baptists were less threatening to seventeenth century Massachusetts, although their presence in the colony added to the general atmosphere of religious disorder in the second half of the century. The seventeenth century Anabaptist (later, "Baptist") sect in England argued against infant baptism, a position that was acceptable to most Congregationalists after 1640. But some Baptists also claimed that man had an active role in his salvation, and some Baptists rejected the need for an educated clergy. There were also fears that the Baptists would refuse to fight for the state, because of their pacifist beliefs, and that they would challenge the authority of Massachusetts' government generally. By 1660s, there was increasing suspicion of Baptists in New England,²⁰² especially as they tried to break away from the Puritan churches and form their own congregations. Massachusetts' leaders feared the Anabaptists would not bear arms, obey any magistrate, or allow children to be baptized.²⁰³ After inconclusive hearings in April 1668,²⁰⁴ the General Court decided against any toleration of this sect.

²⁰² For information on colonial Massachusetts' Baptist problems, see William G. McLoughlin, *New England Dissent: The Baptists and the Separation of Church and State, 1633-1833* (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1971); Stephen Foster, "New England and the Challenge of Heresy, 1630 to 1660: The Puritan Crisis in Transatlantic Perspective." *WMQ* 38, no. 4 (Oct. 1981): 224-60; William G. McLoughlin, *Soul Liberty: The Baptists' Struggle in New England, 1630-1833* (Hanover: Brown UP, 1991); Carla Pestana, *Quakers and Baptists in Colonial Massachusetts* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1991); Philip Ranlet, *Enemies of the Bay Colony* (New York: P. Lang, 1995); and James F. Cooper, Jr., "Higher Law, Free Consent, Limited Authority: Church Government and Political Culture in Seventeenth-Century Massachusetts," *NEQ* 69, no. 2 (Jun. 1996): 201-22. William H. Brackney's *The Baptists* (Westport: Greenwood, 1988) is a useful source for information on the sect's origins in England and America.

²⁰³ The decree passed against the Baptists in Massachusetts, November 13, 1644 claimed that the Baptists were well-known trouble-makers in both Britain and America, and that acceptance of their theological heresies would eventually destabilize the civil government as well. "Forasmuch as experience hath plentifully and often proved that since the first arising of the Anabaptists, about a hundred years since, they have been the incendiaries of commonwealths...whereas divers of this kind have, since our coming into New England, appeared amongst ourselves, some whereof have (as others

Massachusetts' struggles with the Baptists never approached the frenzy of the contemporaneous struggles against the Quakers. Massachusetts Puritans generally regarded the Baptists as Puritan in their beliefs, but erring in their judgment on one issue, and much of the Puritan authorities' efforts focused on attempting to win them back.²⁰⁵ The quarrel with the Baptists, however, was part of a larger struggle on the part of the Massachusetts magistracy to retain control of their churches, a position threatened by changing circumstances in England. The most significant source of tension was the Baptists' desire to break away from Puritan churches and form their own. While not subject to the same level of violence as the Quakers, stubborn Baptists were fined, imprisoned and threatened with banishment.

Hutchinson started his coverage of the Baptists' persecutions²⁰⁶ in 1665, remarking that these were the first persecutions of the Anabaptists that he could find

before them) denied the ordinance of magistracy, and the lawfulness of making warr, and others the lawfulness of magistrates, and their inspection into any breach of the first table, which opinions, if they should be connived at by us, are like to be increased amongst us, and so must necessarily bring guilt upon us, infection and trouble to the churches, and hazard to the whole commonwealth." *Records of the Colony of Massachusetts Bay* (Boston, 1854), 2: 85.

²⁰⁴ "The Baptist Debate of April 14-15, 1668," ed. William McLoughlin and Martha Davidson, *MHS Proc.* 76 (1964): 91-136.

²⁰⁵ See Pestana, *Quakers and Baptists in Colonial Massachusetts*. Pestana saw the Baptists as much less of a threat to Massachusetts' religious identity than the Quakers. The Baptists schism grew out of Puritan theology—their main difference was their rejection of infant baptism. Their arguments still fell within the limits of mainstream Reformed theology. The Quakers, by contrast, held radically different ideas from the Puritans on salvation, proper forms of worship, and the role of women. Pestana claimed this resulted in the "Puritans opposing the Baptists and despising the Quakers." Pestana, *Quakers and Baptists*, 166. After an initial period of controversy, the Baptists moved quickly out of their *pariah* status to that of a respected although subordinate group. Puritan Massachusetts took far longer to accept the Quakers, who were perceived as much more radical. Both groups gained legal standing in Massachusetts after 1680, however, mainly because the General Court was given little choice in the matter by a more activist British ministry.

²⁰⁶ Hutchinson called the sect "Anabaptists," their original name.

on the record.²⁰⁷ The Baptists were first admonished, then disfranchised, then imprisoned, then banished. As with the Quakers, Hutchinson noted that persecutions of the Baptists proved counter-productive. “Severity made converts, and then it was thought advisable to cease from further persecutions.”²⁰⁸

Hutchinson minimized the disruption caused by the Baptists, but still regretted the province’s actions against the sect.²⁰⁹ He noted that both churches and communities were torn apart by what seemed to him to be a relatively minor point of doctrine, but noted that this was often the case with religious disputes: “Separations, and divisions, in churches and religious societies, are liable to subdivisions *ad infinitum*, and it argues the perverseness of human nature, that the fiercest disputes, and the strongest alienations, are often caused by a difference of sentiment upon a singly, and perhaps an immaterial, tenet only”²¹⁰

As he had for the Quakers, Hutchinson’s *History* also demonstrated the ultimate folly of the rationale behind the Baptist persecutions. Like the Quakers, the Baptists turned out to be excellent citizens, despite the earlier, inflammatory charges against them. Those urging restraint in dealing with the new sect were proven correct

²⁰⁷ Lawrence S. Mayo, in a footnote, noted that Hutchinson apparently overlooked John Clarke, Obadiah Holmes, and John Crandal’s experiences in Boston in 1651, which would be covered a few years later by Isaac Backus in his *History of New England*. Hutchinson’s Baptist coverage is *History* 1, ch. 2: 195-97. It is considerably shorter than his coverage of the Quaker trials.

²⁰⁸ *History* 1, ch. 2: 196.

²⁰⁹ Hutchinson notes at another point in the text, “During the fifty years the charter continued, there were very few instances of any society of christians differing...from the established churches. The number of baptists was small. The quakers came over in small parties; but notwithstanding the strange delusion they were under in courting persecution, and the imprudence of the authority in gratifying this humor...yet they were never numerous enough to form a society of any consequence, except upon the borders of Rhode Island.” *History* 1: 363.

²¹⁰ *History* 1, ch. 2: 233.

in the long run. Writing of one example of the harmony that could exist even between different sects in this period, Hutchinson mentioned that he had read a letter from the Swanzy Baptist minister to one of Boston's leading Congregational clergy "which breathes the true spirit of the gospel, and urges Christian concord, charity and love, although they did not agree in every point."²¹¹ Also, despite earlier warnings that the Baptists would prove unwilling to fight in the colony's defense, several of the leading officers in King Philip's War were of Baptist persuasion, a point that Hutchinson took pains to emphasize.²¹² The relatively brief outcry over the Baptists caused an emotional upheaval, but faded away almost as quickly as it appeared. Its only legacy was the unnecessary disruption of individual lives and communities.

THE HALF-WAY COVENANT

At the same time controversy was raging over the Baptists in the 1660s, another religious dispute was brewing within the Puritan orthodoxy. The Synod of 1662 decided to allow children of adults who attended services, but had not yet made public demonstrations of their salvation, to be baptized.²¹³ The Half-Way Covenant,

²¹¹ Ibid., 197. Hutchinson means Swansea, Massachusetts: 197, footnote 2.

²¹² Note for example Hutchinson's remarks on William Turner, a Baptist who was later killed in the Indians wars, Edward Drinker, who was imprisoned for his Baptists beliefs, and later became a lieutenant during King Philip's War. *History* 1, ch. 2: 195.

²¹³ The Synod of 1662 determined that members of the congregation who had been admitted as children who publically professed their faith and "not scandalous in life" should be allowed to baptize their children: "Result of the Synod of 1662," in *The Creeds and Platforms of Congregationalism*, ed. W. Walker (Boston, 1960): 328.

For information on the Half-Way Covenant, see Perry Miller, "The Half-Way Covenant," *NEQ* 6, no. 4 (Dec. 1933): 676-715; Edmund Morgan, *Visible Saints: The History of a Puritan Ideal* (New York: New York UP, 1963), and "The Half-Way Covenant Reconsidered," in *Puritanism in Seventeenth-Century Massachusetts*, ed. David D. Hall, (New York: Holt Rinehart & Winston, 1968): 99-107; E. Brooks Holifield, "On Toleration in Massachusetts," *Church History* 38, no. 2 (Jun. 1969): 188-200; Robert G. Pope, *The Half-Way Covenant: Church Membership in Puritan New England* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1969); Richard C. Simmons, "The Founding of the Third Church in Boston,"

as it came to be known, was a compromise solution to a growing problem by the 1660s—the diminishing number of people who stood as full members of the churches, and hence qualified to have their children baptized. While many of the leading ministers accepted it as a way to keep Puritan society from fragmenting further, it was seen by critics as evidence of degeneracy. The Half-Way Covenant dispute, together with the Baptist controversy divided congregations across New England in the 1660s and 1670s, and resulted in larger schisms within the Puritan communities and the General Court.

Hutchinson barely addressed the theological dispute behind the Half-Way Covenant; however, he bemoaned the disorder which it and the Baptist controversy together created.²¹⁴ Regarding the dissensions sown by both religious quarrels, Hutchinson noted that the entire situation proved the ill effects of the clergy's continuing power within the civil government, and the lack of separation between church and state. In his reasoning, this interdependency hurt both the churches and the state:

WMQ 26, no. 2 (Apr. 1969): 241-52; and James F. Cooper, Jr., *Tenacious of Their Liberties: The Congregationalists in Colonial Massachusetts* (New York: Oxford UP, 1999).

Edmund Morgan noted that one reason for the declining full membership was that Massachusetts had stauncher standards for certification as elect than anywhere else in the Anglo-American Protestant world. Even within the dissenting churches in England, all that was required for church membership by the 1660s was “godly walk”—upright behavior—and a profession of faith. Robert Pope suggests that the Half-Way Covenant was meant to preserve the distinctiveness of the Elect, while at the same time maintain the communal nature of Puritanism by allowing a larger percentage of the population to claim some membership in the churches. Pushed by a segment of the ministry, it encountered significant resistance on the part of the laity.

²¹⁴ Hutchinson's coverage of the theological basis of the Half-Way Covenant, such as it was, is at *History* 1, ch. 2, 231-34. Holifield noted that supporters of the Half-Way Covenant and supporters of the Baptists tended to represent the two extreme positions of the theological spectrum at the time. “The Half-Way Covenant permitted children of the unregenerate to be baptized; the Baptists baptized no children; the “traditionalists” stood somewhere between.” Holifield, “On Toleration in Massachusetts,” 199.

“I have been more particular in relating this transaction, because it gives us a pretty good idea of the connection between the civil and ecclesiastical power, the churches, notwithstanding their claim to independency, being liable to controul as oft as their proceedings were disapproved by the civil magistrate, and on the other hand, the magistrates, who were annually elected, being sometimes liable to be displaced by the influence of the clergy in elections.”²¹⁵

With regard to the tumult caused in many New England towns by the Half-Way Covenant of the 1660s, Hutchinson quoted the minister of Dorchester, Josiah Flint, on the general evils of persecution and religious intolerance that this time produced: “A spirit of division, persecuting and oppressing God’s ministers and precious saints, is the sin which is unseen and none bears witness against. It is a great sin and threatens a sword of divine wrath. God’s seers fear it, and their bowels and compassions are moved at it.”²¹⁶

THE DECLENSION QUESTION

Hutchinson’s coverage of the religious struggles of seventeenth century Massachusetts demonstrated the distance the author had come from his family’s Puritan roots. Reviewing his coverage, the most striking aspect is the careful balancing of Hutchinson’s respect for the Puritan founders and admiration for their achievements with his rejection of their religiously-oriented society. Hutchinson acknowledged the contributions seventeenth century Massachusetts had made to the realm, and praised the founders as well as the overall loyalty and stability of the society they created. He ascribed the periodic disturbances and persecutions in the time period to the general temper of the age, rather than any unique flaw of

²¹⁵ *History* 1, ch. 2: 234-35.

²¹⁶ *History* 1, ch. 2: 232, footnote † (cross).

Massachusetts Puritan society, and maintained that these persecutions had at times been exaggerated by the colony's enemies.²¹⁷

At the same time, however, Hutchinson also refused to excuse his colony's history of persecutions and religious schisms. His work demonstrated how the colony's earlier zeal for orthodoxy caused disputes within the settlement, with neighboring colonies, and with the home government, and laid the seeds for many of their later problems. The rigidness and theocratic inflexibility of Puritan Massachusetts led it to violate the liberties of its citizens. It led to quarrels with neighboring colonies, and religious divisions that destabilized the colony and rendered it more vulnerable to attack. Finally, Massachusetts' denial of religious liberty to its minorities was at the heart of many of Massachusetts' quarrels with the home government over the course of the seventeenth century and beyond.

Hutchinson steadfastly celebrated the values of his enlightened present in opposition to a more ignorant and intolerant past. His work differed from that of earlier New England historians not only in rejecting the colony's quest for religious orthodoxy, but also in completely rejecting the declension interpretation of Massachusetts history,²¹⁸ the vision of the early, golden city on a hill collapsing into

²¹⁷ Hutchinson cited the authority of an unnamed historian whom he says is "very erroneous in some historical facts which concern the Massachusetts colony, but has many judicious observations" as saying, "[s]uch is the manner of proceeding of religious parties towards each other; and in this respect, the New-England people are not worse than the rest of mankind, nor was their severity any just matter of reflection upon that mode of religion which they profess." *History* 1, ch. 1: 175-76, footnote *.

²¹⁸ The concept of "declension," or a decline from a moral virtuous and purer past, runs through Puritan literature and the sermons of seventeenth century Massachusetts, particularly after the Restoration. The core concept was the idea that Massachusetts, by the second and third generations, had "fallen away" from its original ideals and moral standards. David Scobey noted that ministerial claims of declension first appeared around the time of the Half-Way Covenant in the 1660s. Scobey suggested that the key issue may not have been a true decline in church participation, but the ministers declining influence on civil society, and the fragmentation of the churches. David M. Scobey

corruption and decadence, which had dominated Massachusetts' histories and literature since the late seventeenth century.²¹⁹ Hutchinson's rejection of the declension paradigm was particularly noticeable right at the point in the narrative when earlier commentators begin to note the loss of the Golden Age: the mid-seventeenth century, when the original generation began dying off. Hutchinson noted with regard to the original generation of settlers: "After forty years, the greatest part of our first emigrants had finished their pilgrimage...Some of them lamented their being born too soon, to see New-England in its most flourishing state. This will be the case with their posterity for many generations yet to come."²²⁰

Summing up his colony's history in the second half of the seventeenth century, Hutchinson noted that fellow historian Daniel Neal had attributed many of

"Revising the Errand: New England's Ways and the Puritan Sense of the Past," *WMQ* 41, no. 1 (Jan. 1984): 3-31. It was described most forcibly by Perry Miller, in *The New England Mind: From Colony to Province* (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1953), and *The New England Mind: The Seventeenth Century* (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1954).

For the declension tendency in seventeenth and early eighteenth century New England writers, see James F. Maclear, "'The Heart of New England Rent': The Mystical Element in Early Puritan History," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* 42, no. 4 (Mar. 1956): 621-52; Peter Gay, *A Loss of Mastery: Puritan Historians in Colonial America* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1966); Cecelia Tichi, "The Puritan Historians and Their New Jerusalem," *Early American Literature* 6, no. 2 (1971): 143-55, and "Spiritual Biography and the 'Lords Remembrancer,'" *WMQ* 28, no. 1 (Jan. 1971): 64-85; Kenneth B. Murdock, "Clio in the Wilderness: History and Biography in Puritan New England," *Early American Literature* 6 (1972): 201-19; Robert G. Pope, "New England versus the New England Mind: The Myth of Declension," in *Puritan New England: Essays on Religion, Society and Culture* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1977), 314-25; Theodore D. Bozeman, *To Live Ancient Lives: The Primitivist Dimension in Puritanism* (Chapel Hill: UNC Press, 1988); Jon Butler, *Awash in a Sea of Faith: Christianizing the American People* (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1990); and Stephen C. Arch, *Authorizing the Past: The Rhetoric of History in Seventeenth-Century New England* (DeKalb: Northeastern Illinois UP, 1994).

²¹⁹ Michael McGiffert noted Perry Miller's similar opinion: "we have no evidence of any extraordinary degeneracy" in the late seventeenth century. Late seventeenth century New England certainly was changing, in ways that its ministers would only be able to interpret as deterioration. Miller saw the jeremiads as psychological products of the clergy's tortured state with regard to these changes, which they were forced to accommodate. The jeremiads nostalgically transformed the early seventeenth century into a golden age of unity. Michael McGiffert, "American Puritan Studies in the 1960's," *WMQ* 27, no. 1 (Jan. 1970): 36-67, quote p. 43.

²²⁰ *History* 1, ch. 2: 222.

the colony's problems, including the charter issues, the epidemics, and the border wars to the declining morality of the people. According to Hutchinson, the earlier historian had maintained that 'the people began to grow intolerably licentious in their morals, that devout people observed the judgments of God seemed to follow them, blasting epidemical disease, uncommon losses by sea, &c.'²²¹ Hutchinson rejected this utterly, noting that everything mentioned had purely natural causes. Smallpox was a worldwide problem at this time. The military difficulties the colony was experiencing at the time were hardly surprising, given the unsettled nature of their Indian relations and the presence of the hostile Dutch and French. Government problems were not unique to Massachusetts, as the entire English system was experiencing unprecedented invasions of their liberties at this time, "[s]uffering under a prince inimical to civil and religious liberty." Hutchinson claimed that with regard to the late seventh century as a whole, "we have no evidence of any extraordinary degeneracy."²²²

Hutchinson's work demonstrated admiration for the founding generation of Massachusetts, while at the same time rejecting the notion that their era was superior to his own present time. His seventeenth century religious sources, and even many of the eighteenth century historians such as Prince and Neal, still wrote Massachusetts' history around the central assumption that the present-day was a tawdry, immoral age compared to the godly world of the original settlement.

²²¹ *History* 1, ch. 2: 274.

²²² *History* 1, ch. 2: 274, and 274, footnote *. For a discussion of the declension paradigm in Massachusetts literature, see Robert G. Pope, "New England versus the New England Mind: The Myth of Declension," *Journal of Social History* 3 (1969): 95-108.

Unlike his contemporaries Thomas Prince and Daniel Neal, Hutchinson had a respectful but not a worshipful attitude toward the founders. He admired Puritan Massachusetts in some aspects, but he did not want to live there. His *History*, throughout all three volumes, at least until it fell apart into the day-to-day recounting of the Revolutionary crisis, was a progress story. This put Hutchinson's history much more in the category of an Enlightenment history—it may be the first New England history to be shaped as a progress story.²²³

²²³ Stow Parson argued that there were three distinct theories of history in time period of American Enlightenment. The first was the religious or supernatural interpretation, where human history was conceived to be a process of redemption, guided by divine will. This concept of history was still in wide circulation even in the late eighteenth century. The second theory of history, the cyclical view, in some ways shared qualities with the first concept. It was closely tied to ideas of moral corruption—societies were viewed as similar to living organisms, which had a brief period of health, and then declined. The third concept, that of a progress-oriented interpretation of history, where human affairs were assumed to improve over time rather than regress, he associated mainly with the period after the American Revolution. Stow Persons, "The Cyclical Theory of History in Eighteenth Century America," *American Quarterly* 6, no. 2 (Summer 1954): 147-63.

CHAPTER 4: INDIAN AFFAIRS

Indian affairs were a major preoccupation for the Massachusetts colony from its earliest days, and played a prominent role in the *History*. Massachusetts' two early Indian Wars, the Pequot War of 1636-1637 and King Philip's War of 1675-1676 were key events in the colony's first century of existence. They helped determine the course of the colony's subsequent Indian relations, and influenced Massachusetts' relationship with its neighboring colonies and with the imperial government.²²⁴ Hutchinson covered both wars in Volume One of his work. His writings on the subject reveal much about his political philosophy and views of his colony.

Hutchinson's concerns regarding the treatment of Indians, as a "minority" (in the sense that they were not only a minority of the population in the area but also because they were a people set vastly apart from the Europeans by race, religion and lifestyle) mirrored many of the same concerns that he showed in his coverage of the religious schisms, and demonstrated many of the same anxieties that would guide him in his political career. In their dealings with the Indians, New Englanders were often led astray by their religious and racial prejudices, particularly in their refusal to

²²⁴ James Axtell argues that it was largely the reactive changes colonial Englishmen made in response to various Indian threats that slowly changed them into Americans. Having the Indians as a recognizable "other" helped the Americans define themselves by who they were not. The Indians' existence as enemies, or even as allies, helped create the garrison mentality of colonial America, and with it the colonists' self-perception of themselves as a chosen if sometimes beleaguered people. James Axtell, "Colonial America without the Indians: Counterfactual Reflections," *JAH* 73, no. 4 (Mar. 1987): 981-96. Steven Webb makes the provocative argument that King Philip's War in New England (along with Bacon's Rebellion in Virginia) helped destroy much of the earlier colonial autonomy, by weakening the colonial governments and giving the home government an excuse to exert much greater control: Steven S. Webb, *1676: The Death of American Independence* (New York: Knopf, 1987).

honor Indian land rights or treat the Indians fairly in court. Their most egregious brutality was often attributable to their surrender to rage and emotion. As a vulnerable minority, the Indians had particular need of fair and equitable treatment by the law, which they did not always receive. The Indians' legal status as subjects of the colonial governments was itself not clear in this earlier period, a point Hutchinson demonstrated in his account, and their behavior and their treatment by colonial authorities reflected this.

On the political side of the scale, Hutchinson's account once again both chided and defended the actions of his colony. Overall, Hutchinson argued that, despite the constant strain brought on by colonial-Indian tensions throughout the century, Massachusetts had generally maintained the peace, and behaved honorably in times of war. New England's Indian history was not without its blots and blemishes, but on the whole it was a success story, and this success was largely attributable to Massachusetts' good leadership. The *History* demonstrated the mistakes the colony had made regarding its relations with the Indians, and it explored the points at which the colonists' emotions and prejudices had led them astray. But it also showed the colony's overall self-sufficiency and ability to govern themselves, and demonstrated the contributions Massachusetts had made to the defense of the British Empire.

This chapter will first examine Hutchinson's coverage of the Pequot War, New England's first major Indian conflict, and its role in shaping New England's history. It will next discuss colonial-Indian relations in the post-war period, and the growing tension that ultimately resulted in King Philip's War, one of the greatest

challenges to confront seventeenth century New England. It will address how Hutchinson's interpretations of Indian affairs and the Indian wars differed from that of earlier accounts, and how the challenges of the Indian conflicts related, in his mind, to the larger challenges facing New England.

HUTCHINSON'S VIEW OF THE INDIANS

Historical accounts of the Indians in colonial New England were generally quite negative. Cotton Mather, writing in 1702 about the Pequots (and the Indians generally), described them as "Bloody Salvages" (i.e., savages) over whom the colonists prevailed because of God's blessings:

...when Bloody *Salvages* in their Neighbourhood, known by the Name of *Pequots*, had like to have nipt the Plantation in the Bud by a cruel War, within a Year or two after their Settlement, the marvellous Providence of God immediately extinguished that War, by prospering the *New-English* Arms, unto the utter subdueing of the Quarrelsome Nation, and affrightning of all the other Natives.²²⁵

Samuel Niles, who was writing at about the same time as Hutchinson, characterized the Indians as "salvages" having a "barbarous and cruel disposition" both toward whites and each other.²²⁶ The European writer William Robertson, whose *History of America* came out in 1777, called the Indians an immature or degenerative species in a "savage state" and described their domestic relations as "perverted."²²⁷

²²⁵ Mather, *Magnalia*, Book 1, 147, quotation 166.

²²⁶ Samuel Niles, "A Summary Historical Narrative of the Wars in New-England with the French and Indians, in the Several Parts of the Country. *MHS Collections*, 3rd ser. 6 (1837): 197.

²²⁷ William Robertson, *The History of America* (London: W. Strahan, 1777): Book 6, 299, 306, quoted in Jeffrey Smitten, "Impartiality in Robertson's History of America," *Eighteenth Century Studies* 19, no. 1 (Autumn 1985): 58.

While Hutchinson does refer to the Indians at various places as “savages” (as does his twentieth century editor, Lawrence M. Shaw),²²⁸ Hutchinson throughout the *History* generally displayed more sympathy than hostility toward the Native American groups. Unlike many contemporary historians, Hutchinson could always tell his Indians apart, and was far less apt to make blanket statements with regard to tactics or means of warfare. Hutchinson noted the significant differences between tribes, as well as the difficulties inherent in judging their capacities, due to the paucity of information and the biases of European observers.²²⁹

Throughout his *History*, Hutchinson treated the Indians as legal persons, who had a right to expect fair and equitable treatment by the colonial courts and the larger society. His work demonstrated that the early settlers ignored this fact at their peril. Early in his narrative, in discussing plans to fortify Boston, a scheme Hutchinson disapproved of as impractical, Hutchinson noted of the original settlement:

Their design was to make improvements, and to extend their settlements in the several parts of the country. Unless they were upon such terms with the Indians, that they could do this with safety, the colony could not long subsist. If they were upon such terms, fortified towns were unnecessary.²³⁰

Letters in the *London Evening Post* in 1776 described the Indians as ‘tawny savage beings, who resemble Devils more than men,’ and claimed the Indian “lives under no sort of government.” The same year, the Earl of Chatham, in high rhetorical style, anticipated the British government’s new Indian allies in America “torturing, murdering, roasting, and eating...the mangled victims of his barbarous battles!” In 1778, Edmund Burke called the Indians “savages and Cannibals...unnatural and savage.” *London Evening Post*, no. 8393 (Jan. 4-6, 1776): 3, and *London Evening Post*, no. 8509 (Oct. 1-3, 1776): 2; *Genuine Abstracts from Two Speeches of the Late Earl of Chatham...* (London, 1779), 55-57; Edmund Burke, “Speech on the Use of Indians, Feb. 6, 1778,” in *Writings and Speeches of Edmund Burke* (Oxford, 1996): 3: 356, 361; all quoted in Dror Wahrman, “The English Problem of Identity in the American Revolution,” *AHR* 106, no. 4 (Oct. 2001): 1246, 1248.

²²⁸ See for example *History* 1, ch. 5: 367, 370. Hutchinson also calls the Indians “barbarous” at one point in the text, although he is paraphrasing a letter to the French commander Vaudreuil from the Massachusetts General Court here: *History* 2, ch. 2:137.

²²⁹ *History* 1, ch. 5: 393.

²³⁰ *History* 1, ch. 1: 23.

Hutchinson also regarded the Indians as having genuine property rights, a key issue in their problems with the settlers.²³¹ He remarked with regard to the dubious claims to Massachusetts' land of adventurers like Ferdinando Gorges that their claims were wholly without merit, as the territory they claimed was all included in other grants made by the Massachusetts Council or the Crown, "or has been purchased of the natives, which, if done *bonâ fide*, so far as respects the property, has been thought by some to be the best title."²³²

While Hutchinson depreciated Indian culture and religious beliefs as inferior to white culture and religion, he gave no indication in the text that he believed the Indians were biologically inferior. Like many Enlightenment writers (most notably John Locke), he accepted that their society closely represented a "state of nature" at the time of European arrival, "destitute of most of the improvement which are the usual effects of civil society."²³³ Also like many Enlightenment commentators, Hutchinson was most discomforted by the Indians' seeming lack of respect for their women and the lack of European gender-divisions in their work roles.²³⁴

Hutchinson also accepted that the Indians needed to be Christianized; both he and his father were long-time contributors to the New England Company, the main

²³¹ He remarked, later in Volume Two of the *History*, that French historian Charlevoix was wrong to reproach the English for violating Indian land rights, as all of the European powers were equally guilty in this respect: "The European nations, which have their colonies in America, may not reproach one another upon this head. They all took possession, contrary to the minds of the natives, who would gladly have been rid of their new guests." *History* 2, ch. 3: 200.

²³² *Ibid.*, 47-48.

²³³ *Ibid.*, 388.

²³⁴ *History* 1, ch. 5: 388-89.

Puritan missionary organization.²³⁵ In the earlier part of his narrative, Hutchinson criticized the earlier generations of Puritan Massachusetts for doing too little toward this goal:

One professed design of the colony charter was the gospelizing the natives. The long neglect of any attempts this way cannot be excused. The Indians themselves asked, how it happened, if Christianity was of such importance, that for six and twenty years together the English had said nothing to them about it.²³⁶

Hutchinson defended the small numbers of Indians converted to the Congregational Church compared to the converts made by Catholic or Anglican missionaries (a frequent criticism made back in England) by noting the much more strenuous requirements for admission to the Protestant congregations, adding that the Praying Indians were examined by the magistrates as well as ministers and forced to give up all their old habits before being accepted into the church. “Whereas, with the Romish priests, the repetition of a Pater Noster or Ave Maria, or perhaps the telling over a few beads, made them fit subjects for baptism.”²³⁷ Hutchinson approved of John Eliot’s efforts on behalf of the New England Indians as far more enlightened than those of Catholic missionaries:

Mr. Eliot, a minister in New-England, at the same time applied himself with zeal, equal to that of the missionaries of the Romish church, but instead of adopting a favorite maxim of some of that church, that ignorance is the mother of devotion, he endeavoured to enlighten the understandings of the Indians, to draw them from

²³⁵ For the activities of the New England Company, see William Kellaway, *The New England Company, 1649-1776: Missionary Society to American Indians* (London: Longmans Green, 1961).

²³⁶ *History* 1, ch. 1: 137. Both Hutchinson and his father supported Indian missionary activities: Samuel Mather, “The Faithful Man Abounding with Blessings. A Funeral Discourse Upon the Death of the Honourable Thomas Hutchinson, Esq.” (Boston: J. Draper, for N. Procter, 1740).

²³⁷ *Ibid.*, 142, footnote ‡ (double cross).

their savage, barbarous, and wandering way of life, to civility,
government and cohabitation...²³⁸

Hutchinson did not regard the Indians as trustworthy as a political group, noting, in relation to the Narragansett alliance during the Pequot War, “Indian fidelity is proverbial in New-England, as Punick was in Rome.”²³⁹ In one example, Hutchinson discounted treaties signed by Philip before the war as completely disingenuous: “[t]he Indians, in general, will promise any thing required of them to remove an impending danger, or to procure an immediate benefit, and they regard such promises not a minute longer than it is for their advantage to do it.”²⁴⁰ However, Hutchinson generally seemed to analyze the behavior of the Indians much as he would that of European rivals, such as the French or Spanish (who also received similar disparaging remarks).²⁴¹

While appalled by the Indians’ primitive customs, lack of personal hygiene, and ruthless violence towards enemies, Hutchinson recognized the vices as well as the virtues of their societies: “[s]ome appearances there were of compassion, gratitude, and friendship, and of grief at the death or distress of their children or near relations. Some degree of these social affections is inseparable from human

²³⁸ Ibid., 139.

²³⁹ Ibid., 53. An interesting classical choice: Carthage was considered untrustworthy by the Romans partly because the state let its public assemblies guide its foreign policies, and they were easily led and fickle. Hutchinson also mentioned in another place that the Indians could see the whites as equally untrustworthy and fickle. He noted, quoting the French historian Charlevoix, that the Indians found the French and English propensity for warfare with each other a source of great mystery. Teganissorens, an Iroquois, remarked, “Europeans, says he, are an out of the way people; they go to war again, for meer nothing at all. This is not our practice; after we have once signed to a treaty, there must be some very strong reason to induce us to break it.” *History* 2, ch. 2: 105.

²⁴⁰ *History* 1, ch. 2: 238.

²⁴¹ For example, with regard to the Dutch, *History* 1, ch. 1: 135, 153, and 157. Hutchinson blamed much of the Indians’ early hostility towards the Puritans on the colonists of rival European nations, who planted seeds of suspicion against the English. *History* 1, ch. 5: 384, 385.

nature.”²⁴² Hutchinson had little regard for Native American religion, but he defended the Indians against the common accusations of witchcraft, or consorting with the Devil, which he attributed to European misunderstandings of their powwows.²⁴³ Hutchinson also recognized that some of Indian medicine was superior to that of Europeans: “I will mention an instance of their sagacity. Observing that the musquash fed freely upon the hemlock without hurt, they took out the stomach of the animal, dried and pulverized it, and gave it to their children who had eaten of the plant, and found it to be an antidote for the poison.”²⁴⁴ Hutchinson also noted that the men were notably inclined to sloth, and would be drunkards if allowed to drink, but noted that English and French women need not fear rape from them.²⁴⁵

Hutchinson also asserted that some of the Indians’ conduct, described as barbaric by white commentators, was militarily necessary. Describing one incident where fleeing Indians killed a female English captive who, weakened from recent childbirth, could no longer keep up with them, Hutchinson noted,

“This is not mentioned as an instance of savage barbarity. Their own preservation often depends upon their destroying their prisoners. Henry the fifth of England killed in cold blood, the flower of France, when he supposed his own little army to be in danger. The Indians after these onsets, always suspected to be pursued. If they left their grown captives in the woods, they would discover them to the pursuers....To leave young children to die would be more cruel than to kill them outright.”²⁴⁶

²⁴² Ibid., 394-95.

²⁴³ “We have many idle stories of the intercourse they had with the Devil. Their craft was in danger from the preachers of the gospel, who condemned their cheats and juggles as diabolical...” *History* 1, ch. 5: 398.

²⁴⁴ *History* 1, ch. 5: 399, footnote *.

²⁴⁵ Ibid.

²⁴⁶ *History* 2, ch. 2: 104, footnote *.

Hutchinson went on to remark that some captives from King Philip's War were so well treated by their Indian captors that they refused to return to white society when their relatives attempted to redeem them.²⁴⁷

In some places, Hutchinson seemed quite contemptuous of Indian leadership, noting that the English initially treated them as they would petty European princes, but "the base sordid minds of the best of them, and the little authority they had over their own subjects, soon rendered them contemptible."²⁴⁸ Generally, however, Indian leaders were treated as individuals, who varied widely in abilities and character. Miantonomo, the Narragansett sachem who made the treaty with Massachusetts Bay that helped secure their neutrality in the Pequot War, was described rather ambivalently as making his overtures to Boston "whether out of love or fear they could not tell," but also as being a "very high spirited fellow" who was shamed when his warriors broke into an English house during his visit.²⁴⁹ On the other hand, Pequot sachem Tatobem was a "very stout fellow" who "hated the English, and was for ever moving the other Indians to join with him against them."²⁵⁰

While Hutchinson was not wholly free of prejudice towards Native Americans, his attitudes toward them were in many ways more nuanced than those of many of his contemporaries. Hutchinson's narrative demonstrated that the

²⁴⁷ Ibid.

²⁴⁸ *History* 1, ch. 2: 235.

²⁴⁹ *History* 1, ch. 1: 26. Hutchinson also said of Miantonomo, in a note to his edited collection of papers, that he regretted that the Commissioners of the United Colonies arranged to have him assassinated: "[t]he best that can be said of this advice is, that it was politick. Miantonomo was a man of great spirit. The English were in more fear of him than of any other Indian upon the continent." *Collection of Papers*, ed. Hutchinson, 1: 159, footnote 107.

²⁵⁰ Ibid., 41, footnote ‡ (double cross).

colonists were often at fault in Anglo-Indian disputes. Moreover, the nature of colonial mistreatments of the Indians—the unfair treatment in the legal courts, lynch mobs, and emotional miscarriages of justice driven by popular hysteria—were all subjects to which Hutchinson would return again and again in other parts of his narrative. Hutchinson’s analysis of the colonial relations with the Indians over the course of the seventeenth century demonstrated his concern with the need for order, as well as his fear of rule by prejudice or emotion. In his concern with the validity of Indian land purchases, his questions regarding the sovereignty of Indian nations, and his queries regarding the legal position of Indian nations with regard to the English king, Hutchinson once again demonstrated his concern with fairness in legal matters and his appreciation of constitutional government. He showed both his concern with legality and his criteria for honorable and competent leadership.

THE PEQUOT WAR

Two major events involving the Indians occurred in Massachusetts over the course of the seventeenth century—the Pequot War of 1636-1637, and King Philip’s War of 1675-1676. The Pequot War²⁵¹ was the first significant New England Indian war, and resulted in the destruction of the most powerful Indian tribe in the area. It

²⁵¹ For background on the Pequot War, see Alden T. Vaughan, “Pequots and Puritans: The Causes of the War of 1637,” *WMQ* 21, no. 2 (April 1964): 256-69; Yasuhide Kawashima, *Puritan Justice and the Indian: White Man’s Law in Massachusetts, 1630-1763* (Middletown, CN: Wesleyan UP, 1986); Steven T. Katz, “The Pequot War Reconsidered,” *NEQ*, 64, no. 2 (Jun. 1991): 206-24; Alfred A. Cave, “Who Killed John Stone? A Note on the Origins of the Pequot War,” *WMQ* 49, no. 3 (Jul. 1992): 509-21; Patrick M. Malone, *The Skulking Way of War: Technology and Tactics among the New England Indians* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1993); Michael Freeman, “Puritans and Pequots: The Question of Genocide,” *NEQ* 68, no. 2 (Jun. 1995): 278-93; Steven T. Katz, “Pequots and the Question of Genocide: A Reply to Michael Freeman,” *NEQ*, 68, no. 4 (Dec. 1995): 641-49; Alden T. Vaughan, *New England’s Frontier: Puritans and Indians, 1620-1675*, 3rd ed. (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1995); Alfred A. Cave, *The Pequot War* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1996); and Ronald D. Karr, ““Why Should You Be So Furious?”: The Violence of the Pequot War,” *JAH* 85, no. 3 (Dec. 1998): 876-909.

set the tone for Anglo-Indian relations for the better part of the seventeenth century. The Pequot War provoked a good deal of contemporary writing, although nowhere near the level inspired by the later war with King Philip's warriors. Contemporary writers were united in blaming the Pequots for the conflict, and spent a great deal of time defending the conflict as a "just war."²⁵²

On the eve of the Pequot War, the Pequots were a highly unified people with a complex power structure. With 3,000-4,000 members at lowest estimates, they controlled a large part of the Thames, Mystic and Connecticut River Valleys, a territory coveted by both the English and the Dutch colonists. In the summer of 1636, the Massachusetts and Plymouth General Courts declared war on the Pequot nation for the murder, ostensibly by Pequots or allied tribesmen, of two white settlers, John Stone and John Oldham. The ultimate origins of the war, however, lay in a complex battle over trade in the Connecticut River Valley, and in the general English fears of Indian uprisings.

²⁵² For contemporary accounts of the Pequot War, see Captain John Mason, "Brief History of the Pequot War," in *History of the Pequot War: The Contemporary Accounts of Mason, Underhill, Vincent and Gardiner*, ed. Charles Orr (Cleveland: Helman-Taylor Co., 1897): 11-46; Captain John Underhill, "Newes from America," in *Pequot War*, 49-86; Philip Vincent, "A True Relation of the Late Battel Fought in New England," in *Pequot War*, 97-111; and Lion Gardener, "Relation of the Pequot War," in *Pequot War*, 93-112. See also William Bradford, *Of Plymouth Plantation, 1620-1647*, ed. Samuel E. Morrison (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1953), particularly 290-97; John Winthrop, *The Journal of John Winthrop, 1630-1649*, ed. Richard Dunn, James Savage, and Laetitia Yeadle (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1996): 183-238, and Edward Johnson, *Wonder-Working Providence of Sions Saviour in New England* (London, 1654; Delmar, NY: Scholars' Facsimiles & Reprints, 1974). William Hubbard's Indian history and Cotton Mather's account of King Philip's War deal both dealt with this earlier conflict as well. Hubbard's account was entitled *The History of the Indian Wars in New England from the First Settlement to the Termination of the War with King Philip, in 1677* (London, 1677). A republished edition was edited by Samuel G. Drake (New York: Burt Franklin, 1836; 1990). Mather's 1677 account has been republished as *Increase Mather and Cotton Mather, The History of King Philip's War, by the Rev. Increase Mather. Also, A History of the Same War, by the Rev. Cotton Mather*, ed. Samuel G. Drake (Heritage Books Reprint, Albany: J. Munsell, 1862; 1990). Hubbard's general history, which remained in manuscript until the nineteenth century also dealt with both Indian wars in less detail; it was published in 1842 as *A General History of New England, from the Discovery to MDCLXXX* (Boston: C. C. Little & J. Brown, 1842; reprinted New York: Arno Press, 1972).

John Stone had been killed three years before the commencement of the Pequot War, and his death initially provoked little initial outcry in New England. A year after his death, however, Massachusetts-Bay made the return of Stone's killers a term in treaty negotiations they opened with the Pequots. When these treaty negotiations collapsed, both sides began preparing for war. This tension was further heightened by the murder of another Englishman, John Oldham, in 1636.²⁵³

Contemporary accounts clearly show that the whites initiated the Pequot War. On August 25, 1636, Massachusetts Governor John Endicott, John Underhill and William Turner organized an expedition of about a hundred men to march against the Pequots. Their initial target was the Block Island Indians, allies of the Pequots who were suspected of sheltering Stone's killers. The expedition proved a failure—the villages on Block Island were destroyed, but the Indians escaped. By the late summer of 1636, furious Pequots were attacking Connecticut settlements as well as Fort Saybrook, where a siege continued for months.

The culminating event of the Pequot War was the Puritan attack on a fortified Pequot fort, Fort Mystic, near present-day New Haven, Connecticut, on May 26, 1637.²⁵⁴ English and Mohegan forces arrived at night and encircled the sleeping fort.

²⁵³ Like Stone, Oldham was a non-Puritan with a generally unsavory reputation. Bradford describes Stone as a drunkard and a thief who had once contemplated murdering the Plymouth governor for an alleged insult. Bradford, *Of Plymouth Plantation*, 268-69.

²⁵⁴ The Puritans' motivation for the Mystic attack, which all contemporary sources depicted as a massacre, was the controversy arising out of the Pequot War. Nineteenth century historian John Fiske argued that the actions were wholly justified: "As a matter of practical policy, the annihilation of the Pequots can be condemned only by those who read history so incorrectly as to suppose that savages, whose business it is to torture and slay, can always be dealt with according to the methods in use between civilized peoples": John Fiske, *The Beginnings of New England*; or, The Puritan Theocracy in its Relations to Civil and Religious Liberty (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1889; 1930, 144-45; quoted by Orr, "Introduction," in *Pequot War*, xviii. Modern historian James Drake argued that the Puritans' conduct of the Fort Mystic massacre was consistent with accepted codes of conduct of warfare, and not

At dawn, they set it ablaze; sentries killed any who tried to flee the fire. The attack was a rout: by various estimates as many as 600-700 Pequot were killed, including a large number of women and children; the English estimated that only about a dozen warriors escaped.²⁵⁵ The English lost two men, and the attack lasted less than an hour. The brutality of the attack devastated the Pequot forces, the remainder of whom surrendered within months.

The Pequot War provoked a good deal of commentary in all of the existing New England colonies. Many of the contemporary accounts focused on the victory as God's gift to the colonists, depicting the Pequots as savages who started the conflict for no apparent reason other than love of bloodshed. The four contemporary military accounts of the battle all agreed that the English and the Pequots were each aiming for the complete annihilation of the other, and all four writers attributed the English victory in the war to God's help in vanquishing a heathen enemy. These seventeenth century accounts were driven not so much by questions of race (although Philip Vincent was not certain if the Indians even counted as men),²⁵⁶ but

due to racism. Drake argues that in the time of the Pequot War, unlike the later King Philip's War, the Indians were seen as sovereign nations and treated accordingly. The massacre at Mystic, while brutal, followed accepted codes of European siege warfare, where surrendered towns could only expect quarter if they yielded before the siege began. James Drake, "Restraining Atrocity: The Conduct of King Philip's War," *NEQ* 70, no. 1 (Mar. 1997): 33-56.

²⁵⁵ Casualty estimates for the Fort Mystic attack: Winthrop estimated that during the course of a nightlong siege, all but twenty of an estimated 80 men and 200 women and children were killed or captured: "Winthrop to Bradford, 20 May 1637," in *Of Plymouth Plantation*, Appendix 8, 394-96. Vincent's Mystic estimates were 300-400 killed, none escaped, only two English dead, one by friendly fire. Vincent, "True Relation," in *Pequot War*, 104. Underhill's estimated there were about 400 in the fort, and only about five escaped. Underhill, "Newes from America," in *Pequot War*, 81. Bradford also estimated the casualties at Mystic around 400: Bradford, *Of Plymouth Plantation*, 296. Mason (who was present, along with Underhill) had the highest estimates, putting the Indian casualties at 600-700 killed, 7 taken captive, about 7 escaped; for the English, 2 killed and 20 wounded: Mason, "Brief History," in *Pequot War*, 30.

²⁵⁶ Vincent, "True Relation," in *Pequot War*, 98.

by questions of religion—the Pequot War was seen as a holy war between God’s chosen people and Satan’s forces—a form of rhetoric which would reappear during King Philip’s War. In these terms, even the attack on Fort Mystic was justified along Biblical lines.

This “holy war” mentality concerning the Indian conflicts was still present in Hutchinson’s time. Even some eighteenth century accounts viewed the Pequots as savages beyond salvation, and saw the conflict as God’s righteous justice smiting the heathen. In his edition to John Mason’s account of war, published in 1736, Thomas Prince quoted Psalm 44 on the title page: “we have heard with our Ears, O God, our Fathers have told us, what Word Thou didst in their Days, in the times of old; How Thou didst drive out the Heathen with they Hand, and plantedst Them: how thou did afflict the People and cast them out...”²⁵⁷

Hutchinson by contrast took the Pequots seriously as a legitimate foe with genuine grievances of their own. Hutchinson’s coverage of the Pequot War generally lacked the animosity toward the Pequot Indians present in many other histories of the war, and the religious overtones that presented colonial forces as God’s avenging sword.²⁵⁸ Relying primarily on the accounts of Underhill and Mason, the secondary accounts of William Hubbard and Cotton Mather, the correspondence of Winthrop and Bradford, and the official records of Plymouth and Massachusetts Bay,

²⁵⁷ Frontispiece, in Mason, *A Brief History of the Pequot War*, ed. Thomas Prince (1736; reprinted Freeport, NY: Books for Libraries Press, 1971).

²⁵⁸ Hutchinson’s coverage of the Pequot War is mainly in vol. 1, ch. 1: 67-71, although he makes the occasional comment on the growing tensions between the colonists and the Pequots earlier in the *History*.

Hutchinson depicted the Pequot War as a serious conflict, although not one that threatened the existence of the new colonies.

Hutchinson presented the murders of both Oldham and Stone as the cause of the war, and described both murders as unprovoked. There is no mention in his text that both of these men had highly dubious reputations, or that Oldham had been suspected of trying to round up Indian hostages to hold for ransom.²⁵⁹ Hutchinson described the Pequot tribe as “the most warlike of all the Indians,” and took it as a given either that they murdered Stone and Oldham, and tried to pin the murders on other tribes, or at least that they were sheltering the murderers.²⁶⁰ However, while Hutchinson accepted the Pequots as a bloodthirsty threat to the colonists, the larger thrust of his account was not the treachery of the Indians, but diplomatic failures among the whites, due to lack of leadership and inter-colonial rivalries. He noted the failure of treaty negotiations that might have prevented the war entirely.²⁶¹

Arguably the single most controversial and long-remembered aspect of the Pequot War was the attack and slaughter of hundreds of sleeping Indians at the Pequot Fort on the Mystic River. One of the more notable aspects in Hutchinson’s downplaying of the seriousness of the Pequot War is the way he managed to make the Mystic massacre sound accidental—which was not the way it was portrayed in the sources he was using. Both the Mason and Underhill accounts state that the New

²⁵⁹ Hutchinson does refer to Stone in another place as “an uneducated man and a blusterer” whose behavior quickly caused him to be banished from Plymouth: *History* 1, ch. 1: 7, footnote 2.

²⁶⁰ *History* 1, ch. 1: 41, footnote ‡ (double cross), and ch. 1: 52. For Stone’s murder, see *History* 1, ch. 1: 41-42.

²⁶¹ *History* 1, ch. 1: 40-43, 52-55.

England forces made a conscious decision beforehand to kill everyone.²⁶² Mason, who led the raid, said that the English had “formerly concluded to destroy them by the sword and save the plunder.” Underhill said that the village was torched when the English decided they could not take it without destroying it—they had initially wanted to kill everyone and then take the loot, which had been promised to the soldiers.²⁶³ Hutchinson’s account, by contrast, implied that the Indian tents accidentally caught on fire, and the only reason the troops went to Fort Mystic in the first place was that they were diverted there by a lame horse. While it cannot be known for certain, this gloss may be the result of Hutchinson’s discomfort with the tactics used by the whites at this point in the conflict.

Hutchinson clearly saw the Pequots as a particular danger to the colonists in the region, but he was not without sympathy for the predicament of the Native American tribes in the region. Unlike his source material, which refused to grant any legitimate grievances to the Indians to justify war, Hutchinson recognized that the Indian groups had legitimate reasons to attack. One interesting aspect of Hutchinson’s coverage of the Pequot War was his commentary on the Pequot Indians’ ultimate fate. When noting that the Narragansett ultimately declined to fight on the side of the Pequot, Hutchinson implied that this was a bad decision on their part. He noted that the Pequots tried to tell the Narragansett that the English would

²⁶² Both men were present, but as they were rivals, their accounts do not usually coincide on every detail.

²⁶³ *History* 1, ch. 1: 69. See for comparison Mason “Brief History,” in *Pequot War*, 28; and Underhill, “Newes from America,” in *Pequot War*, 78-81. That the colonial forces always intended to annihilate the Pequots (they believed the Pequots had similar goals with regard to them) is one of the few things the four contemporary accounts contained in Orr agreed upon.

ultimately deprive them of their lands as well, and that by siding with the English, “all the Naragansets could hope for from their friendship, was, the favour of being the last devoured.” Comparing them to Polyphemé and Ulysses, Hutchinson commented that the Narragansetts, old enemies of the Pequots, “preferred the present pleasure of revenge upon their mortal enemies, to the future happiness of themselves and their posterity.”²⁶⁴

Hutchinson also regretted the lack of mercy shown the tribe at the war’s conclusion, rejecting the argument made by contemporary writers that the brutality of the Pequots justified similar treatment by the English. At the end of his account, regarding the execution of the remaining male Pequot captives and the sale of the women and children into slavery, Hutchinson remarked

[t]he policy, as well as the morality of this proceeding, may well be questioned. The Indians have ever shewn great barbarity to their English captives, the English in too many instances have retaliated it. This has only enraged them the more. Besides, to destroy women and children, for the barbarity of their husbands and parents, cannot easily be justified.²⁶⁵

Where Hutchinson deviated most notably from his source material was in his depiction of the motivation behind Indian anger, and the causes for white success. In contrast to almost all of his sources, Hutchinson displayed significant insight into why the Indians of the seventeenth century should be “so furious,”²⁶⁶ and came close to saying their anger may have been justified. Also, in explaining white victory, Hutchinson dispensed (at times contemptuously) with the explanation favored by all

²⁶⁴ *History* 1, ch. 1: 52, 53. Hutchinson cites “MS. Journal” as his source for the story.

²⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 70.

²⁶⁶ The Indians initially applied this expression to the whites during the Pequot War: it appears in Underhill, “Newes from America,” in *Pequot War*, 81.

of the previous historians of the seventeenth century wars (including his contemporaries Neal and Prince): that God had intervened to favor a chosen people. Hutchinson, by contrast, arrived at a conclusion favored by many historians today: that the greatest advantage the white colonists had was their diseases—the Indian population had already been decimated before the two wars, and would continue to be obliterated by disease beyond anything the colonists could do to them.²⁶⁷

THE INTER-WAR PERIOD

The period between the Pequot War and King Philip's War was on the surface one of peace between the various Indian nations and the English, yet Hutchinson noted that this peace was deceptive, as the English nearly went to war with various Indian groups several times in the 1640s, 1650s and 1660s. Hutchinson also described rumors of plotting going on within the Narragansett nation from the 1640s onward. He noted that "[t]he minds of men were filled with fear from these rumours of a general conspiracy, and every noise in the night was alarming."²⁶⁸

Hutchinson stressed both the difficulties of maintaining peace during this time period, and the accomplishment that stable relations represented for most of the seventeenth century. One notable aspect of Hutchinson's coverage of the interwar period was that Massachusetts generally appeared as a restraining influence on New England-Indian relations, reining in the smaller, more impetuous colonies. In 1642,

²⁶⁷ Hutchinson noted that the vast majority of the Indians in the New England area died not by wars, but by disease. He refused to credit this to the immediate intercession of divine providence, as his Puritan forebears did, but says the numbers are striking. *History* 1, ch. 1: 32-33, footnote *. See also *History* 1, ch. 1: 141-44, footnote ‡ (double cross); and ch. 2: 239, footnote † (cross).

²⁶⁸ *History* 1, ch. 1: 98, 99.

Edward Hutchinson, Thomas Hutchinson's great-grandfather, was sent along with John Leverett to the Narragansett to negotiate a peace, which he did. According to Hutchinson, Connecticut wanted war, but Massachusetts wanted more proof of Indian malfeasance, and the Massachusetts delegation succeeded in calming the situation.²⁶⁹

In 1643, the United Colonies of New England was established to try to pull New England's tangled colonial defense system together. It consisted of representatives from Massachusetts, Plymouth, Connecticut, and New Haven. This was the official body ultimately charged with defending the region against Indian as well as European threats in the period prior to King Philip's War. Hutchinson noted that the other New England colonies almost went to war against the Narragansett twice in the 1650s, but Massachusetts again prevented it.²⁷⁰

Indian attacks were not the only danger the colonies feared in this period, and it is striking that in Hutchinson's discussion of the major European threats in the region, the French and the Dutch, he used much the same language as in his discussion of Indian threats. Hutchinson generally treated the various Indian groups as little different from the potentially hostile European settlements. A desire to wipe the English colonies off the face of the Earth was not simply a "savage" goal in Hutchinson's mind; he attributed this same aspiration to the French and the Dutch. He remarked with regard to the Dutch settlement at Manhattan, "[w]hether the Dutch had any pretence of title or not, no doubt can be made that they would have

²⁶⁹ Ibid., 98. See also *ibid.*, 237, with regard to King Philip's War.

²⁷⁰ *History* 1, ch. 1: 158-60.

extirpated the English if it had been in their power, but they were few in number.”²⁷¹

He also chastised the French for encouraging their Catholic Indian converts toward greater aggression: “such Indians have generally been taught to treat the English, as heretics, with greater cruelty, and it has been made more meritorious to extirpate them than if they had been infidels or the worst of idolaters.”²⁷²

KING PHILIP’S WAR

In the summer of 1675, the New England colonies found themselves embroiled in the most calamitous struggle of their history. King Philip’s War of 1675-76²⁷³ nearly destroyed the New England settlements and put their continued

²⁷¹ Ibid., 135.

²⁷² Ibid., 144, footnote *. Hutchinson also noted that in 1653, “information was given by the Indians from several quarters, that the Dutch government was privately soliciting them to a general confederacy, in order to totally extirpate the English.” The English commissioners defended their decision to accept Indian testimony from the Dutch, who were amazed it would be given any credit: *History* 1, ch. 1: 153-54. Hutchinson also accused Dutch governor Peter Stuyvesant of secretly encouraging the Indians to attack English settlements in the 1650s, as he feared the English more than he feared a general Indian alliance, which would have ultimately threatened the Dutch as well: *History* 1, ch. 1: 157.

²⁷³ For information on King Philip’s War, see Douglas E. Leach, *Flintlock and Tomahawk: New England in King Philip’s War* (New York: Macmillan, 1958); Yasuhide Kawashima, *Puritan Justice and the Indian: White Man’s Law in Massachusetts, 1630-1763* (Middleton, CN: Wesleyan UP, 1986); Philip Ranlet, “Another Look at the Causes of King Philip’s War,” *NEQ* 61, no. 1 (Mar. 1988): 79-100; Russell Bourne, *The Red King’s Rebellion: Racial Politics in New England, 1675 1678* (New York: Athenaeum, 1990); Jill Lepore, “Dead Men Tell No Tales: John Sassamon and the Fatal Consequences of Literacy,” *American Quarterly* 46, no. 4 (Dec. 1994): 479-512; Jenny H. Pulsipher, “Massacre at Hurtleberry Hill: Christian Indians and English Authority in Metacom’s War,” *WMQ* 53, no. 3 (Jul. 1996): 459-86; James D. Drake, “Restraining Atrocity: The Conduct of King Philip’s War,” *NEQ* 70, no. 1 (Mar. 1997): 33-56; Jill Lepore, *The Name of War: King Philip’s War and the Origins of American Identity* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1998); James D. Drake, *King Philip’s War: Civil War in New England, 1675-1676* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1999); and Yasuhide Kawashima, *Igniting King Philip’s War: The John Sassamon Murder Trial* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2001);

For coverage of the military engagements of the war, see John Ferling, *Struggle for a Continent: The Wars of Early America* (Arlington Heights: Harlan Davidson, 1993), and Patrick M. Malone, *The Skulking Way of War: Technology and Tactics among the New England Indians* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1993). For colonial policy towards the Indians in the aftermath of King Philip’s War, and the effects of the war in the colony, see Michael J. Puglisi, *Puritans Besieged: The Legacies of King Philip’s War in the Massachusetts Bay Colony* (Lanham, MD: University Press of

existence in doubt. The conduct of the war and debate over its causes, conduct, and outcome spawned an outpouring of literature in the colonial presses unlike any previous event,²⁷⁴ and the war continued to be a source of great interest in Hutchinson's own time.

America, 1991); and Colin G. Calloway, ed. *After King Philip's War: Presence and Persistence in Indian New England* (Hanover: University Press of New England, 1997).

²⁷⁴ Jill Lepore's work *The Name of War* is an intensive study of how King Philip's War was remembered, both by contemporaries of the war and later historians (the title comes from William Hubbard's remark that King Philip's War did not deserve "the name of war"). Lepore argues that the war shook the New Englanders' self-image to its core, not merely because they almost lost, but also because the war blurred the boundaries between white and Indian behavior. The English were stripped of their homes, societies and even clothing, and forced to fight by what they considered "barbaric" methods. Lepore attributes the huge outpouring of writing concerning the war to a desire to "reclaim" the conflict and change the way it was remembered. Lepore noted over 400 surviving letters in the New England archives concerning King Philip's War, and at least 21 different separate printed accounts. She includes an excellent list of primary sources on pages 50-51 and 241-45. Despite rising literacy among the Christian Indians in this time period, no Indian accounts have survived. Lepore, *The Name of War*, 27.

Massachusetts contemporary accounts include English observer Benjamin Batten's report in the *London Gazette* (London, 1675); the Anonymous "News from New-England, Being a True and last Account of the present Bloody Wars carried on betwixt the Infidels, Natives, and the English Christians, and Converted Indians of *New-England*..." (London, 1676); Edward Rawson's "The Present State in New England" (London, 1676); Richard Hutchinson's "The Warr in New-England visibly Ended." (London, 1677); and N. S.'s [Nathaniel Saltonstall] serial works published in the *London Gazette*, including "The Present State of New-England with Respect to the Indian War" (London, 1675), "A Continuation of the State of New-England; Being a Farther Account of the Indian Warr" (London, 1676), and "A New and Further Narrative of the State of New-England" (London, 1676).

The two main competing histories of the war emerged immediately after its conclusion: Increase Mather's *Brief History of the Warr with the Indians in New-England* and William Hubbard, *A Narrative of the Troubles with the Indians in New-England*. One of the leading commanders, Benjamin Church, also published his account in the early eighteenth century, as *The Entertaining History of King Philip's War* (Boston, 1716). A modern edition edited by Alan Simpson and Mary Simpson has been published entitled *The Diary of King Philip's War, 1675-1676* (Chester, CN: Pequot Press, 1975). Most of the main Puritan accounts of the war are included in *So Dreadfull a Judgment: Puritan Responses to King Philip's War, 1676-1677*, ed. Richard Slotkin and James K. Folsom (Middleton: Wesleyan UP, 1973).

Non-Puritans were less inclined to see King Philip's War as a glorious struggle between God and heathen, but none went so far as to sympathize with Philip. Rhode Island Quakers condemned the war; not only because of their pacifism, but also due to lingering hostility toward Massachusetts for its earlier treatment of the Quakers. Quakers William Harris, Peter Folger, and Samuel Groome presented the war as God's retribution for the colony's persecution of religious dissenters. Peter Folger, "A Looking Glasse for the Times" (1676), *AAS Collections*, 2 (1836): 423-534; Samuel Groome, "A Glasse for the People of New-England" (London, 1676); William Harris, Letter to Sir Joseph Williamson, August 12, 1676" reprinted as *A Rhode Islander Reports on King Philip's War: The Second William Harris Letter of August, 1676*, ed. Douglas Leach (Providence: RIHS, 1963).

The ostensible cause of the war was the murder, in 1675, of Christian Indian and alleged spy John Sassamon, and the subsequent execution of three Wampanoag Indians for Sassamon's murder. However, tensions had been building for some time between the English colonists and their neighboring tribes. Long-simmering quarrels over treatises, land purchases and religion turned a diplomatic crisis into a major conflagration involving all the New England colonies as well as most of the major Indian tribes of the region.

For most of the war, the Indians appeared to be winning. As late as May 1676, colonists still feared defeat, and had abandoned about a third of their towns. However, the Indians' smaller numbers and lack of provisions eventually proved their undoing. The culminating battle of King Philip's War came in August 1676, in the Great Swamp Fight, where John Winslow led fifteen hundred men against the Narragansett stronghold. King Philip was killed by Indians allied to the whites in a swamp near his old home in Mount Hope. The war officially ended a few months later, although fighting continued sporadically on the frontier. The captured Indian leaders were executed, and many other Indians were sold into slavery.

King Philip's War has remained America's bloodiest American war in terms of deaths to proportionate population. There were about 60,000 English colonists and 18,000 Indians in the region at the time of the conflict. Contemporary casualty estimates vary, but all place the losses as sizable portions of both populaces. The English lost 1% to 5% of their population, and the Indians as much as 40%.²⁷⁵ Thousands of English settlers became refugees; thousands of Indians were enslaved.

²⁷⁵ James D. Drake, *King Philip's War*, 4.

Fifty-two of New England's ninety towns were attacked; twenty-five were pillaged, and seventeen razed.²⁷⁶ English official Edward Randolph estimated that colonists had lost houses and livestock valued at over 150,000 pounds.²⁷⁷

The war debt and huge poor relief rolls of widows and orphans caused unprecedented tax increases that lasted long after the war's conclusion. The war also underscored colonial jealousies. Lack of cooperation between the New England colonies (in particular Massachusetts and Plymouth) had helped start the war, and prevented its effective prosecution. The war itself proved very disturbing to the Puritans' self-image, and not just because of the brutal methods used in the fighting. Loyalties did not always break down along white/Indian lines, and it was often hard to tell friend from foe. The colonial line of settlement was pushed back almost to the coast; it would take another half century to regain the territory.

Contemporary colonial accounts gave no motive for the sudden attack by King Philip's troops in the spring of 1675 except for the Indians' love of carnage and cruelty. Among the earliest accounts of King Philip's War appearing in print were the letters of Nathaniel Saltonstall, an author appearing frequently as "N. S." in Hutchinson's footnotes. Saltonstall's narratives appeared in the *London Gazette* during the war. Prurient and entirely secular, Saltonstall, a young Boston merchant, emphasized Indian atrocities and acts of barbarism. Other popular accounts of the war, including Cotton Mather's and William Hubbard's, were less inclined to see

²⁷⁶ Bourne, *Red King's Rebellion*, 36.

²⁷⁷ Drake, *King Philip's War*, 4.

King Philip's War as a glorious struggle between God and heathen, but none went so far as to sympathize with Philip's forces.²⁷⁸

Hutchinson began his coverage of the war not with Sassamon's death in 1675 (the usual beginning) but several years earlier, with the growing discontent among the Algonquin Indian tribes.²⁷⁹ His coverage of King Philip's War focused on Philip, and described the Indian leader with sympathy notably absent from the other sources. Hutchinson described Philip as "a man of great spirit"²⁸⁰ and detailed his growing frustration with the New England colonies from the 1660s onward. In 1662, Philip was commanded to appear before the Plymouth court to answer charges of "designs against the English." Philip pledged his friendship, and vowed that he and his successors would be faithful subjects of the English king. He promised that he would not alienate his lands nor make war on other Indian groups without Plymouth's permission.²⁸¹ Hutchinson noted this in a footnote: "[h]owever it may be questioned whether this was a reasonable requisition, the terms of it were plain and well understood."²⁸²

Unlike many earlier historians, Hutchinson found Philip's desire for war quite understandable. Philip was a sovereign among his people, and the traits which

²⁷⁸ The only partial exception to this, Daniel Gookin's account, languished in a manuscript archive and was not published until the early nineteenth century. Even Gookin's account was not a defense of Indian behavior as a whole so much as a protest against the mistreatment of the Christian "Praying" Indians. Gookin, "An Historical Account of the Doings and Sufferings of the Christian Indians in New England, in the Years 1675, 1676, 1677." (London, 1836; New York: Arno Press, 1972).

²⁷⁹ King Philip's War is covered *History* 1, ch. 2: 235-63.

²⁸⁰ *History* 1, ch. 2: 236.

²⁸¹ *Ibid.*

²⁸² *Ibid.*, 236, footnote ‡ (double cross).

the colonists considered “haughty” and “proud” were only what one would expect in a ruler. Philip’s anger sprang from a long series of encounters with colonial justice in which he had not been treated with respect or fairness: “[t]hey charged him with pride and ambition, in aspiring to the sovereignty of a country which he would have enjoyed as his inheritance if they had not prevented; with perfidy in breaking promises made whilst under restraint.”²⁸³ Hutchinson saw Sassamon’s death as the trigger, but not the cause, of a war that had been brewing for some time.²⁸⁴

Repeatedly in his analysis of Philip’s behavior during the conflict, Hutchinson stressed that Philip was sachem, the leader of his people, and that he could easily have seen himself justified as a sovereign for disciplining his own people, or taking umbrage at the demands of Plymouth and Massachusetts. Hutchinson seems to have accepted that Philip’s men murdered Sassamon, and that his murderers were fairly convicted. He noted, however, that if Philip did order the execution of the man, he might well have felt within his rights as sachem to do so: “[t]his action of Philip, in procuring the death of Sausaman, has always been pronounced to be a most heinous crime. Philip no doubt considered him as a traitor and renegade, who had justly forfeited his life.”²⁸⁵

²⁸³ Ibid., 236, footnote † (cross).

²⁸⁴ For Sassamon himself, Hutchinson accepts the account of his death determined upon by the Plymouth court. Hutchinson said Sassamon initially left Eliot’s employ for Philip “upon some misdeameanor,” but then regained his Christian faith due to Eliot’s influence and returned to the Christian Indian community to become a preacher. There is no mention of the allegation contained in many of Hutchinson’s sources that Sassamon’s returned to white employment due to a thwarted attempt to cheat Philip in a land deal while acting as his interpreter. See Lepore, “Dead Men Tell No Tales.”

²⁸⁵ *History* 1, ch. 2: 243, footnote *. One of Hutchinson’s sources, John Easton, also brought this point up in his account. Easton remarked that while Philip might have had cause to kill Sasamon, he would have been unlikely to attempt to hide it: “If Philip had dun it it was ther Law so to execute

However, while Hutchinson accepted that the Indians had legitimate grievances, he faulted Philip as a commander for bringing his people into a war before they were militarily ready.²⁸⁶ Philip was responsible for the actual outbreak of hostilities. After executing the sachem's warriors, Plymouth made no moves to apprehend Philip himself, hoping the situation would calm down. Philip, however, had grown "insolent" due to the growing number of allies flocking to him; he began attacking the English settlements.²⁸⁷ Hutchinson held Philip to the same standards of leadership as white leaders; in this instance, his fatal mistake was surrendering to his anger and provoking a war before his people had made adequate military preparations.

Hutchinson's account of King Philip's War, like his account of the Pequot War, was rather dry compared to the vivid language used by his sources. For the most part, Hutchinson's account was almost wholly lacking in the dramatic descriptions of Indian atrocities that peppered earlier narratives and in large part served to justify colonial aggression. Hutchinson did include one anecdote that he felt demonstrated "the great propriety" of referring to the Indians as "savages." In the incident, one Wampanoag Indian brave cut into the heart of another half-dead

home [whom] ther kings judged deserved it that he had not Case to hide it." Easton, "A Relation of the Indyan Warre," (1678) in *Narratives*, ed. Lincoln, 7-8. For a discussion of what might actually have happened to Sassamon, see Lepore, "Dead Men Tell No Tales," 479-512. Kawashima agrees that the trial of the three Indians for Sassamon's murder seems to have been irregular even by the standards of the day and the heavy-handed assumption of authority by the Plymouth authorities threatened the Wampanoags' sense of autonomy: *Igniting King Philip's War*, 102-111.

²⁸⁶ "They did not expect to be prepared before the spring of 1676, but Philip precipitated his own nation and his allies into a war, before they were prepared. This was evident from the distraction of the Indians in all part of New-England, upon the first news of the disturbance from Philip." Ibid., 242.

²⁸⁷ Ibid., 243.

Indian prisoner to drink his blood, claiming that it would give him the man's strength.²⁸⁸ In general, however, Hutchinson's narrative lacked the fevered descriptions of scalping, eviscerations and finger-removing presented by earlier historians. Hutchinson also included numerous examples of heinous white behavior, generally inspired by anger, fear, and desires for vengeance, including the 1677 attack on two Indian prisoners by the women of Marblehead, who seized and "barbarously murdered them."²⁸⁹

One major source of the Indian anger that had led to King Philip's War, according to Hutchinson, was colonial miscarriages of justice—the inability of Indians to find justice in English colonial courts.

The English have been charged, by some writers, with acts of injustice to the Indians, which have provoked them and occasioned the frequent wars. There have been many instances of abuses offered to particular persons among the Indians, by evil minded Englishmen, and the inhabitants of some parts of the province which have suffered most by Indian cruelties, may have been under too strong prejudices, and, by this means, offenders, when brought upon trial, may have been acquitted by too favourable juries.²⁹⁰

Hutchinson noted that the existing colonial prejudice against Indians that had led to these miscarriages of justice were heightened by the war itself, with the result

²⁸⁸ Ibid., 251, footnote *.

²⁸⁹ Ibid., 260, footnote *. Hutchinson cited Increase Mather as his source. James Axtell postulated that the original source of this story must be a 1677 deposition by Robert Roule of Marblehead, and noted that Hutchinson is the only historian to take note of it: James Axtell, "The Vengeful Women of Marblehead: Robert Roule's Deposition of 1677," *WMQ* 31, no. 4 (Oct. 1974): 647-52.

²⁹⁰ *History* 1, ch. 2: 241. In her discussion of Anglo legal mistreatment of the Christian Indians during King Philip's War, Jenny Pulsipher noted that the New England magistrates attempted to deal justly with the Christian Indians, but were stymied by popular rage and prejudice—and the situation grew no better after the conclusion of the war. Jenny H. Pulsipher, "Massacre at Hurtleberry Hill: Christian Indians and English Authority in Metacom's War," *WMQ* 53, no. 3 (Jul. 1996): 459-86.

that during the conflict, even friendly groups found themselves being ill-used and denied basic rights in colonial courts. Speaking of the most vulnerable of these groups, the Christianized Indians who lived within the white settlements, Hutchinson noted that a growing suspicion of all Indians caused the status of the Christian Indians to plummet. Even though the “Praying Indians” often fought on the side of the whites, they became the victims of vigilante attacks as well as more concerted action by the courts.²⁹¹ With little legal justification, the Massachusetts courts rounded up the Praying Indians, deprived them of their property, and herded them onto Deer Island for the duration of the war. Hutchinson described in great detail the colonial hostility targeted at the Christian Indians:

All of their colour were thought by many of the people worthy of death, and although their rage did not carry them that length, as to murder any of them without the authority of government...yet their clamour seems to have prevailed on the authority to use greater severity than otherwise they would have done.²⁹²

He later detailed the near lynching of one Christian Indian who had been arrested on dubious grounds, and his later execution despite John Eliot’s attempted intervention.²⁹³

Significantly, Hutchinson attributed many of the colonists’ problems with their Indian neighbors to a basic constitutional misunderstanding—the Indians, who

²⁹¹ Ibid., 250, footnote *.

²⁹² Ibid., 251. Seventeenth century commentator Nathaniel Saltonstall, Hutchinson’s source for some of this information, had no problem with the colonists’ harsh treatment of the allegedly friendly “praying” Indians. Saltonstall agreed with the common colonial perception of them as traitors in their midst, and repeatedly referred to them as “preying” Indians, trusted by neither side. Saltonstall approvingly included the order of the Massachusetts General Court, confining the Praying Indians to their towns, and making it acceptable to kill any Indian found elsewhere in their towns or woods. N. S. [Nathaniel Saltonstall], “Present State of New England,” in Lincoln, ed., *Narratives*, 49. The General Court’s Order of August 30, 1675, is quoted by Saltonstall at 32-33.

²⁹³ Ibid., footnote *.

were being treated as subjects of the English King by the time of King Philip's War, had never intended to accept legal dependency, and had no understanding of the concept; "[s]ubjects [and sovereigns] were words of which they had no precise ideas."²⁹⁴ In Hutchinson's view, this misunderstanding was always present in the colonists' relations with the Indians, but posed little problem in the earlier decades of settlement. It became more pronounced in the 1670s, as interactions between the two peoples increased. In his marginalia comments, added later, Hutchinson reiterated his doubts about the legal status of the Indian warriors fighting under Philip, who were treated as rebels once the conflict had concluded: "[t]hey are called Rebels and Murderers and treated as such. They knew not what was intended by Subjects and at most supposed they had broken the promise to live in peace with the English."²⁹⁵

Discussing the treaties made by Philip and his people before King Philip's War, Hutchinson remarked:

Notwithstanding, that in the treatises from time to time, the Indians have acknowledged themselves subjects to the Kings of England, yet they still retained, in their idea of subjection, a degree of independency which the English subjects have no pretence to. The Six Nations go no farther than to call the great King their father. They never call themselves subjects.²⁹⁶

Hutchinson also noted that Philip, in his appearance at Boston in 1671 and subsequent court appearances, described the agreements made by his predecessors as agreements "for amity and not for subjection." Philip accepted that the Praying Indians living in the townships were subjects of Massachusetts, and consequently

²⁹⁴ Ibid., 235. Brackets around "and sovereign" in original denote *marginalia* addition.

²⁹⁵ Ibid., 260.

²⁹⁶ *History* 1, ch. 2: 239, footnote † (cross). For further discussion of this legal question, see Jenny H. Pulsipher, "Subjects . . . Unto the Same King": New England Indians and the Use of Royal Political Power," *Massachusetts Historical Review* 5 (2003): 29-57.

accepted Massachusetts' jurisdiction over these groups, but maintained that the others "had no such things with them, and therefore were not subjects."²⁹⁷

Hutchinson went on to note that:

In the several treaties between the Massachusetts and the Eastern Indians...the Indians have always acknowledged subjection to the crown of England; notwithstanding such agreements, they have remained as independent of the Massachusetts government as they were before any treaty was made with them. When they call the King their Sovereign, perhaps they have no other idea than the Six Nations have when they call him father.²⁹⁸

Hutchinson also disapproved of colonial behavior toward the defeated Indians after the war's conclusion. In particular, he bemoaned the lack of mercy shown to defeated Indian hostages by the whites. Noting that after Philip's death, the English refused to offer terms of mercy to the survivors, executing the chiefs and selling the rest of their captives into slavery, he remarked: "Every person, almost, in the two colonies, had lost a relation or near friend, and the people in general were exasperated; but all does not sufficiently excuse this great severity."²⁹⁹

²⁹⁷ *History* 1, ch. 2: 239, footnote † (cross).

²⁹⁸ *Ibid.* See also p. 294, where Hutchinson called the Eastern Indians remaining after King Philip's War "a free independent people," and noted "[n]o mention is made of any subjection to the government of the colony, or to the King of England."

The question of Indian subjugation was one which Hutchinson would return to repeatedly throughout his *History*. Discussing the Castine Indian rebellion of the 1720s, Hutchinson remarked, "To have punished [Castine] as a traitor, would have destroyed all hopes of an accommodation. It might also be very well questioned whether it would have been justifiable. The tribe or nation, with which he was mixed, has repeatedly, in words of which they had no adequate ideas, acknowledged themselves subjects; but, in fact...had always been considered as free and independent." While the group lived within the boundaries of the white territories the colonists had not attempted to exercise jurisdiction over them "except when any of them came within the English settlements and disputes had arisen between them and the English subjects." *History* 2, ch. 3: 205. See also *History* 2, ch. 3: 203, where Hutchinson noted that if one looked at Indian-colonial affairs since the beginning of white settlement, it would be "difficult to say what sort of subjects they were, and it is not certain that they understood that they had promised any subjection at all." *History* 2, ch. 3: 203.

²⁹⁹ *History* 1, ch. 2: 260.

In general, Hutchinson's work was strikingly free from the racial assumptions concerning the Indians that were often present in the works of his contemporaries. He recognized white complicity in the disputes, and instances of white barbarism. He was also willing to credit both Indian grievances and Indian bravery in his text. In the conclusion of his account of King Philip's War, Hutchinson objected to the colonial tendency to dismiss the Indians as unworthy of white respect. He summed up the character of the Indian war leader in terms that made him sound almost akin to a Greek tragic hero:

We are too apt to consider the Indians as a race of beings by nature inferior to us, and born to servitude. Philip was a man of high spirit, and could not bear to see the English of New-Plimouth extended their settlements over the dominions of his ancestors; and although his father had, at one time or other, conveyed to them all that they were possessed of, yet he had sense enough, to distinguish a free voluntary covenant from one made under a sort of duress, and he could never rest until he brought on the war which ended in his destruction.³⁰⁰

There was one final message behind Hutchinson's presentation of King Philip's War. Like the heresy persecutions, New England's Indian problems had been used in the past by enemies of the colony back in England to justify greater

³⁰⁰ Ibid., 241. In a footnote to his edited collection of papers, Hutchinson also commented that the seventeenth century colonials' general failure to treat the Indians as equals was particularly shameful in people who claimed to be Christian. Hutchinson was aggravated by instructions given to the military commanders by the Commissioners of the United Colonies, which instructed them to treat the Indians fairly, but to also respect "the distance which is to be observed betwixt Christians and Barbarians." Hutchinson remarked, "It seems strange that men who professed to believe that God hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth, should so early and upon every occasion, take care to preserve this distinction. Perhaps nothing has more effectually defeated the endeavours for Christianizing the Indians. It seems to have done more: To have sunk their spirits, led them to intemperance, and extirpated the whole race." *Collection of Papers*, ed. Hutchinson, 1: 171, footnote 113. Russell Bourne, *The Red King's Rebellion* sees the period of King Philip's War as the turning point for more racist attitudes towards Indians on the part of the colonists. See also G. E. Thomas, "Puritans, Indians, and the Concept of Race," *NEQ* 48, no. 1 (Mar. 1975): 3-27; William S. Simmons, "Cultural Bias in the New England Puritan's Perception of Indians," *WMQ* 38, no. 1 (Jan. 1981): 56-72; Alden T. Vaughan, "From White Man to Redskin: Changing Anglo-American Perceptions of the American Indian," *AHR* 87, no. 4 (Oct. 1982): 917-53; and Nancy Shoemaker, "How Indians Got to be Red," *AHR* 102, no. 3 (Jun. 1997): 625-44.

imperial control.³⁰¹ Hutchinson remarked that stories of King Philip's War and the colonial losses in it had been exaggerated by men hostile to the colony, in order to further their own agendas: "[t]he accounts which were transmitted to England of the distresses of the colony, during the war, although they might excite compassion in the breasts of some, yet they were improved, by others, to render the colony more obnoxious." Those contemporary accounts implied that the war was being lost because of the incompetence of the colonial governments, and, more importantly, by the colonies' stubborn refusal to ask England for help. "A fine country, it was said, was in danger of being lost to England, by the penuriousness of those who were at the head of affairs, in not raising monies for the defence of it, and by their obstinacy in refusing to apply to the King for relief."³⁰² Hutchinson included in the footnote for this text a letter from the Earl of Anglesey to Massachusetts Governor John Leverett, chiding the people of New England for not asking England for aid. Anglesey hinted that Massachusetts' refusal to ask for help, even in the dire straits of King Philip's War, had been looked upon suspiciously by some in the ministry. The colonists' stubborn insistence on prosecuting the war on their own was being regarded as a rejection of the king's protection, "as if you were independent of our master's

³⁰¹ In 1676, Massachusetts' perennial critic Edward Randolph sent a letter to the Privy Council that blamed the colony for causing New England's most severe Indian conflict due to their poor governance. Randolph faulted Massachusetts for aggravating Philip by repeatedly calling him to court on trumpeted up charges (it was actually Plymouth that did this), and for allowing the Indians to become military threats in the first place, by teaching them how to use guns. Randolph, "A Short Narrative of my Proceedings an Several Voyages to and from New England to White Hall to the Lords of the Privy Council," Oct. 12, 1676, in *Collection of Original Papers*, ed. Hutchinson, 2: 226. Edmund Andros, governor of New York at the time, was also critical of Massachusetts' conduct of the war: see Andros to the Governor and Council of Massachusetts, January 24, 1676, in *Collection of Papers*, ed. Hutchinson, 2: 209-10.

³⁰² *Ibid.*, 261.

crown, needed not his protection, or had deserved ill of him.”³⁰³ Anglesey charged that the colony was “too tenacious of what is necessary for your preservation...you are poor and yet proud.”³⁰⁴

Hutchinson argued that this charge was without merit, as the colonies had sufficient men and resources to take care of themselves.³⁰⁵

An application to England, for men, was [not] necessary, and I meet with no papers which intimate that there was any thought of it in any persons in the colony. Fighting made soldiers. As soon as the inhabitants had a little experience in the Indian way of fighting, they became a match for them.³⁰⁶

Hutchinson also maintained that not only had the New England colonies been able to defend themselves without outside military support (and thus were not remiss in not asking for help), but that the war itself had incurred no great expense to the empire. “[T]his is certain,” he wrote “that as the colony was at first settled, so it was now preserved from ruin without any charge to the mother country.”³⁰⁷ Not only had the expense of the war to the empire been overstated, but New England had since more than made up for the sums contributed. Hutchinson argued that the contributions of Massachusetts residents to English charitable causes during the period more than equaled the amounts spent by the home government during King

³⁰³ Letter of Lord Anglesey to John Leverett, May 16, 1676, *History* 1, ch. 2: 262, footnote *.

³⁰⁴ Ibid.

³⁰⁵ *History* 1, ch. 2: 262. Nathaniel Saltonstall, author of one of the contemporary accounts of the war, noted that New England asked for no military aid from England during the struggle, because they were concerned they would not be able to get rid of the soldiers after the war: N. S., “Present State of New England,” in *Narratives*, 24-50.

³⁰⁶ *History* 1, ch. 2: 262, brackets in the original. This looks like a correction of a typographical error in the printed text.

³⁰⁷ *History* 1, ch. 2: 263.

Philip's War.³⁰⁸ The settlement of Massachusetts had in fact enriched the empire in the long run; this was proven once again by the colony's success at overcoming the challenges of the Indian wars through their own resources.

Hutchinson's account of the Indian wars demonstrated many of his principle values. The Massachusetts citizens who appeared in Hutchinson's account were generally upright and responsible citizens, but when they went astray, it was often due to violent emotions and irrational prejudice against the Indian nations. Their failure to extend basic rights to the Indians—to respect their property rights, to give them justice in their courts, and to recognize them as men—helped lead to one of the worst wars of the century. Their squabbling with each other also at times undercut their defense efforts.

However, while Hutchinson faulted the colony for some of its past behavior with regard to the Indians, his overall stress was on their successes rather than their failures. The seventeenth century was a dangerous age, when the small colonies were threatened not only by various Indian groups, but by conniving European settlements as well. King Philip's War may have been unnecessarily, but the roots behind it were complicated, and the colony acquitted itself well in the military struggle without resorting to calls for aid from abroad.

Hutchinson's account of the province's experiences with the Indians reinforced several of the basic tenets that he promoted throughout his *History*. On the whole, the narrative justified the conduct of the colonists, and worked to demonstrate the obstacles his forebears overcame in creating the thriving colony that

³⁰⁸ Ibid.

Massachusetts was by his own time. However, the work also provided moral lessons to the readers, in keeping with Hutchinson's Enlightenment philosophy. The narrative demonstrated that the colony did not always respect the liberties of unpopular minorities, and also showed the consequences of such lapses. Popular "enthusiasm," here in the form of racial and religious prejudice and popular desires for revenge, led the colony to horrific actions that would have long-term negative consequences. Massachusetts' magistrates were not always capable of restraining these popular prejudices. Atrocities were also committed against innocent Indians in times of war. Hutchinson recognized that such actions were motivated by fear and ignorance, but ultimately saw them as blots on the colony's reputation, which had long-term negative consequences for the colony.

CHAPTER 5: THE CHARTER STRUGGLES

Massachusetts' struggle for control over its own government and charter dominated both domestic politics and imperial relations throughout the seventeenth century. This issue was of intense concern to Hutchinson, and he gave the charter struggles extraordinary prominence throughout the *History*, particularly in Volume One. Hutchinson saw the charter issue as central to both Massachusetts' internal development and its relationship with England. However, the dispute had deeper ramifications as well. The charter struggles laid the basis for Massachusetts' framework of government, as well as the colony's constitutional status within the empire.

In the Anglo-American world of the eighteenth century, both law and the English constitution were largely the products of history, a situation that made understanding that history critical. The traditions of the eighteenth century American Enlightenment also emphasized that the best guide to the ideals of good government and an understanding of human behavior as it related to the political realm lay in the lessons of the past.³⁰⁹ As indicated by numerous asides throughout Volume One, Hutchinson realized that the legal and constitutional issues of this period had

³⁰⁹ For a discussion of the importance of history to American Enlightenment thought, particularly in relation to questions of balanced government and the proper principles of government, see H. Trevor Colbourn, *The Lamp of Experience: Whig History and the Intellectual Origins of the American Revolution* (New York, Norton, 1965). Colbourn noted that the line between history and legal theory was not nearly as stark in the eighteenth century as it is often seen today. Eighteenth century Americans accepted that a solid knowledge of history was necessary for an understanding of Anglo-American law and constitutional theory, and consequently historical arguments played a large role in the political debates of time.

frequently been misunderstood by his countrymen, creating a false general understanding of Massachusetts' legal status within the realm.

Hutchinson's coverage of the charter crises demonstrated that he did not accept all royal actions as legitimate, and that he recognized a basic Lockean right of resistance, adhering to the people at large, once a certain threshold had been crossed by their government. His acceptance particularly of the Glorious Revolution in England and its counterpart in Massachusetts provide the best insight into what violations and crimes could legitimate popular resistance. Hutchinsons' account of the Restoration and Dominion periods also provided strong support for him in his contention that the both the provincial and the imperial governments under which he lived were far superior to those of the past, demonstrating the progress his world had come from a less enlightened age.

MASSACHUSETTS UNDER THE EARLY STUARTS

In 1629, the founders of Massachusetts were granted a corporate charter to settle the Massachusetts territory and administer its government.³¹⁰ This legal document, which the colonists brought with them to Boston, soon acquired almost religious significance to the colonists. It was regarded as the foundation of the "Citty on a Hill's" government and the guarantor of their independence, and the leadership of Puritan Massachusetts vehemently fought any attempt to alter or abolish the

³¹⁰ For the text of the original 1629 charter, see "A Coppie of Ye Kings Maiste [Majesty's] Charter for Incorporating of the Companie of the Massachusetts Bay in New England in Amarica [Sic]...." (Boston Atheneum manuscripts, 1629).

document. Challenges to the 1629 charter began a few years after it was granted, and these challenges continued for most of the century.³¹¹

³¹¹ For general information on Massachusetts' seventeenth century struggles over its charter, see Viola Barnes, *The Dominion of New England: A Study in British Colonial Policy* (New York: F. Ungar Pub. Co., 1923; 1960); Philip S. Haffenden, "The Crown and the Colonial Charters, 1675-1688: Part I," *WMQ* 15, no. 3 (Jul. 1958): 297-311; Michael G. Hall, *Edward Randolph and the American Colonies, 1676-1703* (Chapel Hill: UNC Press, 1960); Bernard Bailyn, *Ideological Origins of the American Revolution* (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1967); Frank W. Craven, *The Colonies in Transition, 1660-1713* (New York, 1968); Guy H. Miller, "Rebellion in Zion: The Overthrow of the Dominion of New England," *Historian* 30, no. 3 (1968): 439-59; Alison G. Olson, and Richard N. Brown, eds., *Anglo-American Political Relations 1675-1775* (New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 1970); Theodore Lewis, "Royal Government in New Hampshire and the Revocation of the Charter of Massachusetts, 1679-1683," *Historical New Hampshire* 25, no. 4 (1970): 3-38, and "A Revolutionary Tradition, 1689-1774: 'There Was a Revolution Here as Well as in England,'" *NEQ* 46, no. 3 (Sept. 1973): 424-38; Alison G. Olson, *Anglo-American Politics, 1660-1775: The Relationship between Parties in England and Colonial America* (London: Oxford UP, 1973); Stephen S. Webb, "The Trials of Sir Edmund Andros," in *The Human Dimensions of Nation Making: Essays on Colonial and Revolutionary America*, ed. James K. Martin (Madison: University of Wisconsin, 1976), 23-53; T. H. Breen, "War, Taxes and Political Brokers: The Ordeal of Mass. Bay, 1675-1695" in *Puritans and Adventurers: Change and Persistence in Early America* (New York and Oxford, 1980), 81-105; J. G. A. Pocock, ed. *Three British Revolutions: 1641, 1688, 1776* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1980); J. M. Sosin, *English America and the Restoration Monarchy of Charles II: Transatlantic Politics, Commerce, and Kinship* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1980); Richard R. Johnson, *Adjustment to Empire: The New England Colonies, 1675-1715* (New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 1981); Ian K. Steele, "Communicating an English Revolution to the Colonies, 1688-1689," *JBS* 24, no. 3 (Jul. 1985): 333-57; Stephen S. Webb, *1676: The End of American Independence* (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1985); David S. Lovejoy, *The Glorious Revolution in America* (Middletown, CN: Wesleyan UP, 1987); Ian K. Steele, "Origins of Boston's Revolutionary Declaration of 18 April 1689," *NEQ* 62, no. 1 (Mar. 1989): 75-81; Robert Bliss, *Revolution and Empire: English Politics and the American Colonies in the Seventeenth Century* (Manchester: Manchester UP, 1990); K. G. Davies, "The Revolutions in America," in Robert Beddard, *The Revolutions of 1688: the Andrew Browning Lectures, 1988* (New York: Oxford UP, 1991), 246-70; and Stephen S. Webb, *Lord Churchill's Coup: The Anglo-American Empire and the Glorious Revolution Reconsidered* (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse UP, 1998).

The main primary records for the period are William H. Whitmore, ed., *The Andros Tracts: Being a Collection of Pamphlets and Official Papers Issued During the Period between the Overthrow of the Andros Government and the Establishment of the Second Charter of Massachusetts* (Boston: Prince Society, 1874); Edward Randolph, *Edward Randolph: Including His Letters and Official Papers*, ed. Robert N. Toppan and Alfred T. S. Goodrick (Boston: Prince Society, 1909); Charles M. Andrews, ed., *Narratives of the Insurrections, 1675-1690* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1915; Cranbury, NJ: Scholar's Bookshelf, 2005); Michael G. Hall, Lawrence H. Leder, and Michael G. Kammen, eds., *The Glorious Revolution in America: Documents on the Colonial Crisis of 1689* (Chapel Hill: UNC Press, 1964); and Robert E. Moody, and Richard C. Simmons, eds., *The Glorious Revolution in Massachusetts: Selected Documents, 1689-1692* (Boston: CSM, 1988). The second volume of Hutchinson's *Collection of Papers* covered the period from the Restoration to the Glorious Revolution, and contains a great deal of correspondence between English government and Massachusetts regarding the *quo warranto* proceedings, the establishment of the Dominion under Andros, and the 1689 overthrow.

The official British and colonial records of the period, including the text of the 1629 and 1691 charters and the laws and instructions pertaining to Massachusetts can be found in William Macdonald, ed., *Select Charters and Other Documents Illustrative of American History, 1606-1775* (New York, 1914); Leo F. Stock, ed., *Proceedings and Debates of the British Parliament Respecting North America*, Vol. 2 (Washington, DC, 1927); and Clarence S. Brigham, ed., *British Royal Proclamations*

In 1633, Sir Christopher Gardiner, Thomas Morton and Philip Ratcliff (all of whom had been banished from Massachusetts for various reasons), lodged the first challenge against the charter, presenting a petition to the English Privy Council that accused Massachusetts Bay of desiring independence from the mother country. The charges were successfully refuted and dismissed. However, the next year the Crown, which may not have initially realized that the charter had left the realm, began attempts to recover it. This signaled the beginning of more concerted moves to rein in the colony. In 1635, Charles I attempted to supplant the authority of the Massachusetts General Court by creating a council of English lords (including William Laud, the colony's arch-enemy) to oversee their government.³¹² In 1638, on the eve of the English Civil War, Charles I began legal action to revoke the Massachusetts charter, an action that was interrupted by the start military hostilities.³¹³

The English Civil War and Interregnum gave Massachusetts a needed if temporary respite. The only serious challenge to the charter in the period of the Civil War and Interregnum was the Remonstrance petition of 1646. Robert Child and several other non-Puritans challenged the Massachusetts laws excluding them from

Relating to America, 1603-1783 (New York: B. Franklin, 1968). Massachusetts' official records for the period can be found in Nathaniel B. Shurtleff, ed., *Massachusetts Colony Records: Records of the Governor and Company of the Massachusetts Bay in New England* (Boston: W. White, 1853-54; New York, AMS Press, 1968); Abner C. Goodell, and Melville M. Bigelow, eds., *Acts and Resolves, Public and Private, of the Province of the Massachusetts Bay* (Boston: Wright & Potter, 1869-22); *The Boston Town Records, 1631-1822* (Boston: Rockwell & Churchill, 1881-1906); and John Noble, ed., *Records of the Court of Assistants of the Colony of the Massachusetts Bay, 1630-169*, vols. 1-3 (Boston: County of Suffolk, 1928).

³¹² Charles I's "Commission for Regulating Plantations," dated 28 April 28, 1635, in Hutchinson, *History* 1, Appendix D, 418-20.

³¹³ Charles' 1638 attempt to vacate the Massachusetts charter is printed in *Collection of Papers*, ed. Hutchinson, 1: 114-16.

participation in government, and eventually appealed the question to Parliament.³¹⁴

Despite the eventual denial of the appeal, the legal issue raised by the Remonstrance petitioners would continue to haunt the colony in the ensuing decade. Child's petition raised a vital legal question that would ultimately prove the colony's undoing: despite their charter's specific directive to make "no laws repugnant to English law," Massachusetts persisted in religious discrimination, even against Anglicans, that would be illegal in England.³¹⁵

The colony prospered during the 1640s and 1650s, due to their alliance with the victors in the English Civil War, but found themselves in a much more uncomfortable position after the Restoration of the Stuart monarchy in 1660. The Restoration signaled the beginning of a new and difficult relationship between Massachusetts and the Crown. The colony was considered suspect, not only due to the dissenting faith of the majority of its inhabitants, but more crucially because it had sided decisively with Parliament in the Civil War.

The 1660s and 1670s were periods of significant challenge to the province. In 1664, Charles II sent over four commissioners to Massachusetts, authorizing them to review the colony's laws, hear appeals from its court rulings, and settle land disputes. Massachusetts failed to recognize the authority of the commissioners, and

³¹⁴ Robert Child, *et al.*, "Petition presented to the General Court held at Boston, May 19, 1646," in *Collection of Papers*, ed. Hutchinson, 1: 214-23. The General Court's response, "A Declaration of the General Court holden at Boston 4 (9) 1646, is 1: 223-47. For more information on the Remonstrance petitioners, see George L. Kittredge, "Dr. Robert Child the Remonstrant," *CSM Publications* 21 (1919): 1-146.

³¹⁵ As Child's petition noted, "we cannot, according to our judgments, discern a settled forme of government according to the laws of England, which may seem strange to our countrymen, yea to the whole world, especially considering we are all English." *Collection of Papers*, ed. Hutchinson, 1: 216. Child claimed there were "many thousands in these plantations, of the English nation, freeborne, quiet and peaceable men, righteous in their dealings...who are debarred from all civill imployments (without any just cause that we know)" *Ibid.*, 218.

pronounced their presence a violation of the province's charter.³¹⁶ The Commissioners eventually returned to England in high dungeon,³¹⁷ and Massachusetts was ordered to send agents to England with sufficient authority to answer the various crimes charged against them. Massachusetts delayed sending such agents for over a decade.³¹⁸ When the Massachusetts agents finally arrived in London in 1676, the ministry discovered that they lacked sufficient power to agree to substantive changes to the charter on their own authority, as the General Court, advised by the Puritan ministers, had decided against granting them such power.

The colony's position, which they first expressed in 1661 and never wavered from thereafter, was that their 1629 charter had been a legally recognized gift from

³¹⁶ The Commissioners appointed were Richard Nichols, Robert Carr, George Cartwright, and Samuel Maverick. The text of their commission is in the *History* 1, Appendix No. 15: 443-44. As Hutchinson noted, the last of these men was already an established opponent of the Massachusetts charter, who had been campaigning against it for years. The Danforth Papers in *MHS Coll.*, 2nd ser. 8 (1819): 46-112, contain a good deal of the correspondence between King Charles, the Commissioners and the Massachusetts General Court for the period of 1662-1666. The correspondence includes the colony's repeated claims of charter privilege against the Commissioners' power. See particularly the Commissioners' Brief Narration of the Negotiation between the General Court and the Commissioners, 92-95, the Petition of the Massachusetts Governor and General Court to the King, 95-96, the Proceedings of the Massachusetts Court for 1666, 98-101, the Letter from Charles II, 22 Feb. 1665/6, 101-02, and the Massachusetts General Court's Answer to Letter of the King, 17, 7 mo., 1666, 108-09.

³¹⁷ Massachusetts' failure to respect the authority of the King's Commissioners in the 1660s was one of the main complaints against them that led to the 1684 *quo warranto* proceedings, according to Edward Randolph: "...you may remember the King in 1664 was at great Charge in sending over Commissioners thither upon sundry complaints made at y^e Council board & instead of admitting them to Act according to theyr Commission they openly by sound of Trumpet declared agst theyr Proceedings and would not permit them to stay as Comissioners in Boston and so returned *re infecta*, and this high Contempt of theirs was one Article agst them..." Edward Randolph to Dean Hicks, Sept. 20, 1684, quoted in C. E. Doble, ed., "Notes and Documents: Mather and Randolph," *Eng. Hist. Rev.* 1, no. 1 (Jan. 1886): 147.

³¹⁸ With regard to Massachusetts' decision to stall rather than immediately obey the king's order to send agents to England, see particularly "The Address of Mass. Gen. Court to Charles II," *Collection of Papers*, ed. Hutchinson, 2: 43-47, "The Advice of the Elders concerning the Address," *ibid.*, 50-51, and "King Charles II to Gov. Endecott," *ibid.*, 51-52.

Charles I that the current monarch had no legal right to revoke.³¹⁹ In response to this, in 1683 the monarchy of Charles II began *quo warranto* procedures, the legal process to revoke a corporate charter such as the Charter of 1629.³²⁰ Judgment was entered against Massachusetts in the Court of Chancery on October 13, 1684.³²¹ The colony was informed that their charter had been legally revoked, and they were to be placed under a military command. In June of 1686, Sir Edmund Andros was appointed governor of the Dominion of New England, a territory comprising all the of New England colonies. New York and New Jersey were subsequently added.

Massachusetts' seventeenth century struggles with the Crown were clearly of vital interest to Hutchinson, judging from the attention he paid to them, and the prominence he gave these disputes in his narrative.³²² Hutchinson's account of the

³¹⁹ In 1661, the Massachusetts General Court declared their charter "the first and mayne foundation of our civil polity here." The statement listed the responsibilities Massachusetts believed it owed the monarch, including protecting his dominions militarily, defending his honor in wars, furthering the Christian religion, and maintaining his laws against criminals. What this document pointedly did not include is any recognition of king's authority to approve Massachusetts' laws or system of government. Court's Declaration of their rights by Charter, 1661, from Massachusetts General Court, June 10, 1661, in *History* 1, Appendix No. 13: 439-40.

³²⁰ A *Quo warranto* action was a "writ against any person or corporation which usurped a franchise or liberty." Philip S. Haffenden, "The Crown and the Colonial Charters, 1675-1688: Part I," 302, footnote 12. Under English law, a colonial charter was considered the private property of English subjects, and could not be seized without solid evidence presented in court of law.

³²¹ "Exemplification of the Judgment for vacating the charter of the Massachusetts Bay in New England, 1684," in *MHS Coll.*, 4th ser. 2 (1854): 246-78. The judgment was entered against the Massachusetts in the final months of Charles II's reign; and issued by his successor, James II. Edward Randolph's "Articles against the Government of Boston" presented the ministry's legal justification for revoking the charter. "Articles against the Government of Boston. Rcd. 4 June 1683," in *Randolph Letters*, ed. Toppan and Goodrick, 3: 299-300.

³²² The *History*, particularly Volume 1, is organized primarily around the charter struggle. Volume 1, Chapter 1, which ends with the Restoration of 1660, is the only substantive chapter in Volume 1 whose title does not reflect the charter struggle. Volume 1, Chapter 2 is subtitled "Historical Occurrences from the Restoration of King Charles the 2d to the Year 1686, when the Charter was vacated." (*History* 1, ch. 2: 179). Volume 1, Chapter 3 is subtitled "From the dissolution of the charter in 1686, until the arrival of the province charter in 1692." (*History*, 1, ch. 3: 297). The conclusion of Volume 1, which according to Hutchinson's text was originally meant to end the entire work, ended its narrative not with the event that might seem more likely to a modern reader—the Salem Witch Trials

charter struggles was designed to convey several important points to his readers. His work addressed both the *moral* and the *legal* justness of the revocation of the 1629 charter, an issue that was still hotly debated in Hutchinson's own time.³²³ The second overriding concern in this part of the account was the question of whether Massachusetts in any way deserved the revocation, or bore any responsibility the loss of their charter. This required looking into the initial terms of the 1629 charter and the circumstances of its acquisition, the deviations from the charter committed by the colonists, and the critics of the colony and the nature of their grievances.

Overall, Hutchinson argued that Massachusetts lost its original charter through little fault of its own. The revocation was the result rather of the more arbitrary system of monarchy present in England at the time, which provided all English subjects, including those in Massachusetts, with little protection from arbitrary proceedings. On the other hand, Hutchinson did not hold the colony entirely blameless. Several of their deviations from their original patent had opened the door for a legal challenge, particularly their denial of civil rights to non-Puritans. Hutchinson's account also demonstrated that the legal status of early Massachusetts within British common law, particularly under the 1629 charter, was a more complicated matter than was generally appreciated in his own time.

of 1692—but rather halfway into the year 1692, with the arrival of Governor Phips and the beginning of government under the second charter (*History* 1, ch. 3: 351.). Finally, Volume 2 is subtitled “From the charter of King William and Queen Mary in 1691, until the Year 1750.” (*History* 2, ch. 1, title page). Volume two then begins with a nine-page recapitulation of the work up to date—a summary that focuses almost wholly on events pertaining to the charter. (*History* 2, ch. 1: 1-9).

³²³ These were two separate issues to Hutchinson; thus, a government could commit an act that was legal under the law but morally reprehensible, and accordingly, a people might have a moral right to resist such acts, but not a legal one. The best expression of these views is Hutchinson's “Dialogue between an American and a European Englishman (1768),” ed. Bernard Bailyn, *Perspectives in American History* 9 (1975): 343-411.

It is clear in Hutchinson's account that there were two key sources of the Crown's unhappiness with Massachusetts after 1660. Firstly, the Stuart kings had serious doubts concerning the colony's loyalty. In addition to having supported the Parliamentary cause, the colony had been notably lacking in enthusiasm for Charles II's Restoration, even failing to congratulate the new monarch at his accession.³²⁴ The Crown was also irritated over the colony's deviations from English law, particularly their insistence on persecuting religious minorities. Hutchinson found the second charge a much more legitimate one than the first.

Puritan Massachusetts, former home of several of the regicides who had signed Charles I's death warrant, was not beloved by Charles II, or by his brother James II. Accusations of disloyalty were lodged against the colony from the first years of the Restoration forward.³²⁵ Hutchinson refuted most of these charges. In

³²⁴ Massachusetts' belated August 7, 1661 recognition of the Restoration monarchy was hardly celebratory: "FORASMUCH as Charles the second is undoubted King of Great Britain... We there do, as in duty we are bound and acknowledge him to be our Sovereign..." *History* 1, ch. 2: 187. Hutchinson's explanation for the colony's delay in sending acknowledgements and other violations of monarchical etiquette was that as Charles II was the first king to ascend to the English throne since the colony's founding, they were unaware of proper procedure: *ibid.*, 186-87.

³²⁵ Accusations of disloyalty had dogged Massachusetts since its earliest years of settlement. In 1633, an Crown inquiry was launched into the colony's increasing immigration, which was alleged to include "divers persons known to be ill affected, discontented not only with civil but ecclesiastical government..." King in Council, 21st Feb. 1633, quoted *History* 1, ch. 1:30. Hutchinson also noted a letter found in Archbishop Laud's study from George Burdett of Salem that accused New England of disloyalty and desires for independence: "it was not new discipline which was aimed at, but sovereignty; and that it was accounted perjury and treason, in their general court, to speak of appeals to the King." *History* 1, ch. 1: 76-77.

One of first communication between the colony and the Restored Crown alluded to charges of disloyalty. In his letter announcing his coronation, Charles II assured the Massachusetts settlers he was assured of their loyalty, despite rumors to the contrary: Letter of Charles II to Gov. Endecott, announcing Restoration of the monarchy, Feb. 15, 1660," in *Collection of Papers*, ed. Hutchinson, 2: 51-52. Suspicions concerning Massachusetts' attachment to the realm persisted into the 1680s: John Cotton to Thomas Hinckley, Jan. 13, 1681, and William Blathwayt to Thomas Hickley, 27 Sept. 27, 1683, both in "Hinkley Papers: Being the Letters and Papers of Thomas Hinckley, Governor of the Colony of New Plymouth, 1676-1699," *MHS Coll.*, 4th ser. 5 (1861): 55-57, 91-92

Some in the British ministry were not entirely convinced of Massachusetts' loyalty even in the eighteenth century, due to the colony's past, as was shown in a 1720 letter written by Massachusetts agent and historian Daniel Neal: "I see no hopes of saving the country unless the next

Hutchinson's view, the colony's reluctance to embrace the new monarch was rooted solely in religious concerns. Putting rather a positive gloss both on the colony's sentiments during the English Civil War and their reception of news of the Restoration, Hutchinson argued, "I have no where met with any marks of disrespect to the memory of the late King, and there is no room to suppose they were under disaffection to his son, and if they feared his restoration it was because they expected a change in religion, and that a persecution of all non-conformists would follow it."³²⁶ Hutchinson also refuted Charles II's charge that the colony was harboring criminals in sheltering several of the escaped regicides, noting that the colony made several efforts to recapture them.³²⁷

general assembly will disavow the proceedings of the last. The cry of the city here runs exceedingly against you, and they revive the story of 1641." Daniel Neal to ____ [no date given], in *History* 2, ch. 3: 219, footnote *.

³²⁶ *History*, 1, ch. 2: 179. For another view of Puritan Massachusetts' response to the Restoration, see Francis J. Bremer, "In Defense of Regicide: John Cotton on the Execution of Charles I," *WMQ* 37, no. 1 (Jan. 1980): 103-24, and *Puritan Crisis: New England and the English Civil Wars, 1630-1670* (New York: Garland Pub., 1989); and Stephen Foster, "English Puritanism and the Progress of New England Institutions, 1630-1660," in *Saints and Revolutionaries: Essays on Early American History*, ed. David D. Hall, John M. Murin, and Thad Tate (New York: W.W. Norton, 1984), 3-38.

³²⁷ For the issue of the regicides, see *Collection of Papers*, ed. Hutchinson, 2: 52-59, 63-64, 148; and Danforth Papers, *MHS Coll.*, 2nd ser., 8 (1819): 46-112. Correspondence from Hutchinson's collection left unpublished in his time relative to the regicides was later published as "Papers related to Whalley and Goffe," in *MHS Coll.*, 3rd ser. 7 (1838): 123-28. The manuscripts are mainly dated 1660-1664. The Massachusetts General Court was ordered to find and apprehend Whalley and Goffe, "who stand here convicted for the execrable murder of our Royall Father, of glorious memory..." Letter of Charles II to the Governor of New England, 5 March 1660/1, in "Papers related to Whalley and Goffe," 123. Whitehall had been informed that their fugitives had sought shelter in New England. In the correspondence, New England seems to have been making an outward appearance of searching, but with little sincere effort, a lack of enthusiasm which was both noted and resented by the English authorities.

Mark Sargent notes that Hutchinson significantly downplayed the sympathy seventeenth century New England felt for the regicides. Douglas Wilson added that, based on the persistent rumors of Goffe and Whalley sightings, the regicides seem to have moved about the New England countryside relatively freely for two hunted people. Mark L. Sargent, "Thomas Hutchinson, Ezra Stiles, and the Legend of the Regicides," *WMQ* 49, no. 3 (Jul. 1992): 431-48; Douglas C. Wilson, "Web of Secrecy: Goffe, Whalley, and the Legend of Hadley," *NEQ* 60, no. 4 (Dec. 1987): 515-48.

Hutchinson saw most of the deviations from the terms of the 1629 charter as understandable, given the distance of the colony from England, and the difficult circumstances of life in the early settlement. England's troubled state during the period also in large part justified the independence shown by the colony in this period, and the resulting innovations in their laws and government. Hutchinson believed this combination of circumstances explained most of innovations adopted by the new colony: "[i]f we add...the troubles in England taking off from the colonies, the attention of the several successions of supreme power there, for near thirty years together; from all these circumstances, we may pretty well account for all the peculiarities in the laws of the colony."³²⁸

Massachusetts' government departed from the powers expressed in their charter very early on, with the establishment of the legislative body, the second such institution established in the colonies. In noting the development of the General Court, Hutchinson described it as having come about through the general will of the freeholders, who had become uncomfortable with the degree of power held in the hands of the governor and assistants.³²⁹ While Hutchinson generally approved of this innovation as a measure necessary for the general welfare of the colony, he noted that

³²⁸ *History* 1, ch. 5: 370. For a discussion of the colony's deviations from the terms of the 1629 charter, and English law, see Abel Cushing, ed., *Historical Letters on the First Charter of Massachusetts Government* (Boston: J. N. Bang, 1839); Richard B. Morris, "Massachusetts and the Common Law: The Declaration of 1646," *AHR* 31, no. 3 (Apr. 1926): 443-53; Michael Kammen, *Deputies & Libertyes: The Origins of Representative Government in Colonial America* (New York: Knopf, 1969); G. B. Warden, "Law Reform in England and New England, 1620 to 1660," *WMQ* 35, no. 4 (Oct. 1978): 668-90; Michael G. Hall, "Origins in Massachusetts of the Constitutional Doctrine of Advice and Consent," *MHS Proc.* 91 (1979): 3-15; and Daniel R. Coquillette, "Radical Lawmakers in Colonial Massachusetts: The 'Countenance of Authoritie' and the Lawes and Libertyes," *NEQ* 67, no. 2 (Jun. 1994): 179-211; and Ronald D. Karr, "The Missing Clause: Myth and the Massachusetts Bay Charter of 1629," *NEQ* 77, no. 1 (Mar. 2004): 89-107.

³²⁹ *History* 1, ch. 1: 33-34, and 34, footnote *.

it rendered the legality of Massachusetts' entire framework of government somewhat questionable. In creating their government, the colonists were largely acting on their own authority: "[m]ost of these regulations were made without any authority from their charter..."³³⁰ Hutchinson attributed the colonists' willingness to deviate from their written orders to their isolated situation: "[i]n America they were less scrupulous than they would have been in England."³³¹ However, Hutchinson also noted that Massachusetts was hardly the only colony to rework their structure of government in this turbulent time. The author pointed out that all of the mainland colonies were guilty of deviations from their approved frameworks. He noted that the Virginians had been even more brazen than the Bay Colony, their House of Burgesses having no prior authorization whatsoever, "the King nor the grand council at home not having given any power or directions for it."³³²

Hutchinson described most of Massachusetts' deviations from English law as understandable given their unsettled circumstances, the inattention of England in the period, and the religious goals of the Puritan settlers. For example, to explain the discrepancies between English and Massachusetts criminal law, a major English complaint, Hutchinson noted that due to their lack of ecclesiastical courts, transgressions that normally fell under church law in England came under the authority of the state in Massachusetts. While Hutchinson was reluctant to approve

³³⁰ Ibid., 34, footnote *.

³³¹ Ibid.

³³² Ibid., 83, footnote † (cross).

entirely of this arrangement, he noted it was in keeping with the religious nature of the age and the stated theocratic goals of the settlement.³³³

It appears that there were only two deviations from the original charter instructions that made Hutchinson significantly uncomfortable. The first was the physical removal of the charter from London to Massachusetts, a move that allowed the government to be located in the province, rather than back in London. This question would prove important later in court cases related to the charter, which aimed at determining to what extent the colonies had in fact “left the realm” in settling in Massachusetts. If, as had been the case with every other province, the guiding corporation’s headquarters had remained in London, the question of Parliament or the ministry’s legal jurisdiction over the colony would have been less open to debate.

Hutchinson noted in his discussion of the original settlement that the physical removal of their charter had been considered vitally necessary by the Founders, several of whom made it a condition of their joining the settlement. Nevertheless, he was not entirely convinced that the removal of the charter from the realm was truly legal. Noting that the Massachusetts Company’s officers had consulted Crown lawyer John White, who had determined that both the patent and the government should be settled in America, Hutchinson objected mildly, “[i]t is difficult to conceive any reasons in support of this opinion.”³³⁴ The point was important, because the physical

³³³ *History* 1, ch. 5: 369-70. Hutchinson noted that in the realm of criminal law particularly, “they professed to have no regard to the rules of the common law of England” and intended to be guided by “law of Moses.” *Ibid.*, 370-71.

³³⁴ *History* 1, ch. 1: 13.

removal of the charter to Massachusetts turned out to be a constitutional coup for the New Englanders, which gave them an independence not held by colonies with charters back in England.³³⁵ It also demonstrated that the colonists had been departing from the terms of their original charter from the very beginning, making the political structure they eventually established somewhat less constitutionally legitimate.³³⁶

The second and more important deviation that gave Hutchinson pause was the colony's franchise restrictions. The close relationship between Massachusetts' religious problems and their subsequent political struggles with the home government is a connection which has been sometimes overlooked by modern historians, but one of which Thomas Hutchinson was very much aware. Massachusetts' exclusion of non-church members from the franchise and other civil rights was Hutchinson's most significant complaint regarding the early structure of Massachusetts government. He pointed out repeatedly that the Puritan church membership requirements for government participation violated basic civil liberties, and created significant problems for the colony. This requirement was established with the colony's earliest

³³⁵ As Hutchinson expressed it in his summary of the charter struggles in Volume Two: "[h]ad the corporation continued within the realm, as was intended, the company and every member must undoubtedly have been subject to the law of the land." *History* 2, ch. 1: 3.

³³⁶ "The removal of the corporation from England was the first instance of departure from the charter and in a most essential point." *History* 1, ch. 1: 34, footnote *. See also *History* 2, ch. 1: 1. Hutchinson's discomfort with the uncertain legality of the removal of the patent continued in the footnotes of his *Collection of Papers*. Commenting on a 1638 letter sent from the Lords of the Council to Winthrop, requesting that the charter be returned to London, Hutchinson commented: "[w]hether the intent of this order was that the Patent should be sent over that the Government of the Colony might be under a Corporation in England, according to the true intent of the Patent, or whether it was that the Patent might be surrendered, is uncertain." (*Collection of Papers*, ed. Hutchinson, 1: 199, footnote 86). Again, commenting on an early dispute between the Massachusetts Assistants and the House of Deputies, Hutchinson noted, "[t]he patent, if the corporation had continued in England as was intended, admits of no difficulty in the construction of it. These doubts and questions arise merely from changing a corporation in England into a common wealth in America." *Hutchinson Papers*, 1:205, footnote 162.

government, and despite increasing pressure from England, it remained the law of the land until the colony's original government was dissolved in the 1680s.³³⁷

Those settlers who were not full members of a Congregational church were not only disenfranchised, but also prevented from serving on juries or participating in government in any way. Moreover, as ministers were the ones to certify individuals for full church members, this requirement gave the ministry a tremendous power over civil government, something Hutchinson bemoaned as destructive to both church and state.³³⁸ In his discussion of the charter struggles, Hutchinson introduced another consequence of this injustice. The exclusion of non-church members from civic participation gave the Crown a legitimate cause to act against the colony. This became an even more critical issue after 1660: "not only Episcopalians, but Baptists, quakers, Gortonists, &c. preferred complaints against the colony; and

³³⁷ "[I]t continued in force until the dissolution of the government, it being repealed, in appearance only, after the restoration of King Charles the second."

The documents Hutchinson included in his appendix showed this was this issue of religious discrimination was the source of a major dispute between the colony and the imperial government from the outset, from which both sides refused to retreat. Puritan Massachusetts believed the authority to maintain their religious orthodoxy and keep their government only in the hands of full church members was vital to their society. The English Crown objected to this as a basis of government even before the settlement had been planted, but despite repeated challenges, the colonists refused to change their style of government: "Proposals made by Lord Say, Lord Brooke, and others, as conditions of their removing to New England, with the answers (1636)," in *History* 1, Appendix 2: 410-13.

An anonymous letter from the 1660s demonstrated that the sense the seventeenth century colonists had of this issue under their charter: "...it was the intent of the Pattentees to transplant them selves at their own charge that they might enjoy the free Exercise of their religion which cannot be secured to them and their successors unless supported by the Civill Authority and that in a way of Absolute Power without allowance of Appeale..." Anon., "Letter, ca. 1666," in "Documents relating to the Massachusetts Patent," *MHS Proc.* 46 (1913): 292.

³³⁸ As Hutchinson understood it, a lack of separation of church and state was corruptive to both institutions. At another point in the *History*, he also objected that the seventeenth century General Court frequently interfered in ecclesiastical matters: "however inconsistent it may seem with the professed ecclesiastical constitution and freedom of every church, the general court, in several instances, interposed their authority." *History* 1, ch. 1: 161. Hutchinson based his understanding of the need for a religious tolerance by government, and separation between church and state primarily on the doctrines enunciated by Voltaire and Montesquieu: *History* 1, ch. 1: 176, *History* 1, ch. 2: 190, footnote *.

although...King Charles confirmed their charter, yet he required a toleration in religion and alternation in civil matters, neither of which were fully complied with.”³³⁹ The province made matters worse by attempting to deny the right of appeal on this issue to England, an action which the Crown saw as an attempt at autonomy.³⁴⁰

While Hutchinson ultimately absolved the colony from most of the responsibility for the loss of their original charter, he did fault the settlers for giving England legitimate grounds for legal action in their stubborn refusal on this issue. Hutchinson also recognized that this discrimination put the colony on shakier moral ground in their defense of their charter than they would otherwise have been. He acknowledged that this was an unacceptable violation of civil liberties, and those thus excluded had ample cause for complaint: “[h]ad they been deprived of their civil privileges in England by an act of parliament, unless they would join in communion with the churches there, it might very well have been the first in the roll of grievances.”³⁴¹

³³⁹ *History 2*, ch. 1: 3. Hutchinson reiterated this objection in Volume Two: “I know not how to excuse the persecution of all who could not conform to their religious establishment, when their charter granted toleration to all christians, except papists.” *History 2*, ch. 1: 2.

³⁴⁰ The Crown argued that Massachusetts’ refusal to allow appeals to the Commissioners from their court rulings meant that they were refusing the basic right of an English subject to appeal to the king: “if in truth, in any extraordinary case, the proceedings there aue been irregular, and against the rules of justice...it cannot be presumed that his Majesty hath or will leaue his subjects of New-England without hope of redresse by an appeale to him, which his subjects of all his other kingdoms haue free liberty to make.” Letter from Earl of Clarendon to Mass. Gen. Court, Mar. 15, 1664, in *History 1*, Appendix 17: 450. The colony’s refusal to yield on this point was seen by the Crown as a rejection of the king’s authority: “...It is uery euident to his Majesty, notwithstanding many expressions of great affection and duty, that in truth they doe, upon the matter, belieue that his Majesty hath noe jurisdiction ouer them, but that all persons must acquiesce in ther judgments and determinations how unjust soeuer, and cannot appeale to his Majesty...” Letter from King Charles II, to Mass. Bay, in 1666, in *History 1*, Appendix 19: 452.

³⁴¹ *History 1*, ch. 1:25.

Hutchinson recognized that the colonists could have been more diplomatic in their dealings with the Crown, as their absolute refusal to compromise during their period was cited as a partial justification for the eventual revocation of their charter. Hutchinson also admitted that his forbearers could have possibly been more tactful and flexible in their responses.³⁴² However, Hutchinson insisted that the colonists' intransigence was based on legitimate concerns: "it cannot be denied that the commission was a stretch of power...there appears in the conduct of the general court, upon this occasion, not an obstinate perverse spirit, but a modest steady adherence to what they imagined, at last, to be their just rights and privileges."³⁴³ Hutchinson recognized the threat that the Commissioners posed to the colony's ability to govern itself:

"[t]he government of the colony, I imagine, will not be thought culpable for refusing entirely to submit to the absolute authority of the commissioners, which must have superseded their charter; and if this authority had been once admitted they would have found it very difficult ever after to have ejected it."³⁴⁴

³⁴² Hutchinson actually had a pronounced tendency to gloss over his colony's less-than-deferential tone of address in much of their correspondence throughout this period. That the colony took regularly took a defiant tone of address in their communications with the Crown is clear from the documents in Hutchinson's own appendix. One early correspondence regarding the charter, the Massachusetts General Court's response to the 1638 *quo warranto* attempt, edged close to treason. In answer to the demand that their patent be surrendered, the General Court replied that if colony were to lose its charter without any charges being proven against them, their common people would assume that the king had cast them off, and would form a new government, which would be a dangerous example for the other colonies. Mass. Gen. Court, Address, 6 Sept. 1638," in *History 1*, Appendix No. 5: 421-22.

The Earl of Clarendon wrote Massachusetts' General Court in 1664 to bemoan another similarly belligerent address: "I do confesse to you, I am so much a friend to your colony, that if the same had been communicated to no body but my self, I should haue dissuaded presenting the same to his Majesty, who, I doubt, will not think himself well treated by it..." The Earl pronounced his friends all "equally amazed to find that you demand a revocation of the commission and commissioners, without laying the least matter to their charge of crymes or exorbitances..." Earl of Clarendon to the Mass. Gen. Court, Mar. 15, 1664, in *History 1*, Appendix 17: 450.

³⁴³ *History 1*, ch. 2: 220.

³⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 215. Commenting upon the proceedings of the General Court regarding the Commissioners in Jan. 1661, Hutchinson noted that colony was divided whether or not to respond to demand to send agents to England, and that the agents may have been personally fearful to go, due to

While both the removal of the charter to America and the religious restrictions on the franchise clearly concerned the lieutenant governor and he did acknowledge some recalcitrance in the colonists' behavior during the Restoration period, Hutchinson's narrative was for the most part a defense of the colony. As Hutchinson saw it, the settlement struggled through much of the seventeenth century against a host of enemies and a sovereign whose power was not yet reined in by a firm constitutional framework.

Hutchinson noted that many of Massachusetts' critics had personal motives at stake in the struggle against the colony, and that their accounts were thus somewhat biased. While many of the critics had begun as religious dissenters from the colony, their motives were often financial as well. Two of the most active opponents of the charter since the early 1630s had been Thomas Morton and Christopher Gardiner, non-Puritans who had both run afoul of the Puritan government. Hutchinson noted that both men were failed adventurers who were pursuing land claims against the colony as well as religious complaints. Quoting a 1632 letter between them, Hutchinson demonstrated that the two had been scheming for years to have the colony's charter revoked: "If Jove vouchsafe to thunder, the charter and the kingdom of the separatists will fall asunder...The brethren have found themselves frustrated,

the uncertainty of affairs there: "[t]he agents themselves seem to have been pressed into the service. They fear a long detention in England and were not sure that they were intirely free from danger of restraint upon their liberty. Complaints had been preferred against the colony from all quarters...Besides, it was doubtful what would be the fate of the charter. If taken away they would not know where to obtain satisfaction for any extraordinary expence or trouble in England." *Collection of Papers*, ed. Hutchinson, 2: 65, footnote 70.

and I shall see my desire upon mine enemies.”³⁴⁵ Hutchinson attributed Massachusetts’ problems as much to malcontents such as these two as to the desires of the ministry.

This was particularly the case concerning Massachusetts’ foremost critic in the Restoration period, Edward Randolph. First sent over to gather information on the colony in 1676, Randolph was in 1678 appointed collector of Crown revenue.³⁴⁶ An Anglican and a royalist, he detested the Massachusetts government from the outset, and soon began sending home a variety of charges against the colony. Hutchinson saw Randolph as motivated wholly by base and scurrilous motives (he was a relative of land claimant John Mason, and in the man’s pay), and blamed Randolph principally for the loss of the first charter³⁴⁷

³⁴⁵ Morton to Gardiner, May 1, 1634, quoted *History* 1, ch. 1:29, footnote *. Morton and Gardiner, together with Samuel Maverick, John Mason, and Sir Fernando Gorges were all among the earliest leading critics of Massachusetts charter, and their testimony would be among the accounts eventually used to vacate the charter. Hutchinson noted that all of these men had personal quarrels with Massachusetts. Gorges was pursuing a claim for the Maine settlement, a legal dispute that dragged on for most of the century. Mason was also pursuing a property claim, as was Maverick. Of Gardner, Hutchinson noted that he was expelled from Massachusetts in disgrace, due to his suspected immorality: *History* 1: ch. 1: 20, 23-24.

³⁴⁶ His initial instructions, dated 9 July 1678, are contained in the “Instructions from the Commissioners to Edward Randolph,” printed *MHS Coll.*, 3rd ser., vol. 7 (1838): 129-38.

³⁴⁷ *History* 2, ch. 1: 3, and 3-04, footnote ‡ (double cross). For background information on Randolph’s apparently self-appointed role as Massachusetts irritant, see C. E. Doble, ed., “Notes and Documents: Mather and Randolph,” *English Historical Review* 1, no. 1 (Jan. 1886): 146-49; Michael G. Hall, *Edward Randolph and the American Colonies, 1676-1703* (Chapel Hill: UNC Press, 1960), and “Randolph, Dudley, and the Massachusetts Moderates in 1683,” *NEQ* 29, no. 4 (Dec. 1956): 513-16; and John J. Reardon, *Edmund Randolph: A Biography* (New York: Macmillan, 1974). Philip Haffenden agrees with Hutchinson’s assessment of Randolph’s influence, calling him a “yapping dog” who eventually aggravated the slow-moving ministry into action against Massachusetts: Haffenden, “Crown and the Colonial Charters, Part I,” 306.

Hutchinson’s criticism of Randolph continued in his *Collection of Papers*. In the footnotes to Randolph’s 1676 “Narrative of Sept. 20th and Oct. 12th 1676,” Hutchinson inserted a running defense of the colony against Randolph’s charges, an editorial intrusion unlike any other in the work: *Collection of Papers*, ed. Hutchinson, 2: 210-52. Hutchinson was particularly incensed at one Randolph charge in the document: that the members of “the faction” were all men of low birth. Randolph had charged, “I know but one man who was not a servant or a servants son, who now governe their governor and the whole country.” Hutchinson responded, “[t]his is a scandalous

Ultimately, Hutchinson saw *quo warranto* proceedings of the 1680s, the culmination of this period of political struggle, as arbitrary and unjust, but hardly unexpected given the general disposition of James II's regime. Unlike many modern historians, who place some blame on Massachusetts for their refusal to compromise and repeated refusal to comply with ministry demands,³⁴⁸ Hutchinson presented the *quo warranto* as simply part of the general destruction of charter rights under Charles II and James II. While Massachusetts might have borne some responsibility for their refusal to abandon their franchise restrictions, this refusal in Hutchinson's view was not the true cause of the *quo warranto* action. Hutchinson saw the revocation as ultimately part of the general plan on the part of the Stuarts to seize greater control

misrepresentation." Of course, one of the "faction" prominently listed was Hutchinson's own grandfather Elisha Hutchinson. *Collection of Papers*, ed. Hutchinson, 2: 278, and 2: 278, footnote 161. For Elisha Hutchinson's prominence among the "faction" named by Randolph, see the lists on pages 282 and 285.

³⁴⁸ For an opposing view, see Theodore Lewis, "Royal Government in New Hampshire and the Revocation of the Charter of Massachusetts, 1679-1683," *Historical New Hampshire* 25, no. 4 (1970): 3-38; Richard R. Johnson, *Adjustment to Empire: The New England Colonies, 1675-1715* (New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 1981); and K. G. Davies, "The Revolutions in America," in *The Revolutions of 1688: The Andrew Browning Lectures, 1988*, ed. Robert Beddard (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991): 246-70. Lewis argued that English's initial goals in sending the commissioners had been mainly related to an anticipated war with the Dutch, and the commissioners only began recommending punitive measures against Massachusetts when the stubborn Puritans blocked them at every turn. Davies agrees that the colony's stubborn defiance provoked the imperial response. As Davies phrased it: "the Puritans acted as if their charter of 1629 was a divine gift and could never be revoked." Davies, "Revolutions in America," 256.

David Lovejoy sees the colony's position regarding its charter rights as an extreme one, which not surprisingly provoked an extreme response: "[b]esides its religious character, what distinguished Massachusetts from other colonies was its idea of royal and Parliamentary power. It may have come as a surprise to the Crown and the makers of colonial policy that the General Court of Massachusetts believed English laws were bound within the four seas and did not reach 'America.'" (Lovejoy, *Glorious Revolution*, 141). On the other hand, Lovejoy also agrees with Hutchinson in seeing the Massachusetts *quo warranto* proceedings as part of a larger crackdown on corporate privileges within the empire, which would have occurred with or without Massachusetts' cooperation. Within a year of the Massachusetts revocation, the Crown's lawyers had also brought *Quo warranto* proceedings against City of London and other several corporate charters. By end of Charles's reign, according to Lovejoy, while the king's power was still debated within the realm, Charles had succeeded in establishing himself as supreme ruler in America—view shared even by many English Whigs. The Lords of Trade delighted in citing Shaftesbury's view that "all plantations were of the King's making, and that he might at any time alter or dispose of them at his pleasure." CSP Coll. Papers, 1681-1685, No. 1087; quoted in Lovejoy, *Glorious Rev.*, 168.

over all areas of their empire, by invalidating earlier agreements that gave their subjects partial autonomy. The action showed the true colors of the Restoration Stuarts: “[i]n 1684, by a judgment or decree in chancery, their charter was declared forfeited, and their liberties were seized into the king’s hands; and whatever opinion some had formed, that their subjection depended upon mutual compact between the Crown and the colony, they were forced to submit to the superior power...”³⁴⁹ Hutchinson described both Charles II and James II as tyrants, and with regard to the latter, noted that Massachusetts could hardly have expected protection from such a monarch, given his crimes even within the realm: “King James was making daily advances towards despotism in England. It was not likely that he should consent to any degree of liberty in the colonies”³⁵⁰ The revocation of Massachusetts’ charter was simply part of the general trend towards the restriction of privileges by Charles II and James II that had led ultimately to the Glorious Revolution.

THE DOMINION OF NEW ENGLAND

Under the new structure of government instituted for the province in 1686, Massachusetts lost its legislative assembly, and with it, all representative government at the provincial level. The power of the town governments in their town meetings was also severely curtailed. The province was given an appointed governor and

³⁴⁹ *History* 2, ch. 1: 4. Hutchinson has a modern supporter in this interpretation: Philip Haffenden also argued that the revocation of Massachusetts’ charter was part of a larger ministry plan, which had been conceived of as early as the 1670s. Haffenden, “The Crown and the Colonial Charters, Part 1.”

³⁵⁰ *History*, 1, ch. 3: 311. In his review of the period, Hutchinson queried, rather ironically, why New Englanders should have expected their rights to be honored by a series of monarchs who violated the rights of Englishmen within the realm: “[w]hat dependence then could, rationally, be placed upon a special charter to a small part of his subjects in America?” Letter from the Massachusetts governor to Emanuel Downing, *History* 2, ch. 1: 2; footnote *.

council; religious toleration for all Protestants was mandated, and the tax-based government support of the Congregational ministry was abolished.³⁵¹

Joseph Dudley³⁵² was appointed interim governor, a role he filled for less than a year, until the arrival of the appointed governor, Sir Edmund Andros. Andros arrived with about a hundred soldiers—the first standing army to exist in Massachusetts. Andros set up his government, composed mainly of an appointed Council taken from his New York associates. He also reorganized the local militia, replacing many of the Puritan officers with Anglicans, and took the power of jury selection out of the hands of the freeholders, giving it to the sheriffs who were now appointed by the governor. Acting on his commission, Andros also moved to extend his authority over New Hampshire, Plymouth and Rhode Island as well as Maine and Massachusetts.³⁵³

In March of 1687, over the objections of most of his Council, Andros imposed a new set of taxes on the territory. When the inhabitants of Ipswich, Massachusetts, led by their minister, attempted to question the legitimacy of these taxes, their leaders

³⁵¹ Hutchinson on the changes in government under the Dominion: *History* 1, ch. 3: 299-309.

³⁵² Dudley's interim governorship ran from May to December of 1686. Hutchinson described this interim administration as "not very grievous," because the man and his associates were familiar to the colony, and his administration was more restrained than the one that followed, but mainly because the Puritans were still hoping that the situation would prove temporary, and they would be able to renegotiate the return of their charter. *History* 1, ch. 3: 297.

For more information on Dudley's administration, see the "Dudley Records," *MHS Proc.*, 2nd ser., 13 (1899): 226-86; Everett Kimball, *The Public Life of Joseph Dudley: A Study of the Colonial Policy of the Stuarts in New England, 1660-1715* (New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1911); Michael G. Hall, "Randolph, Dudley, and the Massachusetts Moderates in 1683," *NEQ* 29, no. 4 (Dec. 1956): 513-16; Theodore B. Lewis, and Linda M. Webb, "Voting for the Massachusetts Council of Assistants, 1674-1686: A Statistical Note," *WMQ* 30, no. 4 (Oct. 1973): 625-34; and Theodore B. Lewis, "Land Speculation and the Dudley Council of 1686," *WMQ* 31, no. 2 (Apr. 1974): 255-72.

³⁵³ Hutchinson's coverage of the Andros administration is *History* 1, ch. 3: 300-317.

were fined and imprisoned.³⁵⁴ The Ipswich trial ended all further attempts to dispute the Andros' right to levy taxes. Andros also announced that the revocation of the charter had voided all land titles as well, and that all titles needed to be re-confirmed by the king.

Andros also created significant ill will with his Indian policies. During the early winter months of 1688 and 1689, there had been Indian attacks on the northern frontier in Maine. The governor believed that Massachusetts' prior Indian wars had been caused by the colonials' harsh treatment of the Indians, and he attempted to renegotiate friendlier terms with them, which raised colonial suspicions. Andros, widely if erroneously seen by the colonists as Catholic, was assumed to be pro-French, and was suspected of encouraging the French-allied Indians to attack the colony.³⁵⁵ The governor also spent half of the winter of 1688-1689 building a line of forts in Maine to protect the frontier against Indian attacks, a move that was widely regarded by the New Englanders as militarily unnecessary. Andros hauled a significant portion of the Massachusetts militia into the Maine frontier in the dead of winter as manual labor to build these forts, a maneuver that raised significant colonial hackles.³⁵⁶ In May 1688, Increase Mather departed surreptitiously for London to protest Andros and the Dominion and to attempt to negotiate the return of the charter.

³⁵⁴ One anti-Andros tract, after the Dominion's overthrow, pointed to the Ipswich tax rebellion as a clear defense of the liberties of Englishmen: E. R. [Edward Rawson], "The Revolution in New England Justified (1690)," in *Andros Tracts*, ed. Whitmore, 1: 63-132. The Ipswich tax revolt is covered by Hutchinson in *History* ch. 3: 310-11.

³⁵⁵ Hutchinson dismissed the fears that Andros was actually a French agent as facetious, but recognized that the genuinely close relationship between James II and the French court at the time gave an air of reasonableness to these widespread fears. *History* 1, ch. 3: 314.

³⁵⁶ Hutchinson strenuously objected to Andros' administration of the Maine war, particularly his forced march to Maine in mid-winter: "[t]his measure was universally condemned, the men were exposed to extreme hardships, without any prospect of service." *History* 1, ch. 3: 314.

Mather remained in London, eventually joined by other Massachusetts agents, for over four years, engaged in charter negotiations.³⁵⁷

Hutchinson's coverage of the Dominion, particularly under the command of Sir Edmund Andros, proved that he did not believe, as his Revolutionary enemies would later allege, that all rulers had an automatic right to rule, and that no moral right of resistance adhered to the people at large. Hutchinson's account of the Andros regime provided clear proof that he did not subscribe to a completely royalist approach to government, where a ruler could do no wrong. As Hutchinson presented him, Andros was a textbook example of a despot.³⁵⁸ The issues that Hutchinson stressed in his account of Andros' brief regime are quite revealing. Hutchinson complained that Andros censored the press, that men were committed to prison without bail or trial, and that the government restricted travel outside the Dominion. The very small Anglican population, many of whom had arrived with Andros from New York, received the bulk of civil and military appointments.

Andros, in Hutchinson's view, failed to abide by even the limited restraints provided by his instructions. Under the Dominion's structure of government, Andros was supposed to rule with the advice and aid of an appointed Council. Most of these

³⁵⁷ For a discussion of the Mather negotiations, see C. E. Doble, ed., "Notes and Documents: Mather and Randolph," *English Historical Review* 1, no. 1 (Jan. 1886): 146-49; Kenneth B. Murdock, *Increase Mather: The Foremost American Puritan* (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1925; 1966); Richard D. Hathaway, "'Ye Scheme to Bagge Penne': A Forged Letter Smears Cotton Mather," *WMQ* 10, no. 3 (Jul. 1953): 403-21; Robert Middlekauff, *The Mathers: Three Generations of Puritan Intellectuals, 1596-1728* (New York: Oxford UP, 1971); Francis J. Bremer, "Increase Mather's Friends: the Trans-Atlantic Congregational Network of the Seventeenth Century," *AAS Proc.* 94, no. 1 (1984): 59-96; and Michael G. Hall, *The Last American Puritan: The Life of Increase Mather* (Middletown: Wesleyan UP, 1988). Practical details pertaining to Mather's mission can be found in Murdock, "Increase Mather's Expenses as Colonial Agent," *CSM Transactions* 27 (1930): 200-04.

³⁵⁸ Hutchinson described Andros as "known to be of an arbitrary disposition," and said that, while in New York, "[h]is letters discovered much of the dictator" (*History* 1, ch. 3: 300). Hutchinson called Andros' government during the Dominion "tyrannical": *History* 1, ch. 3: 321, footnote † (cross).

men had been hand-picked by Randolph, according to Hutchinson, and were expected to be loyal to the new regime.³⁵⁹ But the governor did not allow even these men to act as a check on him. Andros' councilmen complained that "the governor had always three or four of his creatures to say yes to every thing he proposed, after which no opposition was allowed."³⁶⁰ Hutchinson commented with regard to Andros' arbitrary style of government, that "Nero concealed his tyrannical disposition more years than Sir Edmund and his creatures did months."³⁶¹

Hutchinson also stressed the clear threat to freedom of conscience that Andros appeared to present to the colony: "[t]he people were menaced, that their meeting-houses should be taken from them, and that public worship in the congregational way should not be tolerated."³⁶² Hutchinson quoted a letter from Randolph to the Archbishop of Canterbury that seemed to imply that one long-term objective of the Dominion was to replace the Congregationalists with Anglicans in most Massachusetts government offices. Hutchinson quoted the bureaucrat as suggesting that more stringent oversight of the Congregational clergy was badly needed: "[m]ost

³⁵⁹ *History* 1, ch. 3: 297-98.

³⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, 301. In a footnote, Hutchinson presented Randolph's explanation for this arbitrary behavior: "His Excellency has to do with a perverse people. Here is none of the council at hand," except for Randolph and three others, "who appear lively for his Majesty's interest." Randolph to Blathwayt, May 21, 1687, *History* 1, ch. 3: 301, footnote † (cross).

Hutchinson found many of the men surrounding Andros worse than the governor himself. A colonist complaining to the council about the arbitrary nature of Andros' government was told, according to Hutchinson, "that they must not think the privileges of Englishmen would follow them to the end of the world. *History* 1, ch. 3: 302. Hutchinson added in an addition that such "imprudent irritation expressions from persons in whom the Governor placed his confidence confirmed the opinion which had been conceived of his own intention to enslave them. *History* 1, ch. 3: 302. See also his comment on the exorbitant new fees collected by Andros' bureaucrats: the "harpies themselves quarreled about their share of the prey." *History* 1, ch. 3: 304-305.

³⁶¹ *History* 1, ch. 3: 301.

³⁶² *Ibid.*, 303.

part of our chief officers, as justices of peace &c., are congregational men, not above three church of England men are officers in the militia, so that, in the main, I can only assure your Grace, that the persons only, and not the government, is changed.”³⁶³

To Hutchinson, the Dominion’s government was at the very least considering abridging both the general freedom of conscience of the settlers, and the freedom of speech of their ministry. Quoting another Randolph letter, Hutchinson noted that Randolph wanted control over the Congregational clergy, even in their pulpits. Randolph complained that the Congregational ministers “make an ill use of his Majesties indulgence and liberty of conscience. Some of them have spoken treasonable words in their pulpits...so that I am humbly of opinion that liberty of conscience will much obstruct the settlement unless duly regulated by the authority of a prudent Governor.”³⁶⁴

The threat to private property, in the form of the land title challenges, seemed to bother Hutchinson the most. In Hutchinson’s interpretation, Andros’ challenges to titles were launched wholly for reasons of personal greed; they were designed to collect a new array of fees to fill his lackeys’ pockets. Of all Andros’ crimes, Hutchinson described this as the act that ultimately drove the colony against him, because it made all property rights uncertain: “[t]he charter being vacated, the people were told that their titles to their estates were of no value.”³⁶⁵

³⁶³ Randolph to Archbishop of Canterbury, undated, in *History* 1, ch. 3: 297, footnote *.

³⁶⁴ Randolph to Lord Hugh Treasurer, Aug. 23, 1686, *History* 1, ch. 3: 298-99, footnote *.

³⁶⁵ *History* 1, ch. 3:305-06.

Earlier in his *History*, Hutchinson had computed how much he estimated the settlers had spent to settle New England during the Great Migration. He put a “modest computation” of the total expense of moving the settlers and their goods, and stocking sufficient provisions, at around 192,000 l. sterling, and commented, “[a] dear purchase, if they had paid nothing before to the council of Plimouth, and nothing afterwards to the sachems of the country. Well might they complain, when the titles to their lands were called in question by Sir Edmund Andros.”³⁶⁶

Hutchinson saw the Dominion as wholly illegitimate, the unsurprising product of a monarchy that was proving itself arbitrary and without respect for the traditional constitution and laws of England. Governor Andros was merely the creature of James, and was taking his cues from the man who had placed him in power: “Sir Edmund knew too well the disposition of his master, to give himself any concern about the complaints preferred against him.”³⁶⁷ Hutchinson stressed both the arbitrary nature of the Andros government and the fact that this lack of justice did not concern them, as they seemed to revel in their unchecked power: “Randolph writes, with an air of triumph, that they were as arbitrary as the great Turk.”³⁶⁸

³⁶⁶ *History*, 1, ch. 1: 82, footnote *. Richard Johnson argued that Andros’ land title measures were not intended as a bid to seize property, but were rather a needed effort to clear up the chaotic land title situation in New England. However, Johnson also acknowledged that it was done in so heavy-handed a fashion as to make people fear that they could lose their lands. Johnson, *Adjustment to Empire*, 79-80.

³⁶⁷ *History* 1, ch. 3: 311.

³⁶⁸ Randolph letter to ____, June 21, 1688, cited in *History* 1, ch. 2: 313, footnote *.

THE GLORIOUS REVOLUTION AND THE OVERTHROW OF EDMUND ANDROS

Massachusetts' problems were ultimately relieved by a change in government at home. Andros' "master"³⁶⁹ had been experiencing increasing problems since the beginning of his reign in 1685. By the summer of 1688, when his queen, to general surprise and concernment, delivered a baby boy, James had arrayed an impressive number of enemies against him. The prospect of an heir, and thus the continuation of James II's Catholic line, proved to be the monarch's undoing. In June of 1688, seven prominent English leaders sent an invitation to James' Protestant son-in-law, William of Orange, to take the throne. By October of that year, James was preparing for an invasion, sending out a warning of an anticipated Dutch attack to the colonies.³⁷⁰

The timing of Andros' Maine military campaign proved particularly unfortunate for him, as New England by the winter of 1688 was in turmoil over the rumors emanating from England. By early 1689, conflicting reports of William's

³⁶⁹ "Master" is Hutchinson's expression: *History* 1, ch. 3: 311.

³⁷⁰ For the events and significance of William's bloodless (in England) coup, see Maurice Ashley, *The Glorious Revolution of 1688* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1966; rev. 1968); Geoffrey S. Holmes, ed., *Britain after the Glorious Revolution, 1689-1714* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1969); J. R. Jones, *The Revolution of 1688 in England* (New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1972); J. P. Kenyon, "The Revolution of 1688: Resistance and Contract," in *Historical Perspectives: Studies in English Thought and Society, in Honour of J. H. Plumb*, ed. Neil McKendrick (London: Europa, 1974), 43-69; J. G. A. Pocock, ed., *Three British Revolutions: 1641, 1688, 1776*, (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1980); John C. Miller, "The Glorious Revolution: 'Contract' and 'Abdication' Reconsidered," *Historical Journal*, 25, no. 3 (Sept. 1982): 541-55; David L. Jones, *A Parliamentary History of the Glorious Revolution* (London: HMSO, 1988); W. A. Speck, *Reluctant Revolutionaries: Englishmen and the Revolution of 1688* (New York: Oxford UP, 1988); Lois G. Schwoerer, "Locke, Lockean Ideas, and the Glorious Revolution," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 51, no. 4 (Oct. 1990): 531-48; Jonathan I. Israel, *The Anglo-Dutch Moment: Essays on the Glorious Revolution and Its World Impact* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1991); J. R. Jones, ed., *Liberty Secure?: Britain Before and After 1688* (Stanford: Stanford UP, 1992); Lois G. Schwoerer, ed., *The Revolution of 1688-1689: Changing Perspectives* (New York: Cambridge UP, 1992); Tony Claydon, *William III and the Godly Revolution* (New York: Cambridge UP, 1996); Dale Hoak and Mordechai Feingold, eds., *The World of William and Mary: Anglo-Dutch Perspectives on the Revolution of 1688-89* (Stanford: Stanford UP, 1996); Christopher Hill, *England's Turning Point: Essays on 17th Century English History* (London: Bookmarks, 1998); and Eveline Cruickshanks, *The Glorious Revolution* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2000).

November invasion were reaching Boston.³⁷¹ Andros, sensing trouble, returned to Boston from the Maine frontier at the end of March. William's declaration of October 1688, which announced his planned invasion and ordered all unjustly deposed magistrates to resume their posts, arrived in Boston in early April 1689. It became common knowledge despite Andros' best efforts.³⁷² Boston's own uprising began two weeks later.

Shortly after dawn, the captain of an English frigate lying in harbor, the *Rose*, was arrested in Boston, thus preventing the ship from either engaging in the revolt or fleeing back to England with news. The Boston rebellion started around eight in the morning on April 18, 1689. It was over almost as soon as it began. By nine A.M., drums were summoning the Boston area militia, and Andros' supporters were being arrested in the streets. By noon, a majority of Andros's Council, together with many of the leadership of the prior 1686 administration, gathered at the Boston Town Hall before noon to demand the governor's surrender. The leaders stepping forward to resume control of the colony professed themselves surprised by events. As most of Andros' soldiers were still in Maine, the governor had less than a dozen men with him. Seriously outnumbered, he quickly surrendered.³⁷³ The governor, the Andros officials who had not joined the rebellion and the fort were in insurgent hands by

³⁷¹ Ian K. Steele, "Communicating an English Revolution to the Colonies, 1688-1689." *JBS* 24, no. 3 (Jul. 1985): 333-57.

³⁷² See Steele, "Communicating an English Revolution to the Colonies," and Johnson, *Adjustment*, 84, for discussions on when the colonists (and Andros) received word of the various events playing out in England. Johnson noted that Andros, who was relying on official word from England and his sources in New York, seemed less well informed than the general Boston populace.

³⁷³ For a description of the seizure of Andros and his associates by the Boston mob, see Bradford to Nathaniel Thomas and Thomas Hinckley, April 20, 1689, in "Hinkley Papers," *MHS Coll.*, 4th ser. 5 (1861): 190-191, and Danforth to Hinckley, Boston, Apr. 20, 1689, *ibid.*, 191-92.

sundown. The next day, the two remaining points of resistance—the man-of-war *Rose* in the harbor and the Castle Island fort—were taken.³⁷⁴

After an intensive, seventeen-page discussion of the crimes of the Andros administration, Hutchinson's coverage of the actual uprising that overthrew him was extremely brief. Hutchinson's summary of the revolt might be one of the blandest descriptions of a violent upheaval ever. Hutchinson acknowledged that the "old magistrates and heads of the people silently wished, and secretly prayed" for the success of the Glorious Revolution, but "the people were more impatient. The flame,

³⁷⁴ For works discussing the Andros overthrow, see Theodore B. Lewis, "Massachusetts and the Glorious Revolution, 1660-1692," (PhD diss., University of Wisconsin, 1967); Guy H. Miller, "Rebellion in Zion: The Overthrow of the Dominion of New England," *Historian* 30, no. 3 (1968): 439-59; Theodore B. Lewis, "A Revolutionary Tradition, 1689-1774: 'There Was a Revolution Here as Well as in England,'" *NEQ* 46, no. 3 (Sept. 1973): 424-38; Stephen S. Webb, "The Trials of Sir Edmund Andros," in *The Human Dimensions of Nation Making: Essays on Colonial and Revolutionary America*, ed. James K. Martin (Madison: University of Wisconsin, 1976), 23-53; Richard L. Johnson, "The Humble Address of the Publicans of New-England: A Reassessment," *NEQ* 51, no. 2 (Jun. 1978): 241-49; J. G. A. Pocock, ed. *Three British Revolutions: 1641, 1688, 1776* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1980); Richard L. Johnson, *Adjustment to Empire: The New England Colonies, 1675-1715* (New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 1981); J. M. Sosin, *English America and the Revolution of 1688: Royal Administration and the Structure of Provincial Government* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1982); Ian K. Steele, "Communicating an English Revolution to the Colonies, 1688-1689," *JBS* 24, no. 3 (Jul. 1985): 333-57; David S. Lovejoy, *The Glorious Revolution in America* (Middletown, CN: Wesleyan UP, 1987); Richard C. Simmons, "Historical Introduction," in *The Glorious Revolution in Massachusetts*, ed. Robert E. Moody and Richard C. Simmons (Boston: CSM, 1988), 1-42; Ian K. Steele, "Origins of Boston's Revolutionary Declaration of 18 April 1689," *NEQ* 62, no. 1 (Mar. 1989): 75-81, and "Governors or Generals?: A Note on Martial Law and the Revolution of 1689 in English America," *WMQ* 46, no. 2 (Apr. 1989): 304-14; K. G. Davies, "The Revolutions in America," in Robert Beddard, *The Revolutions of 1688: the Andrew Browning Lectures, 1988* (New York: Oxford UP, 1991), 246-70; Stephen C. Arch, "The Glorious Revolution and the Rhetoric of Puritan History," *Early American Literature* 27, no. 1 (1992): 61-74; Stephen S. Webb, *Lord Churchill's Coup: The Anglo-American Empire and the Glorious Revolution Reconsidered* (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse UP, 1998); and John E. Findling, "The Glorious Revolution in America, 1688-1689," in *Events That Changed America through the Seventeenth Century* (Westport: Greenwood Press, 2000), 139-58.

For primary documents related to the Andros overthrow, see William H. Whitmore, ed., *The Andros Tracts* (Boston: Prince Society, 1868-1874); Charles M. Andrews, ed. *Narratives of the Insurrections, 1675-1690* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1915; Cranbury, NJ: Scholar's Bookshelf, 2005); Michael G. Hall, Lawrence H. Leder, and Michael G. Kammen, eds., *The Glorious Revolution in America: Documents on the Colonial Crisis of 1689* (Chapel Hill: UNC Press, 1964); Clifford Shipton, ed., "The Massachusetts Revolution of 1689: Three Early American Political Broadides." *Journal of American Studies* 2 (1968): 1-12; and Robert E. Moody, and Richard C. Simmons, eds., *The Glorious Revolution in Massachusetts: Selected Documents, 1689-1692* (Boston: CSM, 1988). Despite the book's title, the documents in Moody, ed., *Glorious Rev. in Massachusetts* pertain mainly to the post-Andros period.

which had been long smothered in their breasts, burst forth with violence.”³⁷⁵ For what would be the only time in Hutchinson’s narrative, the people at large, without prodding by the leadership, apparently rose up as one, in a genuine, spontaneous Lockean “revolt of the people.”

Hutchinson accepted that the “Gentlemen,” the men who stepped forward at noon on April 18 to take control of events, were not behind the revolt, had no prior knowledge of it, and only assumed leadership of the rebellion (and the subsequent colonial government) in order to prevent further disorder.³⁷⁶ While Hutchinson could not entirely approve of the insurrection that overthrew Edmund Andros, calling it a “rash precipitate proceeding,” what was striking in the narrative was the lack of any serious condemnation for this particular “mob action,” and the very brief attention the revolt itself received. Hutchinson’s main complaint was that the colony might have waited only a bit longer to have certain news from England before launching their own attack.³⁷⁷ The focus of account as a whole was rather on the serious nature of Andros’ offences during the Dominion regime and the propriety of the colonial leaders’ actions after the revolt.

³⁷⁵ *History* 1, ch. 3: 317. Hutchinson’s summary of the Andros overthrow in Volume Two was more opaque still, written wholly in the imperfect tense (unusual for Hutchinson). The event hardly seemed an upheaval at all: “[u]pon the first advice of the landing of the Prince of Orange, they resumed their charter...but the King could not be prevailed upon to consent to it. A new charter was obtained...” *History* 2, ch. 1: 4.

³⁷⁶ For this initial statement justifying the Andros overthrow, see Winthrop, *et al.*, “The DECLARATION of the Gentlemen, Merchants and Inhabitants of BOSTON and the County Adjacent, April 18, 1689...” (Boston: Samuel Green, datd April 18, 1689), reprinted in *Andros Tracts*, 1, 11-20.

³⁷⁷ *History* 1, ch. 3: 323.

AFTER 1689

During the relatively brief but turbulent period after the Andros overthrow, intense debates over Massachusetts' constitutional status took place in both England and Massachusetts. For months, Mather and other agents urged that Massachusetts' charter be added to corporate charters in the realm, which were being restored by William's Parliament. But negotiations ultimately proved unsuccessful. William was unwilling to return the 1629 charter to Massachusetts, but ultimately proved willing to grant a new one.³⁷⁸ Increase Mather was allowed to nominate the first Royal Governor and members of his council; he chose a political ally of his in London, Sir William Phips, as first governor. In May 14, 1692, Increase Mather and Phips arrived in Boston to begin the new administration under a new form of government, the Charter of 1691.³⁷⁹

In terms of the overall Enlightenment discourse that Hutchinson maintained throughout the *History*, the lessons of the charter struggle were complicated ones. Hutchinson demonstrated, in his account of the Dominion and Sir Edmund Andros,

³⁷⁸ Mather Papers, "Petitions related to the Charter," in Mather Papers, *MHS Coll.*, 4th ser., 8 (1868): 695-714.

³⁷⁹ As a frame of government, Hutchinson considered the 1691 charter superior to the 1629 one. In his summary of the charter struggles in Volume Two, Hutchinson argued that the 1691 charter actually presented a more workable frame of government, with a better balance of power between the executive and legislative branches. In Hutchinson's view, the earlier system, being created piecemeal, necessarily resulted in an unbalanced and more fragile system: "[t]he Governor, under the old charter, altho' he carried great porte (so does the Doge of Venice) yet his share in the administration was little more than that of any one of the assistants." The new charter provided for annual meetings of the General Court, but the governor could dissolve them at any time. Legislative matters were left strictly to the legislative branch, and the governor was to have no voice in legislative deliberations. This division preserved the independence of both branches. According to Hutchinson, under the new system the governor rightly "has no vote in the legislature, and does not, or regularly should not, interest himself in matters in debate, in council, or in the house; but no act of government is valid without his consent." *History* 2, ch. 1: 6-8. Hutchinson detailed the differences between the old and new charters in *ibid.*, 4-9. For more information on the new charter, see Richard C. Simmons, "The Massachusetts Charter of 1691," in *Contrast and Connection: Bicentennial Essays in Anglo-American History*, ed. H. C. Allen and Roger Thompson (London: G. Bell, 1976), 66-87.

the sorts of violations against civil liberties that would justify an overthrow of an established regime. Edmund Andros moved through Hutchinson's narrative as a prime exemplar of all the characteristics that made a man, and a government, illegitimate and despotic. His crimes were not merely violations of property rights, but also significant violations against religious and personal liberty, and threats against the colony's physical well-being. Andros' regime was, however, only a smaller echo of the problems being faced back in England in the home government. The rule of the earlier Stuarts was an irrational, unbalanced regime, the product of a less enlightened and refined age. The problems the colony experienced as a result in this period were reflected in the difficulties experienced by the English cities and corporations in the same period.

At first blush, the story of the Massachusetts charters was an alarming one—the English government was, in Hutchinson's view, acting in an arbitrary manner, and the ultimate reason for the colony's submission was simple necessity. The revocation of the 1629 charter was an unjust act, but the colony had no choice but to accept it. However, Massachusetts ultimately prevailed and the government established after 1691 proved to Hutchinson to be eminently superior to the earlier framework of government. It was a stronger framework both because the government set up by it was founded on a more constitutional basis, with a better balance of government, and because the imperial power that stood behind it was also immeasurably improved.

One point Hutchinson stressed throughout his narrative of the charter struggles, and reiterated even more forcefully in his summary of the episode at the beginning of Volume Two, was that a legal document such as a charter was only

valuable if the government that stood behind it was credible. Throughout the seventeenth century, the colony's leadership put its faith in its charter, operating on the assumption that it was legally irrevocable. Despite some mistakes on the part of their leaders, Massachusetts lost its original charter not because of defects in the construction of that charter, or misbehavior by their leadership, but mainly due to the despotic natures of Charles II and James II as rulers. These two kings, in Hutchinson's account, were the enemies of protected "privilege" throughout their domains; Massachusetts was merely one more victim of their drive for greater power.

Ultimately, the main thrust of Hutchinson's account of the charter struggles was to demonstrate the superiority of government in Hutchinson's own day, over the turbulent and unsettled days of the earlier Stuart kings. Thomas Hutchinson pointedly contrasted the behavior of the early Stuarts with the much more satisfactory rule of the Hanoverians, noting that James II refused to consider even the humblest request of his colony: "However modest these desires may appear to us, at this day, who are in the possession of such ample privileges, yet they could not prevail in the reign of King James. The solicitations in England had not the least influence upon measures in New-England."³⁸⁰

The obvious question for anyone reading Hutchinson's description of the Andros administration today would likely be: why would the lieutenant governor take such a position with regard to the events of 1689 but not, a few years later, to the events of 1765. A key difference lay in the respect Hutchinson had for the constitutional arrangement that Britain and in Massachusetts had reached by his own

³⁸⁰ *History* 1, ch. 3: 313.

time, an arrangement rooted in the settlement begun with the Charter of 1691. After 1689, while the imperial system was hardly perfect, it had provided a much greater degree of security for the rights of its citizens, both within and without the realm.

Hutchinson believed that the entire force of colonial history since that time had borne this assertion out:

“[s]eventy years practice, under a new charter, in many respects to be preferred to the old, has taken away, not only all expectation, but all desire of ever returning to the old charter. We do not envy the neighbouring governments which retained...their ancient charters. Many of the most sensible men in those governments, would be glad to be under the same constitution that the Massachusetts province happily enjoys.”³⁸¹

³⁸¹ Ibid., 351.

CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSION

Thomas Hutchinson was one of most important Americans of the eighteenth century, but his values and political philosophy have been consistently misunderstood. His views remained largely consistent throughout his career, and were less reactionary and more thoughtful than have been generally recognized. This consistency was clearly demonstrated in his *History of Massachusetts-Bay*. Throughout the writing of this work, even in the first volume written before the imperial crisis, Hutchinson promoted a consistent ideology and political value system consistent with the moderate American Enlightenment. As was typical of American enlightened thinkers of his time, Hutchinson used the stories of the past primarily as a means to understand the present, and to convey to his readers both his understanding of Massachusetts' history, and the moral lessons that this history illustrated.

Hutchinson's work showed, more than anything, the dangers of what he called "enthusiasm." Enthusiasm could take many forms—religious zealotry, fear of the unknown, racial prejudice, and war lust being only some of the examples that appeared in the history. Enthusiasm was dangerous ultimately because it was illogical, and was based on an appeal to the emotions, rather than to reason. It was often based in ignorance and even anti-intellectual. Enthusiasm was capable of great harm because, although the passions it provoked usually faded with time, while it held a populace in thrall it was capable of overriding all the restraints of society and government. It was specifically because of the dangers of enthusiasm that just and rational government was so necessary.

The *History*, particularly Volume One, provides a unique window into Hutchinson's ideology on the eve of the Revolutionary crisis. Hutchinson maintained the philosophical views he had laid out in Volume One of his *History* throughout the remainder of his career. His opinions on the best form of proper government, the important principles for virtuous leaders and citizens, and the twin dangers of irrationality and enthusiasm continued to be shaped by both his understanding of history and by the values he ascribed to as a man of the Moderate Enlightenment.

Volume One of Hutchinson's *History*, which came out in late 1764, was greeted with near-universal approval; the only significant criticism being that the work was somewhat dry in tone.³⁸² Its political agenda was largely unnoticed at this time. However, over the next few years, the lieutenant governor's politics became a great deal more controversial, and this notoriety eventually affected his *History*'s reception as well. Reviewers began to view the *History* as promoting typically Tory views, supporting the expansion of power at the expense of liberty.³⁸³

However, the Patriots misunderstood Hutchinson. Rather than a reactionary work celebrating a Hobbsian understanding of government,³⁸⁴ the *History* was well

³⁸² Ezra Stiles to Thomas Hutchinson, undated, *NEHGR* 26 (1872): 162-63.

³⁸³ *Mass. Gazette and Boston News-Letter*, June 26-July 22, 1773. By 1771, Hutchinson was, in the eyes of the Patriot newspapers, "a traitorous usurper, a most ungrateful, subtle, cruel, and ambitious tyrant" and all of his views were thus suspect, and assumed to be surreptitiously promoting craven submission to despotism. "Leonidas," [Thomas Young] *Massachusetts Spy*, May 2, 1771. The author's identification is by Arthur Schlesinger, *Prelude to Independence: The Newspaper War on Britain, 1764-1776* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1958), 138.

³⁸⁴ Isaac Zorrea, in his analysis of Hutchinson's presentation of Massachusetts charter struggles in the *History*, as well as the governor's 1773 debate with the Massachusetts General Court over constitutional matters, depicted Hutchinson as a defender of absolutist rule. Zorea argued that Hutchinson operated a Hobbsian understanding of government, "a government with no checks and balances." Zorea believed that the Massachusetts Patriots, as represented by the House and Council, were following more enlightened principles, arguing based on Montesquieu's philosophical

within the scope of general Enlightenment thought. The values his work promoted included the importance of religious toleration and general freedom of speech, the dangers of enthusiasm and credulity, and the injustice of governmental interference into private religious beliefs. The history of seventeenth century Massachusetts clearly illustrated the vulnerable position of minorities in any society, be they racial or religious, and the necessity of a fair and impartial rule of law to secure their liberties. It also demonstrated the damage that “enthusiasms,” whether motivated by religion, racial prejudice, or political factionalism, can do to a state in periods when passions run amuck. Finally, it showed that fair, balanced government and an independent leadership willing to stand against popular prejudices were necessary in order to secure the rights of the citizens at large.

Hutchinson explicitly connected the worst abuses of his colony’s past to popular hysteria and emotional prejudices. Hutchinson pleaded that a rational government needed to be protected from both the caprices of its rulers and the emotional passions of its people. In one of his comments on the religious persecutions of the seventeenth century, Hutchinson acknowledged the existence of what a modern writer might term the “mob mentality”: “in all ages and countries, by bodies or communities of men such deeds have been done, as most of the individuals of which such communities consisted, acting separately, would have been ashamed of.”³⁸⁵ This was one of the largest dangers of allowing society to be driven by the fears and

framework. Isaac D. Zorea, “The Colonial Charter of Massachusetts: Flint for Revolution” (MA Thesis, San Jose State University, 1997), 153.

³⁸⁵ *History* 1, ch. 1: 133.

prejudices of the people at large, especially when they were in a heightened emotional state.

As Massachusetts entered a new period of turmoil after 1765, Hutchinson saw many of the same concerns resurfacing again. While the lieutenant governor also objected to the Parliament's new approach to colonial taxation on both practical and constitutional grounds,³⁸⁶ the popular response to Britain's incursions worried him more. In the growing emotionalism of the Revolutionary crisis, Massachusetts' populace seemed to Hutchinson to be regressing from the rationality and order that he prized in his own time.

Boston's inflammatory responses to the Stamp Act and Townshend Duties, and the Patriots' inflamed rhetoric of conspiracies and enslavement seemed based not on reason but emotion. To Hutchinson, the Patriots' arguments seemed exaggerated and unnecessarily strident, and their constitutional positions seemed based on a false understanding of colonial and English history. The Patriots were behaving, to his mind, like the enthusiasts of past history. Hutchinson explicitly connected the emotionalism of the Revolutionary crisis to these periods of "enthusiasm" in the past: "[y]ou certainly think right when you think Boston people are run mad. The frenzy was not higher when they banished my pious great-grandmother, when they hanged

³⁸⁶ For Hutchinson's resistance to any changes in the Massachusetts constitution see "Thomas Hutchinson and the Stamp Act," ed. Edmund S. Morgan, *NEQ* 21, no. 4 (Dec. 1948): 459-92; "Dialogue between an American and a European Englishman (1768)," ed. Bernard Bailyn, *Perspectives in American History* 9 (1975): 343-411; Hutchinson to William Bollan, April 19, 1768, Mass. Archives, vol. 26, 627. This continued to be Hutchinson's position even after his departure for England: Hutchinson to Thomas Flucker, July 7, 1774, *Diary and Letters*, 1:178; Interview with George III, July 1, 1774, *ibid.*, 1: 157-75; Hutchinson to General Gage July 4, 1774, *ibid.*, 175-78.

the Quakers, when they afterwards hanged the poor innocent witches, when they were carried away with a Land Bank.³⁸⁷

Hutchison also saw danger in the Patriots' arguments in that many of them were presented in tones of absolute moral certitude not unlike the dogmatic certainty guiding the religious zealots of a previous century. For people operating under such a mindset, a sense of righteousness was all that was necessary to justify any action, and immune to reasoning.³⁸⁸

Hutchinson described the Revolutionary fervor in terms that evoked the spread of an infectious disease, or an emotional panic. The people were "in a frenzy," and "a distemper."³⁸⁹ While the lieutenant governor believed that this disturbance would prove temporary, as these sorts of agitations had always proven fleeting aberrations in the past,³⁹⁰ he also knew they could do remarkable harm while they lasted. Hutchinson was concerned about the potential for both violence and the destruction of general respect for government in the interim.

One fundamental difference between Hutchinson's beliefs and those of the Patriots was that Hutchinson did not accept the common Patriot argument, that people never rioted or revolted unless they had compelling reason to, and hence were always

³⁸⁷ Hutchison to William Parker, 26 Aug. 1770, quoted in Hosmer, *Life of Hutchinson*, 195.

³⁸⁸ Regarding Samuel Adams, Hutchinson noted that a "clergyman" who had heard him speak at the Harvard Commencement, "and who heard him declare, that every man had good right to put an end to the life of a tyrant, expressed the horror he felt, upon considering that meerly a difference in opinion upon the principles of government had caused many of the best men in the Province to be denominated tyrants" and possibly even marked down for assassination. "Additions to Thomas Hutchinson's 'History of Massachusetts Bay,'" ed. Catherine B. Mayo (Worcester: AAS, 1949), 26.

³⁸⁹ Hutchinson to Thomas Whatley, Oct. 4 1768, "Copies of Letters," (Appendix C), in Hosmer, *Life of Hutchinson*, 433.

³⁹⁰ "It is not possible this anarchy should last always": Hutchinson to Thomas Whatley, June 18, 1768, "Copies of Letters," (Appendix C), in Hosmer, *Life of Hutchinson*, 430.

justified in so doing.³⁹¹ The *History* had demonstrated numerous instances when “crowd action” had been unjustified. In Massachusetts’ past, enraged crowds had attacked innocent Indian tribes in times of war, spurred witch crazes, and rioted during the introduction of a needed medical reform, smallpox inoculation, in the 1720s. Moreover, throughout history, the people at large had shown themselves to be vulnerable to manipulation from “designing men.” As Hutchinson described the events, the manipulations of Henry Vane largely helped create the Antinomian Crisis, while polemical writer William Douglass exaggerated fears in the inoculation hysteria for his own personal gain as an author and politician.³⁹² In the *History*, there were many examples of crowd action that traced back to unscrupulous leaders who were engineering panic for their own selfish purposes.

In an earlier, manuscript account of the Revolutionary crisis, Hutchinson had addressed this issue directly:

“Revolutions in states have often proceeded from the ambitious aspiring views of a few persons, than from oppression, or any just cause of complaint from the people in general. No form of government is so perfect, and no administration so upright as to deprive such persons of plausible pretences to effect discontent in the minds of the people.”³⁹³

³⁹¹ As for example, John Adams, in Novanglus Letter 1 of Jan. 23, 1775: “The most sensible and jealous people are so little attentive to government, that there are no instances of resistance, until repeated, multiplied oppression have placed it beyond a doubt, that their rulers had formed settled plans to deprive them of their liberties; not to oppress an individual or a few, but to break down the fences of a free constitution, and deprive the people at large of all share in the government and all the checks by which it is limited.” John Adams and Daniel Leonard, *The American Colonial Crisis: The Daniel Leonard-John Adams Letters to the Press 1774-1775*, ed. Bernard Mason (New York: Harper & Row, 1972), 104.

³⁹² History 1, ch. 1: 57-58; *History* 2, ch. 3: 207. Hutchinson argued that Douglass, a contemporary historian for whom he had little respect, used the fears engendered by the inoculation crisis to elevating his own political clout in the province, by spreading and “improving” all of the most extreme inoculation rumors in his pamphlets.

³⁹³ “Additions to Thomas Hutchinson’s ‘History of Massachusetts Bay,’” ed. Catherine B. Mayo (Worcester: AAS, 1949), 41.

Hutchinson's study of seventeenth century history, particularly the period of the charter struggles, also showed him that many of Massachusetts' problems in that period were due ultimately to lack of restraint in government at the imperial level, and to a lesser extent, violations of civil liberties and problems in government at the colonial level. Hutchinson felt the present imperial structure of the British government was on the whole a fair and constitutional arrangement, which contrasted strikingly when observed in contrast to the arbitrary rule of the Stuarts. While this section of the *History* spoke more directly to the lessons of history than to general Enlightenment values, it did convey messages concerning virtuous leadership and, at least implicitly, the moral justification for rebellion against an arbitrary ruler.

As his coverage of the Andros regime indicated, Hutchinson was not committed to the maintenance of government simply because he liked power. The *History* demonstrated that Hutchinson did not believe all governments were legitimate and automatically worthy of support. In his account of the Restoration period, Hutchinson called both Charles I and James II tyrants, and approved of not only the Glorious Revolution in England, but the overthrow of Andros' government in 1689. This popular upheaval, which occurred before the people of Massachusetts knew for certain what was happening in England, was justified, in Hutchinson's view, both because Andros was ruling without restraint, and because the upheaval that displaced him was a genuine act of the entire populace, encompassing not merely "the mob" but all ranks of society.

Hutchinson did not see the constitutional framework of the imperial government under which he lived as perfect, and he did not see the king and

Parliament as incapable of error or injustice. However, he did accept, based on his experiences as a statesman and his study of the past, that his government, both at the provincial and the imperial level, was a framework of government worth defending.³⁹⁴ The Anglo-American system, as it existed in the 1760s, was the product of a century of and a half of development, and was as much a product of colonial culture as imperial design. Particularly with regard to his own province, Hutchinson saw the overall framework of government as admirable, and capable of dealing, as it had in the past, with problems through its existing structure.

³⁹⁴ A good example of Hutchinson's reasoned weighing of the pros and cons of the current imperial system appears at the end of Volume Two of the *History*, which was written around 1767. Discussing the navigational restrictions that the imperial government seemed belatedly intent on enforcing, Hutchinson admitted both that hurt mainland America, and that they were not well thought-out even from an imperial standpoint. Anticipating some of Adam Smith's arguments in *The Wealth of Nations*, Hutchinson argued that general free trade would benefit England as much as America economically, by increasing the overall wealth, and would also be advantageous militarily, as it would encourage the mainland colonies to grow. He asserted that the mercantile restrictions' only true purpose seemed to be to enrich the politically better-connected West Indies merchants. However, Hutchinson argued that economically, as much as militarily, mainland America gained more by remaining in the empire than they lost by obedience to these restrictions. *History* 2, ch. 4: 338-43. This passage, which doesn't seem to have obtained notice in America, was quoted approvingly, in full, by *The London Magazine or Gentleman's Monthly Intelligencer* 37 (1768): 188-92.

NOTE ON SOURCES

HUTCHINSON'S SOURCES

One methodological problem in studying the *History* is the difficulty of determining what records and historical narratives Hutchinson used in its composition. Hutchinson's work was part of an ongoing dialogue about the meaning and interpretation of New England's past, a debate that had begun in the early seventeenth century and was still very much in contention during Hutchinson's time. Determining what sources Hutchinson read tells us more than simply what his sources for factual information were. It also places Hutchinson within this historiographic debate, by clarifying which earlier authors Hutchinson was answering, at least implicitly.

No detailed record of Hutchinson's library exists, due to the destruction of his North End mansion during the Stamp Act riots, and the later dispersal of his papers caused by his removal to England and the seizure of his estate. According to Ezra Stiles, who saw Hutchinson's collection shortly before the August 1765 attack, Hutchinson had assembled possibly the best historical library in the colonies, and had acquired the private papers of several of the leading New England families (Stiles' letter to Hutchinson is printed in *NEHGR* 26 (1872): 162-63, and Hutchinson's reply in *NEHGR* 26, 163-64). For thirty years prior to the Revolution, Hutchinson had been collecting historical records relating to Massachusetts. He had used his positions as Judge of the Common Pleas and Justice of the Superior Court, as well as his travel throughout the colony on provincial business, and to neighboring colonies during border arbitrations. As the main heir to the estates of his father, Colonel Thomas Hutchinson, his maternal grandfather, John Foster, and his Uncle Elisha Hutchinson,

Hutchinson inherited the correspondence of several of the province's leading families.

The destruction of Hutchinson's papers and library in 1765 prevents us from saying, with complete assurance, what records and histories Hutchinson had or did not have. Hutchinson provided the British government with a detailed list of his losses in the Stamp Act riots in his petition for reimbursement, but he did not list his library by individual volume, and the only identifiable history mentioned specifically on the list was Voltaire's *Universal History*: Thomas Hutchinson, "Furniture Destroyed or Carried from my House and Lost the Night of the 26th of August, 1765," Massachusetts Archives, Colonial Series, Vol. 7, pp. 301-320; reprinted Hosmer, *Life of Thomas Hutchinson*, "Appendix A," p. 351-62.

We can gain a partial sense of some of Hutchinson's sources from Hutchinson's collections of primary documents. Three of these collections exist, two published by Hutchinson, and one that came to light after his death. Hutchinson began his career as a historian due partly to his concern with preserving Massachusetts' rich drove of historical documents. In 1764, when Volume One of the *History* appeared, it included a large appendix providing many of the primary works cited by the text. Hutchinson's original plan was apparently to provide such an appendix for each of his volumes, but this plan was altered by the 1765 destruction of his library. In 1769, Hutchinson published the most important of his surviving documents as *A Collection of Original Papers Relative to the History of the Colony of Massachusetts Bay* (Boston: Thomas Hutchinson & John Fleet, 1769). A new edition was published as *The Hutchinson Papers*, ed. William H. Whitmore and William S.

Appleton (Albany: Prince Society, 1865; New York: B. Franklin, 1967).

A third Hutchinson collection of primary documents turned up unexpectedly during a survey of papers collected for the new Massachusetts Archives in the early nineteenth century. Alden Bradford donated this collection to the Massachusetts Historical Society in 1820. Bradford suggested that this mysterious cache of papers, which he entitled the “Hutchinson Papers,” might have been seized by Patriot forces from Hutchinson’s Boston home during the Stamp Act riots, or later from his country estate in Milton, which was seized in 1776. Whitmore and Appleton’s edition of *The Hutchinson Papers* contains an index listing the additional surviving unpublished works. Beyond these three collections, and the works cited by Hutchinson in his *History*, there is no way to say for certain which works Hutchinson read or did not read, beyond the works actually cited in the text.

SOURCES FOR HUTCHINSON

Hutchinson’s two most significant published works are the history, and a collection of his personal papers edited by his grandson, entitled *The Diary and Letters of His Excellency Thomas Hutchinson...* ed. Peter O. Hutchinson (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin, 1884-1886; New York: AMS Press, 1973). Peter Hutchinson compiled the *Diary and Letters* from the correspondence retained by Hutchinson at the time of his death and passed on to his family in England. The *Diary* was primarily based on the journals kept by Hutchinson from 1774 until shortly before his death in 1780.

The only modern edition of the history was published in 1936, as *The History of the Colony and Province of Massachusetts Bay*, ed. Lawrence S. Mayo

(Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1936). In editing the modern version of the *History*, Mayo worked from Hutchinson's own copies of Volumes One and Two, and a surviving manuscript of Volume Three. Mayo included all of Hutchinson's handwritten corrections and marginalia, as the governor had left extensive handwritten corrections and additions in the margins of his own copies of the work.

No manuscript version of Volume One of the *History* or complete version of Volume Three has survived. Hutchinson's manuscript of Volume Two (the document stomped on in the Stamp Act riots) is currently in the Massachusetts Archives, Volume 28, with a Photostat at the MHS. A manuscript version of Volume Three, Chapter Three (the period of the Revolutionary Crisis) that differs in substantial ways from the published account surfaced after Mayo's edition of the history went to press. This was subsequently published as "Additions to Thomas Hutchinson's *History of Massachusetts Bay*," ed. Catherine B. Mayo (Worcester: AAS, 1949). The manuscript version of this work is currently in the collection of Chapin Library, in Williamstown, Massachusetts. Earlier drafts of Hutchinson's treatment of the Antinomian Controversy, the Salem witch trials, and the Boston Tea Party have also been published separately, as "Anne Hutchinson of Massachusetts" (Boston: Directors of the Old South Work, 1907); "The Witchcraft Delusion of 1692: from an unpublished manuscript," ed. William F. Poole (Boston: privately printed, 1870); and "The Destruction of the Sea" ed. Peter O. Hutchinson (Boston: Directors of Old South Work, 1896).

In addition to the *History* and the *Diary and Letters*, Hutchinson also left several shorter political works, some published and others in manuscript, that provide

insight into his thinking. These include “A letter to a member of the Honourable House of Representatives on the present state of the bills of credit” (Boston, 1736), his earliest known political work; “Journal of the Proceedings of the Commissioners Appointed to Treat with the Eastern Indians” (Boston: J. Draper, 1749), reprinted, in part, in *Collections of the Maine Historical Society* 4 (1856): 145-67; “The Case of the Provinces of Massachusetts-Bay and New-York, respecting the boundary lines between the two provinces...” (Boston: Green & Russell, 1764); a 1765 essay on the Stamp Act published for the first time in 1948 as “Thomas Hutchinson and the Stamp Act,” ed. Edmund S. Morgan, *NEQ* 21, no. 4 (Dec. 1948): 459-92; “Dialogue between an American and a European Englishman (1768),” ed. Bernard Bailyn, *Perspectives in American History* 9 (1975): 343-411; “Vindication and Account and Defense of his Actions in Massachusetts (ca. 1775),” unpublished, MHS Manuscripts, Ms. N-1460; “Strictures upon the Declaration of the Congress at Philadelphia; in a Letter to a Noble Lord, &C,” *Remembrancer* 4 (London, 1776): 25-42, new edition ed. Malcolm Freiberg (London: Old South Leaflets, 1958); and a ninety-nine page family memoir, “The Hutchinsons in America” (unpublished, Egerton MSS 2664, microfilm at MHS).

As a prominent public official, Hutchinson also left a significant mark in the official records for Massachusetts and Great Britain. For Hutchinson’s official writings and speeches, and legislation in which he was involved, see *Massachusetts Colony Records: Records of the Governor and Company of the Massachusetts Bay in New England*, ed. Nathaniel B. Shurtleff (Boston, 1853-1854; New York, AMS Press, 1968); *Reports of Cases Argued and Adjudged in the Superior Court of Judicature of*

the Province of Mass. Bay between 1761 and 1772, ed. Josiah Quincy, Jr. (Boston, 1865); *Acts and Resolves, Public and Private, of the Province of the Massachusetts Bay*, ed. A. C. Goodell & M. M. Bigelow (Boston: Wright & Potter, 1869-1922); *Boston Town Records, 1631-1822* (Boston: Rockwell & Churchill, 1881-1906); *Journals of the House of Representatives of Massachusetts (1715/1717-1780)*, ed. Malcolm Freiberg, *et al.*, (Boston: MHS, 1919-1991); and *Royal Instructions to British Colonial Governors, 1670-1776*, ed. L. W. Labaree (New York: D. Appleton-Century, 1935). For Hutchinson's public speeches, see *Speeches of the Governors of Massachusetts, from 1765 to 1775; and the Answers of the House of Representatives to the Same; with Their Resolutions and Addresses for That Period*, ed. Alden Bradford (Boston: Russell & Gardner, 1818). John P. Reid has edited and republished Hutchinson's series of 1773 debates with the Massachusetts Council and House, which give the clearest expression of Hutchinson's constitutional views, as *Briefs of the Revolution: Constitutional Arguments Between Thomas Hutchinson, Governor of Massachusetts Bay, and James Bowdoin for the Council and John Adams for the House of Representatives*, ed. John P. Reid (New York: New York UP, 1981).

Hutchinson also left behind a voluminous mound of correspondence. The bulk of these materials concerned his life after the 1760s. There are two main collections of Hutchinson correspondence. A large collection of his papers dated 1741-1774 were seized by the Patriots in 1775. This collection is now in the Massachusetts Archives, Volumes 25-27. A microfilm copy, with a transcription provided by Malcolm Freiberg, is available at the MHS.

A second collection of correspondence came to rest in the British Museum's Egerton Collection, MSS 2659-2674. These were the papers Hutchinson carried with him to England, or composed subsequent to his exile. This collection was used by Peter O. Hutchinson in his compilation of the *Diary and Letters*. After publication of the diary, Peter Hutchinson indexed the remaining correspondence into fourteen volumes, and then sold them to the British Museum. Photostats of this collection are available at the MHS.

A series of letters written in 1768 between Hutchinson and other Boston officials to British bureaucrat Thomas Whatley was published in Boston to great fanfare in the last year of Hutchinson's governorship, with the title "Copies of letters sent to Great Britain, by his Excellency Thomas Hutchinson, the Hon. Andrew Oliver, and several persons...born and educated amongst us..." (Boston: Edes & Gill, 1773). This correspondence was acquired by the Patriots through somewhat murky circumstances, although it did become clear in the ensuing controversy that Benjamin Franklin, the colonial agent for Massachusetts, was somehow involved: *Papers of Benjamin Franklin*, ed. William B. Willcox, *et al*, (New Haven: Yale UP, 1976): 20: Appendix, 539-80. The Patriots edited and rearranged this correspondence for maximum political impact.

Hutchinson also left substantial correspondence in the collections of Francis Bernard, Lord Hardwicke, and others leading government officials, in particular his friend Israel Williams. The manuscript collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society, the Boston Public Library, and the Houghton Library at Harvard have been most useful for tracking down this correspondence.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

MANUSCRIPT RECORDS

- Bernard, Francis. Papers of Sir Francis Bernard in Sparks Manuscripts. Houghton Library, Harvard; MHS microfilm.
- Bollan, William, and Jasper Mauduit. Papers of Jasper Mauduit...and of his Predecessor William Bollan, 1760-1767. MHS Manuscripts.
- Boston Public Library, Miscellaneous American Manuscripts. Ms. Am. 1502, vol. 7. BPL Manuscripts.
- Boston Town House Papers, BPL Manuscripts.
- Boston, Committee of Correspondence. Letters and Proceedings Received, 1772-1774. New York Public Library, George Bancroft Collection, microfilm at MHS.
- Colonial New England Personal Legal Papers, 1724-1797. BPL Manuscripts.
- Commissioners of Customs Letters, 1764-1774. British Public Records Office; microfilm at MHS.
- Dorr, Harbottle, ed. Collection of Annotated Massachusetts Newspapers, 1765-1767. MHS Manuscripts.
- Elwyn, Alfred Langdon, comp. Collection of Papers Relating to Massachusetts History, 1749-1777. MHS Manuscripts.
- Gay, Frederick L. Transcripts of Documents Relating to the Colonial History of New England, Copied from British and Canadian Archival Collections. MHS Manuscripts.
- Greenleaf Family Papers, ca. 1685-1883. Miscellaneous Papers of the Greenleaf, Dawes, Price, Woodward, and Wroe Families, 1777-1883. MHS Manuscripts.
- Greenough, John, Papers, 1766-1820. MHS Manuscripts.
- Hutchinson, Elisha. Letterbook, 1774-1777. MHS Manuscripts.
- Hutchinson, Peter Orlando. Papers. 1885-1886. MHS Manuscripts.
- Hutchinson, Thomas. Account and Defense of his Actions in Massachusetts, ca. 1775. MHS Manuscripts, Ms. N-1460.

_____. Correspondence in Massachusetts Archives, 1741-1773. Mass. Archives, vols. 25-27. Transcripts compiled by Malcolm Freiberg, at the MHS.

_____. Correspondence, 1773-1774. A Small Collection of Papers Related to Thomas Hutchinson. MHS Manuscripts.

_____. Draft of Preface [1769?]. MHS, Miscellaneous Bound Manuscripts, 1769.

_____. Hutchinson Correspondence, 1774-1780, in British Museum Egerton Collection, MSS 2659-74. Ed. Peter O. Hutchinson. Originals at British Library, microfilm at MHS.

Hutchinson, Thomas, and Thomas Gage. Correspondence of Thomas Hutchinson and Thomas Gage, in William L. Clements Library, Gage Papers, 1766-1791. Microfilm at MHS.

Hutchinson, Thomas, and Lord Hardwicke. Letters and Papers Relating to the War in America, 1771-1781. Originals in British Museum manuscripts, Add. Ms. 2135, no. 205-06, Add. Ms. 35427, f. 173, 1771-1781. F. L. Gay Transcriptions, MHS.

Hutchinson, Thomas, Thomas Pownall, and the Earl of Hillsborough. Letters to John Pownall and the Earl of Hillsborough, Jan. 22, 1771 to Mar. 3, 1772...from papers in the Public Record Office in London, copies at MHS.

Hutchinson Family Papers, 1673-1769. MHS Manuscripts.

Hutchinson-Oliver Papers, 1638-1858. MHS Manuscripts.

Hutchinson-Watson Papers, 1766-1896. MHS Manuscripts.

Hutchinson-Watson-Oliver Letters, 1769-1892. MHS Manuscripts.

Mascarene Family Papers, 1687-1839. MHS Manuscripts.

MHS Miscellaneous Bound Collection.

MHS Photostat Collection.

Oliver, Andrew. Letterbook, 1768-1774. British Museum, Egerton Mss. 2670, microfilm at MHS.

Oliver, Peter. Peter Oliver Diary, 1761-1821. British Library, microfilm at MHS.

Oliver Family Papers, 1419-1957. MHS Manuscripts.

Pickering Family Papers, 1767-1844. MHS Manuscripts.

Prince, Thomas. Papers of Thomas Prince, 1661-1743. MHS Manuscripts.

Savage, James. Papers of Lawyer, Genealogist, and Antiquarian James Savage, 1751-1835. MHS Manuscripts.

Thwing Card Catalog Index, MHS Manuscripts.

Williams, Israel. Papers of Israel Williams of Hatfield, MA, 1728-1785. MHS Manuscripts.

PUBLISHED PRIMARY SOURCES, 17TH CENTURY

Bradford, William. *Of Plymouth Plantation, 1620-1647* [1630-1646]. Edited by Samuel E. Morison. New York: A. A. Knopf, 2001.

Church, Benjamin, and Thomas Church. *The Entertaining History of King Philip's War, which began in the Month of June, 1675*. Boston, 1716. Edited by Alan Simpson and Mary Simpson. Chester, CN: Pequot Press, 1975.

Cotton, John. *John Cotton on the Churches of New England*. Edited by Larzer Ziff. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1968.

_____. *The Correspondence of John Cotton*. Edited by Sargent Bush, Jr. Chapel Hill: UNC Press, 2001.

Gookin, Daniel. "An Historical Account of the Doings and Sufferings of the Christian Indians in New England, in the Years 1675, 1676, 1677." London, 1836; New York: Arno Press, 1972.

Hubbard, William. *A General History of New England, from the Discovery to MDCLXXX* [1680]. Boston: C. C. Little & J. Brown, 1848; New York: Arno Press, 1972.

_____. *A Narrative of the Troubles with the Indians in New-England...to This Present Year 1677*. London, 1677. Edited by Samuel G. Drake, 1865. Bowie: Heritage Books, 1990.

Johnson, Edward. *The Wonder-Working Providence of Sion's Saviour in New England, 1628-1651*. London, 1654. Edited by J. Franklin Jameson. New York: Barnes & Noble, 1959.

- Lechford, Thomas. *Notebooks Kept by Thomas Lechford, Esq., Lawyer, in Boston, from June 27, 1638 to July 29, 1641*. Edited by Edward E. Hale, Jr. Bowie, MD: Heritage Books, 1998.
- Locke, John. *Two Treatises of Government*. (1690). Clark, NJ: Lawbook Exchange, 2006.
- Mather, Cotton. *Diary of Cotton Mather*. 2 vols. New York, F. Ungar Pub. Co., 1957.
- _____. *The Mather Papers: Cotton Mather and Salem Witchcraft*. Edited by William F. Poole. Boston, 1868.
- _____. *Selected Letters of Cotton Mather*. Edited by Kenneth Silverman. Baton Rouge: LSU Press, 1971.
- Mather, Cotton, and Robert Caleb. *Salem Witchcraft: Comprising More Wonders of the Invisible World...and Wonders of the Invisible World*. Edited by Samuel P. Fowler. Clark, NJ: Lawbook Exchange, 2005.
- Mather, Cotton, and Increase Mather. *The History of King Philip's War*. Edited by Samuel G. Drake. Albany: J. Munsell, 1862; New York: Heritage Books Reprint, 1990.
- _____. *Two Mather Biographies: Life and Death and Parentator*. Edited by William J. Scheick. Bethlehem, PA: Lehigh UP, 1989.
- Mather, Increase. *Autobiography of Increase Mather*. Edited by Michael G. Hall. Worcester: AAS, 1962.
- _____. *Diary by Increase Mather, March, 1675-December, 1676. Together with Another Diary by Him, 1674-1687*. Edited by Samuel A. Green. Cambridge: J. Wilson & Son, 1900.
- Randolph, Edward. *Edward Randolph: Including His Letters and Official Papers*. Edited by Robert N. Toppan and Alfred T. S. Goodrick. 7 vols. Boston: Prince Society, 1898-1909.
- Sanford, Peleg. *The Letterbook of Peleg Sanford of Newport, Merchant (Later Governor of Rhode Island), 1666-1668*. Edited by Howard W. Preston. Providence: RIHS, 1928.
- Sewall, Samuel. *The Diary and Life of Samuel Sewall*. Edited by Melvin Yazawa. Bedford Books, 1998.
- Shepard, Thomas. *God's Plot, the Paradoxes of Puritan Piety*. Edited by Michael McGiffert. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1992.

Wheelwright, John. *John Wheelwright—His Writings: Including His Fast-Day Sermon, 1637*. Edited by Charles H. Bell. Boston: Prince Society, 1876; 1996.

Williams, Roger. *The Complete Writings of Roger Williams*. 7 vols. New York: Russell & Russell, 1963.

_____. *The Correspondence of Roger Williams*, Vol. 1. Edited by Glenn W. LaFantasie. Hanover: Brown UP, 1988.

Winthrop, John. *The Journal of John Winthrop, 1630-1649*. Edited by Richard S. Dunn, James Savage, and Laetitia Yeandle. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1996.

Winthrop, John, *et al.* *The Winthrop Papers*, Volume 1, 1645-1649. Edited by Allyn B. Forbes. Boston: MHS, 1931-1947.

PUBLISHED PRIMARY SOURCES, 18TH CENTURY

Adams, John. *The Diary and Autobiography of John Adams*. Edited by Lyman Butterfield *et al.* 4 vols. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1961.

_____. *The Legal Papers of John Adams*. Edited by Kinvin L. Wroth, and Hillier B. Zobel. Cambridge: Belknap Press, 1965.

Adams, John, and Jonathan Sewall. *Novanglus, and Massachusettensis...to Which Are Added a Number of Letters, Lately Written by President Adams*. New York: Russell & Russell, 1819; 1968.

Adams, Samuel. *The Writings of Samuel Adams*. Edited by Harry A. Cushing. 4 vols. New York: Octagon Books, 1904-1908; 1968.

Andrews, John. "Letters of John Andrews, Esq., of Boston, 1772-1776." *MHS Proc.* 8 (1864): 316-412.

Backus, Isaac. *A History of New-England, with Particular Reference to the Denomination of Christians called Baptists*. Boston: Edward Draper, 1777; Newton, MA: Backus Historical Society, 1871.

Besse, Joseph, ed. *A Collection of the Sufferings of the People called Quakers, for the Testimony of a Good Conscience*. London, 1753.

Bernard, Francis. *Select Letters on the Trade and Government of America; and the Principles of Law and Polity, Applied to the American Colonies*. London: T. Payne, 1774.

- Bernard, Sir Francis, and William W. Barrington, Viscount. *The Barrington-Bernard Correspondence*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1912; 1970.
- Boucher, Jonathan. *Reminiscences of an American Loyalist, 1738-1789*. Edited by Jonathan Bouchier. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1925.
- _____. *A View of the Causes and Consequences of the American Revolution*. London: G. G. & J. Robinson, 1797.
- Burke, Edmund. *On Conciliation with the Colonies, and Other Papers on the American Revolution*. Edited by Peter J. Stanlis. Lunenburg, VT: Stinehour Press, 1975.
- _____. *The Correspondence of Edmund Burke*. 10 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1958-1978.
- _____. *On Empire, Liberty, and Reform: Speeches and Letters*. Edited by David Bromwich. New Haven: Yale UP, 2000.
- _____. *Selected Letters of Edmund Burke*. Edited by Harvey C. Mansfield, Jr. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984.
- Callender, John. *An Historical Discourse, on the Civil and Religious Affairs of the Colony of Rhode-Island*. Boston: S. Kneeland & T. Green, 1739.
- Cooper, Samuel, and Thomas Pownall. "Letters of Samuel Cooper to Thomas Pownall, 1769-1777." *AHR* 8, no. 2 (Jan. 1903): 301-30.
- Curwen, Samuel. *The Journal of Samuel Curwen, Loyalist*. Edited by Andrew Oliver. The Loyalist Papers Series. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1972.
- Dickerson, Oliver M., ed. *Boston under Military Rule [1768-69] as Revealed in A Journal of the Times*. Westport, CN: Greenwood Press, 1936; 1971.
- Dickinson, John. *The Political Writings of John Dickinson, 1764-1774*. Edited by Paul L. Ford. New York: Da Capo Press, 1970.
- Douglass, William. *A Summary, Historical & Political, of the First Plantation...of the British Settlements in North-America*. 2 vols. Boston, 1749-1751; New York: Arno Press, 1972.
- Dummer, Jeremiah. "A Defence of the New-England Charters." London: J. Almon, 1721; 1765.
- Franklin, Benjamin. *Autobiography and Other Writings*. Edited by Kenneth Silverman. New York, NY: Penguin Books, 1986.

- _____. *Benjamin Franklin's Letters to the Press, 1758-1775*. Edited by Verner W. Crane. Chapel Hill: UNC Press, 1950.
- _____. *Papers of Benjamin Franklin*. Edited by Leonard W. Labaree and William B. Willcox. 28 vols. New Haven: Yale UP, 1947-1997.
- _____. *The Political Thought of Benjamin Franklin*. Edited by Ralph L. Ketcham. Indianapolis, IN: Hackett Pub. Co., 2003.
- Galloway, Joseph. *A Candid Examination of the Mutual Claims of Great Britain, and the Colonies*. New York: James Rivington, 1775.
- _____. *Historical and Political Reflections on the Rise and Progress of the American Rebellion*. London: G. Wilkie, 1780.
- George, III. *Correspondence of King George the Third from 1760 to December 1783*. Edited by John Fortescue. 6 vols. London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd., 1927-1928.
- Gordon, William. *The History of the Rise, Progress, and Establishment, of the Independence of the United States of America*. 4 vols. London: Printed for the author, 1788.
- Hutchinson, Thomas. "Additions to Thomas Hutchinson's 'History of Massachusetts Bay.'" Edited by Catherine B. Mayo. Worcester: AAS, 1949.
- _____. "Anne Hutchinson of Massachusetts." Boston: Directors of the Old South Work, 1907.
- _____. "The Case of the Provinces of Massachusetts-Bay and New-York, Respecting the Boundary Lines between the Two Provinces." Boston: Green & Russell, 1764.
- _____. ed. *A Collection of Original Papers Relative to the History of the Colony of Massachusetts Bay*. Boston: Thomas Hutchinson & John Fleet, 1769. New edition edited by William H. Whitmore and William S. Appleton. Albany: Prince Society, 1865; New York: B. Franklin, 1967.
- _____. "The Destruction of the Sea." Edited by Peter O. Hutchinson. Boston: Directors of Old South Work, 1896.
- _____. "Dialogue between an American and a European Englishman" [1768]. Edited by Bernard Bailyn. *Perspectives in American History* 9 (1975): 343-411.
- _____. *The Diary and Letters of His Excellency Thomas Hutchinson Captain-General and Governor-in-Chief of His Late Majesty's Province of Massachusetts Bay*.

- Edited by Peter O. Hutchinson. 2 vols. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin, 1884-1886; New York: AMS Press, 1973.
- _____. *The History of the Colony and Province of the Massachusetts-Bay*. 2 vols. London, 1765-1768.
- _____. *The History of the Province of Massachusetts Bay, from 1749 to 1774*. [Vol. 3]. Edited by John Hutchinson. London: J. Murray, 1828.
- _____. *The History of the Colony and Province of Massachusetts Bay*. Edited by Lawrence S. Mayo. 3 vols. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1936.
- _____. "Strictures upon the Declaration of the Congress at Philadelphia; in a Letter to a Noble Lord, &C." London, 1776. Edited by Malcolm Freiberg. London: Old South Leaflets, 1958.
- _____. "Thomas Hutchinson and the Stamp Act." Edited by Edmund S. Morgan. *NEQ* 21, no. 4 (Dec. 1948): 459-92.
- _____. "The Witchcraft Delusion of 1692: From an Unpublished Manuscript." Edited by William F. Poole. *NEHGR* 24 (1870): 381-415.
- Hutchinson, Thomas, James Bowdoin, and John Adams. *The Briefs of the American Revolution*. Edited by John P. Reid. New York: New York UP, 1981.
- Hutchinson, Thomas, *et al.* "The Letters of Governor Hutchinson, and Lieut. Governor Oliver, &C., Printed at Boston, and Remarks Thereon." London: J. Wilkie, 1774.
- Lloyd, Henry. "Account of the Boston Riot of 1765." *Bulletin of the Business Historical Society* 7, no. 4 (Jun. 1933): 12-13.
- Mauduit, Israel. "Proceedings of His Majesty's Privy Council, Upon an Address of the Assembly of Massachusetts Bay, to Remove Governor Hutchinson and Lieutenant Governor Oliver." In *A Collection of Scarce and Interesting Tracts*, 229-63. London, 1787-1788.
- _____. *A Short View of the History of the Colony of Massachusetts Bay, with Respect to Their Charters and Constitution*. London: J. Wilkie, 1774.
- Mather, Cotton. *Cotton Mather's Magnalia Christi Americana*. Edited by Thomas Robbins. 2 vols. New York: Russell & Russell, 1852; 1967.
- Minot, George R. *Continuation of the History of the Province of Massachusetts Bay, from the Year 1748 [to 1765]*. 2 vols. Boston: Manning & Loring, 1798-1803.

- Montesquieu, Charles de Secondat, baron de. *The Spirit of Laws*. 2 vols. London: J. Nourse & P. Vaillant, 1750.
- Neal, Daniel. *The History of New-England: Containing an Impartial Account of the Civil and Ecclesiastical Affairs of the Country, to the year of Our Lord, 1700*. London: A. Ward, 1747.
- Niles, Samuel. "History of the French & Indian Wars." [ca. 1760s] *MHS Coll.*, 3rd ser., 6 (1837): 154-279.
- Oliver, Peter. *Origins and Progress of the American Rebellion: A Tory View*. Edited by Douglas Adair and John A. Schutz. San Marino: Henry E. Huntington Library, 1961.
- Otis, James. *Some Political Writings of James Otis*. Edited by Charles F. Mullett. 2 vols. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1929.
- Penhallow, Samuel. *The History of the Wars of New-England, with the Eastern Indians*. Boston: T. Fleet, 1726.
- Pownall, Thomas. *The Administration of the Colonies*. London: J. Walter, 1768. Reprint edited by Daniel Baugh and Alison G. Olson. Delmar, NY: Scholars' Facsimiles & Reprints, 1993.
- Prince, Thomas. *A Chronological History of New-England in the Form of Annals: Being a Summary and Exact Account of the Most Material Transactions and Occurrences Relating to This Country*. 2 vols. Boston: Kneeland & Green, 1736-1755.
- Quincy, Josiah, Jr. "Extracts from the Diaries of Josiah Quincy, Jr." *MHS Proc.* 4 (1860): 47-51.
- _____. "Journal of Josiah Quincy, Jr., 1773." Edited by Mark A. De Wolfe Howe. *MHS Proc.* 49 (1916): 424-81.
- _____. *Memoir of the Life of Josiah Quincy Junior, of Massachusetts: by his Son, Josiah Quincy*. Boston: Cummings, Hilliard, & Co., 1825; New York: Da Capo Press, 1971.
- _____. *Portrait of a Patriot: The Major Political and Legal Papers of Josiah Quincy Junior*. Edited by Daniel R. Coquillette and Neil L. York. Boston: CSM, 2005.
- Robertson, William. *The History of America*. London: W. Strahan, 1777.

- Rowe, John. *Letters and Diary of John Rowe*. Edited by Anne Rowe Cunningham. New York: New York Times, 1903; 1969.
- Smith, William. *Historical Memoirs, 1763-1776, of William Smith*. Edited by William H. W. Sabine. 2 vols. New York: New York Times, 1969-1971.
- Stiles, Ezra. *Extracts from the Itineraries and other Miscellanies of Ezra Stiles*. Edited by Franklin B. Dexter. New Haven, 1916.
- Thatcher, Oxenbridge. "Considerations on Lowering the Value of Gold Coins, within the Province of the Massachusetts-Bay." Boston: Edes & Gill, [1762]; 1923.
- Voltaire, François Marie Arouet de. *The Works of M. de Voltaire*. London: J. Newbery, 1761-1770.
- Warren, Mercy O. *History of the Rise, Progress, and Termination of the American Revolution*. Boston: Manning & Loring, 1805. Edited by Lester H. Cohen. Indianapolis: Liberty Classics, 1988.

GENERAL RECORD COLLECTIONS

- Andrews, Charles M., ed. *Narratives of the Insurrections, 1675-1690*. Cranbury, NJ: Scholar's Bookshelf, 1915; 2005.
- Bailyn, Bernard, ed. *Pamphlets of the American Revolution, 1750-1776*: Vol. 1, 1750-1765. Cambridge: Belknap Press, 1965.
- Barbour, Hugh and Arthur O. Roberts, eds. *Early Quaker Writings, 1650-1700*. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1973.
- Boston, Govt. *Boston Town Records, 1631-1822*. Boston: Rockwell & Churchill, 1881-1906.
- _____. *Records Relating to the Early History of Boston*. 39 vols. Boston: Rockwell & Churchill, 1877-1909.
- Bradford, Alden, ed. *Speeches of the Governors of Massachusetts from 1765-1775: And the Answers of the House of Representatives ...* Boston: Russell & Gardner, 1818; New York: Da Capo Press, 1971.
- Brigham, Clarence S., ed. *British Royal Proclamations Relating to America, 1603-1783*. New York: B. Franklin, 1968.
- British, Govt. *Massachusetts Royal Commissioners, 1681-1774*. Boston: CSM, 1913.

- Cushing, Abel, ed. *Historical Letters on the First Charter of Massachusetts Government*. Boston: J. N. Bang, 1839.
- Cushing, John D., ed. *The Laws and Liberties of Massachusetts*. 3 vols. Wilmington: Scholarly Resources, 1976.
- Davis, Andrew M., ed. "A Calendar of Land Bank Papers." *CSM Publications* 4 (1910).
- _____. *Tracts Relating to the Currency of the Massachusetts Bay, 1682-1720*. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1902.
- Emerson, Everett, ed. *Letters from New England: The Massachusetts Bay Colony, 1629-1638*. The Commonwealth Series. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1976.
- Force, Peter, ed. *American Archives: Consisting of a Collection of Authentick Records...Forming a Documentary History of the Origin and Progress of the North American Colonies...* 9 vols. New York: Johnson Reprint Corp., 1972.
- Freiberg, Malcolm, et al., ed. *Journals of the House of Representatives of Massachusetts (1715/1717-1780)*. 50 vols. Boston: MHS, 1919-1991.
- Goodell, Abner C., and Melville M. Bigelow, eds. *Acts and Resolves, Public and Private, of the Province of the Massachusetts Bay*. 21 vols. Boston: Wright & Potter, 1869-1922.
- Grant, W. L., and James Monroe, eds. *Acts of the Privy Council of England, Colonial Series*. Edited by Public Record Office. 6 vols. Hereford, UK: HMSO, 1908-1912.
- Hall, David D., ed. *The Antinomian Controversy, 1636-1638; A Documentary History*. Durham: Duke UP: 1990.
- Hall, Michael G., Lawrence H. Leder, and Michael G. Kammen, eds. *The Glorious Revolution in America: Documents on the Colonial Crisis of 1689*. Chapel Hill: UNC Press, 1964.
- Hansard, T. C. *The Parliamentary History of England from the Earliest Period to the Year 180...* 23 vols. London: T. Hansard, 1806-1820.
- Heartman, Charles F., ed. *The Cradle of the United States, 1765-1789: Five Hundred Contemporary Broad-sides, Pamphlets, and a Few Books...* Perth Amboy, NJ, 1922.

- Jensen, Merrill, ed. *Tracts of the American Revolution, 1763-1776*. Indianapolis: Hackett Pub. Co., 2003.
- Labaree, Leonard W., ed. *Royal Instructions to British Colonial Governors, 1670-1776*. 2 vols. New York: D. Appleton-Century Co., 1935; 1967.
- Lincoln, Charles H., ed. *Narratives of the Indian Wars, 1675-1699*. New York: Scribner's Sons, 1913; Cranbury, NJ: Scholar's Bookshelf, 2005.
- Macdonald, William, ed. *Select Charters and Other Documents Illustrative of American History, 1606-1775*. New York, 1914.
- McMurtrie, Douglas C., ed. *Massachusetts Broad sides, 1699-1711; Fourteen Broad sides Previously Undescribed by Bibliographers...* Chicago: Privately printed, 1939.
- MHS, ed. *More Early Massachusetts Broad sides: The First Century, 1639-1739*. Boston: MHS, 1981.
- _____. *Some Early Massachusetts Broad sides*. Boston: MHS, 1964.
- Moody, Robert E., and Richard C. Simmons, eds. *The Glorious Revolution in Massachusetts: Selected Documents, 1689-1692*. CSM Publications 64. Boston: CSM, 1988.
- Morgan, Edmund S., ed. *Prologue to Revolution: Sources and Documents on the Stamp Act Crisis, 1764-1766*. Chapel Hill: UNC Press, 1959.
- Noble, John, ed. *Records of the Court of Assistants of the Colony of the Massachusetts Bay, 1630-1692*. 3 vols. Boston: County of Suffolk, 1901-1928.
- Orr, Charles, ed. *History of the Pequot War: The Contemporary Accounts of Mason, Underhill, Vincent, and Gardiner*. Cleveland: Helman-Taylor, 1897.
- Pickering, Danby, ed. *The Statutes at Large from Magna Charta to the End of the Thirteenth Parliament of Great Britain, Anno 1773*. 36 vols. Cambridge, UK: J. Bentham, 1761-1806.
- Plumstead, A. W., ed. *The Wall and the Garden: The Massachusetts Election Sermons, 1670-1775*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1968.
- Quincy, Josiah, Jr., ed. *Reports of Cases Argued and Adjudged in the Superior Court of Judicature of the Province of Massachusetts Bay between 1761 and 1772*. Edited by Samuel M. Quincy. Boston: Little, Brown, 1865; 1969.

Sainsbury, W. Noel, ed. *Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series, America and the West Indies, Preserved in the State Paper Department of Her Majesty's Public Record Office*. 37 vols. London: HMSO, 1860-1889.

Seybolt, Robert F., ed. *The Town Officials of Colonial Boston, 1634-1775*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1939.

Shurtleff, Nathaniel B., ed. *Massachusetts Colony Records: Records of the Governor and Company of the Massachusetts Bay...* 6 vols. Boston: W. White, 1854; New York, AMS Press, 1968.

Simmons, R. C., and P. D. G. Thomas, eds. *Proceedings and Debates of the British Parliament Respecting North America, 1754-1783*. Millwood, NY: Kraus International Publications, 1984-.

Slotkin, Richard, and James K. Folsom, eds. *So Dreadfull a Judgment: Puritan Responses to King Philip's War, 1676-1677*. Middleton, CN: Wesleyan UP, 1973.

Toppan, Robert N., ed. "Andros Records." *AAS Proc.*, new ser. 13 (1899-1900): 237-68, 463-99.

Tracts Against New England. New York: AMS Press, 1985.

Whitmore, William H., ed. *The Andros Tracts... Papers Issued During the Period between the Overthrow of the Andros Government and the Establishment of the Second Charter of Massachusetts*. 3 vols. Boston: Prince Society, 1868-74.

_____. *The Colonial Laws of Massachusetts. Reprinted from the Edition of 1660... with the Supplements through 1686...* 2 vols. Boston: Rockwell & Churchill, 1890.

_____. *The Massachusetts Civil List for the Colonial and Provincial Periods, 1630-1774...* Baltimore: Genealogical Publishing Co., 1870; 1969.

Young, Alexander, ed. *Chronicle of the First Planters of the Colony of Massachusetts Bay, 1623-1636*. Boston: C. C. Little & J. Brown, 1846; New York: Da Capo Press, 1970.

SECONDARY WORKS, BOOKS

Adair, Douglass. *Fame and the Founding Fathers: Essays by Douglas Adair*. Edited by Trevor Colbourn. Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, 1998.

Appleby, Joyce. *Liberalism and Republicanism in the Historical Imagination*.

- Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1992.
- Arch, Stephen C. *Authorizing the Past: The Rhetoric of History in Seventeenth-Century New England*. DeKalb: Northeastern Illinois UP, 1994.
- Ashcraft, Richard. *Revolutionary Politics and Locke's Two Treatises of Government*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1986.
- Ashley, Maurice. *The Glorious Revolution of 1688*. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1966.
- Backus, Isaac. *A History of New England with Particular Reference to the Denomination of Christians Called Baptists*. Newton, 1871.
- Bailyn, Bernard. *Faces of Revolution: Personalities and Themes in the Struggle for American Independence*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1990.
- _____. *Ideological Origins of the American Revolution*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1967.
- _____. *The Ordeal of Thomas Hutchinson*. Cambridge: Belknap Press, 1974.
- Bailyn, Bernard and John B. Hench, eds. *The Press and the American Revolution*. Boston: Northeastern UP, 1981.
- Beddard, Robert. *The Revolutions of 1688: the Andrew Browning Lectures, 1988*. New York: Oxford UP, 1991.
- Beeman, Richard. *The Varieties of Political Experience in Eighteenth-Century America*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004.
- Benton, William A. *Whig-Loyalism: An Aspect of Political Ideology in the American Revolutionary Era*. Rutherford, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson UP, 1969.
- Bercovitch, Sacvan. *The Puritan Origins of the American Self*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1975.
- Billias, George, ed. *Law and Authority in Colonial America*. Barre, MA: Barre Publishers, 1965.
- Billias, George A., and Gerald N. Grob, eds. *American History, Retrospect and Prospect*. New York: The Free Press, 1971.
- Billington, Ray A., ed. *The Reinterpretation of Early American History; Essays in Honor of John Edwin Pomfret*. New York: Norton, 1968.

- Bliss, Robert. *Revolution and Empire: English Politics and the American Colonies in the Seventeenth Century*. Manchester, NY: Manchester UP, 1990.
- Bourne, Russell. *The Red King's Rebellion: Racial Politics in New England, 1675 to 1678*. New York: Athenaeum, 1990.
- Breen, T. H. *The Character of a Good Ruler: A Study of Puritan Political Ideas in New England, 1630-1730*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1970.
- . *Puritans and Adventurers: Change and Persistence in Early America*. New York: Oxford UP, 1980.
- Bremer, Francis J. *John Winthrop: America's Forgotten Founding Father*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2003.
- Bremer, Francis J., and Alden T. Vaughan, eds. *Puritan New England: Essays on Religion, Society, and Culture*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1977.
- Brown, Robert E. *Middle-Class Democracy and the Revolution in Massachusetts, 1691-1780*. New York: Harper & Row, 1969.
- Brown, Wallace. *The Good Americans: The Loyalists in the American Revolution*. New York: Morrow, 1969.
- Burns, John F. *Controversies between Royal Governors and Their Assemblies in the North American Colonies*. New York: Russell & Russell, 1969.
- Bushman, Richard L. *King and People in Provincial Massachusetts*. Chapel Hill: UNC Press, 1985.
- Calhoon, Robert M. *Dominion and Liberty: Ideology in the Anglo-American World, 1660-1801*. Arlington Heights, IL: Harlan Davidson, 1994.
- . *The Loyalists in Revolutionary America, 1760-1781*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & Jovanovich, Inc., 1973.
- Calhoon, Robert M., et al., eds. *The Loyalist Perception and Other Essays*. Columbia: USC Press, 1989.
- Cave, Alfred A. *The Pequot War*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1996.
- Chester, Joseph L. *Notes upon the Ancestry of William Hutchinson and Anne Marbury from Researches Recently Made in England*. Boston: Clapp & Son, 1866.
- Chu, Jonathan M. *Neighbors, Friends, or Madmen: The Puritan Adjustment to*

- Quakerism in Seventeenth-Century Massachusetts Bay*. Westport, CN: Greenwood Press, 1985.
- Clark, J. C. D. *The Language of Liberty, 1660-1832: Political Discourse and Social Dynamics in the Anglo-American World*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1994.
- Cohen, Lester H. *The Revolutionary Histories: Contemporary Narratives of the American Revolution*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1980.
- Colbourn, H. Trevor. *The Lamp of Experience: Whig History and the Intellectual Origins of the American Revolution*. New York, Norton, 1965.
- Cooper, James F. *Tenacious of Their Liberties: The Congregationalists in Colonial Massachusetts*. New York: Oxford UP, 1999.
- Delbanco, Andrew. *The Puritan Ordeal*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1989.
- Demos, John P. *Entertaining Satan: Witchcraft and the Culture of Early New England*. New York: Oxford UP, 1982.
- Dexter, Henry M. *As to Roger Williams, and his 'Banishment' from the Massachusetts Plantation; with a few further words concerning the Baptists, the Quakers, and Religious Liberty...* Boston: Congregational Publishing Society, 1876.
- Dunn, John. *The Political Thought of John Locke: An Historical Account of the Argument of the "Two Treatises of Government."* London: Cambridge UP, 1969.
- Dunn, Richard S. *Puritans and Yankees: The Winthrop Dynasty of New England, 1630-1717*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1962.
- Erikson, Kai. *Wayward Puritans: A Study in the Sociology of Deviance*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1966.
- Foster, Stephen. *The Long Argument: English Puritanism and the Shaping of New England Culture, 1570-1700*. Chapel Hill: UNC Press, 1991.
- Freiberg, Malcolm. *Prelude to Purgatory: Thomas Hutchinson in Provincial Massachusetts Politics, 1760-1770*. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1990.
- _____. *Thomas Hutchinson of Milton*. Milton: Milton Historical Society, 1971.
- Galvin, John R. *Three Men of Boston*. New York: T. Y. Crowell, 1976.

- Gay, Peter. *A Loss of Mastery: Puritan Historians in Colonial America* Jefferson Memorial Lectures. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1966.
- Godbeer, Richard. *The Devil's Dominion: Magic and Religion in Early New England*. New York: Cambridge UP, 1992.
- Gough, John W. *Fundamental Law in English Constitutional History*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961.
- . *John Locke's Political Philosophy: Eight Studies*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1950.
- Gould, Eliga H. *The Persistence of Empire: British Political Culture in the Age of the American Revolution*. Chapel Hill: UNC Press, 2000.
- Greene, Jack P., ed. *The American Revolution: Its Character and Limits*. New York: New York UP, 1987.
- . *The Intellectual Construction of America: Exceptionalism and Identity from 1492 to 1800*. Chapel Hill: UNC Press, 1993.
- . *Peripheries and Center: Constitutional Development in the Extended Politics of the British Empire and the United States, 1607-1788*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1986.
- , ed. *The Reinterpretation of the American Revolution, 1763-1789*. Westport, CN: Greenwood Press, 1968, 1979.
- Gura, Philip F. *A Glimpse of Zion's Glory: Puritan Radicalism in New England, 1620-1660*. Middleton, CN: Wesleyan UP, 1984.
- Haffenden, Philip S. *New England in the English Nation, 1689-1713*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1974.
- Hall, David D. *The Faithful Shepherd: A History of the New England Ministry in the Seventeenth Century*. Chapel Hill: UNC Press, 1972.
- , ed. *Puritanism in 17th Century Massachusetts*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1968.
- . *Worlds of Wonder, Days of Judgment: Popular Religious Beliefs in Early New England*. New York: Knopf, 1989.
- Hall, David D., John M. McMurrin, and Thad W. Tate, eds. *Saints and Revolutionaries: Essays on Early American History*. New York: W.W. Norton, 1984.

- Hall, Michael G. *Edward Randolph and the American Colonies, 1676-1703*. Chapel Hill: UNC Press, 1960.
- . *The Last American Puritan: The Life of Increase Mather, 1639-1723*. Middleton: Wesleyan UP, 1988.
- Harpham, Edward J., ed. *John Locke's Two Treatises of Government: New Interpretations*. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas, 1992.
- Higham, John, and Paul K. Conkin, eds. *New Directions in American Intellectual History*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1979.
- Higham, John. *Writing American History: Essays on Modern Scholarship*. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1970.
- Hoerder, Dirk. *Crowd Action in Revolutionary Massachusetts, 1765-1780*. New York: Academic Press, 1977.
- Hoffer, Charles, ed. *A Rage for Liberty: Selected Articles on the Immediate Causes of the American Revolution*. New York: Garland Pub., 1988.
- Hoffer, Peter C. *The Devil's Disciples: Makers of the Salem Witchcraft Trials*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1996.
- . *The Salem Witchcraft Trials: A Legal History*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1997.
- Hosmer, James K. *The Life of Thomas Hutchinson, Royal Governor of the Province of Massachusetts Bay*. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin, & Co., 1896.
- Jacob, Margaret C., and James R. Jacob, eds. *Origins of Anglo-American Radicalism*. Atlantic
- Johnson, Richard R. *Adjustment to Empire: The New England Colonies, 1675-1715*. New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 1981.
- Jones, J. R., ed. *Liberty Secured?: Britain Before and After 1688*. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1992.
- Jones, James W. *The Shattered Synthesis: New England Puritanism before the Great Awakening*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1973.
- Kammen, Michael G. *Deputies & Libertyes; The Origins of Representative Government in Colonial America*. New York: Knopf, 1969.

- Kawashima, Yasuhide. *Igniting King Philip's War: The John Sassamon Murder Trial*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2001.
- Koch, Adrienne, ed. *Power, Morals, and the Founding Fathers: Essays in Interpretation of the American Enlightenment*. Ithaca: Great Seal Books, 1961.
- Kramnick, Isaac. *Republicanism and Bourgeois Radicalism: Political Ideology in Late Eighteenth-Century England and America*. London: Cornell UP, 1990.
- Kraus, Michael, and Davis D. Joyce. *The Writing of American History*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1985.
- Kurtz, Stephen G., and James H. Hutson, eds. *Essays on the American Revolution*. Chapel Hill: UNC Press, 1973.
- Labaree, Benjamin W. *Colonial Massachusetts: A History*. Millwood, NY: KTO Press, 1979.
- Labaree, Leonard W. *Conservatism in Early American History*. New York: New York UP, 1948.
- Leder, Lawrence. *The Colonial Legacy, Vol. 1: The Loyalist Historians*. New York: Harper & Row, 1971.
- Lepore, Jill. *The Name of War: King Philip's War and the Origins of American Identity*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1998.
- Lerner, Ralph. *Revolutions Revisited; Two Faces of the Politics of Enlightenment*. Chapel Hill: UNC Press, 1994.
- Lovejoy, David S. *The Glorious Revolution in America*. Middletown, CN: Wesleyan UP, 1987.
- Lustig, Mary Lou. *The Imperial Executive in America: Sir Edmund Andros, 1637-1714*. Madison NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson UP, 2002.
- Marston, Jerrilyn G. *King and Congress: The Transfer of Political Legitimacy*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1987.
- May, Henry F. *The Enlightenment in America*. New York: Oxford UP, 1976.
- McFarland, Philip J. *The Brave Bostonians: Hutchinson, Quincy, Franklin, and the Coming of the American Revolution*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1998.

- McLoughlin, William G. *New England Dissent, 1630-1833. The Baptists and the Separation of Church and State*. 2 vols. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1971.
- _____. *Soul Liberty: The Baptists' Struggle in New England, 1630-1833*. Hanover: Brown UP, 1991.
- Middlekauff, Robert. *Ancients and Axioms: Secondary Education in Eighteenth-Century New England*. New York: Arno Press, 1963.
- Miller, Perry. *Errand into the Wilderness*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1967.
- _____. *The New England Mind: From Colony to Province*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1953.
- _____. *The New England Mind: The Seventeenth Century*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1954.
- _____. *Orthodoxy in Massachusetts, 1630-1650*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1959.
- Mohlo, Anthony, and Gordon S. Wood, eds. *Imagined Histories: American Historians Interpret the Past*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1998.
- Morgan, Edmund S. *Inventing the People: The Rise of Popular Sovereignty in England and America*. New York: Norton, 1988.
- Morgan, Edmund S., and Helen M. Morgan. *Stamp Act Crisis; Prologue to Revolution*. Chapel Hill: UNC Press, 1995.
- Moseley, James G. *John Winthrop's World: History as a Story; The Story as History*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1992.
- Nicolson, Colin. *The "Infamous Governor" Francis Bernard and the Origins of the American Revolution*. Boston: Northeastern UP, 2001.
- Norton, Mary Beth. *The British Americans: The Loyalist Exiles in England, 1774-1789*. London: Constable, 1974.
- _____. *In the Devil's Snare: The Salem Witchcraft Crisis of 1692*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2002.
- O'Brien, Karen. *Narratives of Enlightenment: Cosmopolitan History from Voltaire to Gibbon*. New York: Cambridge UP, 1997.
- Olson, Alison G. *Anglo-American Politics, 1660-1775: The Relationship between Parties in England and Colonial America*. London: Oxford UP, 1973.

- _____. *Making the Empire Work: London and American Interest Groups, 1690-1790*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1992.
- Olson, Alison G., and Richard N. Brown, eds. *Anglo-American Political Relations 1675-1775*. New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 1970.
- Outram, Dorinda. *The Enlightenment*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1995.
- Patterson, Stephen E. *Political Parties in Revolutionary Massachusetts*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1973.
- Pencak, William. *America's Burke: The Mind of Thomas Hutchinson*. Washington, DC: University Press of America, 1982.
- _____. *War, Politics, and Revolution in Provincial Massachusetts*. Boston: Northeastern UP, 1981.
- Pestana, Carla G. *Quakers and Baptists in Colonial Massachusetts*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1991.
- Pocock, J. G. A. *The Machiavellian Moment: Florentine Political Thought and the Atlantic Republican Tradition*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1975.
- _____, ed. *Three British Revolutions, 1641, 1688, 1776*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1980.
- Pole, Jack R. *Political Representation in England and the Origins of the American Republic*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1966.
- Potter, Janice. *The Liberty We Seek: Loyalist Ideology in Colonial New York and Massachusetts*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1983.
- Puglisi, Michael J. *Puritans Besieged: The Legacies of King Philip's War in the Massachusetts Bay Colony*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1991.
- Ranlet, Philip. *Enemies of the Bay Colony*. New York: P. Lang, 1995.
- Reid, John P. *The Ancient Constitution and the Origins of Anglo-American Liberty*. DeKalb: Northern Illinois UP, 2005.
- _____. *The Concept of Liberty in the Age of the American Revolution*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988.
- _____. *The Concept of Representation in the Age of the American Revolution*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989.

- _____. *Constitutional History of the American Revolution*. 4 vols. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1986-1993.
- _____. *Rule of Law: The Jurisprudence of Liberty in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries*. DeKalb: Northern Illinois UP, 2004.
- Rivers, George R. *The Governor's Garden: A Relation of Some Passages in the Life of His Excellency Thomas Hutchinson...* Boston: J. Knight, 1896.
- Robbins, Caroline. *The Eighteenth-Century Commonwealthman*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1959.
- Rosenthal, Bernard. *Salem Story: Reading the Witch Trials of 1692*. New York: Cambridge UP, 1993.
- Round, Phillip H. *By Nature and Custom Cursed: Transatlantic Civil Discourse and New England Cultural Production, 1620-1660*. Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 1999.
- Schultz, Eric B., and Michael Tougas, eds. *King Philip's War: The History and Legacy of America's Forgotten Conflict*. Woodstock, VT: Countryman Press, 1999.
- Schwoerer, Lois G., ed. *The Revolution of 1688-1689: Changing Perspectives*. New York: Cambridge UP, 1992.
- Selement, George. *Keepers of the Vineyard: The Puritan Ministry and Collective Culture in Colonial New England*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1984.
- Shaffer, Arthur H. *The Politics of History: Writing the History of the American Revolution: 1783-1815*. Chicago: Precedent Pub., 1975.
- Shaw, Peter. *American Patriots and the Rituals of Revolution*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1981.
- Smith, James M. *Seventeenth-Century America: Essays in Colonial History*. Chapel Hill: UNC Press, 1959.
- Smith, William R. *History as Argument: Three Patriot Historians of the American Revolution*. The Hague: Mouton & Co., 1966.
- Sosin, J. M. *English America and Imperial Inconstancy: The Rise of Provincial Autonomy, 1696-1715*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1985.

- _____. *English America and the Restoration Monarchy of Charles II: Trans-Atlantic Politics, Commerce, and Kinship*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1981.
- _____. *English America and the Revolution of 1688: Royal Administration and the Structure of Provincial Government*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1982.
- Spurlin, Paul M. *The French Enlightenment in America: Essays on the Times of the Founding Fathers*. Atlanta: University of Georgia Press, 1984.
- Steele, Ian K. *The English Atlantic, 1675-1740: An Exploration of Communication and Community*. New York: Oxford UP, 1986.
- Suggs, George C. *Perspectives on the American Revolution: A Bicentennial Contribution*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois UP, 1977.
- Tyler, John W. *Smugglers and Patriots: Boston Merchants and the Advent of the American Revolution*. Boston: Northeastern UP, 1986.
- Walmsley, Andrew S. *Thomas Hutchinson and the Origins of the American Revolution*. New York: New York UP, 1999.
- Warden, Gerald B. *Boston, 1689-1776*. Boston: Little, Brown, 1970.
- Waters, John J., Jr. *The Otis Family in Provincial and Revolutionary Massachusetts*. Chapel Hill: UNC Press, 1968.
- Webb, Stephen S. *1676: The Death of American Independence*. New York: Knopf, 1987.
- Whitmore, William H. *Brief Genealogy of the Descendants of William Hutchinson and Thomas Oliver; Families Closely Allied by Inter-marriage...* Boston: Drake, 1865.
- Wood, Gordon S. *The Radicalism of the American Revolution*. New York: A. A. Knopf, 1992.
- Young, Alfred F., ed. *Beyond the American Revolution: Explorations in the History of American Radicalism*. DeKalb: Northern Illinois UP, 1993.
- Zobel, Hiller. *The Boston Massacre*. New York: W.W. Norton, 1970.
- Zuckert, Michael P. *Natural Rights and the New Republicanism*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1994.

SECONDARY WORKS, ARTICLES

- Adams, Randolph. "New Light on the Boston Massacre." *AAS Proc.*, new ser., 47 (1937): 259-354.
- Anderson, Virginia D. "Migrants and Motives: Religion and the Settlement of New England, 1630-1640." *NEQ* 58, no. 3 (Sept. 1985): 339-83.
- Arch, Stephen C. "The Glorious Revolution and the Rhetoric of Puritan History." *Early American Literature* 27, no. 1 (1992): 61-74.
- Ashcraft, Richard, and M. M. Goldsmith. "Locke, Revolution Principles, and the Formation of Whig Ideology." *Historical Journal* 26, no. 4 (Dec. 1983): 773-800.
- Bailyn, Bernard. "Between King and Country: The Ordeal of Thomas Hutchinson." *American Heritage* 25, no. 3 (Apr. 1974): 4-07, 88-96.
- _____. "Thomas Hutchinson in Context: The *Ordeal* Revisited." *AAS Proc.* 114, no. 2 (2004): 281-300.
- Bell, Hugh F. "A Personal Challenge: The Otis-Hutchinson Currency Controversy, 1761-62." *Essex Institute Historical Collections* 106 (Oct. 1970): 297-323.
- Belz, Herman J. "Currency Reform in Colonial Massachusetts, 1749-1750." *Essex Institute Historical Collections* 103, no. 1 (1967): 66-84.
- _____. "Paper Money in Massachusetts." *Essex Institute Historical Collections* 101, no. 2 (Apr. 1965): 149-63.
- Bercovitch, Sacvan. "New England's Epic: Cotton Mather's *Magnalia Christi Americana*." *English Literary History* 33 (1966): 337-50.
- Black, Barbara A. "Massachusetts and the Judges: Judicial Independence in Perspective." *Law and History Review* 3, no. 1 (1985): 101-62.
- Bonomi, Patricia. "Hippocrates' Twins: Religion and Politics in the American Revolution." *History Teacher* 29, no. 2 (Feb. 1996): 137-44.
- Bozeman, Theodore D. "The Puritans' 'Errand into the Wilderness' Reconsidered." *NEQ* 59, no. 2 (Jun. 1986): 231-51.
- Breen, T. H., and Stephen Foster. "The Puritans' Greatest Achievement: A Study of Social Cohesion in Seventeenth-Century Massachusetts." *JAH* 60, no. 1 (Jun. 1973): 5-22.

- Bremer, Francis J. "Communications: The English Context of New England's Seventeenth-Century History." *NEQ* 60, no. 2 (Jun. 1987): 323-35.
- . "In Defense of Regicide: John Cotton on the Execution of Charles I." *WMQ* 37, no. 1 (Jan. 1980): 103-24.
- . "Increase Mather's Friends: The Transatlantic Congregational Network of the Seventeenth Century." *AAS Proc.* 94, no. 1 (1984): 59-96.
- . "Remembering—and Forgetting—John Winthrop and the Puritan Founders." *Massachusetts Historical Review* 6 (2004): 38-69.
- Bumsted, J. M. "'Things in the Womb of Time': Ideas of American Independence, 1633 to 1763." *WMQ* 31, no. 4 (Oct. 1974): 533-64.
- Cheng, Eileen Ka-May. "American Historical Writers and the Loyalists, 1788-1856: Dissent, Consensus, and American Nationality." *JER* 23, no. 4 (Win. 2003): 491-519.
- Clark, Dora M. "The Impressment of Seamen in the American Colonies." In *Essays on Colonial History Presented to Charles McLean Andrews by His Students*, 198-224. New Haven: Yale UP, 1931.
- Cohen, Lester H. "The American Revolution and Natural Law Theory." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 39, no. 3 (Jul. 1978): 491-502.
- . "Explaining the Revolution: Ideology and Ethics in Mercy Otis Warren's Historical Theory." *WMQ* 37, no. 2 (Apr. 1980): 200-18.
- Colley, Linda. "The Politics of Eighteenth-Century British History." *JBS* 25, no. 4 (Oct. 1986): 359-79.
- Cooper, James F., Jr. "Higher Law, Free Consent, Limited Authority: Church Government and Political Culture in Seventeenth-Century Massachusetts." *NEQ* 69, no. 2 (Jun. 1996): 201-22.
- Crocker, Lester G. "Interpreting the Enlightenment: A Political Approach." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 46, no. 2 (Apr. 1985): 211-30.
- De Wetering, John Van. "Governor Hutchinson's Historical Publications." *MHS Proc.* 3 (1855): 134-50.
- Deane, Charles. "A Bibliographic Essay on Governor Hutchinson's Historical Publications." *MHS Proc.* [3] (Feb. 1857): 134-50.
- Demos, John. "Underlying Themes in the Witchcraft of Seventeenth-Century New

- England." *AHR* 75, no. 5 (Jun. 1970): 1311-26.
- Detweiler, Philip F. "The Changing Reputation of the Declaration of Independence: The First Fifty Years." *WMQ* 19, no. 4 (Oct. 1962): 557-74.
- . "Shifting Perspectives on the Salem Witches." *History Teacher* 8, no. 4 (Aug. 1975): 596-610.
- Dickinson, H. T. "The Eighteenth-Century Debate on the 'Glorious Revolution.'" *History* 61 (1976): 28-45.
- Dippel, Horst. "The Changing Idea of Popular Sovereignty in Early American Constitutionalism: Breaking Away from European Patterns." *JER* 16, no. 1 (Spr. 1996): 21-45.
- Drake, James D. "Restraining Atrocity: The Conduct of King Philip's War." *NEQ* 70, no. 1 (Mar. 1997): 33-56.
- Dunn, Elizabeth E. "'Grasping at the Shadow': The Massachusetts Currency Debate, 1690-1751." *NEQ* 71, no. 1 (Mar. 1998): 54-76.
- Edney, Matthew H., and Susan Cimburek. "Telling the Traumatic Truth: William Hubbard's Narrative of King Philip's War and His 'Map of New-England.'" *WMQ* 61, no. 2 (Apr. 2004): 317-48.
- Ellis, George E. "Governor Thomas Hutchinson." *Atlantic Monthly* 53, no. 319 (May 1884): 662-76.
- Ellis, Joseph. "Habits of Mind and an American Enlightenment." *American Quarterly* 28, no. 2 (Sum. 1976): 150-64.
- Ferguson, James R. "Reason in Madness: The Political Thought of James Otis." *WMQ* 36, no. 2 (Apr. 1979): 194-214.
- Findling, John E. "The Glorious Revolution in America, 1688-1689." In *Events That Changed America through the Seventeenth Century*, 139-58. Westport: Greenwood Press, 2000.
- Fiske, John. "Thomas Hutchinson, Last Royal Governor of Massachusetts." In *Essays Historical and Literary*, 1-51. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1925.
- Foster, Stephen. "New England and the Challenge of Heresy, 1630 to 1660: The Puritan Crisis in Transatlantic Perspective." *WMQ* 38, no. 4 (Oct. 1981): 224-60.
- Freeman, Michael. "Puritans and Pequots: The Question of Genocide." *NEQ* 68, no. 2

(Jun. 1995): 278-93.

Freiberg, Malcolm. "Footnote to a Riot or, How Not to Preserve a House." *Old-Time New England* 48, no. 1, serial no. 169 (Sum. 1957): 105-06.

_____. "How to Become a Colonial Governor: Thomas Hutchinson of Massachusetts." *Review of Politics* 21 (Oct. 1959): 646-56.

_____. "Thomas Hutchinson and the Province Currency." *NEQ* 30, no. 2 (Jun. 1957): 190-208.

_____. "Thomas Hutchinson: The First Fifty Years (1711-1760)." *WMQ* 15, no. 1 (Jan. 1958): 35-55.

Friedman, Lawrence J., and Arthur H. Shaffer. "Mercy Otis Warren and the Politics of Historical Nationalism." *NEQ* 48, no. 2 (Jun. 1975): 194-215.

Gipson, Lawrence H. "Thomas Hutchinson and the Framing of the Albany Plan of Union, 1754." *Pennsylvania Magazine of History & Biography* 74 (1950): 5-35.

Gordon, Colin. "Crafting a Usable Past: Consensus, Ideology and Historians of the American Revolution." *WMQ* 46, no. 4 (Oct. 1989): 671-95.

Guttridge, G. H. "Thomas Pownall's the Administration of the Colonies: The Six Editions." *WMQ* 26, no. 1 (Jan. 1969): 31-46.

Haffenden, Philip S. "The Crown and the Colonial Charters, 1675-1688: Part I." *WMQ* 15, no. 3 (Jul. 1958): 297-311.

_____. "The Crown and the Colonial Charters, 1675-1688: Part II." *WMQ* 15, no. 4 (Oct. 1958): 452-66.

_____. "Randolph, Dudley, and the Massachusetts Moderates in 1683." *NEQ* 29, no. 4 (Dec. 1956): 513-16.

Heyd, Michael. "The Reaction to Enthusiasm in the Seventeenth Century: Towards an Integrative Approach." *JMH* 53, no. 2 (Jun. 1981): 258-80.

Hoh-Cheung and Mui, Lorna H. "Smuggling and the British Tea Trade before 1784." *AHR* 74, no. 1 (Oct. 1968): 44-73.

_____. "'Trends in Eighteenth-Century Smuggling' Reconsidered." *Economic History Review* 28, no. 1 (Feb. 1975): 28-43.

Hosmer, James K. "The Debt of Massachusetts to Thomas Hutchinson." *CSM*

- Publications, Transactions* 12 (Feb. 1909): 238-50.
- Howell, Wilbur S. "The Declaration of Independence and Eighteenth-Century Logic." *WMQ* 18, no. 4 (Oct. 1961): 463-84.
- Hulsebosch, Daniel J. "The Ancient Constitution and the Expanding Empire: Sir Edward Coke's British Jurisprudence." *Law and History Review* 21, no. 3 (Autumn 2003): 439-82.
- Irwin, Raymond D. "Cast out from the 'City Upon a Hill': Antinomian Exiles in Rhode Island, 1638-1650." *Rhode Island History* 52, no. 1 (1994): 2-19.
- James, Sydney V. "Where the People Thought Otherwise: Rhode Island before 1776." *Newport History* 57, no. 4 (1984): 97-121.
- Johnson, Richard L. "The Humble Address of the Publicans of New-England: A Reassessment." *NEQ* 51, no. 2 (Jun. 1978): 241-49.
- _____. "The Imperial Webb: The Thesis of Garrison Government in Early American Considered." *WMQ* 43, no. 3 (Jul. 1986): 408-30.
- _____. "'Parliamentary Egotisms': The Clash of Legislatures in the Making of the American Revolution." *JAH* 74, no. 2 (Sept. 1987): 338-62.
- Karr, Ronald D. "The Missing Clause: Myth and the Massachusetts Bay Charter of 1629." *NEQ* 77, no. 1 (Mar. 2004): 89-107.
- _____. "'Why Should You Be So Furious?' The Violence of the Pequot War." *JAH* 85, no. 3 (Dec. 1998): 876-909.
- Kerber, Linda K. "The Republican Ideology of the Revolutionary Generation." *American Quarterly* 37, no. 4 (Autumn 1985): 474-95.
- Kirby, Ethyn W. "The Quakers' Efforts to Secure Civil and Religious Liberty, 1660-96." *JMH* 7, no. 4 (Dec. 1935): 401-21.
- Knollenberg, Bernhard. "Benjamin Franklin and the Hutchinson and Oliver Letters." *Yale University Library Gazette* 47, no. 1 (1972): 1-09.
- Koch, Adrienne. "Pragmatic Wisdom and the American Enlightenment." *WMQ* 18, no. 3 (Jul. 1961): 313-29.
- Kramnick, Isaac. "Augustan Politics and English Historiography: The Debate on the English Past, 1730-35." *History and Theory* 6, no. 1 (1967): 33-56.
- Labaree, Leonard. "The Nature of American Loyalism." *AAS Proc.*, new ser., 54

(Apr. 1944): 15-58.

- Larkin, Edward. "Seeing through Language: Narrative, Portraiture, and Character in Peter Oliver's *The Origin & Progress of the American Rebellion*." *Early American Literature* 36, no. 3 (Dec. 2001): 427-54.
- Laslett, Peter. "The English Revolution and Locke's 'Two Treatises of Government.'" *Cambridge Historical Journal* 12, no. 1 (1956): 40-55.
- Lax, John, and William Pencak. "The Knowles Riot and the Crisis of the 1740s in Massachusetts." *Perspectives in American History* 10 (1976): 163-214.
- Leach, Douglas E. "Benjamin Batten and the *London Gazette* Report on King Philip's War." *NEQ* 36, no. 4 (Dec. 1963): 502-17.
- Lebovics, Herman. "The Uses of America in Locke's Second Treatise of Government." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 47, no. 4 (Oct. 1986): 567-81.
- Lepore, Jill. "Dead Men Tell No Tales: John Sassamon and the Fatal Consequences of Literacy." *American Quarterly* 46, no. 4 (Dec. 1994): 479-512.
- Levin, David. "Cotton Mather's Declaration of Gentlemen and Thomas Jefferson's Declaration of Independence." *NEQ* 50, no. 3 (Sept. 1977): 509-14.
- Lewis, Theodore B. "A Revolutionary Tradition, 1689-1774: 'There Was a Revolution Here as Well as in England.'" *NEQ* 46, no. 3 (Sept. 1973): 424-38.
- _____. "Royal Government in New Hampshire and the Revocation of the Charter of Massachusetts, 1679-1683." *Historical New Hampshire* 25, no. 4 (1970): 3-38.
- Lucas, Paul R. "Colony or Commonwealth: Massachusetts Bay, 1661-1666." *WMQ* 24, no. 1 (Jan. 1967): 88-107.
- Lundberg, David, and Henry F. May. "The Enlightened Reader in America." *American Quarterly* 28, no. 2 (Sum. 1976): 262-93.
- Maier, Pauline. "Popular Uprisings and Civil Authority in Eighteenth-Century America." *WMQ* 27, no. 1 (Jan. 1970): 3-35.
- Mayo, Lawrence S. "Governor Hutchinson's Own Copies of his *History of Massachusetts-Bay*." *CSM Transactions* 28 (1930-1933): 438-46.
- _____. "Thomas Hutchinson and his *History of Massachusetts Bay*." *AAS Proc.*, new ser., 41 (Oct. 1931): 321-39.

- McCoy, Drew R. "Benjamin Franklin's Vision of a Republican Political Economy for America." *WMQ* 35, no. 4 (Oct. 1978): 605-28.
- McKirdy, Charles R. "A Bar Divided: The Lawyers of Massachusetts and the American Revolution." *American Journal of Legal History* 16, no. 3 (Jul. 1972): 205-14.
- McLoughlin, William G. "Anne Hutchinson Reconsidered." *Rhode Island History* 49, no. 1 (1991): 13-25.
- Messer, Peter C. "From a Revolutionary History to a History of Revolution: David Ramsay and the American Revolution." *JER* 22, no. 2 (Sum. 2002): 205-233.
- Meyer, D. H. "The Uniqueness of the American Enlightenment." *American Quarterly*, 28, no. 2 (Sum. 1976): 165-86.
- Miller, Guy H. "Rebellion in Zion: The Overthrow of the Dominion of New England." *Historian* 30, no. 3 (1968): 439-59.
- Moore, LeRoy, Jr. "Roger Williams and the Historians." *Church History* 32, no. 4 (1963): 432-51.
- Morgan, Edmund S. "The Case against Anne Hutchinson." *NEQ* 10, no. 4 (Dec. 1937): 635-49.
- Morris, Richard B. "Legalism versus Revolutionary Doctrine in New England." *NEQ* 4, no. 2 (Apr. 1931): 195-215.
- Morrison, Kenneth M. "The Bias of Colonial Law: English Paranoia and the Abenaki Area of King Philip's War, 1675-1678." *NEQ* 53, no. 3 (Sept. 1980): 363-87.
- Murdock, Kenneth B. "Clio in the Wilderness: History and Biography in Puritan New England." *Early American Literature* 6 (1972): 201-19.
- _____. "William Hubbard and the Providential Interpretation of History." *AAS Proc.*, new ser., 52 (1942): 34-35.
- Murrin, John M. "The Myths of Colonial Democracy and Royal Decline in Eighteenth-Century America: A Review Essay." *Cithara* 5, no. 1 (1965): 53-69.
- Nash, Gary. "The Transformation of Urban Politics, 1700-1765." *JAH* 60, no. 3 (Dec. 1973): 605-32.
- Nelson, Anne K. "King Philip's War and the Hubbard-Mather Rivalry." *WMQ* 27, no. 4 (Oct. 1970): 615-29.

- Nelson, Jeffrey M. "Ideology in Search of a Context: Eighteenth-Century British Political Thought and the Loyalists of the American Revolution." *Historical Journal* 20, no. 3 (1977): 741-49.
- Nelson, William E. "The Legal Restraints of Power in Pre-Revolutionary America: Massachusetts as a Case Study, 1760-1775." *American Journal of Legal History* 18, no. 1 (Jan. 1974): 1-32.
- Nicolson, Colin. "Governor Francis Bernard, the Massachusetts Friends of Government, and the Advent of the Revolution." *MHS Proc.* 103 (1991): 24-113.
- Norton, Mary Beth. "The Loyalist Critique of the American Revolution." Paper presented at The Development of a Revolutionary Mentality: A Library of Congress Symposium, Washington, DC, 1972.
- _____. "The Loyalists' Image of England, Ideal and Reality." *Albion* 3, no. 2 (Sum. 1971): 62-71.
- Olson, Alison G. "Eighteenth-Century Colonial Legislatures and the Constituents." *JAH* (Sept. 1992): 543-67.
- _____. "Rhode Island, Massachusetts, and the Question of Religious Diversity in Colonial New England." *NEQ* 65, no. 1 (Mar. 1992): 93-116.
- Outram, Dorinda. "'Mere Words': Enlightenment, Revolution, and Damage Control." *JMH* 63, no. 2 (Jun. 1991): 327-40.
- Park, Charles E. "Puritans and Quakers." *NEQ* 27, no. 1 (Mar. 1954): 53-74.
- Payne, Daniel G. "Defending against the Indefensible: Spectral Evidence at the Salem Witchcraft Trials." *Essex Institute Historical Collections* 129, no. 1 (1993): 62-83.
- Pencak, William. "The Martyrology of Thomas Hutchinson: Family and Public Life." *NEHGR* 136 (Oct. 1982): 279-93.
- _____. "The Revolt against Gerontocracy: Genealogy and the Massachusetts Revolution." *National Genealogical Society Quarterly* 66 (1978): 291-304.
- _____. "Thomas Hutchinson's Fight against Naval Impressment." *NEHGR* 132 (Jan. 1978): 25-36.

- Pestana, Carla G. "The City upon a Hill under Siege: The Puritan Perception of the Quaker Threat to Massachusetts Bay, 1656-1661." *NEQ* 56, no. 3 (Sept. 1983): 323-53.
- _____. "The Quaker Executions as Myth and History." *JAH* 80, no. 2 (Sept. 1993): 441-69.
- Pope, Robert G. "New England versus the New England Mind: The Myth of Declension." *Journal of Social History* 3 (1969): 95-108.
- Pulsipher, Jenny H. "Massacre at Hurtleberry Hill: Christian Indians and English Authority in Metacom's War." *WMQ* 53, no. 3 (Jul. 1996): 459-86.
- _____. "'Subjects . . . Unto the Same King': New England Indians and the Use of Royal Political Power." *Massachusetts Historical Review* 5 (2003): 29-57.
- Ranlet, Philip. "Another Look at the Causes of King Philip's War." *NEQ* 61, no. 1 (Mar. 1988): 79-100.
- Reid, John P. "'In Our Contracted Sphere': The Constitutional Contract, the Stamp Act Crisis, and the Coming of the American Revolution." *Columbia Law Review* 76, no. 1 (Jan. 1976): 21-47.
- Remer, Rosalind. "Old Lights and New Money: A Note on Religion, Economics, and the Social Order in 1740 Boston." *WMQ* 47, no. 4 (Oct. 1990): 566-73.
- Rogers, Daniel T. "Republicanism: The Career of a Concept." *JAH* 79, no. 1 (Jun. 1992): 11-38.
- Russell, Peter E. "The Massachusetts Superior Court and the American Revolution: The Professionalization of a Judicial Elite, 1740-1775." *Men and Nature: Proceedings of the Canadian Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies* 1 (1982): 109-18.
- Sabine, Lorenzo. "Thomas Hutchinson." In *Biographical Sketches of Loyalists of the American Revolution, with an Historical Essay*, vol. 1, 558-60. Port Washington: Kennikat Press, 1864; 1966.
- Salisbury, Neal. "Red Puritans: The 'Praying Indians' of Massachusetts Bay and John Eliot." *WMQ* 33, no. 1 (Jan. 1974): 31-60.
- Sargent, Mark L. "The Conservative Covenant: The Rise of the Mayflower Compact in American Myth." *NEQ* 61, no. 2 (Jun. 1988): 233-51.
- _____. "Thomas Hutchinson, Ezra Stiles, and the Legend of the Regicides." *WMQ* 49, no. 3 (Jul. 1992): 431-48.

- Schnorrenberg, Barbara B. "An Opportunity Missed: Catharine Macaulay on the Revolution of 1688." *Studies in Eighteenth-Century Culture* 20 (1990): 231-40.
- Schutz, John A. "Succession Politics in Massachusetts, 1730-1741." *WMQ* 15, no. 4 (Oct. 1958): 508-20.
- Schworer, Lois G. "Locke, Lockean Ideas, and the Glorious Revolution." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 51, no. 4 (Oct. 1990): 531-48.
- Scobey, David M. "Revising the Errand: New England's Ways and the Puritan Sense of the Past." *WMQ* 41, no. 1 (Jan. 1984): 3-31.
- Shalev, Eran. "Ancient Masks, American Fathers: Classical Pseudonyms during the American Revolution and Early Republic." *JER* 23, no. 2 (Sum. 2003): 151-72.
- . "Empire Transformed: Britain in the American Classical Imagination, 1758-1783." *Early American Studies: An Interdisciplinary Journal* 4, no. 1 (2006): 112-46.
- Shalhope, Robert E. "Republicanism and Early American Historiography." *WMQ* 39, no. 2 (Apr. 1982): 334-56.
- . "Toward a Republican Synthesis: The Emergence of an Understanding of Republicanism in American Historiography." *WMQ* 29, no. 1 (Jan. 1972): 49-80.
- Shaw, Peter. "Fathers, Sons, and the Ambiguities of Revolution in 'My Kinsman, Major Molineux.'" *NEQ* 49, no. 4 (Dec. 1976): 559-76.
- Shoemaker, Nancy. "How Indians Got to be Red." *AHR* 102, no. 3 (Jun. 1997): 625-44.
- Silva, Alan J. "Increase Mather's 1693 Election Sermon: Rhetorical Innovation and the Reimagination of Puritan Authority." *Early American Literature* 34, no. 1 (1999): 48-77.
- Simmons, Richard C. "The Massachusetts Charter of 1691." In *Contrast and Connection: Bicentennial Essays in Anglo-American History*, edited by H. C. Allen and Roger Thompson, 66-87. London: G. Bell, 1976.
- Steele, Ian K. "Communicating an English Revolution to the Colonies, 1688-1689." *JBS* 24, no. 3 (Jul. 1985): 333-57.

- _____. "Governors or Generals?: A Note on Martial Law and the Revolution of 1689 in English America." *WMQ* 46, no. 2 (Apr. 1989): 304-14.
- _____. "Origins of Boston's Revolutionary Declaration of 18 April 1689." *NEQ* 62, no. 1 (Mar. 1989): 75-81.
- Straka, Gerald M. "Sixteen Eighty-Eight as the Year One: Eighteenth-Century Attitudes toward the Glorious Revolution." *Studies in Eighteenth-Century Culture* 1 (1971): 143-67.
- Tucker, Bruce. "The Reinterpretation of Puritan History in Provincial New England." *NEQ* 54, no. 4 (Dec. 1981): 481-98.
- _____. "The Reinvention of New England, 1691-1770." *NEQ* 59, no. 3 (Sept. 1986): 315-40.
- Van de Wetering, John. "Thomas Prince's Chronological History." *WMQ* 18, no. 4 (Oct. 1961): 546-57.
- Van Doren, Carl. "Thomas Hutchinson and the Framing of the Albany Pan of Union, 1754." *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 74, no. 1 (Jan. 1950): 5-42.
- Vaughan, Alden T. "From White Man to Redskin: Changing Anglo-American Perceptions of the American Indian." *AHR* 87, no. 4 (Oct. 1982): 917-53.
- _____. "Pequots and Puritans: The Causes of the War of 1637." *WMQ* 21, no. 2 (Apr. 1964): 256-69.
- _____. "A Test of Puritan Justice." *NEQ* 38, no. 3 (Sept. 1965): 331-39.
- Walett, Francis G. "The Massachusetts Council, 1766-1774: The Transformation of a Conservative Institution." *WMQ* 6, no. 4 (Win. 1949): 605-27.
- Waters, John J., and John A. Schutz. "Patterns of Massachusetts Colonial Politics: The Writs of Assistance and the Rivalry between the Otis and Hutchinson Families." *WMQ* 24, no. 4 (Oct. 1967): 543-67.
- Webb, Stephen S. "The Trials of Sir Edmund Andros." In *The Human Dimensions of Nation Making: Essays on Colonial and Revolutionary America*, edited by James K. Martin, 23-53. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1976.
- Weiss, Roger W. "The Issue of Paper Money in the American Colonies, 1720-1774." *Journal of Economic History* 30, no. 4 (Dec. 1970): 770-84.
- _____. "Who Shall Rule at Home: The American Revolution as a Crisis of

- Legitimacy for the Colonial Elite." *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 6, no. 4 (Spr. 1976): 679-700.
- Westerkamp, Marilyn J. "Puritan Patriarchy and the Problem of Revelation." *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 23, no. 3 (Win. 1993): 571-95.
- Wilson, Judith A. "My Country Is My Colony: A Study of Anglo-American Patriotism, 1739-1760." *Historian* 30, no. 3 (May 1968): 333-49.
- Wilson, Kathleen. "Inventing Revolution: 1688 and Eighteenth-Century Popular Politics." *JBS* 28, no. 4 (Oct. 1989): 349-86.
- Winship, Michael P. "'The Most Glorious Church in the World': The Unity of the Godly in Boston, Massachusetts in the 1630s." *JBS* 39, no. 1 (Jan. 2000): 71-98.
- . "Were There Any Puritans in New England?" *NEQ* 74, no. 1 (Mar. 2001): 118-38.
- Wood, Gordon S. "Conspiracy and the Paranoid Style: Causality and Deceit in the Eighteenth Century." *WMQ* 39, no. 3 (Jul. 1982): 401-41.
- . "Rhetoric and Reality in the American Revolution." *WMQ* 23, no. 1 (Jan. 1966): 3-32.
- Zemsky, Robert M. "Power, Influence, and Status: Leadership Patterns in the Massachusetts Assembly, 1740-1755." *WMQ* 26, no. 4 (Oct. 1969): 502-20.
- Zobel, Hiller B. "Newer Light on the Boston Massacre." *AAS Proc.* 78, no. 1 (1968): 119-28.
- Zuckerman, Michael W. "The Fabrication of Identity in Early America." *WMQ* 34, no. 2 (Apr. 1977): 183-214.

THESES

- Cheng, Eileen Ka-May. "American Historical Thought and the American Revolution, 1784-1850." PhD diss., Yale University, 1998.
- Cole, Thomas P. "History and Historical Consciousness in Colonial British America: A Study in the Construction of Provincial Culture. PhD diss., Johns Hopkins University, 1993.
- Egan, James F. "Ideology and the Study of American Culture: Early New England Writing and the Idea of Experience." PhD diss., University of California, Santa Barbara, 1991.

- Freiberg, Malcolm. "Prelude to Purgatory: Thomas Hutchinson in Massachusetts Politics, 1760-1770." PhD diss., Brown University, 1950.
- Gilbert, Leslee K. "The American Enlightenment: Science, Politics, and the Religion of Reason." PhD diss., University of Kentucky, 1998.
- Lewis, Theodore B., Jr. "Massachusetts and the Glorious Revolution, 1660-1692." PhD diss., University of Wisconsin, 1967.
- Messer, Peter C. "Stories of Independence: Eighteenth-Century Narratives." PhD diss., Rutgers, 1997.
- Nicolson, Colin. "The Friends of Government: Loyalism, Ideology and Politics in Revolutionary Massachusetts, 1765-1776." PhD diss., University of Edinburgh, 1988.
- Patterson, Stephen E. "A History of Political Parties in Revolutionary Massachusetts, 1770-1780." PhD diss., University of Wisconsin at Madison, 1968.
- Patton, Jack T. "The Beat of a Different Drummer: The Loyalists in American Historiography." MA thesis, California State University, Fresno, 1993.
- Potter, Janice C. "Is This the Liberty We Seek? Loyalist Ideology in Colonial New York and Massachusetts." PhD diss., Queen's University at Kingston, Canada, 1978.
- Thomas, Leslie J. "Partisan Politics in Massachusetts during Governor Bernard's Administration, 1760-1770." PhD diss., University of Wisconsin, 1960.
- Tyler, John W. "The First Revolution: Boston Merchants and the Acts of Trade, 1760-1774." PhD diss., Princeton University, 1980.
- Walmsley, Andrew S. "Thomas Hutchinson and the Decline of Royal Government in Massachusetts." PhD diss., University of Houston, 1996.
- Wood, Timothy L. "Agents of Wrath, Sowers of Discord: Authority and Dissent in Puritan Massachusetts, 1630-1655." Ph.D. diss., Marquette University, 2002.
- Zorea, Isaac D. "The Colonial Charter of Massachusetts: Flint for Revolution." MA Thesis, San Jose State University, 1997.