
A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php

ARTICLE V.

REVIEW OF PALFREY'S HISTORY OF NEW ENGLAND.[1]

BY REV. RALPH EMERSON, D. D., FORMERLY PROFESSOR OF ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY, ANDOVER, MASS.

MANY will unite with us in the belief that any good history of New England is better for the great purposes of Christian education than any other uninspired literature. By Christian education we mean, not simply the acquisition of knowledge, however diversified and important, nor simply the right training of the intellect, but also and chiefly the right training of the heart and the shaping of the grand principles and purposes of life; in a word, it is such a training as is best fitted to form immortal minds for all the purposes for which God has made them. If one is to form himself for splendid military achievements, let him adopt, like Charles XII. of Sweden, the life of Alexander as his favorite book. But if he is to aim at a crown that will never fade, a kingdom that cannot be shaken, let him first of all select the only book of infallible instruction on the nature of that kingdom and the way to secure it, and next, the book which gives the best account of the most earnest, protracted, successful attempts ever made to emulate, not an Alexander or a Caesar, but those higher characters whose names are enrolled in the eleventh chapter of Hebrews, who out of weakness were made strong, subdued kingdoms, turned to flight the armies of the aliens, counted not their lives dear unto themselves; of whom the world was not worthy.

And where, among uninspired annals, shall we find this best book for the purpose? Where, but in the history of

[1] History of New England. By John Gorham Palfrey. Vols. I. and II., pp. 636 and 642. Boston: Little, Brown, and Company.

the early settlement of this country by the Puritans? They, of all men since the days of the Apostles, both professedly and really took the Bible without note or comment for their guide, their law, and the charter of their hopes.

It has been slanderously said of them that they instituted a theocracy. None but God himself could institute a theocracy. But while the Puritan immigrants never pretended that God ruled them by miraculous indications of his will, they did believe in the guidance of his Providence and Spirit to those who properly sought it; and they did (the most formally in the New Haven Colony) avouch the laws which God had already given in his word as their supreme guide, to be applied wherever applicable in the letter and everywhere in their spirit. And this it is — adopted and carried out so conscientiously and so long by the state, the church, the family, the individual — precisely this, that made the Puritans what they were, and their early descendants what they became.

And be it so, that they made some mistakes in applying God's laws; it was a thousand times better than to have no *higher law*. The mistakes were as nothing. And even these few mistakes now serve as warnings. It was the very experiment needed. The world had never seen the like. And for it God had reserved this vast continent, away across the wide Atlantic; and for planting it with choice seed he "sifted three kingdoms."

The experiment came at the right time. Literature, commerce, enterprise, had been roused. Constantine, thirteen centuries before, had combined church and state; and this dark and ever darkening combination of heathen and Jewish polity had for all time wrought out its warning results; results far better yet to be understood by both church and state.

But for these high purposes of Christian training we must have a just and not a false or distorted history. Yet we grieve to say, that perhaps of no other people on earth has there been more of distorted history, — absolute caricature. Now it is in the shape of low ridicule; anon it is a libel on

their motives for emigration; and then a malignant falsification of the facts; and this from the period of the base tampering with the text of Clarendon, the historian of the rebellion in England, down to our own day.

Judge, then, of our joy over every new history of the right stamp pertaining to this people. It is even greater than our bitter grief over the abortive or misguided attempts to portray those eventful scenes and rare characters. For the one, like the munition of rocks, shall stand the earthquake and the fire; the other, like the house upon the sand, will disappear at the first inundation. And in these times of research, bringing out from the treasuries things new and old, the waters shall soon overflow the hiding-places of the prevaricators. How marvellously, for instance, has the unveiling of the corruptions of the text of Clarendon, about one age ago, reversed the moral estimate of the reading world in regard to Cromwell. No longer detested as a hypocrite, bigot, fanatic, and ambitious usurper, "damned to everlasting fame," he is now lauded by multitudes as among the truest of patriots as well as the greatest of generals.

The lessons of experience cannot easily be overestimated. They may be perverted, or imperfectly taught, and then they may only "lead to bewilder." Or they may be relied on to accomplish by their own force what nothing but the Almighty grace of the divine Spirit can effect, the renovation of the heart of sinful man. But as *a means* to this most exalted end, and as a moral cause to all other high ends in human society, where is the man that has exaggerated their importance?

The teachings of experience are alike important to man in every relation of life. From the necessity of the case, human society at its commencement, was destitute of this guide; and the speedy consequence was a total wreck. Notwithstanding the tremendous admonitions of her Creator, the woman, *being deceived*, was in the transgression. If, in addition to this warning, her eye had been directed to the fatal lapse of some other being like herself, and to the executed penalty, she might not have been deceived into the

belief that she should not surely die, and so she might not have fallen. But from the hour when the curse was actually pronounced on the three offenders, sad experience has been accumulating its refutations of that first lie in Eden, and all its subsequent repetitions. And, although our race are still sinners, yet the accumulating evidence that the way of transgressors is hard, has an increasing power as a means of reformation. Knowing the terrors of the Lord we persuade men.

And so with nations. It has not been utterly in vain that the flood came and destroyed all the giants in sin by whom the earth was so early filled with violence; not utterly in vain the dispersion of the rebels at Babel, the destruction of Sodom, the drowning of Pharaoh and his hosts, the calamities brought by their sins on God's ancient people, the rise and ruin of the four kingdoms of antiquity; nor, in a word, is it in vain, nor is it to be in vain, that one form after another of national sins has risen, and all have been followed by the curse they naturally bring. Neither is it in vain that one form after another of religious error, has sprung up, flourished like the green bay tree, and passed away. Had Mohammed never blasted the earth like the sirocco of his own deserts, the Mohammedanism of our own land and age might now have been in full career towards universal domination over the lives and consciences of men. Had French atheism never had its bloody day, not simply Paris, but every capital in Christendom might now have been on the eve of a Reign of Terror. The peril might have lurked just where many a peril is now doubtless lurking to all that is precious in this world and the future — in that wily pantheism which, like the atheism of Voltaire and the Illuminati, sneers at everything Puritan, whether of doctrine, or worship, or practice, as "behind the age," and which is promising mountains of bliss to the nations, in a freedom from the Sabbath and all religious superstitions.

Or, again, if religious persecution had come only from infidels and the heathen, and neither Rome nor any other Christian power had ever lighted a fagot, what should we

now have been left to expect? Provided Austria or any other secular power shall again place the Pope in a condition to shed the blood of non-conformists, what torrents of blood might not be expected, had not experience already taught the futility and wickedness of such a course? If religious persecution is about the very worst thing in the universe, it is, at the same time, about the most plausible, aside from experience. For shall we be commended for defending ourselves with fire and sword against pirates and all who kill the body, and shall we not lift a weapon against those who would destroy both soul and body in hell? So men reasoned for a thousand years. The Puritans and some of the Dutch Protestants well-nigh learned a better logic — not persecution, but toleration — from the things that they suffered.

Nor is human experience to be consulted merely for the correction of evils. Its lessons of positive utility are alike important. They show us the best forms of civil and religious polity, the best doctrines to be taught, the best rewards and punishments to be employed in the family and the state, the best customs (as of holy days) and how to observe them, — in a word, the best education.

But how are these lessons to be gained? How, except by first having the experience itself correctly given? Erroneously reported, it is worse than nothing; a lie instead of the truth; a traitor instead of a safe guide.

Again, then, do we say we exult over any good history of important transactions, and above all over a good history of such a people as the New England Puritans; a history fraught with important experiences beyond that of any other people since the dispersion of the Jewish nation.

Has, then, Dr. Palfrey here given us such a history? Joyfully and emphatically we answer *yes;* so far as it extends. It covers, as yet, but the first forty-seven years, but this is by far the most important period, because the forming period. Dr. Palfrey is indeed a Unitarian, and has ever dwelt in the very centre of American Unitarianism, and has been promoted to the highest stations in the gift of his denomination, first

as a clergyman in Boston, and then as professor at Cambridge. But notwithstanding his position and his creed, he has here given us not only a most candid and truthful history of our forefathers, but one written throughout in the most unaffected good will. He is an admirer and lover of the Puritans, though he occasionally intimates his dissent from their views. Candor, a prime attribute of any historian, is the leading trait of this work. And while we deeply regret that this lineal descendant of some of the first settlers of Plymouth, and also of Massachusetts, is not of the like precious faith with them, we can yet even doubly rejoice that such a work has come from *him;* for it will do *us* quite as much good, and may do much more good among such as differ in faith or practice from those holy men. They will be more likely both to read and believe the narrative. Its statements can now be imputed neither to prejudice nor sectarian pride.

And no more, we proceed to remark, can our author's statements be imputed to ignorance. In the public and private libraries of Cambridge, Boston, and the vicinity, he has enjoyed the best facilities for such a work, which our country affords; and he has also travelled and resided in Europe for the same end, and has even gained some new light there, from manuscripts, on our early history.

The style also is good, allowing us to think only of the matter, without compelling us to stop and exclaim: How splendid, how powerful, how poetic,—or, How obscure, how transcendental, how mystified, how barbarous! Of course the author takes care of his style, but he *seems* to care no more for it than the sleeping infant for the manner of its breathing, or the serene lake for its transparency. We think it quite as good as Prescott's, because equally pure, and clear, and concise, and even more natural; and, for history, though not for oratory, better than that of Scott or Macaulay. Whether his style is chiefly the result of care, or chiefly of correct early taste fostered by classic studies and classic intercourse, we presume it now costs him vastly less labor than the transcendentalists bestow in burying so deep what-

ever thoughts they may have. And yet he is at an equal remove from those careless writers who commit a solecism on every page, or worse yet, those who affect carelessness, or delight in odd and obsolete expressions, like *either* in the sense of *each*.

We rejoice in being able to speak thus favorably of the work, on so many important points; and we should have rejoiced still more to see the inward, spiritual life of the Puritans as distinctly, if not as extensively, set forth as their political and social life; we mean their religious experience. We should have liked, much, to see just how they felt, and what they thought, in view of God, sin, holiness, duty, death, the judgment, salvation, and condemnation. And all this, not, to be sure, by any labored description of the author, but chiefly, as his manner is, by quotations from their own writings. And nothing would be easier than to collect such religious experiences from the writings of these men. From some other classes, the task would be more difficult; but the Puritans tell us, freely, how they felt under conviction of sin, amid the fervors of first love and hope, in hours of despondency or bereavement, on returning from backsliding, in anxiety for the salvation of their friends and of the whole world, and when descending to the grave. If, for instance, we would know how their religion sustained them in perils of the sea, we have Bradford's wonderful account of himself during his perilous passage from England to Holland, which, with characteristic modesty, he gives as though of another.

And now, what if some do not believe in such experience, and even feel nothing but disgust at the rehearsal; shall their unbelief exclude the whole from history? or throw it into the shade? Much rather, especially in our incredulous age, let it exclude the whole of witchcraft, if either. And be it so, that their experience *was* but an idle fancy (we shudder at the horrid words); even supposing that all was delusion and fanaticism; it was yet a great moral cause in history, a fundamental cause, that has turned the world upside down — just as it had often done before. This belief in the Puritan

bosom was real, and the feeling real, whatever the ground for it; and the result, one of the most important and cumulative which human society has ever experienced. If the external life of the Puritan, the part he acted in the world, is important to be known, no less so is his internal life, which was the source and support of the external. If we would know what the Puritan was, it is equally important to know what made him such. This is, alike, the voice of the philosopher and the theologian; just as we would know what has made the Mohammedan what he is, and Mohammedan society what it is; and so of the papist, and papal society.

But as we would here have an enlargement of the work (which we hope Dr. Palfrey will readily give, in another edition), so, on the other hand, would we cheerfully submit to a curtailment of the history pertaining to that portion of the Puritans that remained in England; submit, we say, for it is all interesting enough; though much less of it would, perhaps, have sufficiently shown the connection between the two portions; and so of the very minute facts in the discussions of the united colonies with each other, a more general statement would have sufficed. This last remark is particularly applicable to the second volume, where the reader cannot feel so deep an interest in minute details, as in the earlier transactions. The contention between Massachusetts and Connecticut, about levying duties on goods passing up the river to Springfield, is an instance.

The accuracy of some small things may be questioned, especially in the early part of the first volume. But what properly constitutes the history, we think as remarkable for its accuracy as its candor. To a greater extent than any other historian we can name, Dr. Palfrey interweaves, in his narrative, the very language of his authorities, especially where they belong to the founders of New England; thus giving us, at once, a visible proof of his accuracy, and often almost a sight of those venerable men — such being the godly simplicity with which they wrote, and such the skill with which he has gracefully combined their words and sentences with his own. An admirable passage of this kind gives us,

mostly in the words of Gov. Bradford, an account of the motives which induced the pilgrims to leave Holland for this country. In what we retain, the words of Bradford are put in half-quotations.

"There can be," says our author, "no more generous ambition than is disclosed in these affecting words. Unenterprising villagers at first, habituated at length to a new home, and able to earn a decent living by humble drudgery, some of them now sinking into age, they turn their thoughts to posterity. With a patriotic yearning, they desire to extend the dominion of the native country which refuses to give them a peaceable home on its broad lands. And, through the hardships of a long voyage and an unknown continent, they propose to be missionaries to the heathen."

"The project occasioned much discussion. The cost of the voyage would exceed any means in their possession. — Arrived at its end, they would 'be liable to famine and nakedness, and the want, in a manner, of all things, with sore sicknesses.' Appalling reports had reached them, of the ferocity and treachery of the savage people; their hard experience, in the removal ten years before, was not forgotten; and the ill success of the earlier attempts at settlement, in Maine and in Virginia, was a heavy discouragement."

"On the other hand, they considered 'that all great and honorable actions were accompanied with great difficulties, and must be both enterprised and overcome with answerable courages. — True it was, that such attempts were not to be made and undertaken but upon good ground and reason, not rashly or lightly, as many have done, for curiosity or hope of gain. But their condition was not ordinary. Their ends were good and honorable; their calling lawful and urgent. And therefore they might expect the blessing of God in their proceeding. Yea, though they should lose their lives in this action, yet they might have comfort in the same, and their endeavors would be honorable.' It is a genuine and trustworthy heroism which can reason thus. They pondered, debated, fasted, and prayed, and came to the conclusion to remove."

Such were the motives which induced these good men first to leave their own country and then that of their temporary sojourn, for their final residence. Our author has much more, to the same effect, in divers passages, in regard to the Plymouth settlers and those of Massachusetts, Connecticut, and New Haven. The motives of all were substantially alike; and more emphatically in regard to the great matters of religious freedom for themselves, and the spread of Christian civilization among the natives. And yet such a man as our own Prescott, in his history of the Spanish conquests in America, has suffered himself to draw a parallel in favor of the Spanish conquerors, to the disparagement of the Puritans. Those Romanists, according to Mr. Prescott, came to spread Christianity, the Bible, and literature generally; but these Protestants came — for what? to get a living for themselves and their children! to get rich! Precisely the contrary, especially as regards the chief motives of the Puritans. This our author, without alluding to Mr. Prescott, has shown, and might have shown still more abundantly, from the most trustworthy sources. Their private letters, their public memorials, nay their very charters from the king, carefully specify the spread of Christianity among the heathen, as a very prominent motive for their coming to this country. And their whole subsequent conduct bears the most ample testimony to their sincerity, and perseverance, and success, in their declared purpose. — True, indeed, the spread of the Roman Catholic forms of worship among the Indians, was an incessant object of pursuit by the sons of Loyola and St. Francis, as they accompanied the Spanish armies; and their success, aided by the Spanish arms, was unquestionable. But, while Elliot early translated the whole Bible into the Indian language, and he and his coadjutors assiduously taught the natives to read and understand it, and teach it to their countrymen, where are the proofs of anything like it in the Catholic priests? But our object in this brief digression is, not to inculpate the Spaniards, but to exculpate the memory of our ancestors, so strangely and unjustly assailed. If worldly advantages had been their chief object, how could they have

resisted the splendid allurements simultaneously spread before them for emigration to the Hudson, on the one hand, and to the Orinoco on the other? Speaking of the large offers of the Dutch to them, Winslow says: "they would freely have transported us and furnished every family with cattle," etc. These "proposals were perseveringly renewed," and must have come with peculiar power to the poor emigrants in Holland, who possessed not the means for their own outfit and removal. And the chivalric Sir Walter Raleigh, who had sailed up the Orinoco some twenty years before, had given a glowing description of Guiana, to which some of these Puritans were even disposed to emigrate. "We passed," says Sir Walter, as quoted by Dr. Palfrey, "the most beautiful country that mine eyes ever beheld. — I never saw a more beautiful country, nor more lively prospects. — There is no country which yieldeth more pleasures to the inhabitants. — For health, good air, pleasure, and riches, I am resolved it cannot be equalled by any region, either in the east or west."

But these hardy and conscientious lovers of civil and religious freedom preferred a more independent situation away from the Dutch, and the vicinity of the Spaniards, and from a tropical climate.

Such were the men, and such the motives for the perils before them. From the love of adventure, or the love of gain, others had before attempted settlements on our inhospitable shores; but neither the romance nor the prospect of gain enabled them long to confront the actual perils and privations. They lacked the one thing needful, the stern self-denial and indomitable perseverance that spring from the unshaken faith in God, and the pure and far-reaching love to their posterity and to the whole world, which glowed in the breasts of the Puritans. This broad distinction between the two classes of adventurers to our shores, was soon visible even to the mere worldly merchants of London, who loaned them money, and to the Episcopal adversaries of the Puritans, divers of whom had a pecuniary interest in the settlement of New England. "Neither the Virginia company, nor the London adventurers

as a body, nor especially the Council for New England, would have preferred to employ Separatists in founding a colony, and giving value to their land. But the option was not theirs. At the moment, no other description of persons was disposed to confront the anticipated hardships, and none could be relied upon like them to carry the business through. This was well understood on both sides to be the motive for the engagement that was made." (I. 216.)

If the above representations are just, it is simply preposterous to impute worldly motives to the Plymouth settlers as the chief cause of their removal to this country. And equally preposterous it is to impute such motives to the original settlers of Massachusetts Bay. These, unlike the weary and impoverished, yet still strong-hearted Pilgrims in Holland, came, some ten years later, directly from England, where most of the leading minds were in the enjoyment of all that heart could wish, — wealth, reputation, office, benefices, powerful friends and relatives, — all, we say, except the freedom to worship God, and preach his gospel according to what they believed the dictates of his word. It was for this freedom, and to plant the gospel here, and not from any worldly motive whatever, that they bade farewell to their dear Old England. And the same is equally true of the emigrants to New Haven, several of whom were even more affluent while in England. And of the party generally, our author says: "The Puritanism of the first forty years of the seventeenth century was not tainted with degrading or ungraceful associations of any sort. The rank, the wealth, the chivalry, the genius, the learning, the accomplishments, the social refinements and elegance of the time, were largely represented in their ranks. Not to speak of Scotland, where soon Puritanism had few opponents in the class of the high-born and the educated, the severity of Elizabeth scarcely restrained, in her latter days, its predominance among the most exalted orders of her subjects." (I. 279.)

On the character of the clergy in the reign of Elizabeth, the following will be read with much interest by all who wish more perfectly to understand the moral and religious

state of the church of England when the Puritans left it, and when the best of her clergy were already displaced by the Act of Uniformity. The passage has also a special interest in being just brought forth into the light by the researches of Dr. Palfrey, and embraces the period when the early settlers of New England were just coming upon the stage of life.

"In Dr. Williams's Library, in Red-Cross Street, London, I fell upon a curious collection, in three manuscript volumes, of old letters and various other pieces. Among them are two papers entitled, respectively, 'Lamentable Estate of the Ministers in Staffordshire,' and, 'View of the State of the Churches in Cornwall.' The former is without date, but I believe there is no hesitation about referring it to the latter half of the reign of Elizabeth. It consists of a full list of Staffordshire parishes, with the names and character of their ministers attached. It closes with this summary: 'So that there be one hundred and eighteen congregations served by laymen; by scandelous, forty.' 'Lewd,' 'a bad liver,' 'of scandalous life,' 'very ignorant,' 'drunkard,' 'a common drunkard,' 'a gamester,' are entries continually occurring against the clerical names. One minister is a 'weaver,' having been a gentleman's household servant many years; 'one is very famous for his skill in gaming, and especially in bowling.' The Cornwall record, which bears the date of 1586, has such descriptions of the clergymen named in it as these: 'a man careless of his calling,' 'a very lewd man,' 'a dicer,' 'a very lewd fellow,' 'a pot companion,' 'a good carder and dicer, both night and day,' 'a common ale-house haunter, and gamester,' 'his conversation is most in hounds,' 'he was late a serving-man.' One is qualified as 'a common dicer, and burned in the hand for felony, and full of all iniquity;' one is 'the best wrestler in Cornwall;' another, 'a very bad man.' Very few are favorably represented. There is also a petition of the same period, from the people of Cornwall to the Parliament 'gathered together by the Queen's Majesty's appointment, to look to the wants, to behold the miseries, the ruins, decays, and dissolutions of the

church of God, and Commonwealth of the Realm of England.' The petitioners say: 'We have about eightscore churches, the greatest part of which places is supplied by men who, through their ignorance and negligence, are guilty of the sin of sins, — of the sin of soul-murder. Some are fornicators, some adulterers, some felons, bearing in their hands the marks for the same offence, ... some drunkards, some quarrellers, some spotted with whoredom, and some with more loathsome and abominable crimes than these.'

"Such representations confirm the complaints which reach us from that time, through various channels, of the wretched provision which remained for the service of the churches, when hundreds of exemplary clergymen were displaced by the Act of Uniformity. According to Neal, a 'survey,' laid at this time before Parliament, represented that, 'after twenty-eight years' establishment of the church of England, there were only two thousand preachers to serve near ten thousand parish churches.' " (I. 124, 125.)

Let us now look at the character of the men who were compelled to give place to such men as these. The first clergymen who came to New England were among the best the world has ever seen, whether for learning, piety, self-denial, courage, sound judgment, or pastoral labor. Most of them were educated at Cambridge in England, and had distinguished themselves as preachers and pastors in the church of England till compelled to flee their country, or else to practise conformity to rites which they could no longer conscientiously observe. A considerable number of them were from Emanuel College; but whether their special illumination was derived from the College, or from other luminaries in more private spheres in that region, we cannot say. A large portion of the early emigrants, including the Plymouth settlers, were from the east of England, and not far from the University. The whole number of the English, old and young, in Massachusetts, toward the close of 1632, is said to have been about two thousand. Speaking of the year 1633, Dr. Palfrey says: "Several parties of colonists now arrived at Boston, in one of which came John Haynes, an

opulent landholder of the county of Essex, and three famous divines, Thomas Hooker, Samuel Stone, and John Cotton. They were men of eminent capacity and sterling character, fit to be concerned in the founding a state. In all its generations of worth and refinement, Boston has never seen an assembly more illustrious for generous qualities, or for manly culture, than when the magistrates of the young colony welcomed Cotton and his fellow voyagers at Winthrop's table." (I. 367.)

Cotton came from Boston in England, five miles from the eastern coast, a city of twice the commercial importance of London in the thirteenth century. "Its name was derived from its ancient church of St. Botolph, perhaps the most stately parish church in England, a cathedral in size and beauty. It was from this superb temple that John Cotton came to preach the gospel within the mud walls and under the thatched roof of the meetinghouse in a rude New England hamlet. He was rector of St. Botolph's for nearly twenty years before Winthrop's emigration to America. The son of a barrister in easy circumstances, he had been successively an undergraduate at Trinity College, and a Fellow and Tutor at Emanuel College, in the University of Cambridge, where he had acquired a distinguished reputation for ability and learning. In Boston, his professional labors had been of astonishing amount, and the sanctity and mingled force and amiableness of his character had won for him a vast influence. At the departure of Winthrop's company, he made a journey to take leave of them at Southampton. The Lord Keeper, Williams, his diocesan, was his personal friend, and desired to deal gently with his non-conformity. But the Archbishop was not to be eluded. The dogs of the High Commission Court were set upon Cotton, and with difficulty he escaped to London, where for a time he was concealed by John Davenport, then vicar of St. Stephen's, and by other friends. His design to get out of the kingdom was suspected, and pursuivants were sent to arrest him and Hooker at the Isle of Wight, where it was supposed he would embark. But they went on board in the

Downs, and, avoiding discovery, arrived at their destination." (I. 365—9.)

As an instance of the absurd things occasionally alleged in our day about the Puritan emigrants, we may here just notice the affirmation, sometimes met with, that "they were not driven from England by the sword of persecution. No one wished them gone." Ah! to be sure;—and true it is, indeed, to the letter! Nor is this half the truth. Prelacy would not even suffer them to go. Like a spectre she flitted along the desolate shores of Lincolnshire, to interpose with her naked sword, at midnight, between the boat of the emigrant ship clandestinely hovering on the coast, and the fugitives whose presence was so much desired at her tribunals. No, nor did she drive away the hapless wives and children of Brewster's party, who were apprehended by her light-horsemen, while waiting for the next boat, to follow such of their husbands and sons as had already been carried on board the Dutch ship. Neither did she drive away the men who had escaped on board, and were carried off to Holland by the affrighted Dutchman, without their baggage, or even a change of raiment; far, far more gladly would she have seized them than the women whom she hurried to prison for the crime of attempting to follow them. Yes, it was literally in this full and strong sense (if in any) that Mother Church is to be exculpated from the charge of expelling the pilgrims in 1608, and Cotton and his friends in 1633.

We may remark, in passing, that we are sorry that the picturesque and thrilling account of the escape to Holland has not been transferred from Bradford to the pages of the work before us; and also the account of the sore perplexity of the authorities as to what they should do with the wives and children they had detained. To retain them in custody they found would be as expensive as it would be ungallant and cruel. Neither could they dismiss them to their homes, for no longer had they any homes to go to, nor means for subsistence. In a word, they had begun to experience the inconvenience which Sir Walter Raleigh had predicted

nearly thirty years before, while discussing the bill for the banishment of the Brownists, "who, he then feared, were nearly twenty thousand; and when they should be gone, who should maintain their wives and children?"

Another very important topic, on which Dr. Palfrey amply vindicates the character of the Puritan settlers, is the charge of religious persecution. No charge has been more frequently, or more virulently, or more ignorantly urged against them.

Suppose, however, that the charge *is* perfectly just, so far as the mere fact of persecution is involved, — what then? Are these Puritan emigrants sinners above all others of their day, for doing such things? or just as bad as the Inquisition or the Star-Chamber? Suppose they *were real* persecutors in an age when, for more than a thousand years, all sects had verily believed it not only right, but a bounden duty forcibly to suppress fatal error? what more does this prove than that they were not then so far in advance of all their contemporaries as we now are? or as the leaders in the Dutch Republic under William of Orange, had for a while become? or that the honor of completely establishing the true principles of religious freedom was not quite achieved by them?

But in any proper sense of the term, the Puritan settlers of New England were *not* persecutors. It was not their spirit nor habit. It has been said that they learned persecution of their persecutors. Just the contrary. As before remarked, they rather learned forbearance and kindness from the things they suffered. Even Roger Williams himself being judge, they deserved this meed of praise. He ever remembered with gratitude their forbearance and leniency toward himself, — though, by the way, he was not, as has been so often imagined, banished from Massachusetts for religious but for political offences. He had not even become a Baptist at the time of his banishment.

True, the Puritans, unlike some others, cared enough for their religion to defend it at any cost; but it was their most prayerful study to defend it only by such means as God and reason would approve. And they had, both by charter and

common sense, a right to exclude from their possessions whomsoever they would; just as a householder may determine who shall be the inmates of his home. And had they not, in good time, exercised the right, by excluding Episcopalians, they might well fear they should, ere long, have a bishop among them, to whom they would be required to bow, and their hard-earned liberty would all be lost. It is one thing to send away unwelcome strangers, and quite another thing to drive away the home-born from their birthright, as the pilgrims were driven from England. Says Dr. Palfrey: "where it is strictly true that two sets of people cannot live, with security, in each other's presence, it is an idle casuistry which condemns the earlier comer and the strongest possessor for insisting on the unshared occupation of his residence. — It is preposterous to maintain that, in the supposed circumstances, the right to exclude is not his, or that its exercise is not his bounden duty. And the right becomes of yet more value, and the duty more imperative and inevitable, when the good in question is one of such vast worth as religious freedom, to be protected by the possessor, not only for himself, but for the myriads, living and to be born, of whom he assumes to be the pioneer and champion." (I. 300, 301.)

What our fathers chiefly feared was the repetition, among themselves, of the revolting scenes of Munster: an outrage, alike, against religion, civil laws, and common decency. And this they had reason to fear, as the event soon proved, by the introduction of Quakers from England, where (so totally unlike their since civilized and very orderly descendants) they were now raving, alike, against the ordinances of the gospel and the forms of civil government. And with these were coupled the Anabaptists, who, it was feared, were not quite cured of the disorganizing propensities shown by the sect, at their origin, in Germany. It was against these two sects, especially, that the exclusive laws were framed. And although the language was, of course, applicable to citizens as well as strangers, they were intended, rather, against foreign fanatics than quiet citizens at home, whose only offence was religious heresy. And accordingly Dunster, the first president of Har-

vard college, who was a disbeliever in infant baptism, and Chauncy his successor, who thought immersion essential, remained unmolested, as did also William Witter, an individual in Lynn, and probably other Baptists. Indeed, we doubt whether even one citizen suffered under these laws, merely for religious heresy. From the first heresiarch that troubled Massachusetts, the strong-minded and seemingly devout antinomian, Ann Hutchinson, down to the last Quaker that was there either hung or flogged, there were few, if any, who were not guilty of civil offences. And even Roger Williams, who had been personally exiled from Massachusetts as a disturber, when he had learned a better wisdom by attempting, himself, to govern the wayward spirits who had followed him to Providence, even he came to abhor "such an infinite liberty of conscience," and to speak of the Quakers as "insufferably proud and contemptuous unto all their superiors," and "therefore that a due and moderate restraint and punishment of their incivilities, though pretending conscience, is so far from persecution, properly so called, that it is a duty and command of God unto all mankind." (I. 424.)

We have dwelt the longer on this charge of exclusiveness in the Puritans, because of the great and wide-spread importance given to it, and the very false construction often put upon the facts. We will only add, by way of further statement, that among the practical errors for which Williams was removed from the colony, was that of having "taught, publicly, that a magistrate ought not to tender an oath to an unregenerate person; for that they thereby have communion with a wicked man in the worship of God, and cause him to take the name of God in vain." (I. 410.) But who, save the Searcher of hearts, could decide for certainty, for any one, that he had met with the saving change, and so dare to administer the oath? But this politico-religious doctrine, with all its embarrassments, shake though it might the very pillars of the temple of justice, and consequently even of civil government, Williams felt himself conscientiously bound to inculcate everywhere. And for inculcating this and other strange and noxious tenets, the Puritans felt themselves just

as conscientiously bound effectually to admonish him to leave their borders. And, by the special advice of Gov. Winthrop, he left the bleaker coast of Salem for the fairer regions of the Narraganseths, where he became the founder of a new state.

Williams was a most singular man — one of the rarest compounds of worth and waywardness the world ever saw: having too much of the partisanship of a John Randolph to be either quiet, or peaceful, or happy, in a subordinate capacity, anywhere; and yet, unlike that singular politician, possessing not a little of the practical tact of his own good friend Winthrop, when placed at the head of affairs and with a heavy responsibility upon him. Dr. Palfrey's spirited sketch of his character will be read with deep interest; as will also his more extended sketch of Winthrop, in the second volume — one of the most beautiful portraits of a Christian statesman that was ever drawn. Though in different volumes, the reader will be paid for the trouble of reading them in immediate connection. These men were, in most things, perfect antipodes: one, the very type of order and practical wisdom, the other, the author of confusion and all impracticable schemes, while in a subordinate relation. How two such men could comfortably live together, is not, indeed, the question, for they could not; but how could they possibly continue for life, amid all the scenes they passed through, to esteem and love each other as they did,—this is the question and one full of interest for the rare character of the times as well as of the men. They must have been a study for each other, as they are now for the Christian philosopher. To say that both were most truly conscientious men, is but half the solution. They must, also, have appreciated highly each other's conscientious regard to duty — a habit as rare as it is precious, and one which, with our views of religious liberty, will hush the religious world to universal and perpetual peace, when it shall, itself, become universal and perpetual, as it one day will. Then there will be none to hurt or destroy, however various the forms of worship they may still observe.

And as with Winthrop, so with many others who were impelled by conscience to unite in the expulsion of Wil-

liams. It did not destroy their friendship for him, nor his for them.

The task thrown upon Williams, after his retirement from organized society, was a hard one: that of first learning to govern himself; and then to govern the ludicrously wayward assemblages that gathered themselves in his vicinity — Baptists, Quakers, Ann Hutchinson's antinomians, and such practical antinomians as thieves and sharpers; to say nothing of such ambitious spirits as Gorton. A part were lawless upon principle; and a part for the want of principle. It was a harder task than the founding of Rome, where the banditti were, at least, free from religious fanatics, that worst of all classes to govern. Williams was, perhaps, the best fitted of all men to subjugate this latter class, being himself "within drawing distance." Who could, so hopefully, attempt to curb that "infinite liberty of conscience?" As happy for his fame as for the now "gallant little state" that he founded, that he was called to the task.

But Dr. Palfrey, like others, thinks this drainage a relief to the confederated colonies. "The plantations about Narragansett Bay were, as yet, incapable of a settled government. — They served the confederacy a useful purpose. In the existing ferment of opinion in the parent country, it was to be expected that, among the emigrants to New England, there would be persons affected with all sorts of eccentric humors; and it was beneficial to the other plantations that there should be a place where such persons might conveniently collect, and gradually become quiet and wise by making their experiments where they would do little harm, except to one another. Williams, Coddington, and some of their associates, possessed qualities worthy of high esteem; but it is doing them no injustice to say, that to build solid commonwealths was not their vocation; and that, if the New England settlements had all been Providence Plantations, New England would have proved a failure." (II. 343.)

Another topic of loud complaint against our Puritans, is their supposed treatment of the Indians. But here, again, the vindication is ample. So far as appears, they system-

atically and uniformly treated the natives, not only with perfect justice, but with kindness; and that, both for this life and the future. Other persons and small communities, on our coast, were guilty of enormities, which involved the Puritans in the terrible vengeance of the ignorant natives, and finally led to the Pequot war. Many, with only a partial knowledge of the facts, have imputed blame, where only praise was due. Some newspaper writers of the present day, seem also to take it for granted that the Indians were always treated by the early settlers, as they are now treated by the pioneers on our frontier.

But as one great motive with the Puritan immigrants was to spread Christian civilization on this continent, we might well expect a just and humane treatment from them towards the savages, both as the natural prompting of the same Christian kindness, and as a means of accomplishing the pure and exalted purpose. And such were the facts. Instead of wresting from them their lands without remuneration, they were careful to seek out and fully to pay the proper claimants, wherever the depopulating pestilence had left any; and, in some cases, they paid several successive claimants, in order to avoid the very appearance of evil. The most exemplary punishment, also, was inflicted on individuals whenever detected in injuring the natives; and Sir Richard Saltonstall was ordered "to give sagamore John a hogshead of corn for the hurt his cattle did him in his corn." The utmost kindness was also shown, by Winslow and others, in nursing the Indians when deserted by their own people and perishing by small-pox or other diseases.

Nor was this just and kind treatment lost upon the Indians. Thomas Wiggin, who did not belong to either of the Puritan settlements, but had been superintendent of a plantation on the Piscataqua, wrote thus, in 1632, respecting the English in Massachusetts: "I have observed the planters there, by their loving, just, and kind dealing with the Indians, have gotten their love and respect, and drawn them to an outward conformity to the English; so that the Indians repair to the English governor there, and his deputies, for justice." (I. 362.)

An equally honorable and disinterested testimony is borne by Isaac De Rasieus, the second in authority to the Dutch governor of Fort Amsterdam, now New York, who visited the Plymouth colony in 1627. The English, he writes, "have made stringent laws and ordinances upon the subject of fornication and adultery, which laws they maintain and enforce very strictly indeed, even among the tribes which live amongst them. They speak very angrily when they hear, from the savages, that we should live so barbarously, in these respects, and without punishment. — The tribes in their neighborhood are better conducted than ours, because the English give them the example of better ordinances and a better life : and who also, to a certain degree, give them laws, by means of the respect they have, from the very first, established amongst them." (I. 227, 228.)

Nor was this kindness without its reflex benefits to the benefactors. "Massasoit, in destitution and filth, apparently at the point of death, was relieved, and at length restored to health, under the treatment of Winslow, who condescended to the most humble offices of nurse and cook. In the overflow of his gratitude, the savage revealed the existence of a plot, among the tribes scattered over the country, from Boston Bay to Martha's Vineyard, for the extirpation of the whites. The provocation was, he said, the outrages committed, by Weston's people, at Wessagusset; but the meditated destruction would include the colonists at Plymouth, because of the apprehension that they would attempt to protect or avenge their countrymen." (I. 201.) Thus an act of special kindness to a friendly chief, led to the disclosure of a combination which would probably have proved fatal to the feeble colony.

In consequence of this disclosure, was shed the first Indian blood by the Puritan settlers ; and it was on hearing the news, that Robinson, in the genuine spirit of Puritanism, wrote to them: "O how happy a thing had it been, if you had converted some before you had killed any!" And what Christian heart would not utter the same regret? But probably neither Robinson, nor any other well-balanced and well-in-

formed mind, would intend, by it, to cast any censure on the Puritans for the part they felt impelled thus to take, for their own preservation.

Dr. Palfrey though ever ready to do justice to the character of the Indians, is no such admirer of the savage state in general, or the Indian character in particular, as to praise them in any way to the unjust disparagement of the Puritans, at whose hands they received such invaluable favors, but, it must also be confessed, such severe retribution for their wanton aggressions. And he justifies even that most terrible retribution, the fatal catastrophe of the Pequot war in 1637 — a justification, in the circumstances, seemingly complete if war is ever justifiable in its aggressive form, as it doubtless is when, as in this case, it is defensive in its nature.

Dr. Palfrey quotes the following from a writer by no means prejudiced in favor of the Puritans: "An aboriginal coalition, first suggested by the Pequot chief, and afterwards carried into such terrible effect by King Philip, at this early period might have resulted in the extermination of the English, and some solitary ship, afterwards touching at Massachusetts Bay, would have beheld the stillness of the wilderness where was expected the busy hum of life, and have carried home the startling news that Transatlantic Puritanism had disappeared."

"Such," says our author, "is the just reflection of a recent writer. If I do not often refer to his interesting work (The Puritan Commonwealth), it is not for the want of a thorough acquaintance with it. It is one of the marvels of our time. But for its references to later events, it might have been written by a chaplain of James the Second. Its key note is sounded in its first sentence: When 'King Charles the Martyr,' etc. The Indians, according to this writer, were 'a race proverbial for fidelity in keeping their treaties,' etc., and for this characteristic of theirs he refers to Hutchinson, where Hutchinson had written, 'Indian fidelity is proverbial in New England, *as Punic was at Rome.*'" (I. 470.)

By omitting what we have here put in italics, the sense of the passage is completely reversed, as the reader of Ro-

man history well knows. It is proper, however, to remark, as does Dr. Palfrey, that the work contaning this and other errors, to which he refers, is posthumous, and perhaps its author would have corrected some or all of its errors, had it been published under his own eye. Still the errors are none the less injurious, and ought, in such a work, to have been corrected in notes by the editor, if he knew enough. It was a duty due alike to the subjects and the reader of the history.

In the work before us, the missionary efforts of our fathers among the Indians are very properly stated, though with hardly the particularity which their importance demands. We presume the author will give us more of the details in the sequel. In 1644, the General Court of Massachusetts ordered "that the county courts should take care that the Indians in their several shires should be civilized, and that they should have power to have them instructed in the knowledge and worship of God." And in 1646, the Court "ordered that two ministers should be chosen by the elders of the churches, every year, to be sent, with the consent of their churches, to make known the heavenly counsel of God among the Indians, in most familiar manner, by the help of some able interpreter." Upon this Dr. Palfrey remarks, that "the General Court of Massachusetts was thus the first missionary society in the history of Protestant Christendom." (II. 189.)

The first of the two volumes under review, brings down the history of New England to 1643, the year when our sagacious ancestors formed that remarkable type of our present Federal Union, "The United Colonies of New England." By one of their twelve articles of confederation, these four Puritan colonies bind themselves together in a "firm and perpetual league of friendship and amity for offence and defence, mutual advice and succor, upon all just occasions, both for preserving and propagating the truth and liberties of the Gospel, and for their own mutual safety and welfare." (I. 630.) By the sixth article provision was made for the appointment of a board to manage the business of the confederacy, to consist of two church members from each colony, with power to "determine all affairs of war or

peace." Various other important provisions are contained in the articles for the united administration of such affairs, both civil and military, as could advantageously be committed by the colonies to this already *quasi* independent nation. Asserting as it did the prerogatives of peace and war, and the levying of revenue, the union might well be suspected, by its enemies, of aiming at ultimate independence. And indeed many things before done, especially by Massachusetts, seemed but too obviously intended to meet some future contingency of self-defence against the mother country. But at this time England was too much busied with commotions at home to take any well-considered and efficient measures for counteracting these tendencies in her colonies.

None but the four Puritan colonies were embraced in this union. "The settlements of Gorges, and the plantations about Narragansett Bay, were denied admission to the Confederacy; the former, says Winthrop, 'because they ran a different course from us, both in their ministry and civil administration.' Neither had yet been able to institute a government such as could be relied on for the fulfilment of the stipulations mutually made by the four Colonies."

At the commencement of this Article we stated our views of the importance of the early history of New England as a means for training men for the various duties of a Christian life; nor can we now tell, in reflecting on the very important portion to which we have been attending, whether its lessons are the more weighty and numerous for men in public or in private life, — nor whether to clergymen or to laymen.

The grand moral for all, whether in public or private life, is this: that true godliness in heart and life, is the first requisite for prosperity and usefulness. And now, if all this be meant by the *virtue* which politicians declaim about, we should rejoice to hear them say it fully and clearly, though, perhaps, some of them would be able to give but a poor illustration of it, even in language.

What if the following were to be posted up as a curiosity in the Capitol at Washington? Speaking of Plymouth

Colony, Dr. Palfrey says: "In the thirteenth year of the settlement, a penal provision had to be adopted, to protect the public weal against the prevailing absence of ambition for public office; and 'it was enacted, by public consent of the freemen of this society of New Plymouth, that if now or hereafter any one were elected to the office of Governor, and would not stand to the election, nor hold and execute the office of his year, that then he be amerced in twenty pounds sterling fine. It was further ordered and decreed, that if any were elected to the office of council, and refused to hold the place, that then he be amerced in ten pounds sterling fine, and in case refused to be paid, to be forthwith levied.' At his urgent request, Bradford was now for the first time excused from the office of Governor, and Edward Winslow was chosen his successor, Bradford taking his place as one of the Assistants." (I. 341.)

Another lesson, alike honorable to the genuine and unambitious patriotism and integrity of the Puritans, and admonitory to the times that be, might be derived from the account in the early history of Massachusetts, when Gov. Winthrop, at the close of the gubernatorial year, was unexpectedly, if not uncivilly pressed by some extra-vigilants, to give an account of his pecuniary stewardship. Like the truly great man he was, and equally free from pettishness and scorn and fear, he quietly gave the account, when, behold, he had disbursed, for the public service, about a thousand pounds more than he had received, but of which he was going to say nothing if he had not been thus called to account. Now, however, that his posterity might not be ashamed of him, he required that a notice of the result should accompany the record of the investigation.

As an "all-important consequence of the meeting of the Long Parliament," in 1640, which led the way to the Commonwealth, Dr. Palfrey remarks that it put a final stop to emigration to this country. Winthrop remarks: "The Parliament of England setting upon a general reformation both of church and state, the Earl of Strafford being beheaded, and the Archbishop, our great enemy, and many others of the

great officers and judges, bishops and others, imprisoned and called to account, this caused all men to stay in England, in expectation of a new world." Dr. Palfrey adds: "At the end of ten years from Winthrop's arrival, about twenty-one thousand Englishmen, or four thousand families, including the few hundreds who were here before him, had come over, in three hundred vessels, at a cost of two hundred thousand pounds sterling. During the century and a quarter that passed between that time and the publication of the first volume of Hutchinson's History, it is believed that 'more had gone from hence to England, than had come from thence hither;' nor did anything that can be called an immigration occur again till after Boston was two hundred years old," in 1830. (pp. 584, 585.) Of course it is chiefly from these twenty-one thousand that have, since 1640, sprung up in New England and elsewhere, so many as the stars of heaven for multitude — "the Universal Yankee Nation" — and mostly bearing the general stamp (however distorted in too many cases) of their enterprising and religious progenitors. Probably the like fecundity and the like similarity in character and language is not elsewhere to be found in the modern annals of emigration.

Dr. Palfrey says, in the preface to his first volume: "I am to tell the early history of a vast tribe of men, numbering at the present time, it is likely, some seven or eight millions." And he thinks our present white population may be divided pretty accurately into three equal parts; one belonging to the New England stock; one the posterity of English who settled in other Atlantic colonies; and one the Irish, Scotch, French, Spanish, German, and other immigrants, and their descendants. And he presumes there is one third part of our whole nation, "of whom no individual could peruse this volume without reading the history of his own progenitors." This our author thinks is about as near the truth as we can come in so complicated a problem; and so do we. But it must be obvious, on a little reflection, that many who are "of the New England stock," *i. e.*, descendants of English emigrants to New England, are at the same time descend-

ants of Scotch, French, or Irish immigrants, or even of all four classes. We know a boy in Massachusetts who has Italian, French, Dutch, Irish, and American blood in his veins, though two of the tinctures were imparted in Europe. We presume all the descendants of the Scotch-Irish who settled Londonderry, N. H., are now also descendants of the English immigrants; and that the like will be the fact with the New York Dutchmen, within the lapse of three generations; and with the Pennsylvania Dutchmen in twice that time. And if our Irish are more clannish, and may not amalgamate quite so soon with the other races, we may yet believe that, among the millions in the free states who may be pondering our author's pages, five generations hence, scarcely an individual from either of the old stocks will be found who will not here be reading the history of a portion of his own progenitors—such is the increasing rapidity with which the Puritan race are now pervading the whole North, and who may soon be pervading the South of our land, and thus conspiring the more rapidly to make it the most homogeneous and enlightened and religious of all the great nations of Christendom. Every such book as this must add a fresh impetus towards so grand an event.

ARTICLE VI.

NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

CAPITO AND BUCER, the Reformers of Strasburg, delineated from their manuscript letters, their printed works, and other contemporary authorities. By J. W. Baum, Professor in the Protestant Seminary of Strasburg. Elberfeld, 1860.[1]

THE free city of Strasburg, situated on that part of the Rhine which had long been the centre of religious influence, acted a most important part in the great religious revolution of the sixteenth century. Its political importance, and its close connection with Switzerland, France, and Holland, gave

[1] Capito und Butzer, Strassburgs Reformatoren, nach ihrem handschriftlichen Briefschatze, ihren gedruckten Schriften und anderen gleichzeitigen Quellen, dargestellt von J. W. Baum.