

THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY  
SCHREYER HONORS COLLEGE

DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY

PROFITS AND PIETY: MERCHANT CAPITALISM AND THE PROTESTANT ETHIC IN  
THE MASSACHUSETTS BAY COLONY

NICHOLAS CAPRI  
SPRING 2018

A thesis  
submitted in partial fulfillment  
of the requirements  
for baccalaureate degrees in History and Economics  
with honors in History

Reviewed and approved\* by the following:

Anthony Roeber  
Professor of Early Modern History and Religious Studies  
Thesis Supervisor

Kathryn Salzer  
Associate Professor of History  
Honors Adviser

\* Signatures are on file in the Schreyer Honors College.

## ABSTRACT

Max Weber's *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* has been applied to many areas of study, including the Puritans of New England. Many scholars have argued that it was the ascetic and devout Protestantism of the Puritans that led to the rise of capitalism in the New World, yet recently this narrative has come under increased scrutiny. The current study has sought to demonstrate that the rise of capitalism in the Massachusetts Bay Colony came not as a result of the work of the religiously orthodox Puritans who regarded their settlement to be a 'city on a hill,' but rather as a result of the lives and careers of merchant proto-capitalists. These merchants, or "prominent men of affairs," established Boston as a major trading port on the international market, inhabiting a trade that – in the Bay Colony – was dominated exclusively by men. These men possessed links across the transatlantic world, had high views of their own decision-making abilities, and were often religiously unorthodox. Relying upon studies of the development of European and transatlantic capitalism, studies of other New World colonies, the Antinomian Crisis of 1636, and writings of individual merchants, this paper argues for a deeper understanding of the complexities of the early-modern world economy and the rise of merchant capitalism in the Massachusetts Bay Colony.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....	iii
Introduction.....	1
Chapter 1 Review of Recent Scholarship .....	9
Chapter 2 Analysis of Primary Sources .....	39
The Antinomian Crisis .....	39
‘Prominent Men of Affairs’ .....	43
Mr. Isaac Allerton .....	49
Robert Keayne .....	53
Reverend Richard Blynman .....	57
The Bay Colony within the World Economy .....	60
The Role of Women.....	68
Conclusion .....	72
Chapter 3 Conclusion and Findings.....	74
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	86

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank first and foremost my thesis advisor, Professor A. G. Roeber for his continuous support, guidance and friendship. His assistance and mentorship have been constant and unparalleled, and I am truly grateful to him. I would also like to thank Professor Kathryn Salzer for her guidance, helpful feedback and ginger cookies. Thanks to Professor Dan Beaver for his helpful additions to my literature review and to alerting me of the existence of the Reverend Richard Blynman. Thanks to History Librarian Eric Novotny for his assistance in locating primary sources to pursue. To Professor Michael Milligan, for his help as my previous honors advisor, and to Ben Whitesell, for his help in academic planning and scheduling, I say thank you.

## Introduction

In May of 1663, the pastor of the Salem church, John Higginson, stood in front of the General Court of the Massachusetts Bay Colony in Boston and delivered a sermon. It was election day, and Higginson filled his preaching with civic references to the mythic history of the colony's origins. In his sermon, *The Cause of God and His People in New-England*, Higginson reminded the members of the Court of the many blessings God had bestowed upon them in the wilderness. He reminded them of their humble beginnings, and that it was God who brought them to their current state of prosperity. Higginson also warned his audience of the dangers of wealth and reminded them of their colony's founding. He urged them: "My Fathers and Brethren, this is never to be forgotten, that *New-England is originally a plantation of Religion, not a plantation of Trade*. Let Merchants and such as are increasing center per cent remember this, let others that have come over since at several times understand this, that worldly gain was not the end and designe of the people of New-England, but *Religion*."<sup>1</sup> Higginson's outcry against the merchants revealed an unresolved tension between Puritan theological convictions and society. It was God who had brought prosperity to the colony – a colony that existed primarily for the promulgation of the gospel – not merchants. The rift that Higginson's comment demonstrated was between, on one side, ministers and ruling elites, and on the other, merchants

---

<sup>1</sup> Higginson, John. *The Cause of God and His People in New-England as it was Stated and Discussed in a Sermon Preached before the Honourable General Court of the Massachusetts Colony on the 27 Day of May 1663, Being the Day of Election at Boston*. Cambridge: Samuel Green, 1663, 11.

and prominent men, who disagreed about the primary function of the colony. This debate was not new in 1663 and Higginson's warning underscored an old and sore point – the question of the relationship between the dominant version of English Protestantism of the colony and its economic success. Was it the Bay Colony's piety that had brought material blessings from God?

This question of the relationship between Protestantism and what later generations of scholars would label early capitalism has fascinated historians for over a century, yet a clear and widely-accepted conclusion has yet to surface. Sociologist Max Weber's *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* remains the foundational text on this subject, with which all subsequent studies—including my own—must reckon.<sup>2</sup> Weber's formula, in its essence, was fairly simple. Protestantism, particularly Reformed Protestantism, created a culture of internalized asceticism that demanded hard work in an individual's family life and occupation. Protestants applied their disciplined ethic and asceticism to their vocations, leading—unintentionally—to wealth and the rise of early forms of capitalism. This almost accidental rise of capitalism and wealth also led to the so-called Protestant Dilemma, the question of how wealthy yet pious individuals used this newly-generated wealth without falling into vice and decaying the moral and religious foundations of society.<sup>3</sup> Weber's thesis in its original form has been widely critiqued and rejected by most historians, yet the question he posed about Protestantism and capitalism—and their seemingly causal relationship—continues to intrigue.

Historians have applied Weber's thesis—albeit in various forms—to a wide variety of global cultures and times. The resulting conversation has evolved from Weber's original thesis and varies according to each context in which it is placed, yet the essential question remains:

---

<sup>2</sup> Max Weber. *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. (New York: 1958).

<sup>3</sup> Edmund S. Morgan, *The Puritan Dilemma: The Story of John Winthrop*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. (New York: Pearson, 2007).

What was the relationship between Protestantism and capitalism? This study will ask that question in the Puritan New England context, focusing primarily on the Massachusetts Bay Colony in the seventeenth century. Scholars such as Perry Miller and Bernard Bailyn, as well as many others, have advanced the argument that the Massachusetts Bay settlers appeared to many subsequent generations as a prototype for the American mind. In different ways, both scholars used this isolated group of religious dissidents as representative of the entire early North American colonial situation. The New Englanders have often been presented as men and women of simple moral and religious convictions, whose piety bred in them a uniquely American variety of the Protestant Ethic. In some ways, this narrative remains valid. The settlers of the Massachusetts Bay Colony ploughed the rough soil of New England and managed to build a thriving community of pious farmers, fisherman and craftsmen.

Yet this narrative often neglects the reality of religious diversity in New England and fails to grapple with other aspects of the building of a mercantilist—and eventually capitalist—society in the Massachusetts Bay Colony. These other aspects include differing ideas on personal wealth and moral legislation, among others. This narrative also fails to take into consideration the fact that in other areas of the Atlantic world, settlers of the same religious conviction did not construct such a society. Even still, in areas such as colonial Pennsylvania a similar emphasis on personal asceticism and hard work emerged from a wholly different religious group: The Society of Friends. Recognizing that the Massachusetts Bay Colony cannot be representative of the variety of early American religious conviction and the pursuit of wealth, I argue that it was not the hardworking and pious colonists of New England whose actions led to the rise of proto-capitalism, but rather a small group of religiously unorthodox, wealthy merchants who placed Boston on the map of transatlantic capitalism. Moreover, the focus on the economic success of

the Bay Colony can lead the unwary to forget it's cost of human lives. Disease and warfare had removed most of the First Peoples from areas the English settled.<sup>4</sup>

In order to follow the argument of the thesis, the reader must first recognize the meaning of several common terms. It is important to recognize that no colonist of Massachusetts Bay would ever have referred to themselves as a "Puritan." The people of the colony considered themselves to be the true Church of England and the defenders of Protestant Christian orthodoxy. They were defined by their conflicts with those who resisted further reform movements in the Church of England. Still, I will use the term 'Puritan,' as it has cemented itself in both the scholarly and vernacular languages to refer to the religious, social and political identity of the English settlers in this colony. One must also recognize the diversity of religious thought that was present within the Puritan movement itself. There existed no council of ministers or final doctrinal authority in the Massachusetts Bay Colony to determine religious orthodoxy in terms of practices or doctrine. Instead, the minister and the teacher of each congregation were responsible for the preaching and teaching of what they believed to be Christian truth. The ministers agreed on a majority of issues, yet differences were not uncommon. It is also crucial to recognize that the ministers and the magistrates in the Massachusetts Bay Colony were distinct groups. Ministers could not hold public office in the Massachusetts Bay Colony, and it would not be incorrect to describe the system of church and political governance they developed as displaying a particular form of separation of church and state. While the purity of the Puritan Gospel demanded that ministers refrain from meddling in the affairs of state, moral and religious laws

---

<sup>4</sup> Francis Jennings, *The Invasion of America: Indians, Colonialism, and the Cant of Conquest*, (New York: Norton, 1976).

were enforced by magistrates in the interests of constructing a “godly society,” and the position of governor often blurred the line between a spiritual and political leader.

Since it is difficult to determine what exactly constituted religious orthodoxy in the Puritan New England context, it is equally challenging to determine what was religiously unorthodox. Yet subsequent events revealed this rift to be present within the colony. To attempt a definition, I rely on the distinction between orthodox and unorthodox Puritans presented by Louise Breen. In her book, *Transgressing the Bounds: Subversive Enterprises Among the Puritan Elite in Massachusetts, 1630-1692*, Breen used the Antinomian Crisis of 1636 to open a window into the split that emerged among Puritans, eventually creating what she termed orthodox and unorthodox parties.<sup>5</sup> Breen placed the Governor John Winthrop as the head of her orthodox party, and argues that he: “emerged victorious [from the Antinomian Crisis of 1636] ...because the framers of the New England Way successfully associated their brand of orthodoxy with the freedoms that most ‘middling’ colonists sought to attain when they emigrated to the new world—widespread access to freehold land tenure and economic ‘independency,’ rough egalitarianism among house holding patriarchs, and a greater concern for the local “tribe” of saints than the international community of faith.”<sup>6</sup> Breen added that the middling classes of the Massachusetts Bay Colony agreed with Winthrop’s message since it protected the colony from the transatlantic world and the frontier.<sup>7</sup> She continued, adding that the orthodox, “Godly” society was self-regulated, proto-nationalistic and provincially ordered around the local parish.<sup>8</sup> Membership in this society was contingent on church membership, where neither diversity in

---

<sup>5</sup> Louise A. Breen. *Transgressing the Bounds: Subversive Enterprises Among the Puritan Elite in Massachusetts, 1630-1692*. (Oxford: 2001).

<sup>6</sup> Breen, *Transgressing the Bounds*, 8.

<sup>7</sup> Breen, *Transgressing the Bounds*, 9.

<sup>8</sup> Breen, *Transgressing the Bounds*, 21.

means nor deviation from evidence of salvation was tolerated.<sup>9</sup> For these “visible saints,” to use Edmund S. Morgan’s felicitous term, outward behavior was the best indicator of one’s spiritual estate, despite the traditionally Reformed Protestant notion that no one could know with certainty whether or not he or she was one of God’s predestined elect.<sup>10</sup>

Breen contrasted these characteristics with those of Anne Hutchinson’s antinomian party. She argued that antinomian doctrine (if one can call these professed beliefs doctrine) emphasized a complete separation between the spiritual and physical worlds, a position that posed a direct threat to the experiment in civil and religious establishment created by Winthrop and his fellow colonial leaders.<sup>11</sup> Antinomianism, Breen argues, also placed a stronger emphasis on New England’s place in the transatlantic world. Its emphasis on the increased worth of the individual’s judgement—compared to submission to the ministers and magistrates—attracted “prominent men of affairs” who shared the antinomian frustration with the New England way.<sup>12</sup>

For the purposes of this study, I will use Breen’s definitions with slight modifications. Breen’s definition is based in the Antinomian Crisis of 1636 and provides a suitable basis for discussions which occurred decades later. Breen also glossed over the theological differences between these two parties, an approach that I will contest and expand upon. Also, in the first chapter I will address the Protestant Dilemma in the Massachusetts Bay context. Answering this question reveals an additional rift between the orthodox and antinomian dissident parties.

It is not the orthodox establishment, but rather the men whom Breen described as “prominent men of affairs” who built a New England capitalism that could stand on the world’s

---

<sup>9</sup> Breen, *Transgressing the Bounds*, 21.

<sup>10</sup> Edmund S. Morgan. *Visible Saints: The History of a Puritan Idea*. (Cornell: 1963).

<sup>11</sup> Breen, *Transgressing the Bounds*, 21.

<sup>12</sup> Breen, *Transgressing the Bounds*, 21.

stage, men such as Robert Keayne, Edward Gibbons, William Jennison and Isaac Allerton. These merchants were men, and not women; ironic considering the discussion is grounded in Anne Hutchinson's sparking of the Antinomian Controversy. These individuals were often religiously unorthodox, rebelled against the strictures of New England life and were influenced by streams of thought that originated well beyond the Massachusetts Bay. They also possessed different views on wealth and profits and were more connected to and influenced by the transatlantic world than their orthodox counterparts. It is this connection between religious and cultural unorthodoxy and the development of transatlantic capitalism that this paper seeks to explore.

Puritan orthodoxy and antinomian dissent did not exist as two clearly defined parties, but rather on a spectrum. Men like the pious and successful merchant Robert Keayne may have been sympathetic to antinomian views on international trade and commerce, yet to describe Keayne as theologically unorthodox would be a gross mischaracterization for such a devout Puritan. The industrious canal-builder Richard Blynman also served as Gloucester's minister. Isaac Allerton used the colony of Plymouth's public funds for his own economic ventures yet died a member of New Haven's church. Understanding this spectrum of piety and profit-seeking is essential for understanding the argument this thesis advances.

On one end of the spectrum John Winthrop and Nathaniel Ward emerged as pious men who advocated for the status quo. They apparently enjoyed the support of the majority of the middling folk of the Massachusetts Bay Colony. Pious and hardworking farmers and fisherman and their families, these settlers were concerned primarily with living pious lives drawn from the New England soil. They were less concerned with taking economic risks, and interacted with people close to them, the majority of whom shared their religious beliefs. In contrast to this orthodox establishment of public men and middling sorts, were antinomian men and women such

as Anne Hutchinson. Between these poles of the spectrum are men like the pious merchant Keayne, whose religious and economic beliefs made them distinct from either group. These differences between these two groups often appeared to be subtle, yet in actuality they represented a rift in Puritan religious orthodoxy that could not be repaired. These differences spilled over beyond the spiritual, into the very foundations of society.

## Chapter 1

### Review of Recent Scholarship

Scholarship focusing on the relationship between capitalism and varieties of Reformed Protestantisms continues to appear and remains varied and extensive. This variety of scholarship is no accident, as by the time the *Arabella* landed in the Massachusetts Bay, Reformed Protestantism existed in a variety of forms in each of its contexts. For example, the Dutch context had significant differences with that of the Palatinate, and even within English Puritanism there existed a variety of expressions of Calvinism.<sup>13</sup> Historians and sociologists have struggled to work out the mechanics of the relationship, yet all participants agree that the interaction between the two is worthy of continued and intense scrutiny. Scholarly consensus has changed since Max Weber published his *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* in 1905, and his thesis has been examined, challenged, and even dismissed by many scholars in the years since.<sup>14</sup> Still, scholarly arguments on the subject tend to be framed as ‘Weberian’ or not. In this chapter, I examine some of the recent scholarship that addresses this phenomenon, both in and beyond the “Puritan” context of the colony of Massachusetts Bay.

Before I address the current scholarship, it is essential to finish defining the term “Puritan” and all the theological connotations such a term possesses. To do so, I rely upon Perry

---

<sup>13</sup> Carlos Eire, *Reformations: The Early Modern World, 1450-1650*, (London; New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2016); Michael P. Winship, *Godly Republicanism: Puritans, Pilgrims, and a City on a Hill* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2012).

<sup>14</sup> Max Weber, *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*.

Miller's classic text, "The Marrow of Puritan Divinity" from *Errand into the Wilderness*.<sup>15</sup> The work is somewhat dated, yet Miller's analysis of Puritan theology remains crucial to the discussion and provides a good starting point for the historiography of this study. For Miller, the Puritans were decidedly Calvinist, yet by the seventeenth century Calvinism had evolved several iterations and encompassed a variety of opinions. Miller stated that "the English Puritans may be called Calvinists because they held this central conception," that is, the ultimate unknowability of God.<sup>16</sup> Miller argued that Calvinism needed a rationale in the seventeenth century and was forced to become an intellectually coherent system, when viewed from within, rejecting the rote dogmas of its namesake. Puritanism also faced the question that plagued all Calvinists, argued Miller, and that is, if one is a member of the elect, why do good works?<sup>17</sup> Here Miller touched upon the paradox of the Protestant Ethic, that a religious group that believed works to be meaningless towards one's salvation supposedly produced a distinctive work ethic that – unintentionally – created capitalism. Miller recognized that the Puritans had to ascertain "the reliability of human reason and trustworthiness of human experience as measurements of the divine character," in other words, to develop a practical theology without compromising the unknowability of God.<sup>18</sup>

Miller continued, outlining the development of, arguably, the central tenet of English Puritanism: covenant theology. Miller argued that the notion of the covenant – as a binding agreement between God and his people – is largely absent from Calvin's theology, yet it became central to the English version of Puritanism. Citing the Puritan John Preston's *New Covenant*,

---

<sup>15</sup> Perry Miller, "The Marrow of Puritan Divinity," in *Errand into the Wilderness*. (New York: Harper & Row, 1956), 48-98.

<sup>16</sup> Miller, "The Marrow of Puritan Divinity," 52.

<sup>17</sup> Miller, "The Marrow of Puritan Divinity," 54.

<sup>18</sup> Miller, "The Marrow of Puritan Divinity," 56.

Miller argued that “the doctrine of the covenant becomes the scaffolding and the framework for the whole edifice of theology.”<sup>19</sup> The implication of this theology, Miller argued, is that it creates not only a promise to man, but a collective moral obligation on the community as well. Miller recognized the side effects of constructing such a theology, stating “He has become a God chained... a God who can be counted upon, a God who can be lived with.”<sup>20</sup> Constructing a rational God—as opposed to an arbitrary or unpredictable one—was necessary in order for the followers of Reformed theology to create a rationally ordered godly society. Miller also recognized that a juridical understanding of the relationship between God and man had implications on the individual, particularly in the area of assurance of salvation. For Miller, covenant theology framed the average Puritan’s relationship to God as “a definite legal status, based on a *quid pro quo*, an ‘if I believe’ necessitating a ‘you have to save me.’”<sup>21</sup>

Demonstrating one’s belief became increasingly important, and had to be demonstrated in a curious balance between motivations and actions. Miller concluded that the difference between a sinner and a saint “will be in the aims and aspirations of the saint and in the sincerity of his effort.”<sup>22</sup> Yet Miller also, importantly, noted that a sense “of the margin of human error in grasping ultimate truth...perpetually exists in the back of the Puritan’s mind.”<sup>23</sup> The Puritan could never be fully certain of his election, else he would not be truly Reformed. The central tenets of English Puritanism – covenant theology, a rational God and a perpetually uncertain assurance of salvation – plagued all devout Puritans and manifested themselves in every aspect of life, from commerce to the home. Understanding the pervasiveness of Puritan theology – as

---

<sup>19</sup> Miller, “The Marrow of Puritan Divinity,” 60.

<sup>20</sup> Miller, “The Marrow of Puritan Divinity,” 63.

<sup>21</sup> Miller, “The Marrow of Puritan Divinity,” 71.

<sup>22</sup> Miller, “The Marrow of Puritan Divinity,” 83.

<sup>23</sup> Miller, “The Marrow of Puritan Divinity,” 96.

underpinning the entire society – is essential to understanding the life of the Massachusetts Bay Colony.

Stephen Innes' *Creating the Commonwealth: The Economic Culture of Puritan New England* provides a Weberian argument in accounting for the development of capitalism in New England.<sup>24</sup> Innes' work is—like Miller's—slightly dated, yet it provides an excellent example of the Weberian argument in the Massachusetts Bay Colony. In critiquing Innes' arguments, I will use more recent scholarship that addresses the Bay Colony from an angle of Atlantic history. The main thrust of Innes' argument is “that a distinctive productive ethic originated in some fundamental way among the men and women of Puritan New England.”<sup>25</sup> This distinctive ethic, unique to the New England Puritans, so he claimed, created a culture of discipline and hard work that linked capitalism to a “redemptive community” and enabled the commonwealth's economic success.<sup>26</sup> Innes argued that, unique among the settlers of the continent, the New England Puritan's work ethic and religious devotion created “what some would call an oxymoron: moral capitalism.”<sup>27</sup>

Innes' definition of capitalism is essential for understanding the basis for the argument that he makes. Recognizing the anachronism of applying the term to the seventeenth century, Innes agrees with Perry Miller's assertion that the New England Puritans possessed a unique “capitalist mentality.”<sup>28</sup> Innes argued that the Puritans' economic commonwealth marked a passage from pre-capitalist to capitalist, asserting that “there is ample evidence that in their

---

<sup>24</sup> Stephen Innes, *Creating the Commonwealth: The Economic Culture of Puritan New England*. (New York and London: W.W. Norton & Co., 1995).

<sup>25</sup> Innes, *Creating the Commonwealth*, 5.

<sup>26</sup> Innes, *Creating the Commonwealth*, 6.

<sup>27</sup> Innes, *Creating the Commonwealth*, 7.

<sup>28</sup> Innes, *Creating the Commonwealth*, 44; Perry Miller, *The New England Mind: From Colony to Province* (Boston, 1961), 40.

productive activities, exchange ethics, and political economy, the Bay Colonists were discernibly and irrevocably capitalists.”<sup>29</sup> He based this judgment upon “Weber’s principal criterion for distinguishing pre-capitalist from capitalist production that was free from control by guild, village or municipality.”<sup>30</sup> For Innes, what made the New England Puritans capitalist – as opposed to their co-religionists who settled in Virginia or Providence Island – was their society’s defense of personal property, private individual land ownership and emphasis on productive labor. Contrasting John Winthrop’s Bay Colony with Captain John Smith’s failure in Virginia, Innes made the argument that individual land ownership – private property defended by the commonwealth – motivated the New England Puritans to labor productively.<sup>31</sup> Drawing a link to political rights, Innes stated that for the majority of colonists “the foundation of liberty rested on land ownership, and the opportunity to work for one’s own family.”<sup>32</sup> This economic incentive for productive labor, assisted by Calvinistic asceticism, was channeled by the colonists into their personal farms and trades in order to provide themselves and their family with a comfortable living. Innes’ definition of capitalism is uniquely suited for his argument and does not include aspects that other scholars have deemed important. Innes’ capitalism is based upon land ownership, personal property and individual labor, all of which were indeed present in Puritan New England. The colonists of Massachusetts Bay did indeed have a clean slate (ignoring for the moment their troubling treatment of the remaining Native American population) to combine these factors, yet by the seventeenth century these aspects were by no means absent in Europe.

---

<sup>29</sup> Innes, *Creating the Commonwealth*, 45.

<sup>30</sup> Innes, *Creating the Commonwealth*, 51.

<sup>31</sup> Innes, *Creating the Commonwealth*, 80.

<sup>32</sup> Innes, *Creating the Commonwealth*, 212.

Before diving headlong into Innes' argument, it is essential to clarify what is meant by the term 'capitalism' when applied to European and world economic landscape of the seventeenth century. Prior to the advent of capitalism, mercantilism was the economic theory that dominated the landscape of European thought. As Albert O. Hirschman noted in his, *The Passions and the Interests: Political Arguments for Capitalism before Its Triumph*, many scholars have argued that most pre-seventeenth century economic thinkers considered trade to be a zero-sum game, a characteristic of mercantilism.<sup>33</sup> Mercantilist thinkers argued that there is a fixed amount of wealth present in the world, and thus it is the job of the sovereign to ensure that goods either remain in, or enter, his nation – not leave. Thus, it was the moral obligation of the sovereign to pursue wealth for his nation – only the sovereign could pursue morally pursue wealth. For all others, greed was seen as the basest of the passions. This assessment of human nature, the passions, economic gain, and political power, inherited from medieval Christian thought, is clearly at odds with what we would later identify as free-market capitalism, and Hirschman argued that capitalism gradually replaced mercantilism as the prevailing ideology. Hirschman argued that, looking at the broader arguments of economic theorists, rather than solely ideas of the import and export balance, one “will conclude that *all-round* beneficial effects were widely expected to flow from the expansion of commerce.”<sup>34</sup> This statement demonstrated that, already prior to the seventeenth century, trade was seen by many to have benefits for all parties involved. Hirschman's recognition that the development of capitalism is a gradual process from mercantilism, rather than a completely new ideology, provided an important jumping off point for my own analysis of the Massachusetts Bay colony.

---

<sup>33</sup> Albert O. Hirschman, *The Passions and the Interests: Political Arguments for Capitalism before Its Triumph*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1977), 52.

<sup>34</sup> Hirschman, *The Passions and the Interests*, 52.

Hirschman provided a thorough critique of the Weberian assertion of the development of capitalism as a wholly new and contrarian system. Hirschman grounded his discussion in the development of philosophical and theological views, and in his very first paragraph asked the same question Weber did: how did greed become a noble interest when it had always been a base passion?<sup>35</sup> Whereas Weber and his disciples argued that personal economic motivation – in many ways the core tenet of modern capitalism – was a byproduct of the Protestant Ethic, Hirschman recognized that the concept of individual motivation possessing positive connotations “was extant among merchants as far back as the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, and [in part]...present in the writings of the Scholastics.”<sup>36</sup> Tracing the rescue of personal greed from Augustine’s “lust for money and possessions” as a base of the ‘passions’ to a productive individual ‘interest,’ Hirschman argued that three main strategies developed to address the passions, as previous ways of addressing them became obsolete by the seventeenth century.<sup>37</sup>

Hirschman argued for three strategies that developed in order to address the passions as the coercion and repression of the passions, the productive harnessing of the passions, and countering passions with other passions. Hirschman argued that these strategies became necessary due to the fact that in the face of the religious wars of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries “moralizing philosophy and religious precept could no longer be trusted with restraining the destructive passions of men.”<sup>38</sup> Recognizing these models in the Puritans of the Massachusetts Bay Colony and their understanding of wealth, one recognizes that a mixture of the first two solutions fits best, as the individual Puritan repressed his own passion for wealth in

---

<sup>35</sup> Hirschman, *The Passions and the Interests*, 9.

<sup>36</sup> Hirschman, *The Passions and the Interests*, 9.

<sup>37</sup> Hirschman, *The Passions and the Interests*, 9, 15.

<sup>38</sup> Hirschman, *The Passions and the Interests*, 14-15.

the context of what Innes calls the “redemptive community” of the Bay Colony.<sup>39</sup> The tendency to repress one’s passions, Hirschman argued, dates back to Augustine and is echoed by Calvin. Thus, unsurprisingly, it was visible in the culture of those most ardent Calvinists, the Puritans. In this way, the Puritans are in fact reactionary in their understanding of the passion of greed, yet not wholly so. The individual Puritan’s desire for personal wealth and comfort could come to be seen as noble, yet only to a point and only in the context of the larger community. It is vital to understand Hirschman’s work as providing insight not only to the struggles of the New England Puritans. They were not unique in this approach to vice and passion, this second approach eventually developed further, outlined by Bernard Mandeville, W.F.G. Hegel and Goethe.<sup>40</sup>

Yet what makes Hirschman’s argument particularly germane to this study is his argument that “...the expansion of commerce and industry in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries has been viewed here as being welcomed and not promoted by some marginal social groups, nor by an insurgent ideology, but by a current of opinion that arose right in the center of the “power structure” and the “establishment” of the time, out of the problems with which the prince and particularly his advisors and other concerned notables were grappling.”<sup>41</sup> This statement ran contrary to the Weberian idea of the unique role Reformed Protestants supposedly played in the development of capitalism, or, as Hirschman would phrase it, the transformation of greed from a base passion into a noble interest.

An example of the development of capitalism as emanating from the center of the power structure can be seen in Hirschman’s analysis of the eighteenth-century Scottish economic theorist, Sir James Steuart. Hirschman recognized that Steuart remained partially under

---

<sup>39</sup> Innes, *Creating the Commonwealth*, 6.

<sup>40</sup> Hirschman, *The Passions and the Interests*, 18.

<sup>41</sup> Hirschman, *The Passions and the Interests*, 129.

mercantilist modes of thinking, and quotes from his work *Inquiry into the Principles of Political Oeconomy*. Steuart wrote that “trade and industry... owed their establishment to the ambition of princes... principally with a view to enrich themselves, and thereby become formidable to their neighbours,” demonstrating a clear mercantilist position.<sup>42</sup> Yet Hirschman recognized that Steuart noticed that “the wealth [princes] drew from such fountains was but the overflowing of the spring,” and this overflow of wealth strengthened the “middle rank of men.”<sup>43</sup> Steuart’s observation that trade was started by the princes but produced clear benefits to (or even created) the middle class, vindicated Hirschman’s argument that capitalism was no “insurgent ideology,” but rather resulted from actions by men at the centers of power. It also lends credence to my argument that it was not the average Puritan who contributed to the rise of Boston as a major trading port, but rather “prominent men of affairs” who’s self-interest helped see the rise of transatlantic capitalism.

Building in part on the work of Hirschman, Jerry Z. Muller provided an excellent analysis of the works of Adam Smith, in his *Adam Smith in His Time and Ours: Designing the Decent Society*, demonstrating that much of Smith’s thought was grounded in the moral theories of his day.<sup>44</sup> Muller recognized that Smith believed “*self-interest leads to market exchange, which fosters the division of labor... thereby creating greater wealth,*” and that it is more than correct to label Smith a “capitalist.”<sup>45</sup> Yet Muller rejected the notion that Smith was a modern, laissez-fair capitalist who believed all self-interest inevitably leads to the public good, and he recognized

---

<sup>42</sup> Steuart cited in Hirschman, *The Passions and the Interests*, 83.

<sup>43</sup> Hirschman, *The Passions and the Interests*, 83.

<sup>44</sup> Jerry Z. Muller, *Adam Smith in His Time and Ours: Designing the Decent Society* (New York: The Free Press, 1993).

<sup>45</sup> Muller, *Adam Smith in His Time and Ours*, 69.

Smith's grounding in moral thought.<sup>46</sup> Muller stated that, for Smith, "the greatest achievement of the invisible hand of social institutions in commercial society is to convert the potentially base desire for status and approbation into relatively virtuous forms of conduct," an idea evocative of transforming a base passion into a noble interest.<sup>47</sup> Yet, simultaneously, Smith "emphasized the need for social institutions that restrain egoism, and the dangers inherent in the emulation of the 'loose' lifestyles of the rich and powerful."<sup>48</sup> Linking Smith's thought to philosophers like Adam Ferguson "who linked commerce with corruption" and humanist moralists, Muller stated that Smith "valued the market, the family, and other social institutions for their role in creating that imperfect but attainable level of virtue which he called 'decency.'"<sup>49</sup> In this way, Smith's thought lent credence to Innes' idea of moral capitalism, yet it also is an example of the gradual shift in economic thought. Capitalism did not arise as an immediate counter to mercantilism brought forth by religious dissidents. It overcame mercantilism in stages.

Moral capitalism – in the way that Innes argues for it – was not capitalism. Capitalism is an amoral system, and one that is founded on the individual's motivation for wealth, regardless of whether an individual is a member of a redemptive community or not. Innes argues that in Puritan New England "profit-seeking was fine" if considerate of the needs of the community, yet profit seeking in the absence of government control of markets and profits came to define capitalism.<sup>50</sup> Without the affirmation that this version of profit-making posed no ethical or moral dilemmas, there is no capitalism.

---

<sup>46</sup> Muller, *Adam Smith in His Time and Ours*, 2.

<sup>47</sup> Muller, *Adam Smith in His Time and Ours*, 135.

<sup>48</sup> Muller, *Adam Smith in His Time and Ours*, 139.

<sup>49</sup> Muller, *Adam Smith in His Time and Ours*, 144; 188.

<sup>50</sup> Innes, *Creating the Commonwealth*, 310.

In the context of the Bay Colony, the use of the term “moral capitalism” is intriguing, considering that the Puritans, and not just those of the Bay Colony, never addressed slavery as a moral issue. In his *Freedom Bound: Law, Labor and Civic Identity in Colonizing English America, 1580-1865*, Christopher Tomlins demonstrated the colonial authorities’ views on bond slavery.<sup>51</sup> Citing the *Laws and Libertyes* – adopted by the General Court in 1641 and crafted in part by Nathaniel Ward and John Winthrop (a slave-owner) – Tomlins argued that enslaved servitude in the Bay Colony was reserved for three types of outsiders. The three types of outsiders were, “‘lawful captives, taken in just wars,’ which meant Indian captives, ‘such strangers as willingly sell themselves, or are solde to us,’ that is, imported indentured servants and/or slaves; and ‘persons shall be judged thereto by Authoritie,’ that is, persons committed to serve others by judicial execution.”<sup>52</sup> Tomlins also noted that the colony traded Pequot captives to the Caribbean in exchange for a variety goods, implicating the colony’s government in the slave trade.<sup>53</sup> This stain on the government of the Bay Colony did not fade, and as late as the American Revolution the citizens of Massachusetts were reckoning with slavery, noted Emily Blanck in *Tyrannicide: Forging an American Law of Slavery in Revolutionary South Carolina and Massachusetts*.<sup>54</sup> While Blanck recognized that Massachusetts’ slave laws were not as harsh as South Carolina’s (slaves in Massachusetts could lobby for emancipation through legal

---

<sup>51</sup> Christopher Tomlins, *Freedom Bound: Law, Labor and Civic Identity in Colonizing English America, 1580-1865* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010).

<sup>52</sup> Tomlins, *Freedom Bound*, 254, citing John D. Cushing, editor, *The Laws and Liberties of Massachusetts, 1641-91*, 3 vols. (Wilmington, DE: Rowman & Littlefield, 1976), 1:10.

<sup>53</sup> Tomlins, *Freedom Bound*, 426.

<sup>54</sup> Emily Blanck, *Tyrannicide: Forging an American Law of Slavery in Revolutionary South Carolina and Massachusetts* (Athens, GA and London: University of Georgia Press, 2014), 15.

protest), nevertheless the very existence of these laws was a stain on the government of the state, which quietly ended slavery during the revolutionary war.<sup>55</sup>

Returning to Innes' argument, it is important to recognize that he located the distinctive work ethic and religious devotion of the New England Puritans in their particular brand of Reformed theology—embodied in the social and political structures that the colonists established. New England was unique insofar as “nowhere else in the post-Reformation world did Calvinistic social ethics find such full expression.”<sup>56</sup> Puritanism achieved this full expression because Massachusetts Bay was founded upon Reformed principles, without any prior religious culture in place against which it had been compelled to combat. In every unit of society—from the governorship to the family—New England's shared values were enlisted in achieving the common goal of building a godly society. The common goal of New England's “redemptive community” meant that each individual acted under the guidance of the community's secular and spiritual leadership in the proper moral, spiritual, and religious manner in every aspect of their lives, thus endowing the mundane with a sacred quality. In Puritan New England, all professions were equal in the eyes of God and society, prompting all faithful Christians to work diligently at their calling.

Yet, as Innes noted, the individual Puritan's desire to provide one's family with a modest but consistent level of comfort was tempered by the authority of the political and religious community. The desire for personal gain was deemed a possible good, yet only to a certain point. Innes recognized the importance of this idea for William Ames, a founding father of Puritanism, who stated that “not every desire of riches is covetousnesse, but only the inordinate love of them;

---

<sup>55</sup> Emily Blanck, *Tyrannicide*, 17.

<sup>56</sup> Innes, *Creating the Commonwealth*, 12.

and that love is inordinate which is repugnant to the love which we owe to God, or our Neighbor.”<sup>57</sup> Excess wealth was not to be hoarded, but rather, in the spirit of Puritan covenantal theology, was to be shared with the congregation and the community.<sup>58</sup> While demonstrating that every Puritan must recognize their citizenship in the “redemptive community,” Innes’ quotation of Ames revealed that the Protestant Ethic’s companion, the ‘Puritan Dilemma,’ was indeed present in New England, to borrow the title of Edmund S. Morgan’s work on Winthrop and the paradoxes of puritanism.<sup>59</sup> This dilemma arose from the Protestant Ethic itself, as Perry Miller noted: “The more diligently the people applied themselves...the more they produced a decay in religion and a corruption of morals, a society they did not want...”<sup>60</sup> John Winthrop himself believed this to be true, crediting the lust for “present profit” as the reason for the Virginia Company’s failure.<sup>61</sup> Innes argued that the New England Puritans dealt with the problem of wealth and profit by constructing “moral capitalism,” a religious check on unbridled capitalist impulses. Describing the Puritans as reluctant capitalists, Innes argues that weekly sermons “ensured that there would be some moral check on capitalist excess.”<sup>62</sup> For Innes, Puritanism served simultaneously as a catalyst for and a check against unrestrained capitalism.

What made the Puritan Dilemma threatening, particularly in the godly society of Massachusetts Bay, was its potential to create and sustain social mobility, a threat to the very foundations of the stable, traditional, godly commonwealth. Innes phrased it this way: “the Protestant ethic...threatened to undermine the ancient notions of social hierarchy that all early

---

<sup>57</sup> William Ames, “Cases of Conscience,” in *Works* (London: 1643), 254-255; cited in Innes, *Creating the Commonwealth*, 82.

<sup>58</sup> Innes, *Creating the Commonwealth*, 310.

<sup>59</sup> Morgan, *The Puritan Dilemma*.

<sup>60</sup> Perry Miller, *The New England Mind*, cited in Innes, *Creating the Commonwealth*, 27.

<sup>61</sup> Winthrop, *Journal*, 1:117, cited in Innes, *Creating the Commonwealth*, 84.

<sup>62</sup> Innes, *Creating the Commonwealth*, 29.

modern people, Puritans included, believed essential for good order and stability.”<sup>63</sup> It was not difficult for capitalist desires, ideally channeled for the good of the community, to be used for an individual’s selfish gain. Social mobility—a result of the newfound access to cheap land (relative to Europe) and a scarcity of labor—made a Puritan experiment in building a “Godly commonwealth” a threat to its own existence, a potential outcome met with alarm by many among the Puritan ministers and secular leadership. Salem Puritan Emmanuel Downing expressed the fear that “our Children’s Children will hardly see this great Continent filled with people soe that our servants will stille desire freedome to plant for themselves.”<sup>64</sup> Downing’s anxiety illustrated the peculiar tension within a Puritan society. The potential for social mobility threatened to unhinge a vertically oriented understanding of both religious and secular authority, even though that very mobility was improved by the Bay Colony’s encouragement of religious and economic advancement and growth on both a personal, and a social level.

Innes’ argument also advanced the idea that Puritan New England allowed for the creation of a thriving middle class, unique relative to England itself and other seventeenth-century English colonies. Innes states that “well before the end of the colonial period they had created societies that allowed some three quarters of their households to obtain a “middling” standard of living.”<sup>65</sup> What Innes failed to acknowledge is that the vast majority of the settlers of the Massachusetts Bay colony came to North America from the “middling” population of England. Also, ‘middling’ was much easier to achieve due to the abundance of land taken from indigenous peoples, not as a result of the uniqueness of Puritan society. Still, the middling

---

<sup>63</sup> Innes, *Creating the Commonwealth*, 26.

<sup>64</sup> Emmanuel Downing to John Winthrop, [ca. August 1645], *Winthrop Papers*, 5:38, cited in Innes, *Creating the Commonwealth*, 105.

<sup>65</sup> Innes, *Creating the Commonwealth*, 25.

farmers and fisherman functioned as a key tenet of his argument, and Innes continually referenced their motivation to provide for their families. This effort by the Puritan everyman to provide for his family and excel in his trade was often touted by Innes as evidence for the development of a capitalist society, yet this argument cannot be sustained once we examine more carefully counter-examples from the trans-Atlantic perspective. Innes may describe such social mobility as a side effect of Puritan capitalism, yet many of the settlers of the Bay Colony arrived in the new world already members of the middling classes. It can be argued that it was simply the absence of the social structures of the old world – and not the ‘capitalism’ of the new – that allowed for social mobility in the Massachusetts Bay Colony.

Increasingly, however, and far more than was the case when Innes wrote, scholars have become wary of applying economic systems developed in a European context to early modern North American colonial life. Mercantilism and the eventual rise of capitalism are both economic systems that are to be understood in the context of European trade and politics. Thus, in a colonial setting without the existing structures of Europe, using the terms mercantilism and capitalism will always be incomplete and not fully descriptive of the unique struggles the colonists of New England faced. In many ways, the Puritans of the Bay Colony sought to reproduce English society in the New World in order to avoid chaos and were scandalized – as Emmanuel Downing was – when the constructed social order was threatened. The colonists ignored the existing indigenous peoples and rejected their way of life as an alternative to English society – even going so far as to erect an Indian college at Harvard to civilize and educate the natives. The Bay Colony experiment simultaneously rejected major parts of the society it

spawned from, such as bishops in a House of Lords, and the indigenous society it displaced, charting their own way.<sup>66</sup>

A famous rebuttal to Innes' argument that Puritan society paved the way for capitalism emerged from scholarly analysis of the hapless Puritan Merchant Robert Keayne, to which Innes dedicated an entire chapter. Keayne's condemnation for gain and greed at the hands of the ruling authorities, who punished him for making too large a profit, has served for critics as evidence that the Bay Colony's economic policy was anything but capitalist. Innes argued that this historical interpretation depended on a specific understanding of just price. After a lengthy exposition on the history of the concept and an analysis of the Massachusetts Bay Colony's various wage and price controls, Innes concluded that Keayne was singled out as "a scapegoat for those experiencing capitalist shock," in part due to his reputation for hard bargaining.<sup>67</sup> Innes concluded his argument by emphasizing Keayne's simultaneous piety and ambition as a prime example of the Protestant Ethic in New England.

Innes achieved this by expanding upon Stephen Foster's argument that "it represented no more than an example of inevitable social friction in the early days of a pioneer community."<sup>68</sup> Foster himself mostly focused his attention on what he calls the "Puritan social ethic" in *Their Solitary Way*, and he argued that this ethic called for "subordination, inequality, authority, unity, suppression of the individual will for the good of the whole, and any number of other concepts that have a distinctly sinister sound today."<sup>69</sup> He argued that in spite of this, the largest threat to

---

<sup>66</sup> Jennings, Francis. *The Invasion of America: Indians, Colonialism, and the Cant of Conquest*. (New York: Norton, 1976).

<sup>67</sup> Innes, *Creating the Commonwealth*, 184.

<sup>68</sup> Stephen Foster, *Their Solitary Way; The Puritan Social Ethic in the First Century of Settlement in New England*, (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1971), 119, cited in Innes, *Creating the Commonwealth*, 183.

<sup>69</sup> Foster, *Their Solitary Way*, 7.

the Puritan colonies in New England came from the institutions it created. In the portion of his argument immediately prior to the portion Innes cites, Foster recognized that New England was “the last stronghold of ‘medieval’ economics,” and that “economic backwardness, not economic progress, had caused the Keayne case.”<sup>70</sup> Foster’s assessment – that the Keayne affair is evidence of medieval ideas on wealth – is correct and at odds with Innes’ argument that the Bay Colony represents a modern yet nascent capitalist economy.

Innes supported his overall Weberian argument with several larger examples, including economic development during John Winthrop’s governorship, specifically the Puritan ironwork ventures and shipbuilding industry. He credited Winthrop’s governorship with the successful inculcation of Puritan values that contributed to the success of the society as a whole. Innes also cited examples of towns in the Bay Colony that provided incentives for merchants to move there, such as mills, quarries, and timber rights.<sup>71</sup> The examples of the ironwork and shipbuilding ventures also demonstrate, argued Innes, a uniquely Puritan capitalism that became a major force for economic expansion.

Innes’ argument nonetheless failed to grasp the full picture of the Puritan experience in New England, and often simplified the complex situation of life in the Bay Colony. One such example is Innes’ continued emphasis on the uniqueness of Puritan New England. On the one hand, the success of the Massachusetts Bay Colony was indeed remarkable when compared to other failed Puritan colonies. The failure of Providence Island – especially when considering that this Caribbean experiment possessed similar religious convictions to the colonists in New England – leads one to question the validity of Innes’ claim that Puritanism created a unique

---

<sup>70</sup> Foster, *Their Solitary Way*, 119.

<sup>71</sup> Innes, *Creating the Commonwealth*, 218-219.

work ethic that led to the development of capitalism. In her study, *Providence Island, 1630-1641: The Other Puritan Colony*, Karen Ordahl Kupperman stated that “the Providence Island colony attracted many colonists of the same middling puritan stripe as did New England; backers and settlers alike expected to create a solid godly community in the Indies.”<sup>72</sup> The “other Puritan colony,” Kupperman argued, possessed essentially the same religious convictions as that of the Massachusetts Bay Colony, yet it ended in failure: pioneering the English involvement in the enslavement of Africans, engaging in piracy and violence, and finally, being conquered by the Spanish in 1641.<sup>73</sup>

The colony’s extinction suggested that it was other factors – and not the settlers reformed Protestant religious convictions – that led to the establishment of capitalism in the Bay Colony. This is in direct contrast to Innes’ insistence on the uniqueness of the Massachusetts Bay Puritans, and the scholarly consensus that the “New England way” is the clearest expression of puritanism. Kupperman stated that “the Providence Island example demonstrates that this is not true, that the Massachusetts Bay course represented a series choices among possible paths and that many English puritans thought of the New England regime as unacceptable.”<sup>74</sup> Kupperman placed the blame for the colony’s failure on two main factors: the founders’ unwillingness to grant the settler’s land property rights and the failure to enact a form of civilian control of the military.<sup>75</sup> Denied property rights, “the planters defied instructions and moved heavily in to property in human beings, buying slaves at a rate unparalleled at this early date in any other

---

<sup>72</sup> Karen Ordahl Kupperman, *Providence Island, 1630-1641: The Other Puritan Colony*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 1.

<sup>73</sup> Kupperman, *Providence Island*, 2.

<sup>74</sup> Kupperman, *Providence Island*, 18.

<sup>75</sup> Kupperman, *Providence Island*, x.

English colony, puritan or not.”<sup>76</sup> This fact leads one to question Innes’ “moral capitalism,” although we must be careful not to anachronistically place the morality of today on an era with drastically different conceptions of the morality of slavery. Nonetheless, the failure of Providence Island does not fit the narrative perpetuated by Innes and scholars like him, that the development of capitalism is clearly a result of Puritan theology.

The economic success of the Proprietary colony of Pennsylvania, dominated by members of an even more radical form of Protestantism, the Society of Friends, provided yet another counter-example that Innes fails to account for. Frederick B. Tolles’ *Meeting House and Counting House: The Quaker Merchants of Colonial Philadelphia 1682-1763* provided an excellent, although equally dated, analysis of the Quaker merchant that is relevant to this study.<sup>77</sup> Tolles argued that when addressing the mercantile success of many members of the Society of Friends, with regards to contexts of England and Philadelphia, it nonetheless “becomes apparent that the fundamental explanation must be sought in something inherently characteristic about Quakerism.”<sup>78</sup> Tolles cited numerous Quaker merchants and their observers, one of whom described them as “In a Word, they are singularly Industrious, sparing no Labour or Pains to increase their Wealth.”<sup>79</sup>

These laboring individuals possessed notions of a community ethic, similar to the Massachusetts Bay Colony, yet with a distinctly different theology than their Puritan counterparts. They also possessed a different view of slavery than that of the Puritans. The

---

<sup>76</sup> Kupperman, *Providence Island*, 2.

<sup>77</sup> Frederick B. Tolles. *Meeting House and Counting House: The Quaker Merchants of Colonial Philadelphia 1682-1763* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1963).

<sup>78</sup> Tolles, *Meeting House and Counting House*, 51.

<sup>79</sup> Giovannin Paolo Maran, *Letters Writ by a Turkish Spy* (10<sup>th</sup> ed.: London, 1734), VI, 17, cited in Tolles, *Meeting House and Counting House*, 47.

famous Germantown Protest, or “Resolutions of the Germantown Mennonites/Germantown Quaker Petition Against Slavery,” represented the views of several German Quakers, who believed enslavement to be morally wrong.<sup>80</sup> This letter, sent to the Yearly Meeting in London, made no lasting impact on the abolition of slavery in the Proprietary Colony or the world. Yet it is important to this study insofar as it demonstrated that it was the Quakers who first saw slavery as a moral issue, not the Puritans of the Massachusetts Bay Colony. Thus, the example of the Pennsylvania Quakers provides a hefty counter to Innes’ claims of the uniqueness of Puritan industriousness and “moral capitalism.”

Innes even cited the eighteenth-century observations of the Reverend Andrew Burnaby, the Vicar of Greenwich in the Church of England, as testimony to the quality schooling in New England, yet fails to explain the fact that Burnaby described not the Massachusetts Bay colonists, but instead the Pennsylvanians as “by far the most enterprising people upon the continent.”<sup>81</sup> One would have expected the New England Puritans, supposedly uniquely motivated by their intense Reformed Protestant piety to fulfill their calling in the world, to be described as more enterprising, yet this is not the judgment the outside observer Burnaby made. Innes, throughout *Creating the Commonwealth*, continually argues for the uniqueness of the New England Puritans, yet this argument cannot be sustained.

In order to place the Massachusetts Bay experiment in a broader, trans-Atlantic context, we also need to acknowledge the Dutch Reformed, and their drastically different assessment of

---

<sup>80</sup> “Resolutions of the Germantown Mennonites/Germantown Quaker Petition Against Slavery,” in *American History Through Its Greatest Speeches: A Documentary History of the United States [3 Volumes]* 1, eds. Jolyon P. Girard, Darryl Mace, and Courtney Michelle Smith (Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO, 2017): 30-32.

<sup>81</sup> Rev. Andrew Burnaby, *Travels Through the Middle Settlements in North-America, in the Years 1759 and 1760. With Observations Upon the State of the Colonies* (Dublin: Marchbank: 1775), cited in Innes, *Creating the Commonwealth*, 157.

both profit and religious commitments. Innes also failed to recognize the increased role of trade, particularly transatlantic trade, as a prime indicator of the rise of capitalism, and one that was present in Puritan New England, with the rise of Boston as an international trading port. Innes' definition of moral capitalism and the Puritan harnessing of the desire for wealth must therefore be questioned in this broader comparative context.

Simon Schama's *The Embarrassment of Riches: An Interpretation of Dutch Culture in the Golden Age* provides a foray into the Dutch Reformed and their conceptions of wealth and capitalism.<sup>82</sup> Schama concluded that there appeared to be little connection between Dutch Calvinism and the development of capitalism, particularly with regards to personal consumption. Schama recognized that many Dutch believed the foundations of their prosperity to be products of their frugal and modest habits, with these habits dying as merchants spent newfound wealth on "worldly vanity and luxury," creating a phenomenon strikingly similar to the Puritan Dilemma.<sup>83</sup> Schama noted that, in this category of personal consumption, the Dutch looked little different from Roman Catholic Venetians, and the Reformed Church's attacks on Dutch frivolity "[did] not appear to have diverted capital from expenditure to productive enterprise."<sup>84</sup> Noting that the tradition of Calvinist pastors decrying the moral opulence of Dutch merchants – and the resulting inevitable collapse – was central to Dutch culture in the seventeenth century (hence the title *The Embarrassment of Riches*), Schama stated that "the assumption that high spending was squandering the national patrimony belongs more in the realm of sermons than economic forecasting."<sup>85</sup> He continued, recognizing that this constant denouncement of opulent spending

---

<sup>82</sup> Simon Schama, *The Embarrassment of Riches: An Interpretation of Dutch Culture in the Golden Age*, (New York: Knopf, 1987).

<sup>83</sup> Schama, *The Embarrassment of Riches*, 295.

<sup>84</sup> Schama, *The Embarrassment of Riches*, 298.

<sup>85</sup> Schama, *The Embarrassment of Riches*, 321.

reveals that these prophets possessed a mercantile view of a nation's wealth, to be spent either productively or unproductively.<sup>86</sup> A capitalist may recognize that the two – expenditure and productive enterprise – are not mutually exclusive. Yet Schama recognized that there was a disconnect on this issue between Reformed clergy and their flocks, a disconnect largely (although not wholly) absent in the Massachusetts Bay Colony.

Schama also recognized that these seventeenth-century Calvinist critiques of wealth and spending were neither wholly new, nor exclusively Protestant. Schama cited a Dutch tract, entitled *Geestelijke Roer van 't Coopmans Schip* (“The Spiritual Rudder of Commerce”/ “The Spiritual Rudder of the Merchant’s Ship”), which Godfried Udemans wrote with the goal of reconciling commerce and godliness. Of the righteous merchant practices outlined in the tract, Schama stated that it “was so hedged about with prohibitions and traditional scruples that it was, in the end, no more economically permissible than the classic humanist texts.”<sup>87</sup> Schama’s comparison of Dutch Calvinist critiques of wealth and humanist conceptions of wealth places doubt on Weber’s insistence upon the uniqueness of Reformed Protestantism’s merchant ethic, and adds credence to the idea that the advocates and defenders of capitalism only gradually overcame the moral stigma of the pursuit of wealth.

Pointing to the reactionary tendencies of the Dutch Reformed Church, Schama illustrated that the fostering of capitalism in the Netherlands occurred, not because of, but in spite of the Church. Schama cited as evidence the fact that the lust for money as evil remained church dogma, and since the magistrates would not enforce the Church’s opinions, the church had to; the Amsterdam church councils going so far as to censure several entrepreneurs and founding

---

<sup>86</sup> Schama, *The Embarrassment of Riches*, 321.

<sup>87</sup> Schama, *The Embarrassment of Riches*, 330.

members of the East India Company.<sup>88</sup> Such practices also occurred in the Bay Colony, albeit by a closer alliance between secular and religious authorities. Schama also recognized that “both church and municipal authorities...vigorously defended the guild system,” a fact that fails Weber’s own criteria for capitalism.<sup>89</sup> Citing ardent Calvinists who sought to buy enough shares of the East India Company in order to turn it into a missionary venture, Schama stated that “it was the *less* Calvinist group of patricians who upheld the more purely commercial principles of maximum profits with minimum risk and who disliked intensely the instruments of trade for some obscure fanatical purpose.”<sup>90</sup> Although quick to warn against overgeneralization, Schama concluded “the more passionate his Calvinism, the less likely was an entrepreneur to fit into the older *modus operandi* of Amsterdam capitalism,” an observation completely at odds with Weber’s thesis.<sup>91</sup>

Yet even despite works such as Schama’s, the link between Reformed Protestantism and a culture of discipline continues to fascinate. Philip S. Gorski’s *The Disciplinary Revolution: Calvinism and the Rise of the State in Early Modern Europe*, argued for a connection between Calvinism and the rise of the modern nation-state.<sup>92</sup> Gorski argued that Calvinism provided an example of a new religious faith that created its own unique, bottom-up “mechanisms of discipline and governance.”<sup>93</sup> This started in Calvin’s theology, which focused more on conformity to scriptural law than Catholic and Lutheran confessions, and is linked to Calvin’s

---

<sup>88</sup> Schama, *The Embarrassment of Riches*, 335-336.

<sup>89</sup> Schama, *The Embarrassment of Riches*, 337; Innes, 51.

<sup>90</sup> Schama, *The Embarrassment of Riches*, 339.

<sup>91</sup> Schama, *The Embarrassment of Riches*, 340.

<sup>92</sup> Philip S. Gorski, *The Disciplinary Revolution: Calvinism and the Rise of the State in Early Modern Europe* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003).

<sup>93</sup> Gorski, *The Disciplinary Revolution*, 19.

emphasis on “justification.”<sup>94</sup> Thus, Gorski argued, Calvin’s theology created a system of discipline out of a necessity to live “in perfect obedience to God’s will” and expunge the church of sin.<sup>95</sup> Gorski also recognized that Calvin’s Christian discipline did not stop at the church’s doors, but extended into every aspect of life, even advocating for those outside of the elect to be subject to the laws of the Christian polity.<sup>96</sup> Gorski argued that Weber recognized the relationship between discipline and religion, and that the French scholar Michel Foucault recognized the relationship between discipline and state-making, yet neither recognized the tri-fold relationship, the core of Gorski’s argument in his study. Gorski applied his argument to the sixteenth century Dutch Republic, arguing that the small nation’s military and colonial empire was due, in large part, to “the impact that religious discipline had on social order.”<sup>97</sup> Gorski compared crime rates between the Dutch Republic and the rest of the world, and argued that only England – another nation with strong Calvinistic influences – possessed similarly low rates to those of the Dutch.<sup>98</sup> While Gorski’s argument was largely silent on the topic of the rise of merchant capitalism, his study demonstrated continued scholarly interest in the relationship between Reformed Protestantism and discipline in Weberian fashion, as well as the appropriately international perspective that recognized both similarities and striking differences among various Reformed political and social orders of the early modern era.

In order to get a better sense of the history of the Puritan movement and to demonstrate the transformation of greed from a passion into an interest, we need a brief discussion of Puritan roots in England. A central tenet of Innes’ argument – and one that Kupperman agreed with in

---

<sup>94</sup> Gorski, *The Disciplinary Revolution*, 20.

<sup>95</sup> Gorski, *The Disciplinary Revolution*, 20.

<sup>96</sup> Gorski, *The Disciplinary Revolution*, 21.

<sup>97</sup> Gorski, *The Disciplinary Revolution*, 40.

<sup>98</sup> Gorski, *The Disciplinary Revolution*, 53.

her study of Providence Island – was that land ownership was essential for the success of a colony. Innes argued that the defense of private property and private land ownership was a central cause of the economic success of the Bay Colony and suggested that such a phenomenon is unique to the Bay Colony. Yet in *God speed the plough: The representation of agrarian England, 1500-1660*, Andrew McRae recognized that land ownership existed in England prior to 1630 and was long associated with economic growth.<sup>99</sup> McRae started his discussion by mentioning parliamentary debates on the issues of personal land ownership around the turn of the seventeenth century, citing Sir Walter Raleigh and Henry Jackman as two MPs who argued that allowing individuals to own land and farm it how they chose would be good for the nation.<sup>100</sup> McRae stated that the extension of property rights may or may not be interpreted as a move towards capitalism, yet argued that one “must recognize from the outset their undeniable impact on contemporary observers.”<sup>101</sup> He also recognized that the share of land owned by ‘middling and lesser gentry’ and poor farmers increased dramatically by the end of the seventeenth century.<sup>102</sup>

At the heart of the English debates surrounding land ownership, McRae noted, was a conflict between ideologies of moral economics and economic freedom. Those advocating for continued land restrictions – such as tillage restrictions – tended to be people who wanted the continuation of the existing social order: wealthy and religious landowners who saw the downfall of “rural stewardship” as a threat to the very underpinnings of society.<sup>103</sup> On the opposite side of

---

<sup>99</sup> Andrew McRae, *God speed the plough: The representation of agrarian England, 1500-1660*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).

<sup>100</sup> McRae, *God speed the plough*, 11.

<sup>101</sup> McRae, *God speed the plough*, 14.

<sup>102</sup> McRae, *God speed the plough*, 14.

<sup>103</sup> McRae, *God speed the plough*, 170.

this debate were surveyors and landlords who “promote[d] a rational definition of social and economic relationships, in preference to the network of duties and responsibilities which constitutes the conservative ideal.”<sup>104</sup> McRae noted that analogies to the weights and measures used for purchasing merchant wares were applied to land, and he recognized that this analogy marked a shift in the traditional moral understanding of land stewardship.<sup>105</sup> McRae stated that “the emergence of capitalism, it has been argued, helped ‘turn places into commodities,’” and recognized that this new understanding of land ownership and discourse on surveying “at once justifies and furthers this shift.”<sup>106</sup> Here, McRae recognized the importance of land ownership for economic progress, yet in the beginning of seventeenth century England, prior to Innes’ dating. The colonies of the New World may have had the advantage of not having to fight existing social structures and customs, yet, as Innes noted, the Puritans possessed the same anxiety about the threat individual land ownership caused to social structures, the same anxiety of the conservative opponents to the English surveyors. Here, once again, the curiously contradictory Puritan ethic that supposedly led to the creation of capitalism is revealed.

It also bears remembering that creating ‘godly commonwealths’ was not a uniquely colonial experiment. David Underdown outlined the case of a Puritan experiment in Dorchester in *Fire From Heaven: Life in an English Town in the Seventeenth Century*.<sup>107</sup> Following a devastating fire in August of 1613, the town of Dorchester – led by the Puritan minister John White, much admired across the Atlantic – sought to transform itself from a town of sinners

---

<sup>104</sup> McRae, *God speed the plough*, 172.

<sup>105</sup> McRae, *God speed the plough*, 188.

<sup>106</sup> McRae, *God speed the plough*, 188-189.

<sup>107</sup> David Underdown, *Fire From Heaven: Life in an English Town in the Seventeenth Century*, (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1992).

“into a reformed, disciplined, more truly godly community.”<sup>108</sup> This transformation was characterized by a poor hospital, enlargement of the churches, education, care for sick and elderly, and importantly “some ingenious funding mechanisms to support it.”<sup>109</sup> In classic Puritan fashion, White drew up a covenant outlining the ‘ten vows’ of the community. This community ethic was essential to White’s understanding of Puritanism, and he wrote to John Winthrop, “I would fain know what the general [public] shall gain by making half a dozen rich’ at the expense of the rest.”<sup>110</sup> Underdown argued that this statement demonstrates that Puritanism is not disguised self-interest, and instead provided the impetus for much of the town’s charitable ventures.<sup>111</sup> This Puritan town possessed the same laws against drunkenness, sexual misconduct and theater productions that characterized the New England Puritan movement. Yet, interestingly, the town constructed the Dorchester Brewhouse and “from it came the money for maintaining the Hospital buildings, for paying the wages of employees, for the ‘appareling and teaching’ and apprenticing of Hospital children.”<sup>112</sup> This edifice served as a means to transform the passion of drunkenness into a productive means to fulfill the town’s covenant by caring for the poor. The example of John White’s Dorchester demonstrated that the Puritan experiment was not a uniquely colonial venture, that the English town also possessed deep misgivings about individual gain, and that its leadership sought to transform the passions of humans into benefits for the community.

Another important work that addressed the question of the development of capitalism in Puritan New England – yet outside of the Weberian paradigm – is John Frederick Martin’s

---

<sup>108</sup> Underdown, *Fire From Heaven*, 90.

<sup>109</sup> Underdown, *Fire from Heaven*, 91.

<sup>110</sup> Underdown, *Fire from Heaven*, 92.

<sup>111</sup> Underdown, *Fire from Heaven*, 92.

<sup>112</sup> Underdown, *Fire from Heaven*, 114.

*Profits in the Wilderness: Entrepreneurship and the Founding of New England Towns in the Seventeenth Century*.<sup>113</sup> Martin argued that during the establishment of new towns in New England, the founding of land corporations predated the founding of churches the vast majority of the time, even in the 1630s and 40s.<sup>114</sup> Martin interpreted these facts as demonstrating that these pioneers “could not live on the land without purchasing it, organizing themselves as tenants in common, and creating a system for sharing costs and dividing the property,” yet they could survive without churches.<sup>115</sup> For Martin, these settlers “first purpose was, not to promote religion or realize communal ideas, but to perform the practical work of starting a wilderness settlement.”<sup>116</sup> Martin’s study focused on wilderness settlements (although he surveyed all the towns he could, starting in 1630), and he recognized that towns such as Boston, Hartford and New Haven, among others, were founded by pastors. Yet he stated that “to focus on these towns is to warp understanding of the founding circumstances of most seventeenth-century towns,” and recognized motivations for wealth as reasons for founding new towns.<sup>117</sup>

One cannot overlook the manner by which towns distributed their lands. Land ownership was central to Innes’ thesis, yet Martin interpreted land ownership very differently. Martin recognized that in two-fifths of the towns he surveyed, “the size of each inhabitant’s initial investment in the town determined the size of his land share.”<sup>118</sup> Thus wealthier individuals received larger tracts, and poorer individuals received smaller ones. Martin noted that in the

---

<sup>113</sup> John Frederick Martin, *Profits in the Wilderness: Entrepreneurship and the Founding of New England Towns in the Seventeenth Century*, (Chapel Hill and London: University of North Carolina Press, 1991).

<sup>114</sup> Martin, *Profits in the Wilderness*, 145.

<sup>115</sup> Martin, *Profits in the Wilderness*, 148.

<sup>116</sup> Martin, *Profits in the Wilderness*, 148.

<sup>117</sup> Martin, *Profits in the Wilderness*, 146.

<sup>118</sup> Martin, *Profits in the Wilderness*, 151.

majority of towns, these shares were fixed, and circumstances would change, yet “year after year they drew land according to shares that had been determined by their size, wealth, or investment at the outset of the town.”<sup>119</sup> Yet these shares were transferrable and were often traded on a nascent market that arose in response to this. This system had little to do with the larger community and was largely focused on individual self-interest. As Martin stated, “it is difficult to detect a social or religious ideal behind the land system.”<sup>120</sup> This system was not connected with the “redemptive community,” and more to do with the individual Puritan’s needs at the time.

In this chapter I have sought to demonstrate the existing Weberian version of one stream of scholarship, to recognize the scholarship that has documented the gradual transition between mercantilism and capitalism, and to suggest some inconsistencies in the current narrative surrounding the Puritan colonists of the Massachusetts Bay Colony. Perry Miller’s brilliant analysis of the theology of the settlers, “The Marrow of Puritan Divinity” provided an excellent starting point and a thorough analysis of Puritan theology and the paradoxes that plagued it. Stephen Innes argued that this theology created a unique culture of discipline that allowed for the creation of “moral capitalism,” a system both stimulated and stymied by its relationship to the “redemptive community” of Puritan New England. Hirschman’s *Passions and the Interests* and Muller’s *Adam Smith in His Time and Ours* demonstrated the inadequacy of pitting Protestant Capitalism up against a medieval mercantilism and the continued relevance of morally-tinged capitalism in the thought of Adam Smith. Providence Island and the Dutch Republic served as examples of Reformed Protestant commonwealths that did not possess a real substantial

---

<sup>119</sup> Martin, *Profits in the Wilderness*, 159.

<sup>120</sup> Martin, *Profits in the Wilderness*, 161.

connection between religion and capitalism, despite sharing many features with the Bay Colony. Underdown's discussion of property rights in *God speed the plough* showed that already by the turn of the seventeenth century land was considered a commodity in England, and the example of Dorchester demonstrated an early attempt at a Puritan commonwealth. Now that I have established an historical and economic background in which to place my study, I will now turn to the primary source material. In doing so, it will become clear why I argue, in this thesis, that it was unorthodox individuals – both socially and theologically – whose actions led to the development of proto-capitalism in the Massachusetts Bay Colony and Boston's positioning on the international market.

## Chapter 2

### Analysis of Primary Sources

#### The Antinomian Crisis

If we agree to follow Breen and use the Antinomian Crisis of 1636 to divide the Puritans of the Bay Colony into orthodox and antinomian (or unorthodox) factions, we discover that “The antinomian movement attracted prominent men of affairs who were not necessarily antinomian in a theological sense but who gave varying degrees of support to the dissenters out of frustration with (but not total alienation from) the type of community emerging as the social counterpart of orthodoxy.”<sup>121</sup> Breen cited men such as Israel Stoughton, William Jennison and Edward Gibbons, among others, as evidence for this claim—all men of standing within the community who demonstrated some form of solidarity with the antinomian dissenters. These men – according to Breen – valued their own private judgement, commonly pursued mercantile ventures and believed that they were entitled to having their opinions heard due to their standing in the community.<sup>122</sup> Janice Knight argued that this group inhabited an alternative orthodoxy, led by men like Richard Sibbes and John Cotton, that “presented a vibrant alternative within the mainstream of Puritan religious culture” and stressed God’s grace and love over his demands.<sup>123</sup> This message resonated with younger merchants and “prominent men of affairs” who placed a

---

<sup>121</sup> Breen, *Transgressing the Bounds*, 21.

<sup>122</sup> Breen, *Transgressing the Bounds*, 21.

<sup>123</sup> Janice Knight. *Orthodoxies in Massachusetts: Rereading American Puritanism*. (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1994), 3.

greater emphasis on their own decision-making rather than submitting to the orthodox figures of authority in the Bay Colony, the ministers and magistrates.

The Antinomian Controversy itself was “a struggle for control of Massachusetts” and centered upon the figure of Anne Hutchinson, a Puritan who followed the Reverend John Cotton from Boston, England to the New World.<sup>124</sup> In colonial Boston, Hutchinson began hosting meetings in her home, where women from the community would discuss the week’s sermons.<sup>125</sup> At these meetings, Hutchinson espoused her ideas, including the notion that “with the exception of Cotton, the ministers were ‘legalists’ who argued for some necessary connection between man’s own works and his redemption by Christ.”<sup>126</sup> After an initial and promising conference between the authorities, Hutchinson, and Cotton in October of 1636, a second conference proved unfruitful, with Hutchinson telling ministers that they preached a covenant of works as opposed to the true covenant of grace.<sup>127</sup> A fiery sermon by John Wheelright, Hutchinson’s brother-in-law, in the Boston Church, intensified the disagreement. Because of Wheelright’s sermon, the General Court judged him guilty of increasing bitterness in the colony, much to the chagrin of the Boston Church.<sup>128</sup> Moving the elections for governor and magistrates, “the orthodox party” voted John Winthrop governor, replacing the antinomian-leaning incumbent, Henry Vane.<sup>129</sup> Then, in March of 1638, Anne Hutchinson was placed on trial by the General Court, the rest of the leaders of the antinomian party having been banished in November following political protests in which Hutchinson herself did not participate. Initially embarrassing the Court with her

---

<sup>124</sup> David D. Hall, *The Antinomian Controversy, 1636-1638: A Documentary History*. (Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press), 3, 5.

<sup>125</sup> Hall, *Antinomian Controversy*, 5.

<sup>126</sup> Hall, *Antinomian Controversy*, 6.

<sup>127</sup> Hall, *Antinomian Controversy*, 7.

<sup>128</sup> Hall, *Antinomian Controversy*, 8.

<sup>129</sup> Hall, *Antinomian Controversy*, 8.

wit and demeanor, Hutchinson's claim of receiving revelations from God was too much for the Court, who declared her "unfit for our society," her excessive individualism a threat to social and religious order. The Court banished her from the Colony.<sup>130</sup> Not long after, the Boston Church excommunicated her on March 22, 1638.<sup>131</sup>

The Antinomian Controversy served to demonstrate the strength of the defenders of the status-quo and landed gentry such as John Winthrop. Yet the crisis also demonstrated the tenuousness of Puritanism's hold on the loyalty of those willing to question traditional modes of spiritual and secular authority. Stephen Foster, echoing worries voiced by Winthrop himself, aptly commented that "For all its adherence to time-honored social doctrine, Puritanism on both sides of the ocean contained a strong radical streak that set up an absolute standard by which even traditional authority and the authority of tradition must be judged and discarded if found wanting. In England, this fact cost Charles I his head."<sup>132</sup> In the Bay Colony, this radical streak led to Hutchinson and the Antinomian Crisis, which threatened the very foundations of the colonial society of John Winthrop and fellow landed gentry. Yet it is important to note, as Foster does, that this streak manifested itself in the Puritan practice of rejecting more traditional forms of authority, from the bishops of the Church of England to corrupted political bodies like the House of Lords, and as a logical consequence— with Hutchinson – the final religious and political authority found its home in the individual conscience.

When John Higginson railed against the merchants who had taken over the Massachusetts Bay Colony in his election sermon in 1663, he was not the first to demonstrate antagonism

---

<sup>130</sup> Hall, "Examination of Mrs. Anne Hutchinson," *Antinomian Controversy*, 347.

<sup>131</sup> Hall, *Antinomian Controversy*, 10.

<sup>132</sup> Foster, *Their Solitary Way*, 39.

towards merchants and motivation for personal economic gains.<sup>133</sup> While the Antinomian Crisis itself had little to do with economic issues, both sides in the rift in Puritan society that it displayed exhibited differing economic outlooks. It is necessary first to engage in and examination of the economic views of Winthrop and his ‘orthodox party,’ in order to contrast these views with his opponents among the ‘prominent men of affairs.’

John Winthrop’s short but famous sermon “A Model of Christian Charity” provides a window into his economic and social outlook.<sup>134</sup> Delivered during the journey to New England on board of the *Arabella* in 1630, the future Governor of the Massachusetts Bay Colony displayed optimism and hope as he called his fellow passengers to unity in service to God. Winthrop started his discussion by stating that God has made it so that “some must be rich, some poor,” for a number of reasons.<sup>135</sup> One reason is in order that men will have need of one another, and because God commanded that men love one another.<sup>136</sup> It is this love for one another that Winthrop seized upon in his quest for unity. He stated that “the care of the public must overshadow all private respects,” expressing his belief that public good should always be considered greater than individual desire, a belief that would lead to tension between himself and both merchants and antinomians.<sup>137</sup> Winthrop continued to emphasize the importance of the colonists’ unity in mission and purpose. Quoting God’s words to Israel, Winthrop demonstrated his view that the settlers of the Bay Colony possessed a special, covenantal relationship with God. This communal relationship depended on the moral conduct of the entire community, and if violations occurred,

---

<sup>133</sup> Higginson, John. *The Cause of God and His People in New-England*, 11.

<sup>134</sup> John Winthrop, “A Model of Christian Charity,” in *A Library of American Literature from the Earliest Settlement to the Present Time* v. 1, eds. Edmund Clarence Stedman and Ellen Mackay Hutchinson, 304-307 (New York: Charles L. Webster & Company, 1888).

<sup>135</sup> Winthrop, “Christian Charity,” 304.

<sup>136</sup> Winthrop, “Christian Charity,” 304-305.

<sup>137</sup> Winthrop, “Christian Charity,” 305.

Winthrop hypothesized that “the Lord will surely break out in wrath against us.”<sup>138</sup> It was Winthrop and his party’s communal conception of moral responsibility that influenced his economic decisions and placed him at odds with many prominent men of affairs.

### ‘Prominent Men of Affairs’

Breen highlighted especially as a “prominent [man] of affairs” Israel Stoughton, a General Court deputy who was later barred from holding public office for writing a tract that allegedly “denied the assistants to be magistrates and made them but ministers of justice.”<sup>139</sup> After living down this incident, Stoughton rose to prominence in Dorchester, eventually becoming the town’s magistrate in the same election that replaced Vane with Winthrop.<sup>140</sup> Breen cited this election alongside Winthrop’s as evidence for Stoughton’s religious orthodoxy – of which there was really no question. Yet Stoughton fits nicely into Knight’s “vibrant alternative” to orthodoxy. At one point in the trial, after Hutchinson extensively relayed how the Lord revealed himself to her, Stoughton stated, “Behold I turn away from you.”<sup>141</sup> Yet earlier during the Hutchinson trial, Stoughton did not toe the party line and even advocated on Hutchinson’s behalf on a few occasions. Throughout the trial, Stoughton repeatedly asked that the ministers accusing Hutchinson of wrongdoing swear an oath to speak the truth and cite specific examples of the dissenter’s transgressions. Stoughton insisted that “I would gladly that an oath should be

---

<sup>138</sup> Winthrop, “Christian Charity,” 306.

<sup>139</sup> Israel Stoughton to John Stoughton, 1635, in *Letters from New England: The Massachusetts Bay Colony, 1629-1638*, ed. Everett Emerson. (Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press, 1976), 149.

, Breen, *Transgressing the Bounds*, 22.

<sup>140</sup> Breen, *Transgressing the Bounds*, 22.

<sup>141</sup> Hall, “Examination of Mrs. Anne Hutchinson” in *The Antinomian Controversy*, 338.

given that so the person to be condemned should be satisfied in her conscience, and I would say the same for my own conscience if I should join the censure.”<sup>142</sup> Stoughton’s admonition was eventually dismissed by the Court, and when the censure passed Stoughton agreed with the content yet refused to formally condemn Hutchinson as no witnesses swore upon oath.<sup>143</sup>

Stoughton’s continued admonitions for the accusers to swear an oath to the veracity of their statements demonstrated his tentative membership in the orthodox party. Breen linked Stoughton’s behavior in the Hutchinson trial to the “draconian censure of his own views” put forth in his tract on magistrates and subsequently repudiated publicly after urging by the General Court.<sup>144</sup> This link seems reasonable, particularly when considering Winthrop and Stoughton’s opinions of each other. In a letter to his brother, John Stoughton, Stoughton stated “Mr. Wentthrop said of me ‘This is the man that had been the troubler of Israel’” and that Winthrop “who the truth is had too much forgot and overshot himself” during Stoughton’s censure.<sup>145</sup> In part due to his own treatment by the General Court and his standing as a magistrate, Stoughton dissented from the majority opinion in demanding adherence to what we might see as an early form of due process. Stoughton was not convinced by Winthrop’s rhetorical question “Shall we not believe so many godly elders in a cause wherein we know the mind of the party without their testimony?”<sup>146</sup> Stoughton’s defense of evidence given under oath, in the face of what Breen

---

<sup>142</sup> Hall, “Examination of Mrs. Anne Hutchinson” in *The Antinomian Controversy*, 331.

<sup>143</sup> “The censure which the court is about to pass in my conscience is as much as she deserves, but...I do not formally condemn her because she hath not been formally convicted as others are by witnesses upon oath.” Hall, “Examination of Mrs. Anne Hutchinson” in *The Antinomian Controversy*, 345.

<sup>144</sup> Breen, *Transgressing the Bounds*, 24.

<sup>145</sup> “Israel Stoughton to John Stoughton, 1635” in *Letters from New England: The Massachusetts Bay Colony, 1629-1638*, ed. Everett Emerson (Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press 1976), 148, 151.

<sup>146</sup> Hall, “Examination of Mrs. Anne Hutchinson” in *The Antinomian Controversy*, 331.

describes as “the compelling ring of plain common sense,” reveals an antinomian belief in the validity and respectability of his own opinions and experiences.<sup>147</sup> His defense not only revealed the fissures in Puritan orthodoxy, but also demonstrated the antinomian distrust of the status quo and importance of the individual’s opinions and experiences. Stoughton had risen to prominence on his own judgement, and thus he would exercise it despite the current of opinion. But Stoughton, like Hutchinson herself, also believed in the importance of evidence, not merely the “mind of the party without their testimony.”

William Jennison, a deputy to the General Court from Watertown and a merchant, also occupied a position of questionable orthodoxy.<sup>148</sup> When asked to vote on Hutchinson’s banishment, Jennison replied “I cannot hold up my hand one way or the other, and I shall give my reason if the court require it.”<sup>149</sup> This was not the only time Jennison’s orthodoxy was questioned. In 1634, the General Court had fined Jennison for stating “I pray God deliuer mee from this Court,” a clear sign of disrespect for the court and a demonstration of doubt in the Court’s standing as the hand of God in the Bay Colony.<sup>150</sup> Ten years later, Winthrop wrote in his journal that Jennison “questioned the lawfulness of the parliament’s proceeding in England” during the English Civil War, and that Jennison was questioned by the magistrates. Winthrop also wrote that Jennison “took offence, that being a church member, and in public office” he should be treated so poorly with a public examination rather than a private discussion.<sup>151</sup> Breen

---

<sup>147</sup> Breen, *Transgressing the Bounds*, 28.

<sup>148</sup> Breen, *Transgressing the Bounds*, 19.

<sup>149</sup> Hall, “Examination of Mrs. Anne Hutchinson” in *The Antinomian Controversy*, 348.

<sup>150</sup> Nathaniel B. Shurtleff, editor. *Records Of The Governor And Company Of The Massachusetts Bay In New England*, vol 1 (Boston: The Press of William White, Printer to the Commonwealth, 1854), 132.

<sup>151</sup> John Winthrop, *Winthrop’s Journal: “History of New England,”* vol. 2, ed. James Kendall Hosmer, (New York: Barnes & Noble, Inc., 1946), 178.

also noted that Jennison spent time in the Caribbean, which would have given him a suspect aura in the minds of many orthodox Puritans.<sup>152</sup>

Jennison is thus another example of a “prominent [man] of affairs” who valued his own personal opinion and believed that it deserved to be heard due to his standing in the community. He clearly had reservations about the prevailing “New England Way” of the orthodox party and possessed a view of the world that was larger than the bounds of the Bay Colony. It is these qualities that led Jennison to not make a decision regarding Hutchinson, qualities that link him to Gibbons and Stoughton.

Another merchant who demonstrated certain unorthodox antinomian sympathies during the crisis is Edward Gibbons, a Boston trader. Bernard Bailyn wrote that Gibbons was part of a group of colonists from England, who “once in America...sought to recreate the life they had known at home,” and thus arrived in the New World with Old World wealth.<sup>153</sup> Gibbons briefly possessed vast control over the fur trade in Nova Scotia, and “was involved in complicated dealings with the local merchants” of the Canary Islands.<sup>154</sup> On Gibbons religious leanings, Bailyn described him as a “merchant[] of dubious enthusiasm for Puritanism.”<sup>155</sup> From the *Records Of The Governor And Company Of The Massachusetts Bay In New England*, an interesting picture of Gibbons emerged; one that raised questions about Gibbons’ standing in the community. Gibbons is first mentioned in the records as desiring to be a freeman in the colony,

---

<sup>152</sup> Breen, *Transgressing the Bounds*, 70. I could not discover the specific location in the Caribbean where Jennison resided. The entire region was viewed as questionable to Puritans, and even had Jennison been at Providence Island, the failure of the colony and its involvement in the slave trade would have tainted his credibility.

<sup>153</sup> Bernard Bailyn, *The New England Merchants in the Seventeenth Century*. (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1955), 37.

<sup>154</sup> Bailyn, *New England Merchants*, 60, 84.

<sup>155</sup> Bailyn, *New England Merchants*, 103.

yet his second mention is “for abuseing [himself] disorderly with drinkeing to much stronge drinke.”<sup>156</sup> However this charge of drunkenness does not seem to have greatly affected Gibbons’ standing, as additional entries reveal a man who was tasked with raising public stock, taking inventory on behalf of the General Court and selected as an ensign, among other tasks and responsibilities available only to prominent—and increasingly wealthy—men.<sup>157</sup> Gibbons was also eventually elected as a deputy of the General Court.<sup>158</sup> One can also see Gibbons’ entrepreneurial tendencies as well, including his purchase of land from the Native Americans for the purpose of expanding Charlestowne.<sup>159</sup>

Gibbons had also come to the defense of Hutchinson, arguing: “*Admonition is one of the greatest Censures that the Church can pronounce against any offender...but seinge God hath turned her hart about already to see her Error...Whether the Church had not better wayte a little longer to see if God will not help her to see the rest [of her errors.]*”<sup>160</sup> Gibbons’ comment itself was diplomatic and considerate, yet it was not received well by the rest of the court.<sup>161</sup> This relatively innocuous comment – the only recorded comment Gibbons made throughout the entirety of the crisis – is insufficient evidence to declare Gibbons an antinomian dissenter. Yet Gibbons’ mercantile success and religious unorthodoxy are connected. His belief in his own decision-making abilities – which brought him success in mercantile ventures – prompted him to side with Hutchinson, who had merely expressed her own opinion against the orthodox party.

---

<sup>156</sup> Shurtleff, *Records Of The Massachusetts Bay*, 1:79, 90.

<sup>157</sup> Shurtleff, *Records Of The Massachusetts Bay*, 1:95, 106, 129.

<sup>158</sup> Shurtleff, *Records Of The Massachusetts Bay*, 1:250.

<sup>159</sup> Shurtleff, *Records Of The Massachusetts Bay*, 1:201.

<sup>160</sup> Hall, “Examination of Mrs. Anne Hutchinson” in *The Antinomian Controversy*, 366-367.

<sup>161</sup> “I am much greved to hear that soe many in this congregation should stand up and declare themselves unwilling that Mrs. Hutchinson should be proceded against for such dangerous errors.” Zechariah Symes, minister of Charlestown, in Hall, “Examination of Mrs. Anne Hutchinson” in *The Antinomian Controversy*, 367.

The English origin of Gibbons' wealth also lends doubt to the thesis that it was Puritanism's ascetic work ethic that led to the development of a middle class in New England. As Bailyn noted, Gibbons was not the only merchant who came to the Bay Colony with wealth and a goal to make New England look like Old England.<sup>162</sup> In this way, the economic success of the Massachusetts Bay Colony was due to its prior connections to England and merchants who learned the trade in England. Edward Gibbons is merely one example of this trend.

These "prominent men of affairs," men like Stoughton, Jennison and Gibbons, who engaged in trade and entrepreneurial ventures were not wholly supportive of the handling of the Antinomian Crisis by the colonial government. Successful in their economic ventures and used to making important decisions, these men were unafraid of publicly expressing their unpopular opinions and sided with those who expressed their own theological views in the face of an oppressive orthodoxy. These individuals are excellent examples "prominent men of affairs" whose questionable religious orthodoxy did not prevent them from occupying a high standing in the community. Gibbons came from England already a wealthy man, controlled a vast empire of trade from the Caribbean to Canada, and was largely unconcerned with Puritanism. Jennison lived in the Caribbean for a time. Gibbons, Stoughton and Jennison possessed a global view of the market and were more concerned with their own welfare rather than the local tribe of saints. This larger worldview also provided these men with a willingness to tolerate diversity, as they traded with a wide variety of individuals and interacted with people outside of New England orthodoxy.

Gibbons' Puritan credentials were questionable at best; public drunkenness was not befitting of a good Puritan. Jennison doubted the General Court's divine mandate. Stoughton

---

<sup>162</sup> Bailyn, *New England Merchants*, 37.

disliked his treatment at the hands of the Court. These characteristics place these men in clear contrast with the orthodox party, who valued traditional exercises of authority by magistrates and ministers and intended to govern strictly the local tribe of saints. The Antinomian Controversy allowed the dissenting men to demonstrate their qualms with the New England Way, and their concerns with the direction of orthodoxy stemmed from their merchant values of the importance of the individual's opinion – both theological and political – as well as their willingness to tolerate diversity.

### **Mr. Isaac Allerton**

Another merchant who inhabited the margins of society and engaged in extensive trade across New World colonies was Isaac Allerton. Allerton stood out as an individual “who saw beyond political borders and sought trading opportunities wherever his vast network of mercantile contacts took him.”<sup>163</sup> Allerton's credentials were also impeccably sound – he arrived in Plymouth on board the *Mayflower* and was one of the colony's two elected officials beside William Bradford, serving as the colony's London business agent.<sup>164</sup> John Winthrop even wrote that Allerton welcomed Winthrop and his fellow colonists to the New World.<sup>165</sup> Over time, Allerton's standing among the leadership of the Plymouth Plantation began to wane, and his religious sensibilities are difficult to understand and impossible to define. Many of his actions scandalized leaders such as William Bradford, yet he died in New Haven as a member of the

---

<sup>163</sup> Todt, ““New Netherland and New England,” 369.

<sup>164</sup> Bradford, William. *Of Plymouth Plantation 1620-1647*, ed. Samuel Eliot Morrison (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1952) 441(appendix xiii), 86, 182-183.

<sup>165</sup> “Mr. Allerton came aboard us in a shallop as he was sailing to Pemaquid.” Winthrop, *Journal*, 1:49.

church. Without downplaying the reality of his piety, Allerton's religious sensibilities are best understood as being fluid and secondary to his mercantile ventures.

Allerton joined an English separatist congregation in Leiden, where he was one of relatively few Englishmen to become a citizen of the city, eventually emigrating to the New World with the group.<sup>166</sup> In Plymouth, after sponsoring the arrival of a new preacher who turned out to be "crazed," "Mr. Allerton was much blamed that he would bring such a man over," yet this turned out to be among the least of his sins.<sup>167</sup> Allerton involved the colony in a fishing venture in Maine on his own accord, which failed to produce returns. After this failed, he involved the colony in another fishing venture which also failed to bring back returns.<sup>168</sup> After being relieved of his post as an agent of Plymouth, the ventures Allerton involved the colony in "were not ended till many years after...to the great loss and vexation of the Plantation."<sup>169</sup>

Allerton also employed Thomas Morton, a belligerent Anglican whose scandalous behavior gave Bradford cause to have him sent back to England.<sup>170</sup> The plantation later discovered that Allerton had repeatedly taken out credit he had failed to repay, and had used the plantation's resources for his own gain. He also engaged in trade with Native Americans and the Dutch, and his ability "to move across cultural boundaries with ease made [him a ] symbol of everything that Bradford mistrusted."<sup>171</sup> Bradford wrote that Allerton was proof that "'the love of money is the root of all

---

<sup>166</sup> Cynthia J. Van Zandt, *Brothers Among Nations: The Pursuit of Intercultural Alliances in Early America, 1580-1660*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 92.

<sup>167</sup> Bradford, *Of Plymouth Plantation*, 211.

<sup>168</sup> Bradford, *Of Plymouth Plantation*, 220, 227.

<sup>169</sup> Bradford, *Of Plymouth Plantation*, 233.

<sup>170</sup> Van Zandt, *Brothers Among Nation*, 96.

<sup>171</sup> Van Zandt, *Brothers Among Nations*, 101.

evil.”<sup>172</sup> In the end, Allerton destroyed the finances of his former father-in-law, the well-respected William Brewster, and deserted the colony.<sup>173</sup>

Allerton, while never a freeman of the Bay Colony, established a fishing village within the colony’s boundaries in Marblehead following his departure from Plymouth. This venture proved to be short lived as well. In March of 1635, the General Court sent a posse to his village to inform him of “the desire of the country for his removeall from Marble Harbour.”<sup>174</sup> In the colony’s records the Court did not specify its reasoning for expelling Allerton, yet in a late nineteenth century self-published family history, William S. Allerton – a descendent of Allerton’s – claimed that it was “on account of his religious views.”<sup>175</sup> While William Allerton’s book was clearly biased in favor of his ancestor, his research was thorough and he rarely failed to cite his sources. In William’s defense, one might argue that Bradford’s *Of Plymouth Plantation* painted an equally biased picture of Allerton, unfairly maligning the liberal-minded merchant.<sup>176</sup> It is also quite reasonable to question the piety of a man like Allerton, who undoubtedly misused the Plymouth colony’s funds for his own gain.

Following his unceremonious departure from the Bay Colony, Allerton moved to New Amsterdam where he quickly established himself as a respected merchant, making new contacts in the Dutch colony without alienating his old trade partners in numerous New England

---

<sup>172</sup> Bradford, *Of Plymouth Plantation*, 239. 1 Tim. 6:10

<sup>173</sup> Bradford, *Of Plymouth Plantation*, 242, 244.

<sup>174</sup> Shurtleff, *Records Of The Massachusetts Bay*, 1:140.

<sup>175</sup> Allerton, William S, *A History of the Allerton Family in the United States: 1585 to 1885. And a Genealogy of the Descendants of Isaac Allerton*, (New York: published by the author, 1888), 37.

<sup>176</sup> William S. Allerton would no doubt agree. He stated that Bradford’s journal was “written with all the energy and rancour of his narrow and prejudiced mind” and described the colonists at Plymouth as narrowminded and “bigoted.” Allerton,

colonies.<sup>177</sup> By the early 1640s, Allerton had established a second residence in the recently established colony at New Haven, serving the colonists there as a useful interlocutor between New Haven and New Amsterdam.<sup>178</sup> His success there is all the more remarkable given the fact that scholars regard New Haven as the most religiously conservative of New England's Puritan colonies and yet, Allerton flourished there after having been removed from the Bay Colony on suspicion of religious deviancy. Regardless, his residence in New Haven demonstrated that Allerton continued to inhabit both various versions of Puritanism and the world of international trade. Allerton continued to expand his trade contacts, selling tobacco to Swedish colonists on the Delaware and encompassing Virginia within his trade network.<sup>179</sup> Towards the end of his life, he often served as a mediator of disputes, including one instance where he settled a dispute involving a stolen boat sold to a resident of another colony. In another instance the council records of New Amsterdam stated that the council was "informed by Isaac Allerton of the arrival of several men-of-war at Boston, designed against New Netherland."<sup>180</sup> Although Allerton was an Englishman, his actions demonstrated how he could operate between boundaries and loyalties.

Allerton died in 1659 in New Haven, yet his long life illustrated the true nature of economic life in New England and the Bay Colony.<sup>181</sup> He arrived in the New World already a man of standing in the community – in Leiden his business acumen was so valued he was asked to help plan the venture to New England – and he was quickly elected to leadership in the

---

<sup>177</sup> Van Zandt, *Brothers Among Nations*, 103.

<sup>178</sup> Van Zandt, *Brothers Among Nations*, 107.

<sup>179</sup> Van Zandt, *Brothers Among Nations*, 111.

<sup>180</sup> Van Zandt, *Brothers Among Nations*, 112. E.B. O'Callaghan, ed. *Calendar of Historical Manuscripts in the Office of the Secretary of State*, vol. 1 (Albany, NY: Weed, Parsons and Company, 1865), 137.

<sup>181</sup> Van Zandt, *Brothers Among Nations*, 113.

Plymouth colony.<sup>182</sup> Allerton had connections across the Atlantic in London and traded across colonial North America, from Maine to Virginia as well as New Sweden and New Netherland. His religious sensibilities were nonchalant at best, and he moved across religious boundaries as easily as he moved between colonies. While an elected official of Plymouth he used the colony's money to his own benefit, and he was removed from the Bay Colony due to his religious views.

Yet despite these facts, and William Bradford's opinion of him, the colonists needed Allerton for the goods and services he provided. Allerton – and men like him – linked the New World with the Old. Widely known as simply “Mr. Allerton” across colonies, Allerton made himself a commodity, trading news, luxury items and anything in between across the New World.<sup>183</sup> The mercantile career of Isaac Allerton illustrated – perhaps better than anyone – the interconnectedness of the early modern transatlantic world. It also demonstrated how proto-capitalism was not driven by a small group of ascetic Puritans, but rather extended from Europe and existed in the Massachusetts Bay Colony as the property of religiously unorthodox “prominent men of affairs.” It was Allerton's experiences in the larger world and self-interest that led him to conduct business across the Atlantic world in a vast network of trade.

### **Robert Keayne**

A notable example of the backwardness of the Bay Colony's approach to emerging patterns of trans-Atlantic economic life is the famous censure of the pious merchant Robert Keayne in 1639. Keayne was born in England towards the end of the sixteenth century to humble

---

<sup>182</sup> Van Zandt, *Brothers Among Nations*, 92.

<sup>183</sup> Van Zandt, *Brothers Among Nations*, 107.

beginnings as a butcher's son. After an apprenticeship, Keayne entered the merchant profession and quickly demonstrated his ability for hard-bargaining, entering the ranks of the Merchant Tailors' company in 1615.<sup>184</sup> Twenty years later, Keayne emigrated to the New World, having already made a fortune in the Old, much like Gibbons. As Bailyn noted, "a reputation for sharp dealing and heartlessness in business had preceded him to the New World," yet Keayne arrived in the Bay Colony not for economic reasons, but spiritual ones.<sup>185</sup> John Winthrop confided to his journal that Keayne "was wealthy and sold dearer than most other tradesmen, and for that he was of ill report for the like of covetous practice in England," and that Keayne arrived in New England "for the advancement of the gospel here."<sup>186</sup> Yet Keayne's economic habits quickly tarnished whatever spiritual virtues he may have possessed. In 1639, the General Court declared that "Mr Robrt shalbee fined 200, whereof 100 to bee paid before the first month next, & the other 100 to be respited till the next Generall Court."<sup>187</sup> The Court punished Keayne "for taking above six-pence in the shilling profit; in some above eight-pence; and, in some small things, above two for one."<sup>188</sup> The godly commonwealth of the Massachusetts Bay Colony would not tolerate greed, especially towards one's Christian brothers.

Keayne's censure – and the resulting embarrassment – remained with him throughout his life, as he believed himself to be innocent of any real sin. His will, "The Last Will and Testament of Me, Robert Keayne, All of it Written With My Own Hands and Began by Me, Mo: 6: I: 1653, Commonly Called August," displays a bitter man addressing the censure that occurred fourteen

---

<sup>184</sup> Bernard Bailyn, "The Apologia of Robert Keayne," *The William and Mary Quarterly* 7, no. 4 (Oct. 1950): 569-570.

<sup>185</sup> Bailyn, "The Apologia of Robert Keayne," 572.

<sup>186</sup> Winthrop, *Journal*, 1:316.

<sup>187</sup> Shurtleff, *Records Of The Massachusetts Bay*, 1:281.

<sup>188</sup> Winthrop, *Journal*, 1:315.

years earlier.<sup>189</sup> Initially acknowledging wrongdoing in his life and profession – and praising the justice of God, Keayne’s tone quickly changed to one of sarcasm and frustration: “Was the selling of 6 d. nails for 8 d. per lb. and 8 d. nails for 10 d. per lb. such a crying and oppressing sin?”<sup>190</sup> Asking rhetorically if such mercantile practices were uncommon in the realm of commerce, Keayne clearly believed that his actions were not sinful and that similar—and much worse – actions occurred often in the marketplace. He also hypothesized an individual member of the court – whom Bailyn estimates to be Richard Bellingham – to have a personal vendetta against him, and thus brought the charges against him two years after the incident, when Bellingham was a member of the court.<sup>191</sup>

Despite the fact that Bellingham’s presence on the court may have swayed it against Keayne, Keayne’s censure revealed the Bay Colony’s ambivalence towards profit-seeking ventures, no matter how justified. Keayne repeatedly argued (albeit years later in his will) that his behavior was common and befitting for a merchant, asking “was it such a heinous sin to sell 2 or 3 dozen of great gold buttons for 2 s. 10 d. per dozen that cost 2 s. 2 d. ready money in London...as I showed to many by my invoice...?”<sup>192</sup> The General Court’s decision answered Keayne’s question in the affirmative. In addition, Winthrop’s account of the affair also demonstrated commonly held Puritan beliefs on commerce, and how an individual engaging in such an activity was to comport oneself. Winthrop stated that Keayne’s behavior was due to

---

<sup>189</sup> Robert Keayne and Bernard Bailyn. “The Apologia of Robert Keayne: The Last Will and Testament of Me, Robert Keayne, all of it Written with My Own Hands and Began by Me, 1653, Commonly Called August; the Self-Portrait of a Puritan Merchant” (New York: Harper & Row, 1965).

<sup>190</sup> Keayne, “The Last Will and Testament of Me, Robert Keayne,” 52.

<sup>191</sup> Bailyn, “The Apologia of Robert Keayne,” 574, footnote 36. Keayne, “The Last Will and Testament of Me, Robert Keayne,” 53.

<sup>192</sup> Keayne, “The Last Will and Testament of Me, Robert Keayne,” 52.

“being misled by some false principles,” such as attempting to make up for in one good what one lost in another good and charging above New England fair market value due to the high market price in England. Winthrop then continued his discussion of “false principles,” citing a lecture from John Cotton in which Cotton had addressed false mercantile beliefs and proposed proper, godly “rules for trading.”<sup>193</sup> Winthrop’s citation of Cotton is ironic considering that Cotton was wrapped up in the Antinomian controversy. Hutchinson had followed Cotton to the New World and considered him to be one of the few ministers who was not a “legalist.”<sup>194</sup> During the controversy, Cotton’s orthodoxy was questioned. Thomas Shepard even stated that “Mr. Cotton repents not, but is hid only,” and complained that Cotton’s teachings had enabled Hutchinson’s blasphemy.<sup>195</sup> Cotton survived the controversy but was forced to give a demonstration of his orthodoxy. Concluding his summary of the incident, Winthrop relayed that Keayne was only given an admonition from the First Church in Boston,<sup>196</sup> as he was in the communion of the church and only sinned due to “an error in his judgment, being led by false principles.”<sup>197</sup> Winthrop, Cotton and the General Court’s mercantile “principles” were clearly at odds with those of the merchant Keayne.

---

<sup>193</sup> Winthrop, *Journal*, 1:317.

<sup>194</sup> Hall, *Antinomian Controversy*, 6.

<sup>195</sup> Thomas Shepard, *Gods Plot: The Paradoxes of Puritan Piety, Being the Autobiography and Journal of Thomas Shepard*, ed. Michael McGiffert (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1972), 74.

<sup>196</sup> “The 26<sup>th</sup> Day of the same 9<sup>th</sup> Moneth. being a day of Publique fast for our Congregation, our brother Mr Robert Keayne was Admonisht by our pastor in the Name of the Church for selling his wares at excessive Rates, to the Dishonor of Gods Name, the Offence of the Generall Court, and the Publique Scandall of the Cuntry” reads the text of the admonition. “Records of the First Church in Boston 1630-1868.” *Publications of The Colonial Society of Massachusetts*, vol 39, ed. Richard D. Pierce (Boston: The Colonial Society of Massachusetts, 1961), 25.

<sup>197</sup> Winthrop, *Journal*, 1:318.

Thus, the Keayne incident prompts one to conclude that the government of the Massachusetts Bay Colony was not amenable to the proto-capitalist, profit-seeking urges of its merchants. It is true that the Keayne incident could also be touted as evidence for a colonial government protecting its citizens from price-gouging by the few merchants in the new colony. However, the fact of Keayne's prominence in the community – as a member of the First Church of Boston, as a representative to the General Court and as a surveyor – revealed that Keayne's censure is evidence of a distrust of wealth and proto-capitalist ideals, and not a colonial government defending its citizens from a greedy merchant.<sup>198</sup> The General Court, the Governor of the Colony, a prominent pastor and the First Church in Boston all demonstrated “principles” of trade contrary to the proto-capitalist ideals of the pious and profit-seeking merchant, Robert Keayne. The Keayne affair served to demonstrate that the Massachusetts Bay Colony was no bastion of economic freedom and capitalist ideals. If anything, the Bay Colony's policies and rulings demonstrated its economic backwardness in comparison to Europe and its unwillingness to encourage profit-seeking, which it viewed as a threat to the experimental religious ideals and purposes of the community.

### **Reverend Richard Blynman**

Another example of a pious and industrious man arrived in the person of the Reverend Richard Blynman (sometimes Blinman or Blindman), the preacher of Gloucester in the Bay Colony during the 1640s. Blynman came to the Bay Colony from Wales in Great Britain, officially organizing the Colony's nineteenth church in Gloucester in 1642, according to John

---

<sup>198</sup> Bailyn, “The Apologia of Robert Keayne,” 572.

Babson's nineteenth century history of the town.<sup>199</sup> Blynman's religious convictions fell well within the bounds of Puritan orthodoxy – he even corresponded with Increase Mather upon matters of European wars and “our comon fears of Popery.”<sup>200</sup> A tract written towards the end of his life polemically constructed his views on infant baptism (which he adamantly opposed), and its conclusion revealed the distinct covenant theology of the Puritans, particularly the American variety. Blynman wrote that, “In baptizing the infants, or young children of an inchurched Parent, we do not alter and change the subject, but do give them what God hath appointed should be given to such, whose Parent is externally in covenant with him: and that is, the initiatory sign and seal of that covenant of grace which God made with *Abraham* and his Church-seed.”<sup>201</sup> Blynman's theology was clearly that of a Puritan dissenter from the view of baptism as transforming sacrament taught by the Church of England, a fact solidified by his various appointments as preacher in various Bay Colony towns.

Yet scandal seemed to follow Blynman, no matter where he went. Babson wrote that “unhappy dissensions drove Mr. Blynman from the scene in his first ministry” in the Plymouth Colony and that “he himself was scoffingly spoken of for what he had delivered in the way of ministry,” even after his arrival in Gloucester.<sup>202</sup> In Thomas Lechford's *Plain Dealing*, Lechford detailed that “Master Wilson [Rev John Wilson of Boston] did lately ride to Greens harbour in Plymouth Patent, to appease a broyle between one Master Thomas, as I take it, his name is, and

---

<sup>199</sup> John J. Babson, *History of the Town of Gloucester, Cape Ann, Including the Town of Rockport*. (Gloucester: Procter Brothers, 1860), 189.

<sup>200</sup> Richard Blinman to Increase Mather, March 8, 1678. Massachusetts Historical Society. *Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society*, vol VIII, Fourth Series. (Boston: Wiggin and Lunt, 1868): 331.

<sup>201</sup> Richard Blinman, Rev. *A Rejoynder to Mr. Henry Danvers his Brief Friendly Reply to my Ansvver About Infant-Baptism*. (London: Thomas Wall, Bookseller, 1675.), 28.

<sup>202</sup> Babson, *History of the Town of Gloucester*, 190-191.

master Blindman, where master Blindman went by the worst” and was removed from the colony by Wilson, and, ironically, Captain Robert Keayne.<sup>203</sup> Winthrop described the same event in his journal, stating that it was a peaceful disagreement that could not be repaired, and that Blynman moved to Gloucester not even a year after first arriving in New England from Wales.<sup>204</sup> No details on the specifics of this disagreement remain, and were probably never recorded, yet the fact that Blynman was escorted from Plymouth by a Boston pastor is intriguing. Babson noted that Blynman appeared have good dealings in his other affairs, and the details of the “dissensions” are unavailable, yet it appears Blynman’s personal orthodoxy didn’t translate successfully to the pulpit.

Blynman’s standing as a minister within Puritan orthodoxy did not prevent him from engaging in relatively unorthodox economic ventures. The minister of Gloucester – in an act of his own “individual enterprise” – constructed a canal through Cape Ann, connecting the Massachusetts Bay to the Ipswich Bay.<sup>205</sup> Babson noted that this project had been desired by the General Court since 1638, yet it was not determined to be important enough to warrant government funding.<sup>206</sup> Instead, the town of Gloucester voted on ““26<sup>th</sup> 5 mo. 1643,”” that Blynman “was to ‘cut the beach through, and to maintain it, and to have the benefit of it to himself and his for ever; giving the inhabitants of the town free passage.’”<sup>207</sup>

---

<sup>203</sup> Lechford, Thomas. *Plain Dealing or News from New England*, ed. J. Hammond Trumbull (Boston: J.K. Wiggin & Wm. Parsons Lunt, 1867), 125-126.

<sup>204</sup> Winthrop, *Journal*, 2:58-59.

<sup>205</sup> Babson, *History of the Town of Gloucester*, 7.

<sup>206</sup> Babson, *History of the Town of Gloucester*, 7.

<sup>207</sup> Babson, *History of the Town of Gloucester*, 7. Babson does not specify his source material, although it almost certainly came from the First Town Book, the records of the town of Gloucester. Thanks to Professor Dan Beaver for alerting me to this source.

Blynman's economic initiative is strange, particularly when considering his position as a minister. Blynman built the canal as the English Civil War raged on, himself a member of the second wave of colonists in the 1640s. Many members of this group colonists went ahead with economic ventures, engaging in a wide array of profit-seeking activities. Blynman's Welsh roots also distinguished him from many of the Bay Colony's founders, who hailed from London and Eastern England. It is even fair to speculate that part of the reason his Gloucester congregation continued to view him "scoffingly" was due to his interest in economic ventures at the expense of his pastoral ministry. After all, Blynman organized the first church in Gloucester in 1642, and built the canal during the next year. His economic ventures may also have scandalized the landed gentry establishment, who possessed certain ideas about the behavior of a minister and bristled when such ideas were not fulfilled. Overall, Blynman's canal building initiative is important because it demonstrated the many factors necessary for a minister to risk engaging in economic ventures. The uniqueness of Blynman's venture demonstrated that it was not religious orthodoxy that prompted proto-capitalist, profit-seeking ventures, but rather a combination of other factors.

### **The Bay Colony within the World Economy**

In order to better understand the economic success of the Massachusetts Bay Colony, we must turn our attention finally to its place in the early modern economy of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. It is naïve to assume that the success of the Bay Colony arose solely, or even primarily, from the sweat and toil of the women and men who hoed the rocky soil of New England. A fuller picture emerges when we analyze the global economy at the turn of the seventeenth century and the factors that enabled the Bay Colony to thrive as an outpost of

merchant capitalism. Recognizing the debate surrounding the term ‘merchant capitalism,’ it remains true that a definition is necessary in order to proceed. To achieve this, we will turn to the economic historian Jan Luiten van Zanden.

Van Zanden clarified his definition of merchant capitalism in an important essay “Do We Need a New Theory of Merchant Capitalism?”<sup>208</sup> Van Zanden described merchant capitalism as “capitalism in the process of construction” and argued that it is characterized by various entities that enable economic production. He continued: “The construction process is concentrated in relatively small urbanized, commercial islands in a noncapitalist sea. The merchant-entrepreneur, the architect of the whole, operates within production systems which are characterized by a poorly developed commercial traffic, in which labor is still tied to the soil and precapitalist notions continue to survive.”<sup>209</sup> Van Zanden’s definition remained relevant in the face of more recent scholarship which emphasized the regional nature of economic growth in Early Modern Europe and the colonies. The definition van Zanden described also fits with the merchants of the Massachusetts Bay Colony – and the ‘precapitalist’ orthodox Puritans – although the characteristics of this definition rests largely upon theories of labor that do not necessarily fit the colonial context. Still, the emphasis on slave and forced labor as a driving force in the world economy can be seen in the Bay Colony’s servant population of indigenous and enslaved persons, and was certainly present in the Caribbean, where the Bay Colony enjoyed ties to the Puritan colony of Providence Island.<sup>210</sup> Yet overall, van Zanden’s definition and supporting evidence can be applied to the situation in the Bay Colony, where merchants such as Keayne,

---

<sup>208</sup> Jan Luiten van Zanden, “Do We Need a Theory of Merchant Capitalism?” *Review (Fernand Braudel Center)* 20, no. 2 (Spring 1997): 255-267.

<sup>209</sup> Van Zanden, “Merchant Capitalism,” 258.

<sup>210</sup> Van Zanden, “Merchant Capitalism,” 259. Kupperman, *Providence Island*.

Gibbons, and Jennison operated in the colony with strong ties to London and the international market of trans-atlantic proto-capitalism, with prevalent growing pains, such as the Keayne affair.

In recent years, historical economic scholarship has continued to allow room for a theory of merchant capitalism. The articles in *Early Modern Capitalism: Economic and social change in Europe, 1400-1800* demonstrated an early modern economy that was both global and regional; progressive and backwards, and as a whole the volume affirmed van Zanden's definition of merchant capitalism.<sup>211</sup> Jan Lucassen questioned the veracity of the term, but ultimately left it up for debate and argued that it fits with data that shows a gradual economic conversion from proto-capitalism to modern capitalism.<sup>212</sup> In the introduction to the volume, Maarten Prak emphasized that the articles it contained "strongly reinforce that case" of a regional approach to economic growth in the early modern economy.<sup>213</sup> Edwin Horlings even stated that "stark regional contrasts in the level of economic development...should consequently be regarded as characteristic of the premodern economy," citing aggregate economic performance of more modern nations as evidence.<sup>214</sup> This regional approach to economic growth fits perfectly with van Zanden's definition of merchant capitalism as existing in proto-capitalist oases within a largely 'precapitalist' society. The early modern period experienced this proto-capitalism in several ways that pertain to the current study. The surge in growth in England's economy, the

---

<sup>211</sup> Maarten Prak, ed. *Early Modern Capitalism: Economic and social change in Europe, 1400-1800* (London and New York: Routledge, 2001).

<sup>212</sup> Jan Lucassen, "Mobilization of labour in early modern Europe," in *Early Modern Capitalism*, ed. Prak, 170.

<sup>213</sup> Prak, introduction to *Early Modern Capitalism*, 18.

<sup>214</sup> Edwin Horlings, "The transition to an industrial economy," in *Early Modern Capitalism*, ed. Prak, 92-93.

rise of cities as bastions of proto-capitalism and colonization as a result of growth all demonstrated that economic growth largely depended on factors outside the Puritans' control.

The economic growth of England during the early modern period made it an outlier during a time when “economic growth was not a normal condition in Europe.”<sup>215</sup> England – as well as the Netherlands – stood out due to its consistently increasing population, urbanization ratio and GDP per capita (although the sixteenth century is a potential exception to GDP). This corresponded to an increase in the size of England's merchant fleet and iron production.<sup>216</sup> The increasing size of England's fleet and population transformed it into a strong international player in terms of trade and colonization. This colonization demanded colonists – mainly for the Caribbean but also for New England – a demand that England's increasing population could provide.<sup>217</sup> Colonization was also one of “the best recipe[s] for growth,” as it allowed a nation to take advantage of resources that had been largely untapped.<sup>218</sup>

Critical for both colonization and international trade was the status of a region's main city. Van Zanden wrote that, a nation's “economic growth was closely related to the fact that the specific city and region either managed to acquire a central position in the international trading network.”<sup>219</sup> For England, London arose on the international scene at this time period, and in the New World it was Boston (and New Amsterdam) that came to acquire a central position in the international trade network. It was through Boston – not Plymouth or New Haven – that the timber, agricultural products, fish, and even trading vessels of America were shipped both to

---

<sup>215</sup> Jan Luiten van Zanden, “A survey of the European economy, 1500-1800,” in *Early Modern Capitalism*, ed. Prak, 84.

<sup>216</sup> Van Zanden, “survey of the European economy,” 85.

<sup>217</sup> Jan Lucassen, “Mobilization of labour in early modern Europe,” in *Early Modern Capitalism*, ed. Prak, 166.

<sup>218</sup> Horlings, “transition to an industrial economy,” 97-98.

<sup>219</sup> Van Zanden, “survey of the European economy,” 84.

ports in the Caribbean and in other cases, back to Europe. It was Boston's status as an important port city that allowed for the Bay Colony's economy to flourish.<sup>220</sup> In the early modern economy, there existed an "urban monopoly on long-distance trade," and Boston possessed a share of that monopoly, its comparative advantage being its status as one of few ports in the North Atlantic New World.<sup>221</sup>

Stephen Alford's *London's Triumph: Merchants, Adventurers, and Money in Shakespeare's City* has detailed the rise of the city from an economic backwater to an international hub of trade and commerce and reiterated the importance of cities in early modern trade.<sup>222</sup> Alford wrote: "Where for centuries London's merchants had been content to send their ships to and from the Low Countries..., France and the Baltic, by 1620 they knew Russia, Persia, the far eastern Mediterranean and Africa, and had bases from the Red Sea to Japan, as well as colonies in North America. Their ambitions were without limit; they built vast trading corporations and entertained hopes of trans- and inter-continental business that would circumnavigate the globe."<sup>223</sup> It is within this network of global trade that the Massachusetts Bay Colony was founded, after all, its founding charter was that of the Massachusetts Bay Company, a for-profit venture. Alford described how England's unique conditions allowed London's merchants to adapt to a changing global economy, dealing with the seizure of ships, a war-torn

---

<sup>220</sup> Still, the Bay colony remained dependent on the international market. During the English Civil War in the 1640s, the economy suffered a recession due to its reduced trade with London. Horlings wrote that "The long-term economic strength of a city was ultimately determined by its capacity to remain in control of its trade network and was therefore a military as much as an economic issue." This is certainly true of Boston. Horlings, "transition to an industrial economy," 98.

<sup>221</sup> Horlings, "transition to an industrial economy," 97.

<sup>222</sup> Stephen Alford, *London's Triumph: Merchants, Adventurers, and Money in Shakespeare's City* (New York: Bloomsbury, 2017).

<sup>223</sup> Alford, *London's Triumph*, xi.

Europe, learning to lend and borrow money and looking for new markets.<sup>224</sup> Alford defended the global-view of his study on London by stating that “it would be impossible to understand what made the city’s mercantile elite tick without taking in the whole globe.”<sup>225</sup> It is out of this global-focus of London and her merchants that the Bay Colony arose.

Alford described the motives for exploring the globe, the New World as well as Russia, the eastern Mediterranean, Africa and the East Indies, by quoting the poet Thomas Churchyard: “For country’s wealth for private gain, / or glory seek we all.”<sup>226</sup> This brief verse summed up the mixed bag of motives for pursuing economic ventures abroad. It also served to demonstrate the status of the New World as just another location among many for London’s merchants to seek profits. True, the New World was exotic and unknown, but also were the Indies and parts of Russia. Still, America possessed a certain appeal, as it was completely unknown and “it offered raw materials, potential for colonization, and the hope of future transatlantic trade.”<sup>227</sup> These characteristics of the New World drew English merchants to her shores, not only the hope of creating a godly commonwealth.

Proto-capitalistic activities and mercantile ventures operating within – and in spite of – a hostile and non-capitalist sea lie at the core of the argument being put forth in this analysis of the Bay Colony and its tentative relationship to Max Weber’s suppositions. An example from the Massachusetts Bay Colony of these activities in a non-capitalist sea can be seen in its trade with New Netherland. Kim Todt analyzed this in “Trading between New Netherland and New England, 1624—1664,” where she argued that merchants from the Dutch and English colonies

---

<sup>224</sup> Alford, *London’s Triumph*, xv.

<sup>225</sup> Alford, *London’s Triumph*, xvi.

<sup>226</sup> Thomas Churchyard, *A discourse of the Queenes Majesties entertainment in Suffolk and Norfolk*, London, 1578, sig. H3v, cited in Alford, *London’s Triumph*, 172.

<sup>227</sup> Alford, *London’s Triumph*, 178.

engaged in trade that was vital to both settlements.<sup>228</sup> Todt noted that New England provided an excellent source for quality horses and cattle, and that merchants in the Dutch colony viewed Boston as a major trading hub.<sup>229</sup> The Bay Colony also hired a Dutch translator in order to facilitate trade and correspondence between the two colonies.<sup>230</sup>

Yet perhaps the most important aspect of trade between these two colonies is that during the English Civil War, and thereafter, New Netherland provided a means by which New England merchants could interact with the Atlantic world. The political upheaval of England during the 1640s forced New England and her merchants to turn to New Netherland for capital, credit and currency, as the Dutch colony “had the commercial institutions in – and stability of – Amsterdam.”<sup>231</sup> The Bay Colony’s turning from London to Amsterdam demonstrates the colony’s dependence on the transatlantic market based in Europe. The Bay Colony – and all the New England colonies – could not have existed without a lifeline to Europe. As Bernard Bailyn noted, “civil war and a political revolution snapped the cords of public life,” not just in the Old World but in the New as well.<sup>232</sup> The war ended the flow of settlers seeking God and a plow in the rocky soil of the Massachusetts Bay, causing major problems for the nascent economy. The colonists depended on exports from England, and the decreasing flow of people meant that new wealth was not arriving in the colony, and thus the only people who could buy products were similarly impoverished Puritans who had purchased their lands on English credit. This drove

---

<sup>228</sup> Kim Todt, “Trading between New Netherland and New England, 1624—1664,” *Early American Studies* 9, no. 2 (Spring 2011): 348-378.

<sup>229</sup> Todt, ““New Netherland and New England,” 365, 369.

<sup>230</sup> Todt, ““New Netherland and New England,” 370. Shurtleff, *Records Of The Massachusetts Bay*, 4:424.

<sup>231</sup> Todt, ““New Netherland and New England,” 349.

<sup>232</sup> Bailyn, *New England Merchants*, 45.

down the prices of commodities, while at the same time, the English credit with which many Puritans had purchased their farms could not be repaid, as returns were hard to come by through farming.<sup>233</sup>

In addition, historians have now documented the massive impact of a “Little Ice Age” that reached its nadir during the 1640s. Geoffrey Parker’s *Global Crisis: War, Climate Change and Catastrophe in the Seventeenth Century* analyzed the effects of this ice age on various regions, concluding that “few areas of the world survived the mid-seventeenth century unscathed.”<sup>234</sup> Parker cited Winthrop, writing in his journal in 1642, who stated “the frost was so great and continual this winter, that all the bay was frozen over, so much and so long, as the like by the Indians’ relation, had not been these 40 years.”<sup>235</sup> It was not only a cold decade for the Bay Colony. Parker cited numerous examples of cold temperatures across the globe, which greatly affected crop yields.<sup>236</sup> The “Little Ice Age,” working in tandem with the English Civil War, made the 1640s a difficult decade for the Bay Colonists. These facts – as Todt noted – led to some New England merchants engaging in trade with Dutch colonists in New Netherland. The Massachusetts Bay Colony could not long remain an independent or isolated ‘city on a hill’ experiment as Winthrop and the magistrate gentry of his generation had hoped. Rather, it depended on its connections to Europe and the international world.

Ironically, actions taken by the leaders of the Bay Colony during the recession brought about by the English Civil War and the “Little Ice Age” demonstrated their limited understanding of markets and backwardness of their economic thought. Bailyn noted that despite

---

<sup>233</sup> Bailyn, *New England Merchants*, 46-47.

<sup>234</sup> Geoffrey Parker, *Global Crisis: War, Climate Change and Catastrophe in the Seventeenth Century*, (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2013), xxii.

<sup>235</sup> Winthrop, *Journal*, 2:54; Parker, *Global Crisis*, 4.

<sup>236</sup> Parker, *Global Crisis*, 17.

the attitude of the merchants, the government “took steps to preserve the populace from the consequences of the money shortage and the rapacity of middlemen.”<sup>237</sup> One such step was the enacting of a law to prevent estates at being valued too low by creditors seeking repayment. The General Court achieved this by declaring that an estate “shallbee valewed at by 3 understanding & indifferent men, to bee chosen, the one by the creditor, another by the debtor, & the third by the marshall.”<sup>238</sup> They also enacted a law enabling a debtor to repay his debts “in corne, cattle, fish or other comodities” at a rate established by the Court.<sup>239</sup> These steps were taken in order to defend the consumer and the debtor rather than the producer and the creditor. Bailyn described such efforts as “a practical application of the idea of just price,” – a medieval concept that the European world had started to move away from – the same concept that cost Robert Keayne his reputation.<sup>240</sup> In this way, the Bay Colony demonstrated that its ruling elites possessed an economic outlook that was dated in regards to the emerging patterns of contemporary European economic thought.

### **The Role of Women**

This thesis has, up until this point, focused primarily on the role of men as economic actors on the international stage, and this is no accident. The Massachusetts Bay Colony was like most of the early modern world in that it was a patriarchal society, where women played secondary roles as wives and homemakers. Ironically, the current study started with a woman,

---

<sup>237</sup> Bailyn, *New England Merchants*, 47.

<sup>238</sup> Shurtleff, *Records Of The Massachusetts Bay*, 1:307.

<sup>239</sup> Shurtleff, *Records Of The Massachusetts Bay*, 1:304.

<sup>240</sup> Bailyn, *New England Merchants*, 49.

Anne Hutchinson, and the challenge she brought to social and religious orthodoxy in the Bay Colony. Yet in analyzing the rift that the Antinomian Controversy revealed, this study has focused overwhelmingly upon the mercantile ventures of men. We will now turn our discussion to a gendered rendering of the question of the relationship between merchant capitalism and puritanism in the Massachusetts Bay Colony—and beyond.

The Bay Colony functioned as a patriarchal society – and this fact cannot be ignored – yet in terms of gender the Puritan colonies differed in significant ways from England. Cornelia Hughes Dayton’s *Women Before the Bar: Gender, Law, and Society in Connecticut, 1639-1789*, detailed the ways in which women interacted with the colonial court system, predominantly in New Haven.<sup>241</sup> Dayton acknowledged that women in New England faced discrimination, in differing forms such as being disproportionately tried for witchcraft and in silencing women, such as Hutchinson, who sought to be “political beings and religious leaders.”<sup>242</sup> Yet Dayton also recognized that Puritans often accepted testimony from women as equal to men, even on cases involving sexual encounters, citing New Haven’s effectively single standard for sexual misconduct of both women and men.<sup>243</sup> Another example of New Haven’s openness towards women is the fact that the colony granted full divorce and remarriage rights to both women and men, provided the remarrying party was innocent.<sup>244</sup> In this way, the Puritan colonies were more accepting towards women in public life compared to England and to other colonies such as the royalized colony of Virginia.

---

<sup>241</sup> Cornelia Hughes Dayton, *Women before the Bar: Gender, Law, and Society in Connecticut, 1639-1789* (Chapel Hill and London: University of North Carolina Press, 1995).

<sup>242</sup> Dayton, *Women before the Bar*, 9.

<sup>243</sup> Dayton, *Women before the Bar*, 10.

<sup>244</sup> Dayton, *Women before the Bar*, 31.

Women in both New Haven and the Bay colony played an important role in economic activity. Laurel Ulrich described New England women as ““deputy husbands,”” serving as economic agents of their husbands. These women operated out of personal interest insofar as it was also their husband’s interest and possessed little autonomy.<sup>245</sup> In the Bay Colony, the ruling authorities opposed divorce, but offered jointures – a promise of support for a woman during her likely widowhood – which spoke to “their concern for widows, and does not contradict their opposition to separate estates giving women independence as wives,” as a single interest was viewed as essential for the thriving of a family.<sup>246</sup> Still, Dayton argued that women “were perceived as integral to the local economy,” especially important in the pseudo-barter economy of New England.<sup>247</sup> Women’s testimony was also valued in the memory-based economy of New England, and women were often called upon by husbands and fathers to testify in court to business conversations had in their presence months before.<sup>248</sup>

Yet as the economies of the Bay Colony and New Haven became more and more engaged in international trade, the status of women changed. Dayton wrote that “the growing economy did not change the rhythm of New Haven County women’s lives as much as it distanced them from the changing world of men’s dealings and the litigation those dealings engendered.” Previously, women and men both functioned on the local marketplace, yet as the economy expanded in the form of credit and transferable notes, transactions became more and more the property of men.<sup>249</sup> It is important to note that the Bay Colony was silent on the issue of

---

<sup>245</sup> Laurel Ulrich, *Good Wives*, quoted and paraphrased in Marylynn Salmon, *Women and the Law of Property in Early America* (Chapel Hill and London: University of North Carolina Press, 1986), 122.

<sup>246</sup> Salmon, *Women and the Law of Property*, 122-123.

<sup>247</sup> Dayton, *Women before the Bar*, 71.

<sup>248</sup> Dayton, *Women before the Bar*, 73.

<sup>249</sup> Dayton, *Women before the Bar*, 58.

females engaging in trade, never explicitly protecting the practice. Females engaging in trade could be dealt with through other laws, yet even if a woman did operate a shop or a tavern, “their legal rights were subject to challenge.”<sup>250</sup> Thus Salmon concluded that it was really only in slave-driven Maryland – a society as far removed from the Bay Colony as possible – where law allowed women to inherit slaves, that married women became true property owners and left wills and inheritances.<sup>251</sup> In no small part was this a reversion to the practices of England, and the courts of Massachusetts and Connecticut adopted English practices. Dayton wrote that “the single-minded pursuit of godly communities...was no longer the guiding principle of New England society.”<sup>252</sup> This process occurred earlier in the Bay Colony due to Boston’s standing on the international marketplace, at the expense of the women of the colony.

The revolt of the women of New Haven and the Bay Colony took the form of “the domestic and religious sphere created by and for middle-class women as their exclusion from public life became manifest.”<sup>253</sup> In other words, as women became more and more excluded from public life – in a large part due to the unhinging of the Puritan ‘city on a hill’ mission – they turned their energy to religion and the home. In the Bay Colony, this corresponded with the second and third generations of female colonists having conversion experiences and gaining church membership at a much higher rate than males. It appeared that as mercantile trade continued to be gendered exclusively male – we have no Anne Hutchinson international merchant types in the Puritan world – church membership leaned towards being gendered female. The fact that there is no Antinomian push for increased variety of female roles

---

<sup>250</sup> Salmon, *Women and the Law of Property*, 45-46.

<sup>251</sup> Salmon, *Women and the Law of Property*, 149.

<sup>252</sup> Dayton, *Women before the Bar*, 34.

<sup>253</sup> Dayton, *Women before the Bar*, 67.

demonstrated that, even in the 1630s, women (such as Hutchinson) who had been excluded from the public sphere turned towards religion.

Sarah Goodhue's "A Valedictory in Monitory Writing" can be interpreted as demonstrating this gendered trend toward religiosity due to increased trade.<sup>254</sup> Goodhue wrote a letter to her husband, Joseph Goodhue, a resident of Ipswich, and children just days before she died in 1681. Goodhue's "Valedictory" is filled with pious exhortations to trust in the Lord and reflected the covenant theology of the Bay Colony Puritans. Predicting her death with eerie accuracy, Goodhue entrusted several of her children to relatives and entreated her children "to get a part and portion in the Lord Jesus Christ, that will hold, when all these things will fail."<sup>255</sup> She reminded her children of the love their earthly father had from them, and how lovingly he would pick them up when he returned from his work. Although Goodhue had a clear premonition of her death, she mentioned no specifics that one would find in a will, and it is safe to assume that this is due to the fact that she owned nothing, but rather her husband owned all of their possessions. Thus, Goodhue exemplified the pious and faithful wife who sought to raise up her children in the faith while her husband labored.

### **Conclusion**

This collection of examples serves to demonstrate that the rise of transatlantic capitalism in the Massachusetts Bay Colony and Boston's position on the international market was enacted by "prominent men of affairs," and not the religious establishment. These merchants of standing

---

<sup>254</sup> Sarah Goodhue, "A Valedictory and Monitory Writing Left by Sarah Goodhue," (Cambridge: New England, 1681).

<sup>255</sup> Goodhue, "Valedictory," 6.

learned from their experiences in Europe's cities and the transatlantic market, valued their own decision-making abilities above those of the authorities and possessed religious views that often subjected them to scrutiny. As these men rose to ascendancy on the international market, the women of the Bay Colony receded further into the realm of the household, their banishment from the marketplace, leading females to increased religiosity compared to men and domestic pursuits. In the final chapter, one can begin to appreciate interpret the significance of the primary evidence presented here and to draw conclusions in tandem with the state of current scholarship regarding the development of merchant capitalism in the Massachusetts Bay Colony.

### Chapter 3

#### Conclusion and Findings

The current study has sought to demonstrate that the rise of capitalism in the Massachusetts Bay Colony came not as a result of the work of religiously orthodox Puritans who regarded their settlement to be a ‘city on a hill,’ but rather as a result of the lives and careers of merchant proto-capitalists. These merchants, or “prominent men of affairs,” established Boston as a major trading port on the international market, inhabiting a trade that, in the Bay Colony, was dominated exclusively by men. These men possessed links across the transatlantic world, had high views of their own decision-making abilities, and were often religiously unorthodox. In addressing the issue of the connection between religious persuasion and economic ventures, this study has brought forth evidence that contests the veracity of Max Weber’s famous thesis, outlined in his *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, and questions the suitability of identifying the Puritans of the Bay Colony as exemplary of the early American experience.<sup>256</sup> We will now turn to an analysis of the presented evidence, arriving at conclusions on scholarly trends, the Bay Colony’s placement in the early modern world and the larger transatlantic economy, and an analysis of the evidence presented in this study.

For decades, scholars such as Bernard Bailyn and Perry Miller argued that the Puritans were representative of the entire early American experience, elevating this group of religious dissidents above other societies and peoples. While both excellent scholars, Bailyn and Miller overemphasized the importance of this small group of religious deviants. Miller’s analysis, “The Marrow of Puritan Divinity” revealed that none of these deviants of the Bay Colony would have

---

<sup>256</sup> Weber, *The Protestant Ethic*.

considered themselves to be a ‘puritan,’ and that English Puritanism was itself a unique version of Reformed Protestantism, placing particular emphasis on covenant theology.<sup>257</sup> Scholars such as Stephen Innes seized on the work of Bailyn and Miller and applied Weber’s thesis to the Bay Colony, arguing that it was the unique Puritan variety of reformed Protestantism that led to the colony’s economic success. The Bay Colony’s individual property rights, land ownership and emphasis on productive labor led Innes to conclude that the “redemptive community” of the Massachusetts Bay Puritans led to the rise of “moral capitalism.”<sup>258</sup> While Innes’s concept of “moral capitalism” should not be rejected in its entirety – Jerry Muller demonstrated that a similar concept is contained within Adam Smith’s economic thought – as a whole it does not reflect the reality of the situation in the Bay Colony, with its treatment of the indigenous peoples and links to the slave trading at Providence Island.<sup>259</sup> After all, John Winthrop owned slaves and was implicated in the international slave trade as much as any merchant.<sup>260</sup>

Recent scholarship has identified problems with the neo-Weberian thesis and argued that Puritan society in the Bay Colony was hardly homogenous, and that the Bay Colony was not unique in its economic success. Scholars such as Louise Breen demonstrated that rifts were present within the Bay Colony’s public life as early as the Antinomian Crisis and identified a connection between individual merchants and antinomian sentiments, manifested as support for Anne Hutchinson.<sup>261</sup> Examples of other early modern colonies who succeeded and failed also lent doubt to claims advanced by those fascinated with Weber’s thesis for the Bay Colony’s uniqueness. The failed Puritan colony of Providence Island served to demonstrate that the

---

<sup>257</sup> Miller, “The Marrow of Puritan Divinity,” 96.

<sup>258</sup> Innes, *Creating the Commonwealth*, 7.

<sup>259</sup> Muller, *Adam Smith in His Time and Ours*, 144, 188.

<sup>260</sup> Tomlins, *Freedom Bound*, 254, 426.

<sup>261</sup> Breen, *Transgressing the Bounds*, 20-35.

religious leanings of the Massachusetts Bay Colony were not enough on their own to bring economic success, as well as how easily a colony of well-intentioned settlers could disregard moral and religious reflections on the sale and purchase of human beings, an issue Pennsylvania's Quakers confronted by the end of the seventeenth century in the famous Germantown Protest.<sup>262</sup> The economic success of that Quaker Proprietary Colony of Pennsylvania showed that adherents to a vastly different form of Protestantism could achieve the mercantile achievements argued to be unique to the Puritans of the Bay Colony.<sup>263</sup> Simon Schama even concluded in his study of the Reformed Dutch context of the Netherlands that "it was the *less* Calvinist group of patricians who upheld the more purely commercial principles of maximum profits with minimum risk," a conclusion that fits well with current findings on the Massachusetts Bay Colony.<sup>264</sup> These examples demonstrate the futility of claiming that it was the unique Protestantism of the Puritans of Massachusetts Bay that created – or even encouraged – the development of transatlantic capitalism. It is in this vein of recent scholarship – emphasizing the fissures within Puritan orthodoxy and contributing economic factors outside of the Bay Colony's control – that the current study sits.

Recent economic historical scholarship has demonstrated the validity of a theory of merchant capitalism, as well as the regional development of capitalism in the early modern world. Merchant capitalism arose gradually, as antiquated economic theories and systems – predominantly mercantilism – waned and were not immediately replaced by modern-looking capitalist markets. This is true both in the structure of early-modern economic markets and in the

---

<sup>262</sup> Kupperman, *Providence Island*, 18: "Resolutions of the Germantown Mennonites/Germantown Quaker Petition Against Slavery," 30-32.

<sup>263</sup> Tolles, *Meeting House and Counting House*.

<sup>264</sup> Schama, *The Embarrassment of Riches*, 339.

economic thought of the era. Capitalism rose as a regional phenomenon, dominated by cities such as London and Amsterdam, and often existed within pockets of “pre-capitalist” markets and modes of thinking, a tenet of the pre-modern economy.<sup>265</sup> The importance of cities as hubs of economic progressivity cannot be overstated. Cities operated as centers in an international network market of long-distance trade, and London held an important position, particularly with regards to the colonization of the New World.<sup>266</sup>

It is within this larger context that the Bay Colony arose on the international scene. Evaluating the growth of the Bay Colony based on these findings, one can easily see that the colony’s success was largely dependent on factors outside of its control. Boston existed as a capitalist region in a non-capitalist region, and within Boston’s society, merchants such as Robert Keayne acted as capitalists in a society that tried to subdue profit-making impulses. Albert O. Hirschman’s conclusion that capitalism arose from the center of the European power structure – and not from a group of religious dissidents – showed how the orthodox party operated not on the forefront of contemporary trade theory, but at the rear.<sup>267</sup> The fact of London’s importance as an economic powerhouse lent doubt to the claim of self-sufficiency for the Bay Colony, particularly when considering the economic depression that befell the colony during the English Civil War. Colonization had also been initiated by Winthrop and his associates largely for the benefit of the home nation as they envisioned it, but also and often at its expense. After all, the Massachusetts Bay Company was formed as a for-profit venture with many English backers. It is inappropriate to blame solely the Civil War for the recession of the

---

<sup>265</sup> Van Zanden, “Merchant Capitalism,” 258. Horlings, “The transition to an industrial economy,” 92-93.

<sup>266</sup> Horlings, “transition to an industrial economy,” 97; Alford, *London’s Triumph*, 178.

<sup>267</sup> Hirschman, *The Passions and the Interests*, 129.

1640s, as recent scholarship identifying a “Little Ice Age” during the 1640s showed how climate change reduced the crop yields of the Bay Colony.<sup>268</sup> However, increased trade with New Netherland during the same era showed how dependent the Massachusetts Bay Colony was upon the European market.<sup>269</sup> Overall, historical economic scholarship on the early modern era demonstrated that economic growth was the product of many factors, such as the size of a nation’s economy and the status of their chief port city on the international market.

The orthodox Puritans examined in this study, such as Winthrop and Higginson, and the governments they created demonstrated economic views that restricted entrepreneurial ventures and displayed archaic economic outlooks. This is despite the fact that the orthodox benefitted from access to the transatlantic market as much as anyone. Winthrop believed the larger interests of the community to outweigh individual interests, economic or otherwise.<sup>270</sup> The Bay Colony’s treatment of Keayne revealed the economic outlook of the authorities, particularly in their decision to fine Keayne for making too much profit.<sup>271</sup> Here, the economic backwardness of Winthrop and the authorities was a result of their mission to build an ideal religious community, a ‘city on the hill.’ The New England Way was not intended to be primarily an economic venture, at least to Winthrop and other members of his tribe. It was intended to be first and foremost an experiment in building a Christian society, an example that could then be used to refashion England itself, yet the problem quickly emerged that everyone had to be in agreement for it to work. Too often they were not. In restricting aspects of economic activity, the Bay Colony sought to improve the welfare of all of its pious citizens, yet instead it revealed the

---

<sup>268</sup> Parker, *Global Crisis*, 17.

<sup>269</sup> Todt, ““New Netherland and New England,” 349.

<sup>270</sup> Winthrop, “Christian Charity,” 305.

<sup>271</sup> Winthrop, *Journal*, 1:315.

differences of opinion within. It also revealed the so-called Puritan Dilemma. According to the Weberian argument, the ascetic Puritan piety was supposed to act as a catalyst for economic growth, yet here religious conviction functioned in the complete opposite manner, restricting unbridled capitalism. The concept of ‘moral capitalism’ is insufficient as a solution to this paradox of a religious belief that could act as simultaneous catalyst and check on early forms of capitalism, particularly when recognizing that the orthodox Puritans were implicated in the transatlantic trade of enslaved persons.<sup>272</sup>

The differences of opinion present within the Massachusetts Bay Colony manifested themselves during the Antinomian Controversy. The rift left by the controversy, with Winthrop and the orthodox on one end of the spectrum and Anne Hutchinson and the antinomians on the other, had already been latent perhaps from the very beginnings of settlement. However, many merchants and “prominent men of affairs” demonstrated their objections to the ruling orthodoxy due to a variety of factors. As argued above, it was Israel Stoughton, Edward Gibbons, William Jennison, Robert Keayne, Isaac Allerton, and those like them, who enabled the development of merchant capitalism in the Massachusetts Bay Colony. Frustrated with the narrowness of the New England Way, these men possessed links to the transatlantic world, held a high view of their own judgements, and were religiously unorthodox.

The claim that the merchants of the Bay Colony who saw the rise of transatlantic capitalism were “prominent men of affairs” within the society they inhabited is easy to prove. Both Jennison and Keayne served as captains, and Jennison even served as Watertown’s deputy to the General Court.<sup>273</sup> Stoughton served as Dorchester’s, and Allerton was known throughout

---

<sup>272</sup> Tomlins, *Freedom Bound*, 426.

<sup>273</sup> Winthrop, *Journal*, 2:178; Bailyn, *New England Merchants*, 37.

the New England colonies simply as “Mr. Allerton.”<sup>274</sup> Gibbons raised public stock, took inventory on behalf of the General Court and was chosen as an ensign, among other tasks.<sup>275</sup> That these men who were engaged in trade all possessed status and wealth revealed that the claim of social mobility in the Bay Colony is also largely unfounded. A common man desiring to become a merchant faced considerable boundaries to entry in the form of wealth and connections. Those who came wealthy were those who became wealthier still.

In contrast to the orthodox party’s emphasis on the local tribe of saints, the merchants of the Bay Colony entertained a larger view of the world and their place in it. These men possessed ties around the globe, to cities such as London and Amsterdam, as well as the Caribbean. Gibbons arrived in the New World already a rich man and sought to recreate his comfortable life at Boston.<sup>276</sup> Keayne arrived from London already a wealthy man and accomplished merchant, eager to put his acumen to use in the New World.<sup>277</sup> Allerton possessed contacts from New Amsterdam to London and spoke Dutch as well as English.<sup>278</sup> The connections to the larger transatlantic world that these men possessed enabled them to succeed in their economic endeavors. They also possessed a view of the world much larger than their orthodox counterparts and often interacted with individuals outside of their religious communities.

As “prominent men of affairs,” these individuals considered themselves to be worthy of respect, and their opinions worthy of airing. As merchants, they made their fortunes on their decision-making abilities, and bristled when slighted, as Keayne’s entire apologia

---

<sup>274</sup> Breen, *Transgressing the Bounds*, 22; Van Zandt, *Brothers Among Nations*, 107.

<sup>275</sup> Shurtleff, *Records Of The Massachusetts Bay*, 1: 95, 106, 129.

<sup>276</sup> Bailyn, *New England Merchants*, 37.

<sup>277</sup> Winthrop, *Journal*, 1:316.

<sup>278</sup> Van Zandt, *Brothers Among Nations*, 103.

demonstrated.<sup>279</sup> Stoughton wrote an entire tract that, “denied the assistants to be magistrates and made them but ministers of justice,” an unpopular opinion that he was forced to recant.<sup>280</sup> He also repeatedly requested that those testifying against Hutchinson swear an oath to the truth of their statements, despite Winthrop’s objections.<sup>281</sup> Jennison was offended when he was publicly reprimanded for asking God to save him from the General Court, rather than being told in private as a gentlemen.<sup>282</sup> These men clearly did not think of their first identity as being a member of the godly community on the ‘city on a hill.’

It is to this questionable status of the merchants’ membership in the godly community that we will now turn. While acknowledging that these men existed on a spectrum of orthodoxy, and that the Antinomian Controversy served only as a means with which to distinguish these groups, the “prominent men of affairs” were men of questionable Puritan orthodoxy in terms of their theological convictions. Jennison prayed that God deliver him from the General Court.<sup>283</sup> Bailyn described Gibbons as possessing a “dubious enthusiasm for puritanism” and was fined for public drunkenness by the General Court.<sup>284</sup> Allerton was removed from the Bay Colony for his religious convictions, and Keayne’s piety was obviously not thought highly of by the authorities.<sup>285</sup> Still, the piety displayed in Keayne’s apologia is clearly authentic, and Allerton was granted Church membership in the conservative New Haven.<sup>286</sup> The only mark against

---

<sup>279</sup> Keayne, “The Last Will and Testament of Me, Robert Keayne.”

<sup>280</sup> Breen, *Transgressing the Bounds*, 22, direct quote from Stoughton.

<sup>281</sup> Hall, “Examination of Mrs. Anne Hutchinson” in *The Antinomian Controversy*, 345, 331.

<sup>282</sup> Winthrop, *Journal*, 2:178.

<sup>283</sup> Winthrop, *Journal*, 2:178.

<sup>284</sup> Bailyn, *New England Merchants*, 103; Shurtleff. *Records Of The Massachusetts Bay*, 1:79, 90.

<sup>285</sup> Allerton, *A History of the Allerton*, 37; Keayne, “The Last Will and Testament of Me, Robert Keayne.”

<sup>286</sup> Van Zandt, *Brothers Among Nations*, 107.

Stoughton's orthodoxy was his defense of Hutchinson during the crisis, and he did not agree with her religious convictions, uttering "Behold I turn away from you," when Hutchinson relayed how God spoke directly to her.<sup>287</sup> These facts bring doubt to the claim that religious deviancy motivated merchants to economic pursuits, eventually leading to the development of proto-capitalism. In the end, perhaps Knight's "vibrant alternative" is a better descriptor for these men.<sup>288</sup> Regardless, the ventures they pursued demonstrated that it was not the orthodox establishment that sought material gains on the world market, but rather men of a questionable and alternative orthodoxy who existed on a spectrum of belief.

Accepting the questionable orthodoxy of merchant "prominent men of affairs" renders difficult and challenging our understanding the Reverend Richard Blynman. Still, Blynman's uniqueness demonstrated that it was not his religious orthodoxy that motivated him to pursue economic gains. A Welshman when most members of the Bay Colony were Londoners or East Anglians, Blynman arrived in the colony in the early 1640s, at the start of a recession and in a second wave of colonists, many of whom were involved in entrepreneurial ventures.<sup>289</sup> Blynman's canal was long-desired by the General Court, yet never supplied with funds, and fulfilled an important role in the colony's trade. Even Blynman's orthodoxy can be questioned, as he was removed from his original pulpit in Plymouth and was scoffed at by his congregants in Gloucester.<sup>290</sup> The disrespect this shepherd received from his flock was, most likely, related to Blynman's speed in constructing the canal and the neglecting of his pastoral duties. Blynman was just a pastor from Wales and was certainly not worthy of being labeled a "prominent [man]

---

<sup>287</sup> Hall, "Examination of Mrs. Anne Hutchinson" in *The Antinomian Controversy*, 338.

<sup>288</sup> Knight, *Orthodoxies in Massachusetts*, 3.

<sup>289</sup> Babson, *History of the Town of Gloucester*, 189-191.

<sup>290</sup> Babson, *History of the Town of Gloucester*, 7; Winthrop, *Journal*, 2:58-59.

of affairs.” His entrepreneurial motivations, while clearly present, were also exclusively local and focused on the local ‘godly society.’ It was clearly not Blynman’s dubious orthodoxy that led him to pursue entrepreneurial gains, but other factors unique to himself and the class of colonists with whom he arrived.

The issue of the male monopoly on mercantile and entrepreneurial ventures has also been examined in this study, albeit briefly. Studies by Corneila Hughes Dayton and Marylynn Salmon have demonstrated that in early modern New England, as the local economy became increasingly absorbed into the transatlantic market – a market inhabited by exclusively male merchants – women increasingly turned their attention to religion and the home, despite previous membership in the local economy. In the Massachusetts Bay Colony, this manifested itself as an increased church membership of women – and a decrease in male membership – as the seventeenth century progressed. While these studies often rely on evidence from numerous colonies, particularly New Haven, the argument holds in the context of the Bay Colony.<sup>291</sup> Yet this religious and political experiment also did not give women the right to own property; instead they functioned as “deputy husbands.<sup>292</sup>” It was only in slave-owning Maryland – a vastly different society compared to the Bay Colony – that married women, especially widows, emerged as owners, investors, and speculators in property real and personal.<sup>293</sup> The gradual retreat of women into domestic life corresponded with the decay of the Puritan godly society in the Bay Colony, yet it demonstrated that while women may have participated in the local economy of a closed society, they did not engage in mercantile activities. There are no “prominent women of affairs” who

---

<sup>291</sup> Dayton, *Women before the Bar*; Salmon, *Women and the Law of Property*.

<sup>292</sup> Ulrich, *Good Wives*, quoted and paraphrased in Marylynn Salmon, *Women and the Law of Property*, 122.

<sup>293</sup> Salmon, *Women and the Law of Property*, 149.

possessed the connections or capital to engage in trade. This is ironic considering that Anne Hutchinson initiated the Antinomian Controversy. In the end, antinomian women delved more into personal religion than entrepreneurial ventures. Sarah Goodhue's "A Valedictory in Monitory Writing" demonstrated that the chief concern of a dying Puritan woman was the faith of her children, not the bequeathing of what little property she may have owned.<sup>294</sup>

When John Higginson railed against the merchants and declared that "*New-England is originally a plantation of Religion, not a plantation of Trade,*" he revealed the uneasiness towards mercantile ventures that characterized the mind of the orthodox Puritan.<sup>295</sup> To Higginson, trade and commerce – money – had drawn the colony away from its original goal of building a 'godly society.' Higginson, Winthrop, and those like them, valued the community over the individual and the pulpit over the profit. "Prominent men of affairs" like Robert Keayne, Isaac Allerton, Edward Gibbons, William Jennison and Israel Stoughton – while certainly religious individuals – often valued their own opinion over the majority's and the sum over the sermon. While the Antinomian Crisis of 1636 did not create this very-present rift within the Massachusetts Bay Colony, Anne Hutchinson's endeavors revealed the rift's existence and shook the foundations of society. The rise of Boston as an international trading port was not due to the 'godly society' that the orthodox sought to establish, but rather a result of the efforts of the male merchants who engaged in trade across the Atlantic world in search of profits. As women were not tolerated within this international marketplace, its rise saw their retreat into the home and domestic life. The merchant capitalism that placed the Bay Colony on the international market

---

<sup>294</sup> Goodhue, "A Valedictory and Monitory Writing."

<sup>295</sup> Higginson, John. *The Cause of God and His People*, 11.

arose not as a result of many pious souls on the rocky soil of New England, but from the profit-seeking men who traded across the Atlantic world.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Primary Sources

Ames, William. "Cases of Conscience." In *Works*. London, 1643.

Blinman, Richard, Rev. *A Rejoynder to Mr. Henry Danvers his Brief Friendly Reply to my Ansvver About Infant-Baptism*. London: Thomas Wall, Bookseller, 1675.

\_\_\_\_\_. to Increase Mather, March 8, 1678. Massachusetts Historical Society. *Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society*. Volume VIII, Fourth Series. Boston: Wiggin and Lunt, 1868.

Bradford, William. *Of Plymouth Plantation 1620-1647*. New Edition edited by Samuel Eliot Morrison. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1952.

Burnaby, Rev. Andrew. *Travels Through the Middle Settlements in North-America, in the Years 1759 and 1760. With Observations Upon the State of the Colonies*. Dublin: Marchbank, 1775.

Churchyard, Thomas. *A discourse of the Queenes Majesties entertainment in Suffolk and Norffolk*. London, 1578.

Goodhue, Sarah. "A Valedictory and Monitory Writing Left by Sarah Goodhue." Cambridge: New England, 1681.

Higginson, John. *The Cause of God and His People in New-England as it was Stated and Discussed in a Sermon Preached before the Honourable General Court of the Massachusetts Colony on the 27 Day of May 1663, Being the Day of Election at Boston*. Cambridge: Samuel Green, 1663.

Keayne, Robert and Bernard Bailyn. "The Apologia of Robert Keayne: The Last Will and Testament of Me, Robert Keayne, all of it Written with My Own Hands and Began by Me, 1653, Commonly Called August; the Self-Portrait of a Puritan Merchant." New York: Harper & Row, 1965.

Lechford, Thomas. *Plain Dealing or News from New England*. Edited by J. Hammond Trumbull. Boston: J.K. Wiggin & Wm. Parsons Lunt, 1867.

O'Callaghan, E.B., ed. *Calendar of Historical Manuscripts in the Office of the Secretary of State*, v. 1. Albany, NY: Weed, Parsons and Company, 1865.

“Records of the First Church in Boston 1630-1868.” *Publications of The Colonial Society of Massachusetts*. Vol. 39. Edited by Richard D. Pierce. Boston: The Colonial Society of Massachusetts, 1961.

“Resolutions of the Germantown Mennonites/Germantown Quaker Petition Against Slavery.” In *American History Through Its Greatest Speeches: A Documentary History of the United States [3 Volumes]*. Vol 1. Edited by Jolyon P. Girard, Darryl Mace, and Courtney Michelle Smith. Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO, 2017: 30-32.

Shepard, Thomas. *Gods Plot: The Paradoxes of Puritan Piety, Being the Autobiography and Journal of Thomas Shepard*. Edited by Michael McGiffert. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1972.

Shurtleff, Nathaniel B., editor. *Records Of The Governor And Company Of The Massachusetts Bay In New England*. Boston: The Press of William White, Printer to the Commonwealth, 1854.

Steuart, James. *Inquiry into the Principles of Political Oeconomy: Being an Essay on the Science of Domestic Policy in Free Nations*. 2 vols. London: A. Millar and T. Cadell, 1767.

Stoughton, Israel to John Stoughton, 1635. In *Letters from New England: The Massachusetts Bay Colony, 1629-1638*. 5 vols. Edited by Everett Emerson. Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press, 1976.

Udeman, Godfried. *Geestelijke Roer van 't Coopmans Schip*. Dordrecht: Boels, 1640.

Ward, Nathaniel. *The simple cobbler of Aggawam in America: willing to help 'mend his native country, lamentably tattered, both in the upper-leather and sole, with all the honest stitches he can take, and as willing never to be paid for his work, by old English wonted pay*, London: Printed by J. Dever & R. Ibbitson for S. Bowtell, 1647.

Winthrop, John. *Winthrop's Journal: "History of New England,"* Edited by James Kendall Hosmer. 2 vols. New York: Barnes & Noble, Inc. 1946; original 1908.

\_\_\_\_\_. “A Model of Christian Charity.” In *A Library of American Literature from the Earliest Settlement to the Present Time*. Vol. 1. Edited by Edmund Clarence Stedman and Ellen Mackay Hutchinson. New York: Charles L. Webster & Company, 1888.

Winthrop, Adam, John Winthrop, Fitz-John Winthrop, Wait Still Winthrop, and Massachusetts

Historical Society. *Winthrop Papers*. Boston: Massachusetts Historical Society, 1929.

#### Secondary Sources

Alford, Stephen. *London's Triumph: Merchants, Adventurers, and Money in Shakespeare's City*. New York: Bloomsbury, 2017.

Allerton, William S. *A History of the Allerton Family in the United States: 1585 to 1885. And a Genealogy of the Descendants of Isaac Allerton*. New York: published by the author, 1888.

Babson, John J. *History of the Town of Gloucester, Cape Ann, Including the Town of Rockport*. Gloucester: Procter Brothers, 1860.

Bailey, Richard A. *Race and Redemption in Puritan New England*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Bailyn, Bernard. "The Apologia of Robert Keayne." *The William and Mary Quarterly* 7 (4), Omohundro Institute of Early American History and Culture. (1950): 568-587.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The New England Merchants in the Seventeenth Century*. New York: Harper & Row, 1964.

Blanck, Emily. *Tyrannicide: Forging an American Law of Slavery in Revolutionary South Carolina and Massachusetts*. Athens and London: University of Georgia Press, 2014.

Breen, Louise A. *Transgressing the Bounds: Subversive Enterprises Among the Puritan Elite in Massachusetts, 1630-1692*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Breslaw, Elaine G. *Tituba, Reluctant Witch of Salem: Devilish Indians and Puritan Fantasies*. New York: New York University Press, 1996.

Dayton, Corneila Hughes. *Women before the Bar: Gender, Law, and Society in Connecticut, 1639-1789*. Chapel Hill and London: University of North Carolina Press, 1995.

Eire, Carlos. *Reformations: The Early Modern World, 1450-1650*. London and New Haven: Yale University Press, 2016.

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

- Gorski, Philip S. *Disciplinary Revolution: Calvinism and the Rise of the State in Early Modern Europe*. Chicago: University of Chicago, 2010.
- Hall, David D, ed., *The Antinomian Controversy: 1636-38: A Documentary History*. Middletown, CN: Wesleyan University Press, 1968.
- Hirschman, Albert O. *The Passions and the Interests: Political Arguments for Capitalism before Its Triumph*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1977.
- Innes, Stephen. *Creating the Commonwealth: The Economic Culture of Puritan New England*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1995.
- Jennings, Francis. *The Invasion of America: Indians, Colonialism, and the Cant of Conquest*. New York: Norton, 1976.
- Johnson, Amandus. *The Swedish Settlements on the Delaware: 1638-1664*. Vol. 2. Philadelphia, PA: Swedish Colonial Society, 1911.
- Knight, Janice. *Orthodoxies in Massachusetts: Rereading American Puritanism*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1994.
- Kupperman, Karen Ordahl. *Providence Island, 1630-1641: The Other Puritan Colony*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Maran, Giovannin Paolo. *Letters Writ by a Turkish Spy*. 10<sup>th</sup> ed.: London, 1734.
- Martin, John Frederick. *Profits in the Wilderness: Entrepreneurship and the Founding of New England Towns in the Seventeenth Century*. Chapel Hill and London: University of North Carolina Press, 1991.
- McRae, Andrew. *God speed the plough: The representation of agrarian England, 1500-1660*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Miller, Perry. "The Marrow of Puritan Divinity." In *Errand into the Wilderness*. Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1964.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The New England Mind: From Colony to Province*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1961.
- Morgan, Edmund S. *The Puritan Dilemma: The Story of John Winthrop*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. New York: Pearson, 2007.

Muller, Jerry Z. *Adam Smith in His Time and Ours: Designing the Decent Society*. New York: The Free Press, 1993.

Parker, Geoffrey. *Global Crisis: War, Climate Change and Catastrophe in the Seventeenth Century*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2013.

Prak, Maarten, ed. *Early Modern Capitalism: Economic and social change in Europe, 1400-1800*. London and New York: Routledge, 2001.

Salmon, Marylynn. *Women and the Law of Property in Early America*. Chapel Hill and London: University of North Carolina Press, 1986.

Schama, Simon. *The Embarrassment Of Riches: An Interpretation Of Dutch Culture In The Golden Age*. New York: Knopf, 1987.

Todt, Kim. "Trading between New Netherland and New England, 1624—1664." *Early American Studies* 9, no. 2 (Spring 2011): 348-378.

Tolles, Frederick B. *Meeting House and Counting House: The Quaker Merchants of Colonial Philadelphia 1682-1763*. New York: W.W. Norton, 1963.

Tomlins, Christopher. *Freedom Bound: Law, Labor and Civic Identity in Colonizing English America, 1580-1865*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

Underdown, David. *Fire From Heaven: Life in an English Town in the Seventeenth Century*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1992.

Valeri, Mark R. *Heavenly Merchandize: How Religion Shaped Commerce in Puritan America*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010.

Van Zanden, Jan Luiten. "Do We Need a Theory of Merchant Capitalism?" *Review (Fernand Braudel Center)* 20, no. 2 (Spring 1997): 255-267.

Van Zandt, Cynthia J. *Brothers Among Nations: The Pursuit of Intercultural Alliances in Early America, 1580-1660*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Weber, Max. *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. New York: Scribner's, 1958.

Winship, Michael P. *Godly Republicanism: Puritans, Pilgrims, and a City on a Hill*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2012.

## ACADEMIC VITA

---

**Nicholas Capri**  
caprinick@yahoo.com

---

### **History (B.A.) and Economics (B.S.), The Pennsylvania State University**

- Graduated with Honors in History (B.A.), Spring 2018

### **Scholar, Schreyer Honors College**

- Completed Honors Thesis:
  - *Profits and Piety: Merchant Capitalism and the Protestant Ethic in the Massachusetts Bay Colony*
  - Supervised by Anthony Roeber, Professor of Early Modern History and Religious Studies
  - Presented research at Penn State History Department's History Undergraduate Research Conference, 2 December 2017

### **Paterno Fellow, Paterno Fellows Program**

- Honors Program including advanced academic coursework, thesis, ethics study, as well as leadership and service commitment

### **Research Assistant, Professor Anthony Roeber**

- Added and properly formatted citations for Professor Roeber's various projects

### **Museum and Library Services Intern, Antietam National Battlefield, Sharpsburg MD**

- Completed internship June 2017 to 1 August 2017
- Assisted Head of Museum and Library Services in maintaining collections, organizing archival files, and various park duties
- Read, analyzed and properly sorted primary source documents into park archival system
- Supervised by Stephanie Gray, Chief of Museum and Library Services

### **Recipient, Best Schreyer Honors Thesis Award, Department of History**

- Selected by department for superior performance on a Schreyer Honors Thesis
- April, 2018