

Unbinding Order in History:
Conscience and Civil Good in the Thought of
Roger Williams, 1603-1683

by Jennifer H. Smith
Submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
University of Leicester
October, 2001

UMI Number: U602394

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



UMI U602394

Published by ProQuest LLC 2014. Copyright in the Dissertation held by the Author.
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This work is protected against
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.



ProQuest LLC
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

Abstract

*Unbinding Order in History: Conscience and the Public Good in the Thought of
Roger Williams, (1603-1683)*

By Jennifer H. Smith

This thesis argues that Roger Williams' state fulfilled explicitly spiritual purposes, protecting and promoting the free exercise of conscience. The thesis further argues that far from elevating 'private' interest, Williams expected the strong exercise of natural conscience to endorse patterns of household and civil authority, securing individuals in the commission of their social positions and callings in civil society. Williams expected government and other civil agents to support the ordering exercise of natural conscience, to serve the public good in present history.

The thesis corrects scholarly emphasis on Williams' 'separation of church and state,' showing how this historical accent has obscured the 'spiritual purposes' of his government in protecting the access of Grace to the souls of the elect, in present history. Incorporating notice of a previously unrecognised manuscript of 1666, the study examines Williams' account of the effects of 'natural history' (that is, history conditioned by original sin) on authority, power, order, and individuals within commonwealths. It explains the exceptional status Williams thought would accrue to states protecting conscience, the positive power of state institutions to promote and protect free conscience, and the related position of individuals within present commonwealths. Beginning with a detailed account of Williams' theological outlook, the thesis explores the social and political implications of original sin in history. Driven by these conclusions, it then gives full account of his expectations of 'democraticall' government, before anatomising the practical mechanics of the collaboration Williams pursued between conscience, the state, and heads of households in Providence and Providence Plantations, forming an extended network of informal civil relationships to conform individual interests to community prerogatives.

Acknowledgements

This study has been long in the making, and many have contributed materially and intellectually to its development. The first seeds were planted by spirited debate in Stephen Innes' seminar, 'Community in American Life,' fostered by conversations with William Lee Miller comparing the 'Political Ethics' of Williams and Madison, and ably pruned by the attentions of Joseph Kett and Heather Warren to the undergraduate thesis that began the real encounter with Williams the advocate for civil order.

At the University of Leicester, the topic was developed with the help of John Hoffman, Robert Borthwick, and Laura Brace; John Coffey and Elizabeth Clapp both gave critical attention to early chapters, helping to develop the inquiry into Williams the 'Puritan,' and Williams the devotee of 'patriarchal' order. Post-graduate colleagues, notably Timothy Stanton, have brought detailed knowledge of the intellectual history of seventeenth century Britain to bear, aiding the clarification of themes in the considerable body of Williams' own work. Within the wider department, Renie Lewis has challenged and encouraged, and deserves much thanks. Supervising the thesis with tenacity in the pursuit of intellectual coherence, Ian Harris has given both practical and intellectual support. Fostering a necessary attention to detail in the reading of early modern texts, his encouragement to challenge received wisdom about Williams and early New England accounts of conscience, civil society, and the state proved fundamental to the conclusions of the completed study.

Grateful acknowledgement is due the Arts and Humanities Research Board of the British Academy, which funded the project, in addition to extended research at a variety of American libraries and archives. Special thanks is due the reference staff at the Rhode Island Historical Society, and the John Carter Brown Library of Brown University; also to the very supremely knowledgeable and friendly staff at the American Antiquarian Society, who directed the author to the manuscript sermons of the Thomas Shepards. Staff at the Massachusetts Historical Society, and the New England Genealogical Society, also gave help and advice in the treatment of the 'Esau and Jacob' manuscript; last but not least, librarians at the University of Leicester itself have cheerfully pulled dusty volumes from external store on repeated occasions: without the professional help of all these people, this study would not have been possible.

The acknowledged experts in conforming individual interest to the demands of the common good are the women and men who give their professional and personal lives to the care of adolescents in boarding education: all thanks to Tessa Drummond, Sarah Gomm, and Wendy McLachlan, along with Stewart, Philip, and Al. Their friendship, humour, and faith continue to sustain. James Hutchinson encouraged and took pride in the first parts of this work, though he could not stay to see it completed.

Finally, thanks are due to Sybil and Donald Smith, whose love and support are without measure, and who may even read the completed study, a true demonstration of parental love.

Table of Contents

Chapter One	Roger Williams' Intellectual Biography	1
Section One	<i>Life and Intellectual Career</i>	7
Section Two	<i>Trends in Historical Treatment</i>	19
Section Three	<i>the Published, Printed, and Manuscript Record</i>	33
Conclusion	<i>Thematic Structure of the Thesis</i>	49
Chapter Two	Sin and the Progress of Grace	53
Section One	<i>Original Sin and the Human Faculties</i>	64
Section Two	<i>Roger Williams' Bible</i>	89
Section Three	<i>Christ's Church and its Mission in History</i>	101
Conclusion		107
Chapter Three	The Natural History of Order in Civil Society	109
Section One	<i>Williams' 'Natural History'</i>	115
Section Two	<i>the Quality and Function of Order in Present History</i>	127
Section Three	<i>Challenges to Public Order, and its Preservation (Liberty For Conscience)</i>	138
Chapter Four	The State and Civil Order	152
Section One	<i>The Necessity of Government</i>	157
	1.1 Sovereignty: state, individual, and the fifth commandment	
	1.2 Necessity	169
Section Two	<i>Exceptionalism, Representation, Obligation</i>	175
	2.1 Exceptionalism	177
	2.2 Derivation and Evolution of State Power in Providence	179
	2.3 Representation and Consent	184
	2.4 Obligation	188
Section Three	<i>Democracy and the Officers of the State</i>	192
Chapter Five	Challenges to Civil Order, and Historical Remedies	210
Section One	<i>Anatomy of Disorder</i>	217
Section Two	<i>the Conscience of a 'boysterous and desperate' husband</i>	231
Section Three	<i>Conscience and Positive Law</i>	242
Section Four	<i>'Private Ends' and State Prerogatives in Land and Trade</i>	255
Conclusion		266
Conclusion		270
Appendix One	'To the Town of Providence, 15 January 1681/82'	276
Appendix Two	Introductory Essay	278
	'Esau and Jacobs Mystical Harmony...'	291
Bibliography		357

Chapter One: Intellectual Biography: a Sketch of Roger Williams' Life and Writings

Toward the end of his political life, Roger Williams' greatest lament was that 'private interest' seemed all around him to be superseding the 'publike good' as a motive for individual actions within communities. His banishment from Massachusetts Bay in 1636 provided the catalyst for a small settlement at the northern end of Narragansett Bay, on land he purchased from local Sachems: by 1687, some four years after Williams' death, the total population of Providence approached 900 inhabitants.¹ An advocate for complete liberty of conscience within the civil state, Williams sought to establish a commonwealth with '...a permission of the most *Paganish, Jewish, Turkish, or Antichristian consciences and worships:*' in Providence he succeeded.² This was the same man, however, who would react with alarm when a group of neighbours, out of conscience, suggested that it was '*...against the Rule of the Gospel, to execute Judgment upon Transgressors, against the private or public Weal.*'³ 'That ever I should speak or write a Tittle that tends to such an infinite Liberty of Conscience,' Williams wrote, '...is a Mistake; and which I have ever disclaimed and abhorred.'⁴ Indeed he would condemn those who claimed conscience as a motive justifying actions against the '*common good*,' threatening the material and

¹ Carl Bridenbaugh, *Fat Mutton and Liberty of Conscience: Society in Rhode Island, 1636-1690*, (Providence, RI: Brown University Press, 1974) p. 13.

² Roger Williams, 'The Bloudy Tenent of Persecution' (1644), *The Complete Writings of Roger Williams*, 7 Volumes (Perry Miller, ed.), (NY: Russell and Russell, 1963) Volume III, p. 3. Hereafter text from the *Complete Writings* will be cited by title, volume, and page number. Discussion of the statutory progress of liberty of conscience in Providence will be discussed in Chapter four, 'The State and Civil Order.'

³ Roger Williams, 'To the Town of Providence, ca. January 1654/55,' in *The Correspondence of Roger Williams, 1629-1682*, 2 Volumes (Glenn W. Lafantasie, ed.), (Hanover and London: Brown University Press/University Press of New England, 1988) I, p. 423. The text quoted is from the title of a paper circulated amongst the townspeople. Hereafter text from Williams' correspondence is cited by title of letter, volume, and page number.

social defence of the community. No one, Williams wrote, could legitimately exempt him or herself from ‘the sense of *common evil*:’ to do so was to promote a ‘...*selfish Monopoly*, a kinde of *Tyranny*, [which] tendeth to the destruction both of [private] *Cabin* and *Ship*, that is, of *private* and *publike* safety.’⁵ Invoking the need for both personal and communal security, Williams articulated a powerful argument for the suppression of individual interest in the service of public order.

This study argues that the engine of all Williams’ political advocacy was the effort to protect the public good by creating and preserving an orderly civil society, in which individual interest was readily conformed to the material needs of the wider community. As this study will show, both Williams’ zeal for liberty of conscience, and his condemnation of those who elevated individual interest or conscience over the claims of the civil good, explicitly served this end. At the heart of his thought, fuelling this engine, was an acute awareness of the eschaton: the most important fact Williams knew about human history was that God would close it. This meant that all the concerns and conditions of present history were temporary, ‘Smoke and Shadows’ compared with what he took as the true glorious end for humanity and the rest of creation.⁶ Related to this, the second most important fact of human history was that Adam’s sin had begun it, and that present people, families, communities, churches, and states were conditioned by that beginning. With Christ’s redemption of an elect remnant among corrupt humanity, Williams believed, God had established the first fact of history, despite the second.

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ *The Examiner Defended* (1652), CW VII, p. 203. This pamphlet, part of the Thomason Collection of Commonwealth Pamphlets held by the British Library, was published anonymously, and identified by James Ernst in 1930.

⁶ ‘To Major John Mason and Governor Thomas Prence, 22 June 1670,’ *Correspondence* II, p. 615.

The question to which Williams devoted himself, then, was what should be done by humans in the meantime, while true perfection was yet unobtainable, because of the conditions of present history, but while the promise of God's return lingered, and the elect remnant remained intermixed with the 'tares' of the world. This study explains his answer, and the constituent beliefs that formed it. By Williams' account, in present 'historical' societies there should be a formal collaboration between the civil state and its officers, and heads of households as civil agents, to encourage the strong exercise of natural conscience. Natural conscience, by Williams' understanding, would be the mechanism by which individuals' worldly interests, were suppressed in favour of conformity to the needs of the civil good.⁷ This was why, in practical terms, Williams advocated liberty for conscience, and rejected claims that this policy would tear society apart. Liberty of conscience served authority in his system of civil order, both as natural conscience obligated individuals to the claims of community, and as it ensured the correct commission of civil power by a state's officers, and its constituent householders.

Williams expected natural conscience, in its checking and goading function, to create a web of interwoven claims within civil society, as by conscientious action in his or her calling or position, each individual scrutinised and corrected the behaviour of others, and was in turn corrected by them. Within the broader context for ensuring the continuing 'civil good,' this web of interwoven, conscientious relationships involved wives, children, servants, and neighbours in the stewarding of civil power, as

⁷ 'Natural' conscience Williams took to be an universal human faculty, as distinct from 'saving' conscience, obtained only by the elect. Conscience and its function in his account are discussed in Chapter two, 'Sin and the Progress of Grace.' Its role in creating a 'web' of civil relationships is discussed in Chapter three, 'The Natural Order of History;' Chapter five, 'Challenges to Civil Order, and Historical Remedies,' develops the formal collaboration Williams expected between civil agents in support of the individual checking role of conscience, with reference to particular cases in the public life of Providence and the wider colony.

they (within the parameters of their callings and positions) corrected and controlled each other and their superiors, if only by the responsibility for their upkeep. By Williams' account, civil freedom of conscience was a founding requirement for these relationships to function correctly, and a secure civil society to be preserved. In addition to this civilly ordering influence, of course, liberty of conscience in Williams' account allowed Grace access to the elect, manifested in the 'saving conscience' they would experience. While not exercising any specific spiritual remit, civil powers in Williams' system were responsible for protecting free conscience, 'unbinding order in history,' to serve both worldly and spiritual ends. As such, they were involved explicitly in God's purposes in present history: Williams' state might have been particularly *civil* in its remit and tools, but was not exclusively *secular* in its purpose or institution.⁸

It is illegitimate to artificially separate 'theory' from 'practice' in the consideration of Williams' political writing and advocacy, as some studies have attempted to do.⁹ No consideration of Williams' political thought can hope to be

⁸ Discussion of the 'spiritual purposes' of Williams' state and other civil officers is included in Chapter four, 'The State and Civil Order.' It is in this context that historiographic emphasis of Williams' 'separation of church and state' has obscured its true position in his system of historical ordering of civil society. Ian Harris has suggested that the term 'secular,' in early modern intellectual and theological context, 'denotes that which terminates in the terrestrial life, as distinguished from the eternal.' Harris further argued, in specific relation to John Locke's account of the 'secular' state, that just because 'secular' referred to events of the present earthly life, rather than the next, 'it need not be equated with the exclusion of theological reference,' assuming that reference was limited to 'informing matters which concern terrestrial existence.' Ian Harris, 'Toleration, Church and State in Locke,' (unpublished paper), pp. 7, 8. While Williams' state was exclusively civil in its remit and tools, he did identify a spiritual purpose for the state that pointed beyond terrestrial life: Williams' state had responsibility for ensuring access for Grace to the souls and consciences of the elect, in present history, and indeed (as will be discussed in Chapter four) Williams described an exceptional status deriving from God to states that correctly fulfilled that purpose.

⁹ As will become apparent later in chapter, most 'progressive' and 'consensus' school histories of Williams treat him as a political figure, emphasising his theoretical 'liberty of conscience,' leaving problems with how to explain away what seem like embarrassing lapses from this theoretical liberty in Williams' political practice in Providence. See for example treatment in Charles Andrews, 'Roger Williams and the Founding of Rhode Island,' in *The Colonial Period of American History*, 2 vols. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1936) I, pp.7-36, which blames anti-authoritarian groups within the colony for Williams' perceived illiberality.

complete without a grounding in the events which dictated the themes of his intellectual career, the first project of this chapter. This introductory chapter will give a brief account of the historical background of Williams' education, emigration, banishment, and intellectual and political career, though it will not attempt an exhaustive biography of Williams or history of Providence's founding: this is not the central project of this study, and has been done amply elsewhere.¹⁰ Further detail of the events that shaped Williams' political advocacy will be included in the text of the study, to support the analysis of each chapter, as necessary.

This chapter will continue by giving an introduction to the main trends in Williams' treatment by historians, from the 17th through the 20th century. Recent interest has attached to Williams' historiography, partly because he has been amply considered across the broad sweep of historical writing about America: comparisons in the way he is treated give an excellent window into the motives of American historians generally. Indeed, the primary usefulness of the bulk of writing about Williams lies in providing this window into the study of history itself, and it is much less important or relevant to this and other contemporary accounts of Williams' thought.¹¹ As such, an exhaustive review of the literature associated with Williams is neither necessary nor useful to this study, and would largely repeat work done elsewhere: specific Williams' scholarship will be included and assessed as part of each other chapter, as relevant. The most important historiographic distinction for

¹⁰ Ola Elizabeth Winslow, *Master Roger Williams* (NY: Macmillan Co., 1957) gives a good historical account of Williams' life, if displaying an overly 'liberal' view of his toleration. For treatments of Providence and the other towns, see Bruce Colin Daniels, *Dissent and Conformity on Narragansett Bay: The Colonial Rhode Island Town* (Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press (distributed by Harper ad Row), 1984)

¹¹ See Wallace Coyle, *Roger Williams a Reference Guide* (Boston, Mass.: G. K. Hall & Co., 1977) for a complete list of works relating to Williams, through 1974. R. D. Irwin gives a concise, if somewhat flawed, account of five 'eras' of American historical treatment of Roger Williams, with assessment of

this study is between those scholars who mistook Williams to have exclusively secular, i.e., worldly, ends for liberty of conscience and the state, and those who began the process of correcting this mistake, a process this study concludes. This introductory chapter will examine the point of disagreement between these two broad ‘camps,’ by way of comparing their assumptions about Williams’ thought and that of John Locke. Williams’ account of individuals as political agents, of states, and of toleration did not resemble that of Locke, and historical identification of Williams as a precursor to American liberalism, in which Locke’s influence did pertain, was inappropriate.

Following from the assessment of historical treatment of Williams, the chapter will present a synopsis of Roger Williams’ published and manuscript writing, examining his literary forms and rhetorical style. Most significantly, this section will introduce a previously unrecognised Williams manuscript.¹² Although adding depth to positions articulated elsewhere in his work, the themes of this manuscript are not central to the emphases of this study; in this introduction there will be only brief analysis of the themes and argument of this manuscript, in relation to Roger Williams’ account of civil and religious conflict in society as developed in his other writings. An essay examining its themes in greater detail, in relation to Williams’ other work, and offering proof of authorship, accompanies the transcribed text of the manuscript, in Appendix Two of this study. Detailed discussion, in comparative contexts, of the themes of all Williams’ works will follow in later chapters, in developing the

their motives and assumptions, in ‘A Man for all Eras: The Changing Historical Image of Roger Williams’ *Fides et Historia* Vol. 26 (1994) pp. 6-23.

¹² ‘R.W.’ (Roger Williams), ‘*Esau and Jacobs Mystical Harmony Unvailing...*,’ (1666) Massachusetts Historical Society Ms. N-313, presented to the MHS by G. Gannett, 1813.

component beliefs leading to his particular account of conscience and the civil good in present history.

Section One: Roger Williams' Life and Intellectual Career

Roger Williams was born in 1603 to a relatively prosperous London shopkeeper, and through the patronage of Sir Edward Coke, gained a position as a foundation scholar at Charterhouse, where he studied from 1621-1623. Mrs. Anne Sadleir, Coke's eldest daughter, recorded in the margin of one of Williams' letters in 1652 that her father had in the past facilitated the education of 'so hopefull a youth,' noticed Williams, and provided for his schooling in the same way. Williams had transcribed from short hand speeches in the Star Chamber, presenting them to Sir Edward as a gift.¹³ Williams' early education would have included the study of grammar, catechism, Latin, and Greek, along with logic and rhetoric: certainly the method of reasoning and problem-solving Williams acquired would profoundly shape the structure of his writing, and more importantly, his approach to political debate and dispute. As Norman Fiering has implied in the introduction to his analysis of the teaching of moral philosophy at 17th century Harvard, understanding the place and

¹³ Mrs. Anne Sadleir, 'From Mrs Anne Sadleir, ca. Summer or Fall 1652,' *Correspondence* I, p. 365. Mrs. Sadleir was the eldest daughter of Sir Edward Coke, and a devoted adherent to the Church of England and monarchy. She was horrified at the direction in which Williams' career and theology had developed. Sending back a copy of his *Experiments in Spiritual Life and Health* (1652), and, when he responded with a copy of the newly published *Bloody Tenent Yet More Bloody*, that volume as well, she appended and kept his accompanying letter: 'This Roger Williams when he was a youth would in a short hand take sermons, and speeches in the Star Chamber and present them to my dear father, he seing him so hopefull a youth, tooke such likeing to him that he put him in to suttons hospital and he was the second that was placed there[.] Full little did he think that he would have proved such a rebble to god the king and his cuntry. I leve his letters that, if ever he has the face to return into his native country Tyborn may give his wellcome.' *Correspondence* I, p. 359, note.

function of rhetoric is fundamental to understanding the way in which educated 17th century New Englanders wrote, and read.¹⁴ The style of reasoning Roger Williams was taught would have been a formal, systematic process, beginning with the rote learning of initial precepts, then the learning of the best examples of the application of these precepts to particular cases, and finally the imitation of that best application.¹⁵ In the absence of historical documents relating specifically to Williams' early training, an analogy can be made between the education Williams would have received and recent historical treatment of the rhetorical training of Thomas Hobbes: Quentin Skinner has correctly re-articulated the necessity of developing sensitivity to the use and perception of language in reasoning to which contemporary education has made commentators unreceptive.¹⁶

Williams went on to Pembroke Hall, Cambridge, where he studied from 1623-1627, and after taking his BA went on to take a position at Otes, Essex, as chaplain to the household of Sir William Masham. In coming to Essex Williams encountered an intellectual community of notable independents, and was exposed to a variety of politically powerful and well-connected members of the extended Masham family and their circle.¹⁷ Having been rebuffed in a marriage bid for Jane Whalley, cousin of Elizabeth Masham, Roger Williams married Mary Barnard on 15 Dec. 1629.

¹⁴ Norman Fiering, *Moral Philosophy at 17th Century Harvard: a Discipline in Transition* (Chapel Hill, NC: published for the Institute of Early American History and Culture, by the University of North Carolina Press, 1981)

¹⁵ Winslow, *Master Roger Williams*, p. 41.

¹⁶ Luc Borot, review of Quentin Skinner, *Reason and Rhetoric in the Philosophy of Hobbes* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996) in *17th Century News* Vol. 56 (1998) pp.31-34.

¹⁷ Sir William Masham, the county magistrate for whom Williams served as Chaplain was the second husband of Elizabeth, daughter of Lady Joan Barrington and grand-daughter of Sir Henry Cromwell, and therefore cousin of Oliver Cromwell, Edward Whalley, and John Hampden. Elizabeth's father had been Sir Francis Barrington, prominent Baronet and Parliamentarian, much involved (before his death in July) with the Petition of Right in the Spring of 1628, which 'declared illegal both arbitrary imprisonment [by the King] and the [Royal] collection of taxes without Parliamentary consent.'

Winslow suggests that Mary Barnard had been the paid companion of Jane, the first object of Williams' affections.¹⁸ Although the exact calendar of his religious evolution is unclear, by the time of his marriage, Williams had developed a local reputation for his rejection of the ceremony and structure of the Church of England. Moreover, he had come to believe that a true (visible) church had an obligation to repent from and renounce all previous participation in the corrupt practices of the Church of England. As he had put it some months earlier in his letter to Lady Joan Barrington, ca. April 1629, 'It is well knowne (though I would gladly conceale my selfe) how A gracious God and tender Conscience (as Balak said to Balaam) hath kept me from honour and preferment.'¹⁹ Among Williams' acquaintance in Essex, there were many Independent-minded clergy interested and involved in emigration enterprises, and in the same letter to Lady Joan, Williams was already referring to his 'late new-England call,' albeit with the intention of reassuring Lady Joan that he intended to stay at Otes should a marriage to Jane Whalley go ahead. In this context, Roger and Mary's decision to leave England for Massachusetts Bay in late 1630 was not without local precedent, and it seems reasonable to assume they would have expected to arrive in Massachusetts Bay already well-connected.

John Winthrop, Governor of Massachusetts Bay, recorded in his diary for February 5, 1630/31, 'The ship Lyon, Mr. William Pierce, master, arrived at

Christopher Hill, *The Century of Revolution, 1603-1714*, second edition (London: Van Nostrand Reinhold: 1979) p. 8. Family detail from *Correspondence* I, p. 3.

¹⁸ 'To Lady Joan Barrington, ca. April 1629' *Correspondence* I, p. 1 gives evidence of Williams' affection for Jane Whalley. Williams acknowledged, in this letter to Jane's protector, that he was not Jane's equal in class, and that her family connections would be 'invaluable.' The suggestion is that Lady Joan put a speedy end to Williams' aspirations. For a more prurient treatment of the episode, see Williams Addison, *Essex Heyday* (London: J. M. Dent and Sons Ltd, 1949) p. 72-76, in which Addison speculates that it is 'doubtful whether any class endures more than the clergy from the indiscreet affections of ardent young ladies,' and describes Williams as one of 'the young clergymen who suffered this way,' p. 72.

¹⁹ *Correspondence* I, p. 2.

Nantasket. She Brought Mr. Williams, (a godly minister,) with his wife...and others, with their wives and children.'²⁰ The fact that the Governor should particularly record Williams' arrival among the group of some twenty passengers suggests that Williams was known to and admired by him: Williams' place and status among the small group of settlers at Boston should have been secure. But within five years, Williams would alienate himself politically and theologically from his friends and colleagues, fleeing in January 1635/36 from his home in Salem to Narragansett Bay to avoid deportation and trial in England. In the same entry in which he recorded the admission of Mr. Henry Vane, 'a young gentleman of excellent parts,' to the Boston church, Winthrop would report that though the general court had offered Williams a month's recess to re-consider and amend his opinions, he refused, and they 'could not reduce him from any of his errors.'²¹ Backed into a corner by Williams, the court (which for this meeting had specially required the presence of all ministers of the Bay) sentenced him to banishment, later amended to deportation.

As has been well-chronicled by generations of historians, the Massachusetts leaders were determined to gather the elect out of their communities into true churches, basing their civil commonwealth on participation in a divine Covenant inherited from God's Old Testament commissioning of the nation Israel.²² As well as creating a safe place for practising their resistance to church hierarchy, however, this covenanted commission implied a high standard of individual conformity to the communal purpose, if God's favour was to be maintained. John Winthrop exemplified this position when he warned the initial settlers en route to Boston:

²⁰ Winthrop, *Journal*, (5 Feb. 1630/31) p. 23.

²¹ *Ibid*, (1 Nov. 1635) p. 89.

²² Roger Williams' and Massachusetts' notions of historical typology, and implications for the construction of commonwealths will be considered fully, in historiographic context, in Chapter two.

But if wee shall neglect the observacion of these Articles, which are the ends wee have propounded; and, dissembling with our God, shall fail to embrace this present world and prosecute our carnall intencions, seekeing greate things for our selves and our posterity, the Lord will surely breake out in wrathe against us, be revenged of such a perjured people and make us knowe the price of the breache of such a Covenant.²³

By ‘carnall intencions,’ Winthrop meant avid economic gain, but also would have included such self-oriented actions as Williams’ following his own ‘tender’ conscience in a disruptive public way. Winthrop saw Massachusetts Bay as a beacon for the Church and state at home, the ‘Citty upon a Hill’ which might serve as a model for reform. Feeling ‘the eies of all people’ in the old world upon them, the Magistrates governing the colony were highly self-conscious about preventing spiritual dissent not only because they thought they were right, but because unity safeguarded the authority of their infant government, in practical and covenantal terms. As Winthrop put it, ‘Wee must be willing to abridge our selves of our superfluities, for the supply of others necessities. We must uphold a familiar Commerce together in all meeknes, gentlenes, patience and liberallity [generosity].’²⁴ Williams agreed: it was his conflict about the historical position of civil power in relation to divine authority, churches, and conscience, not (by his account) a breach of these sentiments that would lead to his banishment, five years after his lauded arrival.

Williams reported later that he had ‘conscientiously refused’ a call to be ‘Teacher’ in the Boston church, because [he] durst not officiate to an unseparated people, as upon Examination and Conference, [he] found them to be.’²⁵ Although

²³ John Winthrop ‘A Modell of Christian Charity,’ (1630) in Myra Jehlen and Michael Warner, eds., *The English Literatures of North America, 1500-1800* (New York and London: Routledge, 1997) p. 158.

²⁴ Winthrop, ‘Modell’, pp. 158, 159.

²⁵ ‘To John Cotton, Jr., 25 March 1671,’ *Correspondence II*, p. 630. Churches in the Bay divided clerical and lay church leadership into four offices, based on Calvin’s division of the ministry: pastor,

making no mention of any call, Winthrop recorded that Williams had refused membership of the Boston church, because its members ‘...would not make a public declaration of their repentance for having communion with the churches of England.’ Williams planned to accept an invitation to minister at Salem, until the disgruntled Boston court pressured the Salem church into revoking the call.²⁶ With no other formal preaching position immediately forthcoming, Williams established his home in the nearby town of Plymouth, to the South of Boston. It was while in Plymouth that he developed close trade relationships with several of the Narragansett, taking pains to learn their language: during this period Williams’ living came mainly from farming, and certainly from trade, greatly facilitated by his mastery of Narragansett. However, Williams was as affronted by the fact that members of the church at Plymouth, itself separated, were received back into communion after having worshipped with unseparated congregations on return journeys to England. This episode typifies the increasing lack of distinction Williams’ made between theory and practice, compared to his comments to Lady Barrington in 1629 that he would happily conceal his conscience. William Bradford described Williams as ‘a man godly and zealous, having many precious parts but very unsettled in judgment,’ and recorded in 1633 that ‘He this year [1633] began to fall into some strange opinions, and from opinion to practice, which caused some controversy between the church and him.’²⁷ As recorded in the records of the first church of Salem, Williams returned there to accept an

teacher, elders, and deacons. The exact function of, and qualifications for each office was a matter of intermittent debate: see note 4, *Correspondence*, I, p. 11.

²⁶ Winthrop, *Journal*, (entry of April 12, 1631) pp. 25, 26.

²⁷ William Bradford, *Of Plymouth Plantation 1620-1647* (intro. and notes by Samuel Eliot Morison) (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1959) p. 257.

assistant position in 1633.²⁸ Showing himself a man of strong spiritual conviction and a master of publicity, he pitted himself against the General Court in Boston no fewer than three times before it sentenced him on October 9, 1635, after long controversy to ‘depart out of our jurisdiction within six weeks.’²⁹

Though church and state in Massachusetts were more separate than historical reputation has sometimes suggested, magistrates’ duty to be ‘nursing fathers’ to the church was accepted. John Winthrop recorded the church at Boston’s formal petition to the churches at Salem and Plymouth for ‘advice’ on ‘whether one person might be a civil magistrate and a ruling elder [a lay post: see note 17] at the same time,’ and ‘If not, then what should be best done,’ in regard to the influence of church leaders in government, and vice versa.³⁰ Winthrop reported that all the churches agreed that an elder could not be simultaneously a magistrate, but acknowledged generally that there were a variety of responses in respect of the second question: the issue of church/state relations was evolving in Massachusetts, and minority attitudes in and of themselves were not seen as civil threats, requiring suppression. Indeed, as the final crisis leading to Williams’ banishment developed during 1635, the General Court called him to testify to and defend his opinions twice before the meeting in October at which he refused continuance. However, ultimately magistrates and church leaders required that debate proceed in the terms set out by Winthrop in the ‘Modell,’ characterised by meekness and gentleness, and recognising the lower status of individual obligation compared with community unity. At least in public terms, proper citizenship required religious as well as political conformity, and Williams’ persistent theological entrance

²⁸ Richard Pierce, ed. *The records of the First Church in Salem, Massachusetts, 1629-1736*, (Salem, MA: Essex Institute, 1974) p. 339.

²⁹ Winthrop *Journal*, (entry of 1 November, 1635) p. 89.

³⁰ *Ibid*, (early July, 1632) p. 38.

into considerations of the civic polity did thus seem a real threat, both to material peace, and to the colony's obligation (to God) to uphold its articulated covenant.³¹

The 'strange opinions' Williams developed and promoted regarded a variety of issues: he objected to civil magistrates enforcing violations of the first table, including Sabbath-breaking, argued against the law, passed 4 March 1634/35 that all male inhabitants over the age of 16 take what John Cotton later referred to as an 'Oath of Fidelitie,' submitting to the magistrates and governor, and most importantly, advocated the return of the Massachusetts patent to London, arguing that the King had no basis on which to appropriate land from the native tribes.³² He also objected to church members praying with non-members and giving thanks after meals, in addition to advocating the wearing of veils by all women when out of their homes. Williams reported the delineation of the offences for which he was punished as follows:

First, That we have not our Land by Pattent from the King, but that the Natives are the true owners of it; and that we ought to repent of such a receiving it by Pattent.

Secondly, That it is not lawfull to call a wicked person to Sweare, to Pray, as being actions of Gods Worship.

Thirdly, That it is not lawfull to heare of any of the Ministers of the Parish Assemblies in *England*.

Fourthly, That the Civill Magistrates power extends only to the Bodies, and Goods, and outward state of men.³³

³¹ For more general analysis of Williams' threat to the ecclesiastical basis of authority in Massachusetts Bay, see Perry Miller, *Roger Williams: his Contribution to the American Tradition* (New York: Atheneum, 1962) p. 26.

³² In John Cotton's claim that the sanction for non-compliance should be a bar on taking public office, he does not appear to contradict the legal requirement that all take the oath, as first Isaac Backus, and then Perry Miller report. Isaac Backus, *History of New England with Particular Reference to the Denomination of Christians Called Baptists* (2 vols. in 1) E.S. Gaustad, (advisory editor) Religion in America Series (NY: Arno Press and New York Times, 1969) (written 1771-1790) I, p. 48; Perry Miller, ed. *Master John Cotton's Answer to Master Roger Williams, Complete Writings*, CW II, note 11, p. 48.

³³ *Mr. Cottons Letter, Lately Printed, Examined and Answered* (1644) CW I, pp. 40, 41.

The basis of these opinions will be developed and explained fully in Chapter two, but it was his position over the oath and the patent which proved the most civilly threatening in the judgement of the General Court, as these addressed central points of sovereignty and immediate public order concerns.³⁴ Williams' interpretation of Scripture caused him to reject outright any inheritance in God's onetime covenant with Israel, as he judged the Old Testament histories to have been rendered metaphor in relation to current events, by Christ's resurrection. This meant not only that he challenged the view of the civil project proposed by men like Winthrop, but that he rejected the notion that any government, or King, could claim to be Christian, therefore deriving authority for the appropriation of 'promised' land. Williams would develop this point at length in his published exchanges with John Cotton in the years to come: he would complain bitterly that '*Christian Kings* (so calld) are invested with Right by virtue of their *Christianitie* to take and give away the *Lands and Countries* of other men.'³⁵

For the rest of his life Williams referred to being 'driven out in pain of Death' to the 'barbarous Wildernes' in mid-winter, using it to garner support and sympathy for his positions.³⁶ In fact, because of his history of illness, the Court offered him clemency until Spring if he would cease preaching, a wistfully unrealistic ultimatum. When he continued and the Court learned of his plan to settle with a group of followers around the Narragansett Bay in the Spring, it attempted to deport him to England rather than exile him in the most bitter month of the New England winter. Warned of the Court's plan, Williams' fled south, where he and his small party, founded the settlement of Providence the following summer. Williams kept his main

³⁴ Rev. J. Lewis Diman, 'Editor's Preface' (1867) to *Cotton's Answer* CW II, p. 5.

³⁵ Roger Williams, *Bloody Tenent Yet More Bloody* (1652) CW, IV, p 461.

residence at Providence, with intermittent visits to his trading post Cocumscoussoc, (sold, to finance the second trip to England) some twenty miles to the south, for the rest of his life. Twice he returned to England on political business, 1643-45, and 1651-54, but he showed no inclination to return more permanently.

On March 24, 1637/38, the two Narragansett Sachems Canonicus and Miantunomi signed the document known as the ‘Towne Evidence,’ acknowledging that they had ‘two yeares since sold vnto Roger Williams, y^e river and fields at Pawtuckqut...[and did] establish and confirme y^e bounds of those lands.’ The two Sachems extended the grant to Williams in a second paragraph of the Evidence, ‘in consideration of the many kindnesses and services he hath continually done for us, both with out friends at Massachusetts, as also at Quinickicut and...Plymouth.’³⁷ Although probably written by Williams himself, this document gives evidence of his role as a go-between of the local tribes and the Boston English authorities, a role he would retain throughout his life, arbitrating both in the aftermath of the Pequot War, and in the lead-up to King Philip’s War, some forty years after. The town of Providence initially comprised 13 householders (including Williams), nine of whom were among the forty one persons who signed the town ‘Combination’ on the 27th of July, 1640. This ‘Combination’ made no mention of religious purpose or appeal to God’s favour in its introduction, but rather acknowledged the motivation behind its writing as the towns inhabitants ‘having many differences amongst us,’ and ‘being desirous to bringe [the town] to vnity and peace.’ The authors wrote of having examined ‘our owne State and alsoe of States abroad in way of government,’ and having found ‘no way so suitable to our condition as government by way of

³⁶ ‘Roger Williams to Thomas Hinkley, 4 July 1679.’ *Correspondence* II, p. 768.

arbitration.’³⁸ By way of comparison, the ‘Mayflower Compact’ of 1620, of the original Plymouth settlers, set up as its goal ‘y^e glory of God and advancement of y^e Christian faith, and honour of our King and countrie.’³⁹

Although Williams was not an identified author of the ‘Combination,’ his influence shows both in the omission of any religious appeal, and in the inclusion of the proviso that ‘as hath formerly bin the liberties of the town, so still, to hould forth liberty of Conscience.’⁴⁰ This is important, because it highlights Williams’ place in the public life of Providence Plantations: his views were influential, but the development of his political thought did not mirror the development of the political institutions of the five towns which would comprise the colony when recognised Parliamentary Charter on 14 March, 1643/44. As the list of signers to the 1640 ‘Combination’ and other documents show, a variety of outcasts and migrant traders swelled the population gradually, over the next forty five years of Williams’ life, creating five settlements around the Bay and on the island of Aquidneck itself. By 1690, some seven years after Roger Williams’ death, the total population approached 6000, with almost all of the families having arrived prior to 1660.⁴¹ His brother Robert and his family joined Williams at Providence (Robert was a signer of the 1640 ‘Combination’), and Roger and Mary themselves would have six children, all of whom survived to adulthood. Eschewing the professional ministry, Williams

³⁷ John Russell Bartlett, (ed.) *Records of the Colony of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations in New England*, Vol. 1, 1636-1663, (Providence, RI: A. Crawford Greene and Brother, 1856) p.18.

³⁸ Bartlett, *Records*, I, pp. 27, [2]8 (1856 edition omits 2 in page number).

³⁹ Stephan Farnum Peckham, ‘First Attempt to Organize Society into a Free Political Body,’ *the Journal of American History* (Mississippi Valley Historical Review) April/June 1909, pp. 191.

⁴⁰ Ibid.

⁴¹ Bridenbaugh, *Fat Mutton and Liberty of Conscience*, p. 13. For population estimates of Providence itself (as distinct from the colony as a whole) see also R. deVries Brunkow, ‘*Individualism and Community on the New England Frontier: Providence Rhode Island in the Age of Roger Williams, 1636-1686*’ (unpublished PhD, University of California at Santa Barbara: 1980), Table 1, p. 63.

subsisted largely through farming and trade, both with English and Dutch settlers and with the Narragansett. He resisted joining the more profitable trades of gunpowder and alcohol with the natives, claiming to have lost considerable income thereby, and received little or no income from preaching. Williams' knowledge of the Narragansett language would aid his trade relationships and give him a powerful role as an intermediary in negotiations with the local tribes throughout his life.

The 1640 'Combination' set up a loose federal government, with each town sending representatives to regular meetings, but maintaining its own executive officers. Governments under both the 1644 and 1663 charters confirmed this basic structure, though adding layers of institutions and accumulated statute. As Williams wrote in a set of 'Instructions' from the town of Providence to its committee, which would participate in establishing a new government with committees from the other towns, 'We desire to have full power and authority, to transact all our home affairs, to try all manner of causes or cases, ...excepting such cases and executions as the colony shall be pleased to reserve to generall trials and executions.'⁴² Williams served as chief officer in Providence from 1644-1647, and was chosen deputy president of the federated Providence Plantations in March 1648/49. He served as President of the colony from 12 September 1654 until May of 1657, and was exceedingly active in a variety of civil controversies concerning boundaries and land distribution in the 1660s, his role in which would significantly erode his political influence. Williams always maintained a wide correspondence and public profile, however, and his coup de grace was the three day debate with prominent Quakers in Newport (after the visit of George Fox) in August of 1672. Surviving the attack and burning of Providence

Brunkow estimates a population of 895 in 1687, and notes that William Harris estimated the population of Providence (without Pawtuxet) at 500 prior to King Philip's war.

during King Philip's war, on 29 March 1676, Williams played a significant role in the re-building and organisation of Providence in the years following, before dying at Providence, sometime between 16 January and 15 March, 1682/83, in his early eighties.

Toward the end of his life, Roger Williams' greatest lament was that 'private' interest, whether in religious practice, household management, or in economic life, seemed all around him to be superseding the 'common good' as a motive for guiding political advocacy. On superficial analysis, Williams' lament seems nothing more than a founder settler resisting change, complicated by growing prosperity and citizens' increasing distance from the working of the 'Commonweal,' compared with the structurally simple, but highly involved participation of all householders in Providence's first governing bodies. However, Williams' dissatisfaction cannot be so easily explained: his distress was not the simple product of inhabitants' degenerating civil altruism, although that is how he described the changes he witnessed, or conversely of his inability (or stubborn unwillingness) to accommodate a diversity of lifestyle and opinions. What was at stake for Williams was agreement about the nature of conscience as a force for the conforming of individual interest to public good.

Section Two: Trends in Historical Treatment of Williams

As was suggested in the introduction to this chapter, for this study the most important historiographic distinction is between those commentators who have concluded that Williams developed exclusively secular ends for liberty of conscience, and a secular view of the state, and those who have shown that this was a fundamental

⁴² Bartlett, *Records*, I, p. 43.

misinterpretation of Williams thought. This study concludes that historiographic shift, as it places Williams' work in correct and complete intellectual historical context, rather than assessing it in a liberal framework. Even where current commentators on Williams have proved him to be no liberal, they have largely retained a liberal framework in assessing the coherence of his thought.⁴³ Williams assumed no opposition between liberty for individual conscience and the historical authority of civil power. Historiographic emphasis of the separation of civil and spiritual power and tools (the so-called 'separation of church and state') in Williams' thought has obscured the fact that his state fulfilled particular spiritual ends pointing beyond present history, and its explicitly religious origins. Williams' historical state may have been a *civil* institution, but it was certainly not a *secular* one. This is one historiographic error that this study remedies. It extends beyond that shift in emphasis, however, to build a complete picture of Williams' understanding of order in civil society, as has been discussed.

Williams' himself has been much written about, with recent interest in his 'historical image' giving as much notice to what the attitudes toward Williams say about the changing priorities of historians as to Williams' life and ideas themselves. Raymond D. Irwin provided a useful chronological structure categorising Williams'

⁴³ The most recent book length study of Williams, by Timothy Hall, and Williams' treatment by Edwin Gaustad, are exemplary of this trend. Timothy L. Hall, *Separating Church and State: Roger Williams and Religious Liberty*, (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1998); Edwin Gaustad, *Liberty of Conscience: Roger Williams in America*, (Valley Forge, PA: Judson Press, 1999 [first published, 1991]) See Chapter four, notes 9 and 10, and related discussion: 'Hall asked the wrong questions about Williams' account of sovereignty in trying to discover the respective 'limits' to the free exercise of conscience, and state power in Williams' account. While his conclusion that 'Williams did not simply define an inviolate area of conscience and then leave the government free to act in any manner outside this narrowly prescribed area,' (p. 109) is correct, his analytical goal, discerning what rules Williams applied to delineate the scope of conscience from government, exemplifies the over-emphasis of the political individual in his approach. These kinds of questions, looking for the respective 'limits' of Williams' state in relation to conscience, are at best a distraction from the real centre of Williams' ideas about states and their citizens, which concern obedience to civil peace, not the articulation of a 'private' sphere of the citizens' life.'

historiography, building on the analytical frameworks of LeRoy Moore, Jr., and Nancy E. Peace.⁴⁴ Irwin criticised Moore for failing ‘to explain the influences of historical epochs on scholarship,’ and Peace for neglecting to locate the analysis of individual works in historiographic ‘schools.’ His own treatment attempts both these things, though his analysis of the impact of events on the motives of historians does seem to presuppose a degree of unanimity in response to national crises and episodes. His assessment of the Puritan historians is overly reliant on assumptions that cultural ‘insecurity’ dominated their writing, and more depth in treatment of historians’ response to World War Two, and to the Vietnam era, would be necessary to support the plausible generalisations he offers. His framework does have value, however, as it turns the historiographic lens around, using the treatment of a particular individual to offer critical analysis of the changing focus of professional historians in the United States. While Irwin’s chronological approach is perfectly legitimate, grouping and critiquing treatments of Williams thematically is also necessary to explain why historians still complain (despite the wealth of historical treatments) that Williams is ‘enigmatic,’ ‘had many faces,’ or that his ‘religious status and ideals [remain]...open to scholarly debate.

It is useful to examine early treatments of Williams and his work, before drawing out the disagreement between the two most relevant thematic ‘camps,’ suggested above. Here Irwin’s framework is instructive, if flawed. He divided his

⁴⁴ Raymond D. Irwin, ‘A Man for All Eras: The Changing Historical Image of Roger Williams,’ *Fides et Historia*, 26 (1994) pp. 6-23. LeRoy Moore, Jr., ‘Roger Williams and the Historians,’ *Church History*, 32 (1963) pp. 432-451. Nancy E. Peace, ‘Roger Williams – a Historiographic Essay,’ *Rhode Island History*, 35 (1976) pp. 3-13. Irwin concluded that ‘the popularity of the “gentle radical” is due to his ambiguity,’ and organised treatments of Williams in the framework of ‘traditional schools of American historiography (pp. 8, 7):’

1. the Puritan era writers (1630s-1740s)
2. the Revolutionary and national historians (1740s-1870s)
3. the Progressive historians (1880s-1930s)

treatment of the first 'era' into three broad categories: early contemporaries/observers, Puritan ministers, and the 'first' Puritan historians. He accurately reports John Winthrop and Williams Bradford's initial respect for, and then rejection of Williams, but is almost unconsciously reliant on discredited assumptions (characteristic of the second 'school' he identified) about the static and dogmatic approach of Massachusetts Bay 'Puritans' to any dissent. As has already been established in this chapter, the Bay authorities tried actively for three or more years to 'reduce' Williams from his errors, and ordered his banishment only after he rejected another continuation of the debate. Irwin concluded that 'Both Winthrop and Bradford, as heads of closed societies and as believers in one 'Truth,' had obvious concerns about Williams the political renegade, yet were able to appreciate his positive personal qualities.'⁴⁵ As Chapters three, four, and five will make clear, it was not just Williams' 'personal qualities,' or indeed, the reluctance of Massachusetts Bay to punish him which endeared Williams to these and other leaders: it was the fact that he agreed with them about how power in society should function, and particularly how non-governmental institutions (other than churches) should relate to governmental in the maintenance of civil unity and peace. This is not to argue that Williams was not well-liked by many of his contemporaries: all evidence suggests he was. In a letter to Governor Winthrop immediately after Williams departure from Mass Bay, Sir William Martin wrote 'I am sorey to heare of M^r W^{ms} Seperation from you: His former good affectiones to you ...were well knowne...' Sir William continued that he had written to Williams urging him 'to submit to better judgments and especially to those, whom formerly he received and admired.' He asked Winthrop to 'shew him

4. the Consensus School (1930s-1960s)
5. the New Social History (1960s-1980s)

[Williams] what favoure you can, w^{ch} maye stand wth y^e comon good.’⁴⁶ Aside from any basic agreement of principles, Williams was certainly well known, and well-liked in the Bay.

The next notice of Williams, was by the Puritan ministers John Cotton and Nathaniel Ward, both of whom criticised Williams’ theological stance. Cotton’s exchanges with Williams were long and bitter: as Perry Miller identified, the ultimate source of disagreement between Cotton and Williams was a differing notion of typology.⁴⁷ Ward worried that liberty of conscience would open civil floodgates to all manner of error.⁴⁸ Other ‘Puritan’ treatments of Williams appeared in Edward Johnson’s *Wonder-Working Providence*, Nathaniel Morton’s *New-England’s Memoriall*, and (as already noted) Williams Hubbard’s *General History of New England*, leading up to what Irwin described as the most influential account during this first era, in Cotton Mather’s *Magnalia Christi Americana*.⁴⁹ Mather’s allegorical imagery is stark:

In the year 1654, a certain Windmill in the Low Countries, whirling round with extraordinary violence, by reason of a violent storm then blowing; the stone at length by its rapid motion became so intensely hot, as to fire the mill, from whence the flames, being dispersed by the high winds, did set a whole town on fire. But I can tell my reader that, about twenty years before this, there was a whole country in America like to be set on fire by the rapid motion of a windmill, in the head of one particular man....one Roger Williams; who being a preacher that had less light than fire in him...⁵⁰

⁴⁵ Ibid, p. 8. Winthrop, *Journal*; Bradford, *Of Plymouth Plantation*.

⁴⁶ Massachusetts Historical Society, *Misc. Bound Manuscripts (n/d1629-1658)* letter signed ‘W. M., March. 29. 1636’.

⁴⁷ Williams read the Old Testament typologically, but only relative to events within the invisible church. He considered that Christ’s resurrection had rendered the stories of the Old Testament allegorical for more general application, whereas Cotton interpreted the Old Testament as literally pre-figuring present day events. This distinction will be developed at length in Chapter 2.

⁴⁸ Nathaniel Ward, *The Simple Cobbler of Agawam*, (London: 1647)

⁴⁹ Edward Johnson, *Wonder-Working Providence*, (London: 1654), pp. 20,21; Nathaniel Morton, *New-England’s Memoriall* (Cambridge, MA: 1669); Hubbard, *General History*, p. 213.

⁵⁰ Cotton Mather, *Magnalia Christi Americana* (The Great Works of Christ in America), 2 vols., (first published London: 1702, current edition Edinburgh: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1852, 1979) I, p. 495.

However, Mather concluded his excoriation of Williams by acknowledging his help in ‘extinguishing’ the threat posed by one Samuel Gorton, one of Providence Plantations early arrivals.⁵¹ Gorton would prove a significant challenge to all organised government which encountered him, and his case highlights Williams’ closeness to the Massachusetts magistracy in most basic assumptions of how order would function in society. Irwin painted the histories of this era as entirely negative about Williams’ theological and political positions, and though it is true that each rejects Williams’ ideas, they share a respect for his person, and express dismay that a good man should have gone so bad, in their view. Providence Plantations itself was held in disregard by its neighbours at the time: a minister of New Amsterdam reviled it in 1657 in terms that held more than a little truth: ‘For that [Providence Plantations] is the receptacle of all sorts of riff-raff people...nothing else than the sewer (*latrina*) of New England. All the cranks of New England retire thither.’⁵² The first generation of local commentators and historians treated Williams, and Providence with suspicion, certainly.

While relying on Mather’s characterisation of Williams as an heretic, eighteenth century historians like Daniel Neal began Williams’ rehabilitation by characterising Providence as an ‘asylum’ for ‘sectaries,’ as opposed to a cess-pool of malcontents, before the Baptist historians John Callender and Isaac Backus appropriated his person and published work, making Williams over as a brave

⁵¹ Mather, *Magnalia*, II, p. 503.

⁵² From a letter of Johannes Megapolensis and Samuel Drissius, Ministers in New Netherlands, 19 August, 1657. from *The Ecclesiastical History of the State of New York*, Vol. I, Albany: 1901, pp. 400, 410. Quoted in Winslow, *Master Roger Williams*, p. 259.

advocate of liberty in the face of bitter oppression.⁵³ Roger Williams came to later eighteenth, nineteenth, and early twentieth century historical notice for his advocacy of civil liberty of conscience, generally misinterpreted by historians as indicating a liberal republican view of government. This ‘camp’ understood Williams largely to form a theoretical precursor to liberalism: David Ramsay wrote in his *History of the United States* (1818), of Williams’ account of religious liberty, ‘...afterwards admired in the writings of Milton, Locke, and Furneau.’⁵⁴ Williams’ mature political opposition to notions of the individual as an autonomous political agent, with rights to government non-interference in certain areas, was either forced into coherence with his supposed liberalism by being described as legitimate restriction of actions posing the threat of civil harm, or else disregarded altogether.

Ready comparison between Williams’ ideas and those of John Locke proliferated among the numerous historical treatments in this ‘camp,’ the first of the two historiographic groupings most relevant to the current study, as suggested above. Williams’ accounts of individuals as political agents, of states, and of toleration did not resemble those of Locke, and historical identification of Williams as a precursor to American liberalism based on the presumed comparison with Locke was

⁵³ Daniel Neal, *The History of New-England, containing an impartial Account of the Civil and Ecclesiastical Affairs of the Country, to the year of our Lord, 1700*, (London: second edition, 1747), vol. II, pp. 233, 234; John Callender, *An Historical Discourse on the Civil and Religious Affairs of the Colony of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations* (1739) (third edition, Romeo Elton, ed., Boston, MA, and NY: T. H. Webb and Co., and Bartlett and Welford, 1843); Isaac Backus, *History*. Irwin concluded his analysis of the historical image of Williams up to the mid nineteenth century with a gesture toward explaining historians’ wider motives: ‘In Sum, Williams became the intellectual property of Americans who faced the future optimistically, and believed their institutions were divinely ordained to spread across the continent and indeed around the planet. Williams, the true democrat and rugged individual, was an ideal model for scholarly devotees of Manifest Destiny.’ (Irwin, page 11) This nineteenth century Romantic image of Williams and later (‘New Social History’) notions of his ‘outsidership,’ particularly as an advocate for Native Americans, parallel directly changing notions of ‘American Exceptionalism.’ In failing to make this explicit, Irwin weakened his claim of assessing the influences of historical epochs on historians, certainly.

⁵⁴ David Ramsay, *History of the United States*, two vols., (second edition) (Philadelphia: 1818), I, p. 183. cf. Coyle, p. 8.

inappropriate. However, it is useful to briefly examine the points of comparison made between the two men, to explain how it was that Williams could have been perceived as a liberal democrat, ‘...the first person in modern Christendom to establish civil government on the doctrine of liberty of conscience, the equality of opinions before the law.’⁵⁵

In his *Two Treatises of Government*, John Locke developed an exclusively secular view of the state. This was not, as Ian Harris has emphasised, to say that Locke identified no ‘divine requirements’ for government, but rather that the will of God expressed in government institutions concerned only things pertaining to the present life, not the life to come.⁵⁶ As such Locke described a government whose magistrates were ‘only made to preserve men in this world from the fraud and violence of one another,’ and were restrained from interference in things spiritual, that is, pertaining to the life to come.⁵⁷ Specifically, Harris suggested, in Locke’s account government had no remit in ‘speculative’ things, that is, things ‘...that affected none in society.’⁵⁸ Locke included worship in this category: this meant that his magistrate had no remit to control or order worship, leading to a position of civil toleration of religious diversity.⁵⁹

⁵⁵ George Bancroft, *History of the United States*, two vols., (tenth edition) (Boston: 1843), I, 254-55, 366, 375-77. cf. Coyle, p. 11.

⁵⁶ Harris, p. 30.

⁵⁷ Ibid, p. 7. The quoted text is John Locke, ‘An Essay concerning Toleration,’ (C. A. Viano, ed.) *John Locke: scritti editi e inediti sulla tolleranza*, (Turin: 1961), pp. 81, 82.

⁵⁸ Ibid, p. 6. The designation and definition of ‘speculative’ things, in relation to Locke’s account of toleration and the legitimate remit of the secular state, Harris develops, pp. 5, 6. He distinguishes between speculative, and practical things in Locke’s explanation of the scope of government remit: speculative, Harris defines as ‘...those action which did not affect other people, whether by being speculations that gave ‘noe bias to my conversation with men’ and did not influence ‘my actions as I am a member of any society,’ or by being transactions only between God and the agent.’ Things in this category had no impact on conduct, or action, in society.

⁵⁹ This restriction did not extend to religious action that threatened civil disorder, a category in which Locke would include atheism: Locke’s state was founded on ‘divine intention,’ even if secular, and a

It is relatively easy to see how this position could be confused with Williams' own, especially if an historian was working largely from the ideas expressed in *The Bloudy Tenent*, as were many in the first half to mid-nineteenth century. Williams divided spiritual and civil power in present history, and removed any civil remit for things spiritual; his magistrate similarly was charged first with protecting citizens' 'bodies and goodes,' and restrained from interference in conscience. The similarity was one of policy only, however. Williams charged his state, although limited to civil means, with protecting the access of Grace to the souls of the elect in present history, a 'divine intention' pointing very much toward the life to come. Far from pursuing a policy of toleration because the state had no interest in conscience in a Lockean model, Williams' state had an active interest in conscience: in promoting and protecting, by civil means, its free function.⁶⁰ Williams' state was limited not because matters of conscience were 'speculative,' but because his typological interpretation removed the spiritual remit from civil authorities, in present history.⁶¹ Further, Williams expected free conscience to serve, not to threaten, secular authority.

Locke never referenced Williams' work directly, though Ian Harris recorded his criticism of many advocates for liberty of conscience, in terms that could easily have applied to Williams. Harris suggested Locke found their arguments generally flawed as they neither specified exactly to what things that liberty would pertain, nor made explicit the limits (if any) of imposed power, in relation to an individual's

position of no belief thus threatened the authority of the state in his account, whereas a belief differing from majority opinion and practice did not, necessarily.

⁶⁰ As will be developed in subsequent chapters, Williams did not expect his state to distinguish between 'saving' conscience, developed only by the elect, and 'natural' conscience, an universal human faculty. Freedom for saving conscience served a spiritual (ie., next-life) end; freedom for natural conscience served a secular end. The central argument of the thesis concerns the secular end natural conscience served, as the mechanism by which civil society was created and preserved, and which made obedience to civil authority possible, for corrupt humans.

⁶¹ This point will be developed in detail in Chapter two, Section two, 'Roger Williams' Bible.'

private action and obedience.⁶² Many have made these exact criticisms of Williams' account of liberty of conscience, most recently Timothy Hall. In his 1998 study of Williams' work, he found it problematic that Williams '...did not simply define an inviolate area of conscience and then leave the government free to act in any manner outside this narrowly prescribed area.'⁶³ The criticism betrays the assumption that individuals are autonomous political agents with 'rights' to government non-interference in matters that were purely 'speculative' (that is, having no impact on a person's interaction with others), religious belief and worship among them.⁶⁴ As will be fully developed in Chapter four, Williams' located the 'political individual,' the exerciser of liberty of conscience, in an explicitly patriarchal context, reminiscent of that derived by Locke's opponent, Sir Robert Filmer.⁶⁵ By implication, Williams assumed no opposition between individual conscience and the demands of obedience to the state: quite the reverse, indeed. The historiographic criticism exemplified by Hall, made in Lockean terms, is perfectly legitimate in a normative context, but does not reflect Williams' own understanding of individualism, conscience, or of the relation of these two to present civil power.

Republication of Williams' work and greater knowledge of the domestic political events of his life, made possible by historical anthologies like Howard M. Chapin's *Documentary History of Rhode Island* (1916) changed the palette from which scholars might work, however it would take another forty-odd years before the

⁶² Harris, p. 5.

⁶³ Hall, p. 109. cf. note 43.

⁶⁴ Harris pp. 5, 6.

⁶⁵ cf. Chapter four, note 19, and related discussion concerning Williams' account of the 'political individual,' in relation to household government and state power.

second relevant ‘camp’ of Williams historiography would emerge.⁶⁶ American historians of the early to mid-twentieth century, (those Irwin includes in the grey area between ‘progressive’ and ‘consensus’ eras) maintained the image of Williams as a forefather of American liberalism, buttressed by these newly edited sources, but ignored or de-emphasised his theological rigidity.⁶⁷ Vernon Parrington’s positively glowing account of Williams is indicative of this tradition. Describing him as a ‘mystic and Christian democrat,’ Parrington was exactly wrong when he called Williams ‘the incarnation of Protestant individualism, seeking new social ties to take the place of those that were loosening.’⁶⁸ Parrington felt that Williams had been ‘obscured’ by historians seeking to cast him as primarily a religious thinker: here he was no doubt thinking of Backus, among many others. By contrast Parrington cast Williams as ‘primarily a political philosopher rather than a theologian...a forerunner of Locke and the natural-rights school, one of the notable democratic thinkers that the English race has produced.’⁶⁹ Parrington’s fundamental problem was a misinterpretation of Williams’ understanding and use of the term ‘liberty,’ a common

⁶⁶ Howard M. Chapin, *Documentary History of Rhode Island*, (Providence, RI: Preston and Rounds Co., 1916).

⁶⁷ Historical debate between the two ‘camps,’ those who mistakenly applied a Lockean framework to Williams’ work, and those who began the process of removing him from that framework, dominated Williams historiography from the late 1940s: typified by treatments by Vernon Parrington, James Ernst, Samuel Brockunier and amplified in relation to the foundation of liberty in American civilisation by John Dos Passos, accounts of Williams as a political champion of individual liberty in a Jeffersonian model were challenged by Clarence S. Roddy, Mauro Calamandrei, Perry Miller, Alan Simpson, and Edmund Morgan among others since. See discussion in Chapter one, section two. Vernon Parrington, ‘Roger Williams, Seeker,’ in *Main Currents in American Thought I*, (NY: Harcourt Brace) pp. 62-75; James Ernst, *Roger Williams: New England Firebrand*, (NY: Macmillan, 1932); Samuel Brockunier, *The Irrepressible Democrat: Roger Williams*, (NY: Ronald Press, 1940); John Dos Passos, ‘Roger Williams and the Planting of the Commonwealth in America,’ in *The Ground We Stand On*, (NY: Harcourt Brace, 1941) pp. 21-158; Clarence Roddy, ‘*The Religious Thought of Roger Williams*,’ Ph. D. dissertation, New York University, 1948; Mauro Calamandrei, ‘Neglected Aspects of Roger Williams’ Thought,’ *Church History*, 21(September, 1952) pp. 239-258; Perry Miller, *Roger Williams: His Contribution to the American Tradition*, (NY: Bobs-Merrill, 1953); Alan Simpson, ‘How Democratic Was Roger Williams,’ *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd Series, 13 (February, 1956) pp. 53-67; Edmund Morgan, *Roger Williams: The Church and State*, (NY: Harcourt Brace, 1967).

⁶⁸ Parrington, p. 65.

flaw in treatments of Williams from a variety of eras, including the present day. He thought that Williams endorsed the ‘democratic...rights and liberties of the individual citizen’ generally in society, against the forces of aristocracy represented by Cotton, a mis-casting if ever there was one.⁷⁰ James Ernst, in his influential *The Political Thought of Roger Williams* and *Roger Williams: New England Firebrand*, echoed this approach, and error, as did others.⁷¹ Henry Steele Commager and Samuel Eliot Morison absorbed Parrington’s image of Roger Williams almost verbatim in their two volume *Growth of the American Republic*, which became the standard university text of mid-century, with five editions published between 1930 and 1962.⁷² Writing what Irwin would have categorised as the height of ‘progressive’ history, they said of Williams, ‘the most modern of the Puritans,’ that he ‘coupled democracy with religious liberty,’ identifying Williams at the beginning of an inevitable American advance.

These historians writing on Williams operated with a liberal intellectual model for the separation of church and state shaped by George Mason’s *Virginia Statute of Religious Liberty* and the first amendment of the US Constitution. Derived from a particular typological stance, Williams argued in the *Bloudy Tenent* that civil and spiritual power were alienated, one from the other, as forces in present history. However, the separation Williams introduced in the *Bloudy Tenent* and developed more fully in later works was not a normative plea, advocating separation of church and state per se: it was rather a description of the incompleteness of God’s work in

⁶⁹ Ibid, p. 66.

⁷⁰ Ibid, p. 72.

⁷¹ James E. Ernst, *The Political Thought of Roger Williams*, (Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press, 1929), and *Roger Williams: New England Firebrand*, (New York: Macmillan, 1932), as already cited.

human history before the second coming, when civil power would again be subsumed in spiritual, as it had been in the Theocracies described in the Old Testament.⁷³

However, by interpreting Williams' distinction between civil and spiritual power in the terms of their own republican model, adopting Williams as the first 'American' proponent of separation of church and state, nineteenth and early twentieth century accounts created an interpretative tension between Williams' political and religious thought, where none in fact existed. While appropriately revising the earlier categorisation of Williams as a 'proto-Jefferson,' recent historians have absorbed this artificial dichotomy into their mindset about Williams.

This has led to ultimately irrelevant controversy over whether Williams' should best be understood as a religious, or political thinker, and it is into this trap that commentators following or revising Perry Miller's lead have largely fallen.⁷⁴ Though the citizens of Providence ultimately rejected his position, Williams expected the expanded scope of civil interest and power implicit in his account of liberty of conscience to act as precedent for civil intervention to restrict private gain, where it opposed common interest, and enforce social conformity as a buttress to civil peace. As such, Williams' account of liberty of conscience, correctly understood, was inextricable linked to the foundation of civil power in his system. Such a statement only becomes paradoxical if interpreted in a liberal framework which presupposes the

⁷² Henry Steele Commager and Samuel Eliot Morrison, *The Growth of the American Republic*, 2 vols., 1000-1930, (NY: Oxford University Press, 1962).

⁷³ The difference, of course, was that Old Testament theocracies had been governed by Mosaic Law, which Williams judged (based on his interpretation of Galatians) redundant after Christ's resurrection. He was not certain what form authority would take after Christ's return, but in more mature work increasingly accepting of civil and spiritual dissent in present history, as not detracting from the ultimate unity of all power in human life. See *Esau and Jacobs Mystical Harmony Unveiling*, (1666).

⁷⁴ More useful accounts of Williams' thought which begin to correctly assess his notion of liberty, in relation to political thinkers of the day overplay the divide between his account of civil and spiritual power. Edmund S. Morgan, *Roger Williams: Church and State* (Harcourt, Brace, and World, Inc., NY: 1967).

opposition of liberty and authority: the thesis will develop this case, examining Williams' thought as it developed in relation to the conflicts he faced.

Although admitting that he 'broke new ground,' in his historical survey of work on Williams, Irwin passed over detailed examination of one of the best treatments, by Mauro Calamandrei. Irwin implied Calamandrei's 1952 article was just an example of the 'Consensus' school's de-emphasis of Williams' conflict with the Massachusetts leaders, in favour of emphasising the debate in the context of conflict within Reform Christianity generally, but it is much more than that. For the first time, an historian read Williams' less well-known works in the context of the claims made about his political liberality, and concluded immediately that such interpretations were invalid. Calamandrei developed a detailed explication of the real root of Williams' advocacy of toleration, in his reading of Scripture, removing him from the Lockean model of toleration.⁷⁵ Calamandrei correctly rehabilitated Williams as a theological absolutist, and articulately criticised the contemporary image historians had of him. However, his article did not adequately pursue the implications of this revised outlook for understanding Williams political expectations and ideas: Calamandrei explained where toleration actually came from, in Williams' thought, but could not account adequately for the apparent contradiction between this toleration and Williams' demands for subjugation of religious expression to public order in later life. Although its exact relation to Williams' political thought was underdeveloped in an article largely concerning itself with theological arguments, Calamandrei did correctly determine that he valued order and the claims of the political whole above 'the personal liberty and political rights of the minority within a democratic

⁷⁵ Calamandrei, 'Neglected Aspects of Roger Williams' Thought,' pp. 239-258.

organisation.’⁷⁶ Spurred by Perry Miller’s re-publication of Williams’ *Complete Works* in 1963, a generation of revisionist political and religious historians redeemed Roger Williams from any charge of liberalism, finding him to be a religious radical, but not in the least republican in political thought, or relativist in theological. Among these, Edmund Morgan and Edwin Gaustad’s treatments, although very different, stand out as beginning the enquiries that led to this current study. It was a less well known treatment of Williams, however, that correctly settled on Williams’ understanding of history within his larger theology, as being especially important: this was the work of W. Clark Gilpin, examining Williams’ ‘Millenarian Piety.’⁷⁷ The direction of the present study derived from expanding Gilpin’s thoughts about Williams’ understanding of history, and asking what social and political implications the conditions of history contained for present civil societies, in the context of historical attention to ‘Puritan’ notions of conscience and social order more generally.

Section Three: Roger Williams’ Published, Printed, and Manuscript Writing

A man of great personal warmth and charm, endowed with ‘an irresistible affection,’ Williams also proved himself to be a cunning judge of political timing; he was not above a cheap rhetorical shot or emotional ploy if it advanced his cause.⁷⁸ Steeped in scriptural references and admonitions, his writing and argument tended to follow rigidly formal patterns. By his own admission, however, this rhetoric was sometimes muddled or confusing in structure: ‘I sometimes fear that my lines are as

⁷⁶ Ibid, pp. 254, 255.

⁷⁷ W. Clark Gilpin, *The Millenarian Piety of Roger Williams*, (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1979). Gilpin developed Williams’ understanding of history, in comparison to others, pp. 56-62. See also Chapter three of this study for more detailed explication.

thick and over busie as the Muskeetoos etc. but your wisdom will connive; and your Love will cover etc.’⁷⁹ Muddy prose notwithstanding, the Massachusetts magistrates respected university training and personal piety, otherwise they would not have called him to the Boston church upon his arrival in 1631, nor would they have tolerated his very public dissent for so long before banishing him. Long into the next decade he kept up friendly correspondence with several ministers who had voted to expel him, John Winthrop the most notable amongst them.

Much of the conflict in Williams’ public and private life that makes such fertile reading for researchers of early colonial government and civil authority derives from the developing gulf between his own world view and that of his compatriots, the ‘audience’ in the civil theatre where his ideas played out. Peeling back the layers of historic treatment of his correspondence and work to the point of its writing and publication establishes a critical background to better inform the analysis and conclusions about Williams’ thought that follow. To give a balanced picture of the sources used to reconstruct the colonial setting in which Williams operated requires treating both his and some others’ published works, as well as public records and personal correspondence. This requires an examination not only of the form and authorship of the works in question, but also their intended audience, as well as the context of and reactions to their publishing.

Roger Williams published career did not begin until the age of forty in 1643, some twelve years after he had first achieved both renown and notoriety in New England. It is probable that he consistently committed his thoughts to paper during earlier years, but the opportunities for publishing in the New World itself were few,

⁷⁸ Perry Miller, *Roger Williams: his Contribution to the American Tradition*, p. 27.

⁷⁹ ‘Roger Williams to John Winthrop, ca. early June 1638,’ *Correspondence I*, p. 159.

and in New England, controlled by Williams' adversaries in Massachusetts. There is evidence that he circulated at least one treatise concerning the inevitability of persecution in states with an established church following his banishment from Massachusetts in 1636, but any extant copies have eluded all editors and scholars.⁸⁰ This treatise has been supposed to be a response to the Reverend John Robinson's 'Treatise of the Lawfulnesse of Hearing of the Ministers in the Church of England' [Amsterdam(?), 1634], which Williams had in his possession the Summer after his banishment.⁸¹ While it is likely that any ideas contained in that early paper would be repeated and recorded in Williams' publications of 1643 and 1644, its loss prevents modern scholars from doing more than speculating about the exact evolution of Williams' thought. Fortunately, ample correspondence and some public records of this early period remain, largely gathered and preserved by the Rhode Island Historical Society.

The loss of the early paper is only one instance in which the record of works associated with Roger Williams is incomplete. Along with the majority of buildings and stores in Providence, Williams' home was burned by a native war party on 26 March, 1676, and none of his personal papers, business records, or received correspondence remain. In fact, the book containing forty years of public records of town proceedings was itself only saved by quick retrieval from a burning building. In the absence of more direct personal evidence, the record of Williams' life and ideas derives from public sources, secondary accounts, and chiefly, his gathered

⁸⁰ The 'lost paper' was said to concern 'the errors of listening to the preachings of unseparated ministers...[and] the differences between the ancient state of Israel and all modern states,' disproving the belief that Israel could be seen as a 'type' for any contemporary civil government, particularly that of Massachusetts. From *Correspondence*, I, p. 103,104.

⁸¹ referred to in *Correspondence* I, p. 103, cited from *The Works of John Robinson*, 3 vols., Robert Ashton, ed. (London: 1851).

correspondence and eleven original published works. In this context the recognition of a previously ignored manuscript representing Williams' mature view of the origin of conflict in church and society represents a valuable addition. Given the incompleteness of the sources, one danger for the researcher is in ascribing greater significance to the themes and emphases of the record as it stands in relation to the whole of Roger Williams' thought than may be appropriate. Obviously, assuming too much to fill in the blanks in the Williams record is just as pernicious a temptation, but the researcher must take a balanced account of the form of the extant record before building an accurate picture of Roger Williams' thought. For instance, attacking what he saw as the evil of civil persecution 'for cause of conscience' was the overriding and most repeated theme in Roger Williams' printed writing. However, understanding of this theme is complemented and expanded by more careful consideration of Williams' views of the exercise of power in society more generally, and correct householding, property ownership, work, and trade as aspects of public virtue, specifically. This introduction to the extant Williams' sources aims to make such a study possible, in the later chapters of this work.

Williams' return to London in pursuit of a Royal Charter to protect the Narragansett Bay settlements in February of 1643 gave him much greater opportunity and motivation to publish. His first publication was *A Key Into the Languages of America*, a topical guide and phrase book for the Narragansett and Algonquin dialects of southern New England, which Williams claimed to have written during his sea passage. A practical phrase book with sections ranging from 'Of Eating and Entertainment' to 'Of Buying and Selling,' the Key found a ready market on publication, and is one of the earliest such phrase books to have been written. In his introductory section 'To the Reader,' Williams' stated the purpose of the *Key* as the

spread of ‘civilitie’ and ‘Christianitie,’ but his choice of topics and comments throughout the text show a much more worldly focus.⁸² Even in the chapter ‘Of Religion, the Soule, &c.,’ where he does give a brief guide for explaining the basic tenets of Christianity, he spends the bulk of the chapter cataloguing Native belief and detailing his vehement opposition to forcing either conversion or outward adherence to Christian customs.⁸³ Whatever perfunctory statement of evangelical purpose Williams made, his final instructions to the reader in the second introductory section, ‘Directions for the Use of Language,’ recommended the Key as useful ‘whatever your occasion bee either of Travell, Discourse, Trading, &c.’: practicality and expediency were his clear goals.⁸⁴ The Key does provide interesting insights into Williams’ notion of the ‘naturall’ state of humanity, however, of which he judged the natives to be exemplary, and provides real opportunities for him to develop a notion of human duality, a tension between the natural faculties of humans and their potential to respond to Grace, which will be more fully described in Chapter two.

Williams was not an innovator of the written form, and this first published work would not be unique among his writings in its reliance on standard repetitive constructions. He spiked the conclusion of each chapter in the *Key* with a section of short verse chastising the British readership for its licentiousness against a backdrop of the native ‘savages’ comparatively moral behaviour, often in direct contradiction to the political intrigue and sometime brutality of Narragansett life he had just finished describing. In later works, Williams relied heavily on a formal dialogue construction, either between real or symbolic adversaries. Often he took on the narrative voice of

⁸² *A Key into the Language of America* (1643), CW I, p. 80.

⁸³ *Ibid*, pp. 214-221.

⁸⁴ *Ibid*, p. 89.

his opponent, recording an imagined debate that invariably cast himself as the wronged but humble proponent of truth.

After the commercial success of the *Key* had put Roger Williams in the public eye, the anonymous publication of 'A letter of Mr. John Cottons, Teacher of the Church in Boston, in New England, to Mr. Williams, a Preacher there' (London: 1643) created a public debate which Williams quickly turned to his political advantage. Cotton had written the letter in the months immediately after Williams' expulsion from Massachusetts Bay in 1636, and Williams had circulated copies for comment to a few friends over the intervening seven years. The letter lambasted Williams, by 1643 a popular figure, for his intransigence over the issue of complete separation from the English church, as well as his stubborn refusal to tolerate civil endorsement of or support for churches. Cotton endorsed Williams' civil banishment for 'disturbance both of civill and holy peace' as 'righteous in the eyes of God,' and even appeared to gloat over it, declaring somewhat sarcastically that, 'were my soule in your soules stead, I should thinke it a worke of mercy of God to banish me from the civill society of such a Commonwealth [Massachusetts], when I could not injoy holy fellowship with any church of God amongst them without sin.'⁸⁵

What had been written some seven years earlier in a private letter suddenly became public testimony in London to the Massachusetts' clergy's support of civil persecution for cause of conscience. Williams' pursuit of a Royal Patent for Providence and the other towns around Narragansett Bay was directly opposed by

⁸⁵ CW II, p. 298. Also published as 'From John Cotton, ca. early 1636,' in *Correspondence* I, pp. 33, 34. In the context of the protracted written debate that followed between Williams and Cotton, many subsequent historians have made this early letter out to be more personally bitter than it was, given the knowledge that Williams had been offered and turned down Cotton's position as Teacher in Boston when he arrived in 1631. In fact, there is no evidence that this was widely known, and it is only referred to by Williams himself in the letter 'To John Cotton Jr., 25 March 1671,' *Correspondence*, II, p. 630.

emissaries from Massachusetts who had lodged a counter claim to the region, and much depended on the favour either party received from the eighteen Parliamentary commissioners under the Earl of Warwick who would collectively decide the issue. There were many good reasons to add the territory occupied by the disparate towns of Narragansett Bay to the Massachusetts Patent, not the least of which were that the towns had fast become a haven for heretics and non-conformists of many varieties, and Massachusetts needed land for an expanding population.⁸⁶ Its General Court might do well to restore order and discipline. But in the parliamentary climate of the day, the last thing that the Massachusetts envoys wanted was negative publicity about one of their leading ministers. Although Williams' personal lobbying of the individual commissioners was certainly the decisive factor in the decision of a majority to support a separate Patent for 'the Providence Plantations,' granted on 13 March, 1643/44, the publication of Cottons' letter and Williams' reply certainly came at an inauspicious moment for Massachusetts Parliamentary interests.

There is no evidence other than a supposed motive that Williams had anything to do with the publishing of Cotton's letter, and he denied any knowledge of the circumstances of its publication. However, he did bring with him to London a 'response' that he had written well before, which quoted Cotton's letter extensively and dissected it sentence by sentence, point by point. While Cotton's original covers a mere fourteen pages as printed in the *Complete Writings*, the reply, 'Mr. Cottons LETTER Lately Printed, EXAMINED and ANSWERED' goes on for eighty-two. Published on 5 February, 1643/44, just five weeks before the Providence Patent was granted, in this work Williams introduced the broad themes which would dominate the remainder of his published writing: the complete rejection of civil persecution for

⁸⁶ Winslow, *Master Roger Williams*, p. 182.

the cause of conscience, and the illegitimacy of any civil authority acting in the spiritual sphere. Four days later, on 9 February, Williams published the *Queries of Highest Consideration*, a short treatise which he had written in response to the Parliamentary and religious upheaval of the previous months in London. While his reply to John Cotton had been aimed mainly at those who were concerned with the colonial enterprise and knew the players personally, the *Queries* was a direct foray into the issues of the day. With all characteristic minimalism, Williams subtitled the *Queries*:

..proposed to Mr. Tho. Goodwin, Mr. Philip Nye, Mr. Wil. Bridges, Mr. Jer. Burroughs, Mr. Sidr. Simpson. AND To the Commissioners from the Generall Assembly (so called) of the Church of SCOTLAND; Upon occasion of their late Printed Apologies for themselves and their *Churches*. In all Humble Reverence presented to the view of the Right Honourable the Houses of the High Court of Parliament.⁸⁷

At twenty-four pages, a short treatise in twelve sections, the *Queries* begins with a gentle admonition directly to members of Parliament, that they proceed with open hearts in reading the document. It is predictable that Williams would address himself to both of the main religious factions, leading Independents and Presbyterians, and be equally critical of their involvement of the civil powers in sorting out the religious life of the nation in their favour. From his standpoint, the True church had never changed and never would, and the 'Fatall Miscarriages' of Parliamentary meddling in religious practice had led to '*what setting up, pulling downe, what Formings, Reformings, and againe Deformings....*' of which there were ample evidence in the preceding hundred years.⁸⁸ In setting himself publicly against both of the main power bases in religious consideration of the day, rejecting the founding premise of the Assembly of Divines,

⁸⁷ *Queries of Highest Consideration* (1644), CW II, p.251.

⁸⁸ *Ibid*, p. 255.

that a civil power could even indirectly address itself to religious practice, he could expect to cause a stir, and he would begin to find his political welcome wearing thin. Although later works more fully develop the theme of separate spheres of spiritual and civil authority and means, the *Queries* remains the simplest statement of Williams' view of this division, addressed to what Williams saw as specific failures of the combating groups, measured against Scriptural dictates. What he here developed as the separation between church and state became much more complex for Williams, however, ultimately implying both restriction and empowerment of political institutions (family, household, church, academy, and government) in the spiritual lives of individuals, as later chapters will show. The reading public and those mentioned in the subtitle to the *Queries*, however, did not see enough of a civil threat in its publication to cause much concern, and relative to the tumult of the day, Williams' *Queries* amounted to an extra gust of wind during a hurricane.

With his primary purpose in London fulfilled, Williams made plans to return home. Before he left London, however, he published what has become his widest known work, *The BLOODY TENENT, of PERSECUTION, for cause of Conscience, discussed, in A Conference betweene TRUTH and PEACE*.⁸⁹ Williams had been working to gather and distribute fuel in London, and of the final stages of writing the *Bloudy Tenent* later wrote:

God is a most holy witness, that these meditations were fitted for publike view in change of rooms and corners, yea sometimes (upon occasion of travel in the country concerning that business of fuell) in variety of strange houses, sometimes in the fields, in the midst of travel; where he hath been forced to gather and scatter his loose thoughts and papers.⁹⁰

⁸⁹ *The Bloudy Tenent* (1644), CW III, p. 1.

⁹⁰ *The Bloody Tenet Yet More Bloody* (1652), CW IV, p. 38.

As recorded by its primary Victorian editor, Samuel L. Caldwell, the *Bloudy Tenent* was printed without listing either the author or publisher, and appeared on 15 July 1644. Caldwell concluded that the work was reprinted promptly, as errors in the earliest printing are corrected in an otherwise identical volume, also of 1644.⁹¹ Unlike the *Queries*, this work did arouse civil response, and was ‘mentioned for censure’ in the House of Commons on 7 August 1644, then censured two days later on 9 August.⁹² By this time, however, Roger Williams was on his way back to Providence, where he was greeted as a returning hero.

His *Bloudy Tenent* was only one of a group of contemporary works considered dangerous in their advocacy of toleration, but Williams distinguished himself by his complete exclusion of government from church affairs. The *Tenent* relied largely on an unwieldy, often repetitive dialogue format, with sections also countermanding work written by Massachusetts divines. Williams claimed that Cotton was the author of this ‘*Model of Church and Civil Power*,’ which argued for the involvement of the civil state in spiritual affairs as the servant of the church, but Cotton claimed to have had nothing to do with its writing. Unfortunately, no independent copy of this treatise remains, and researchers have relied on Williams’ extensive references from its text to evaluate it. In addition, Williams included a letter supposedly written by an Anabaptist imprisoned in Newgate in the early 1620’s, along with Cotton’s response to the query written privately, in which Cotton endorsed the imprisonment. Despite these inclusions, Williams did not direct the *Tenent* solely at the larger controversy with Cotton, but rather meant it to stand as an independent statement of the civil inviolability of conscience, proceeding from the exclusion of civil authority from

⁹¹ *The Bloudy Tenent* (1644), CW III, p. iv.

spiritual affairs. In style it is convoluted and often hard to follow, with drawn-out sentences, detailed scriptural analogies, and Williams' characteristic '&c.' ending many thoughts. Nonetheless, it stands as the most complete statement of Williams' thought concerning toleration and its typological origin, and makes interesting reading in the context not only of his expulsion from Massachusetts, but also of his construction of Providence and relations with the other Narragansett settlements. He did not expect civic relations or decision-making to be peaceful, but he did expect people to follow administrative rules and procedures to the letter. Given the wide variety of settlers and diversity of religious practice in Providence alone, he was right in expecting controversy.

Before leaving London, Williams had apparently given another small pamphlet to friends for publication in January, 1645/46. This short work was titled *Christenings Make Not Christians*, and extended Williams' Calvinist belief to show the spiritual equality of the unsaved Narragansett and the unsaved but so-called Christian mass of people in Europe. He used this equation to explain why he chose not to pursue the mass conversion of the Natives, showing that it would be in the first instance meaningless to convert heathen to heathen, and in the second place would be sinful as a mocking parody of true Christianity. This pamphlet's history illustrates the difficulty of assembling the complete record of Williams' works, as the only known copy remained uncatalogued in the Thomason Collection of the British Museum, escaping the notice of the editors who preserved and reprinted Williams' works in the United States in the 1860s. Perry Miller records its accidental discovery by Henry

⁹² *Commons Journals*, Vol. III, 1 March 1642 - 24 December 1644, p. 585, column 1, Dic Veneris, August 9, 1644. Referred to in Winslow, p. 195.

Martyn Dexter in 1881, after he had given up the search for citations referring to it.⁹³

In any event, its publication marked the end of Williams' first bout of publishing, and he turned his focus to the public affairs of his colony, his growing family, and much depleted finances.

Much embarrassed by the publication of his letter to Williams and the subsequent reply, as well as the charges in the *Bloudy Tenent*, John Cotton published his major reply to Williams under the title *The Bloudy Tenent Washed Clean in the Blood of the Lamb*. It was published on 15 May 1647 in London, and bound in one volume with *Reply to Mr. Williams his Examination*, which Cotton had written some time earlier. Cotton attempted not only to vindicate himself, but also to rationally justify the involvement of the civil magistrate in protecting and serving religious life. In fact, he agreed with Williams that the government and spiritual leadership ought be kept separate, but he also recognised that civil control was easier to maintain when they co-operated and communicated, even while keeping to their separate spheres of operation. Williams took five years to publish his response, waiting until his next trip to London on behalf of the colony in 1651 and 1652. This heavy text took the complete title *The BLOODY TENENT yet More Bloody: by Mr Cottons endeavour to wash it white in the BLOOD of the LAMBE; of whose precious Blood, spilt in the Blood of his servants; and Of the blood of Millions spilt in former and later Wars for Conscience sake, THAT Most Bloody Tenent of Persecution for cause of Conscience, upon a second tryal, is found now more apparently and more notoriously guilty.*⁹⁴ In the same year, Williams published *Experiments of Spiritual Life and Health*, a manual for Christian living written as an open letter to his wife Mary, *The Fourth Paper*

⁹³ Editor's Foreword, CW VII, p. 28.

⁹⁴ *The Bloody Tenent Yet More Bloody* (1652), CW IV, p. 1.

Presented by Major Butler, written in support of the treatise named in the title, *The Hireling Ministry None of Christs*, and then a response to critics of his Major Butler paper, *The Examiner - Defended in a Fair and Sober Answer*. All of these were written fairly close to the dates of publication, and they make very interesting reading for the researcher of Williams' developing thought, as they clarify his earlier themes. However, Williams had reached the height of convergence with greater public discourse in the *Bloudy Tenent*, and popular and intellectual consideration of his themes had moved on.

For the researcher of Williams' thought and political advocacy, his correspondence and other public records take on greater predominance after 1652 in considering the functional framework of political power and free conscience as it developed in Providence and the larger colony. For the present study, Williams' correspondence, along with public records of the colony, have provided the best entry into understanding in practice, how Williams expected civil society to function, and order to develop. They are invaluable as Williams in correspondence instructed neighbours or opponents in the correct standard of behaviour he expected from them, in relation to state activity. The Victorian editors of the Narragansett Club collected many of Williams' letters and included them as the last volume of their published set of Williams' Complete Writings in 1874. It was not until after Perry Miller's reprint of the Narragansett Club six volume set in 1963 with a seventh volume of commentary and discovered material that further letters were assembled, mostly by members of the Rhode Island Historical Society.

In 1988 the complete collection was republished, edited by Glenn Lafantasie in a two volume set integrating the discovered letters with those of the Narragansett Club edition, and expanding the contextual notes and indexes. Perry Miller published

his edition of the *Complete Writings* keeping the pagination of the nineteenth century Narragansett Club editions for the aid of researchers, adding all new material in a seventh and final volume. He preserved the notes and introductory comments of the original Narragansett edition as well, because the cross-referencing and notes on repositories of secondary citations were useful to researchers. However, much as the republishing of Williams' correspondence with modern editing has clarified connections between events, letters, and political context, the body of published works would benefit similarly from such treatment.

It was common practice for men of learning to write and pass short treatises around amongst themselves for comment and debate in seventeenth century New England, especially where such documents explained a combatant's underlying reasoning in taking a particular political or 'policie' approach, in a present controversy. Historians know that Roger Williams wrote at least one such paper early in his residence in Providence, and one book length treatise, neither of which have come to the notice of historians of his work. '*Esau and Jacob's Mystical Harmony Unvailng...*' (1666) is another such pamphlet, written by Williams, never printed, but donated in fair copy to the Massachusetts Historical Society by Caleb Gannett in 1813.⁹⁵ '*Esau and Jacobs Mystical Harmony unvailng The Myserie of Jehovahs Eternal will in Universal unity branched Through several Allogies, or Communication on Their typical Nativity; visible Separation; and Invisible unity...*' (1666) contains an attempt by the author, albeit by highly technical and convoluted Scriptural exegesis, to explain the problem of theodicy in relation to the

⁹⁵ Physical, contextual, stylistic, and thematic proof of Williams' authorship, and discussion of themes of the treatise are offered in the introductory essay accompanying the transcribed text, in Appendix Two, attached to this study.

tumult he sees not only in churches, but in present civil society generally.⁹⁶ The manuscript's subject is the allegorical significance of Esau and Jacob's struggling in their mother's womb, which is taken to stand as allegory for 'All darknes: All bondage, All discords: All Emnity: All Hate: All wrath: All vengeance: All Corruption: All Judgments: All Condemnation: all Hell, and all misery...'. ecclesiastical and civil.⁹⁷ The brothers' quarrel over material ends, and ultimate reconciliation, is explained by the Williams as typing God's ultimate 'mystical' unity, to reconcile political and religious tumults in present human history. As he wrote:

The womb must first be barren: That so it may be fruitfull; The foot lame: That it may walke: The eye blind: That it may see: The ear deaf: That it may hear: The H^cart hard: That it may be soft: and the whole ffabrick of man-kind dissolved into dust & ashes: That it may be raised in Immortality.

Peace must first be taken from the face of the Earth; And the whole creation set at Disorder: Struggling, Contending, and destroying one another: That lo it might travail in paines & [g]rownes To be delivered into the peace & unity of ye glorious liberty of the sons of God: And that Jehovah, the only King of Love, Peace, Unity, and Righteousness, may in the fulnes of times Himselfe (alone) Rule & Reign, for Everlasting.⁹⁸

Thus Williams explained the seeming paradox of present disorder, as the necessary historical foil to highlight God's eternal unity at the time of the eschaton. Reference to this 'eternal unity' speaks to Williams' millenarianism, ever present in his work.

A 'fair copie' with fly-leaf introduction, this manuscript was written just before the height of Williams' entry into what Lafantasia has called the 'political schism' of land disputes, Williams' entry into which was spurred in large measure by his apprehension that William Harris, his primary opponent, was motivated by profit alone. This open placement of 'selfish interest' as the motive for political advocacy

⁹⁶ By 'theodicy' is meant the problem of why a loving, all-powerful God allows evil in the world.

⁹⁷ 'Esau and Jacob...(1666)', p. 64.

would have seemed to Williams to introduce chaos into the very foundation of Providence's commonwealth, as will be made clear in the discussion of Williams' view of the civil state in Chapter three, and examination of the particular case, in Chapter five. At such a time, for him to struggle to explain the over-arching purpose of such conflict would be logical. Further discussion of the themes of the manuscript, and implications for Williams' scholarship, will be developed in later chapters; it represented the mature Williams seeking to understand how current controversies could be reconciled with Providence's special purpose as a haven for refugees 'for conscience' sake.

In 1676, Williams would publish the last and longest of his printed works, a point by point argument against Quakerism in general (Quakers by then made up a voting majority among the freemen of Rhode Island Colony) and George Fox's autobiography in particular. Its writing and publishing followed on from a three day public debate, where Williams, by then past the age of seventy, debated three Quakers in the town of Newport, some thirty miles by row boat from his home in Providence. With this work, entitled *George Fox Digg'd out of His Burrowes*, Williams demonstrated that the fruit of his framework of civil toleration of religious diversity was not to be relativism, but that spiritual authority in the form of the 'sword of the spirit,' wielded by a variety of institutions within society was the correct tool of discipline in spiritual matters. Although he never advocated the state censure of Quaker worship or belief, he did strenuously object to Quaker social affectations, like long hair or equality of address, which he felt entered the civil sphere and threatened the civil structure of the commonwealth. This last and most vitriolic public work throws his view of the nature of conscience itself and the obligations of citizens in a

⁹⁸ Ibid, p. 15.

tolerant state into high relief. His opposition to Quakerism was not simply theological: he saw their withdrawal from what he considered civil intercourse with non-Quakers as withdrawing from the web of civil society itself, intolerant and a potent threat to civil order. In support of their emphases, Chapters two and five will offer further development of the character of Williams' disagreement with the Quakers. Williams was largely stymied in his attempts to suppress what he saw as Quaker incivilities.

Conclusion: Thematic Structure of the Thesis

The themes of Roger Williams' works were remarkably consistent, across his intellectual and political career: what differences there are, are differences of emphasis rather than evolution of his thought. He generally wrote to enter controversy, and as such, the emphases of each particular printed work reflect the immediate contexts of their publication. Williams never made a systematic treatment of his ideas, or at least, never wrote one which has survived as part of the historical record.⁹⁹ To present a systematic analysis of his underlying assumptions, this study draws on the whole body of work, to discover the themes closest to Williams' heart, and tease out their interrelation in his intellectual and theological framework. What emerges is a picture of a man obsessed with the progress of Grace through history: the most important themes of Williams' work concern creating the kind of civil society that should best facilitate the access of Grace to the souls of God's elect remnant. The introduction to each chapter in this study explains its internal structure: brief

⁹⁹ Williams referred in 1669 to having written in 1657 a book length manuscript that he tantalisingly described as a '...Defence of Civill Order and Governmt,' no copy of which has been found. 'RW to John Whipple, Jr., 24 Aug. 1669,' *Correspondence* II, p. 602, and note 53, p. 608. Lafantasic, 'Roger Williams and His Papers,' *Correspondence* I, p. xlvii.

explanation of the thematic progress of the thesis as a whole is necessary, however. A map of Williams' ideas about conscience and order, in present society, would very much resemble a visual image of the web of civil society in which he expected each person to fulfil his or her calling: each theme and assumption, each part of his argument, is connected to each other. This structure of this study sets out to most clearly explain those connections, gradually building a complete picture of Williams' system of 'historical' order in practice.

As the founding assumptions of all Roger Williams' thought were theological, the first point of entry in this study is a comparative analysis of his theological outlook, in relation to current historiography. Chapter two, 'Sin and the Progress of Grace,' accomplishes this purpose. The central argument of the thesis assumes that Williams operated with a fixed body of assumptions about the effect of original sin on individuals and their constituent faculties, it is important to be specific about exactly what Williams took these effects to be, in relation to the views of his local contemporaries, to begin to build a picture of the ways in which his statecraft resembled, or differed from, theirs. Likewise, Scripture was a chief authority for Williams: knowing how he read the Bible (and which Bible he read), in addition to how he applied the lessons of Scripture to present situations in a particular typological style, is necessary. Visible church institutions and sacraments, were not of great importance to Williams' civil projects, but understanding why helps to explain Williams' millenarian view of history. All of these projects, Chapter two addresses, in preparation for the discussions which follow.

If Chapter two develops a picture of the conditions Williams took to pertain in present life, derived from his theological outlook, Chapter three, 'The Natural Order of History,' examines the social and political implications of these conditions. It is

the work of this Chapter which treats the broadest sample of Williams' work, building a picture of what he understood civil society and order to look like, and how he expected it to function, in practice. It was in the service of creating, and preserving order (both spiritual and civil, indeed) that Williams advocated liberty for conscience; as such this headline position is treated here, in its correct thematic context. Chapter three explains how Williams expected civil society to function, but he did not separate civil society from the exercise of civil power: Chapter four, 'The State and Civil Order,' completes the picture of how Williams expected civil power to function. State institutions, and their officers, were the special stewards of civil power, by Williams' account. However, given the small size, and institutional simplicity of civil life in early Providence and Providence Plantations, it is predictable that many of the functions of civil power in present history Williams apportioned to heads of households directly, in collaboration with state institutions.

The way in which this collaboration developed in practice, and the ways in which Williams attempted to manage it in particular circumstances, is discussed in Chapter five, 'Challenges to Civil Order, and Historical Remedies.' For this discussion to make sense, however, Williams' theoretical understanding of the derivation of civil power in present history, in relation to households, must be clear. Thus the discussion of Williams' understanding of the fifth commandment, 'Honour thy Father and Mother,' in relation to patriarchal understanding of government power, contained in Chapter four gives crucial introduction to the activity described in Chapter five. Chapter five does not attempt an account of all civil conflict in the colony, or even of the most important conflicts in the wider life of the colony. The three areas of conflict Chapter five discusses are chosen explicitly to examine Williams' responses to the tension between the balance of power apportioned to the

community, and to individual conscience, in his account of civil order. The preceding chapters all make clear the theoretical, and practical importance of households, civil law, and the suppression of private interest, in relation to conscience: Williams' involvement in conflict around these three areas best shows the success and failure of his system of 'unbinding order in history.' No one part of this study can stand alone: each requires the thematic development of the others to provide an intellectually coherent picture of exactly how Williams expected God's projects to be protected, in present history by the ordering mechanism of free conscience.

Chapter Two: Sin and the Progress of Grace

In the introduction to his first published work, *A Key in to the Language of America*, (London: 1643) Roger Williams told of his deathbed conversation with Wequash, a prominent Pequot:

Amongst other discourse concerning his *sicknesse* and *Death*...I closed with him concerning his *Soule*: Hee told me that some two or three yeare before he had lodged at my House, where I acquainted him with the *Condition* of *all mankind*, & his *Own* in particular, how *God* created *Man* and *All things*: how *Man* fell from *God*, and of his present *Enmity* against *God*, and the *wrath of God* against *Him* untill *Repentance*: ...said hee *me much pray to Jesus Christ*: I told him so did many *English, French, and Dutch*, who had never turned to *God*, nor loved Him: He replied in broken English: *Me so big naughty Heart, me heart all one stone!*¹

Williams reported the exchange in anticipation of readers' questions about the success of native conversions, but the segment is most interesting as Williams' own short summary of the points he considered central to Christianity, as related to someone whom he and his readers, whatever their view of the covenantal role of the English in God's plan, would accept unequivocally as a representative 'natural man.' Thus the entry point to Roger Williams' belief was the depravity of natural man in current history, for him a condition shared equally, but for which each individual was

¹ *Key*, CW I, pp. 86,87. Thomas Shepard I (1605-1649), pastor of the church near what became Cambridge and prominent Bay spiritual authority also reported Wequash's death, as quoted in *New England's First Fruits*, (London: 1643), p. 7: 'Wequash, the famous Indian ...is dead, and certainly in heaven: gloriously did the grace of Christ shine forth in his conversation, a year and a half before his death, he knew Christ, he loved Christ, he preached Christ up and down...' Both Williams' and Shepard's treatments attempted to fit Wequash's 'conversion' into an expected template for divining election, a process which they expected to proceed through discernible stages, beginning with recognition of one's own natural depravity, continuing with intensive self-examination for signs of redeeming grace, and culminating in public testimony to the evidence of grace acting in one's life. Although Williams was more explicit in the quoted passages, neither measured conversion (by natives or anyone else) exclusively by participation in overt forms of worship or 'Christian' modes of behaviour. Either way, Wequash had not completed the process, in Williams' eyes, because he died before discerning whether Grace would redeem him from his recognised depravity. Williams 'had

personally responsible. This condition resulted from Adam's Fall and the Creator's rejection of him, redeemed only in Christ's sacrifice. But as importantly in Williams' brief synopsis, with humanity's 'present *Enmity* against God,' history would remain unfinished until each individual acknowledged his or her depravity and committed to the resultant search for Grace: ultimately, history would remain in flux until Christ's physical return.

It is an understanding of the origin, character, and implications of this historical anxiety, permeating Williams' religious and political thought across his career, which this chapter will develop. It is true to say that 'the cast of Williams' mind was primarily theological,' and this chapter will explain Williams' particular beliefs in a number of important areas, giving a series of theological 'benchmarks' by which he can be usefully compared with his contemporaries, and located within the larger framework of reformation theology. But W. Clark Gilpin was right to suggest (even if in an aside) in his study of Williams' 'Millenarian' piety that the centre of Williams' thought was less to be found in his particular ideas about specific subjects '...than in his ideas about himself, his religious vocation, and his place and duty in the providential order of history.'² Also, in relation to the larger purpose of this study Williams' theology is more important for the explanation of civil society's function which it demands, than for the exact detail of his doctrinal beliefs.

These two starting points suggest a methodological approach to Williams' basic theology which is consistent with that of recent British and American scholarly debate around definitions of Puritanism more generally. Recent scholarship both in

hopes' of Wequash's election, but as he said, 'I know not with how little *Knowledge* and *Grace* of Christ the Lord may save, and therefore will neither *despaire*, nor *report* much.' *Key*, CW I, p. 25.

² W. Clark Gilpin, *The Millenarian Piety of Roger Williams*, (Chicago, IL and London: University of Chicago Press, 1979) p. 4. Chapter 3 will develop Williams' particular view of history, developing the implications of his synthesis of theological strands for present civil society.

Britain and America argues that a methodological approach to Puritanism which seeks to trace the inter-weaving of different strands of belief on particular subjects, building a picture of a common practice of voluntary piety, is far more useful for defining Puritanism than approaches which separate out, define, and label particular points of doctrinal 'truth.'³ As a logical extension of that position, this chapter will develop a picture of the interaction and causal references between the strands of doctrine which informed Roger Williams' assumptions about civil society generally, and the wielding of civilising power by its particular institutions, the state and household primary among them. By 'causal references' is here meant inter-dependent chains of Roger Williams' particular beliefs on given theological subjects, explaining the relation between his notions of original sin, the natural faculties of humanity, and conscience, or the symbiotic relation of his notion of typology and his view of the visible church in history, for example. As part of this project, the chapter will explain the theological origins of Williams' avowed separation of church and state authority in the present day. Detailed explanation of the spiritual purposes of Williams' state, as part of Williams larger system of civil order and in relation to powers exercised by a variety of institutions in civil society, will occur in subsequent chapters.

This chapter, then, will begin by locating Williams generally in relation to transatlantic Puritanism, revisiting unfinished (and in some cases, simply omitted or ignored) answers to the question of why, and in what way Williams should properly be considered a 'Puritan,' and what implications that definition might have for the proper understanding of his thought. The chapter will continue with a three broad

³ Peter Lake, 'Defining Puritanism – again?' in *Puritanism: Transatlantic Perspectives on a Seventeenth-Century Anglo-American Faith*, ed. Francis Bremer (Boston, Massachusetts: Northeastern University Press for the Massachusetts Historical Society, 1993), p. 3-6. Lake did not 'rule out' the possibility of identifying distinct doctrinal positions which might be labelled Puritan, but argued that scholarly '...concern should not be so much to list and delimit a group of telltale Puritan opinions as to pull together a sense of the central core of a Puritan style or tradition or world view.' *ibid.*, p. 6.

sections, concerning his view of humanity, the Bible and Spiritual authority, and the church. The first of these will investigate Williams' view of original sin and the related faculties of natural and regenerate humans, before developing his notion of conscience in some detail. The middle section will be devoted to his use of the Bible, exploring Williams' Christology, typology, and view of covenant. A final subject section will explore Williams' notions of election and separatism, and view of the visible and invisible church in history. Each subject section will build on the explanations which have preceded it, 'to pull together...' (to answer Peter Lake's directive for historical treatment of Puritan theologies) '...a sense of the central core of [Roger Williams'] Puritan style or tradition,' his cast of mind or theological 'world view.'⁴ At each stage Williams particular views will be compared to those of his contemporaries, and where appropriate, different historical assessments of his theological outlook will be critically evaluated. Establishing a coherent view of the causal references between the doctrinal strands is the guiding principle behind these section divisions; the chapter will conclude with a brief explanation of the transition to the consideration of conscience, conformity, and the role of Christian belief as a civilising force in Williams' theological framework, preparing the ground specifically for the chapter which will follow.

Many have argued over whether Williams can correctly be labelled 'Puritan,' though debate about the label itself is less useful than a direct understanding of Williams' views about the progress of Grace through history, the gathering of churches and practice of worship, and the place of the church in civil society. Certainly, Williams shared with 'Puritanism' an antipathy toward what he saw as the

⁴ Ibid.

structure and trappings of Rome still present in the Church of England, and by the time he arrived in Boston, advocated the complete spiritual separation of the elect from Church of England worship and its adherents. In his well-thought of (and indeed, well-done, in most respects) study of Williams which followed Miller's republication of the *Complete Works*, Edmund S. Morgan confidently called Williams 'Puritan,' while side-stepping debate about what 'Puritanism' included or whether 'Puritanism' existed as a coherent grouping in English Protestantism during the early modern period. Morgan accepted uncritically the view of Charles H. and Katherine George, that as he put it, '...there was no such thing as a Puritan, that the ideas and attitudes generally attributed to Puritans were shared in varying degrees by all English Protestants.'⁵ While Morgan might persuasively argue that engaging with such questions would have detracted from the focus of a short work explicating Williams' thought largely on its own, without a vast comparative element, his monograph does suffer from the absence of a more fully developed picture of Roger Williams in relation to other 'Puritans,' or at least greater notice of the debate about how such a group should be defined. Others, including Perry Miller and W. Clark Gilpin also hedged round the issue of Williams in relation to Puritanism, despite highly developed accounts (especially in Gilpin's case) of his theology and piety. Gilpin refers the reader to Calamandrei's 1952 article, to Miller, and to the Georges: one cannot but feel that Gilpin's approach to Williams' theology, moving away from an anatomisation of doctrine to provide a more integrated 'world view,' pre-figured Peter

⁵ Edmund S. Morgan, *Roger Williams, the Church and State*, (New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, Inc., 1967) p. 11 and following. Charles H. and Katherine George, *The Protestant Mind of the English Reformation, 1570-1640*, (Princeton, NJ: 1961). Adherents to this interpretation, described in slightly more detail in Lake, 'Defining Puritanism,' p. 5, have included M. G. Finlayson, *Historians, Puritanism and the English Revolution* (Toronto, 1983) and J. C. Davis, 'Puritanism and Revolution: Themes, Categories, Methods and Conclusions,' *Historical Journal* 34 (1991), pp. 479-490. I disagree with Lake that Patrick Collinson's *The Puritan Character: Polemics and Polarities* (Los Angeles, CA: 1989) makes the same conclusion.

Lake's approach to Puritanism more generally. Lake argued that a core definition of Puritanism must come from an understanding of the 'synthesis...of strands most or many of which taken individually could be found in non-Puritan as well as Puritan contexts, but which taken together formed a distinctively Puritan synthesis and style.'⁶ It is this approach which Gilpin applies to Williams' theology, and by which he identified Williams' particular brand of 'millenarian piety' to be the core of his theological outlook. Miller's account, albeit before his re-publication of the *Complete Writings*, included no critical mention of 'Puritanism' at all.⁷ These approaches, all by American historians, exemplify Francis Bremer's characterisation of the problems associated with considering Puritanism from any other than a transatlantic perspective. As he put it: 'English historians customarily view the colonies as a sideshow, and Americanists seek mainly to mine the ore of British history for the specific elements of background which will shed light on their colonial concerns.'⁸ It is logical that many American approaches to Roger Williams (and, indeed, to other

⁶ Lake, 'Defining Puritanism,' p. 6; Gilpin, *Millenarian Piety*, p. 2; Mauro Calamandrei, 'Neglected Aspects of Roger Williams' Thought,' *Church History*, 21 (1952), pp. 239-258. For explication of Calamandrei's article, see Chapter 1, p. 14. Perry Miller, *Roger Williams, His Contribution to the American Tradition*, (New York: Atheneum, 1965 [first published 1953]); Charles H. and Katherine George, *Protestant Mind*; Lake briefly identified and criticised three trends in recent historiography concerning Puritanism: 1. those scholars following the lead of Patrick Collinson in defining Puritanism by action, that is, by participation in a movement to reform the government and liturgy of the English church; 2. those who try to identify Puritanism as a 'style of piety,' and therefore seek to trace 'Puritan' construction of 'structures of meaning' giving insight to the self and the world: Lake divides this group broadly into two strands, those who seek to separate out and catalogue distinctly Puritan views in particular areas of theological debate, and those who try to identify Puritanism more as a style, or cast of mind, who seek to develop accounts of the relationship between tenets and tendencies as a way of defining Puritanism; and 3. those scholars following the lead of the Georges, accounting for it more as part of larger Protestant reform thought, abandoning notions of an independent identity for English Puritanism. Lake identifies his own view as being a mix of the second and third approaches, arguing that Puritanism was a 'distinctive style of piety and divinity,' but did not exist in an intellectual island vacuum. Lake, pp. 3-6.

⁷ Perry Miller, *Roger Williams*; see for example pp. 22-27.

⁸ Francis Bremer, 'Puritan Studies – the Case for an Atlantic Approach' in *Puritanism: Transatlantic Perspectives on a Seventeenth-Century Anglo-American Faith*, ed. Francis Bremer (Boston, Massachusetts: Northeastern University Press for the Massachusetts Historical Society, 1993), p. xii. For more detailed consideration of 'Puritanism' historically and theologically, see Patrick Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967); William Haller,

early colonial 'Puritan' figures) in recent decades have found the Georges' view of Puritanism appealing, as it creates intellectual space for notions of a distinctly New World Puritanism, and excuses the scholar from locating his or her subject in the shifting tangle of mid seventeenth century English religious combat.

The relevance of this debate and its present outcomes to accounts of Roger Williams' theology, in relation to his notions of civil and social order, will become immediately apparent, with some explication of Peter Lake's synthesis of the various approaches. Building on Patrick Collinson's description of Puritanism '...as a form of voluntary religion, largely contained within and enriching rather than seeking to overturn or remake the institutional and liturgical frameworks provided by the national church,' Lake collapsed rigid notions of Puritans as a separate faction, completely opposed to and distinct from an 'Anglican mainstream.'⁹ As such, Lake does accept part of the Georges' approach, agreeing with Collinson that Puritanism was not just an autonomous cast of mind, but was part of a general protestantisation of English culture, marked by the vogue for reformation of manners. In very practical terms 'Puritan' modes of voluntary piety were meant to increase and reinforce social order, by Lake's definition, an assumption which accurately characterises much of the religious advocacy around social issues in New England, throughout the seventeenth century. For example, in a sermon to his Charlestown congregation of October 30, 1668, Thomas Shepard II (1635-1677/78) lamented that:

...did y^e vain companion, & drunkard spend as much time in his closet a Daie, at prayer unto God, as he doth at y^{is} or y^{at} shop of y^e Devill, I mean the

The Rise of Puritanism (NY: Columbia University Press, 1938); and Christopher Hill, *Society and Puritanism in Pre-Revolutionary England* (NY: Schocken Books, 1964).

⁹ Lake, 'Defining Puritanism,' pp. 8, 9. Also Peter Lake, 'Puritan Identities,' *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 35 (1984), pp. 112-123, and Peter Lake, *Moderate Puritans and the Elizabethan Church*, (Cambridge: 1982).

unlicenced houses where he waste his estate upon stronge drink, & base company in all probability he might ... be eternally saved.¹⁰

As Lake identified both specific forms of voluntary religious practice, and theological themes which characterised 'Puritanism:' '...religious sociability, the conventicles, private fasts, exercises, market day lectures around which the godly organized their devotional and social lives,' he might easily have been describing Shepard and his congregation. For Lake, a characteristic synthesis of these particular forms and themes developed into a distinctly Puritan cast of mind, concerning views of a theology of Grace, the rejection of popery, the status of episcopacy, and sabbatarianism.¹¹ It is clear from Lake's emphases that he considered the forums for discussion and patterns of clerical friendship, which promoted a word-centred synthesis of views around characteristic themes as much the crux of Puritanism, if not moreso, than any particular doctrinal view itself.

By such definitions, Roger Williams was certainly a Puritan, though his particular theological views went far beyond those characteristic even of a defined 'Puritan opposition' within English culture. As will be developed later in this chapter.

¹⁰ Thomas Shepard II (1635-1677/78), sermon on Matth 7.14, dated Oct. 30 1668, in the *Shepard Family Manuscripts* c 1636-1681, Mss. 'S', Boxes 'S', 1 box, folder 6 (1668). Collections of the American Antiquarian Society, Worcester, MA. Hereafter referred to as 'Shepard Manuscripts,' with specific folder or volume noted. [This truncated quote is used to show Shepard's assumption that 'Puritan' styles of piety would aid public order and orderly living. Removed from its context in the larger sermon, the final phrase of the quote seems to imply an Arminian view that diligent piety and good works could effect salvation: this was not Shepard's belief, and only appears so because of the isolation of the quoted text. With his father, Roger Williams, and most of his contemporaries, Shepard believed salvation was by arbitrary and irresistible grace alone. Diligent piety might only aid one in the discovery and acceptance of this Grace. Specifically, '...y^e L^d can work wthout meanes, yet he tyes us to y^e conscionable use y^{ro}f, as The Word.' sermon of April 1669, folder 7 (1669)] Thomas Shepard II graduated from Harvard in 1635, became a fellow in 1654, was admitted to the church in Charlestown in 1658 before being ordained its minister in 1659, where he served with his colleague Zechariah Symmes. In 1664 Shepard was appointed censor of works printed in Massachusetts Bay, and he delivered a widely circulated election sermon in 1672. Shepard was a prominent and well-respected member of Massachusetts clergy community. His death in a small pox epidemic in 1677/78, along with the loss of several other prominent leaders, was seen as an indication of divine judgment to come. See Urian Oakes (c. 1631-1681), 'Elegy on the Death of Mr. Thomas Shepard,' (Cambridge: 1677) in George F. Horner and Robert A. Bain, eds., *Colonial and Federalist American Writing*, (NY: the Odyssey Press, 1966), pp.151-160.

Williams considered himself a separatist in the tradition of Henry Ainsworth (1571-1622/23) and John Canne (?-1667?), both of whose relative poverty he compared favourable with the example of those 'Puritans' who had not progressed to separatism. That Roger Williams assumed such a progression was inevitable, if the believer was truly listening to his conscience, was evident. *As he said in Mr Cottons Letter Examined and Answered* (1644):

...I beleeeve that there hardly hath ever been a conscientious Seperatist, who was not first a Puritan: for (as Mr. *Can* hath uanswerably proved) the grounds and principles of the Puritans against Bishops and Ceremonies, and prophanes of people professing Christ, and the necessitie of Christs flock and discipline, must necessarily, if truly followed, lead on to, and inforce a separation from such wayes, worships, and Worshippers, to seek out the true way of Gods worship according to Christ Jesus.¹²

Williams seems to have used the terms non-conformist and Puritan almost synonymously: he here identifies several of the themes of Puritan discourse Lake alluded to, in addition to the distinctive practice of voluntary piety, the formation of smaller groups within parish churches, which is central to Lake's definition of Puritanism. Williams shared the anti-popish reforming impulse, rejecting vestments, set liturgy, church hierarchy, the 'hireling' ministry, and believing that a congregation could only be gathered from the elect few who demonstrated selection and conversion. Explaining why it was that separatists had sometimes fared better under Anglican or Catholic persecution than the 'Puritan or Non-conformist,' Williams argued that Puritans were more likely to be wealthy land-owners, and thus offer a richer (and potentially more powerful) opponent for persecutors: '...such of Gods servants as have been Non-conformists have had faire estates, been great persons, have had rich livings and benefices, of which the Bishops and theirs (like greedie

¹¹ Lake, 'Defining Puritanism,' p. 14, p. 25.

¹² *Mr. Cottons Letter Examined and Answered*, (1644) CW I p. 381.

Wolves) have made the more desirable prey.’¹³ It is clear that Williams considered himself as having come from the Puritan camp within English religious culture, but had moved beyond it. Although he agreed with the emphasis on Scriptural authority and particular views he identified as Puritan, as far as they went, he did not identify himself as a Puritan, having made what he thought of as the inevitable progression to separatism.

Williams did recognise, however, that in the eyes of those outside the Puritan camp, he was tarred with the same brush as his main opponents within it, and was conscious later in life of not having wanted to give fodder to those who might have used internal divisions against the larger group. As he wrote to John Cotton’s son (1639-1698/9?) in 1671, defending himself against the latter’s charges of the character assassination of his father:

...And I have there fore desired to Wave all personall Failings etc. and rather mencion their Beauties, to prevent the Insultings of the Papists or Prophane Protestants who use to scoff at the Divisions of those they use to brand for Puritants. The holy Eye of God hath seen this the Cause why I have not said nor writ what abundantly I could have done, but have rather chose to beare all Censures, Losses and Hardships etc.¹⁴

It is important that Williams did not consider himself a Puritan anymore (in contrast to his Massachusetts accusers) by the time of his banishment, but just as important that he indeed correctly identified himself as part of ‘Puritanism’ viewed from the

¹³ Ibid, pp. 381, 382.

¹⁴ ‘To John Cotton, Jr., 25 March 1671,’ *Correspondence* II, p. 627. Though Cotton and Williams’ initial friendship, which pre-dated their arrival in Massachusetts Bay, did not survive their ‘Bloody Tenent’ exchanges, Williams claimed always to be opposing the doctrine, not the man: ‘...it is my constant heaviness and souls grief as to differ from any fearing God; so much more ten thousand times from Mr Cotton, whom I have ever desired, and still desire highly to esteem, and dearly do respect, for so great a portion of mercy and grace vouchsafed unto him, and so many Truths of Christ Jesus maintained by him.’ *Bloody Tenent Yet More Bloody...* (1652), CW, IV, pp. 41-42. Williams went on to beg pardon if his had mistakenly crossed the line into personal attacks – there is no reason to doubt his sincerity, but it is true that he wrote only a handful of letters, all of them contentious, to Cotton or his son after his banishment, compared to the dozens he penned to Governor John Winthrop (also one

outside by its detractors. However, in this complex self-identification in relation to his contemporaries, Williams accepted the collective label 'Puritan' not just as an epithet, but because he did feel genuine affinity for a particular style of piety which Lake identifies. Although important differences (largely springing from a different understanding of covenant theology as part of the theology of grace) marked the synthesis of strands which made up Williams' theological world view from that Lake identifies as typically Puritan, Williams absolutely shared in the elevation of voluntary 'experimental' piety, the Word-centred approach marked by what Lake called a classically dialectical process' of discerning truth in any case, and the main reform impulses of more mainstream English Puritanism.¹⁵

If the historical situations of Puritans shaped their theological identity as much as the conjunction of specific doctrines, then Williams theological outlook, formulated initially as a response to local Essex circumstances of social and religious order, modified by the local exigencies of Massachusetts Bay, and evolving specific political actuality with the special mission identified for Providence Plantations, provides a very interesting historical case to observe. What is important in understanding Williams' theology, however, is understanding how it could be that much of his thought, even in maturity of years in Providence remained continuous with more conservative, even Anglican forces within English society. Lake's thoughts on the place of Puritanism in relation to a 'protestantisation' of culture are helpful here: he argues that his and Collinson's approach creates a picture of '...a relatively dynamic and decentralised vision of the social order in which true order was

of his accusers) and his son, who had settled in the Connecticut valley, and whom Williams hoped for a time to convince to settle in Providence Plantations.

¹⁵ Lake talked of this 'Puritan style' as the '...product of the application of the central theoretical insights of the English reformed tradition to the practical situation of the most zealous and self-consciously Protestant elements in England.' Lake, 'Defining Puritanism,' pp. 22, 23.

to be achieved through the autonomous response of many consciences to the dictates of the word and the demands of the common good.’¹⁶ For Lake, ‘Puritanism’ was fundamental to creating the conditions whereby the voluntary ‘autonomous response’ of different consciences would support traditional social order. Williams’ evolved notion of the function of free conscience and spiritual authority within the civil state achieved much the same purpose. It is with this awareness, that preserving social order and conforming individual desires to the common good was a necessary outcome of spiritual authority in present history, that Roger Williams’ particular synthesis of ideas around the themes Lake described must be approached.

Section One: Original sin and the Human Faculties

The central fact of Roger Williams’ theology, as related in his witness at the deathbed of Wequash, was the depravity of humans after the Fall, and God’s sacrifice of his Son to expiate the sin of a elect few. Historians have acknowledged this when developing treatments of Williams’ theological ideas, but largely neglected to offer a fully developed account of Williams’ view of the character and function of original sin in current history.¹⁷ Many of Roger Williams’ contemporaries anatomised their views of original sin and its effect on humanity and human faculties in specific

¹⁶ Ibid, p. 11.

¹⁷ Ian Harris characterised this neglect more generally, beginning a comparison of the views of Sir Robert Filmer (1588-1653) and John Locke (1632-1704) with the sentence ‘Historians are not sufficiently interested in sin.’ Harris argued that Locke’s attack on Filmer depended on a rejection of Filmer’s view of Adam as the representative of all humanity, and a re-interpretation of the extent of original sin’s corruption of human faculties. Thus Locke could challenge Filmer’s position that a legitimate monarch inherited absolute sovereign power by his line of descent from Adam, and move away from the Augustinian notion that all human faculties were absolutely corrupted by Adam’s Fall. Harris’ general point is that an early modern subject’s view of original sin might have profound

treatments of the subject, but Williams never published any systematic account of his views, and no such manuscript effort remains extant. Williams generally wrote to enter public controversy, where his view of a subject differed from that of his audience, so it is not illogical to assume that his view of original sin largely agreed with those that he saw expressed around him by Independents or other non-conformists, or Anglicans, for that matter. Williams' view can, however, be pieced together from important allusions in his published work and correspondence. Williams' view derived much from an Augustinian interpretation of Adam's Fall, with two particular implications: firstly, he assumed that all humanity shared an inheritance of Adam's sin, and secondly he believed that this though this inheritance corrupted all the faculties of a human being, including reason, will, senses, and conscience, the 'naturall' capacity of humans retained a shadow of their original goodness. His Massachusetts contemporaries shared the first conclusion, even as some of them might have developed it differently than Williams did, identifying both a spiritual inheritance of all people in Adam's sin, and a separate inheritance of political sovereignty, devolving onto the King.¹⁸ Williams accepted the dualist notion that the Fall had instituted a split between the temporal world in which human history played out, and the heavenly, extra-historical realm, a dualism he extended to describe a corresponding split between the natural and grace-endowed faculties of men and women. However, the social and political implications of Williams' views in these areas will not become clear until they are seen in relation to his particular typology and resultant view of history, which will be developed in the next section of this

implications for his social and political thought, often overlooked by historians. Ian Harris, 'The Politics of Christianity,' in *Locke's Philosophy*, ed. G.A.J. Rogers (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994).

¹⁸ Thomas Shepard I argued that Adam's sin should certainly be imputed to all his posterity, but added that '...o^e parents [from whom, seminally, Adam's sin came to us] are private psons, but Adam was a publike pson to stand & fall for all; as in parlament men...' This view ran in parallel to that of Filmer:

chapter. It can only be in the description of the interwoven themes of Roger Williams' theology that a useful understanding of his theological 'world view' can be advanced. Chapter three will develop the social and political implications of Roger Williams' particular synthesis of theological ideas, and the impact on his view of the state and other institutions of civil society, so these will be largely ignored for the moment.

Summarising a chapter concerning physical traits, characters, and bodies in his earliest published work, the *Key into the Language of America* (1643), Williams wrote:

Nature knows no difference between *Europe* and *Americans* in blood, birth, bodies, &c., God having of one blood made all mankind, *Acts* 17. and all by nature being children of wrath, *Ephes.*2.

More particularly:

*Boast not proud English, of the birth and blood,
Thy brother Indian is by birth as Good.
Of one blood God made Him, and Thee, & All,
As wise, as faire, as strong, as personall.*

*By nature wrath's his portioⁿ, thine no more
Till Grace his soule and thine in Christ restore
Make sure thy second birth, else thou shalt see,
Heaven ope to Indians wild, but shut to thee.*¹⁹

From this relatively early example, it is clear Williams accepted an Augustinian view of the universality of human participation in Adam's sin: Ian Harris has explained that this may have developed from an 'insecure grasp' of the Greek language, but noted

see note 17. Quote is from 'Essay on the Latter End of misery + Blessedness, (ca. 1635)' *Shepard Manuscripts*, Mss. Octavo Volumes 'S', Octavo Volume 1 (pages unnumbered).

¹⁹ *Key into the Language of America* (1643), CW I, p. 141. See chapter one, p.17 and following for discussion of the publishing and purpose of the *Key* in relation to the works which came after it. The sense intended by 'personall' in the end of the first stanza is 'individual,' or having distinctive identity.

that it typified the view of the reform tradition.²⁰ With the phrase ‘all by nature being children of [God’s] wrath’ Williams made clear that he considered all humanity to be cast out, with Adam and Eve, from God’s redeeming favour. Significantly, with the discussion of Adamic heritage passing through ‘blood,’ Williams does not derive from Adam’s status as a literal ancestor and human representative for spiritual purposes any inherited political status devolving to present powers, as would Sir Robert Filmer (1588-1653).²¹ The point of the comparison will become clear in chapter three, when the implications of Williams’ ‘world view’ are explored, and in Chapter four, in relation to Williams account of the legitimate state in present history.

At many points in his writing and correspondence Williams made reference to the equality of humans as bound by original sin, often appealing to disparate factions to seek reconciliation by appealing to the claim of ‘...the Common Bonds of Humanitie.’²² Although ‘bonds of humanity’ were fundamentally bonds of original sin, Williams appropriated the natural bond between Christians of all persuasions, and non-Christians as a potentially positive, unifying force in contemporary history. In

²⁰ Harris, ‘The Politics of Christianity,’ pp. 198, 199. Harris explained that Augustine read the phrase in Romans 5:12 Authorised Version, ‘for all that have sinned,’ (alternately, because all have sinned) as referring to Adam, and identifying humanity’s participation in his sin. As Augustine had it, the Greek phrase became *in quo omnes peccaverunt*, (in whom all have sinned). Harris identified the source of this observation as Augustine, *De Peccatorum Meritis et Remissione*, I.ii, in J. P. Migne, ed., *Patrologia Latina* (Paris: 1843-66), xl. 116.

²¹ Sir Robert Filmer (1588-1653), *Patriarcha*, in *Patriarcha and Other Political Works of Sir Robert Filmer*, ed. Peter Laslett, (Oxford: Blackwell, 1949). See for example, p. 57: ‘And indeed not only Adam, but the succeeding Patriarchs had, by right of fatherhood, royal authority over their children...And this subordination of children is the fountain of all regal authority, by the ordination of God himself....Which quite takes away that new and common distinction which refers only power universal or absolute to God, but power respective in regard of the special form of government to the choice of the people. Nor leaves it any place for such imaginary pactions between Kings and their people as many dream of.’ Williams understood the sovereignty of Adam to be inherited by individual householders, upon whose ‘consent’ legitimate government would be based. This did not, however, imply that Williams saw individuals as independent, autonomous political agents. The scope and function of a householder’s ‘consent’ was conditioned by his historical position. A full explanation and discussion is included in Chapter four, Section 2.3, ‘Representation and Consent.’

²² ‘To John Winthrop, 25 June 1645,’ *Correspondence*, Vol. I, p. 225. Williams appealed to Winthrop to lobby settlers in Connecticut to join with Massachusetts Bay in diffusing violent conflict between the

the jeremiad-style lament with which Williams closed the *Bloudy Tenent* (1644), for example, he called on all ‘Sons of *Men*’ to ‘...depart from the *dens* of *Lyons*, and mountaines of *Leopards*, and to put on the *bowels* (if not of *Christianitie*, yet) of *Humanitie* each to other!’²³ Significantly, Williams called on this common humanity across boundaries of religion, race, culture, and position in society. For Williams the universality of original sin implied an equality of all humans, even if that equality was based in equal corruption and culpability. All men and women retained a ‘natural’ identity as fallen creatures, English as well as native: as such he did not need the natives to serve as present archetypes of natural man, as they did for many of his contemporaries, but they did provide convenient rhetorical examples, certainly.

The reliance on Grace expressed in the second stanza of the section of the *Key* quoted above and in other texts shows the influence of John Calvin (1509-1564) on Williams’ view of original sin. Calvin argued, however, that original sin infected not just the soul, but all the faculties of post-lapsurian humans, particularly reason, rationality, the will, and conscience. Calvin sought to show the corrupt nature of these faculties to make the point that human rationality could never effect salvation, which could only happen through God’s arbitrary gift of Grace to the helpless, corrupt person.²⁴ Williams certainly agreed with Calvin that humans were helpless to effect their own salvation, but his view of human potential for reason, and his assumptions about human understanding and wisdom did not echo Calvin’s complete negation of human rationality, reflecting more reliance on an Augustinian, or humanist tradition.

Narragansett and Mohegans in southern New England, which he ultimately did. For details of the conflict, and English involvement, see ‘editorial note,’ pp. 220-224.

²³ *The Bloudy Tenent* (1644), CW III, p. 424.

²⁴ For related influences of Calvin and Augustine on New England notions of original sin, particularly that of Edward Taylor (1642?-1729), see William J. Schieck, ‘Like Children Catching Speckled Butterflies: Reason and Nature’ in Schieck, *The Will and the Word: The Poetry of Edward Taylor*, (Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 1974).

William Scheick has noted that though other New England Puritans [particularly Edward Taylor, (1642?-1729)] derived much from Calvin's thought, many questioned his rejection of any role for human reason in conversion, and his dismissal of human physical nature as having value in the temporal world.²⁵ Roger Williams was not, then atypical in his 'rehabilitation' of Calvin's understanding of human reason. However, not all New England divines dismissed Calvin's notion of complete infection of human faculties. In a manuscript written soon after he arrived in Boston and accepted the call of a church in Cambridge, the non-conformist Thomas Shepard (I, 1605-1649) argued that '...y^e subject of y^{ls} sin [original sin]; tis y^e WHOLE NATURE.' [author's emphasis]²⁶ That is, Shepard believed original sin touched all the human faculties, reason and conscience most specifically. The issue of the extent and function of original sin remained an open conflict in Massachusetts Bay and New England generally throughout the seventeenth century, and Roger Williams' views should be seen in the context of that shifting debate.

Discussing Edward Taylor's view of knowledge and human capacity for understanding, Scheick suggests that Taylor 'relied on the Augustinian view of the cognate relation between intellectual and sensible knowledge.' Scheick implies not so much that there were two separate reservoirs of truth, but that Taylor distinguished between sensible knowledge of the natural world developed through experience, and

²⁵ Scheick, pp. 6, 7. Scheick refers to Perry Miller's discussion of Puritan efforts to distinguish 'sensory knowledge from that of the interior principle,' in Perry Miller, *The New England Mind, the Seventeenth Century*, (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1939) pp. 193,194. Miller's comments immediately follow on from his discussion of the 'rehabilitation of natural powers' (p. 192) of humans, which was advanced through the rehabilitation of conscience's role in the process of discerning election.

²⁶ Thomas Shepard I, 'Essay on the Latter End of misery + Blessedness, (ca. 1635)' *Shepard Papers*, Mss. Octavo Volumes 'S', Octavo Volume 1 (pages unnumbered). Thomas Shepard I had been born in Towcester in 1605, had received a B.A. and M.A. from Emmanuel College, Cambridge by 1627, before being 'silenced' for non-conformity in 1635. He moved his family to Massachusetts Bay in 1635, serving as pastor to the church in Cambridge until his death in 1649. *Dictionary of American Biography*, Vol. 17, pp. 75,76.

intellectual knowledge developed through an ‘interior capacity ...[which] responds to and gives meaning to experiential learning.’²⁷ Williams shared this partial vindication of human capacity, but made a straightforward distinction between reason as part of natural and elect souls. All humans equally shared in ‘natural’ reason and understanding, in Williams’ view, but the elect, endowed by God’s arbitrary gift of Grace, possessed extra reason and capacity for wisdom beyond their natural faculties, while still retaining the natural. Roughly but not exactly corresponding to the dual state of human faculties, Williams also described two different sorts of knowledge, carnal or natural, and spiritual, or God’s truth. Discussing a similar distinction in Edward Taylor’s thought, William Scheick notes that the leading divines of Massachusetts Bay also found difficulty in exactly quantifying these distinctions between types of knowledge, in relation to natural and elect capacities of men and women. In a framework for quantifying knowledge similar to that of Williams, Taylor distinguished between ‘common knowledge,’ ‘...available to any rational creature, indeed even to Satan, who “as an Eaves dropper gets the knowledge of what is said in the house,”’ and ‘saving knowledge,’ by which the elect’s ‘naturall Conscience’ adds to the basic understanding of observable fact a sense of his or her utter corruption.²⁸

A prior understanding of these common categories of knowledge and of human faculties after the Fall (Adam would have had both kinds of knowledge and perfect reason before his sin) makes understanding Roger Williams’ ample references

²⁷ Schieck, p. 6, text and note. He identifies this view as Augustinian based on his reading of Augustine, *The Teacher*, 12.39, trans. Joseph Colleran, in *Ancient Christian Writers*, Vol. 9, (Westminster, MD: Newman Press, 1950) pp. 113-186, and *The Trinity*, 15.12.21, trans. Stephen McKenna, in *The Fathers of the Church*, Vol. 45, (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America, 1963). The view that ‘through sensible knowledge (*scientia*) man proceeds toward wisdom (*sapientia*)’ Scheick cites from *The Trinity*, 13.19.24.

²⁸ Scheick, p. 7, quoting Taylor.

to these topics much easier to understand. Williams referred in many places to the ‘natural man,’ often for purposes specifically of deriding his or her capacity for developing ‘saving knowledge’. Indeed he acknowledged that one of the grounds of his banishment from Massachusetts had been ‘...the calling of *Naturall* Men to the exercise of those holy *Ordinances of Prayers, Oathes*, etc.’²⁹ Williams had objected to the unregenerate participating in grace said at meals, and to the administration of oaths to all people in civil contexts, to assure truth-telling or binding contract. In *Christenings Make Not Christians* (1645) Williams assured his readers that he could easily have ‘turned’ many natives to a so-called Christian practice, playing on the esteem in which the natives held him: ‘Let none wonder at this, for *plausible persuasions* in the mouths of those whom naturall men esteem and love...hath done this in all the *Nations* (as men speake) of *Christendome*.’³⁰ Here Williams assumed that natural reason unendowed by Grace would not be sufficient to judge spiritual truth, and might be easily perverted. However flawed, Williams did believe that natural reason retained some power of judgement. He acknowledged later in the same work that ‘...*naturall* men, and *Hypocrites* [might] admire the *Nature*, and *works* of *God*,’ but only the elect could be possessed by the ‘...wonder as draweth up the heart unto God, with *longings* to be *united* unto him, to fear his *Name*, to partake of his divine *Nature*, and to be like unto *Him* in *holines*, and *true Righteousnes*.’³¹ Thus natural reason might admire, or apprehend God, but did not possess the faculty of wonderment, available only by Grace.

²⁹ ‘To Governor John Endicott, ca. August – September, 1651,’ *Correspondence* I, p. 339.

³⁰ *Christenings Make Not Christians* (1645), CW VII, p. 36. Williams referred to ‘Christendome’ only sarcastically, as what other people talk about as Christendome. This point will be developed in the next section of the chapter, regarding his view of history.

³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 72.

Williams identified the capacity of natural reason for the gaining of 'Morall Wisdom...' which:

...may teach persons the *vanity* and grosse *wickednesse* of the *Tongue*, but onely *Gods spirit* (and strength of it) doth teach *Gods children*, in true *feare* and *love* of *God*, not onley to *restraine* from *vaine* and *foolish*, but also to attaine to a *spirituall* and *heavenly Language*.³²

Williams explicitly identified natural reason as useful, with a disciplining and ordering role to play in human society in the spread of moral wisdom, but clearly distinguished this from the positive comprehension of God which Grace endowed reason might achieve. Williams' attached more emphasis to the useful function of 'natural' or corrupted human faculties than did his New England contemporaries, but many of them grudgingly shared it. Even Thomas Shepard I, who had a much less generous view of human faculties after the Fall than Williams, admitted that a (naturally) reasoned approach to life might be '...morally [and] outwardly good,' even if it would never lead to salvation, remaining 'sp[iritua]lly Evill.'³³ Williams expected the infusion of Grace in an elect soul to enhance natural reason and its temporal benefits, arguing that 'Gods children (as well as naturall men) may also act from Rules of Reason, and naturall wisdom, but withall they act from an higher ground...'³⁴ Implicit in this statement was Williams' firm belief that even election could not erase the stain of Adam's sin from a soul, meaning that the elect, while living, were just as subject to natural laws and restrictions as the unregenerate. Just as Williams expected a 'common bond' of humanity to restrain natural people of all

³² *Experiments of Spiritual Life and Health* (1645), CW VII, p. 91.

³³ 'Essay on the Latter end of misery and Blessedness,' *Shepard Papers*, Octavo Volume I.

³⁴ *Experiments in Spiritual Life and Health* (1645), CW VII, p. 99.

races and nations from the worst excesses of violence, he expected natural reason to restrain individuals from incivility.

Williams' clearest statement of his view of the capacities and limitations of natural reason came in his Treatise *The Examiner Defended*, (1652). Responding explicitly to charges that it was inconsistent to claim that humans could discover idolatrous practice in themselves by the 'light of nature' alone, unless he acknowledged some saving power in natural reason, Williams struggled to clarify and justify his opinion. He acknowledged that 'natural wisdom' might be two-fold, that is, divided into 'That which is Common to all mankind in general; to the people, the lowest, the vulgar,' and 'That which is more *Noble* and High, (in degrees) refined and elevated by finer *Animal Spirits*, by *Education*, by *Study*, by *Observation*, by *Experience*.'³⁵ (Indeed, Williams included Plato, Seneca, Aristotle '&c.' in this latter group.) But without reservation, Williams rejected utterly any suggestion that even the second kind of reason might lead to salvation. He asked:

...if it be not a downright Doctrine of *Free-will*, in depraved nature...to attribute so much *Light* to any of the *Eldest* and *Gallantest* sons of Nature, as to attain a *Spiritual* and saving knowledge of *God* ...or to any thing but *Splendidum Peccatum*, without the Revelation of the *Word* and *Spirit* of God, out of his absolute, free, and peculiar Grace and mercy in Jesus Christ.³⁶

Clearly, the notion of a free-will turning to God, that is, salvation by human endeavour rather than arbitrary Grace, was anathema to Williams, as much as he acknowledged the use of natural reason in the temporal world. Williams was not alone in seeing election's effect as making 'add ons' to human faculties, while not

³⁵ *The Examiner Defended* (1652), CW VII, p. 241.

³⁶ Ibid, p. 242. Williams used *Splendidum Peccatum* ironically, to indicate a bright, shining, or noble sin: for him a sin disguised was just as foul – see his metaphor of dressing a rotting corpse in different clothes to describe setting up successions of un-Christian church institutions, in *Christenings Make Not Christians* (1645), CW VII, p. 37.

erasing an individual's natural identity. In this Williams was much closer to the so-called orthodox Puritans of Massachusetts Bay than he was to the group who followed Anne Hutchinson (1591-1643) and her family to Providence Plantations in 1638, or to the Quakers. Williams believed strongly, that even after an individual had found assurance of election, he or she remained bound by the limitations imposed on human faculties by original sin, and therefore subject still to all temporal law and requirements of civility. In election Williams agreed with his Massachusetts opponents that Grace would draw the whole person to God, enhancing all faculties, but the confirmed regenerate person would still be under the burden of sin, needing to seek always for greater closeness to God's truth.

The effect of election on natural human capabilities can best be seen in Roger Williams' thought by examining his view of conscience. In a letter to Governor John Endicott of Massachusetts, later appended to *the Bloudy Tenent Yet More Bloudy* (1652), Roger Williams described conscience as more than just fashion or opinion of the moment:

I speake not of the streame of the multitude of all *Nations*, which have their *ebbings* and *flowings* in *Religion*, (as the longest *Sword*, and strongest *Arme* of *Flesh* carries it) [...] But I speake of *C'onscience*, a *perswasion* fixed in the minde and heart of a man, which inforceth him to judge (as *Paul* said of himself a *persecutour*) and to doe so and so, with respect to *God*, his worship, etc.³⁷

Though perhaps with differences of wording or emphasis, most of Williams' English contemporaries would have agreed with him in this basic definition of conscience and its authority.³⁸ Indeed, although Williams' notion of conscience must be considered

³⁷ 'To Governor John Endicott, ca. August-September 1651,' *Correspondence* I, p. 340.

³⁸ See 'Coercion of Conscience' in Edmund Morgan, *Roger Williams: the Church and State*, (Harcourt, Brace and World: 1967) pp. 130-135, for a further discussion of Williams' view of conscience in relation to William Perkins and William Ames.

as part of the role that conscience played in European reform thought generally, Williams described something uniquely English in the authority he ascribed to conscience: As he reminded Governor Endicott, ‘...remember that that thing which we call *Conscience* is of such a Nature (especially in *English-men*) as once a *Pope* of *Rome* at the suffering of an *English-man* in *Rome*, himselfe observed that although it be groundles, false, and deluded, yet it is not by any *Arguments* or *Torments* easily removed.’³⁹ Williams would have agreed with Calvin’s earlier definition of conscience as ‘...a kind of medium between God and man,’ or as Edmund S. Morgan elaborated, ‘knowledge (*scientia*) accompanied by a sense of divine justice.’⁴⁰ As such, Williams identified conscience as the cognitive bridge between common and saving knowledge in the Augustinian framework. However, Williams identified conscience not just as an extension of human reason or intellectual faculties, but also as touching the will and emotions. Characterising the effect of forced conformity to public worship, Williams spoke of the imprisonment ‘...not onely of the sensible and *outward* man, but of the most noble and *inner part*, the *minde*, the *spirit*, and *Conscience*.’⁴¹ Williams had begun to elevated the role of conscience in relation to reason, declaring that among soul, mind, and conscience, conscience was ‘...indeede the *man*.’⁴² Williams was at times unclear about the exact boundaries between natural reason and conscience, often using ‘natural wisdom’ (that knowledge obtainable by human reason) as synonymous with conscience. As such, understandings of

³⁹ ‘To Governor John Endicott, ca. August-September 1651,’ *Correspondence* I, p. 340. Williams gave no indication of which Pope or Protestant martyr he alluded to. To refer back to the earlier discussion of the historiographic debate about defining English Puritanism, this aside by Williams does indicate that he saw something uniquely English in the power of conscience as he experienced it: this would add support to Lake’s definition of English Puritanism, mitigating the Georges’ claim that English Puritanism had no unique identity in relation to European reformed thought generally.

⁴⁰ John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, John Allen, trans., 2 volumes, (Philadelphia: 1932) Vol. II, p. 75. Morgan, p.130.

⁴¹ *The Bloody Tenent Yet More Bloody* (1652), CW IV, p. 439.

conscience like that of Williams' allow a more subjective, dynamic account, even if Williams himself still identified correct conscience with God's objective truth.

Williams saw conscience as the vessel that might carry hints of God's potential Grace in the case of election, and as such it was central to the mechanics of his individual theology. Although his work post-1660 was not as clear in this regard as earlier work, Williams distinguished between natural, and spiritual, or saving conscience. As a natural faculty, Williams assumed the presence of conscience was universal in all people, though its 'perswasion' would obviously differ greatly: 'This *Conscience* is found in all mankind, more or lesse, in *Jewes, Turkes, Papists, Protestants, Pagans*, etc.'⁴³ Glenn Lafantasia and the recent editors of Williams' correspondence described his view of universal conscience as an 'inner voice in the souls of all religious men,' but their definition obscures Roger Williams' notion of conscience as one of the related human faculties effected by original sin. Williams' distinction between natural and spiritual conscience mimicked the dualism he expected between natural reason (leading to 'common knowledge') and in cases of election, spiritual reason (leading to saving knowledge). In Williams' framework, '...naturall Conscience and Reason of all men...' functioned much as common sense in the temporal world.⁴⁴ But while natural conscience was, as natural reason, very important for ordered living, Williams in no way believed that it could play the role that spiritual conscience, given only to the elect would, in the conversion process.

⁴² Ibid, p. 440.

⁴³ 'To Governor John Endicott, ca. August-September 1651,' *Correspondence I*, p. 340.

⁴⁴ *The Bloody Tenent Yet More Bloody* (1652), CW IV, p. 443. Williams here appealed to natural conscience and reason to distinguish between crimes which posed an immediate civil danger (murder, treason, adultery) and crimes which even in intolerant states, did not pose such a tangibly immediate danger (blasphemy, heresy, etc.). Williams' main argument for toleration was not based in humanist principles, but here his approach showed at least the seeds of a humanist argument, complementing his central point about no present state retaining the covenantal position of Israel, with its national church.

Williams wrote of natural conscience, or 'The Spirit of a man,' [that is, in his words, the 'natural wisdom (that Candle or Light remaining in man)' after the Fall]:

...It is an *Excuser* and *Accuser*; a *Secretary*, a *Sergeant*, and *Adversary*, a *Judge*, and *Executioner*, within the bosome of all mankind: But yet I ask, how far this spirit of Man, this *Candle* of *Jehovah* hath searched, and doth, or possibly may search, into all the inward parts of the *Belly*, or Heart of man, as touching this great mystery of true or false *Deities*, and their respective *Worships*?⁴⁵

Thus Williams distinguished his view from the rigid Calvinist approach of contemporaries like Thomas Shepard I. who argued that the 'candle of Jehovah' in present human faculties had been entirely extinguished. But Williams would not go as far as to admit a role for it in the conversion process. Natural conscience, then, while not evidencing Grace, would certainly be informed by the witness of God's creation, that is, by observation, experience, and shrewd judgement. Shepard, for his part, made sharper distinctions between reason and conscience, reminding his parishioners that the '...life of reason is not sp[iritua]ll life...' and rejecting any potential for divine instruction of natural conscience. He pointed out that for the unregenerate, '...defile[d] consc: is for a mans self as a pure consc:,' meaning that without Grace, natural conscience would not have the ability to act in any of the restrictive capacities identified by Williams above, as the corrupt person's conscience would have no vestige of Grace against which to judge its owner's actions.⁴⁶ Indeed, Williams' account of dual conscience would have trouble responding effectively to this problem. Shepard continued, in answer to the rhetorical objection (paraphrased) 'but I abhor all my sin, and am a good church-goer,' with the conviction that 'all y^{is} may be but y^e life of naturall consc: for y^r is like y^l sence reason & naturall consc: in

⁴⁵ *The Bloody Tenent Yet More Bloody* (1652), CW IV, p. 241.

man; now naturall consc: y^e acts of it y^o morally & outwardly good yet sp[iritua]lly
Evill...for y^e consc: beinge naturally presumptious as well as desprate, it conveys
some hope.⁴⁷ Shepard here dismissed what Williams would have seen as evidence of
a vestige of divine knowledge in natural conscience as simply desperate self-delusion.
The question of whether original sin corrupted natural conscience absolutely, to which
Shepard answered 'yes,' and Williams answered only 'almost,' would prove crucial to
the different policies which Williams and Massachusetts Bay developed toward
individual conscience.

Williams was not the first to emphasise the authority of conscience in an
individual soul's progress through doubt, despair, conversion, and conviction of
election. The English ministers and writers William Perkins and William Ames, both
of whom influenced the New England divines, wrote extensively on the nature and
functioning of conscience, and on correct regard for it.⁴⁸ For them both, in varying
degrees, the diversity of the voice of conscience in the world was a function of
Original Sin: before Adam and Eve's Fall, natural and spiritual conscience would
have been unified, and only held the voice of God. As a result of human seeking
knowledge of Good and Evil, most unregenerate humans would only ever have access
to imperfect natural conscience, open to erring judgements as a function of human
reason and (corrupt) free will. For Ames and Perkins, as for Williams, though,
conscience's authority was not to be rejected casually, even in error. As Perkins
wrote, 'Whatsoever man doth, whereof he is not certainly perswaded in judgement

⁴⁶ Thomas Shepard I, 'Essay on the Latter End of misery and Blessedness (ca. 1635)' *Shepard Papers*,
Octavo Vol. I.

⁴⁷ Ibid.

⁴⁸ See Williams Perkins, 'The Whole Treatise of the Cases of Conscience,' in *Workes*, II, 1-152; and
William Ames, 'Conscience, with the Power and Cases Thereof, Divided into five Bookes,' in *Workes*,
(London, 1643).

and conscience out of God's word, that the thing may be done, *it is sinne*.'⁴⁹ Perkins here requires that actions be checked against conscience prior to commission. This implies that conscience functions not just as a 'prick' after involvement in incorrect behaviour, as when persons complain of 'pangs of tender conscience,' at having to conform to worship they reject for example, but that conscience functions first as a static law or reference point.

While less systematic, Williams' anatomised list of the different roles he expected conscience to play echoed this distinction, shared by many of his contemporaries. This division of the functions of conscience, being both a law (*synteresis*) and a witness to action (*syneidesis*), was most explicitly articulated in Robert Sanderson's *De Obligatione Conscientiae*, delivered in 1647, but not published until 1660.⁵⁰ Sanderson expected both faculties of conscience to guide individual action, in particular cases. Thomas Shepard II (1635-1677/78), pastor of the church at Charlestowne in Mass Bay from 1659, and from 1664 censor of works printed in the colony, showed a similar working understanding of the roles conscience might play. In a sermon of October 30, 1668, on the text of Matthew 7:14, Shepard admonished his congregation to be wary of the beginnings of backsliding: even if they had not committed ungodly actions yet, Shepard preached that despite '...such kind convictions, & checks of conscience, & admonitions, & feares....do many [fail] before they wholly cast off, & turn quite away from this straight gate...'⁵¹ Here Shepard described the function of conscience as *synteresis* (law) acting before sin.

⁴⁹ Perkins, *Workes*, II, p. 12. Morgan, p. 130.

⁵⁰ Robert Sanderson, *De Obligatione Conscientiae*, with English notes including an abridged translation, William Whewell, D.D. (trans.) Lecture One, Section XII, pp. 12-13. Sanderson here explains what are in his view four senses of conscience; for the purposes of this study, the first two are most relevant.

⁵¹ *Shepard Papers*, Mss. S, Boxes 'S', 1 box, folder 6.

implicitly expected his congregation to treat conscience both as an extant law, and as a witness of guilt after sin had occurred.

Williams agreed with Perkins' and Ames' view of conscience's authority, but recognised implicitly that the dictates of natural conscience would vary, as even with a retained glimmer of its original perfection, forces other than God's voice would also instruct natural conscience. As Williams argued, dismissing the idea of a national church, no church could '...possibly be framed without a racking and tormenting of Soules, as well as of the Bodies of persons, for it seems not possible to fit every conscience: sooner shall one suit of Apparell fit every Body, one Law president every case, or one Size or Last every Foot?'.⁵² Although Williams did not explicitly distinguish between natural and spiritual conscience in this passage, it is clear he meant to indicate the natural faculty, from the comparison to the variation of physical body parts. Correspondence shows that Williams had read Ames' *Medulla SS. [Sacrae] Theologiae* (Amsterdam: 1623, London: 1630), which he passed on to John Winthrop Jr. (settled in Connecticut) in June of 1645.⁵³ It is certainly likely that Williams read Ames' other works as well, given the pattern of learned men passing books and pamphlets newly arrived from England within their circle. Indeed Ames was very popular and influential with the New England ministers: John Cotton's justification of coercing a person to abide by orthodox precepts against his or her own conscience was only a small evolution of Ames' view. Cotton's policy towards dissenting conscience, developed in the same way as Ames', was that if an individual remained wrongly convinced in his or her own conscience, and attempts to sway this conviction had failed, (as, indeed, had Cotton's attempts with Williams himself) that

⁵² *Queries of Highest Consideration* (1644), CW, Vol. II, pp. 265, 266.

⁵³ 'To John Winthrop, Jr., 22 June 1645,' *Correspondence*, Vol. I, p. 219. This work was published in English translation, as *The Marrow of Sacred Divinity*, (London: 1638?).

person should be judged to be sinning against his or her conscience, not out of regard for conscience.⁵⁴ Although both Perkins and Ames were more systematic in the presentation of their views on conscience than Williams ever was, Williams' differences with them, as with John Cotton and Thomas Shepard I, originated in his expectation that natural conscience retained that vestige or 'candle,' of God's truth. Ames certainly agreed with Shepard's view that natural conscience was corrupted absolutely, arguing that it was '...most certaine, that a man is tied to lay downe such an erroneous Conscience, for it is a part of that old man, whom we are commanded to put off. Ephes. 4.22.'⁵⁵ All of these men, Williams included, acknowledged that it was impossible for one human to judge another's conscience as natural or spiritual, and that ultimately, a person's conscience was known only to God, and perhaps to him or herself.

Williams' differences with these contemporaries resulted in two further subtle, but important variations of his view of conscience. Firstly, while he accepted some distinction between conscience and human will and reason, the distinction between the different human faculties was blurred for him, as has been alluded to already, in the discussion of Williams' emphasis of conscience as 'the whole man.' Specifically, however, while believing conscience to be a rational and intellectual faculty, Williams believed conscience would also instruct emotion.⁵⁶ In this Williams' view of the quality of spiritual and natural conscience's expression in the human heart seems closer to Calvin's idea of spiritual, or saving conscience: if Calvin saw conscience as

⁵⁴ See *Mr. Cotton's Letter Examined and Answered* (1644), CW I. The social and political implications of the view of original sin adhered to by Cotton, Shepard I, and Ames, in contrast to the implications of Williams' own, will be developed fully in the next chapter.

⁵⁵ Williams Ames, *Conscience*, Book I, pp. 9-10. See Morgan, p. 132.

⁵⁶ This idea is alluded to, but not examined, by Lafantasia in *Correspondence*, Vol. I, p. 349, note 21. See Mauro Calamandrei, 'The Theology and Political Thought of Roger Williams,' Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago: 1953, pp. 305-311.

scientia (knowledge experienced by the senses) endowed by a sense of divine justice, as Morgan put it, then Williams' emphasised that the sense of divine justice might enter the human heart as heated feeling, not to be put aside by rational argument. Williams' expectation that feeling took an authoritative place in the function of conscience explains his 1651 dismissal of Governor Endicott's defence that he would have been warmer in his address to Williams' had he been '*free in his spirit*.'⁵⁷ As things stood between Williams and the divines of Massachusetts Bay, Endicott claimed his conscience forbade such warmth. Williams was clear in his response that the voice of emotion Endicott dismissed was the voice of conscience itself, and that Endicott evidenced guilt in ignoring it.⁵⁸

This exchange with Governor Endicott points to the second subtle difference between Williams' account of conscience and that of his contemporaries: Endicott, like Cotton, Shepard I, Shepard II, Perkins, and Ames, believed that authority could only be attributed to individual conscience as it followed Truth, functionally speaking, the accepted orthodoxy of the day. Although they certainly saw conscience as an individual capacity, in practical terms they recognised conscience as a corporate faculty, a socially constructed organ against which an individual was obligated to measure the leanings of his or her own conscience against. As Thomas Shepard II preached on July (the fifth month) 25, 1669, '...so it should be y^e sollicitous care, & resolution, & indeavour of every faithfull soul not to rest in private communion wth x^t [Christ]. But to enjoy him in y^e settlement & continuance of his publick worship in ch[urch]...not only in private but publick duties also.'⁵⁹ Aside from undergirding the

⁵⁷ 'To Governor John Endicott, ca. August-September 1651,' *Correspondence* I, pp. 337. Williams quoted a previous letter from Endicott, to which he was responding, extensively in his own text.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.* p. 338.

⁵⁹ Thomas Shepard II, sermon on 'Cant. 3:4, 25.5.69 (25 July, 1669),' *Shepard Manuscripts*, Mss. 'S', Boxes 'S', 1 box, folder 7 (1669).

requirement of church attendance. Shepard was keen that his congregation continue their practices of private piety, but not withdraw into them, attaching more authority to private 'conscionable' use of Scripture and doctrine than to the church way.⁶⁰ Williams, on the other hand, accepted no corporate notion of conscience whatsoever, and located the ultimate authority of conscience in the individual. This was predictable, given that by implication, Williams' certainty that the apostolic succession had vanished from human history meant that he rejected the legitimacy of gathering churches on the congregational model: as such, he would not have accepted the authority any visible church institution attached to its corporate notion of true conscience. But more significantly, Williams' belief that original sin left some 'candle' of God's truth in natural conscience assured him that the authority of individual conscience could be trusted, as long as it was used wisely, and judged against the other main source of authority in his system, Scripture. None of this is to say that Williams thought individual conscience was impervious to persuasion; quite the contrary was true, as he proved in the end of his letter to Governor Endicott, urging him to examine his conscience and consider what a force against the sin of intolerance he might become if it were changed. Except for the question of relative corruption, Williams in large part agreed with the account of conscience's function articulated by his 'Puritan' contemporaries, even as he differed in these two areas, emphasising emotion as a quality of conscience and rejecting notions of corporate conscience.

Williams assumed that conscience was not the only authority determining individual behaviour and belief. He clearly expected that conscience might function independently from self-interest, allowing for appeals to conscience to show people

⁶⁰ Ibid, sermon of April, 1669 (date obscured: first sermon in folder).

errors in their ways, but by the same token he acknowledged a degree of personal uniqueness to conscience. Considering selfish or carnall interest as a motive for action and polluter of true conscience, Williams' view fell much closer to that of his Massachusetts opponents, believing it to be entirely corrupted by original sin. Such an identification on Williams' part is logical, given his rejection of any possibility for humans to effect their own salvation. Self-interest was not identified as part of the authority of conscience, but as a false teacher of conscience, to which both the elect and non-elect might fall prey:

...for light of Nature leadeth men to heare that onely which Nature conceiveth to be good for it, and therefore not to heare a Messenger, Minister or Preacher, whom *conscience* perswades is a false *messenger*...as Millions of men and women in their severall respective *religions* and *consciences* are so perswaded, conceiving their owne to be true.⁶¹

Williams made two assumptions which answer his paradoxical expectations of natural conscience. Firstly, he expected that the same God and the same Truth instructs all people, saved and unsaved. In a world before the self-interest inherent in natural law, literally before the Fall, people would have agreed on the object of any case of conscience. Secondly, in response to the fact that worldly life and decisions are subject to self-interest and many remain in ignorance of what the right choices are, Williams expected a tangible humility and self-denial to precede all considerations of conscience: while individual conscience might be sacrosanct in his system, he did not

⁶¹ CW III, *The Bloudy Tenent* (1644), p.287. In this passage Roger Williams explains the relationship between conscience and natural law: he argues that if an individual's conscience is wrongly convinced, thereby preventing the individual from seeing truth and responding with a change of behaviour, 'the light of Nature,' or natural law will do no good in opening the conscience, because natural law will always instruct the individual in the path of his/her material self-interest. The two operate as separate but complementary systems of authority in the internal life of every individual. Arbitrarily conferred Grace may or may not be present in each individual soul, but is independent and irrelevant to the presence of natural law as an authority in individual life.

expect it was the only authority functioning in human life.⁶² In this expectation, he remained quite close to William Ames' instruction that '...a Conscience hath never so sure a ground, as that there needeth not further examination and inquiry into things.'⁶³ Williams also showed that he considered saving conscience to be an entirely spiritual versus worldly phenomenon in negative terms, by describing its independence from civil authority: '...he [God] hath also appointed a spiritual Government and Governours in matters pertaining to his worship and the consciences of men...'⁶⁴ The purpose of conscience is to liberate the redeemed soul from the trap of material comforts and political conveniences of the physical domain, acting as the mechanism for existing in the world, but not being wholly owned by it. Williams saw it as a function of the individual soul's potential selection for Grace. Without the literally visible presence of angry angels at work in the world, moreover, conscience allied with Scripture and the example of the early Christian church provided the only way of criticising sinful human institutions.

Williams expected natural conscience, acting in the various roles he anatomised in *the Bloody Tenent Yet More Bloody* (1652), (that is, accuser, excuser, secretary, sergeant, etc.) to instruct all people in areas of worldly life. Although conscience was, for Williams as for others, most importantly the vessel for God's voice, he believed strongly that conscience spoke to issues of day to day motives: by countermanding worldly interest, conscience should encourage socially acceptable, orderly, behaviour in household management, labour, trade, and all areas of civil

⁶² As such, Williams intended that other, external authorities vested in a variety of institutions would help the function of 'autonomous conscience' in the maintenance of civil and social order. In this Williams resembled political expectations of much more conservative, Anglican thinkers, like Sir Robert Filmer's, in contrast to the description of 'Puritan' visions for social order alluded to by Lake. This point will be developed fully in Chapter three.

⁶³ Ames, *Conscience*, Book I, p. 9.

⁶⁴ *Mr. Cottons Letter Lately Printed, Examined and Answered*, CW I, p. 335.

life.⁶⁵ Although vital to God's instruction of the individual soul, created perfect by God as all things were, and impaired from its original function by the stain of original sin, conscience itself could carry both spiritual and civil measures. This view was exemplified by the language he used to describe a violent disagreement with Captain Atherton, who acting on behalf of the Commissioners of the United Colonies, had attacked Narragansett homes in an effort to extort fines out of their Sachem. Williams felt the Captain had betrayed any trust the natives might have had in him, or Williams, and wrote: 'I presume he feares God in the maine but feare he can never satisfie me nor his owne Conscience, wch I hope the Lord will shew him and shew the Countrey what dangerous Counsell[s] [policies] the Commissioners produce.'⁶⁶ Here Williams referred to natural conscience, but clearly expected it to retain some vestige of ability to discern divine motives in present history, and to act as a restraint. He expected an adherence to natural conscience to lead to success in worldly life, much as adherence to spiritual conscience would lead to conviction of election, for the saved. As such, Williams treated natural conscience like a tool that the individual owned himself and could use in all aspects of daily life to further his cause: though Williams was never explicit in expressing conscience in terms of property, as others would do, his thought certainly hedged in this direction. For example, in the *Examiner Defended* (1652), Williams would make an analogy between proper human '...freedom of their consciences,' and 'freedom of their purses,' both of which, Williams argued, were '...their due.'⁶⁷ Indeed Williams supported his Providence neighbour Gregory Dexter's refusal to pay a rate levied to reimburse John Clarke for his service as the

⁶⁵ The theoretical point will be developed in Chapter three; practical examples and consideration of Williams' own political advocacy around this conforming power will be developed in Chapter five. Williams expected the civil state to collaborate with heads of households and other informal civil agents, to buttress the activity of individual natural conscience in securing public order.

⁶⁶ 'To John Winthrop, Jr., 9 October 1650,' *Correspondence*, I, p. 323.

town's agent in London, when Dexter objected to William Harris' appointment as tax collector. Harris had, in Williams' words, '...strained for the Rate... with such imperious insulting over his [Dexter's] Conscience wch all Conscientious Men will abhor to hear of.' Dexter objected to Harris' appointment particularly because he felt Harris had acted out of self-interest rather than being guided by conscience in moving to extend the town boundaries to his own advantage, and refused to pay tax to an 'unconscionable' person. Williams agreed with Dexter's condemnation of Harris' actions in the land dispute, but thought Dexter made a 'Foole of his Conscience' by refusing to pay the rate, a civil duty Williams found to be itself dictated by conscience. Nevertheless, Williams supported Dexter's 'conscientious' refusal to pay, saying he must '...commend that man whether Jew or Turke, or Papist, or who ever that steeres no otherwise then his Conscience dares, till his Conscience tells him that God gives him a greater Latitude.'⁶⁸

This exchange exemplified the practical ramifications of Williams view that natural conscience retained a remnant of God's truth. In this case, Williams was sure that Dexter's conscience was not instructed by God, but he implicitly rejected corrupt human reason as a means of judging it, and certainly rejected the potential of the civil state forcing Dexter's compliance. However, Williams did seem to obscure the distinction between natural conscience and spiritual, or saving conscience, here, a blurring of boundaries implicit in his view that natural conscience might have escaped absolute corruption. If natural conscience did retain a vestige of its original creation, before the Fall, but human reason did not, in practical terms Williams would not always be able to distinguish between instruction offered by conscience as distinct from that of saving conscience. But Williams never did jettison an idea of separated

⁶⁷ *The Examiner Defended* (1652), CW VII, p. 207.

natural and saving conscience: the point remained unresolved, a loose end in Williams' system. It is easy to see why his Massachusetts opponents would have found it much more practical to condemn natural conscience as entirely polluted by original sin, avoiding the problem entirely.

Williams presumed natural conscience was present in all people, but not just as a vessel for the voice of God, though a vestige of God's truth might remain. He had no doubt that selfish interest, other voices of nature, or demonic influence might easily trick an individual into ignoring the voice of God in natural (or spiritual, for that matter) conscience, as in Dexter's case above.⁶⁹ Conscience was a tool, which like any other, could be used badly. Even Williams' Massachusetts contemporaries agreed that it was exceedingly difficult for humans using natural reason to judge whether the particular conscience of an individual person indicated the injection of Grace which would assure election. The problem of how to judge whether natural conscience applied to a particular case was being used for ill or good, and whether it was naturally or grace-endowed was that much more thorny for Williams to work out. Either way, he did expect the best use of natural conscience to lead people toward social conformity and civil order, aided by the important conforming function of other social institutions.⁷⁰ It is easy to see how a hypersensitivity to conscience's dictates, and constant seeking to test and probe its 'perswasions' against Scripture would become essential for Roger Williams. Conscience was a universal human faculty.

⁶⁸ 'To John Whipple, Jr., 8 July 1669,' *Correspondence* II, p. 586.

⁶⁹ *Correspondence* I, p. 349, note 22. In any event, Williams would reject a distinction between 'religious,' and 'irreligious' persons: he had no liberal sensibility to leave the Truth of God's existence to a matter of individual opinion. An individual might hear and respect the Christian message or not, but individual unbelief or impiety would not change his or her status as God's 'creature.' Here again Lafantasia would do better to explain Roger Williams's notion of conscience in relation to original sin and the related faculties of reason.

⁷⁰ See for example 'To the Town of Providence, ca. January 1654/55,' *Correspondence* II, pp. 423-425, and preceding editorial note. In this expectation Williams view of the function of spiritual authority in

functioning both as a law to precede action and a witness to admonish, various in its convictions, but authoritative on an individual level. Most importantly for him, as for his Puritan compatriots, conscience was the vessel through which a man or woman might receive the hint of arbitrary Grace indicating election: but conscience controlled the whole life of the person, spiritual and civil.

Section Two: Roger Williams' Bible

The central text of Williams' theology was the Bible, which he understood both as an historical document and as parable. For Williams Scripture both explained the place of current events in history, and acted as a guide, by specific direction and by inference, for individual and corporate action. Although he accepted and used with authority a variety of texts including medieval Christian and ancient writers, an individual study of Scripture was the beginning of all forms of piety and worship in Williams' 'Puritan' system. This section will briefly examine the history and politics of Biblical translation itself, in relation to Williams and his New England contemporaries, before examining Williams' view of Jesus Christ, and how this influenced the particular way in which he approached the Bible. Finally, the implications of Williams' Biblicism will be examined in relation to the question of individual and national covenant, and in relation to Williams' notion of human history itself. Building on the focus of the previous section (in broad terms) on human capacities, this part of the chapter will examine God's authority in Scripture as

present history parallels the 'Puritan' expectation described by Lake. See this chapter, note 15. The point will be developed in practice, in Chapter five.

Williams felt people should encounter it, before the final section examines the results of human encounters with God in contemporary history: church and church structure.

Roger Williams emphasis of Scriptural authority was very much part of the Reformation doctrine of *sola scriptura*, which David Hall defines as the belief that ‘...truth lives in the Word of God and not in men’s “inventions” or what Catholics proclaimed as the “reason of forefathers.”’⁷¹ Hall points to the articles of faith, written in 1549 and confirmed in 1560 for evidence of the degree to which this doctrine had taken hold in the England which shaped Roger Williams’ religious education:

Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation: so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required in any man, that it should be believed as an article of the Faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation.⁷²

Obviously, different Biblical interpretations would still give rise to much controversy, but the articles of faith confirmed the presupposition that the Bible, rather than present church authorities or other historical Christian writers, formed the centre of spiritual authority in present history. Implicit in this approach was the reality that the Bible should be available in the common language for use by people in all walks of life: people were meant to read their own Bibles, but to rely on ministerial guidance for interpretations. Roger Williams absorbed completely the view that the Bible was not to be the exclusive preserve of the ordained, or the educated, but he derived from the text itself the view that each individual was responsible for his or her own understanding of Scripture. For Williams, moreover, this meant that individuals had a clear duty to treat the Bible authoritatively: he held no truck with the Quakers, whom

⁷¹ David Hall, *Worlds of Wonder, Days of Judgment: Popular Religious Belief in Early New England*, (NY: Alfred A. Knopf, 1989) pp. 22, 23.

he called ‘*unmanly* Childish and *effeminate*’ for deriding their opponents ‘...and yet give me not one Reason or one Scripture against any one of them?’ In Williams view, spiritual argument which did not proceed from the Bible was ‘irrationall and brutish,’ nothing less than a negation of the shadow of the God-image in human faculties.⁷³

Indeed, Williams was shocked at what felt to him like the complete jettison of Biblical authority by the Quakers. Condemning George Fox’s approach, that Scripture might be ‘Gods words, though not his [uniquely authoritative] *Word*,’ Williams wrote:

...is it not prodigious and monstrous Contempt that these holy Words, this holy Book and Writing of God should be so undervalued and slighted, yea vilified, and nullified, if compar’d with their *new found Light* within them, which was (say they) before the *Scriptures*, and gave forth the *Scriptures*, ...and therefore is not to be judged or tried by the *Scriptures*, but they by it.⁷⁴

As they elevated other authorities above Scripture itself, Williams compared the Quakers to the Pope in their his perception of their parallel abuse of the Bible, referring to ‘...the *Pope* and the *Quakers Infallible Spirit* and its immediate *Inspirations*.’⁷⁵ In the same terms, Williams would condemn familists and libertines of all kinds, equating reference to individual conscience un-tried by Scripture with the attachment of authority to church hierarchies and histories of all kinds. In this elevation of Scriptural authority Williams shared much with his Massachusetts opponents, and such an approach remained logically consistent with his insistence on approaching human judgement from a perspective of humility. Williams’ advocacy

⁷² Hall, p. 23.

⁷³ *George Fox Digg’d Out of his Burrowes* (1676), CW V, p. 11.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 49.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 50.

remained Bible-centred, as his own ideas about spiritual authority in present history progressed.

Harry Stout argues in his essay 'Word and Order in Colonial New England' that '...Puritanism was actually the product of two Bible translations, each of which dominated at different stages in the movement's history, and each of which served different needs and purposes.'⁷⁶ Although Stout overplayed the contrast between the two traditions he traced in colonial New England, (allowing notions of a monolithic 'New England Way' to make it seem as if the boundaries between Biblical factions were much more pronounced than they were) his analysis is useful to understanding Roger Williams' approach to the Bible in relation to its role for his Massachusetts contemporaries, especially. The first of translation Stout referred to was the 'Geneva Bible' completed in 1560, an English translation written by a small group of Protestant exiles who had fled to Geneva during the reign of Mary Tudor, (1553-1558). This translation was geared in every way to the less erudite reader: text was organised into chapters and verses for ease of reference, Latin phrases were removed or translated so as not to distract the less educated reader from the central message of the text, and extensive marginal notes incorporating suggested interpretations swelled the text by more than 300,000 words.⁷⁷

Significantly, the interpretative marginalia of the Geneva Bible ignored issues about translation or theological minutiae relevant to learned discourse on the text, in favour of an overwhelmingly Christological focus. Stout identified this focus, especially in regard to the interpretation of the Old Testament, as guided by Martin Luther's tenet that where a text did not explicitly refer to Christ, interpretative notes

⁷⁶ Harry S. Stout, 'Word and Order in Colonial New England,' in Nathan O. Hatch and Mark A. Noll, eds., *The Bible in America, Essays in Cultural History*, (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982) p. 20.

should go beyond the literal meaning of the text and assign allegorical antecedents from the earlier text to Christ's person.⁷⁸ If the emphasis of the marginalia was largely on Old Testament occurrences as historical precursors to Christ, then the intent was to emphasize for the aspiring Christian his own wretchedness, and the 'promise' of redemption in Christ's sacrifice, rather than in any action of the individual. As such, the Geneva Bible prepared individuals to see the whole body of Scripture in 'typological' terms, that is, in an interpretative framework whereby every person, event, ordinance, or story was a 'type,' 'sign,' or 'figure' of a pre-existent, extra-historical Christ. Sacvan Bercovitch has suggested that two types of typological approach were most influential in early New England: *developmental typology*, in which Old Testament figures were types not only of Christ's person and life events, but also of events at the end of history in the book of Revelations, and *correlative typology*, which was not as focussed on Christ's person, but treated particular Old Testament heroes as types of present-day occurrences, based on their coming back to life ('*redivivus*') in Christ.⁷⁹ The style of typology evident in the Geneva Bible was

⁷⁷ Stout, p. 21.

⁷⁸ 'In Luther's words, "Grammar is necessary for declension, conjugation and construction of sentences, but in speech the [Christocentric] meaning and subject matter must be considered[,] not the grammar, for the grammar shall not rule over the meaning."' Stout, p. 22. Here Stout does not use the word *typology* to describe the approach of the Geneva marginalia, nor does he imply that this was Luther was the sole source of typological approaches to the Old Testament. Typological approaches permeate the Greek New Testament, and many different typological approaches come out of early and medieval church writers. The most concise genealogy of typology as an exegetical approach may be found in Sacvan Bercovitch, 'An Annotated Bibliography,' in Sacvan Bercovitch, ed., *Typology and Early American Literature*, (Boston, MA: University of Massachusetts Press, 1972), pp. 247-337.

⁷⁹ Bercovitch, 'Annotated Bibliography,' p. 251. *Developmental typology* (which Bercovitch describes as an 'historiographic view') is easier to understand: objects and people of the Old Testament have double typological significance, as pre-figuring the person of Christ or events in his life and events in Revelations. *Correlative typology* (which Bercovitch calls 'static biographical parallelism') requires more explanation: people of the Old Testament had spiritual roles which paralleled events in Christ's life, in the same way that present godly people practice a pattern of life parallel to Christ's own. Both are shadows of Christ's perfection, and the shadow of present events will echo the shadow of ancient. As such, Christ becomes the spiritual fulcrum connecting Old Testament figures with present events. Bercovitch quoted John Cotton's *Treatise of Faith* (London: 1713) to make the relation of Old Testament figures, to Christ, and to present life clearer: 'We are not the same person with Christ and therefore we have a life not the very self-same with his, but conformable to his, and fashioned after his Image'; like 'the Image of a seal in the Wax,' we are 'the same in proportion, not the same in number,

much more straightforwardly *developmental*, referring the reader to interpret events as pre-figuring Christ's life or events at the end of history. The significance of this will become immediately apparent when the Geneva Bible is compared with the version which displaced it in official use in the Church of England, the Authorised Version of 1611.

Stout argued that the authorised version was a reponse to the 'main body of Puritan thought emanating from the universities at Cambridge and Oxford' moving in different directions from the Christological focus of the popular piety the Geneva text encouraged. At the universities, Stout says, much more attention was being paid to questions of 'covenant theology,' and the related issue of 'national election.'⁸⁰ National election refers to the idea that a present people or nation, (in this case, England) might be the inheritor of Israel's Old Testament covenant with God, God's chosen people. This line of thought, with all of its related exegetical debate and political implications, leans much more heavily on *correlative typology*, the other main strand Bercovitch identified as influential in early colonial New England. As Stout put it: 'Where the Geneva Bible and its marginalia served well the purpose of an embattled religious minority with thoughts fixed firmly on martyrdom and the world to come, it was less useful in fashioning binding principles of social organization and order in this world.'⁸¹ Where the Geneva Bible led to an emphasis of an extra-political, extra-historical personal covenant of Grace, the Authorised version spoke to emphases on national covenant on top of the individual covenant of Grace. And moreover, while not everyone could hope to gain election, participating in the

and it must needs be so, because the Fathers before Christ had as truly the same spiritual Life of Christ as we. The Life of his Divine Nature neither of us have...[but the] proportion and resemblance of his life before his Coming [they had] as we have after His Coming.'

⁸⁰ Stout, p. 23.

⁸¹ Ibid, pp. 25, 26.

personal covenant, the development of national covenant theology brought all Englishmen and women into participation in a unified goal, administered through the parish church and expressed in national policy. Within parish churches, then, it was not untenable for a minister to gather up a smaller group, a church within a church, who practised voluntary modes of piety with members of the godly elect, while that same minister preached to his whole parish every week as well.⁸²

In New England, as both Stout and Hall recorded, the Massachusetts divines overwhelmingly used the authorised Version, while the more separatist Plymouth church, marking the 1620 settling of the area, and which had offered Roger Williams a home, almost uniformly used the Geneva version. Williams was no doubt conversant in both, but it is more than likely that he relied heavily on the Geneva Bible to the exclusion of the Authorised Version for his preaching, and practice of personal piety. In addition to an argument for Williams' use of the Geneva Bible based on proximity and the role he might have played in the church community at Plymouth, Williams' Christology, and resultant typology both point towards his use of the Geneva text. In his 1652 *Experiments of Spiritual Life and Health*, Williams had expanded on the humble position the godly person should adopt in relation to Christ, drawing out the theme of Christ's redemptive promise, as emphasised in the marginalia of the Geneva text. Williams' Christology was fully integrated with his account of original sin, Jesus the suffering redeemer waiting until the end time before achieving glory. Indeed, Williams' expectation that the godly in present history (especially the *English* godly) should expect the suffering position of prophets in sack

⁸² This interpretation of the parish implications of the typological shift from the Geneva Bible to the Authorised Version fits with Lake's definition of Puritan practise. I am not implying here that all English clergy used the Authorised Version, or that the Geneva Bible disappeared from English parishes, but making a general interpretative point in order to explain the historical and local context of Roger Williams' own brand of typology, later in the argument.

cloth, extended from his assumption that the redemptive purpose of Christ's suffering and death would not be worked out until the revelation. It was in this context, very much tied to his view of the response of the godly to Christ's position in history, that Williams found so much support in John Foxe's popular *Book of Martyrs* (1563), to which he frequently alluded.⁸³ W. Clarke Gilpin correctly highlighted this approach in contrasting Williams' view of Christ with that of the Quakers, saying that 'Williams was convinced that the Quaker interpretation of Christ led away from Christian humility to a belief in the perfection of the individual based upon union with Christ.'⁸⁴ As Quakers believed that Christ's second coming was achieved in the inner light of believers, Williams accused them of rejecting Jesus' historical position, so central to his own theological world-view. Thus Williams view of Christ echoes that explicit in the Geneva commentary.

Williams' particular typology also points to his use of the Geneva Bible, but an understanding of its 'fit' with the other strands of Williams' theological world-view is crucial to understanding Williams' advocacy not just of toleration and church independence from the civil state, but his account of how civil society with all its related institutions should function to preserve order in present history.⁸⁵ Perry Miller was wrong in implying that Williams was unusual in his typological emphasis, and in identifying typology as the root of Williams' belief system, though Miller was the

⁸³ John Foxe, *Book of Martyrs: Being a History of the Persecution of the Protestants, ... known as the 'Acts and Monuments' of the Christian Church*, A. Clarke, ed., (London: Ward, Lock, Bowen, and Co., 1888). David Hall alluded to the popular influence of the Book of Martyrs in New England, but for explanation of its influence on English religious culture and political life, see Williams Haller, *Foxe's Book of Martyrs and the Elect Nation*, (London: Jonathan Cape, 1963).

⁸⁴ Gilpin, *The Millenarian Piety of Roger Williams*, p. 167.

⁸⁵ The political and social implications of Williams' typology will be developed in Chapter 3, but it is appropriate to allude to them here, to explain the emphasis of typology in the examination of his theological outlook generally.

first to pay adequate historical attention to Williams' mode of reading the Bible.⁸⁶

Both Darrett Rutman and Edmund Morgan corrected Miller's unwarranted emphasis on typology in Williams' thought, explaining it much more appropriately in the context of his larger theological outlook.⁸⁷ Williams' writing and correspondence is littered with typological references, as were the arguments of his opponents, but the style of typology differed dramatically, and the content of disputes was as often as not specifically about the style of typology being employed. Writing in the *Queries of Highest Consideration* (1644) which rehearsed many of the arguments of the *Bloudy Tenent of Persecution* (1644), Williams synthesised and then condemned the typological style of his detractors:

We know the Allegations against this Counsell [exclusive reliance on interpretation of Christ's word in the Gospels]: the head of all is that from *Moses* (not Christ) his Pattern in the typicall Land of *Canaan*, the Kings of *Israel* and *Judah*, &c. We humbly desire it may be searched into, & we beleieve it will be found but one of *Moses* shadows vanished at the coming of the Lord Jesus: yet such a shadow as is directly opposite to the very Testament and coming of the Lord Jesus.⁸⁸

Williams' accompanying marginal note urged the reader to see this as evidence of 'The danger and mischief of bringing Moses his Pattern into Kingdomes now since Christ Jesus his Coming.' Though he maintained that the Old Testament retained direct relevance and authority for Christians, Williams insisted that the histories and instructions of the Old Testament were only 'types' of events in the New Testament

⁸⁶ As Richard Reinitz argued, 'Miller erred when he argued that Williams was unusual among Puritans because he used typology... Sacvan Bercovitch, Jesper Rosenmeier, and others have proven that the debate between Williams and John Cotton took place within an intellectual context in which typology was accepted, although there were disagreements about how it should be used.' Reinitz, 'The Separatist Background of Roger Williams' Argument for Religious Toleration,' in Bercovitch, ed., *Typology and Early American Literature*, p. 109, note 6.

⁸⁷ Darrett Rutman, 'Review of the Complete Writings of Roger Williams,' in the *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd series, 21 (1964), pp. 300-304; and in Morgan, *Roger Williams*, also Morgan, 'Miller's Williams,' in the *New England Quarterly*, 38 (1965), pp. 513-523.

and the life of Christ, or of events in Revelations. Therefore the godly in the present day should look to the Gospels and Christ's historical position first in developing the social and political implications of Scripture.

It is useful to consider Williams and his Massachusetts contemporaries in relation to the styles of typology Bercovitch identified as most predominant in New England, the developmental and correlative models. What becomes clear is that where John Cotton, the Thomas Shepards, and other Massachusetts divines relied heavily on a correlative model, seeing Old Testament 'heroes' as types for present day events, Williams' method developed much more from a developmental model. Specifically, he rejected the claim that the historic examples of theocratic governments of the nation of Israel provided templates for civil involvement in spiritual life in the present day. As he put it in the first section of the *Bloody Tenent Yet More Bloody* (1652), 'the *Pattern of the National Church of Israel*, was a *None-such*, unimitable by any *Civil State*, in all or any of the *Nations of the World* beside.'⁸⁹ Simply put, with Christ's death and resurrection, the national covenant God had made with Israel ended, and God instituted a new covenant vested in Christ's redemptive promise, with the few chosen elect sprinkled through history. Where the previous covenant had been with a civil nation, Christ's present covenant was with the individual godly, who together formed an 'invisible church' which would only be gathered together at the revelation. The Old Testament patterns retained authority in Williams' scheme, but only as types of this true church, no longer for any literal nation. Williams expanded the definition of developmental typology offered by Bercovitch, however, in his own method. Where in strict terms, developmental typology would insist on a literal identification of Old Testament types with Christ, or

⁸⁸ *Queries of Highest Consideration* (1644), CW II, pp. 274, 275.

with events of the end of history. Williams applied a much more allegorical approach to the Scriptures. This did not mean that he challenged the historical truth of the Old Testament or New, but that he could be more free with his typological assignments, by expanding types as allegories for events in the Life of Christ, or in the life of the godly elect in the passage of history. Williams' manuscript concerning the implications of an allegorical typological approach to the story of Jacob and Esau exemplified this method. The two brothers were not intended to stand as types literally for people or events in the Gospels or at the Revelation, but their story was interpreted as allegory for a variety of present struggling forces reconciliation in the end time.⁹⁰

It was not that Williams' Massachusetts opponents rejected the authority of Christ, but in typological terms, the Massachusetts ministers tended to use a method friendly to the developed notions of national election and emphasis of national, over personal covenant. Instructed by Paul's letter to the Galatians, they did understand Jewish law to have been negated by Christ's death and resurrection. However, as John Higginson (1616-1708), pastor of the church in Salem exemplified in an election sermon of 1663, the Massachusetts ministers operated with the working assumption that Israel's relationship with God should be the guide for their own in present history. Higginson began his sermon with a careful exegesis of how Solomon's court operated to ensure the Israelites kept their covenantal responsibilities, building to the point that obedience to God's commandments in matters of religion, "...was the cause [purpose] of God and Israel then, and I hope it will appear anon, that the very same is

⁸⁹ *The Bloody Tenent Yet More Bloody* (1652), CW IV, p. 29.

⁹⁰ 'R.W.' (Roger Williams), *Esau and Jacobs Mystical Harmony Unvailng...*, (1666) Massachusetts Historical Society Ms. N-313, presented to the MHS by G. Gannett, 1813.

the cause of God and his people now.’⁹¹ Speaking of Solomon’s civil government, Higginson meant to charge the civil commonwealth of Massachusetts with his warnings. Although the assumption of New England’s covenantal status was not as monolithic and resolved as Harry Stout implied in his essay ‘Word and Order in New England,’ typified by Higginson’s account, a substantial body of thought did support such a view.⁹² Innumerable election sermons in Massachusetts harangued listeners to be wary of failing to fulfil the high demands deriving from God’s special covenanted relationship with their commonwealth, which could only result in God’s wrath being visited on Mass Bay as it had been on the ancient Scriptural states. As Thomas Shepard III (1658-1685) set out the purpose of a Fast Day sermon of 1678:

...y^e 4 pⁱculars yⁱ ...I chiefly intend are these. 1. Gods people may be brought und^r generall distress, dang^r, or calamity. 2. God is y^e principall efficient of all those afflictions. 3. Their sins are y^e meritorious causes of all their trouble. 4. yⁱ y^e people of God should in such a day fast & pray & yⁱ in an extraordinary mann^r.⁹³

Shepard described a cycle of sin, punishment, and prayer and fasting which would have been familiar to his audience: this cycle, writ large on the public stage, only makes sense in light of common perception of national covenant. The Massachusetts leaders, then, understood their covenantal relationship to derive from Scripture, in the

⁹¹ John Higginson, *The Cause of God and his People in New-England, as it was stated and discussed in a sermon reached before the honourable General Court of the Massachusetts Colony, on the 27 day of May, 1663. Being the day of Election at Boston*, (Cambridge, MA: Samuel Green, 1663) p. 4.

⁹² Stout, p. 28. Stout largely accepted Perry Miller’s view that the Massachusetts divines ‘had voyaged to America to create a model of Christian reformation which all England and Europe were to imitate.’ Theodore Bozeman offered a more balanced picture of the founders motives, though with only cursory treatment of their modes of covenant, in ‘The Puritans’ “Errand into the Wildernes” Reconsidered,’ *New England Quarterly*, 59 (1986), pp. 231-251.

⁹³ Thomas Shepard III (1658-1685), *Shepard Family Manuscripts*, Mss. ‘S’, boxes ‘S’, 1 box, folder 8 (1678, 79, 80). Shepard III did not attain the fame of either his father or grand father. He had been born in Charlestown, educated by his father, and took a degree from Harvard in 1676. He served as pastor of the Charlestown church (succeeding his father) from 1677 to his death in 1685.

literal application of Old Testament types to present history by a correlative typological method, quite different from Roger Williams' own.

Section Three: Christ's Church and its Mission in history

The notion of any legitimate visible church institution in present history was one Williams found increasingly difficult to stomach during the 1630s and 1640s. Humans were not fit to constitute churches on their own, in Williams view, because of their participation in original sin. This did not mean that Christian advocacy was impossible, but that in Williams' words, '...in the present *State* of things, I cannot but be humbly bold to say, that I know no other *true Sender*, but the most *Holy Spirit*.'⁹⁴ The historical man Jesus had obviously been free from sin, and therefore could and did commission apostles to act as his agents until his return, establishing the early churches of the Mediterranean diaspora. Because the King could not function as a religious authority, in Williams' account, the commissions of those ordained in the King's name to evangelise and convert non-believers were illegitimate. In the new era, Williams reasoned, Christ alone could commission 'apostles' to evangelise, and 'pastors' to preach to, and to correct the converted and elect. This conclusion presented a problem for Williams, which came to a head not long after he had migrated to Providence. Based on the first part of this idea, that the King's authority to commission officers to undertake apostolic functions was illegitimate, Williams and several of his neighbours re-baptised each other and gathered a small meeting for worship. On further reflection, however, Williams concluded that they had no more

⁹⁴ *The Hireling Ministry None of Christ's* (1652), CW VII, p. 160.

commission to imitate the apostolic roles of the Gospel writers and early churchmen than the King, or anyone else not directly so commissioned by Christ himself or one of his apostles. But Williams was convinced that the apostolic succession begun by Christ had died with its adoption by Rome, and could not be reclaimed, which left him with the problem of explaining how any worship life might be legitimately sustained in present history.

With the perversion of that apostolic succession by the intervention of Constantine and the formation of the Holy Roman Empire and Catholic church, Williams concluded that, 'The *Apostolicall Commission* and *ministrie* is long since interrupted and discontinued.' However, Williams elaborated that:

...during the dreadfull *Apostasy* and *Desolation*, the *Lord* hath not left the *World* without *witnesse*, but hath graciously and wonderfully stirred up his holy *Prophets* and *Witnesses*, such as were before the *Waldenses* mor obscure, but more eminently the *Waldenses*, the *Wicklevists*, the *Hussites*, the *Lutherans*, the *Calvinists* (so called) who have as *Witnesses* prophecyed and mourned in *Sack-cloath* 1260 days or years (prophetically) I say mourned for the routing, desolations of the Christian Church or Army: and panted and laboured after the most glorious *Rally* thereof, and *Restauration*.⁹⁵

Although he could not trace the remnant of apostolic succession back to first early churches, Williams believe that remnant had survived, and gathered force through the Reformation sects.

By implication, (given Williams' rejection of correlative typology) if any potential national covenant had died with Christ's resurrection, there was no civil instrument in current history for the commissioning of apostles to evangelise and convert, or even to baptise believers who discerned election already. In this he differed from his Massachusetts opponents, who largely agreed that the apostolic succession had been lost, but objected that theirs was not a national church, and

identified a different progression of God's remnant in history. As Thomas Shepard III preached, on a Fast day in 1678, the church had evolved through distinct stages, since Christ's original commission:

At first y^e ch^hurch] w^s oeconomicall [household based], then nationall, & now congregationall: And ...A pticular ch^h visible ...may now in time apostatize, & for their declension be divorced from & by God, & so be exposed to those miseries y^l Gods care is want to free his chosen ones from, & yet God will reserve...a remnant (yea) even wⁿ y^l whole nation w^s involved in y^l great calamity, w^{ro^f} y^e Babylonians [when the church was national – Israel] were y^e instruments.⁹⁶

Where Williams rejected the capacity for present institutions, even those constituted by the godly, to renew Christ's commission, his Massachusetts contemporaries accepted that the time of national churches was past but believed that a local group of the elect together might ordain pastors and teachers into that commission.

Incidentally, those Massachusetts men and women who believed strongly that their churches had inherited the covenant of Israel, there was no contradiction in also negating notions of a nationally-controlled, hierarchical church. Their Congregational church structure provided an admirable basis for fulfilling the Covenant, in their view.

Williams, by contrast, wanted to return to the structural example of the early, or 'oeconomicall' church – a primitivism rejected by Shepard even as he would have also rejected a straightforward union between the church and civil authorities.

But in terms of who the members of the church were, whatever its structure, Williams' view did not differ all that much from that of the first generation of his Massachusetts opponents.⁹⁷ Thomas Shepard I wrote in answer to the question 'What

⁹⁵ Ibid, p. 149.

⁹⁶ Thomas Shepard III, Sermon on Nehemiah 90.32.33, 'Bradford Fast day.Nov.21.1678.' *Shepard Family Manuscripts*, Mss. 'S', Boxes 'S', 1 box, folder 8 (1678, 79, 80).

⁹⁷ The issue of church membership would prove extraordinarily divisive in Mass Bay, as the numbers of full church members declined, after mid-century. A compromise position was reached in the 'half-

is the Church?’, ‘the Number of gods Elect.’ He offered the following explication which endorsed the idea, common to Williams, that the elect would be found across history, and from different visible church backgrounds: ‘This description is not of this or that pticular church visible but of the Catholic or universall church... that God hath a number of elect & chosen men & women from y^c rest of mankind...& y^{esc} only are y^c church.’⁹⁸ As Williams wrote in the Winter of 1652/53, ‘I now find that the church and Sanctuarie of Christ Jesus, consists not of Dead, but Living stones...His true Lovers are Voluntiers borne of his Spirit, the now only holy Nation and Royall Priesthood 1 Pet.2. [:] Psal. 110.’⁹⁹ These two versions of church membership were parallel, though their authors had very different ideas as to what the resulting church would look like, and how it would function. Williams affirmed that he considered the partial commission offered by the holy spirit did not provide for the ordination of persons, and therefore rejected ordinations offered by all visible church institutions. ‘...not only popish but protestant, not only Episcopall but presbyterian not only presbitarian but Independent allso...’¹⁰⁰ It was a further consequence of this point that Williams’ finally rejected the legitimacy of evangelical mission to the natives: with no apostolic commission, none might legitimately fulfill the role of the evangelist, let alone the problem posed by trying to convert people to a church whose institutional existence was questionable at best.

way’ covenant of 1662 which allowed children of the baptised to be baptised, even if their parents were not among the ‘living stones.’ However, these offspring could not take communion or vote in church affairs, unless they proved their own election. The half-way covenant moved away from the opinion of Williams, and many of the first generation of Massachusetts founder ministers, like Thomas Shepard I, quoted below.

⁹⁸ Thomas Shepard I, ‘Essay on the Latter End of misery + Blessedness, (ca. 1635)’ *Shepard Manuscripts*, Mss. Octavo Volumes ‘S’, Octavo Volume 1 (pages unnumbered); in final section.

⁹⁹ ‘To Mrs. Anne Sadleir, ca. Winter 1652/53’ *Correspondence* I, p. 374.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid.

Williams also rejected any possibility of metaphysical or intangible renewal of the original commission by Christ: if Christ had renewed the apostolic succession, it would be tangible and open, and not mistakable for anything but what it was.¹⁰¹ This was one issue he had with the Quakers, whom he felt perverted the relation of history in Scripture, as they claimed Revelations had already happened, and that Christ returned to Earth every day in the hearts and actions of true believers. To Williams, this seemed the ultimate arrogance, a conflation of self and God. Failing a legitimate apostolic succession or obvious re-commissioning by Christ, Williams concluded that the visible church was dead in human history, and renounced his baptism, along with any lingering notions he had of converting the Narragansett. He did, however, accept that 'prophets in sack-cloth' might still preach the truth, and keep the flickering flame of the visible church alive in human history, and resolved himself to accept that position, endowed with more responsibility, as the whole preparedness of the elect rested in such people's hands.

Williams had accepted the supremacy of the King in the church and the use of the *Book of Common Prayer* in January 1627 when he took his A.B. at Cambridge, but by 1629 he had given up study toward an advanced degree, forfeiting his scholarship, and rejected the spiritual authority of both.¹⁰² Travelling in Lincolnshire with John Cotton and Thomas Hooker that year, Williams reported later that he refused to participate with them in written liturgy, saying he had '...presented his *Arguments from Scripture*, why he durst not joyn with them in their use of *Common Prayer*.'¹⁰³ Williams' opposition to the Book of Common Prayer was two-fold: firstly

¹⁰¹ Here Williams' rejection of the holy spirit endowing the remnant of the church with prophetic powers should not be confused with a full renewal of the Apostolic Commission.

¹⁰² Gilpin, *The Millenarian Piety of Roger Williams*, p. 31.

¹⁰³ *Bloody Tenent Yet More Bloody* (1652), CW IV, p. 65.

he rejected the King's authority to set religious practice, and secondly he was sure that set, written prayers would impede the self-examination of the elect worshipping in Anglican churches. Soon, by the time he arrived in Massachusetts Bay, Williams would have no worship at all with any who themselves did not separate as he did. Williams' separatism evolved logically with his view that the visible church was close to extinct in human history. His separatism worked with his belief in the depravity of all humans and the identification of Christ's redemptive covenant of Grace as personal. A person could only join the church if he or she was among the examined elect identified by Christ in the personal covenant of Grace: out of this precept Williams rejected English parish structure, which included all people in the written liturgy of worship, whether redeemed or not. He buttressed this instinct with the rejection of Israel serving as a type for present governments, in setting church practice, as has been discussed already. Further, he expected those who had discerned Grace in their lives to separate from such sinful worship practices lest they be tainted by the sin of collusion.

Others had articulated these separatist ideas before: in 1590 Henry Barrow had written that the effect of written prayer was '...utterly to quench and extinguish the Spirit of God, both in ministerie and people.'¹⁰⁴ Williams had much sympathy also with the work of John Canne, whose '*Necessitie of Separation from the Church of England*' (1634) Williams took to prove that any honest 'Puritan' must progress toward separatism. The passage is worth quoting again, for present reference:

For as (as Mr. Can hath unanswerably proved) the ground and principles of the Puritans against Bishops and Ceremonies, and prophanenes of people professing Christ, and the necessitie of Christs flock and discipline, must necessarily, if truly followed, lead on to, and inforce a separation from such

¹⁰⁴ Henry Barrow, 'A Brief Discoverie of the False Church,' in *The Writings of Henry Barrow, 1587-1590*, Leland Carlson, ed. (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1962) p. 366.

wayes, worships, and Worshippers, to seek out the true way of Gods worship
according to Christ Jesus.¹⁰⁵

Many contemporaries, including John Winthrop and John Cotton, broadly shared Williams' suspicion of written liturgy and parish structure, and indeed, his rejection of 'national churches.' However, where Williams took the implications of his orthodoxy to the extreme, others in Massachusetts and England accepted less than ideal present circumstances and contented themselves with making gradual inroads in established practice. Williams himself reported that when he questioned Cotton during their the 1629 encounter, Cotton had responded that '...he selected the good and best prayers in his use of that *Book*, as the *Author* of the *Council of Trent* was used to do, in his using of the *Masse-book*.'¹⁰⁶ Williams had a much narrower interpretation of what the visible church would look like, even as he agreed in most respects with the view of his early Massachusetts contemporaries about who it should include.

Conclusion

These three sections have considered Roger Williams' view of humans, his view of God's authority in the world vested in the Bible, and his view of the fate of the church in present history. In so examining Williams' 'theological world view,' the goal was to respond to the methodology offered by Peter Lake to assess English Puritanism as the synthesis of strands of argument, working together to build a specific mind set, or style. Lake identified a source of social order in the 'autonomous' exercise of individual conscience, a source of order Williams also

¹⁰⁵ *Mr. Cotton's Letter Examined* (1643). CW, I, p. 381.

expected. The question becomes, then, would the changes that Williams' particular synthesis of Puritan ideas be able to sustain the order he envisioned, in the model described by Lake, and how would that order function, in reference to specific social and political institutions. Williams expected civil and spiritual conflict, but not around his founding assumptions about sovereignty in present history, centrality of Word, or the authority of conscience in generating the correct attitude toward civil authority, for the public good. As has been implied, the purpose of the next chapter will be to examine the social and political implications of Williams' theology, in relation to that of his contemporaries. The product will be a consideration of Williams' notion of order in relation to Lake's definition, which has crudely has been called separation of church and state, but is more properly understood as the division of authority in current history.

¹⁰⁶ *Bloody Tenent Yet More Bloody* (1652). CW, IV, p. 65-66.

Chapter Three: The Natural History of Order in Civil Society

The introduction to the previous chapter suggested that Roger Williams' theology must be approached with the '...awareness that preserving social order and conforming individual desires to the common good was a necessary outcome of spiritual authority in present history.'¹ Williams started from the premise that present society could not be perfected, in spiritual terms, but believed that it did have its own organizing and restraining rules of order, dictated by the conditions of humanity in present history. This chapter serves to draw out the social and political implications of Williams' view of original sin and human faculties, the Bible, and his negation of institutional church tradition as a source of spiritual authority. The previous Chapter explained how a particular synthesis of interdependent doctrinal attitudes structured Roger Williams' theological world-view, and how his particular system of belief related to that of his contemporaries. What emerged was a picture of a man largely in agreement with his peers, except in his Scriptural interpretation of history. Answers to the questions of where order originated, how it functioned, and how it can be preserved all hinge on Williams' theological world view. As such, calling the results of this enquiry a 'natural history' of order in civil society is proper, as Williams' ideas about civil order developed as a direct extension of considerations of the progress and potential of 'natural' man in human history. The underlying order that Williams sought to unbind in present history through his political advocacy, was order based in the unifying natural equality of humans as fallen creatures, yet capable of self-restraint by natural conscience and a measure of rationality.² It is important to emphasize that Williams himself made no distinction between his 'spiritual' and

¹ Chapter two, p. 64.

‘civil’ thought: all power and order in his account, whether spiritual or civil, derived from God, even if the remit of particular powers was restricted. Even if he was its advocate, Williams did not consider himself the author of the account of order in civil society that he described: from his perspective he occupied a thoroughly empirical position, having discovered by careful study and graceful inspiration God’s one true plan to mitigate the effects of original sin in present human life.

To provide the most straightforward account of Williams’ view of the ‘natural history of order in civil society,’ the Chapter will be divided into three sections, concerning the origin and status of order, its function, or true characteristics, and its preservation.² The first section will explain the origin of Williams’ notions of social and civil order in his view of history, developed from his treatment of Scripture and rejection of the social and civil authority deriving from institutional traditions of the church, and his rejection of notions of ‘national election’. As has been shown in Chapter two, Williams rejected not just state-established churches, but those basing their legitimacy on any imitation of historical traditions of church order, whether catholic or congregational. By denying the legitimated power of ecclesiastical institutions, Williams removed what others saw as a major support for civil order, the role of church institutions for defining the direction of ‘common good,’ and conforming individual interest to its needs. Indeed many of Williams’ contemporaries expected church institutions to play a stabilising role in civil society, acting formally and informally to conform the actions of individuals to identified goals and mores of civil society as a whole. Comparison of Williams’ argument to those of his

² See Chapter two, section one, for discussion of universal ‘natural’ human capacities.

³ Although speaking to slightly different emphases, for the purposes of this discussion the terms ‘social’ and ‘civil’ will be used synonymously when describing public order. These two refer to the order of society and social structure as a whole: the particular role of the state in the administration of public order will be discussed generally in sections two and three of this chapter, and with specific reference to Roger Williams’ state-craft in Chapter four.

contemporaries on the issue of the civilising role of churches begs a series of related questions, leading to the heart of his account of civil order: did Williams simply require a less orderly civil society (in terms defined by his opponents)? Did his argument provide a straightforward replacement for the civil and social conforming power of church institutions? Or indeed, did he consider the role his contemporaries defined for church institutions at all necessary?

The second section of the chapter will deal with these questions, giving a picture of the style of order for the present day that resulted from Williams' view of history. Developing the implications of Williams' view of conscience and related faculties, this section explain how Williams elevated the role of conscience for establishing order in relation to his contemporaries. It will consider what shape Williams thought order in civil society would take, and develop a picture of Williams' expectations for procedural collaboration of conscience, the state, and other civil institutions to conform individual interest to the 'common good.' A third section will consider what kind of forces, in Williams' view, perverted the collaborative management of individual interest, challenging this order, and how they should be opposed. This final section will explain, in correct context, the importance of liberty of conscience for Williams, giving a corrected account of this headline position. Historical order, by his account, depended on the strong exercise of conscience to goad and judge, conforming individuals to socially acceptable, or useful, behaviour. This discussion supersedes historiographic focus on Williams' 'separation of church and state.' As will become apparent, in this and following chapters, Williams' state fulfilled an explicitly spiritual role, as it collaborated with individual civil agents to

preserve the elect in the field of present history.⁴ The second section will prepare the theoretical ground for more detailed treatment of Williams' account of the state and other 'sovereign' civil institutions in Chapter four, while the third will accomplish this task for more detailed discussion of the real threats to civil order Williams' perceived, and the responses which drove his political advocacy, in Chapter five. As will emerge, it was the peculiarities of his notion of the natural order of civil society that set Williams apart from his immediate compatriots, not his opinions about liberty, *per se*, or his views about the role of the state.

Williams often used the metaphor of the invisible church as a garden, and society as the field, to explain the relationship of worldly order and spiritual. As he wrote in the *Bloudy Tenent* (1644), 'In the *field* of the *World* then are all those *sorts* of *ground*, *high-way hearers*, *stony* and *thorny* ground hearers, as well as the *honest* and *good* ground...' Conditions in the field of the world were variable, whereas in the garden plants grew in tended, 'honest' soil, but the field was obviously not without its own rules of order, which often paralleled those of the garden. Human endeavour in the field of the world needed the order of rain and sun, and a measure of fertility to survive at all: the favourable weather of social and civil order would never turn the field into a garden, but was still fundamental to the most basic survival. If the purpose of the previous chapter was to give an account of Williams' underlying

⁴ Both Chapters four, and five will discuss the spiritual purposes of Williams' state in greater detail. Focus on Williams' 'separation' of church and state has led historians logically to ask questions about the boundaries between civil and spiritual authority, expressed in Williams' political advocacy, and questions about the boundaries of individual (private) conscience and state remit. These questions are inappropriate, except to help place Williams' thought in a liberal framework: conscience was a founder of civil obedience, and the proper function of people's conforming influence over each other in civil society, relied on the conscience both of the remonstrator and the deviant. The liberal dichotomy between private, individual conscience and public, civil action did not exist as such for Williams. The tension he perceived was not between individual conscience and the state, but between 'covetous,' or selfish ends, and the common good.

⁵ *The Bloudy Tenent* (1644), CW III, p. 106. In context, Williams was using the metaphor to explain why preaching for conversions in the 'field' of the world required different tools, or a different commission, than preaching to the elect of the 'garden.'

theology, the lens through which he interpreted events around him, then the project of this chapter is to explain what it was he saw when he looked through that lens at human society, the field in present history to the garden of God's extra-historical, invisible church. By Williams' account, the protection of authority vested in visible church institutions was lost to human history, and indeed perversely misappropriated by established churches, in England and elsewhere. Williams worried for the safety of the elect remnant and their unregenerate brothers and sisters drifting through the tumults of human conflict, the seeds struggling to grow, choked by thorns and brambles. All around him, and especially in England, he observed with horror the social and political results of disorder, the resolution of which formed the centre of Williams' political thought. In order for God's word, the seed, in the field to flourish at all, even in variable soil, it must be allowed sun and rain: a world in which society's correct order obtained would still be the field, but a field in which the seed happening into the good soil of an elect conscience would at least stand a chance of growth. Williams may not have been a 'political' thinker in the sense of developing a unique systematic treatment of politics or theory of the state, separated out from his theological worldview. However, based in his interpretation of history and the progress of God's elect through it, Williams blamed the perversion of the one true social order he perceived for much unnecessary civil tumult and controversy in present history. He did not think that all conflict could be removed from present life, rejecting utopian ideas that the 'field' could ever be made to resemble the 'garden.'

It is worth remembering, in this context, that Williams' view of history was essentially millenarian: because history moved towards the eschaton, utopian efforts in the present were, for Williams, not only illegitimate, but unnecessary. At the point of God's choosing, Williams believed, human history would end, and God would

institute a true order. At that time the divisions and distinctions between spiritual and civil powers, elect and non-elect persons, wheat and tares, features of present history only, would disappear. Although conflict could not be removed from civil society before the end of human time, Williams thought it could, and must, be managed, to protect the elect in the present age. His thought became explicitly 'political' as he first catalogued the order of the field, and then explored and advocated for institutional mechanisms to preserve it.⁶

Peter Lake talked about 'puritan' notions of social order as '...a relatively dynamic and decentralised vision of the social order in which true order was to be achieved through the autonomous response of many consciences to the dictates of the word and the demands of the common good.'⁷ While showing differences in emphasis from Lake's description, Williams' assumptions about social order in civil life do resemble Lake's model: bereft of authoritative church traditions to guide individual behaviour, he relied on natural conscience and vestiges of rational judgement as humanity's guides for conducting civil life.⁸ Williams expected natural conscience to collaborate with governing bodies and other civil institutions to preserve conditions of safety for all humans, God's fallen creatures, elect and

⁶ See notes 36, 37, and 38, with related text, for clarification of Williams' understanding of what 'politics' was, and what it was for.

⁷ Lake, 'Defining Puritanism,' pp. 22, 23. See also Chapter two, pp. 63, 64, for my discussion of methodological approach to Williams' theology, in relation to the preservation of social order.

⁸ See Chapter two, section one, for discussion of Williams' account of natural and saving conscience, and the function of each, in relation to other human faculties touched by original sin. Whereas Lake's description of a puritan 'style' of social order (quoted above) retains a sense of the authority of institutional church traditions in preserving social order, if only as interpreters of the 'dictates of the word' as a universal goal, Williams' account of the social order included no expectation that it would lead all people to observe a single true worship, or 'dictate of the word.' Williams did, however, expect that other, external authorities vested in a variety of civil institutions would help the function of 'autonomous conscience' in conforming individual action to the common good, and it is in this sense that his view resembles Lake's description. See Chapter two, p. 28, and note 62.

unregenerate alike.” Social order resulted from this collaboration, a collaborative relationship Williams sought to control through his active political advocacy: the pursuit of civil order was the first goal of his engagement with the public sphere. Williams’ ‘separation’ of church and state, and advocacy for liberty of conscience itself, the two positions for which he has received so much notice from historians of political thought, make no sense unless taken in the context of a correct understanding of his notion of civil order, which they serve. The project of this chapter is to explain the origins of civil and social order in Williams’ thought, trace its theoretical function in the collaboration between conscience and the institutions of civil life to restrain the excesses of human self-interest, and examine his thoughts on its creation and preservation. This chapter will consider exactly what Roger Williams meant by ‘social and civil order,’ the rules which he took to govern growth in the ‘field of the world’ and the goal of all his ‘politics’ and political thought. In so doing it will examine what forces he thought might challenge it, and exactly how it should be defended and preserved.

Section One: Williams’ ‘Natural History’

Understanding Roger Williams’ assumptions about order in society first requires attention to his view of history, and the related status of individuals, groups, and nations in history. When Williams talked of human history, or history at all, he meant ‘natural’ history, that is, the record of human endeavour since Adam’s

’ Chapter five will discuss ways in which the practical workings of this relationship developed and were expressed in the management of particular historical conflicts in Providence and Providence Plantations.

disobedience to God. All history was natural history, as Williams' associated it with the actions of natural men and women, including the elect, who retained their status as natural, corrupt people, even when they were assured of God's Grace.¹⁰ As an intellectually mature Williams would write during the mid 1660s, the ejection of Adam and Eve from God's 'peculiar Garden' Eden marked '...the first step of universal natural knowledg.'¹¹ Williams' notion of history is fundamental to his assumptions about order in present society because for him, history explained the limits of human potential in the present day. It was because of humans' equal share in the inheritance of Adam's corruption that individual interests proved a threat to peaceful co-existence and needed management in the first place. Similarly, it was Christ's negation of Old Testament models for national covenanted relationships with God that kept the state from being able to manage these corrosive effects of sin, and the idolatry of self-interest, by its own civil authority. With these limiting premises arising from his view of history, Williams was quick to condemn utopian efforts to create perfect communities as illegitimate and unworkable: the nature of history meant that any such efforts were futile attempts '...to turne this *Field* of the *World* into the *Garden* of the *Church*.'¹² Thus his account of order in civil society, the 'field of the world,' was first and foremost a response to the model of history with which he worked.

Roger Williams' view of history devolved directly from his account of original sin and the nature of Christ's redemptive mission on earth: if Adam began

¹⁰ See Chapter two, section one, for discussion of Williams' general understanding of humans' 'natural' faculties.

¹¹ Roger Williams, 'Esau and Jacobs Mystical Harmony Unvailling The Myserie of Jehovahs Eternal will in Universal unity...' (1666) Massachusetts Historical Society Ms. N-313, p. 33.

¹² *The Bloudy Tenent*, (1644) CW III, p. 105. See Chapter two, section three for discussion of the status of visible and invisible church in present history: Williams thought Christ's resurrection had transferred the covenant once owned by the historical nation Israel to the invisible church composed of elect drawn from all times, races, and nations.

history. Christ fulfilled it, and would come again to end it. Perry Miller noted that '...the personal Jesus, crucified in Jerusalem, was the central and decisive fact in [Williams'] history,' or more precisely, that relationships between events in human history could only be explained with reference to their mutual relation to the crucifixion and resurrection.¹³ W. Clarke Gilpin has suggested convincingly that Williams view of history was radically millenarian, and that his 'eschatological reading of history placed the Christians of his own time in a transitional period, a 'wilderness' era during which a revitalized Christian community was fervently anticipated but not yet to be enjoyed.'¹⁴ But simply explaining Williams' account of history as 'millenarian' does not capture a sense of his larger view of God's purposes: it is not an exaggeration to say that Williams considered the entirety of human history, from the Fall onwards, to be an aberration in the larger, 'mystical harmony' of God's plan for creation.¹⁵ History, for Williams, was driven by a syllogistic framework, in which God gradually resolved the conflict created by Adam's sin. The great events in history, then, were points at which conflicting positions were articulated, or resolved: the Fall itself, Christ's redemptive sacrifice, Christ's commissioning of apostles to spread knowledge of the redemption in the world, the forsaking of that commission in the adoption of Christianity by the Roman Empire, and ultimately, the Revelation.

¹³ Miller, *Roger Williams*, p. 241.

¹⁴ Gilpin, *The Millenarian Piety of Roger Williams*, p. 63.

¹⁵ Williams developed the notion of God's 'mystical harmony' toward which history inexorably tended in his manuscript treatise *Esau and Jacobs Mystical Harmony Unvailing...* (1666), offering assurance that the reconciliation of the warring brothers in God's kingdom prefigured the resolution of all civil and spiritual conflict in history. Significantly, however, Williams blurred the lines between the forces of spiritual truth and falsehood in worldly conflict, saying all should be allowed and embraced in the present day, because all would be reconciled once history played itself out, and 'vanishing' or 'contending' time was finished (page 36). Williams had come to believe that there were no 'bolt-holes' for the elect, the invisible church in present history, and therefore no arena in which the toleration of falsehood was illegitimate. He did not collapse the distinction between spiritual and civil things, but rather expanded his notion of what the civil, natural world included, to encompass all church gatherings, worship, and traditions. Thus he collapsed the areas in present history where spiritual authority might hold sway, excluding error and falsehood. Moreover, he reasoned, allowing the

History itself only existed as a result of the conflict introduced by Adam's sin, and was therefore not the arena for human activity God intended at the creation, only a temporary way-station perpetuated by human corruption. As the final section of the previous chapter showed, Williams' believed the redemptive thread offered by Christ in his commission of the Apostles had been broken. This would leave little choice for the remnant of godly people in present history but to accept a position of on-going martyrdom, seeing themselves as prophets of the first Christian churches, without the power to reinstate them as visible institutions. In the context of his oft-used metaphor of the garden and the field, the lives of God's elect were for Williams the chance result of the seed of God's word falling on good soil in the field of worldly history. This vision fit well with Williams typology, as it kept the notice of the godly believer firmly on Christ's historical life, and the end-time, with less to say about God's purpose in the present day.¹⁶

To fully explain Williams' notion of history in relation to his view of social and civil, or worldly order, it is necessary to examine first the effect of history on individuals, and then on nations, before considering them together. The fact that Roger Williams assumed all people shared in the inheritance of Adam's sin, and that this stain corrupted human potential in present life was by no means unique.¹⁷ Indeed, it is not an exaggeration to say that in Williams' account, the Fall not only began, but caused human history: the garden was only separated from the field outside when Adam left it. It is easy to see that Williams found the fruits of original sin in individuals' sinful behaviour at the base of conflict in the present day. Sin caused the

activity of the anti-christ in contemporary history would only serve to highlight the power and goodness of Christ, as hunger acts as a foil to magnify the pleasure of fullness (page 89).

¹⁶ See Chapter two, section two, for a discussion of Roger Williams' typology in relation to *developmental* models, as over and against *correlative* models used by those more interested in proving 'national election.'

first great disordering of God's garden, and continued to cause the disordering of his worldly field. However, the particular conditions of the Adamic inheritance that characterized Williams' account are significant in two ways. First of all, Williams' account of original sin allowed for some human capacity for positive action to re-order the world, such as it was, and secondly, Williams account led to his understanding of the distinction between the 'publike' and 'private' life of each individual.¹⁸

In his belief that all humans, elect and unregenerate, shared 'natural' senses, reason, will, and most importantly, conscience, which though touched by sin, retained a shadow of their original, pre-lapsarian capacity, Williams provided tools by which individuals could judge and effect the order of their worldly lives. While these human tools could never, in Williams' view, be used to effect salvation, (that is, metaphorically, to re-make the field as a garden) the fact that they were not entirely removed from humans meant that Williams could attach authority to them for the task of discerning and promoting order in the 'field' of present life. By implication, Williams operated with the assumption that all individuals, of whatever race or nationality, had the capacity to tell disorder from order, to judge the benefits of order, and to structure their behaviour to promote order instead of disorder. It was in this context citing universal natural knowledge,¹⁹ that Williams would call on the 'common bonds of humanity' as a positive force to promote peaceful co-existence of disparate

¹⁸ See Chapter two, section one, and following for discussion of Williams' view of the effect of original sin on human faculties, in relation to his contemporaries.

¹⁹ See Chapter two, note 18, and related text. The distinction made by Williams, and Thomas Shepard I, between the public and private 'persons' of each individual does not have the quality of our contemporary understanding of the difference between private and public space and actions. Specifically, for Shepard and Williams, the use of the term 'public' to describe an individual's person or activity attached to a representative capacity. That is to say that Adam was a 'public' person as he represented all humankind in the action of sin, as (in the parallel drawn by Shepard in note 18) were members of Parliament, who represented the King's subjects in government. Williams' understanding of individuals' 'representative' responsibilities as members of a 'democraticall' commonwealth are

groups.¹⁹ The potential of any specific individual for the correct exercise of natural faculties in the service of promoting worldly order varied, of course. Individuals' natural capacities had to be improved by correct experience in formal education and observation of human society (as his had been), so that people would understand, by instructed reasoning, how it was that society should ideally function. By acts of will, taught by a reasoned assessment of experience, corrected and spurred by conscience, an individual might then act to support public order.

This leads to the second way in which Williams exact ideas about the Adamic inheritance affected the status of individuals in relation to social and civil order in present history, his distinction between 'publike' and 'private' life. For Williams, conscience was the key faculty exercised by individuals in assessing and preserving public order. In Williams' framework, a person acted in a public capacity when his or her actions concerned the status of social and civil order, whether promoting, or threatening it. It will become clear in the final section of this chapter that Williams' advocacy for separation of church and state and liberty of conscience were not based in a desire to expand the arena of 'private' action. The reverse was true: by endowing conscience with the capacity for the preservation of civil order, Williams implied its responsibility for that preservation. This meant that each individual, as he or she exercised natural conscience for the protection of public order, acted in a representative capacity, in the sense that he or she acted on behalf of, and out of responsibility to, all members of society. Writing of this 'representative' responsibility in his 1652 text, *The Examiner Defended*, Williams used the metaphor of the commonwealth, or society, as a ship at sea:

discussed in Chapter four, Section 2.3. See section three of this chapter for further discussion of the role Williams expected liberty of conscience to play in the preservation of public and private order.

The *Ship of the Commonwealth*...must share her *weals* and *woes* in *common*...Now in a ship there is a *whole*, and there is each *private cabin*. A *private* good engageth our desires for the *publike*, and raiseth *cares* and *fears* for the due prevention of *common evils*. ...Hence, not to *study*, and not to *endeavour* the *common good*, and to exempt our selves from the sense of *common evil*, is a *treacherous Baseness*, a *selfish Monopoly*, a kinde of *Tyranny*, and tendeth to the destruction both of *Cabin* and *Ship*, that is, of *private* and *publike* safety.²⁰

As is clear from this text, Williams believed that all people had public responsibilities to protect social order. But beyond that, the text showed Williams to assume that selfish interest is a fact of human history, and that we must depend on human rationality, natural reason, to engage private interest, or it will certainly become corrosive. Williams here reminded people that to preserve both private and public safety, conscience must 'engage' selfish interest: prompted by conscience, each individual will see that the fulfilment of private interest is tied inextricably to the 'common good,' and act to restrain its excesses accordingly. In this way, Williams' understanding of the activity of conscience, derived from his interpretation of original sin, created conscience in a much more 'public' role than did Shepard, or John Cotton, Williams' primary Massachusetts opponent in his published exchanges of the 1650s and 50s. While put in very different terms, this sentiment can almost be seen as Williams version of what Alexis De Tocqueville identified as 'self interest, rightly understood.'²¹ Of course, Williams was operating with an entirely different set of

²⁰ 'Esau and Jacobs Mystical Harmony Unvailling...' (1666) p. 33, also Chapter two, section one. 'For Williams the universality of original sin implied an equality of all humans, even if that equality was based in equal corruption and culpability.'

²¹ *The Examiner Defended* (1652), CW VII, p. 203. Williams' most famous use of this metaphor was in his letter 'To the Town of Providence, ca. January 1654/55,' (*Correspondence*, II, pp. 423, 424) often called the 'ship of state' letter. This letter and the conflict which precipitated its writing will be discussed in Chapter five, 'Challenges to Civil Order, and Historical Remedies,' section three, 'Conscience and Positive Law.'

²¹ Alexis De Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, 2 Volumes (1835, 1840) (New York: Vintage Books, 1945) Vol. II, p. 129, and following.

perimeters (De Tocqueville assumed the rational potential of individuals without explicit reference to original sin), and observing an entirely different kind of society. The broad point that people must understand their personal safety and prosperity to be tied to the safety and prosperity of the whole commonwealth remains the same, nonetheless. The 1652 text shows exactly how important a detailed understanding of Williams' account of original sin and its effects on the status of individuals is, to begin to understand how he expected order in society to function in the present day.

However important the effects of 'natural history' on individuals, understanding its effect on whole peoples or nations is just as significant for building a correct picture of where Williams thought public order originated, and how it worked in present life. Williams understood the term 'nation' to refer to one sovereign 'people,' which might have any one of several modes of government.²² As will be developed in Chapter four, Williams believed particular governments derived their power from the people, (although the necessity of government was established by God) and that the people could not endow a government with a commission to effect anything but what the people were themselves capable of. Corrupt individuals could certainly not invest government with the authority to establish a true church, for instance. However, the crucial historical moment which defined the status of all present nations, whatever their traditions of government, was not the moment of Adam's Fall as it was for individuals, but the moment of Christ's resurrection. Again, Williams understanding of the status and potential of nations in present life derived

²² Williams' assessment of the basis of sovereignty, and foundation of different traditions of government will be explored in Chapter four. Williams believed a true government must originate in the will of the people. However, he maintained that all traditions of government were equal in historical status: the particular form government took was only a function of the will of a particular people, and their national traditions. Writing of civil government after the end of the covenanted position of Israel, Williams said: 'It is not so [that they inherit the civil commission of David's royal line] with the Gentile Princes. Rulers and Magistrates, (whether *Monarchicall*, *Aristocraticall*, or *Democraticall*) who (though *government* in generall be from *God*, yet) receive their *callings*, *power*

utterly from his interpretation of Scriptural history. Before Christ's advent in human history, Williams understood God to have made a national covenant with the state of Israel, which endowed the civil government of Israel to act to conform individuals to the covenanted ideal for worship and life.²¹ Moreover, Williams argued, '...the people of Israel were all the Seed or Off-spring of one man *Abraham*, *Psal.105.6*. and so downward the seed of *Isaac* and *Jacob*...distinguished into twelve *Tribes* all sprung out of *Israels* Loynes.'²² This text shows that Williams considered the Israelites seminal attachment to Abraham to be much more important than their descent from Adam, in relation to the continuation of the national covenant, and the pursuant powers that covenant offered the state: a message echoed in his later work.²³ Christ's redemption of an elect few served to end the covenant with the nation Israel, and transfer it to the invisible church. As Williams somewhat elliptically put it, 'Onely the Spirituall *Israel* and Seed of *God* New-borne...they only that are *Christs* are only *Abrahams* Seed and Heires according to the promise.'²⁴ The effect of the end of Israel's national covenant, for Williams an historical reality, was that 'Doubtlesse that *Canaan* Land was not a patterne for all [or any] *Lands*: It was a *none-such*, *unparalleled* and unmatchable.'²⁵ The effect of history on present peoples was that no

and authority; (both *Kings* and *Parliaments*) mediately from the people.' *The Bloudy Tenent* (1644), CW III, p. 343.

²¹ See Chapter two, section two for Williams rejection of Mosaic patterns, or types for present governments: Williams urged people to be wary of 'the danger and mischief of bringing Moses his Pattern into the Kingdomes now since Jesus Christ his Coming.' *Queries of Highest Consideration* (1644), CW II, pp. 274. See Chapter two, section two, for the use of such 'patterns' by Williams' Massachusetts contemporaries.

²² *The Bloudy Tenent* (1644), CW III, p. 323.

²³ 'Esau and Jacobs Mystical Harmony Unvailing...' (1666), p. 32. Williams referred to the historical covenant with the Jews as 'manifestation of our Eternal Jehovahs blessed will (with Types & Visions) Especially unto o^r fore Father Abraham and our Father Isaac; That in y^e free borne promised seed; He would reveale the invisible Glorie of his Eternal God=Head; And the Myserie of his blessed will, Concerning his created man (then) visibly representing the universal man=hood.'

²⁴ *The Bloudy Tenent* (1644), CW III, p. 323.

²⁵ *Ibid.*

nation had commission from God to enforce conformity to a true worship, or to build a godly commonwealth in present history.²⁸

Williams continued in the same section of *The Bloudy Tenent* (1644) to extend the analogy between the ethnic purity of a 'people' and its potential for covenanted status: where it was important to the Old Testament covenant that the Jews sprang from one seed, Williams argued that '...now, few Nations of the World but are a mixed Seed, the people of England especially [:] the Britaines, Picts, Romanes, Saxons, Danes and Normans, by a wonderfull providence of God being become one English people.'²⁹ Here he clearly celebrated the present unity and strength of the English people as a sovereign group, but just as clearly separated that ethnic status from any notion of national covenant. Williams' treatment of ethnic purity among 'civilised' nations paralleled his account of a universal equality among individuals, based in their natural 'bonds of humanity.' In his view, while England certainly provided an excellent example of civil habit and tradition of sovereignty, it had no special relationship with God, nor special place in history. All nations were equal after Christ's resurrection, or rather, all nations were equally without claim to chosen status, much in the same way that individuals were equally mired in sin. He declared that 'This taking away the difference between *Nation* and *Nation*, *Country* and *Country*, is most fully and admirably declared [in the vision given to Peter, Acts 10]...' and quashed any claim England might make to national election based in an inheritance of the Mosaic covenant, as over and above any other nation.³⁰

²⁸ Williams' account of liberty of conscience in relation to the ordering of commonwealths in present history, will be fully discussed in section three of this chapter.

²⁹ *The Bloudy Tenent* (1644), CW III, p. 323.

³⁰ *Ibid*, p. 327, 328. As will be developed in the first section of the next chapter, Williams did understand Providence and Providence Plantations to occupy an exceptional position in present history, but that exceptionalism derived from statutory liberty of conscience, not from national election or participation in the Moasaic covenant.

While understanding Williams' parallel reasoning to prove the equality of people and the equality of nations is interesting enough as an intellectual exercise, it is also tremendously significant to Williams' account of the origin of public order. Williams took the basest facts about the nature of people and of nations in present history, and founded his account of public order on them: what for others were hurdles to be orchestrated or legislated out of personal behaviour and nation-building, were for Williams the seeds of public order. Williams banked on humans' equal potential, with correct education, to exercise natural conscience as the mechanism that would 'engage' selfish interests to the common good. And as will become apparent in the next and final sections of this chapter, Williams also relied on present nations' understanding of their true place in history to restrain them from restricting the exercise of this natural conscience.¹¹ None of this is to argue that Williams' God was a 'blind watchmaker' uninterested in the progress of individuals or nations in human history: Williams fervently wished that '...the *Steersmen* of the *Nations* might... Be wise and kisse the Sonne, lest he goe on in this His Dreadfull anger, and dash them in peeces here and eternally.'¹² Indeed, the only way in which nations could receive God's good favour, and escape God's wrath in present history was to end the establishment of national churches, and tolerate all consciences. Pointing out that in present history 'The holy Seed have mingled themselves,' Williams asked:

¹¹ See Chapter two, section one, for discussion of the difficulty of distinguishing the voice of God from other influences or delusions which might be present in the voice of conscience. 'Conscience was a tool, which like any other, could be used badly.' The fact that conscience might be mistaken did not indicate to Williams that it should be restrained, however: to extend the previous analogy, just because persons injured themselves with saw and hammers was not reason to forbid their use in building houses. It was, however, certainly reason to provide for public instruction in, as well as regulation and promotion of, correct use.

¹² *The Bloudy Tenent* (1644). CW III, p. 326. Williams referred here specifically to the civil war and religious conflict in England at the time of publication as the result of Christ's wrath at England's establishment of national churches and persecution of dissenting consciences.

Are not all the Nations of the Earth alike cleane unto God, or rather alike uncleane, untill it pleaseth the Father of mercies to call some out to the Knowledge and Grace of his Sonne, making them to see their filthinesse and strangenesse from the Commonweale of Israel, and to washe in the bloud of the Lambe of God [?]¹³

God was attentive to the progress of nations in present history, but would bestow the blessings of peace and prosperity only on those nations which ‘washed in the bloud of the Lambe.’ Williams’ shorthand for accepting their status after Christ’s resurrection. Of course, his idea of what would induce God’s favour was diametrically opposed to that of many of his Massachusetts clerical contemporaries: their ‘jeremiad’ sermons urged civil endorsement of orderly churches, particularly to avoid God’s censure.¹⁴

In Roger Williams’ political thought, the bases for public order in contemporary society originated in his interpretation of history, and its effects on the status of individuals, and of nations. For him, the particular history of individuals meant that the pursuit of selfish interests would always be corrosive to the common good, but that this reality could not be engineered out of people: whether elect or unregenerate, individual nature was not perfectible during Earthly life. The specific form these selfish interests took in Williams’ observation of the events of own political life and that of Providence Plantations will be addressed in Chapter five, which examines challenges to civil order, and the ‘historical’ remedies Williams prescribed for them, as he sought to negotiate the relationship between individual interest and obligation to the commonweal. The salutary effect of history on individuals meant that with proper education and instruction, people shared an equal

¹³ *The Bloody Tenent* (1644), CW III, p. 327.

¹⁴ See Chapter two, section two, for examples of this assumption in the sermons of John Higginson (1616-1708), and Thomas Shepard III, (1658-1685). Higginson, *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, MA: Samuel Green, 1663); Shepard, *Shepard Family Manuscripts*, Mss. ‘S’, Boxes ‘S’, 1 box, folder 8 (1678, 79, 80).

capacity through the exercise of conscience to train their private interests to the service of public order.

Williams would turn the great tragedy of human existence, inheritance of original sin, into an important basis of safety and security in present life. The effect of history on nations, in Williams' framework, meant that individuals could not look to nations to reform their human natures and selfish interest. Attempts to perfect the behaviour of a people by force would only lead to God's wrath, and to destruction and disorder rather than prosperity and safety. It is important to remember that for Williams, public order was an order based in individual corruption and the historical disinheritance of nations: it was always the lesser of evils. His goal, in promoting public order, was to provide the conditions in the 'field of the world' under which good seed that happened to fall on 'honest soil' would have a chance of producing fruit, and he recognised that the conditions that would protect that seed would necessarily aid the growth of many 'tares' at the same time. He sought these conditions for all governments of nations, not just his own, particularly because the elect would '...be gathered out of *Jew and Gentile, Pagan, [and] Anti-Christian.*'³⁵ History remained unfinished for Williams, but he waited for the establishment of true order, the order of the tended garden, at the time of God's final harvest.

Section Two: The Quality and Function of Public Order in Present History

The previous section examined Roger Williams' thoughts on the origin and foundations of order in present life; this section will look closely at his notion of how that order should function, and what its particular characteristics were. In other

³⁵ *The Bloudy Tenent* (1644), CW III, p. 104.

words, this section will answer the question of what exactly Williams expected society to gain from the particular version of public order he sought, and how he thought that order would be created and preserved. The final section of the chapter will consider Williams' liberty of conscience, the founding policy necessary to condition individuals to a habit of preserved order. This section will confine itself to anatomizing his account of civil order, founded in the historical origins already discussed. Williams' attempts to re-create this ideal in the practical project of constructing the civil order of Providence, and Providence Plantations will be developed in Chapter four.

As has been articulated already, Williams expected the exercise of individual conscience to provide the mechanism by which selfish, private interests would be 'engaged' for the good of the whole commonwealth. After a brief explanation of what Williams meant by politics, and political advocacy, this section will elaborate on the elevation of the public importance of conscience explicit in Williams' account. The argument will examine the nature of its collaborative function with the collective institutions of civil life, assessing the relationship Williams sought between individual conscience and civil institutions, and how he thought conscience should be instructed to work properly to support civil obedience. Finally, this section will explore and assess the public peace Williams thought would result from this successful collaboration. It is important to establish exactly what it was that Williams meant, when he referred to the 'common good,' not only as a precursor to discussing his view of the role of the state institutions in Chapter four, but also to explain the finite goal of his own political advocacy in Providence Plantations. If commonwealths were subject to God's punishment for the perversion of national status in present history, convincing nations to behave in ways of which God approved was of tantamount

importance: to the commonwealth which could achieve a correct understanding of its position and structure its state accordingly would accrue great benefits.

Politics, or the wise exercise of political power, for Williams, meant integrating the activity of the various institutions of present history in collaboration with the natural consciences of individuals, to conform individual activity to the goals of the commonwealth, and thus ensure civil peace. Writing in 1644, while in London lobbying for Providence Plantations' first patent, Roger Williams called on combatants in the ongoing controversy over correct church government to seek the '...Counsel of the great and wisest Politician that ever was, the Lord Jesus Christ.'³⁶

Williams meant that civil peace around the issue of church establishment and governance could only be achieved by emulating Christ's humility in the face of civil authority's power in present history, and his (by Williams' reading) toleration of ungodly worships amongst the true elect, as set out in the parable of the Tares, in Matthew 13. The description shows a dimension to Williams' understanding of the place of 'politics' and politicians beyond that of present perception of the term.

Williams understood 'politics' to refer to the process of balancing of the material needs of people in current history with the ultimate truth of God's coming Revelation. His goal was to establish the social order which would best ensure the elect's safety. However, the conditions which achieved this would also prove least painful and most beneficial to the unregenerate: in the 'field of the world,' Williams argued, conditions which secured the 'growth' of the elect could not be delivered to them without also benefiting the unregenerate, who were mingled in amongst them. As such, Williams' 'politics,' which he understood as 'policie' regarding a particular issue, was entirely a worldly, natural contingency. What he referred to as 'humane,' or 'contrived policie,'

³⁶ *Queries of Highest Consideration* (1644). CW II, p. 274.

could never effect the transformation of the field into the garden.¹⁷ Even so, Williams expected correctly exercised 'human policie' to place less emphasis on advocating for power advantage within state institutions, and more on negotiating the construction and preservation of a secure civil society. Even as a tool of natural history, politics (policie) should never be played in service of covetous or selfish interest, by Williams' account.¹⁸ As will be explored in Chapter five, Williams political interest thus encompassed individual, household, and economic behaviour, in addition to particularly state affairs. He was appalled by the use of politics and the political process for what he considered private, or self-oriented ends, including advocacy to secure personal economic advantage in trade, or control of property in the distribution of land.

Understanding Roger Williams' elevation of the faculty conscience, attaching to it a public importance for the conforming of private interest to the common good, requires a brief reprise of the dualism present in Williams' cataloguing of natural and saving conscience.¹⁹ Williams assumed that all people possessed natural conscience, and though it might be used poorly or perverted by other influences, with the best

¹⁷ 'Esau and Jacobs Mystical Harmony Unvail...'(1666), p. 95. In context, Williams made exactly this point in the text: writing as Jacob, re-telling the story of his reconciliation with Esau, Williams specified that although Jacob had applied his human reason and 'contrived policie' to the problem of mitigating Esau's presumed anger, these tools were ultimately ineffective, and unnecessary in God's reconciliation of them. Here the brothers' reconciliation stood for the same thing as the 'order of the garden,' metaphorically, as Williams distinguished the conditions of present history from God's instituted order following the eschaton.

¹⁸ It is instructive to compare Williams' positive assessment of 'politics' in this context with his absolute condemnation of power-seeking for selfish ends, or as an end in itself, which he typified as 'Machiavellian.' See for one example, Williams' condemnation of recent assassinations among Narragansetts and intrigues between Mianatunomi and Canonicus: 'Their treacheries exceede Machiavills, etc.' 'To John Winthrop, 10 July, 1637,' *Correspondence* I, p. 94. This is not to imply, however, that Williams rejected the cultivation or use of strategic advantage in protecting the peace of the commonwealth, a goal he might interpret widely. See for example his further advice to John Winthrop, the following Spring, where he intentionally misquoted Juvenal, (satire 8, 180) to indicate that the English should seek advantage by punishing unruly tribes lightly. 'To John Winthrop, 27 May, 1638,' *Correspondence* I, p. 156.

¹⁹ See Chapter two, section one for the distinction Williams made between the faculties natural and saving conscience, in relation to reason, and for the detailed examination of Williams' treatment of conscience in relation to a variety of contemporaries.

instruction and support from institutions of civil life, it would function as ‘...an *Excuser* and *Accuser*; a *Secretary*, a *Sergeant*, and *Adversary*, a *Judge*, and *Executioner*, within the bosome of all mankinde.’⁴⁰ The elect would also experience evidences of saving Grace with the aid of conscience, but that saving function of conscience did not relate to their civil, public lives, except as it might serve to make them more obedient to the institutions of the civil state, as instructed by the injunction to ‘render unto Caesar that which is Caesar’s’ of Romans 13. Saving conscience was not what Williams was interested in, when he assumed the public importance of conscience for ‘engaging’ private interest to the common good. It was natural conscience that he elevated to that conforming, public position, which he re-made into a public faculty, touching all aspects of human interaction and activity in civil life. Natural conscience was established as a human faculty by God as well as saving conscience, but was for a very different purpose, as similarly civil government was established by God, but not for the purpose of saving human souls.

Williams assumed that saving conscience, exercised in relation to private matters by the elect, would never threaten public order. Indeed he was far more concerned to prove the possibility of the unregenerate behaving with civility, than with proving evidence of civil obedience as a fruit of election. As he wrote in *The Bloody Tenent* (1644) in a section devoted to explaining why the elect had no more commission to purify the field of the world than did civil magistrates:

And therefore as *Gods people* are commanded, *Jer. 29.* to pray for the peace of *materiall Babell*, wherein they were captivated, and *1 Tim. 2.* to pray for all men, and specially *Kings and Governors*, that in the peace of the *civill State* they may have peace...*obedience* to the command of *Christ* to let the *tares* alone, will prove the onely meanes to preserve their *Civill Peace*, and that

⁴⁰ *The Bloody Tenent Yet More Bloody* (1652), CW IV, p. 241. See also Chapter two, section one.

without obedience to this command of Christ, it is impossible...to preserve the *civill* peace.⁴¹

Williams assumed that '*Gods people*' would practice obedience to civil rulers, assuming the correct institution of civil authority, that is, civil toleration of conscience. As Williams would (characteristically) repeat, 'the *Saints*... are to pray for *all men*, especially for all *Magistrates* (of what sort or *Religions* soever) and to seeke the peace of the City (what ever City it be) because in the Peace of the place... Gods people have peace also.'⁴²

But this injunction assumed a 'city' which understood the effect of history on its remit: God's elect living in a nation that perverted its historical status by trying to enforce an established church were not being disobedient when they resisted efforts of civil authorities to force them to conformity with a false church institution, though their activity threatened the civil peace. Their activity only seemed to indicate resistance to civil authority because of their immediate government's perversion of its historical status. This explains how Williams could argue that the elect would never pose a threat to public order with a straight face, given that he himself had actively threatened the very foundation of the Massachusetts Bay Charter in the name of 'conscience.'⁴³ Thus evaluations of the civil behaviour of the elect had to take into account the situation in which they lived, and states that did not allow a civil liberty of conscience would indeed be legitimately challenged by the elect's exercise of saving conscience. In a nation that understood its historical position, and structured its statutes accordingly, the exercise of saving conscience by the elect could never, in Williams' view, disturb public order and peace, and could only enhance it.

⁴¹ *The Bloudy Tenent* (1644), CW III, p. 112.

⁴² *Ibid*, p. 115.

If an elect person did behave in such a way as to threaten public order, pursuing ‘ungodly practices’ (Williams acknowledged that this was a possibility, given that the elect were still only natural men and women). Williams argued that they did so ‘...not then of Ignorance, but of Negligence, and *spirituall hardnes*, against the wayes of Gods feare.’⁴¹ If a member of the elect exercised saving conscience in a way that threatened civil order in a correctly instituted state, he or she was not listening well enough to conscience’s true voice. In this position, Williams’ argument echoed exactly John Cotton’s reasoning when he insisted in his private letter to Williams (London: 1643) that Massachusetts Bay only took civil action against people who were acting *against* their true consciences, never against those who acted *out of* conscience.⁴² The difference was that Cotton believed civil states had a duty in present history to act support the true church, and Williams obviously rejected this capacity. Because the elect were still only natural men and women, they might also exercise natural conscience, and mistake that natural knowledge for saving: if this happened, then when the civil authority acted against them, they acted to regulate natural, not saving conscience, to legitimately promote public order.

Of course, Williams acknowledged, along with many of his clerical contemporaries, the difficulty of discerning the difference between natural and saving conscience, in particular cases. But he did not, as even the most recent historical analysis of his political thought, by Timothy Hall assumes, distinguish between ‘religious’ and ‘civil’ conscience, but between saving and natural.⁴³ Here it is crucial

⁴¹ See Chapter one, section one, for discussion of the conditions of Williams’ banishment from Massachusetts Bay.

⁴² *Mr. Cotton’s Letter Examined and Answered* (1644), CW I, p. 363.

⁴³ See Chapter one, section three for discussion of the somewhat murky conditions behind the publication of Cotton’s letter, which Williams quoted extensively in *Mr. Cotton’s Letter Examined* (1644).

⁴⁴ Timothy L. Hall, *Separating Church and State: Roger Williams and Religious Liberty*, (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1998) pp. 103.

to refer to the exact manner of collaboration Williams expected between natural conscience and the institutions of the civil state to tie private interest to the public. Hall struggled to explain convincingly how Roger Williams could insist on what looked like the absolute removal of civil force from conscience, while clearly calling for the restraint of conscientious behaviour that he identified as threatening to public order.

Williams' position only seems paradoxical if interpreted in a liberal framework that presupposes the opposition of liberty and authority.⁴⁷ By Williams' reckoning, saving conscience would never threaten the peace of a properly instituted commonwealth, that is, one that recognized its limited historical status. Natural conscience, while playing a crucial role to identify and re-direct self-interest toward actions which served the common good, would never be sufficient by itself to secure obedience to the goals and necessities of the commonwealth as a whole. Williams was universally critical of all claims that government was unnecessary, or attempts to establish communities without governing institutions.⁴⁸ He believed that natural conscience needed instruction and correction to fulfil its purpose for 'engaging'

⁴⁷ See Chapter one, section two, for more details of this mistaken approach in relation to larger trends of historical interpretation of Williams' political thought. A corrected analysis of Williams' account of Liberty of conscience will be offered in the final section of this chapter. In addition to allowing the elect safety to practice the true worship in the 'field of the world,' liberty of conscience was the only possible statutory response a state could make to the historical status of nations. Moreover, conscience had to remain unrestricted by the state if the important role natural conscience played in Williams' account of the establishment and function of public order was to be fulfilled. However, liberty for natural conscience for Williams was only ever liberty for that faculty to promote obedience to civil authority. When it failed to do that, it needed instruction, regulation, and correction: this is why Williams assumed natural conscience was not sufficient to perpetuate public order on its own, without the collaboration of government and other institutions.

⁴⁸ Examples will be offered in Chapter four, section one, where Roger Williams' view of the foundations of the state and sovereignty are examined in some detail, as a precursor to an examination of his view of the remit and legitimate activity of government, in relation to other civil institutions. It was exactly in these terms that Williams' deplored the state of public order in the household and extended community attached to Samuel Gorton, who rejected the necessity for government institutions. It was also in these terms that Williams rejected 'Familist' position that the elect were not subject to spiritual or civil law in present history: he wrote scathingly of their tendency to '...under...pretences of great raptures of Love, deny all obedience to, of seeking after the pure Ordinances and appointments of the Lord Jesus.' *Mr. Cotton's Letter Examined and Answered* (1644),

private interest to the common good, that is, making individuals obedient to civil authorities. Williams expected the state, along with other institutions and habitual relationships that bound individuals, to participate in that instruction and correction. Neighbourly remonstrance with those acting out of accord with the peace and prosperity of the whole community was for Williams a real civil power and civil responsibility.

While the unregenerate, by Williams' account, had no access to saving conscience, he expected them to be exercising natural conscience as the elect did, in collaboration with the state and other civil institutions, in the service of public order. The question then is how exactly did Williams expect natural conscience to work, and what part of the public lives of all people did he expect it to touch? The answer lay in Williams' assumptions about the moral good of the different civil roles all people had to play if public order was to flourish, that is, if the exercise of natural conscience was to promote obedience to the common good.⁴⁹ In addition to the institutions of the state, Williams identified a complex network of smaller, but more intrusive civil institutions, and individual social roles that would act to train natural conscience in its proper direction. By seeking to act as a good father, a good wife, a good child, servant, or a good doctor, lawyer, or businessman, individuals trained, regulated, and corrected the exercise of others' natural conscience, as they fulfilled their own role, whatever it was. All people had definite places and roles to play in Williams account of civil society, and the natural conscience of each person, in whatever calling he or

CW I, p. 385. Such ordinances and appointments included adherence to civil law, which derived its authority from God, in Williams' framework.

⁴⁹ Here Williams' notion of different civil 'roles' individuals' played in natural history must be understood in relation to his and contemporaries' accounts of 'calling.' Calling refers to the object of self-scrutiny (or discernment of regenerative status, as part of Puritan piety), to establish individual suitability for, and progress in, a particular profession, position, or social role. For discussion of the social and economic importance of useful callings in seventeenth century England and Massachusetts,

she found him or herself, would be subtly regulated through his or her daily interaction with a myriad persons fulfilling their own distinct roles. Williams' scheme of stable public order functioned by an ongoing, mutual regulation and checking of private interest, and reached into households, marriages and other family relationships, and economic activity. Each person was simultaneously the guard of others, contingent on their relative position, and guarded by others, to ensure that their exercise of natural conscience was trained in the proper way, and they owned the good of preserving public order as part of their own private roles in life.

Williams was not alone among his immediate contemporaries in his account of conscience at the base of this network of interwoven authorities, which would result in social and civil order in present history. Developing the correct implications in present life of the fifth commandment, 'honour thy father and thy mother,' Thomas Shepard I evidenced a very similar understanding of the construction and maintenance of civility.³⁰ In the application of general precepts to the concerns of daily life for his congregation, Shepard was specific and explicit that the authority vested in a particular calling, or position must never be abdicated or backed away from, but should be exercised in such a way as likely to best encourage compliance. A supremely practical pastor, he listed as worthy of reproof those masters who 'cary it tow: inferiours w^l solemne lookes & surly countenances & [th]at w^lout any known cause,' or who overloaded his servants with work, or 'strike or offer to strike a wife,' child, or servant. Very much in line with Williams' understanding of how order should be constructed in civil society, Shepard (at the conclusion of the same section)

see Stephen Innes, *Creating the Commonwealth: The Economic Culture of Puritan New England*, (New York and London: W. W. Norton and Co., 1995) pp. 120-128.

³⁰ For detailed discussion of the importance of the fifth commandment to Williams, and others' understanding of sovereignty and civil authority, see Chapter four, section one. Understanding sovereignty in present history, as distinct from particular civil governments, to derive from Adam's

reminded his congregation that 'so God rules but by mercie strength not making obed: to issue for consc: if [th]^l.' (March: 2: 1644/5:) In other words, much as Williams did, Shepard expected conscience to be the ultimate engine of social conformity.⁵¹

Williams nowhere articulated this dependence on such a network of civil guardians explicitly, perhaps because he assumed he did not have to: by his account, individuals derived their civil identity only in relation to their positions or professions in society, whatever their spiritual status. As such, it would go without saying that those relationships, more than any idea of civil individualism in liberal terms, defined a person's civil identity within the commonwealth. Williams did make an explicit analogy between the God's institution of useful natural conditions, 'a good *Ayre*, a good *Ground*, a good *Tree*, a good *Sheepe*, &c.,' and God's institution of useful civil roles:

I say the same in Artificialls, a good *Garment*, a good *House*, a good *Sword*, a good *Ship*.

I also adde a good *City*, a good *Company* or *Corporation*, a good *Husband*, *Father*, *Master*.

Hence also we say, a good *Physician*, a good *Lawyer*, a good *Sea-man*, a good *Merchant*, a good *Pilot*, for such or such a *shoare* or *Harbour*, that is, Morally, Civilly good in their severall *Civill respects* and imployments.⁵²

By this explicit analogy, Williams made clear that he saw familial and professional callings as having a civil usefulness, as part of the natural order of society in present history. In order for the 'field of the world' to sustain the conditions securing the

patriarchal authority. Williams and Shepard both attached important civil implications to the commandment.

⁵¹ Thomas Shepard I, in *Shepard Family Papers* c1636-1681, Mss. Octavo Volumes 'S', Octavo Volume 2, American Antiquarian Society. The series of weekly sermons on the fifth commandment titled 'Catechisme' begins 26 January, 1644/45, and included detailed instruction on 'right carriage' in the wielding of, and submission to all forms of civil authority, including economical, (encompassing relations between wife and husband, father and mother and children, and servants and masters/mistresses), civil (anatomizing different forms of government, and the specific duties of the magistrate) ecclesiastical, and academicall (explaining the duties of instruction of children, and the authority vested in school masters). Quoted texts are from sermon of March 2, 1644/45, preached at Cambridge, Massachusetts.

⁵² *The Bloudy Tenent* (1644), CW III, p. 246.

safety of the elect in present history, these roles must serve their civil purpose effectively just as the rain must continue to fall, and sun continue to shine. The most influential non-governmental civil institution Williams identified was the family, or household, and the role of the father within it: Williams attached specific civil purposes to the responsibilities of the father/master and mother/mistress. That they should instruct their offspring and dependants in the correct exercise of natural conscience, that is, instil obedience to social and civil order in them, was fundamental to the function of public order in Roger Williams' account.⁵¹

The correct exercise of natural conscience would lead people to seek to correctly pursue their civil roles in life, and that fulfilment would give them a private stake in the regulation of others in their care, or with whom they came into civil contact. By this simple, but subtle method, Williams assumed that the exercise of natural conscience would tie individual private interest, engaging it with the common good. Far from leading to disorder and license, Williams understanding of natural conscience, rightly applied in civil society, endorsed social and civil authorities in more intrusive, and much more effective ways than the activity of the state alone could guarantee. The result would be a stable civil peace, the 'peace of the city,' in which individuals were tightly bound to one another, and to the state, yet the elect had freedom to pursue the true worship.

Section Three: Challenges to Public Order, and its Preservation

⁵¹ Williams' view of the civil aspects of fatherhood and motherhood will be examined in detail in Chapter four, in relation to the role of magistrates as civil officers. Though Williams did consider the family to be a civil institution (indeed the primary building block of a stable state), and fathers and mothers to be civil officers, he endowed them with greater *particular* powers than he did magistrates. Where civil magistrates were not given Scriptural guidance as to the particulars of their exercise of power, Williams noted that the New Testament gave much guidance '...expresly concerning the duty of *fathers, mothers, children, masters, servants, yea and of subjects toward Magistrates.*' *The Bloudy Tenent* (1644), CW III, p. 114.

It is easy to cast conflicts in early Providence's political life as struggles between individual conscience and the demand of obedience to an authoritarian 'common good,' but such a simple polar treatment misses the point, in relation to Roger Williams' approach. This is not to suggest that there was no such opposition, or that historical questions proceeding from such a liberal framework are illegitimate; it is simply that they obscure the internal logic of Williams' own account, in which he expected liberty of conscience to support obedience to authority. The project of this study is to identify and explain the inter-relation of Williams' founding political assumptions, to understand the practical relationship of conscience and civil order in his thought, not to judge his relative liberalism.⁵⁴ Neither conscience, nor civil order was an ultimate end in itself; for Williams both were simply concessions to the reign of Antichrist in contemporary history. Although it did remove state control over individual conscience, because Williams expected conscience correctly informed to produce obedience to common goals, liberty of conscience actually served order and authority, by his account. Roger Williams' excision of state control of, or responsibility for, the souls of its citizens, expressed as liberty of conscience, was simply the historically appropriate manifestation of his doctrine of separate spheres of

⁵⁴ Historical debate on this subject dominated Williams historiography from the late 1940s: typified by treatments by Vernon Parrington, James Ernst, Samuel Brockunier and amplified in relation to the foundation of liberty in American civilisation by John Dos Passos, accounts of Williams as a secular champion of individual liberty in a Jeffersonian model were challenged by Clarence S. Roddy, Mauro Calamandrei, Perry Miller, Alan Simpson, and Edmund Morgan among others since. See discussion in Chapter one, section two. Vernon Parrington, 'Roger Williams, Seeker,' in *Main Currents in American Thought I*, (NY: Harcourt Brace) pp. 62-75; James Ernst, *Roger Williams: New England Firebrand*, (NY: Macmillan, 1932); Samuel Brockunier, *The Irrepressible Democrat: Roger Williams*, (NY: Ronald Press, 1940); John Dos Passos, 'Roger Williams and the Planting of the Commonwealth in America,' in *The Ground We Stand On*, (NY: Harcourt Brace, 1941) pp. 21-158; Clarence Roddy, 'The Religious Thought of Roger Williams,' Ph. D. dissertation, New York University, 1948; Mauro Calamandrei, 'Neglected Aspects of Roger Williams' Thought,' *Church History*, 21(September, 1952) pp. 239-258; Perry Miller, *Roger Williams: His Contribution to the American Tradition*, (NY: Bobs-Merrill, 1953); Alan Simpson, 'How Democratic Was Roger Williams,' *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd Series, 13 (February, 1956) pp. 53-67; Edmund Morgan, *Roger Williams: The Church and State*, (NY: Harcourt Brace, 1967).

authority for spiritual and civil things. The doctrine of separate spheres was itself a product of his view that Christ's resurrection had ended the God's covenant with the Jewish nation, replacing it with an individual covenant of Grace extended to the elect. As has been developed, this meant that no current state could claim to be the inheritor of Israel's historical covenant.⁵⁶ Williams' developed view of liberty of conscience was fully stated in the colony's second charter, in 1663:

noe person within the sayd colonye, at any tyme hereafter, shall bee anywise molested, punished, disquieted, or call in question, for any differences in opinion of matters of religion, and doe not actually disturb the civill peace of sayd colonye; but that all and everye person and persons may...freelye and fully have and enjoye his and their owne judgment and consciences, in matters of religious concernments...they behaving peaceablie and quietlie, and not useinge this libertie to lycentiousnesse and profaneness...⁵⁶

Not to be misunderstood, Williams explicitly extended the Charter's protection to persons of all religious belief and unbelief, including "the most *Paganish, Jewish, Turkish, or Anti-Christian consciences and worships*."⁵⁷ His trade and relations with the Narragansett and other regional tribes made clear that he included them as much as any European in his vision, considering that people of all nations, European or otherwise, who numbered not among the God's 'elect' had equal status as 'heathens' in relation to the true Christian church.⁵⁸ Without the literal inheritance of Israel's covenant, no state could legitimately establish any spiritual belief or practice, and

⁵⁶ Williams believed that the Old Testament retained typological significance, but that Christ's sacrifice and resurrection had ended the covenant between God and the Jewish nation, manifested by the epoch of Mosaic law in human history. In place of the divine covenant with a nation, God instituted individual covenants with the elect remnant, by Grace. Therefore, the actions and lessons of Old Testament theocracies became patterns or 'types' for things within the spiritual sphere, not for civil institutions or policies. See Chapter two, Section Two, note 89 and related discussion of the typology of Old Testament theocracies.

⁵⁷ Charter, 8 July, 1663, *Records of Rhode Island*, II, pp5-6, as quoted in note 14, p. 541 of Glenn Lafantasia (ed.), *The Correspondence of Roger Williams, 1629-1682*, II. For further discussion of this provision of the charter, in relation to Williams' state, see Chapter four, Section 2.2, *The derivation and evolution of state power in Providence*.

⁵⁸ *The Bloudy Tenent of Persecution* (1644), CW III, p. 3.

⁵⁹ See CW VII, *Christenings make not Christians* (1645) for detail of Roger Williams' views on the equality (equal depravity) of 'natural' man across ethnic and national boundaries: 'Who then are the

civil toleration of diverse consciences was the necessary result. Additionally, the strong exercise of natural conscience was fundamental, by Williams' account, to make individuals obedient to the political and social mores of the community; liberty of conscience might have been an unhappy historical necessity, but it also might provide positive worldly benefits, for civil order.

It is important to be specific in describing Williams' version of toleration as particularly civil; he would certainly not ignore what he considered religious 'heresy,' letting divergent practices or faiths exist without challenge, but he objected to any use of the power of the civil state to address issues of belief. Rather, spiritual error should be opposed with the '*Sword of God's Spirit*, the *Word of God*,' not with civil sanction or physical suppression."⁴ He argued that because spiritual peace or perfection was an impossibility in this world, the magistrate or government which used civil power to enforce adherence to an orthodox belief committed a double sin. First it was guilty of the persecution it inflicted, 'Ungodly strife,' then of the heresy of assuming an illegitimate position of authority, usurping God's rightful and exclusive capacity to judge humanity. Williams was not alone among New England colonists in embracing a separation of civil and ecclesiastical institutions. (Massachusetts went as far as banning men from serving both as a magistrate and even as a lay spiritual leader) but he pushed such separation to its outer limits, excising even the most general responsibility for 'spiritual welfare' from the civil remit. As he wrote in the introduction to '*The Bloody Tenent of Persecution for Cause of Conscience*' (1644) immediately prior to the granting of Providence's first Charter, 'All Civill States with their Officers of Justice in their respective constitutions and administrations are

nations, heathen, or gentiles, in opposition to this *People of God*? I answer, All People, *civilized* as well as *uncivilized*, even the most famous States, Cities, and Kingdomes of the World...' p. 32.

⁴ *The Bloody Tenent* (1644) CW III, p. 3.

proved essentially Civil, and therefore not Judges, Governours, or Defendours of the Spiritual or Christian State and Worship."⁴⁰ He would echo this view, with only slight differences in wording and emphasis, through the text, as he successfully lobbied for the first Royal Patent for Providence Plantations, and throughout the body of his works, for the next thirty-plus years. Williams' view that a magistrate should act positively to protect liberty of conscience did not contradict the separation of civil and spiritual things.⁴¹ He expected churches to function like any other corporation or association within the civil structure, with the state as a neutral arbiter.

While his immediate compatriots in New England generally agreed that the state and church should stay separate, Williams followed this particular orthodoxy to its extreme implications, finding that the King could no more claim land as a Christian ruler in North America than his ministers could legitimately control church practices. If the foundation of his theology was the depravity of humans and an individual covenant of Grace between God and an undeserving remnant, and the true 'invisible' church would only be gathered at Christ's second coming, then accepting a separate sphere of spiritual authority was Williams' historical compromise to delineate the obligations of the elect to God and earthly life. As will be developed through examination of specific cases in Chapter five, Williams' endowment of the state with a positive role for protecting liberty of conscience allowed him to legitimate magisterial involvement in family life, and trade and business practice: by Williams' account, civil order required a collaboration between the powers of the state, strong exercise of individual conscience, and the conforming remonstrance of others in civil

⁴⁰ The justification and practical mechanics of this power, as Williams supported it, are discussed in Chapter five.

society. Persecution for 'cause of conscience' would prove both a spiritual, and worldly disaster, for Williams.

Theodore Bozeman described Roger Williams' religious liberty as a 'peace platform, designed to meet the dilemma of a fragmented and divided Christendom.'⁶² Certainly, the first point of Williams' 1644 *Bloudy Tenent*, as put with uncharacteristic simplicity in its opening sentence, was that '...the blood of so many hundred thousand soules of *Protestants* and *Papists*, spilt in the wars of *present* and *former Ages*, for their respective *Consciencs*, is not *required* nor *accepted* by *Jesus Christ* the *Prince of Peace*.'⁶³ As Williams had it, by Bozeman's account, simple historical observation demonstrated that persecution was a source of civil disorder, '...the greatest occasion of *civill Warre*,' a disorder to be remedied by liberty of conscience.'⁶⁴ It is certainly true that Williams identified persecution of dissenting religious practice as a primary source of civil, not to mention spiritual, disorder, in England's present and immediate past. But his perception of persecution as a source of civil disorder, and the mechanics of the real political remedy he offered, were more complex than the simple equation Bozeman suggested. It was not just that civil

⁶² Theodore Dwight Bozeman, 'Religious Liberty and the Problem of Order in Early Rhode Island,' *The New England Quarterly*, 45 (1972) p. 62. Bozeman was correct in identifying Williams' argument that persecution had led to great bloodshed and civil strife, historically, and thus liberty of conscience would remove that source of violent disorder. Bozeman did not, however, mention the enhanced political obligation, visible in civil obedience, that Williams thought would derive from the unrestricted, correct exercise of conscience. Rather he based his conclusion that Williams found no contradiction between 'soul liberty' and civil order entirely on the basis of Williams' willingness to 'uphold the stern use of the [civil] "sword," limited to its proper sphere.' (p. 63) A more complete explanation would include notice of Williams' understanding that 1. soul liberty would lead to what looked, in worldly terms, like greater civil disorder, 2. free conscience correctly exercised would conform householders to their historical positions as stewards of Adamic sovereign authority, vested in the 'democraticall' commonwealth, and 3. restrict the political expression of covetous, self-oriented motives. See introductory section, note 4, for example and discussion of the civil disorder caused by incorrectly informed conscience, but also the specific positive role Williams expected from its correct exercise.

⁶³ *The Bloudy Tenent* (1644) CW III, p. 3.

⁶⁴ *Ibid*, p. 4. Bozeman juxtaposed this quote with one picked from further down the page, and one some three hundred pages removed in the text, to make his point. While the juxtaposition was not illegitimate, it did obscure Williams' more important introductory point that persecution also perverted

powers involved in religious disputes generated violence, but that persecution for (even mistaken) conscience would undermine the ordering of society, at all levels, according to Williams. Liberty of conscience, in other words, was not simply an expedient 'remedy' to the problem of governing a multi-sect/faith society. Free conscience would act positively in commonwealths to bind individuals to each other and to the state, as it reinforced their correct behaviour within callings and as political agents within the state. Williams did not seek to remove tension from society, but to provide historical remedies where possible to direct individuals to socially useful behaviour. Even in the opening sentence of the *Bloudy Tenent*, quoted above, Williams' lament was not that disorder and violence as such had resulted from persecution, but that this particular disorder was not only unnecessary, but built on premises that were positively offensive to God's plan for history as he understood it.

The civil problem posed by persecution had several different faces, as Williams perceived it: firstly, as Bozeman correctly described, it caused direct conflict as civil officers fought over what constituted true religion and correct practice, and then tried to enforce those 'truths' across the civil commonwealth. Recording the ecclesiastical history of England from the reign of Henry VIII, Williams wrote, 'It hath been *Englands* sinfull shame, to fashion & change their *Garments* and *Religions* with wondrous *ease* and *lightnesse*, as a *higher* [stronger, civil] *Power*, a *stronger Sword* hath prevailed.'⁶ Williams was explicit that the problem was not simply creating 'a whole *Nation of Hypocrites*,' but also the specifically civil threat to the bodies and goods of those who resisted, among them the

the progress of Grace in history, allowing for the '...ravishing of conscience, [the] persecution of Christ Jesus in his servants, and [thus] the hypocrisy and destruction of millions of souls.' (p. 4)

⁶ *The Bloudy Tenent* (1644), CW III, p. 137. The recitation of ecclesiastical changes and the tumult they caused was a familiar theme in Williams' writing. For other treatments of the same point, see also *The Bloudy Tenent*, pp. 325-6, *The Queries of Highest Consideration* (1644), CW II, p. 20, and *The Examiner Defended* (1652), CW VII, p. 205.

elect.”⁶⁶ Not just spiritual ‘soul-rape,’ but actual blood shed followed civil involvement in church matters, by Williams’ account of history. Indeed, the horrors of war between states ostensibly fought for religious purposes were part of God’s vengeance against commonwealths that attributed historically inappropriate powers to their civil rulers. But most importantly, persecution created hurdles for the operation of Grace in the lives of the elect, if they were prevented from following conscience against orthodox practice, whatever that might be, in the historical moment.

Williams was far from the only contemporary observer to comment on the ridiculous position the changes in civil religious institution created, as England’s ‘...Fathers made the Children Hereticks, and the Children the Fathers.’⁶⁷ On all sides of the toleration argument, even in New England, commentators lamented the disorder caused by wholesale changes in the ecclesiastical power structure. Using the same point to add practical support an anti-tolerationist position, Nathaniel Ward wrote in 1646, ‘Never was any people under the Sun, so sick of new opinions as *English-men*.’⁶⁸ Ward had fled Laudian persecution himself, and arrived in Massachusetts Bay in 1634, at the age of fifty-five. Settled at Ipswich, he would write the document which would become the Massachusetts Body of Liberties, in 1641, and railed against the power of human-created fashions in society, much the way Williams railed against the elevation of selfish motives in political advocacy. Both Williams and Ward abhorred the violent civil tumult resulting from English controversies over enforced ecclesiastical order, but that abhorrence complemented their diametrically opposed views of religious liberty: Williams in the *Bloudy Tenent* argued the remedy was toleration, Ward as the ‘Simple Cobbler of Aggawam’ argued the remedy was the

⁶⁶ Ibid, p. 136.

⁶⁷ *Queries of Highest Consideration* (1644), CW II, p. 20.

suppression of further dissent, which he understood as worldly decadence.

Further along the spectrum of opposition to toleration than Ward, Thomas Lechford nonetheless shared Williams' and Ward's fear of the threat to civil order inherent in religious changes: Lechford was sure that even that the relative separation of church and civil authority in Massachusetts Bay, lacking the presence of Bishops to oversee orthodox behaviour, could only result in '...*Anarchie and confusion*,' within the civil state.⁶⁹ Sending back a copy of *The Bloody Tenent Yet More Bloody...* Williams had sent her in 1652, Mrs. Anne Sadleir took this point up explicitly with him, writing that '...since it has bin left to everie mans conscience to fancie what religion he list, there has more christian blood bin shed, then in the ten persecutions.'⁷⁰ All three agreed that the changes in religious structure endorsed by respective civil powers in England over the past century had fundamentally unbalanced the civil order of the commonwealth. However, Williams' historical remedy involved a redefinition of the basis for government in such a way as to remove the threat posed by diverse

⁶⁹ Nathaniel Ward, 'The Simple Cobbler of Aggawam' (c. 1646), in eds. Alan Heimert and Andrew Delbanco, *The Puritans in America: a Narrative Anthology*, (Cambridge, Massachusetts and London, England: Harvard University Press, 1985), p. 182.

⁷⁰ Thomas Lechford, (1610?-1644) *Plain Dealing, or News from New England*, (1642) (New York and London: Johnson Reprint Corporation, 1969) p. 6. Lechford had arrived in Boston in 1638, an opponent of Laud's ceremonial reform within the Church of England, and the authority of Bishops over other ministers. He was, however, unconvinced by the Congregational model for church government, and wrote and argued against it. Although neither ministers nor magistrates at first paid Lechford little attention, he was called to recant his views (which he did) by the Court of Assistants in 1640. Disaffected with the Massachusetts experiment, Lechford returned to England in 1641, where he compiled a collection of letters and treatises defending episcopacy, published in 1642 and re-issued under the title *New England's Advice to Old England*, in 1644. Biographical detail from the introduction to the 1969 re-print, by Darrett B. Rutman.

⁷¹ Mrs. Anne Sadleir, 'From Mrs Anne Sadleir, ca. Summer or Fall 1652,' *Correspondence* I, p. 365. Mrs. Sadleir was the eldest daughter of Sir Edward Coke, and a devoted adherent to the Church of England and monarchy. As she wrote on an earlier letter, by way of explaining their correspondence, 'This Roger Williams when he was a youth would in a short hand take sermons, and speeches in the Star Chamber and present them to my dear father, he seing him so hopefull a youth, tooke such likeing to him that he put him in to suttons hospital and he was the second that was placed there[.] Full little did he think that he would have proved such a rebble to god the king and his cuntry. I leve his letters that, if ever he has the face to return into his native country Tyborn may give his wellcome.' *Correspondence* I, p. 359, note.

consciences, while both Ward and Lechford understood it to be more expedient, and correct, simply to removed the consciences themselves.

Liberty of conscience, as offered as an historical remedy to civil disorder by Williams, was not simply about the expedient removal of civil violence against dissenting consciences. The second 'face' of the civil disorder caused by persecution, by Williams' account, was that the restriction of conscience impaired the conforming of individuals to the common good, undermining their private relationships and callings, and ultimately their political obligation to the state. In his words, '...what hath this truly-ranting doctrine [persecution] (that plucks up all relations) wrought but confusion and combustion all the world over?'⁷¹ In this context it is worth remembering that he distinguished between 'natural,' and 'saving' conscience, believing the first to function in all humans, the second to apply only to the elect, as the gateway for Grace in present history.⁷² It was the exercise of natural conscience among the mass of unregenerate that Williams expected to promote their suppression of selfish interest in aid of the communal good, cementing civil 'relations.' This would be complemented by the exercise of saving conscience among the elect.

By reclaiming natural, tainted conscience as a positive good, in historical terms, Williams circumvented the logical problem many would-be supporters of toleration encountered, in having to create mechanisms to judge between natural and saving, wrongly informed and correct conscience, protecting saving while restricting the natural. John Cotton fell into this camp, arguing that he indeed endorsed liberty of conscience himself, but in cases where an individual remained resolutely convinced of a wrong opinion, he or she sinned against his or her conscience, not out of conscience.

⁷¹ *The Bloody Tenent Yet More Bloody...* (1652) CW IV, p. 207. Williams here made the ironic point that persecution was far more a threat to civil relations and institutions than the 'Ranters' sect, a sometime target of persecution.

In these cases, if every attempt to convince the individual of his or her error failed, it was clearly a mercy to coerce the individual back to true conscientious conviction.

Nathaniel Ward agreed broadly with this position, writing that liberty of conscience correctly understood was ‘...nothing but a freedome from sinne, and error.

Conscientia in tantum libera, in quantum ab errore liberata. And Liberty of Errour nothing but a Prison for Conscience.’⁷³ Therefore the kind of liberty of conscience that Williams proposed, Ward understood to be far greater hardship for individuals than civilly enforced orthodoxy, in the long run. As he had it, ‘...small will be the kindnesse of a State to build such Prisons for their Subjects.’⁷⁴ Although they shared Williams’ understanding of conscience as a powerful inducement to obedient living, liberty of conscience as Williams presented it, which restricted state coercion even of wrongly-convicted conscience, seemed anything but a remedy for civil strife.

The restriction of conscience posed problems for Williams, not only because it would restrict the access of Grace to the elect, but because a free and autonomous exercise of conscience did indeed form the basis for civil obedience, as he understood it. Because conscience was the mechanism for ensuring a householder knew and abided by his position in civil society, wielding his sovereign authority correctly, its restriction would upset the balance of forces creating civil peace. He took as common sense that changes in civilly enforced conscience, would not in any case produce tranquillity, because an individual being forced first one way and then another would find its pre-emptive power to prevent uncivil action, and its judging power to convict, diluted beyond the point of efficacy. As Williams put it:

⁷³ For discussion of Williams’ expectations of conscience as a human faculty, conditioned by original sin, see Chapter two, Section one, especially notes 44, 45.

⁷⁴ ‘Conscience is free only to the extent that it is free from error.’ Nathaniel Ward, ‘The Simple Cobbler of Aggawam’ (c.1646), p. 182.

⁷⁵ Ibid.

This binding and rebinding of conscience, contrary or without its own persuasion, so weakens and defiles it, that it (as all other faculties) loseth its strength, and the very nature of a common honest conscience.⁷⁵

Hence it was, by Williams' account, that where conscience had been forced to a civilly dictated orthodox belief, not only spiritual, but civil corruption and 'filthiness' had followed: he offered the reign of Queen Mary as primary evidence.

Williams understood conscience to act as the guide line ensuring orderly behaviour within all civil relationships, contracts, and political advocacy, ensuring the progress of a civil peace far exceeding the scope of positive law in people's relationships within a community. Recounting the threat posed to civil order by the conflation of heresy and treason, exemplified in the 1417 execution of Sir John Oldcastle, Lord Cobham, Williams asked:

If this [treating dissenting, even if mistaken, conscience as civil treason] be the touchstone of all obedience, will it not be the cut-throat of all civil relations, unions and covenants between Princes and people, and between the people and people?⁷⁶

By Williams' reasoning, assuming that anything except conscience convicted of the absolute 'truth' was treason, made anyone not among the elect necessarily a traitor, and incapable of fulfilling any civil calling. Would John Cotton really want to argue that '...he will not be a faithful *servant*, nor she a faithful *wife*, nor he a faithful *husband*, who grow false and disloyal to their *God*?' Williams' asked, text dripping with sarcasm.⁷⁷ Not to allow liberty of conscience as an historical remedy to civil disorder in the way he Williams advocated was to confuse natural and saving conscience, by his estimation. As he specified, following on from his jab at Cotton, '...*godliness* [election] is profitable in all things, all *estates*, all *relations*: yet there is a

⁷⁵ *The Bloody Tenent Yet More Bloody...* (1652), CW IV, pp. 209, with argument continuing on p. 210.

⁷⁶ *Ibid*, p. 207.

civil faithfulness, obedience, honesty, chastity, &c. even amongst such as own not *God* nor *Christ*.⁷⁸ Liberty of conscience, by Williams' reckoning, was the best historical remedy for all disruption and inappropriate behaviour of individuals within households, in the marketplace and social life of the wider community, and as political agents and subjects of a commonwealth.

As has been amply discussed, Williams considered conflict to be inevitable in present history: liberty of conscience, as an 'historical' remedy for the disorders allowed by persecution, would no more create absolute peace than enforced orthodoxy would.⁷⁹ This point is especially important, as Williams' detractors gloried in evidences abounding in Providence and Providence Plantations of disorder deriving specifically from 'soul liberty,' or 'poly-piety,' as Nathaniel Ward would contemptuously call it.⁸⁰ Williams had predicted correctly, when he avowed in 1636 to John Winthrop that he 'dared not' refuse liberty for all consciences, that it might very well produce what looked (by worldly standards) like greater incivility and civil disorder.⁸¹ He influenced and shared Sir Henry Vane's concern that the contentious people of Providence Plantations would hurt their cause (a renewed patent guaranteeing liberty of conscience) in England by giving all appearance of civil chaos. As Vane pleaded, 'Are there no wise men amongst you, no publike selfe denying spirits, that at least upon grounds of Common safety, Equitie and Prudence

⁷⁸ Ibid.

⁷⁹ Ibid, pp. 207, 208. For discussion of the natural and civil character of roles within personal relationships, professions and callings, see the final paragraphs of Chapter three, section two, *The Quality and Function of Public Order in Present History*.

⁸⁰ The root of this position was in Williams' separation of the 'garden' of spiritual truth, and the 'field of the world,' which humanity confounded at its peril. See introduction to Chapter three, *the Natural Order of History*. Williams developed this extended metaphor in the *Bloudy Tenent* (1644), amplifying the same idea in a different context in *Esau and Jacob's Mystical Harmony...* (1666).

⁸¹ Nathaniel Ward, 'The Simple Cobbler of Aggawam' (c. 1646), p.179.

⁸² Roger Williams, 'To Deputy Governor John Winthrop, before 25 August 1636,' *Correspondence I*, p. 54. '...yet dare I not despise a Libertie, wch the Lord seemeth to offer me if for mine owne or others peace.' cf. note 6, and related discussion in introductory section of this chapter.

can find out some way or meanes of Union and Reconcilement for You...?”⁸² Vane, and Williams, enjoined the householders of the towns to examine their consciences, and act accordingly to make the ‘...kindly and proper Remedies...’ of self-restraint and arbitration work. Specifically, Vane warned that the reports of civil disorder, and challenges to government needed to stop reaching England, ‘...especially since this state by the Last Letter from that Councell of State gave you the freedome, as Supposing that better use would have bene made of it than there hath bene?’⁸³ Williams maintained that conscience correctly functioning gave the only basis for a legitimate, albeit flawed, civil peace in present history.

⁸² Sir Henry Vane, ‘To the Magistrates and Householdiers of Providence Colony, 8 February 1653/54,’ *Correspondence II*, p. 784. The original, in Vane’s hand-writing, is in the Providence Town Papers, along with a copy in Williams’ own hand. *Providence Town Papers*, second series, I, p. 087.

⁸³ Ibid. The letter referred to is not included in the surviving public records of the time, however it is likely that the wording of the ‘liberty’ would have resembled that written by John Clarke in his petitions for the 1663 Royal Charter. See Chapter four, note 68, and related text: as Clarke wrote, asking for full liberty in ‘religious concernments’ that the ‘livelie experiment’ on Narragansett Bay could continue. ‘...true pyety... will give the best and greatest security to true sovereignty, and will lay in the hearts of men the strongest obligations to truer loyalty.’ Bartlett, *Records of Rhode Island, Vol. I*, pp. 490, 491.

Chapter Four: The State and Civil Order

Introductory: the purpose of government

Writing in a public letter to the town of Providence in early 1682, Roger Williams reminded his neighbours that ‘Govrment and Order in Families Towns etc. is the Ordinance of the most High (Rom. 13) for the peace and Good of Mankind...Till matters come to a Setled Govrment, No man is ordinarily sure of his Howse, Goods Land Catle Wife Children or Life.’¹ For Williams the purpose of government institutions in present history was to protect and order civil society, complementing the civil ends of patterns of household authority. State institutions were to remove immediate threats to physical safety and allow for secure living, in community, before the restitution of God’s ‘order of the garden,’ at the second coming. If history pointed only toward the eschaton, in Williams’ account, his state served the purpose of God in present history, where Christ’s spiritual agents were denied access to civil power: Williams’ state created circumstances in which Grace could enter the consciences of the elect, and spiritual authority could function within its remit, in present history. Charging it with the worldly protection of its citizens, Williams deprived his state of spiritual tools and any remit for the specific nurture of souls, but he took these purposes to serve God’s ends: Williams’ state might be exclusively civil, but his account of its institution and purpose, in historical context, was anything but secular.

This Chapter will examine Williams’ founding notions of the state, with particular attention to his understanding of the position of individual citizens within

¹ Roger Williams, ‘To the Town of Providence, 15 January 1681/82,’ *Correspondence II*, pp 774, 775. Complete text of this letter is attached to this study as ‘Appendix One.’

households, developing Williams' account of the 'political individual' in present history. Before drawing some general conclusions, it will also examine his view of the role of government, its officers, and their prerogatives, in relation to various of his immediate contemporaries. The chapter will begin with a section comparing Williams' account of sovereign power expressed in present history, and his assumed role for the state, to that of several notable contemporaries. Including discussion of the derivation of state authority from patriarchal authority within Williams' thought, this section will examine his account of the origin of civil power and the continuing necessity for its institutional exercise in present history. If the purpose of examining Williams' ideas about states in general, and Providence in particular is to explain the practical mechanics of civility within his system, it is important to include reminders of why a state structure remains a necessity.

A second section will examine Williams' understanding of the derivation of particular state powers and governmental forms, with a focus on questions of representation and obligation within his system. It will also develop a picture of the exceptional status Williams expected to accrue to Providence, or any particular commonwealth founded with liberty of conscience at the heart of its understanding of its sovereign commission. Specific attention will be given to developing a picture of the collaboration Williams expected to exist between the public role of state officers and that of householders as fathers, husbands, and masters, in relation to the civil and spiritual capacities of people in present history. A third section will examine Williams' general view of state officers and magistrates, in relation to his account of sovereignty and civility.

Discussion of these themes will lay the necessary foundation for the historical examination of Williams' political conflicts and advocacy in Providence and

Providence Plantations in the following chapter. It will consider in detail Williams' justification of civil power acting positively to protect and promote the free exercise of conscience within the colony, developing a picture of the spiritual purpose of Williams' state, in practice. This project will not be possible without examination of the derived powers of the state and its officers, in relation to individuals in Williams' account, undertaken here. As will become apparent, correct understanding of Williams' account of states, statecraft, and the obligations of citizens within a commonwealth depends on the full integration of his explicitly 'political' thought with the themes of the previous two chapters. Distinctions made between Williams' political and religious thought introduce a fallacious dichotomy: it was his understanding of the conditions of 'natural' history, and the imperative need for a particular civility to allow the progress of Grace in through history, which would inject such urgency into his explicitly political thought, and statecraft.

The reason for including detailed discussion of Williams' view of state institutions, and the political character of individuals, is two-fold. It would be state action, in Williams' attempts to remedy disruptions to the civil peace of Providence, which would firstly protect free conscience, crucial to God's entrance into the lives of the elect, and secondly, support conscience in a collaborative role, promoting civil order for the public good and safety of the colony. Understanding the practical workings of Williams' remedies for disorder in Providence, the project of the final Chapter of this study, necessitates an understanding of the assumptions and expectations about the character both of state institutions, and of their constituent individuals, in present history. As will become apparent in the discussions of Chapter five, the household played a crucial role in Williams' account of civil power in present history: understanding the theoretical and practical relationship of

households to state institutions is necessary. Further, much of the historical misinterpretation of Williams, even among recent commentators, results not from misunderstandings of his theology, or view of conscience, but from a failure to understand the position of his state in relation to the habit of worldly civility Williams intended it to serve.

Williams' account of legitimate state power was based on consent, but consent exercised by individuals in households, in civil relationships with their fellows, and in subjection to history: his political individual was no autonomous agent. By his account no one could absent him or herself from sovereign authority; all were subject to and participants in it. Developing an intricate picture of Williams understanding of the historical bases of governmental power, and its relation to the political individual, proves the crucial link between Williams' account of civility and resultant liberty of conscience, developed in the previous chapter, and his accounts of the real power of government institutions and their officers, in the following sections of this one. It is absolutely necessary to correctly understand how Williams constructed his 'political individual,' the agent of free conscience, in relation to the authority of the sovereign power. Only then will a successful examination of Williams' ideas about government function, the magistracy, and his later political advocacies be possible.

As will become apparent, Williams did not expect his state to achieve a static civil tranquillity, removing conflict from society: rather, he conceived of the state as a mechanism for reconciling the dynamic array of carnal interests present in civil society, the 'field of the world.' His state was to manage a web of tensions and conflicting prerogatives of its citizens. As such it would direct and support the particular role Williams described for natural conscience in ensuring behaviour

directed to the public good.² Following on from the detailed discussion of Williams' account of civility, order, and disorder within present history in the previous chapter, the project of this chapter is to examine Williams' historical state: how it was constructed, and how it worked, as part of the practical mechanism by which he thought civil peace would be achieved and preserved in Providence.

In Providence and Providence Plantations, Williams identified an historically unique opportunity (as he saw it) to foster the civil order truly ordained by Christ in present history. Building on modified notions of national election, Williams articulated an exceptional sovereignty for the small community, based in its status as a haven for refugees of conscience. As examined in the final section of the previous chapter, liberty of conscience and the excision of spiritual remit from civil power were essential preconditions for the civil peace Williams envisaged. Williams' state became the 'nursing father' of the church in present history first as it ensured the 'soul liberty' of its citizens. Order served Grace, as the saints were protected from spiritual distraction, and material destruction. To accord with Williams' account of civil order, the state was first a neutral protector of citizens' bodies and goods, an arbiter of their property negotiations and contracts, and released conscience to other authorities. Neutral, that is, in relation to citizens' individual interests: exercise of state power in aid of appropriate projects would protect all inhabitants in the responsibilities and status accorded to their respective social roles, and civil order would result.³

² Chapter five will examine this collaborative relationship in practice. Williams' view of the state fit logically with his expectations for the conforming power of conscience in the lives and callings of all citizens, regenerate and unregenerate. See preparatory discussion in Chapters two, and three.

³ For discussion of 'natural' quality of social roles, including professions, see Chapter three, section three. George Lee Haskins argued in *Law and Authority in Early Massachusetts* (New York: Macmillan, 1960) p. 45, that 'Even Roger Williams, always a liberal in theological matters, believed that anarchy would result if all were politically equal.' Ignoring Haskins adoption of the common error of labelling Williams' theology 'liberal,' his main point stands: although Williams expected government not to arbitrarily take the cause of one citizen over another or be give undue protection to any particular private interest, he absolutely expected government to endorse the ordered roles, with commensurate status and responsibilities, as present in contemporary history. As such Williams'

Williams' state, charged with preserving the exceptional commonwealth, was anything but neutral when it came to protecting the 'soul liberty' that he put at the base of its sovereign purpose. His state would correctly become the arbitrator of civil order, ever negotiating and maintaining the course toward which the commonwealth would tend.

Section One: the Necessity for government and political Sovereignty

1.1 Household, state, the individual, and the fifth commandment

Roger Williams' account of sovereignty derived directly from his theological outlook, and like his account of conscience, differed little in basic principles from those of his contemporaries. He distinguished clearly between the '...*Soveraigne, originall, and foundation of civill power,*' (which he took to rest with individual householders) and particular government institutions, '...the *Government* set up.'⁴ Williams rejected any notion of the Old Testament theocracies as models or 'types' for present governments. Christ's resurrection had ended the possibility of God's making a specific Covenant with a chosen nation: even if all power ultimately derived from God, legitimate civil power in present history would be based in '...the glorious Creation of this visible world; off [of] the descent, and multipli-cation (through time

government did pursue equality, but not a brand of individualistic equality measured by liberal commentators.

⁴ *The Bloudy Tenent* (1644), CW III, p. 249. The nature of householders as political agents will be considered in detail later in this section; Williams' understanding of the mechanisms of their representation of sovereign power, consent to government, and political obligation, will be developed in the next section.

and number) of the Generations of man-kind.’⁵ For Williams, this meant that what he referred to variously as ‘a Commonwealth, or an human combination, or society’ derived from a civil covenant between individuals, since as he put it, ‘the *Sovereign power of all Civill Authority is founded in the consent of the People.*’⁶

Williams believed that sovereign power in all nations originated from God, and derived from the consent (correctly understood) of individual householders, the people who inhabited the state.⁷ However, very much in line with his ideas about the position of people in their respective roles and callings within the social web, he expected individuals to understand their place in the historical genealogy of political power, as children of sovereign Adam. By implication, this meant that an individual householder was a political child of historical order. The individual was indeed central to Williams’ evolved notions of legitimate civil authority, but this individual was not himself a free historical agent.

Williams located the political individual in an explicitly patriarchal historical context. He made clear that it was the roles and relationships that bound individuals, structuring their lives, which properly defined their place within civil society: in this way he could claim that his version of legitimate government derived from the consent of the governed without creating individual householders as political agents with autonomous authority. While Williams did take legitimate government to derive from the consent of the individual householder, he understood that householder as a

⁵ Roger Williams, *Esau and Jacobs Mystical Harmony Unvailing...* (1666) Massachusetts Historical Society, Ms. N-313, p. 32. In this passage Williams affirmed the historical position of monarchy. The point accords with Williams’ rejection of the Old Testament theocracies as ‘types’ for any present government, expressed throughout his published works.

⁶ *The Bloudy Tenent* (1644), CW III, p. 214. Williams’ account of consent will be examined in the next section, in relation to the derivation of present civil powers from historical sources.

⁷ Williams’ account of consent, representation, and political obligation will be considered in section 2 of this chapter. Just as sons within a household by their filial duty and dependence on their father consented to his sovereignty within the household, Roger Williams expected his householder to understand himself as consenting to civil authority, owing subjection to his sovereign commonwealth based in its patriarchal inheritance from Adam, et al.

steward of civil power inherited from Adam's patriarchal authority, handed down through the '...universal multiplication of man=kind,' as Williams put it (more than once) in his 1666 treatise *Esau and Jacobs Mystical Harmony Unvailing*.⁸

Misunderstanding of this point has led many historians to over-emphasize the autonomy of the political individual within Williams' state, making questions about how Williams limited the state, or where he drew lines between state power and individual conscience, seem most important to understanding his political thought. In the most recent book-length study of Williams, Timothy Hall used a wide variety of Williams' writings and Correspondence to good effect, developing a useful picture of Williams' excision of the Mosaic covenant from sovereign power, and its implications for 'order and civility' within the state. However, Hall asked the wrong questions about Williams' account of sovereignty in trying to discover the respective 'limits' to the free exercise of conscience, and state power in Williams' account.⁹ While his conclusion that 'Williams did not simply define an inviolate area of conscience and then leave the government free to act in any manner outside this narrowly prescribed area,' is correct, his analytical goal, discerning what rules Williams applied to delineate the scope of conscience from government, exemplifies the over-emphasis of the political individual in his approach. These kinds of questions, looking for the respective 'limits' of Williams' state in relation to conscience, are at best a distraction from the real centre of Williams' ideas about states and their citizens, which concern obedience to civil peace, not the articulation of a 'private' sphere of the citizens' life.

⁸ *Esau and Jacobs Mystical Harmony Unvailing...* (1666), p.60. Williams devoted an extensive middle section to tracing the descent of the 'universal man=hood' through Adam and Eve to Seth, and then through Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob to Noah, and then through Noah's sons to present sovereign nations.

⁹ Timothy L. Hall, *Separating Church and State: Roger Williams and Religious Liberty*, (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1998) p. 109.

Edwin Gaustad, like Hall, betrayed a liberal influence in the questions he thought were suggested by Williams' 'Ship of State' letter (ca. 1654/55), in which Williams argued strongly that the exercise of free conscience did not imply a right to challenge the sovereignty of civil governments in the present day. Gaustad used the Letter to distinguish between the spiritual realm, where 'each individual was a law unto himself or herself,' and the political realm, where 'each individual had positive duties to perform, positive restraints to observe.'¹⁰ Again, a correct understanding of Williams' account of sovereignty should not lead the historian of his ideas to divide present civil life into private, individually dominated areas, and public, state-controlled ones. Doing this is to artificially impose liberal assumptions about the authority and status of individuals onto Williams' distinctly pre-liberal understanding of historical bases of sovereignty. Edmund Morgan largely escaped this particular historians' trap, examining the relation of civility and barbarism to the project of government, rather than focussing on 'the individual' in Williams' political thought. His study, however would have been enhanced by more explicit notice of the exact effect Williams' historical understanding of sovereign power had on this relationship.¹¹ Williams' political individual was not an 'owner' or originator of political power, only its steward in present history.

Williams relied on the well-ordered household not only to correct its subject members, but also to provide its head with a model of the kind of filial duty he owed the state. Putting the case in negative terms, arguing against setting a spiritual test to legitimise the civil authority within these relationships, Williams wrote that removing the civil power of '*Fathers, Husbands, [and] Masters,*' would 'at last confound all

¹⁰ Edwin Gaustad, *Liberty of Conscience: Roger Williams in America*, (Valley Forge, PA: Judson Press, 1999 [first published, 1991]) p. 147.

¹¹ Edmund S. Morgan, *Roger Williams: the Church and State*, (New York: Harcourt, Brace, & World, Inc., 1967) pp. 126-129. Morgan's study showed a sophisticated understanding, if not inclusion of, details of Williams' account of the effect of natural history on both people and governments.

Relations, and tear up by the roots all *Civility*, and all *Order*.’¹² It was no accident, then, that he emphasised the role of heads of households in the first short compact recognising thirteen additional men as subject inhabitants of Providence on the 20th of August, 1637. The agreement referred to their willingness to subject themselves to orders made ‘by the major consent of the present inhabitants, masters of families – incorporated together in a Town fellowship, and others whom they shall admit unto them only in civil things.’¹³ Williams worried about the effect that single men who were not heads of households would have on order within Providence: at such an early stage, before explicit institutions of government had been formed, disorder would pose a potent threat to the survival of the town, and thus to the experiment in sovereignty based in soul liberty. While certainly not the independent political agents that liberals would make them in latter years, Williams’ heads of households were present day representatives of the historical patriarchy, at the same time as they were in practical terms, the ‘fountain of power’ conforming each other to the demands of the common good within the daily life of the commonwealth he envisaged. As Williams would write in *the Bloudy Tenent* (1644), accompanied by the marginal note, *Civill Magistracie from the beginning of the World:*

...in *Civill State*, from the beginning of the World, God hath armed *Fathers*, *Masters*, *Magistrates*, to punish evill doers, that is such of whose actions *Fathers*, *Masters* *Magistrates* are to judge, and accordingly to punish such

¹² *The Examiner Defended* (1652) CW VII, p. 211.

¹³ John Russell Bartlett, ed. *Records of the Colony of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, in New England, Volume I, 1636-1663*, (Providence, RI: A Crawford Greene and Brother, 1856) p. 14. Hereafter *Records, Vol. I*. The men pledged to subject themselves ‘in active and passive obedience to all such orders or agreements as shall be made for the public good of the body in an orderly way, by the major consent of the present inhabitants, masters of families...’ It is very likely that Roger Williams wrote this compact: its language almost exactly matches sample covenant language that he sent in a letter to then Deputy Governor of Massachusetts, John Winthrop, dated 26 August, 1636. Williams’ asked Winthrop’s opinion of language stating that the incomers would ‘...promise to subject our selves in active or passive Obedience to such Orders and Agreements as shall be made from time to time, by the greater number of the present Howseholders of this towne.’ *Correspondence I*, p. 54. The date of Williams’ letter throws some doubt on the exact date of the record in Bartlett; Bartlett acknowledges that the date seems to have been added later, by another hand. Both documents, however, seem to be from later Summer, 1636.

sinner as transgresse against the good and peace of their Civill state,
*Families, Townes, Cities, Kingdomes...*¹⁴

In this passage Williams implicitly affirmed his understanding of sovereign power to be based in patriarchal authority, and explicitly confirmed his expectation that present states would be maintained by householders, heads of families. Family, or oeconomicall order correctly understood in historical context and in the present day, formed the basis of Williams' understanding of sovereignty.¹⁵

Though not speaking of Williams specifically, and not tracing the steps by which such derivation was accomplished, Stephen Foster identified this concept when he wrote of 'Puritan exegeticists' 'using the rhetorical device of synecdoche to transform "honour thy father and mother" into "obey thy governors."' Such transformation, as Foster affirmed, located the origin of present government authority in the civil relationships of the present world, deriving from the governed, but just as clearly '...gave government the status of a divine command.'¹⁶ He called this an arrangement made by 'that paradoxical being, the Puritan God,' but explained the seeming paradox, noting that:

The people, however, could not set up any government they found convenient. A state's powers and ends had to conform to the purposes for which God had established all government, and all rulers had to meet the standards he set. If men founded a government by contract, God wrote the terms.¹⁷

Foster may have been talking about the foundation of 'godly commonwealths' (specifically Thomas Hooker's ideas about the covenanted establishment of Connecticut in 1638) the likes of which Roger Williams found anathema, but

¹⁴ *The Bloudy Tenent* (1644), CW III, p. 108.

¹⁵ Whereas the *consent* of heads of households formed the basis for specific government, as distinct from general sovereign power. See discussion in beginning of next section.

¹⁶ 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) p. 67.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*

Williams would absolutely agree with the general premise. He simply understood God to have different 'purposes' for sovereignty than did men like Hooker.

Indeed Foster's analysis fits well with Williams' treatment of the fifth commandment as the basis of legitimate civil power. Considering the challenge of dealing with social misfits or troublemakers, Williams invoked the command to 'honour thy father and mother' almost as an aside, to endorse and underscore the power of the magistrate:

Whereas *Scandalous offendours* against *Parents*, against *Magistrates* in the 5 Command, and so against the *life, chastity, goods, or good name* in the rest, is properly transgression against the Civill State and Commonweale, or the worldly state of Men...¹⁸

Williams differed from his immediate contemporaries by locating state remit so firmly in the world, the field of present history. But as this text demonstrates, he shared their basic view of how the mechanics of civil authority, extending from the fifth commandment, should work. Williams assumed that patterns of authority in family relationships were, and were intended to be, practical analogues legitimising the position of local commonwealths.

In this his ideas paralleled those of Sir Robert Filmer, author (between 1635 and 1640) of the treatise *Patriarcha: a Defence of the Natural Power of Kings against the Unnatural Liberty of the People*.¹⁹ Filmer argued that all sovereign power originated in Adam's economical (family) authority:

¹⁸ *The Bloudy Tenent* (1644), CW III, p. 171. Williams went on in the paragraph to argue that because such 'scandalous offendours' sinned against the civil state, they should be suppressed by civil government, not by the church.

¹⁹ Peter Laslett, ed. *Patriarcha and Other Political Works of Sir Robert Filmer*, (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1949). The preceding quote is from Laslett's introduction, describing the project Filmer set out to consider in *Patriarcha*, p. 3. It is perfectly possible that some of Williams' New England contemporaries read the treatise, which Filmer circulated among friends in Kent, in the late 1630s, but there is no evidence that Thomas Shepard I or Williams himself had access to this circle. *Patriarcha* had recently been re-published; for its wider significance, see James Daly, *Sir Robert Filmer and English Political Thought*, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1979).

If Adam did or might exercise in his family the same jurisdiction which a King doth now in commonweal, then the kinds of power are not distinct. And though they may receive an accidental difference by the amplitude or extent of the bounds of the one beyond the other, yet since the like difference is also found in political estates, it follows that economical and political power differ in no otherwise than a little commonweal differs from a great one.²⁰

Filmer's theory of state power, therefore, depended on Adam's 'fatherly power.' As Edmund Morgan described it in reference to the opinions of the first generation of New England divines, in relation to their understanding of the role of families in social order, 'The state existed in embryo in the authority which God gave Adam over his family, an authority which was later stated in the fifth commandment.'²¹ Men like Roger Williams and his contemporaries understood the notion of Adam's 'embryonic' civil authority in the context of later Mosaic law, and took the fifth commandment's instruction, along with other Scriptural precedents, as a literal guide for responding to civil authority.

While Williams was away in England seeking the first Charter, Thomas Shepard I (1605-1649) delivered a series of sermons from his pulpit in Cambridge, Massachusetts which explicated the fifth commandment to instruct his congregation in proper obedience to its civil implications. Shepard accepted the present state of Massachusetts' inheritance of the Mosaic covenant, but was explicit that he was talking not about a 'particular expression of government,' but about the origin and end of sovereign power generally, in present history.²² In his sermon of March 2, 1644/45,

²⁰ Sir Robert Filmer, *Partriarcha*, Laslett edition, p. 78.

²¹ Edmund Morgan, *The Puritan Family: Religion and Domestic Relations in Seventeenth-Century New England*, (New York: Harper and Row, enlarged and revised edition, 1966) p. 134. For discussion of Filmer and political ideas of early New England in relation to gender issues, see Mary Beth Norton's introduction to *Founding Mothers and Fathers: Gendered Power and the Forming of American Society*, (NY: Alfred A. Knopf, 1996).

²² Thomas Shepard I, in *Shepard Family Papers* c1636-1681, Mss. Octavo Volumes 'S', Octavo Volume 2, American Antiquarian Society. The series of weekly sermons on the fifth commandment titled 'Catechisme' begins 26 January, 1644/45, and included detailed instruction on 'right carriage' in the wielding of, and submission to all forms of civil authority, including economical, (encompassing relations between wife and husband, father and mother and children, and servants and

he argued that an understanding of the origins of sovereign power in present history was fundamental to recognising the purpose of authority, that 'peace & holiness is [the] end of all government, oeconomically; ecclesiastically, politically.'²³

In a didactic style that would be familiar to readers of Williams' printed work, in which careful explanation of each term was necessary, Shepard began by addressing the questions. 'What is meant by honour,' and 'W^t is meant by father & mother.' In answer to the second, crucially, he connected family structure with civil authority, echoing Filmer's conclusions:

Ans 1: Oe naturall parents; the father [th]at begat us & [th]e mother [th]t brought us foal into [th]is world [...] 2: by these are meant all supiors; also; whether [th]ey be in [th]e family (as ha[th] bin sayd) [...] or polity...as princes are called nursing fathers Is. 49:23:²⁴

Like Filmer, and Williams, Shepard made clear to his congregation that the commandment did concern natural parents, their fathers and mothers to whom they owed filial duty in daily life, but also included all those in positions of civil authority in society. As he clarified, 'oeconomically or domesticall or household government [...] this is [th]e first orig. of all societies.'²⁵

In answer to the question, 'Why are all duties to supiours exprest under the name of honour to fathers & mothers,' Shepard continued, advising his congregation about what would happen if civil sovereignty, based in oeconomical authority broke down:

Ans 1. because this is [th]e foundation of all supiority & order amogst men [th]ere should never be [order] but for families never cities but for families of father & mother never master nor servant, nor prince nor people but for this

masters/mistresses), civil (anatomising different forms of government, and the specific duties of the magistrate) ecclesiastical, and academically (explaining the duties of instruction of children, and the authority vested in school masters).

²³ Ibid, 'March: 2: 1644/45.' Most, though not all of the sermons are dated, at weekly intervals.

²⁴ *Shepard Family Papers*, Octavo Volume 2.

²⁵ Ibid, 'April 13.45.'

[...] [if] [th]ese are over turnd cast off authority in commonwealth & wt followes? Murder adultery [th]eft plunderings & all confusion.²⁶

In this language he echoed Williams' expressed concerns to John Winthrop about unattached in-coming males in Providence posing a potential threat to civil order, some nine years later. Without a correct historical understanding of the place of the householder within society, in other words, Shepard and Williams were both certain that chaos would result. The fifth commandment had as much to say about how those in authority should wield power, as how they should be obeyed.²⁷ For both men, it was critical that householders understood the origin and purpose of present power, in order to exercise it correctly.

Shepard's language and examples typify early New England views of the historical origin of civil power; however there are some important differences from Williams' understanding of sovereignty. Significantly, Shepard endorsed a static ideal for the balance of power within the civil relationships from which his account of sovereignty derived. When he spoke about the correct conduct of a wife subject to her husband, or children subject to their father, or a citizen subject to the magistrate, he articulated a unique, unchanging ideal on which the correct function of civility depended. This assumption is reflected in, and itself suggests, his rhetorical style: his exegesis of the commandment 'honour thy father and mother' was not simply

²⁶ Ibid.

²⁷ cf. discussion of Williams' understanding of a 'network' of inter-woven and cross-checking roles as the basis for civility, Chapter three, section two. With specific reference to Shepard, "In the application of general precepts to the concerns of daily life for his congregation, Shepard was specific and explicit that the authority vested in a particular calling, or position must never be abdicated or backed away from, but should be exercised in such a way as likely to best encourage compliance. A supremely practical pastor, he listed as worthy of reproof those masters who 'cary it tow: inferiours w' solemne lookes & surly countenances & [th]at w'out any known cause,' or who overloaded his servants with work, or 'strike or offer to strike a wife,' child, or servant. Very much in line with Williams' understanding of how order should be constructed in civil society, Shepard (at the conclusion of the same section) reminded his congregation that 'so God rules but by mercie strength not making obed: to issue for consc: if [th]'. (March: 2: 1644/5:) In other words, much as Williams did, Shepard expected conscience to be the ultimate engine of social conformity.

experimental in its style of explication, but intensely logical as he sought to discover God's truth by casuistical syllogisms. In his sequence of sermons he began by defining the terms of the verse, before determining the truths or precepts that it suggested, and finally applying these precepts (with the aid of typological understanding of Scripture coupled with patriarchal understanding of origins of authority) to the specific condition of his congregation within the commonwealth.²⁸

What Shepard discovered in his scrutiny of the commandment, and communicated to his congregation, was a body of intensely detailed, specific directives for the particular cases in which they might have questions about how to exercise their patriarchal, or filial duty. Indeed he explicitly divided his account of sovereignty into tidy sections:

...now these are to be distinguished accord: to the severall societies wth men live; w^{ch} stand in need of government & wthout w^{ch} [th]^{ey} are & will be utterly overthrowne; w^{ch} are: 1: Families & 2: commonwealth 3: churches; 4; schooled; the government in the first is oeconomicall or domesticall, [th]e 2d politicall; the 3 sacred & ecclesiasticall; the 4th Scholasticall or Academicall.²⁹

He expected civility to 'be utterly overthrowne' in cases where the casuistical logic was either not applied appropriately, or where a 'supiour' acted out of anger, covetousness, or other selfish motives, perverting his sovereign authority. But Shepard was certain that his account of sovereignty would absolutely produce civil peace, which along with 'holiness' he had argued was the end of all power. These were static, and discoverable truths for him. Writing about Shepard and his contemporaries, Michael McGiffert described them as looking for '...security from

²⁸ For further discussion of the intellectual background and implications of seventeenth century New England rhetoric and rhetorical training, see Norman Fiering, *Moral Philosophy at Seventeenth Century Harvard*, (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1981). Fiering made a compelling argument for the importance of examining rhetorical training, that is, the way the seventeenth century New England ministers were taught to think about, and explain problems, to fully understand the meanings of the conclusions they reached.

²⁹ *Shepard Family Papers*, Octavo Volume 2, 'April 14.45.'

and within a system of ideas that was fairly clear, consistent, and stable,' and holding hard 'to the common principle of ideological uniformity.'³⁰ As McGiffert recorded Shepard writing to Hugh Peters, criticizing the tolerance of English Independents, '...there is but one truth (you know):' the process of discovering true sovereign authority and the particular account of that authority were for Shepard fixed points in the divine scheme.

Williams agreed that legitimate civil power was instituted with divine sanction, and that it was unique and indivisible within its remit. However, by his account, sovereignty was a worldly, 'fleshly' phenomenon, and therefore he came to see human discovery of it as a process not only subject to evolution, but necessarily changeable. For a man or woman to fully comprehend what Shepard referred to as 'God's plot,' or the exact position and composition of sovereignty within history, Williams came to view as an impossibility. Williams was clear that there could only be one true sovereign authority, the 'commission' from which a particular civil government of the commonwealth would derive: '...doubtles as Truth is but One, So but the one sort is True, and ought to be submitted to, and the contrary resisted...'³¹ Order would not happen by correct divination of rules of conduct (ala Shepard) as much as the harnessing of natural conscience to the common good, at least leaving Grace free to operate in history. To Williams it seemed ultimate hubris to pretend to discern the sovereign mind of God.

³⁰ Michael McGiffert, ed., *God's Plot: Puritan Spirituality in Thomas Shepard's Cambridge*, (revised and expanded edition) (Amherst, Massachusetts: University of Massachusetts Press, 1994, pp. 10, 11.

³¹ *Mr. Cotton's Letter Examined and Answered* (1644) CW Vol. I, p. 332, 331. Williams also implied a belief in one true civil authority, deriving from civil covenant with a ruler, in *Queries of Highest Consideration* (1644), CW, Vol. II, p. 265, as he developed the parallel idea of there being only one true church commission. In respect of identifying different areas of commissioned authority, his thought was similar to Shepard's: the great difference in their accounts rested in Williams' certainty, deriving from his particular typology, that the ecclesiastical commission, or sovereignty, was not a worldly, or civil issue, having been removed from 'fleshly' concern in Christ's resurrection. See discussion of Williams' typology, and its implications, in Chapter two.

1.2 Necessity

Williams differed from his Massachusetts and English contemporaries as he followed the implications of the extinction of divinely covenanted government to its logical extreme, in conjunction with his doctrine of separated spheres of spiritual and civil sovereignty, in present history. If Christ's resurrection had rendered as metaphor justifications of the civil state by the authority of divine covenant, until Christ's return no worldly government could resemble the New Jerusalem promised in Scripture. For Williams, this meant that no civil state could call itself Christian or claim divine ordination, even if its leaders were among the elect, than an individual could claim to be without sin. And no one, not even the regenerate for whom the voice of saving conscience added to that of natural, was without sin in present history. The state remained a necessity for Williams because he did not think natural conscience alone would ensure civil peace or continued liberty for conscience, themselves pre-requisite for the operation of Grace in saving conscience.

Under the best of circumstances, Williams expected natural conscience to lead the unregenerate to civil behaviour, but even in that best circumstance, natural qualities would still be driven by self-love or other worldly concerns. He was certain that the unregenerate were capable of civil behaviour, that '...Many Philosophers by naturall wisdome, and many civill and morall men, out of the principles of civility and morality, and sometimes for private ends,' would conform to state control, but relying on natural conscience alone was an impossibility, as it remained corrupted by self-interest.³² The elect had an advantage in aspiring to civil behaviour, but not one that would remove from them the potential for worldly sin: their edge was simply that they

³² *Experiments in Spiritual Life and Health* (1652), CW VII, p. 98.

were more likely to respond to criticism and correction with humility, acknowledging in it God's authority. In Williams' words, '...*Gods children* (as well as naturall men) may also act from *Rules of Reason*, and naturall wisdom, but withal they act from an higher *ground*, and *principle*, that is they see Gods...hand in the foulest *mouth*.'³³ Of course, even the elect were liable to ignore the correction of their neighbours, or pervert the voice of their own conscience, as '...*Gods champions* are sometimes strong, and sometimes weak, *strong* in some things, *weak* in others...'³⁴

Williams assumed not only that nations and governmental institutions were natural necessities, but that all people at all times would *naturally* seek to establish them.³⁵ As he put it after observing the practices of the Narragansett, writing in 1643, 'God having of one blood made all mankind, *Acts 17*. and all by nature being children of wrath, *Ephes. 2.*' 'The wildest of the sonnes of Men have ever found a necessity, (for preservation of themselves, their Families and Properties) to cast themselves into some Mould or forme of Government.'³⁶ Thomas Shepard I shared the expectation that all people would seek government, and that that government would serve to establish social order. He showed this implicitly in a context not dissimilar from Williams', allowing that with nothing to guide them in establishing civil order but '...y^e very light of Nature,' '...all well ordered common-wealths among the heathen...' observed the same basic concern for preserving social and civil order (in specific context, punishing fornication) as did colonial governments.³⁷ This assumption that however limited natural qualities were, they would (with natural

³³ Ibid, p. 99.

³⁴ Ibid, p. 97.

³⁵ Even those intentionally outside of civil society, 'robbers, pirates and rebels,' would institute some form of government, according to Williams. See his letter 'To the Town of Providence, 15 January 1681/82,' attached as 'Appendix One.'

³⁶ *A Key into the Languages of the Americas* (1643), CW I, pp. 81, 167.

³⁷ Thomas Shepard I (1605-1649) 'A Breefe Answer to a Breefe Discourse concerning the punishment of Theft single Fornication Rape, &c., &c...(1642?)' Massachusetts Archives; 87, p. 263. Massachusetts Historical Society.

conscience as the stimulus) lead to a preference for order over disorder, civility and peace over chaos and tumult was important, if government were to be established in the world at all.

Where people, elect or unregenerate, sought to avoid the necessity for government and related social and civil order, Williams took it to be a denial of their basic common bond of humanity. Williams' account of sovereignty, although relying on divine institution, functioned because of the natural predisposition toward order he assumed all people to share. A denial of the legitimacy of civil authority per se, (as opposed to resistance to a particular ill-founded government) whether on grounds that people could order their lives together without civil institutions and relationships, or that civil order itself was unnecessary, assaulted Williams' most basic assumptions about human inheritance of original sin, the fundamental truth at the base of his political thought.³⁸ It conflated the field of the world and the garden of God's church in present history, as surely as did a government enforcing religious conformity, though in different terms.

Williams' understanding of the necessity for civil institutions and relationships, as part of his account of legitimate sovereign authority, became very clear in the terms in which he rejected so-called 'Familist' positions causing conflict in Providence and other towns in the early 1640s. He would write scathingly in 1644 of their tendency to '...under...pretences of great raptures of Love, deny all obedience to, of seeking after the pure Ordinances and appointments of the Lord

³⁸ Understanding this dimension of Williams' account of sovereignty will prove vital to correct treatment of his conflict with the Quakers in Providence Plantations, which will be discussed in Chapter five. Although the Quakers did not reject the legitimacy of civil government per se, Williams found that their practices such as not doffing hats or using terms of respect undermined the network of social relationships fundamental to the preservation of civility, and as much deriving from his account of sovereignty as government institutions.

Jesus.³⁹ Such ordinances and appointments included adherence to civil law, which derived its authority from God, in Williams' framework. At the centre of the conflict was Samuel Gorton, who arrived in Providence with his household and a small group of followers during the winter of 1640/41. Gorton, born in the town of the same name near Manchester, in England, had followed a circuitous and conflict-ridden route to Providence, having left Massachusetts Bay under a cloud, and been banished both from Plymouth colony and from the fledgling town of Portsmouth, where William Coddington and the Hutchinsonian faction held forth.⁴⁰ Based on a typology which found Christ present in Adam, and therefore in his descendents, Gorton deduced that each individual in present history contained the literal being of Christ. By his

³⁹ *Mr. Cotton's Letter Examined and Answered* (1644), CW I, p. 385.

⁴⁰ Samuel Gorton's (1592-1677) case, and Williams' proposed 'remedies,' will be discussed in Chapter five. He had arrived in Boston at the height of the Antinomian crisis in 1636/37, but took no public part in that controversy. Before 1638 he removed himself to Plymouth colony, Cotton Mather said to avoid re-paying debt of £100 chasing him from London, where he almost immediately condemned the civil government, after (by his account) his wife's maid servant was threatened with banishment for smiling during worship. In the course of defending the woman, Gorton condemned the officers and authority of the Court, challenging the legitimacy of their remit and urging others toward civil non-compliance. At the same time, he was gaining popularity as a lay preacher, winning over such high profile devotees as the wife of minister Ralph Smith. Plymouth banished Gorton in December of 1638, after which time he settled with his household and assorted followers in Pocasset, on Aquidneck Island. Gorton allied himself with the Hutchinsonian faction against the leadership of William Coddington, providing enough votes to oust Coddington from office, resulting in his leaving, with others, to found Newport. Coddington was successful in re-unifying the two towns (Pocasset re-constituted itself as Portsmouth) in March, 1639/40, and after further controversy that year touched off by a boundary dispute, Gorton was once again banished. He arrived in Providence during the Winter of 1640/41, where Williams and others violently opposed his acceptance. Approximately a year later, Gorton and his small band re-located of their own accord to land in the Pawtuxet area donated by several of Gorton's adherents, but not before thirteen Providence inhabitants (not including Williams) had sent to Governmor John Winthrop in Boston for help in dealing with Gorton. Four of the Pawtuxet men went as far as subjecting themselves to Massachusetts authority to try to gain assistance against Gorton. Massachusetts did later dispatch a party to bring Gorton and his followers to trial in the Bay colony, which they did, and he served several months hard labour before being shunted home to what would become the town of Warwick. For a brief critical biography, and notice of Gorton's typology, see Philip F. Gura, 'The Radical Ideology of Samuel Gorton: New Light on the Relation of English to American Puritanism,' *Williams and Mary Quarterly*, Third Series, 36, Issue 1 (Jan., 1979), 78-100, pp. 80-86. Also Kenneth Porter, 'Samuel Gorton,' *New England Quarterly*, 7 (1934), pp. 405-44. For a detailed record of Gorton's contact with Providence Plantations' settlers, see Glenn Lafantasie's editorial note in *Correspondence I*, pp. 208-215. It is only Gorton's challenge to the Williams' historical account of sovereignty, and the continuing necessity for government and civil authority, which is relevant here; his broader challenges to Williams' account of civility and civil behaviour will be examined in Chapter five.

reasoning this identification was sufficient to remove the individual from the necessity of participation in, or correction by 'humane ordinances' in the present day.

Gorton applied this equally to spiritual discipline, and to civil, explicitly including both government, and the network of social relationships (so important to Williams) in his rejection. As he wrote in a treatise of 1657, '...this carnall Jerusalem [Massachusetts' government, in specific context] makes gods of terror, or rather Devils to be avoy-ded, of temporary things, as poverty, idlenesse, fornication, drunkenness, pride in gay apparel, want of obedience to Parents, ministers, Magestrates...' ⁴¹ Williams' account of states in present history removed authority from 'temporary' institutions in spiritual matters, but affirmed a commission of authority to promote civil order in the world, as developed already. By contrast, Gorton rejected entirely the continuation of any divinely commissioned sovereign power, and by extension, the necessity of government in the present day. It was not that he did not find civil ordinances or relationships useful in their place, (he claimed strenuously that his beliefs posed no civil threat, and that opposition to him was persecution for conscience) but his argument was that what happened in present 'natural' life was really of very little importance, to the condition of the saved, and that the artificial prohibition of temporary things was a distraction. As he put it:

...yet we do not deny the lawful use of any humane ordinances, no more then we deny the ordinance of the Sun and the moon so they be used as becomes the nature of them in their time and season...[they are] no better then empty husks, such as the prodigal fed upon...' ⁴²

⁴¹ Samuel Gorton, *An Antidote Against the Common Plague of the World...*, (London: 1657) pp. 235-136. Again, note similarity in Gorton's explanation of the origin of social prohibition and Winstanley's explanation of the origin of theft, note 48. Gura's article suggests like parallels, but with limited space, does not make the specific comparison.

⁴² Ibid, pp. 6, 7. Assessing parallels between Gorton's thought and that of Richard Saltmarsh and Williams Dell, Philip F. Gura builds a case for his strain of thought being much more closely allied to radical Independent thought in Britain than has been previously acknowledged. Adding to Gura's case for Gorton's English influences and context, is a parallel between his de-emphasis of worldly ordinances and the rejection of traditions of private property made by English radical contemporaries. Exemplary of this parallel reasoning is the argument made by Gerrard Winstanley, who lamented that

'Humane ordinances' were a useful stop-gap, but like the pigs' swill which sustained the prodigal son, primarily served to convince the believer in present history to flee home for the fatted calf. Gorton was certain that God did not intend to extend any civil commission to such 'husks' as social prohibitions, the position of parents, magistrates, or church institutions.

While for Williams these things were not ends in themselves (he agreed with Gorton, for different reasons, about 'hireling' ministers and church authority), the necessary purpose of civil power delegated to an array of agents in present history was the need to create and preserve an environment in which Grace could function freely. Williams tried desperately to prevent the Gorton's acceptance as a free-man of Providence, writing despairingly to John Winthrop that, 'All suck in his poison, as at first they did at Aquednick [later Portsmouth],' and of Gorton's '...denying all visible and externall Ordinances in depth of Familisme,' refusing to confess or reform '...his

'...all this falling out or quarrelling among mankind is about the earth, who shall and who shall not enjoy it, when indeed it is the portion of everyone and ought not to be striven for, nor bought, nor sold, whereby some are hedged in, and other hedged out. For better not to have had a body, than to be debarred the fruit of the earth to feed and clothe it. And if everyone did but quietly enjoy the earth for food and raiment, there would be no wars, prisons, nor gallows, and this action which man calls theft would be no sin, for universal love never made it a sin, but the power of covetousness made that a sin, and made laws to punish it, though he himself live in that sin in a higher manner than he [whom he] hangs or punishes.' Gerrard Winstanley, *A New-Yeers Gift*, (London: 1650). Gorton did not reject ownership of property outright, (though his opponents in Portsmouth and Williams among others in Providence thought he was heading that way) but did argue that the distribution of land was the chief tool that the New England colonies used to enforce religious conformity, and that they existed to glorify the world over the reality of universal love. See Samuel Gorton, *Simplicities Defence Against 7-headed Policy*... (London: 1646) p. [A5] [from the introductory 'Epistle to the Reader'] and p. 5: see Chapter five for full discussion of Gorton's controversy with Williams, and distribution of land in relation to Williams' proposed 'historical remedies' for familism. Williams considered the preservation of property rights, trade, and contract relations in general to be part and parcel of civil order in present history, and would have disagreed with Winstanley even more vehemently than he did with Gorton.

uncivill and inhumane practices.’⁴³ Williams knew Winthrop would be a sympathetic audience.⁴⁴

The real significance of Williams’ conflict with Gorton for the current discussion, however, is in throwing into relief Williams’ own account of sovereignty, from which he believed all legitimate civil institutions must derive, in present history. Williams understood sovereignty to be divinely commissioned, through the patriarchal authority of Adam and the Old Testament fathers, but not to derive from any ill-conceived attempt to claim participation in the now defunct covenant with the Jewish nation, made with Moses. The position of householders, inheritors of the Adamic patriarchal commission, in Williams’ understanding of sovereignty was paramount: he understood them to be the ‘fountain of power’ in present civil life, and required their consent to legitimise present government. Williams did not, however, place any faith in a householder’s human politics, or ‘contrived policies,’ within a commonwealth to effect the restitution of God’s ultimate order; this far, he and Gorton agreed.⁴⁵

Section Two: Exceptionalism, Representation, and Obligation

⁴³ Roger Williams, ‘To John Winthrop, 8 March 1640/41,’ *Correspondence I*, p. 215.

⁴⁴ Massachusetts’ opinion of Gorton and the Gortonists will be cited in Chapter five, in relation to Gorton’s charges that the colony was using its control of land distribution to enforce an illegitimate sovereign commission in civil things.

⁴⁵ ‘*Esau and Jacobs Mystical Harmony...*’ (1666), p. 95. In this final section explicating the story of the brothers’ reconciliation, Williams, writing as Jacob, emphasised that although he applied his ‘humane reason,’ and ‘contrived policies,’ to the problem of how best to mollify Esau’s presumed anger, these tools were not effective, and indeed unnecessary: ‘But behold the Myserie of our Jehovahs will; transcending farr beyond all my contrived policies; for thou [Esau] was ordered in the Unity of Universal Brotherhood, to disregard all these inticing frailties...in thy free forgiveness to me...’

Williams' notions about state institutions were formed early in his career and very much based in his veneration of English civil structure. As he affirmed in an aside to his main argument in *Mr. Cotton's Letter Examined and Answered* (London: 1644), 'I acknowledge the Land of England, the civill Laws, Government and people of England, not to be inferiour to any under heaven.'⁴⁶ He qualified this view only in rejecting traditions of civilly enforced participation in the various modes of worship thought correct over time, and England's present failure to allow dissenters '*civill cohabitation* in this world.'⁴⁷ As for the origins of parliamentary power, and civil authority generally, Williams asserted that Parliament, or by implication, any 'representative Commonwealth...hath no other power but what the Common weale derive unto, and betrust it with.'⁴⁸ By any standard, Providence Plantations was a relative backwater within the British Colonial world, and its form of government was unlikely to command great notice among the domestic population of England. As such, the 1663 Charter (on which that government was founded for the second half of Williams' life there) was safe in explicitly excusing inhabitants from conforming to the publicly approved liturgy of the Church of England, '... by reason of the remote distances of those places' posing no threat to '...the unities and uniformitie established in this nation.'⁴⁹

This section will build a picture of the shape of actual civil power Williams expected to derive from his account of sovereignty, and the responses he expected this government to elicit from its citizens. As such it will open with brief discussion of

⁴⁶ *Mr. Cotton's Letter Examined and Answered* (1644), CW I, p.361.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*

⁴⁸ *Queries of Highest Consideration* (1644), CW II, p. 259.

⁴⁹ Sydney James (T. Dwight Bozeman, ed) *John Clarke and His Legacies: Religion and the Law in Colonial Rhode Island 1638-1750*, (University Park, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999), p. 5. The Act of Uniformity (1662) had affirmed the Book of Common Prayer as the accepted liturgy of the Church in England. James called the permissions '...the most astonishing clauses in the whole document,' p. 82.

Williams' attachment of exceptional status to the particular government of Providence, and later Providence Plantations, as a commonwealth formed as a haven for 'refugees of conscience.' Attention will be given to Williams' evolved understanding of the nature of representation, considering both what kind of power his consenting individual householders had to vest in a government, and his functional understanding of 'democracy.' Following on from that, the section will examine the particular form of government Williams endorsed in Providence, evaluating the system of 'arbitration' in early Providence in relation to Williams' understanding of the 'consent of the governed.' The section will conclude with detailed notice of the particular kind of obligation Williams thought would characterise civil activity in his commonwealth.

2.1 *Exceptionalism*

Given that Roger Williams understood the Mosaic covenant to have passed from historical relevance with the resurrection of Christ, it is no surprise that he rejected adamantly any argument for a particular nation or people's exceptional relationship with God in the present day. As Williams would conclude, '...in respect of the *Lords* speciall proprietie to one Country more then another, what difference between *Asia* and *Africa*, between *Europe* and *America*, between *England* and *Turkie*, *London* and *Constantinople*?'⁵⁰ And yet, this position did not lead Williams to conclude that all particular governments were equivalent in status, in God's eyes. Although present government was institutionally a worldly or natural phenomenon, he

⁵⁰ *The Bloudy Tenent of Persecution* (1644), CW III, p. 320. This conclusion is part of a detailed exegesis of the typological understanding of Canaan, in which Williams concluded that it typed the 'invisible' nation of the elect, not any present government. See Chapter 2 for discussion of Williams' typology.

held that God maintained a consistent and persistent interest in political history, favouring some governments over others. As such, a strand of exceptionalism ran through Williams' writing about government and certainly guided his political advocacy, but a strand distinctly different in quality from that of the Massachusetts men or others who claimed inheritance of the Mosaic covenant for their own institutions or to describe their sovereign relationship with God generally.

Williams attached exceptional status to particular governments, particular historical commonwealths, as they fulfilled God's purposes in history, rather than attaching it in a permanent way to the sovereign identity of any particular people or nation. By his understanding, God's favour attached to the ideal of correct natural government, incorporating 'soul liberty' so that Grace could function in present history, and to particular commonwealths as they embraced that ideal. Williams was specific about God's continuing interest in government along these lines, writing that '*Christs Interest in this Commonweal* [England, in context] (or any) is the *freedom of the souls of the People*.'⁵¹ By Williams' account, any commonwealth that emulated the ideal he would describe could claim exceptional status, and would derive the benefit of civil peace as a result. He argued that '*Christs interest is the Commonweals [interest]*:'

*Christs interest is that Sheat-anchor, at which this Ship [England] hath rid, and can onely ride in safety. All power in heaven and earth is his. If England make peace with him, ally with him, &c. though every dust of the field were an army, and every drop of the Ocean sprung up a navy against us; yet our tranquillity should not be shortened, our Commonweal, our Parliament, our Peace should flourish.*⁵²

⁵¹ *The Examiner Defended...* (1652), CW VII, p. 204.

⁵² *Ibid.*

Thus by Williams' account, exceptional status accrued to a commonwealth whose government protected the elect in civil society. While the 'peace' Williams envisaged did not resemble the civil peace sought by those, like John Cotton, who aimed at uniformity of worship as a measure of tranquillity, he did expect positive material benefits to follow exceptional status.⁵³

As he pointed out in an introduction directed 'To the High Court of Parliament,' concerning the commercial success of Amsterdam, '...a poor fishing Town, yet harborous and favourable to the *flying*, though dissenting *consciences*: This confluence of the persecuted, by *Gods* most gracious coming with them, drew *Boats*, drew *Trade*, drew *shipping*, and that so mightily in so short a time, that *Shipping*, *Trading*, *wealth*, *Greatnesse*, *Honour*... have appeared to fall as out of Heaven in a Crown or Garland upon the head of that poor fisher Town.'⁵⁴ While economic historians might quibble with Williams' explanation of Amsterdam's success, it is adamantly clear that he understood it to derive explicitly from the preserved safety of the elect in its civil society. Based on its status as a haven for refugees, or position in relation to its immediate neighbours' intolerance, God favoured its material economy, Williams argued.

2.2 *The derivation and evolution of state power in Providence*

Although incorporating explicit statutory 'soul liberty,' it was this model that Williams sought to emulate, seeking an exceptional status for the commonwealth of

⁵³ See Chapter three for discussion of Williams' discussion of the shape of civil peace. His standard, always, was whether Grace was made free to operate in the consciences of the elect, unimpeded and positively aided by government policy and magisterial activity.

⁵⁴ *The Bloody Tenent Yet More Bloody* (1652), CW VI, p. 9. Williams sought to show any Parliamentary readers the material benefits of toleration, as against those who argued that it would cause civil chaos.

Providence, confirming specifically in the public record that he ‘...desired it

[Providence] might be for a shelter for persons distressed of conscience.’⁵⁵

Acknowledging Williams’ exceptionalism is important to understanding his attitude toward the founding, and continued governing of Providence, and Providence Plantations. Indeed it was on this basis that he forfeited any personal claim beyond an equal share in the distribution of land in Providence, though the original grant from the Narragansett had been to him personally. The first town ‘Combination,’ recorded in 1640, included the proviso that ‘Wee agree, as formerly hath bin the liberties of the town, so still, to hould forth liberty of Conscience.’⁵⁶ The 1643 Patent, which Williams had been instrumental in obtaining, contained no explicit acknowledgement of toleration, but instructed the householders of the three towns (Providence, Newport, and Portsmouth) to ‘...order and govern their Plantation in such a Manner as to maintain justice and peace:’

...by such a Form of Civil Government, as by voluntary consent of all, or the greater Part of them, they shall find most suitable to their Estate and Condition...Provided the [laws made by] the Civil Government of the said Plantations, be conformable to the Laws of England, so far as the Nature and Constitution of the place will admit.⁵⁷

This was fairly standard language, but the commissioners who issued the short Patent were aware of Massachusetts’ complaints about conformity in the Narragansett region. And indeed, though most in the three towns supported liberty of conscience, there was certainly variety in their understandings of it, as their tolerance of Gorton amply demonstrated. Despite Victorian historians’ glorification of Williams’

⁵⁵ ‘Confirmatory Deed of Roger Williams and his wife, of land transferred by him to his associates in the year 1638’ in John Russell Bartlett, ed., *Records of the Colony of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations in New England*, Vol. I (1636-1663), (Providence, RI: Greene and Brother, 1856) p. 22.

⁵⁶ *Ibid*, p. [2]8. Page is misnumbered.

⁵⁷ *Ibid*, p. 145.

‘triumphal’ return with the Patent in 1644, the Patent did not immediately command the loyalty of those outside of Providence.⁵⁸

The first complete record of laws made in response to the Patent, agreed in 1647, acknowledged the ‘end’ of the laws it recorded as being their gift, ‘...each to other. (notwithstanding our different consciences, touching the truth as it is in Jesus, whereof, upon the point we all make mention), as good and hopefull assurance as we are able, touching each man’s peaceable and quiet enjoyment of his lawfull right and Libertie.’⁵⁹ In other words, despite the variety in their understanding of what tolerance implied, they agreed, with Williams, that identifying ‘soul liberty’ as the end of their particular government would bring produce civil peace and material prosperity.

In two 1662 petitions to Charles the Second, John Clarke (who had stayed on in London as agent for Providence Plantations, after Williams’ return in 1653), assured the King of the colony’s loyalty to his person and throne, and asked him explicitly to issue a new Charter for Providence Plantation that would include protection for liberty of conscience.⁶⁰ Clarke, a physician by trade, was a prominent Baptist and founder member of the town of Newport, who had himself been banished from Massachusetts Bay. He was one of three Baptists prosecuted on return to the Bay in the early 1650s, and clearly agreed with Williams that statutory liberty of conscience was the only basis for correct government in present history. Clarke did

⁵⁸ Although he does not adequately account for Samuel Gorton’s role in disagreement about civil institutions’ power between the three towns in the early 1640s, G. B. Warden gives a compelling if brief picture of the political relationship of the towns, arguing that the Patent in 1644 ‘had little influence outside of Providence.’ G. B. Warden, ‘The Rhode Island Civil Code of 1647,’ in *Saints and Revolutionaries: Essays on Early American History*, David Hall, John Murrin, Thad Tate, eds., (New York, London: W. W. Norton & Co., 1984) pp. 138-151. Quote from p. 140.

⁵⁹ Ibid, p. 156, 157.

⁶⁰ Ibid, pp. 485-491. For discussion of Clarke’s career as colony agent, see James (and Bozeman, who completed the manuscript after James’ death), p. xiii. They argued that historians had too often seen Clarke’s pursuit of the 1663 Charter as a footnote to John Winthrop, Jr.’s procurement of a similar document for Connecticut.

not explicitly attach the same exceptional status to commonwealths offering such protection as Williams did. However, he did believe, with Williams, that civility and loyalty to the state was best accomplished by liberty of conscience, refuting charges that such liberty would undermine civil order.

In the second petition of 1662, Clarke begged the King to permit the continuation of the ‘...lively experiment, that a flourishing civill State may stand, yea, and best be maintained, and that among English spirits, with a full liberty in religious concernments,’ as he believed that, ‘...true pyety... will give the best and greatest security to true sovereignty, and will lay in the hearts of men the strongest obligations to truer loyalty.’⁶¹ Though he too believed material prosperity would follow liberty of conscience, his advocacy was concerned much more with preserving the peace of the colony as he perceived it in practical terms. Clarke had stated the general point somewhat earlier, in particular condemnation of Massachusetts’ Bay in his 1652 treatise *‘Ill Newes from NEW-ENGLAND...’* writing that ‘...this outward forcing of men in matters of conscience...to practice and worship as others do, cannot stand with the Peace, Liberty, prosperity, and safety of a Place, Commonwealth, or nation.’⁶²

The King, or his pen-man was wont to agree with Clarke’s practical approach for this relatively small collection of towns, as he demonstrated in the language of the Charter he issued in 1663. Recognising the real commercial potential of Providence Plantations, the 1663 Charter cited the use of having a port in southern New England ‘...which lyes verie commodious... for commerce, and to accommodate oure

⁶¹ Bartlett, *Records of Rhode Island, Vol. I*, pp. 490, 491.

⁶² Dr. John Clarke, *Ill Newes from NEW-ENGLAND or A Narative of New-Englands PERSECUTION*, (London: 1652) p. 74. The treatise records the story of Clarke’s imprisonment and punishment, along with two others, in Massachusetts for preaching against infant baptism.

southern plantations.’⁶³ Without amendment except to affirm his sovereign right of consent, he quoted the language cited above concerning the practical relationship between religious liberty and civil peace, in the towns, by way of preamble to his permission:

...in their humble addresse, that have freely declared, that it is much on their hearts (if they may be permitted), to hold forth a livelie experiment, that a most flourishing civill state may stand and best be maintained, and that among our English subjects, with a full libertie in religious concernements; and that true pietye ... will give the best and greatest security to soveraignetye, and will lay in the hearts of men the strongest obligations to true loyaltye.⁶⁴

The text continued, specifying the protection for liberty of conscience, within the colony:

...noe person within the sayd colonye... shall bee any wise molested, punished, disquieted, or called in question, for any differences in opinion in matter of religion, and doe not actually disturb the civill peace of our sayd colonye ...they behaving themselves peaceable and quietlie, and not using this libertie to lyentiousnesse, and profanenesse, nor to the civill injurie or outward disturbance of others...⁶⁵

Perhaps not incorporating Williams’ attachment of exceptional status to the commonwealth government, but certainly establishing tolerance at the heart of the civil commission, the 1663 Charter confirmed the pattern of government established in the towns around Narragansett Bay.

⁶³ ‘The Charter of the Governor and company of the English colony of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations in New England, in America, 1663,’ Bartlett, *Records of Rhode Island*, Vol. II, 1664-1677, p. 4.

⁶⁴ Ibid. See James (Bozeman, ed.), pp 79-82, for discussion of the 1663 Charter’s language, in comparison to that of Connecticut. James does not engage in any analysis of Clarke’s petitions, or the Charter.

⁶⁵ Ibid, p. 5, 6. James does identify the King’s language in the full statement of religious liberty within the colony as echoing that of the Declaration of Breda (1660), in which the King declared a ‘...liberty to tender consciences, and that no man shall be disquieted or called in question for differences of opinion in matter of religion which do not disturb the peace of the kingdom...’ ‘The Declaration of Breda (1660)’ in Ann Hughes, ed., *Seventeenth Century England: A Changing Culture, Volume I: Primary Sources*, (London: Ward Lock Educational, 1980) pp. 248-250. Quoted text p. 250.

In the founding and governance of Providence, Williams expected, was an opportunity to construct a commonwealth with the correct basis for promoting civility. By Williams' account, in order to maintain God's favour, the civil institutions would need to incorporate not only toleration, but also correct understanding of householders as representatives of sovereign power. Just as important would be the kind of consent he expected those householders to give to legitimate the derived power of civil institutions and their officers. His particular understanding of the 'nature' of political individualism in present history, as developed earlier, was crucially important to Williams' practical expectations of representation and consent. His challenge was to aid the formation of a legitimate 'democraticall' civil government, based in the consent of the governed and conducted chiefly by institutionalised arbitration, without exposing that government to the corrupting influences of individuals' private interests. For Williams, the common good was inextricably linked to Providence's exceptional status as a haven for refugees of conscience, and could not be understood in any other terms without displeasing God and leading to civil chaos.

2.3 Representation and consent

Williams believed that civil government in present history would be commissioned by the consent of the people, and that the people could not invest rulers with powers they themselves did not possess. The fact that he understood the individual as a 'representative agent' only in the civil manifestation of Adam's patriarchal power was thus crucial to what historians have confusingly called

Williams' 'separation of church and state.'⁶⁶ Because 'the people,' even the elect, themselves had no power (given the extinction of the apostolic line in present history) to renew the Mosaic covenant, they had no power endow civil government with responsibility for spiritual things. This was simply beyond their representative capacity, as Williams repeated many times in different contexts. He asked 'Whether ...the *Magistrate* being the *Civil Officer* of the People, hath any *Might, Authority*, or *Power*, but what the People commit unto him?' As Williams understanding of political sovereignty in present history precluded anything but a negative answer, he continued, extending the logic, to ask '...Whether any People will or can betrust such a *Power* to the *civil Magistrate*, to compel their Souls and consciences unto his?'⁶⁷ As he had early on believed that the elect covenanted together with God to gather a church, Williams expected inhabitants of the commonweale to covenant with their rulers without God, in civil things, to legitimate civil institutions. The power represented by Williams householders, was a civil power only, and could only legitimate civil, worldly institutions.

Roger Williams' understanding of political representation was two-fold: firstly, Williams understood individual householders, masters of families, to act as representatives of the inherited Adamic sovereignty, which by their consent, would legitimate a civil government in present history. Secondly, he understood

⁶⁶ This phrase has obscured the fact that Williams understood the state and other natural institutions very much to be created and commissioned by God, to aid the progress of Grace in present history. Williams never questioned that God had a persistent and particular interest in the functioning of civil power in present history: that interest was in the soul liberty of the elect. Using the phrase 'separation of church and state' to describe Williams' view of government commission in the 'field of the world' as distinct from spiritual commission has added to the mistaken attribution of liberal ideals to him. Even in historical commentary that does not attach such labels, the phrase suggests liberal measures of Williams' thought which obscure correct understanding of his account of the political individual in relation to sovereignty. See discussion of this point earlier in Chapter.

⁶⁷ *The Examiner Defended* (1652), CW VII, p. 218. The same logical formula appeared many times in Williams writing. See Chapter 2 for discussion of Williams understanding of the extinction of the Mosaic covenant, and the apostolic line, in relation to church institution and the position of the elect in history, as a function of his particular typology.

governmental bodies to 'represent' that authority in their arbitration of disputes and legislating. As Williams argued, '...the truth is, that...Princes could not receive but what the Parliaments gave them, and the Parliaments could not give them but what the People gave the Parliament their Representative.'⁶⁸

Williams expected that householders, however, retained their representative commission even after the establishment of government, as they were to collaborate with civil institutions to promote civil peace, involving the social conformity of their household's members. He made his understanding of the retention of this representative power explicitly clear, in the way that he described the active civil power of householders in present history:

...in *Civill State*, from the beginning of the World, God hath armed *Fathers, Masters, Magistrates*, to punish evill doers, that is, such of whose actions *Fathers, Masters, Magistrates* are to judge, and accordingly punish such sinners as transgresse against the good and peace of their Civill state, *Families, Townes, Cities, Kingdomes*.⁶⁹

Thus Williams included families and local government as independent civil institutions within present nations. He expected householders as representatives of patriarchal authority in present history to collaborate with the officers of the civil state to promote civil peace, punishing those who disrupted it. The state was a necessary adjunct to these institutions, however, as even the elect householder would fall into error, and be subject to '...Covetuous and ambitious ends.'⁷⁰

Part of the state's commission of its representative role, Williams argued, should be to hear '...the complaints of servants, children, wives, against their parents,

⁶⁸ *The Fourth Paper Presented by Major Butler* (1652), CW VII, p. 134.

⁶⁹ *The Bloudy Tenent* (1644), CW III, p. 108. The section following on from this excerpt will be cited later in the Chapter, in reference to the nature of obedience, or political obligation, in Roger Williams' thought.

⁷⁰ 'To John Whipple, Jr., 24 August 1669,' *Correspondence II*, pp 594-609, quote from p. 604. Full discussion of Williams' conflict with William Harris (Whipple was his son in law) will be developed in Chapter five.

masters, husbands, &c.,’ because families and households were ‘...stones which make up the common building, and ...properly the object of the Magistrates care, in respect of Civill Government, Civill order and obedience.’⁷¹ Williams’ specification that the state’s remit in household life, complemented the representative power of the father only in respect to ‘civill obedience’ was important: he expected that all families, as all elect and unregenerate fathers, and masters, among the other callings of society, would be capable of, and called to exercise, a civil role. Williams would have broadly agreed with the point as put elsewhere by Francis Roys (1579-1659): ‘...a man is capable of a three-fold notion according to a three-fold capacity, viz. Naturall, Politick, Religious. He sins or offends in his religious capacity, and hath some heterodox opinions; yet a good subject, and fellow-subject, a good Father to his Family, &c.’ Roys carried the point far enough to argue that for a magistrate to punish a man for dissenting conscience was ‘...as to punish one man for another mans fault,’ so complete was the distinction between a mans civil and spiritual calling.⁷² Part of Williams’ point about the civil efficacy of toleration, in relation to his discussion of the parable of the Tares, was the converse, that the elect in present history should not seek to ‘pluck up’ unregenerate civil rulers, because rulers’ appropriate civil action would not threaten the progress of spiritual truth, but would rather protect it. As he put it, ‘...the *Saints* and *Servants* and *Churches* of *Christ* are to pray for *all men*, especially for all *Magistrates* (of what sort or *Religions* soever) and to seeke the peace of the City (what ever City it may be) because in the peace of the place of Gods people have peace also.’⁷³ The state alone, however, would not be

⁷¹ *The Bloudy Tenent* (1644), CW III, p. 164. Particular conflicts concerning state remit and household authority will be examined in Chapter five, in relation to the 1638 case of Joshua Verin and his wife.

⁷² Francis Roys, *The Ancient Bounds, or Liberty of Conscience, TENDERLY STATED, MODESTLY ASSERTED, and MILDLY VINDICATED*, (London: 1645), p. 22.

⁷³ *The Bloudy Tenent* (1644), CW III, p. 115.

able to accomplish the sovereign project of establishing civil order except in collaboration with householders in their civil capacity.

2.4 *Obligation*

Williams' understanding of the representative commission of individuals had little to do with giving a voice in government to the political opinion, or private interest of citizens. Indeed Williams sought specifically to protect government institutions from being perverted, as he saw it, by the influence of '...private Ends, designs and plots.'⁷⁴ He expected householders to actively 'represent' their Adamic inheritance in the orderly maintenance of their families, and the formation of, and obedience to present government. Legitimate government in present history would derive from this active consent of the 'People,' by Williams' account. But much as he did not believe that any individual could resist his representative capacity as a householder, Williams did not accept that anyone, elect or unregenerate, could resist obedience to a properly constituted civil government in present history. This did not mean that Williams counselled non-resistance to governments that tried to enforce religious conformity. His own experience in Massachusetts Bay, and his support for John Clarke and the other Baptists 'persecuted' by that colony proved immediately to the contrary. By Williams' account, what looked like resistance to a civil government which had exceeded its sovereign commission to invade spiritual life, was not actually resistance at all, but a commitment to true authority, rather than false. Answering the charge that '...bold, and sharp *language*' could not be reconciled '...with humble *Duty, Fear, and Reverence, due unto superiours,*' Williams argued that what '...may

⁷⁴'To John Whipple, Jr., 24 August 1669.' *Correspondence II*, pp 594-609, quote from p. 599.

seem to destroy humane *society*...and civility out of the world,' destroyed only '...corrupt *nature*, and *humanity*, but otherwise ... directeth *nature*, and *civility*, in the fear of God.'⁷⁵ In other words, a persistent advocate for liberty of conscience in a persecuting state was actually showing his obligation to true historically appropriate civil authority, while all others were resisting it. Williams was explicit in this point, that legitimate civil government, based in the proper representative consent of the people and incorporating liberty for conscience, was 'The only way (according to God) of obliging the people of this Nation [England] to the present Government and Governours.'⁷⁶ The source of obligation was, for Williams, the unique civil commission granted to a civil government by the consent of the people, his representative householders.

Williams expected selfish interest to continue in present history, even among the elect: he hoped for, and admonished people to practice humility and self-restraint in obedience to the civil state, but he did not rely exclusively on self-restraint to undergird political obligation, in his framework. Extending the metaphor of the commonwealth as a ship at sea, which he had used before, Williams noted that '...in a Ship there is a *whole*, and there is each *private cabbin*. A *private* good engageth our desires for the *publike*, and raiseth *cares* and *fears* for the due prevention of *common evils*.'⁷⁷ Thus in contrast to leaders like Thomas Hooker of Connecticut, Williams derived obligation not from present government's holy status, but from an expectation that individual householders, in pursuing their own correct patriarchal authority, and interested in protecting their worldly interests, could not but help to preserve public peace.

⁷⁵ *Experiments of Spiritual Life and Health* (1652), CW VII, p. 97.

⁷⁶ *The Examiner Defended* (1652), CW VII, p. 207, marginal note.

⁷⁷ *Ibid*, p. 203. Williams' most widely noted use of the 'ship of state' metaphor is in his 'to the town of Providence, ca. January, 1654/55,' *Correspondence II*, pp. 423, 424.

Concerning ‘the privilege of election’ of rulers, an obligation that Hooker expected to be undertaken with due reverence for the holiness of the commission it implied, Hooker cautioned in 1638 at the time of Connecticut’s founding that it was ‘...not to be exercised according to their [electors’] humors, but according to the blessed will and law of God.’⁷⁸ Stephen Foster explained that Hooker assumed the ruler became God’s deputy: obligation was due because of the divine status of the office, not because the householder’s private interest was tied to the public. As will be developed in the next section of the chapter, Williams agreed that the magistracy was ultimately instituted by God, but argued strongly that it was a natural institution, and that obedience to it required no spiritual capacity. The expectation among Massachusetts authorities paralleled Hooker’s, that political obligation derived from a veneration of the divine status of the instituted government. Obligation in this model would, therefore, engage the spiritual capacity of the individual, which they were sure would enhance his sense of obligation. The synod which met in 1648 concluded that while Congregational churches as instituted in Massachusetts would not ‘interfere with “the authority of Civil Magistrates in their jurisdictions;...[they would] rather [strengthen] them, & [further] the people in yielding more hearty and conscionable obedience unto them.”’⁷⁹ It was a subtle, but important difference: by the Massachusetts and Connecticut account of obligation, even if church and state institutions remained separate, the spiritual capacity of an individual householder was engaged in the act of obligation. This meant that impiety did imply incivility, or at least did by itself pose a potential threat to the civil authority.

⁷⁸ Thomas Hooker, *Collections of the Connecticut Historical Society*, I (1860), p. 20. Discussed in Foster, *Their Solitary Way*, p. 67, 68. Williams agreed that the magistracy was ultimately instituted by God, but argued strongly that it was a natural institution, and that obedience to it required no spiritual capacity.

⁷⁹ T. H. Breen, *The Character of The Good Ruler: A Study of Puritan Political Ideas in New England, 1630-1730*, (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1970), pp. 41,42. Breen quotes from Williston Walker, *The Creeds and Platforms of Congregationalism* (Boston: 1960), p. 235.

By Williams' account, the spiritual capacity of the householder was not required to be engaged in political obligation at all, though as he was quick to assure, nor would it threaten civil relations. Responding to John Cotton's charge that dissenting consciences and divergent religious practices would tend to '...be the *cut-throat* of all *civil relations, unions and covenants* between Princes and people,' Williams admitted that '...*godliness* is profitable for all things, all *estates*, all *relations*,' but argued strongly that '...there is a *civil faithfulness, obedience, honesty, chastity, &c.*, even among such as own not God nor Christ,' even if that person, '...an *husband, a wife, a Magistrate, a Master, a servant*,' was 'wholly ignorant' of God.⁸⁰ As such, Williams' account of political obligation reflected an underlying assumption that individuals possessed different 'persons' (as described succinctly by Roys, quoted above), that the religious capacity was not engaged by the requirement for civil obedience, and that the mechanism for ensuring obligation was thus the engagement of 'the private good with the publike.' Further, Williams took political obligation to encompass all civil relationships, even if in different contexts.

The two related issues of representation and obligation, Williams understood in relation to his account of the householder in the project of sovereign authority in present history generally. Both can only be understood in relation to Williams' account of the householder as a political individual, and his expectation that exceptional status would accrue to a commonwealth constructed with a correct civil commission, founded in liberty of conscience. Williams' commonwealth, a natural institution, was to be preserved by natural qualities and capacities of its subjects, expressed in the natural relationships which defined their lives, within and without the

⁸⁰ *The Boody Tenent Yet More Bloody* (1652), CW IV, pp. 207, 208.

household. To build the civility that would protect the progress of Grace in present history, Williams relied on the state, properly constituted and commissioned, to collaborate with, and support the civil roles of, the other civil institutions extant in history, be they individual callings or private households. As was discussed in the introduction to this chapter, however, Williams' endowing the magistrate with specific positive power to promote and protect free conscience would undermine the civil role of these other relationships, creating an irreconcilable tension in his understanding of how the state should act in relation to other 'civil' authorities in present history.

Much as he expected the elect to suffer as outcasts in present history, Williams accepted that the commonwealth that did found itself in soul liberty might be excoriated and despised by its neighbours. The evidence of God's interest, in worldly terms, might very well not be earthly prosperity (indeed it probably would not, especially if individuals within the commonwealth tried to pervert the project, or used their liberty licentiously for private ends), but as the saints were required to suffer with forbearance and continued witness the vagaries of the field of the world, so to the exceptional commonwealth would have to suffer challenges from within and without, rather than taking the illegitimate, but comparatively easy worldly course of purifying itself with the civil sword.

Section Three: Democracy and the Officers of the State

Williams did believe that the inter-weaving of toleration with English traditions of representation and consent in Providence represented the best constitution of government institutions. This was not simply a pragmatic

acknowledgement on Williams' part. While Williams had rejected the notion that the Old Testament theocracies should act as types for spiritual power of government, he did believe them to provide models for civil authority in civil things.⁸¹ As he acknowledged, '...what was simply *morall*, *civill*, and *naturall* in *Israels state*, in [its] *constitutions*, *Lawes*, *punishments*, may be imitated and followed by the *States*; *Countries*, *Cities* and *Kingdomes* of the World.'⁸² That God had provided England with models of natural civil procedure he saw as historically contextual: this was a government for Englishmen and their families. He was perfectly willing to judge the particular form of government in Providence as carrying a seal of divine approval, based on his account of sovereignty and requirement of toleration, interwoven with particular traditions of representation and consent. However, Williams acknowledged that any particular form of government was a human invention, asking 'who can question the *lawfullnesse* of other *Formes of Government*, *Lawes* and *punishments* which differ, since *civill constitutions* are mens *Ordinances* (or creation, 2 *Pet.* 2.13.) unto which *Gods* people are commanded ...to submit themselves, which if they were unlawfull they ought not to do?'⁸³ He understood a universally correct form of government to be an historical impossibility, even as he argued that some forms were better than others, for promoting the progress of Grace.⁸⁴

Edmund Morgan understood and developed the idea that Williams believed 'It was wrong...for any government to demand that another conform to its own standards,' while continuing to endorse the necessity of government for all people.⁸⁵

⁸¹ This parallels his expectation that the Old Testament patriarchs should type patriarchal authority in its civil incarnation, in present life.

⁸² *The Bloody Tenent* (1644), CW III, p. 364.

⁸³ *Ibid.*

⁸⁴ Indeed, it would prove surprising if he had endorsed a particular form of government for all times and places, given his certainty that the conditions of worldly sovereignty remained, to a degree, unknowable, and that government was a worldly institution.

⁸⁵ Morgan, *Roger Williams: Church and State*, pp. 121, 122. Morgan does not quote, but does reference the text quoted above from *the Bloody Tenent*, CW III, p. 364.

Williams concluded that acknowledging the divine will of Jehovah (in creating a perfect government) to be unknowable did not excuse individuals from responsibility for judgements about institution-building in present history, but did necessitate a humility in their construction, and an understanding that they each derived authority from the same source.⁸⁶ In the text Williams analysed the relationship between imperfect human institutions and Godly ideals. He asked, 'Can there be differing kinds, of one and y^e self-same Spirit? For is not the self=same Spirit, but one kind? Yet differing kind (through unity) of Manifestatioⁿ in operation, throughout the Man=hood.' All the different human 'manifestations' (created, worldly institutions) derived from one universal ideal, unknowable in present history, and were presently reconciled in God's present extra-historical 'mystical harmony.'⁸⁷ They would not be physically, literally reconciled until the Revelation, Williams argued, and thus different government forms might be contextually legitimate, as human expressions of one presently unknowable ideal.

In response to this understanding, that the legitimacy of governmental forms was historically contextual, the form of government which Roger Williams did endorse for Providence Plantations was 'democraticall.' By his account government was 'democraticall' firstly as it derived authority from the patriarchal authority of householders, and secondly as he expected householders to actively participate in the business of governing. During the first year of Providence's 'government,' 1636, the thirteen householders had simply met and agreed common decisions. As Williams explained to then Deputy Governor Winthrop, 'Hietherto, the masters of Families have ordinarily mett once a fort night and consulted about our common peace, watch,

⁸⁶ For this discussion, see 'Esau and Jacobs mystical harmony...', pp. 70-91, where six 'queries' related to this conclusion are considered.

⁸⁷ Ibid, p. 79. (beginning, 4. Querie)

and planting: and mutuall consent hath finished all matters with speede and peace.’⁸⁸

The first task of this small-scale, direct democracy was in Williams’ words, establishing and preserving a ‘common peace,’ then providing for defence (against real or perceived threat of Indian attack), and land distribution.

What is most significant about Williams’ assessment of Providence’s earliest situation, however, was not his seeming endorsement of direct democracy, but the immediate formality he sought in delineating political hierarchy and standards for participation in the government of what was still a very small settlement, by any measure. He told Winthrop about ‘Young men single persons (of whom we had much neede) being admitted to freedome of Inhabitation, and promising to subject to the Orders made by the Consent of the Howse holders,’ but being ‘discontented with their estate, and seek[ing] the Freedom of Vote also, and aequalitie, etc.’⁸⁹ This language suggests that by ‘mutuall consent’ Williams had actually meant majority voting amongst heads of households accepted as freemen of the town. But more importantly, it shows that he was concerned immediately to ensure the correct ‘democratical’ subjection of all inhabitants, and formally dictate the terms of their obligation to participate in governing. By his account democracy was not about making government reflect the opinion of citizens, but rather the business of ensuring that government and its officers derived the correct subject consent of inhabitants, and that inhabitants understood, by giving it, their historical obligation to government.⁹⁰

As Providence developed, Williams would identify different modes of democratic participation that he personally expected from the ‘consenting’

⁸⁸ ‘To Deputy Governor John Winthrop, before 25 August 1636,’ *Correspondence* 1, p. 53. This letter is discussed in relation to Williams’ understanding of the role of householders as political individuals earlier in the chapter.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.* Editor notes that the men were probably Thomas Angell and Francis Weeks, or possibly any or all of Edward Cope, Williams Reynolds, or John Throckmorton.

⁹⁰ This point is one which has been misrepresented by many historical commentators, who have read into Williams an endorsement for democratic participation in liberal terms,

householder. First and foremost, he expected masters of families to care for, and correct, the members of their households. This civil expectation, separate from the spiritual duties a Christian father might have to his subordinates, was largely implicit in Williams' work and political advocacy. Exemplary was the position articulated in a letter Williams wrote from the town council of Providence to Nathaniel Patten, a resident of Dorchester in Massachusetts Bay, in 1666/67. The letter explained the sad situation of Patten's brother-in-law Robert Pike and his wife, a weak elderly couple who were unable to '...supply Themselves with necessaries for their Subsistence,' and for whom the town was 'by publike gathering' supporting. In addition the wife had been wandering away in 'distraction of mind,' necessitating a neighbour attending her to prevent her death by exposure.⁹¹ The town asked Patten (who unfortunately had died himself some days earlier) to assume responsibility for the couple and provide for their care, as their most immediate relation and presumed head of family. In this exchange, among others, Williams demonstrated that he believed there was a civil remit attached to caring for the aged or infirm, but that that remit should be exercised first by the head of a household. State involvement should complement, but not remove this responsibility, in Williams' eyes. Where a householder neglected or abused this duty, it was a neglect or abuse of his civil obligation, as shown by the case of Joshua Verin, who was removed from the franchise for beating his wife.⁹² Thus caring for, and correcting appropriately, members of a household was the primary mode of democratic participation Williams expected from householders in a civil state, and in Providence.

⁹¹ 'Town of Providence to Nathaniel Patten, 12 February 1666/67,' *Correspondence II*, pp. 554-556. The manuscript letter, including signatures, are in Williams' hand, and he was a member of the council at the time, as noted by editor.

⁹² See 'To John Winthrop, 22 May 1638,' *Correspondence I*, pp. 155-157; also Bartlett, *Records*, Volume I, pp. 16-17, and note. The Verin case will be developed in some detail in Chapter five.

Williams further expected householders to participate in the democratic life of the colony as they undertook the civil obligations associated with their respective professional callings, and in relation to their neighbours. It was on this basis, for him, that a person's economic dealings, fulfilment of contracts, or re-payment of debt became a civil matter. Before government's retroactive remit in 'protecting' the goods of someone who had been deprived or cheated of them, was the individual's responsibility, as part of his civil obligation to conduct his commercial affairs honestly. For Williams, the correct behaviour in trade and business, in addition to land use, was part of the civil responsibility of the householder, as part of his participation in the 'democratic' life of the colony. The demands of the common good remained more compelling than any private interest, Williams maintained. Not everyone agreed with Williams on this point, but it was in these terms that Williams himself refused to sell alcohol illegally to the Indians (the trade was limited), and for which he criticised John Throckmorton in a letter of 30 July, 1672.⁹³

Williams further expected that the democratic participation of a householder would include adhering to positive laws and regulations, being a prompt rate payer, attending elections and town meetings, and defending the commonwealth against attackers.⁹⁴ However, the other primary responsibility he identified for the consenting householder in a democratic commonwealth, was serving as its officer if called by his fellows to do so. Using the term 'democratic' in its modern sense indicating the relative dispersal of power among the people, G. B. Warden has argued that taken as a whole, 'actual practice seems to indicate that the Rhode Islanders, for all their reputation as extreme levelers, were no more or less democratic than were their

⁹³ 'To John Throckmorton, 30 July 1672,' *Correspondence II*, p. 675.

⁹⁴ Williams' views on these obligations were developed largely in their breach, and revolved around the issue of elevating private interest over that of the common or 'publike' good. Particular instances and his responses to them will be considered in chapter 5.

neighbors.' He made this judgment on the basis that 'like other New England colonists, [they] tended to reelect the same men of substance and probity year after year.'⁹⁵ In a quantitative analysis of officeholding in Providence between 1646 and 1686, however, Robert de V. Brunkow concluded that although the freemen of the town elected '...officials of mature experience who had a substantial stake in society,' (ie., property-rich men, over the age of fifty, judged to be of good standing and character) that 'no matter how eminent the official, he did not enjoy unlimited occupancy of a position, nor did he pluralistically [concurrently] hold major offices.'⁹⁶ Further, Brunkow has shown that over the whole period of study, greater than half of the freemen in Providence held an office of one kind or another.⁹⁷ Providence did not develop into a radical egalitarian democracy, but defined as Roger Williams understood the term, its development paralleled his aspirations toward, or account of, democratic government.

Early government in Providence, after the initial months, consisted of regular meetings of freemen, presided over by elected officers. The first '*proposals for a form of Government*,' usually known as the Providence 'Combination,' were recorded mid way through 1640, and were signed by thirty-nine inhabitants, including Roger

⁹⁵ Warden, in Hall, et al. eds., *Saints and Revolutionaries*, p. 147. Joshua Miller has presented a somewhat different account of early New England 'Puritans' in relation to American traditions of direct democracy, relating the 'Puritan theory of church membership,' to 'contemporary liberal and democratic notions of citizenship.' While Miller does not argue that the New Englanders were liberals, he does find a model for active citizenship in a participatory democracy in New England churches and town meetings. Joshua Miller, 'Direct Democracy and the Puritan Theory of Membership,' *The Journal of Politics*, Volume 53, Issue 1 (Feb., 1991), pp. 57-74.

⁹⁶ Robert de V. Brunkow, 'Officeholding in Providence, Rhode Island, 1646-1686: A Quantitative Analysis,' *William and Mary Quarterly*, Third Series, Volume 37, Issue 2 (Apr., 1980), p243. Brunkow suggests that when the freemen 'wanted' to elect a less wealthy officer after 1675, they 'usually turned to Roger Williams,' noting that he was elected 'on four of the seven occasions when the less prosperous were elected to major offices of annual tenure, and that he held every moderatorship that went to that group.' pp245, 246. Williams had been impoverished by his second trip to England in the early 1650s, and refused to engage in land speculation for personal profit, or to accept pay for preaching. This helps to explain why Williams did not play a more significant role in the political leadership of the colony, during this time period: his economic position did not support his selection. Given this, it is especially significant that he played as big role as he did, reflecting the esteem for his age and experience among the townspeople.

⁹⁷ *Ibid*, p. 245.

Williams. Disputes were settled by a statutory system of 'arbitration,' whereby other freemen were appointed to settle disputes between local opponents, (with the loser covering costs) who had a limited right of appeal to further arbitration.⁹⁸ With some variation and a variety of other posts, the civil institution of government in Providence, between 1646 and 1686 would evolve to consist of eleven primary offices, plus the town meeting, at which all freemen were expected to attend, or send a proxy. Of chief importance was the moderator, who ran the town meeting, and was elected anew for each session. The town clerk served for a year, and kept records of all proceedings and actions, as well as conducting the town's correspondence and recording land transactions. Of relatively high power and elected annually were also the town surveyor and treasurer. The town deputy served as judge in the town court, and sat with, and performed a variety of other duties as directed by, the town councilmen, who had such remits as probate of wills and admitting freemen, between town meetings. A colony deputy was elected quarterly to sit on the General Assembly of the federated colony, and then at what Brunkow identified as a 'lower level' of government, freemen served as 'constable, sergeant, and hayward (fence viewer),' or might be elected to serve as jurymen for a quarter.⁹⁹

Roger Williams considered service in all of these offices to be part and parcel of the democratic obligation of the householder. The position of magistracy in general, as well as the exercise of particular offices, must be understood in relation to his account of the position of freemen generally in his 'democraticall' commonwealth. T. H. Breen described two opposing 'camps' of understanding of magisterial authority in seventeenth century New England, which will help in examining Roger Williams' account of magisterial power in relation to that of his contemporaries. Firstly, Breen

⁹⁸ Bartlett, *Records*, Volume I, pp. 27-31. System of arbitration described p. 29.

⁹⁹ Brunkow, pp. 244, 245. Brunkow used Bartlett, *Records*, as his primary authority.

described those who understood their civil leaders to hold 'discretionary' power, that is, who once in office, legitimately might act out of their own judgments (within Scriptural parameters) with little reference to the citizenry. The second group Breen identified were those who maintained that magistrates' power was entirely 'delegated' by citizens, and therefore demanded that magistrates stay within the remit set by freemen.¹⁰⁰ By Breen's account, John Winthrop was very much in the 'discretionary' camp, believing his calling as a magistrate to extend from God directly, and only being confirmed by the vote of the electors. This meant that Winthrop believed his commission called for him to use his independent judgment and conscience, as a Christian magistrate, to decide the meaning of law in any given case.

As expressed in his 1604 'EPIEKEIA, or a treatise of Christian Equity and Moderation,' William Perkins' view had profoundly influenced Winthrop's. Perkins identified two modes of magisterial operation which exercised together in correct balance, he took to constitute 'publike equity,' or loosely, good government. The first he identified as 'The *extremitie of the law*... when any law of man, is urged and executed strightly & precisely, according to the literall sense, & strict forme of the words, without any manner of relaxation... when there is good and convenient cause of mitigation, in regard to the person offending.'¹⁰¹ The second Perkins identified as '...the moderation, relaxation, or mitigation of this extremity,' in which situation the magistrate might not moderate or lessen the strict instructions of a law, 'upon good and sufficient reason,' in cases where the law did not apply directly, or the law-maker did not intend its use in a particular way. Perkins was explicit that 'The ground of this

¹⁰⁰ T.H. Breen, *The Character of the Good Ruler: as Study of Puritan Political Ideas in New England, 1630-1730*, (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1970) pp. 58-88.

¹⁰¹ William Perkins, 'EPIEKEIA, or a Treatise of Christian Equity and Moderation, (1604)' in *The Workes of that Famous and Worthy Minister of Christ in the Universitie of Combridge, Mr. William Perkins* (London: I Legatt, 1626-31, 3 Volumes) Volume II, pp. 437-441. Quoted from Edmund S. Morgan, ed., *Puritan Political Ideas, 1558-1794*, (New York: Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1965) p 61.

mitigation is, because no law makers being men, can foresee, or set downe all cases that may fall out.' Perkins relied on the discretion of the individual magistrate to accommodate the impossibility of corrupt human law responding to all situations, and enjoined magistrates to '...labour for that Christian wisdom and discretion, whereby they may be able to discern when *mercy* and *mitigation* should take place, and when extremitie should bee executed.'¹⁰²

When Winthrop wrote that 'All punishments, except such as are made certain in the law of God, or are not subject to variation by merit of circumstances, ought to be left arbitrary to the wisdom of the judges,' he echoed Perkins' expectation that the good (rightly called and commissioned) magistrate would bridge the gap between the limitations of human law and God's greater purposes in society and governing.¹⁰³

Williams identified a version of the same problem, that human law and created institutions could never hope to accommodate God's purposes in present history, but he extended this acknowledged limitation to magisterial offices themselves, rejecting the idea of a divinely commissioned magistracy much as he rejected the idea of a divinely commissioned state. By his understanding, the necessity and role for civil offices were ordained by God as a feature of present history, but the offices themselves, and related powers, were entirely human creations, or ordinances.

Williams understood '...the Ordinance of Magistracie' to be '...properly and adequately fitted by God, to preserve the civill State in civill peace and order: as he hath also appointed a spiritual Government and Governours in matters pertaining to his worship and the consciences of men, both which Governments, Governours, Laws, Offences, Punishments, are Essentially distinct, and the confounding of them

¹⁰² Ibid, p. 62, 66.

¹⁰³ Quote is from Winthrop's *Journal*, II, p. 67, quoted in Breen, p. 61. Breen does not make this point, however.

brings all the world into Combustion.’¹⁰⁴ While involved in the accomplishment of God’s purposes in present history, the civil magistracy had only civil tools at his disposal.

This understanding of the office of the magistracy led Williams firmly into the camp of ‘delegated’ powers’ advocates, using Breen’s categories of opinion in regard to magisterial power. He agreed with Perkins, and latterly with Winthrop, that human law was insufficient to respond to the challenges posed by human corrupt nature in present history, but rejected the idea that any divine commission to magistrates persisted, based on his particular style of typology.¹⁰⁵ Where Perkins had called on the magistrate to ‘labour for... that Christian wisdom and discretion,’ to instruct him how to balance the extremity and moderation of the law for ‘publike equity’s’ sake, Williams’ rejected the idea that the exercise of magisterial power should involve an individual’s spiritual capacity at all. As he had it:

This *civill* Nature of the *Magistrate* we have proved to receive no *addition* of power from the *Magistrates* being a *Christian*, no more then it receives *diminution* from his not being a *Christian*: even as the *Commonweale* is a true *Common-weale*, although it have not heard of *Christianitie*; and *Christianitie* professed in it, makes it ne’re no more a *Commonweale*, and *Christianitie* taken away... makes it ne’re the lesse a *Commonweale*.¹⁰⁶

Williams sought to avoid any misunderstanding, clearly. As his commonwealth was a civil, historically natural institution, so the duty required from its citizens and power ascribed to its magistrates.

Before repeating (almost verbatim) the point about a magistrate’s spiritual status neither adding to nor detracting from his civil position, Williams reminded his

¹⁰⁴ *Mr. Cotton’s Letter Examined and Answered* (1643), CW I, p. 335.

¹⁰⁵ For discussion of Williams’ typology in relation to his rejection of the Old Testament Theocracies as ‘types’ of present day governments in their remit to preserve orthodox religious practice, see Chapter two.

¹⁰⁶ *The Bloudy Tenent* (1644), CW III, p. 355. Williams would repeat the point in almost the same terms, in *The Examiner Defended* (1652), CW VII, p. 274.

audience in 1652 that ‘the nature of the Civil *Magistracie*,’ was ‘essentially Civil all the world over,’ and the ‘power of the *Magistrates* or *Officers* designed unto them by the people’ was ‘as but their *Deputies*, either *Legislative* or *Executive*.’¹⁰⁷ Thus Williams’ endorsement of ‘delegated’ power in magistracy, as opposed to ‘discretionary,’ was a function of his removing spiritual remit from the office as extant in present history. Others in Providence Plantations shared Williams’ understanding of the nature of magistracy. Notably, Dr. John Clarke of Newport wrote of the magistrates as God’s ‘sword-bearers,’ but not to be misunderstood, qualified that the magistracy was:

...an earthly, and outward administration, which suits the outward man, and ...is managed by an outward visible sword of steel, and by a carnall or audible voice, (yet righteous, just, and good, which ... tends to the peace, liberty, and prosperity of a civil State...so far as it concerns the outward man.)¹⁰⁸

Both Williams and Clarke agreed that the magistrate served God’s purposes for both civil and spiritual ends in present history, but interpreted the Scriptural injunction that Kings be the ‘nursing fathers’ of the church to remove the ‘*state bars*, set up to resist to holy *Spirit* of God in his *Servants*.’ A Magistrate who did this, in Williams’ opinion, ‘...hath made fair progresse in promoting the *Gospel* of *Jesus Christ*.’¹⁰⁹

As to what the particular qualities the magistrate should demonstrate, and what specific civil functions his job would consist of, Williams departed little from his contemporaries in Massachusetts or elsewhere in New England. He agreed wholeheartedly that eminence in birth and estate, evidence of moral behaviour, moderation, wisdom, and judgment would make a good magistrate, treating it much

¹⁰⁷ *The Examiner Defended...* (1652), CW VII, p. 274. Williams made this point repeatedly through this treatise: see also CW VII, p. 212, where he specified that the ‘forms and sword’ of the magistracy were ‘derived from the *People*,’ and that election added nothing to the Magistrate’s commission.

¹⁰⁸ Dr. John Clarke, *Ill Newes...* (London: 1652), p. 2, 3, in introductory section directed toward Parliament.

¹⁰⁹ *Christenings Make Not Christians* (1652), CW VII, p. 179.

as any other civil calling for which specific attributes were necessary.¹¹⁰ Williams did not develop these qualities in a systematic way, as did many of the election sermons of his Massachusetts contemporaries, but acknowledged that they were a unique combination of skills, which together indicates ‘*politicall* and *state abilities*’ in an individual, recommending him for office.¹¹¹ Once in office, the role of Williams’ magistrate was to ‘...*make* and *execute* such *Civill Lawes* which may concerne the common *rights, peace* and *safety*...’ of the commonwealth.¹¹² Many times in his work, Williams specified that the remit of the magistrate was to protect the ‘bodies and goodes’ of his citizens, usually however in context in discussions of the limitation of magisterial power, rather than its positive action.¹¹³ Included in the positive remit of the magistrate were certainly the useful civil tasks as recording the births of children, marriages, and burials ‘impartially in a *civil way*,’ all part of constructing appropriate orderly governments.¹¹⁴ Further, the magistrate was to punish breaches of law, and seek redress against murderers, robbers, etc., in addition to punishing uncivil behaviours, which might de-stabilize the state.

However, Williams’ magistrate also had a positive role in promoting and protecting free conscience, extending from the injunction to protect ‘bodies and goodes.’ This role is often obscured in historical approaches to his view of magisterial power, as so much of his discussion emphasizes the limitations, or negative role of officers, rather than explaining what it is their actual responsibilities to preserve free conscience at the base of the civil commonwealth consisted of. If the

¹¹⁰ See Breen, pp. 8-13 for some development of these five characteristics in an English Puritan context: Williams obviously did not require the magistrate to evidence election.

¹¹¹ *The Bloudy Tenent*, CW III, p. 366.

¹¹² *Ibid.*

¹¹³ See for examples, *Mr. Cotton’s Letter Examined* (1644), CW II, p. 254; *The Bloudy Tenent* (1644), CW III, pp. 36, 127, 160, 203, 228, 240, 249, 252, 354, 373, 387. List is exemplary, not exhaustive.

¹¹⁴ *The Hireling Ministry None of Christs* (1652), CW VII, p. 186. It is appropriate, given his account of civility, that Williams should emphasize the role of civil officers in recording the connections and relationships between householders, building a corporate memory of the habit of civil bonds between people and within households.

primary purpose of the magistrate was to get out of the way of Grace in history, and God would materially favour commonwealths so constructed, it does not make such a big leap to find a positive power for state officers in preserving the condition of soul liberty, which under girded Williams' account of political sovereignty. With specific reference to England, Scotland, and Wales, Williams wrote that the proclamation of 'free and impartiall Liberty ...to choose and maintaine what *Worship* and *Ministry* their *Soules* and *Consciencs* are perswaded of...' if instituted, would prove '...a binding force to ingage the whole and every *Interest* and *Conscience*, to preserve the *Common-Freedom* and *peace*.'¹¹⁵ Thus the magistrate should work to discover and nurture liberty of conscience as a 'binding force' promoting civil peace, which would itself best protect the 'bodies and goodes' of the people. Specifically, Williams 'implored' the magistrates to:

...provide in their high *Wisdom*e for the *security* of all the respective *consciencs*, in their respective *meetings*, *assemblings*, *worshippings*, *preachings*, *Disputings*, &c. and that *civil peace*, and the *beauty* of *civility* and *humanity* be maintained among the chiefe *opposers* and dissenters.¹¹⁶

In the Bloody Tenent Williams had written that it was '...*necessary*, *honourable*, *godly*, &c. with *civill* and earthly *weapons* to *defend* the *innocent*, and to *rescue* the oppressed from the violent *pawes* and *jaws* of oppressing persecuting *Nimrods*,' and specifically of the magistrate's duty to '...breake the teeth of the *Lions*, who offer Civill violence and injury' to the elect.¹¹⁷ Thus in a seeming paradox, Williams magistrate undertook a positive responsibility not just for the protection of conscience in his state, but for the promotion of free conscience, as the 'binding force' of political obligation and civility.

¹¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 183.

¹¹⁶ *Ibid.*

¹¹⁷ *The Bloody Tenent* (1644), CW III, pp. 59, 129. Like references are made throughout the text of this work: see also pp. 132, 159, 188, for examples.

This was not simply an abstraction for Williams: his political advocacy in Providence as he perceived the correct brand of soul liberty threatened actively reflected his understanding that magistrates should fulfil these roles.¹¹⁸ Nor was Williams alone among his neighbours in Providence Plantations: Clarke wrote that he considered the correct remit of the magistrate to be the preservation of the state, and people ‘belonging thereunto, safe in their person, name, and estate, from him or them that would rise up to visibly oppress, or wrong them in the same.’¹¹⁹ As such he also endorsed a positive magisterial power to promote and protect free conscience, derived from the need for civil peace and responsibility for people’s bodies and property. In Williams thought, the position of magisterial power must be understood in relation to his whole system for understanding the place of people and civil institutions in present history, as well as his particular account of democracy and incumbent responsibilities it imposed on the people. Williams neatly divided the spiritual capacities of the magistrate from his civil abilities, while bewailing the imperfect state of religion in human history, the ‘...shipwrack of *Mankinde*.’ He frequently defined the role of government with the role of the magistrate, but both always in terms of the separate sphere of civil authority. His magistrate was a strong and stabilizing force in the civil lives of all people, ‘...armed with a civill Sword (Rom. 13.) to execute vengeance against Robbers, Murtherers, Tyrants, &c.’¹²⁰ He believed wholeheartedly that every person, regardless of spiritual orientation, owed unfailing loyalty to the magistrate in ‘civil things.’ This was specifically because civil authority, and the magistracy itself, originated in God, functioning as an unhappy necessity, perhaps, but a necessity of human history nonetheless.

¹¹⁸ Particular cases, both concerning individuals and the whole community, will be developed in detail, along with consideration of the implications for this positive power in Williams’ larger account of conscience, civility, and government, in chapter five.

¹¹⁹ Clarke, *Ill Newes*..., p. 3.

¹²⁰ *Queries of Highest Consideration* (1644), CW II, p. 266.

Conclusion

Williams' foundation of the state in liberty of conscience would have unintended effects within his political thought, one proving catastrophic to his public career within the colony, and the other proving catastrophic to his whole system of thought concerning civil order. In the former case, by attaching a special status to Providence's sovereign existence as a 'haven for refugees of conscience,' Williams put the state's role as the protector and enabler of its citizens' property interests and commercial expansion on a collision course with its responsibility to preserve common land for future incomers. In a nutshell, Williams' addition of positive power to the magistrate's remit to promote liberty of conscience would create confusion about the state's primary role for him. It was to protect its citizens 'bodies and goods,' but was it to do this by creating conditions to maximise their commercial success and cement their community network with economic ties, or by checking their commercial development so as to preserve Providence primarily as conscience's haven rather than a commercial centre and stable community? This was the philosophical question underlying Williams' dispute with William Harris and others aiming to facilitate the improvement of outlying land, which dispute ultimately cost Williams his position as a public authority in the colony.¹²¹ Encouraging self-interest as a basis for obligation to the state, Williams' kind of thought could serve to validate a kind of entrepreneurial spirit among his neighbours resembling nothing as much as

¹²¹ The controversy with Harris will be referred to again in Chapter five, which concerns challenges to civil order, and historical remedies Williams' proposed. Williams' remedies are described as 'historical' in the context of their limitation by the condition of human historical position, as discussed in Chapters two and three.

covetousness and the elevation of selfish interest over the demands of the commonwealth, to him.

Secondly, Williams' placing of liberty of conscience as the mechanism driving Providence's sovereign mission in his own mind, and the positive powers he deduced from this foundation, elevated the role of the state in relation to the importance of other 'natural' institutions within his system. This upset the delicate network of interlocking tensions, which would ideally result in civil order, as described in chapter three. The state that Williams helped to build, as it developed in reality, usurped the civil power Williams thought should be exercised by other institutions, notably the family. If the free exercise of conscience was indeed at the heart of a civil order, Williams' appropriation of responsibility for its preservation to the state undermined the role he thought other institutions and professions should play in shoring up that same civil order. This amounted to nothing less than an effective privatisation of conscience: Williams' diverting responsibility for creating civil order to the state paradoxically removed or diminished the public, civil role for individual consciences. While this did not cause the dissensions that marked Providence and Providence Plantations' civil life during its first fifty years of settlement, it limited Williams' ability to respond to what he saw as increasing disorder. It is no wonder that he became perplexedly frustrated and latterly enraged by what he perceived as a growing covetousness and 'private interest' governing his compatriots' political advocacy and commercial dealings. What he failed to realise was that the philosophical flaws in his own attachment of special status to Providence Plantations as a haven for conscience allowed for the expanded state role, and de-emphasis of conscience's weight in the civilising web of restraint. This study does not claim a causal link between the contradiction in Roger Williams' account of civil order with his expectations for a

state role in relation to conscience and the political conflicts in Providence: the claim is merely that an internal contradiction did develop within Williams' political thought, and that the implications of this contradiction were demonstrated by Williams' responses to events he perceived as threats to civil order over the course of his political career.

Chapter Five: Challenges to Civil Order, and Historical Remedies

Introduction

Roger Williams was very realistic about the level of public disorder that would accompany the expansion and diversification of the population and economy of Providence and Providence Plantations. As early as August, 1636, he wrote bravely to then Deputy Governor of Massachusetts John Winthrop that, 'I desire not to sleep in securitie and dreame of a nest wch no hand can reach. I can not but expect changes, and the change of the last Enemie Death.'¹ Much as he feared that social disorder and challenges to the legitimacy of the fledgling government would lead to the destruction of his settlement (literally, in these early days) Williams clearly expected conflict to feature prominently in human life, and did not think that it could be engineered out of human society, any more than the 'last Enemie' could be avoided.² This did not mean, however, that he retreated from trying to remedy the

¹ Roger Williams, 'To Deputy Governor John Winthrop, before 25 August 1636,' *Correspondence* 1, p. 54. The substance of the letter involved Williams asking the elder Winthrop's advice about how to structure the enlargement of the first group of Providence householders, incorporating much needed young single male incomers, while mitigating against their potential disruption of the local administration of civil affairs, including the apportionment of land for planting, participation in civil defence, and mediating the 'common peace.' Williams showed antipathy towards civil procedure that would give individual freemen an equal voice in the decisions of expansion, and day-to-day administration of town business, yet endorsed the basic principle of consent. He provided Winthrop with sample language by which the incomers and present freemen might express their 'Compact in a civill way and power,' and solicited his suggestions. (p. 53) For detailed discussion of Williams' understanding of democracy, and issues of consent in relation to the nature of the political individual in present history, see Chapter four, section three, *Democracy and Officers of the State*.

² Though written thirty years after this early assertion, and in the midst of much more trying controversies with his neighbours over the correct position of individual interest in public affairs, the sentiments developed in Williams' 1666 manuscript, '*Esau and Jacob's Mystical Harmony Unvailing...*' agree with this early aside to Winthrop. In the manuscript Williams developed in detail his understanding that the anti-christ (in the shape of 'strugglings' and tumult) was a feature of all present 'earthly and fleshly' institutions, and could not be escaped, or engineered out of present history, defined as it was by original sin. Williams did believe, however, that outside of human understanding and experience of time, all worldly factions would be (and were) reconciled in God's 'mystical universal unity.' He could talk about this reconciliation as a present phenomenon, as he understood it to be entirely extra-historical, and not defined by the sequence or progress of time in human history. See for example, Williams' speculation about Paul's regard for humanity's inability to acknowledge such incomprehensible 'harmony' in the present day:

civil and spiritual consequences of political, religious, and social conflicts, or that he thought God's authority vested in present rulers pointed to anything other than civil peace. However, the remedies he offered were profoundly 'historical,' that is, conditioned by the network of logical conclusions deriving from his reading of original sin.³ It has been the argument of this study that within Williams' framework, liberty of conscience supported civil order and obedience rather than conflict and dissent. How then did Williams respond to real conflict deriving explicitly from arguments about conscientious behaviour that threatened civil order? This final chapter will examine the answers to that question, explaining the positive remit for protecting and preserving free conscience that Williams ascribed to civil government, and how he thought this power should be used in the service of that freedom. Public political conflict did accompany the negotiation of individual interests and communal obligation in Providence and Providence Plantations, in which negotiation Williams was an active participant. These were not, however, poles of interest that he recognised. Williams identified liberty of conscience and liberty generally with the prerogatives of the community as a whole, based on the protection it offered individuals. By his account the seeming tension between individual and community was an historical illusion, developing only as a result of covetous interest and will-

Our Brother Paul, in Exhorting Harmony; reflects, from his divine Light, on the fleshly Man=Hood; not living in spiritual Communion; nor worshipping of Jehovahs universal unity; But by corrupt flying (in fleshly selfish ignorance) from the glory of Jehovahs presence; In all earthly transactions, change=eth in Himself, the Eternal Glory of the incorrupt=able God=Head, in to the likenes of Himself, to be alterable and changeable as he is;

Rom:
5.

As implied in the 1636 aside to Winthrop, Williams denied the potential for humans to ever engineer societies in which conflict was removed. Escape from 'fleshly selfish ignorance,' as escape from 'the last Enemy, Death,' was lamentably impossible, explaining why Williams did not seek to create a utopian civil community, given the chance.

³ The word 'remedy,' in this context, is borrowed from Sir Henry Vane's letter 'To the Magistrates and Householders of Providence Colony, 8 February 1653/54,' *Correspondence* II, p. 784. cf. notes 47, 48, and related text, in Section two of this chapter.

worship, among natural men and women. As such, his validation of government interest, or intrusion, in areas of 'private' life was utterly consistent with his avowed liberty of conscience: it is only from a liberal perspective, assuming the opposition of liberty and authority, that Williams advocacy seems paradoxical.

It has been a problem for political historians that Williams seemed to endorse a wide liberty, but curtail it at the first sign of civil threat: correctly defining the terms in which Williams' perceived disorder and order, historically, and explaining the real character and purpose of his liberty for conscience in action, removes this problem. The project of this final chapter is to examine the 'historical' remedies Williams offered to civil conflicts seemingly allowed by statutory freedom for conscience, as they involved government, householder, and the community market place.⁴ This will serve to integrate, in practical terms, his understanding of society and order with his expectations both of government, and of individual householders as political agents.

The conclusions drawn also have relevance for the wider study of early New England political history. Examining Williams' expectations of the interplay of conscience and civil authority, interwoven with the network of social relationships in which each individual found him or herself, sheds important comparative light on how others with more orthodox expectations of church institutions as conforming agents managed the tension between order and self-interest, community and individual. Indeed, Williams' concern with liberty of conscience throws that faculty into the foreground of his responses to disorder, and his affection for order and obedience largely parallels his more orthodox contemporaries in New England. As such, his

⁴ The verb in this sentence is important: Williams along with many contemporary opponents, notably John Winthrop and John Cotton, expected that statutory liberty of conscience would actually cause dissent, versus simply allowing it to go unchallenged. Removing that liberty, however, would not remove dissenting conscience, and would cause further levels of civil disorder itself, in Williams' opinion. Cotton and Winthrop disagreed, if liberty of conscience was defined in Williams terms, certainly. See full discussion in section two of this chapter.

advocacy offers an exemplary window into broader historical understanding of the negotiation of civil and social order in a ‘democraticall’ seventeenth century New England commonwealth. Williams still has lessons to teach historians about how the first generations of leaders in New England understood tension between individual and community to originate, what they thought the effects of this tension were, and how it should be managed to best serve the social cohesiveness of civil society and economy.

The pattern of chapters in this study has unpicked and explained the relationships between the ideas making up Williams’ intricate understanding of human behaviour in societies and commonwealths, with detailed comparisons to his contemporaries. What emerges is a picture of Williams as a political advocate profoundly concerned to re-define the conditions of civil order to respond to his understanding of human history. Civil order, for Williams, relied on the strong exercise of universal natural conscience, making all people obedient to the state, and to the demands of their callings and positions, even including their most personal relationships, within their civil communities. Within this structure liberty of conscience might be an historical necessity because Williams refused to identify present civil structures with the Scriptural type Israel, removing any spiritual commission they might claim. But more fundamentally, liberty of conscience, the first condition allowing the strong exercise of natural conscience in the life of each individual, was for Williams the practical foundation of social and civil authority, and obedience to the state. In four sections, the chapter will explain exactly how this claim could be made, given that actions representing clear threats to the power and order of the state either resulted from, or were allowed by, the statutory liberty.

The argument will first reconsider Williams' understanding of the nature of civil disorder and its origin in practice, briefly drawing together themes from previous chapters to present a picture of the challenges to order he understood himself to face. The final section of Chapter three considered persecution for conscience's sake as a particular source of civil and spiritual disorder, and explored Williams' account of liberty of conscience as an historical remedy to the problems posed in the first section here. Liberty of conscience itself was only the first condition for the strong exercise of well-informed natural conscience, which Williams thought would lie at the heart of civil peace: he agonised in how to correct ill-informed and mistaken conscience, as it masked selfish, or covetous ends in civil behaviour and political advocacy. In roughly chronological order, sections two, three, and four of the chapter will consider particular conflicts in the civil life of Providence Plantations, and Williams' responses: this will allow a practical examination of the negotiated place of conscience in relation to civil authority that Williams developed. More broadly, this investigation will allow a drawing together of the implications for government of Williams' 'historical remedies' for civil disorder, explaining finally the unified spiritual and civil purposes of government in his account. In many ways, this discussion responds to the 'civil sins' (lying, drunkenness, contentiousness, whoredom, stealing, covetousness, voluptuousness, ambition, laziness, and uncharitable meddling) that Williams had referred to in his letter to John Whipple, Jr., in 1669.⁵

The first case will be Joshua Verin's 1638 claim of conscientious ordering of his family and household, resisting civil action (led by Williams) to stop Verin beating his wife. Section two of the chapter will examine Williams' perception of the

⁵ Roger Williams, 'To John Whipple, Jr., 8 July 1669,' *Correspondence II*, p. 586.

threat caused by that case and the disruption of families and households in general, in relation to his understanding of the mechanisms of civil order, in present history.⁶

Section three will consider Samuel and Mahorshalehiashbash (thankfully abbreviated to Mahor in the court records) Dyer's conscientious refusal to participate in military training in aid of the defence of the colony. The brothers were charged in 1659 with larceny against the state: the section will include discussion of Williams' understanding of the position of positive law in relation to conscience, and his remedy for its opposition cloaked in the colony's statutory liberty.⁷ The final section exploring Williams' 'historic' remedies to civil disorder, expressed in practice, will involve a conflict not on its face explicitly concerned with liberty of conscience. Williams was quite literally enraged at what he saw as the elevation of covetous motives in the acquisition and administration of land by William Harris and the Pawtuxet group during the 1660s and fought hard for the civil authority to restrict it. Looking at this longer term controversy will first highlight the role that Williams thought conscience should play, in conforming individual economic and material interests to a greater good. It will also showcase the role he wanted government to play in exerting positive pressure to preserve and promote the conforming activity of conscience in civil life.⁸ Having shown in previous chapters that Williams aimed to enfold or ensnare the political individual in a web of checking conscience and humility conditioned by history, these discussions together will show how he sought to accomplish this end, in practice, seeking the 'peace and libertie' that he thought

⁶ Specific documents and sources will be discussed at length in the section. For quick reference, see 'To John Winthrop, 22 May 1638,' *Correspondence I*, pp. 155-157, and related notes and editorial comment.

⁷ For quick reference, see *Rhode Island Court Records*, 2 vols., 1: *Records of the Court of Trials of the Colony of Providence Plantations, 1647-1662*, (Providence, RI: Rhode Island Historical Society, 1920) p. 57. Williams' opinion can be seen in his 'Ship of State' letter, 'To the town of Providence, ca. August 1654,' *Correspondence II*, pp. 399-403.

⁸ For quick reference, see Glenn Lafantasia, 'editorial note: Partisan Politics and the Pawtuxet Controversy, 1667-1670,' *Correspondence II*, pp. 556-570, and following documents.

should derive from the 1663 Charter.⁹ If Thomas Shepard believed that ‘...y^e L^d would have men wrapt up in societies,’ putting them in ordering positions to take ‘...care for [their] [pro]vision & [pro]tection,’ Williams agreed.¹⁰

The chapter does not aim at, nor accomplish, a detailed or exhaustive social history of all conflict in Providence or Providence Plantations, nor any of the conflicts considered: the focus of this study remains on the mechanics of Williams’ application of liberty of conscience in service of public order. The understanding of order and disorder, obedience and self interest deriving from these discussions must, however, be applied to wider social histories of these conflicts, and others in the continuing study of seventeenth century New England. Williams’ responses to civil conflict were the proving ground for his justification of civil power acting positively to protect and promote the free exercise of conscience within the colony. Offering limited, ‘historical’ remedies, he expected the empowerment of conscience by positive civil action to offer the best chance of order, longing for perfect civil tranquillity while not expecting it to occur.¹¹ The purpose of the discussion of these particular conflicts, then, is to develop a correct picture of the spiritual purpose of Williams’ state, and to

⁹ See Roger Williams, ‘To the Town of Warwick, 1 January 1665-66,’ *Correspondence* II, pp. 534-543. The anatomy of peace and liberty presented in the text of this plea to pay the rate for Clarke will be considered in section five, in relation to conscience and the regulation of people’s use of money and economic behaviour within the commonwealth. Williams wrote about these ‘jewells’ as the fruits of Clarke’s labours in obtaining the 1663 Charter, arguing they were worth paying for, and not to be taken for granted.

¹⁰ Thomas Shepard I, text from ‘Qu: 4, Obs: 1,’ sermon of ‘Jan: 26: 1644-45, Command.5: Ex: 20:12,’ Bracketed text in shorthand. *Shepard Family Papers c1636-1681*, Mss. Octavo Volumes ‘S’, Octavo Volume 2, 1643, 1645, Collections of the American Antiquarian Society.

¹¹ It was in this context that the themes of the 1666 manuscript ‘*Esau and Jacob...*’ prove most interesting: the treatise showed Williams to be struggling to reconcile the worldly tumults of present churches and human societies with a continuing belief in God’s plan for ultimate reconciliation of such conflicts. The problem was to explain how and why conflict continued, if God intended peace, and the answer Williams offered was to divorce human history and timescales from God’s own, in the typological explication of the Jacob and Esau story. It was thus possible for Williams to claim that by a ‘paradoxical mystery,’ present conflict in the world did not abrogate the existence of a divine plan for humanity, and created a typological space for perpetual civil conflict as an intentional part of human history. The political implications of this are developed fully in the section detailing obligation in the previous chapter, and elsewhere, but in general terms, this meant that the focus of government action was not the perfecting of individuals, or eliminating conflict from society.

understand the exact position of 'soul liberty' in preserving civil peace. This project would not be possible without the examination of sovereignty and individualism, in relation to the derived powers of the state and its officers, undertaken in the previous chapter, or the detailed examination of Williams' understanding of the 'natural history' of order offered earlier in the study. As will become apparent, correct understanding of Williams' account of states, statecraft, and the obligations of citizens within a commonwealth depends on the full integration of his explicitly 'political' thought with the themes of the earlier chapters.

Section One: Anatomy of Disorder

Williams fully expected his civil peace to look more disorderly, by the standards of the world, than that of many other commonwealths, and as far as he achieved it in the early life of Providence Plantations, it did. Fears about real and potential civil disorder proved compelling subjects not just for Williams, for whom they occupied a central position in motivating political advocacy, but for civil and ecclesiastical leaders at all levels in the New England colonies during the first century of settlement. It was particularly in this context that men like John Cotton, Thomas Shepard, and others found the mutual support of church and civil institutions a practical aid to ensuring civil peace, buttressing the external and internal discipline which they thought would best protect householders' persons and property within the commonwealth. In Massachusetts, church and state bodies, powers, and authority, while separate, were assumed to properly form a mutual aid society in which the well-

ordered civil commonwealth provided the best circumstances for the progress of Grace in the lives of potential saints within churches, as well.¹²

Massachusetts' orthodoxy and prevailing public wisdom within the colony taught that the free exercise of dissenting conscience, if it moved into public life at all, necessarily challenged civil order, and should therefore be opposed by civil authority in addition to spiritual authority. The general terms in which Edward Rawson, acting as Secretary for the General Court in Boston, recorded the reasoning behind the banishment of 'Anabaptists' Thomas Gold, William Turner, and John Farnham in April of 1669 exemplified the approach. As Rawson explained, in setting up a '...free-scool for seduction into wayes of Error, and casting off the Government of Christ Jesus in his own appointments,' it was not the free exercise of dissenting conscience that proved problematic, but that the Anabaptist teaching would serve as:

...opening a door for all sorts of abominations to come in among us, to the disturbance not only of our Ecclesiastical enjoyments, but also contempt of our Civil Order...manifestly threaten[ing] the dissolution and ruine, both of the peace and order of the Churches and the Authority of this Government: which our duty to God and the Country doth oblige us to prevent.¹³

While the three men themselves might not pose an actual threat to the government at the present time, nor admit to challenging civil authority, the order shows the Court erring on the side of extreme caution in avoiding any slippery slope to such challenges in the future. The court language makes clear that church and state authority and power were indeed functionally separate in Massachusetts, Bay, but implied that the related threat to each legitimately engaged the disciplinary attention of both.

¹² A vast historical literature attaches to this point. For balanced summary of civil and ecclesiastical powers' formal separation, but practical relationship, see Perry Miller, *Orthodoxy in Massachusetts, 1630-1650*, (New York: Harper and Row, 1970) (original publication 1933), pp. 257-262.

¹³ Massachusetts Bay Colony, *Several Laws and Orders Made at the General Court of Election, held at Boston in New-England the 29th of April 1668*, Edward Rawson, Secretary. (Cambridge: 1668) p. 9.

Roger Williams agreed with his Massachusetts' opponents that civil conflict would almost certainly derive from denying government institutions the direct power of structuring the spiritual life of the colony, and permitting the free exercise of all conscience. As Williams himself would experience it, this conflict would include both the direct resistance to government, and the disruption of households, along with the inappropriate elevation of 'covetous' interest in the marketplace. Even writing to Winthrop in 1636, Williams was not naive enough to think that just because the liberty of conscience he envisaged required people to conduct themselves 'peaceable,' reinforcing obedience to civil institutions, did not mean that it would. As he demonstrated time and again, when challenged to defend the results of liberty of conscience, he expected dissenting belief to spill out of private closets and homes into public civil relationships.¹⁴ This was why he was so vigilant and articulate in his specific opposition to civil disorder cloaked as conscientious behaviour in Providence. But for Williams, given the contingencies of present history and the imperfection of human understanding, this was no justification for rejecting such liberty. As Williams had clarified to Winthrop, '...yet dare I not despise a Libertie, wch the Lord seemeth to offer me if for mine owne or others peace.'¹⁵ Whatever greater appearance of civil disorder accompanied liberty of conscience, that liberty in historical perspective was the precondition of any legitimate or lasting civil peace, in Williams' estimation.

Thus he differed very little from other leaders in his local arena in perception of the

¹⁴ See for the clearest example, Williams' defence of Gregory Dexter's 'conscientious' refusal to pay the rate for John Clarke's maintenance in England in 1669, despite the fact that Williams strongly supported the rate. Williams admitted to John Whipple, to whom the defence was addressed, that Dexter's conscience 'forced him to be such a child in his owne house,' i.e., that Dexter was badly mistaken and not acting as a responsible householder should, but commended the free exercise of strong conscience as the best guarantor that a man would '...dare not lye or be drunck, nor be Contentious, nor Whore nor steale nor be Covetous nor voluptuous, nor ambitious, nor Lazie bodies nor busybodies...' the pointed list of civil sins of which Williams implicitly accused Whipple and William Harris, his political mentor. Roger Williams, 'To John Whipple, Jr., 8 July 1669,' *Correspondence II*, p. 586.

¹⁵ Roger Williams, 'To Deputy Governor John Winthrop, before 25 August 1636,' *Correspondence I*, p. 54.

problems posed by civil disorder, but offered different 'historical' remedies, in line with his understanding of civil life amid the 'fleshly strugglings' of present history.¹⁶

Williams' acceptance of disorder as a civil reality in present history did not lead him to acquiesce to it quietly. Nor did disorder as he defined it derive exclusively from the licentious exercise of conscience: disruption of the civil peace happened as a result of the fruits of original sin, expressed in individual behaviour. While all natural people were subject to these, Williams argued that the free exercise of conscience, coupled with a humility derived from correct understanding of the historical context of the householder as a political individual would reduce disorder to a minimum. Specifically, as Williams informed John Whipple, Jr., in 1669, the householder who behaved conscientiously, with appropriate historical humility, would '...dare not iye or be drunck, nor be Contentious, nor Whore nor steale nor be Covetous nor voluptuous, not ambitious, nor Lazie bodies nor busybodies...' ¹⁷ Conscience, well exercised, Williams understood to endorse obedience to civil authority, and the suppression of individual private interests in favour of the material health of the community as a whole.

This view was characteristic of his contemporaries: whether or not they endorsed civil liberty for conscience, the general view among New England leaders was that correctly informed conscience should act to restrain and control instincts toward personal gain or the gratification of private interests. After specifically bothering to fix the acceptable price for scarce commodities like tools and clothing at no more than four pence per shilling's value more than the commodity's cash price in England, the authors of the Massachusetts law to regulate wages and prices (1633)

¹⁶ Different variations of the phrase are often used by Williams in *'Esau and Jacob's Mystical Harmony Unwailing...'* (1666). See for example, p. 53, where Williams discussed the inability of human 'natural' understanding to comprehend the will of God, despite all 'fleshly strugglings.'

¹⁷ Roger Williams, 'To John Whipple, Jr., 8 July 1669,' *Correspondence II*, p. 586.

considered that it was restriction enough to make a final proviso that all sellers should keep 'a good conscience,' in setting prices not specified. They reserved the right to 'punish severely' those who exceeded 'the bounds of moderation,' but their reference to conscience as a general standard of restraint showed their clear understanding that it would serve to restrict, rather than to endorse, economic behaviour that favoured individual profit over communal benefit.¹⁸ In another example of the general assumption that conscience would favour law and order, John Warner assured the town of Providence in 1650 that he desired nothing more than 'Law, Reson, and Contience,' in the consideration of a dispute, and the town echoed the assumption in the response that it would review his situation 'according to Law, truth, and Contience.'¹⁹ The formulaic nature of the reference to conscience underlined the ubiquity of its claim: Roger Williams was not alone, either among adversaries or adherents to 'soul liberty,' in looking to conscience to support obedience to general and particular standards of order. Where he differed from the Massachusetts leaders, was simply in his understanding of the role for the civil state in constructing, and mediating the content of conscience's dictates.

By Williams' estimation, the pointed list of civil sins he referred to in the 1669 letter to Whipple, Jr., quoted above, (and of which he implicitly accused Whipple and William Harris, Whipple's political mentor) were the root of most civil disorder he encountered. Clearly, conscience did not always restrain correctly. But if the

¹⁸ Stuart Bruchey, (ed.) 'The Laws of Massachusetts Regulate Wages and Prices (1633),' in ed. Stuart Bruchey, *The Colonial Merchant: Sources and Readings*, (New York, Chicago, San Francisco, Atlanta: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1966) p. 102. Although the specific wage and price levels were repealed by the General Court in 1635, it replaced them with the blanket statement that 'if any man shall offend...against the true intent of this [the repealed] law, he shall be punished...as the Court...shall adjudge,' p. 103. Dissatisfied with the rigidity of the static limits, the Court nonetheless endorsed the spirit of economic restraint to favour the survival of the community over the profit of any one individual.

¹⁹ *The Early Records of the Town of Providence*, eds. Horatio Rogers, George M. Carpenter, and Edward Field, 21 Vols., (Providence, RI: 1892-1951) Vol. 1, 1639-April, 1682, Nos. 01-0367, no. 044, p. 40.

Massachusetts response to disruption of the civil peace was to legislate and discipline dissent out of individuals by exerting civil control over the expression of conscience among other methods, and that failing, to remove them physically from within the sovereign space of the commonwealth, what remedies did Williams offer? How did he expect government and other civil institutions to function in present history to facilitate both the exercise of free conscience and the 'peace of the city?' If conscience always could be counted on, Williams had no problem: but if humans were still bound by natural constraints, and conscience remained fallible, then these two seem irreconcilable.

His ultimate goals, in order of priority, were firstly, protecting God's access to the consciences of the elect, and secondly, protecting the 'bodies and goodes' of the elect in present history. Williams relied on liberty of conscience, directly and indirectly, in the accomplishment of both goals. The first required the absence of civil restraint of saving consciences and the absence of constraint to corrupt church practices. The only practical way to accomplish the second was to construct a civil commonwealth in which the persons and properties of all were protected from external and internal assault.²⁰ By Williams' account, this required civil peace: peace

²⁰ Two reasons lay behind the necessity of protecting all people's 'bodies and goodes' within the commonwealth: firstly, although Williams believed election could be discerned with some certainty, human understanding and judgment in discovering election, as in other areas, were fallible, and secondly, but related to the first point, in what he described as the 'field' of the world, distinct from the ordered garden of God's invisible church, Williams argued strongly that the 'tares' or weeds should not be plucked up before the general harvest, conducted by God at the eschaton. That is to say, in order to avoid damaging the elect in the same stroke, heretics should be suffered to continue to exist (in civil intercourse) in present history, though opposed with spiritual means. John Cotton disagreed, based on an alternate interpretation of the Parable of the Tares, Matthew 13: 24-30. See Williams' summary of his understanding of the Parable versus Cotton's position, in Chapter 28 of *The Bloudy Tenent of Persecution* (1644) CW III, pp. 118, 119. In negative terms, Williams disputed Cotton's contention that 'tares' in the passage represented doctrine, arguing that they stood for persons, and further, that they stood for persons at large in the world, not for hypocrites or scandalous offenders within visible churches. Williams therefore concluded affirmatively that the field in the passage represented the world, or the whole civil commonwealth in present history, and Christians in the world should leave the tares to grow, for the common good of the elect who 'grew' along side in present history. Despite this disagreement over Scriptural interpretation with Cotton, Williams clearly agreed with him that 'anti-Christian idolaters' were a present problem in the commonwealth; he resisted civil remedies Cotton

facilitated by the checks of freely exercised natural conscience, mediated by the institutions of civil society, and protected from disorder by the magistrate and other civil agents. It is in examining the variance of Williams' historical remedies for disorder in civil society from his contemporaries, then, that it becomes possible to explore Williams' real spiritual purposes of government, in relation to other civil institutions and individual conscience in present history. While Williams' civil power may have been separate from visible church institutions, and restrained from meddling in conscience, his state fulfilled an explicitly spiritual purpose as it defended the 'tares and wheat' in the field of the present day.

A premise of this chapter is that the historiographic rubric identifying Williams with the 'separation of church and state' is insufficient to describe the specific spiritual purposes of government in his system. Distinctions made by historians between Williams' political and religious thought introduce a false dichotomy: it was his understanding of the conditions of 'natural' history, and the imperative need for a particular civility to allow the progress of Grace in history, which would inject such urgency into his explicitly political thought, and statecraft. Conditioned by his understanding of history, the business of government by Williams' account was to mediate and protect civil peace among the covetous, avaricious, and lazy, but nonetheless conscientious householders who served as political agents in civil society. His own responses to civil disorder, and the remedies he offered, give the best window into understanding the interaction that he expected between government, other civil institutions, and individual householders to achieve a legitimate civil peace, the 'peace of the citie' he would eulogise in the final chapters of *the Bloudy Tenent* in 1644. As Williams wrote, he hoped only that people in his

justified by his variant interpretation, but assured his readership that the ultimate fate of such idolaters was as certain as the harvest of the conscientious farmer.

civil commonwealth would be helped to ‘...put on the bowels (if not of Ch[ristian]itie, yet) of Humanitie each to other.’²¹ In other words, perfect harmony, ‘Christian’ peace, was impossible, given the conditions of history and continuing import of original sin for determining individual capacities in present civil life. However, universal ‘natural’ qualities, especially conscience as a goad and judge, might yet lead people into a civil peace in which a balance of interwoven and checking authorities mitigated the fruits of sin in civil life. Or so Williams hoped.

As has been suggested, understanding Roger Williams’ assumptions about order in society first requires attention to his view of history, and the related status of individuals, groups, and nations in history. Roger Williams’ understanding of the origin and character of civil order, as a function of the effects of ‘natural history’ on individuals and institutions was developed in detail in the first two sections of Chapter three. It is necessary, however, to integrate these themes with the discussion of Williams’ understanding of the political individual as related to present government institutions, developed in Chapter four, before examining the particular conflicts Williams’ tried to remedy. Quite simply, Williams’ perception of what did and did not constitute disorder, and the remedies he offered, derived from the political consequences of Adam’s rejection of the perfect peace and harmony of the Garden. The fact that he identified his householder as an inheritor of Adam’s patriarchal authority, as developed in relation to consent and political obligation in Chapter four, explained the limits of human potential in the present day. Williams understood correctly constituted government to capitalise on the Adamic inheritance to promote

²¹ Roger Williams, *The Bloudy Tenent* (1644), CW III, p. 424. This phrase implicitly referenced Williams belief that all people universally were possessed of natural conscience, and that a common, universal bond of humanity, even if ‘natural,’ could be a basis for constructing civil commonwealths. See Chapter Two, Section One, note 23.

civility in the present day.²² However, humans' equal share in the inheritance of Adam's corruption was what made individual interest, expressed in the list of disruptive sins for which Williams had lambasted Whipple, a threat to peaceful co-existence in the first place.

It was in this context that Williams identified civil disorder as any action or political advocacy that seemed to elevate personal, private interest over shared responsibility for the stewardship of patriarchal authority. The action itself might directly challenge state authority, as with resistance to positive law decided upon by the colonies elected officers, or direct resistance to an officer carrying out his duties. But such a definition of disorder, deriving from Williams' particular view of the purposes and historical position of the state, also brought individual motives for action into the arena of civil interest. Civil disorder might result from the reasons behind actions, as well as actions themselves, because civil peace depended on the strong exercise of conscience to constrain individual interest and behaviour to the public good, as defined by Williams. If peace depended on correct motives, then incorrect motives threatened it. Based on this understanding of disorder, Williams endorsed a state interest to preserve peace that was at once consistent with liberty of conscience, and at the same time legitimately touched householders' home and business relationships, in addition to their more formal interactions with state institutions. Liberal expectations that a 'private sphere' outside of state purview would accompany

²² See Chapter four, 'Representation and Consent,' in section two, for detailed explanation of the way in which masters of families in Williams' system had status as political agents only as 'representatives' of Adam's patriarchal authority, meaning that 'consent' to government was not an expression of personal, private opinion, but of historical commission. In practice, this explains how liberal assumptions about the meaning of representation and consent in relation to democratic government might make Williams look a hypocrite when he opposed political advocacy based in private opinion and preference, but still claimed to support 'democraticall' government. This makes a sharp contrast to a De Tocquevillian model of 'self-interest, rightly understood,' where individual restraint as part of a democratic society was observed and valued, but based in a purely personal, private interest.

statutory guarantees of liberty had no place in Williams' own political system.²³

Indeed, liberty of conscience as he conceived it and expected it to function, actually created and supported state interest in householders' more personal relationships.

Conditioned by his understanding of human history as a digression from God's 'mystical universal unity,' constructing a civil peace with what he defined as legitimate foundations was the goal of all Roger Williams' political advocacy. Roger Williams' ideal political individual learned his correct behaviour by a study of the historical relationships in which he found himself: his roles as a father, husband, householder, and his vocational calling and participation in the economic life of the community worked to train his selfish will to the common good, creating the web of checks and balances that Williams thought would result in civil peace. Only a civil peace constructed out of the real historical situation of humanity, in Williams' view, was legitimate. As this historical situation excluded inheritance of the divine civil covenant extended to the Old Testament kingdoms, Williams did not think civil institutions could themselves enforce spiritual truth, buttressing orthodox church practice, but could only mediate the civil peace which would ensure continued historical access for saving Grace to the consciences of the elect. On an individual level, natural conscience would serve to obligate the individual to the community, curtailing public effects of covetousness and selfish interest. Either way, the spiritual purpose of Williams' state was to promote and protect the free exercise of conscience, in the service of protecting the public order that depended on it.

The business of government, for Williams, was to ensure civility, and its primary means of achieving this was to promote and protect free conscience. Saving

²³ Assessing Williams' though without removing these expectations is what has led historians to conclude either that Williams was an early advocate of liberal freedoms, or that he was a hypocrite in suggesting freedoms, but not accepting people's exercise of them. See Chapter one, and Chapter four, notes 12-14, section one, for discussions of the problems liberal assumptions implicit in past historical approaches have created for commentators seeking to understand Williams' thought.

conscience could then lead the elect to self-recognition, and natural conscience could function in an unfettered way, working to give vocational callings and the various civil roles of individual householders their conforming power in present life. The results, Williams hoped, would be civil peace and prosperity, in which disorder succumbed to the ordering claims of family, household, work, and position as a freeman of the commonwealth. As previous chapters have developed, his theology instructed his general political principles, which worked with his understanding of human individual capacities and civil relationships to form an intricate system to describe individual position in communal life. Williams conceived of history as 'the record of human endeavour since Adam's disobedience to God:' the interactions of householders in the present day, for Williams, were entirely subject to the rules governing 'natural history.' By his account this was equally true for all people, of whatever belief, and it was on this basis that he saw no reason that the most 'anti-Christian, paganish' nations could evidence civil peace. The particular history of individuals meant that the pursuit of selfish interests would always be corrosive to the common good, and that this reality could not be engineered out of people: whether elect or unregenerate, individual nature was not perfectible during Earthly life. The elect householder just as much as the unregenerate retained his status as natural and corrupt, even when he was assured of God's Grace.²⁴ However, the effect of history on individuals also meant that with proper education and instruction, enmeshed in a web of mutually refereeing civil relationships, people shared an equal capacity through the exercise of conscience to train their private interests to the service of public order. As an intellectually mature Williams would write during the mid 1660s, the ejection of Adam and Eve from God's 'peculiar Garden' Eden marked '...the first

²⁴ See Chapter two, p. 16-19, for discussion of Williams' general understanding of humans' 'natural' faculties.

step of universal natural knowledge,' the basis of the natural capacities on which his version of civil peace would depend, for its maintenance.²⁵ As has been pointed out in the context of the discussion in Chapter three, but bearing reiteration, civil order, the 'peace of the citie,' was an order based in individual corruption and the historical disinheritance of nations: it was always the lesser of evils. Williams' goal, in promoting public order, was to provide the conditions in the 'field of the world' under which good seed that happened to fall on 'honest soil' would have a chance of producing fruit, and he recognised that the conditions that would protect that seed would necessarily aid the growth of many 'tares' at the same time. He sought these conditions for all governments of nations, not just his own, particularly because the elect would '...be gathered out of *Jew and Gentile, Pagan, [and] Anti-Christian*.'²⁶ History remained unfinished for Williams, but he waited for the establishment of true order, the order of the tended garden, at the time of God's final harvest.

As has also been developed, it was Christ's negation of Old Testament models for national covenanted relationships with God that kept Williams' state from being able to engineer the disorderly effects the idolatry of self-interest out of its householders' interactions, by its own civil authority. The effect of history on nations, in Williams' framework, meant that individuals could not look to nations to reform their human natures and selfish interest. Attempts to perfect the behaviour of a people by force would only lead to God's wrath, and to destruction and disorder rather than prosperity and safety. With these limiting premises arising from his view of history, Williams was quick to condemn utopian efforts to create perfect communities as illegitimate and unworkable: the nature of history meant that any such efforts were

²⁵ Roger Williams, '*Esau and Jacobs Mystical Harmony Unvailling The Myserie of Jehovahs Eternal will in Universal unity...*' (1666) Massachusetts Historical Society Ms. SBd – 51, p. 33.

²⁶ *The Bloudy Tenent* (1644), CW III, p. 104.

futile attempts ‘...to turne this *Field* of the *World* into the *Garden* of the *Church*.’²⁷

Thus his account of disorder in civil society, the ‘field of the world,’ was first and foremost a response to the model of history with which he worked.

Disorder took different forms, as Williams encountered it: it might involve ‘scandalous offence’ against the accepted habits of civilised behaviour, as exemplified by the case of Richard Chasmore, accused (though acquitted) of the capital crime of bestiality in 1656, but subtly, was more likely to involve political advocacy or behaviour in civil relationships that elevated selfish interest over the imperatives of civil peace. Anything that did not accord with Williams’ understanding of the imperfectability of people and states in present history, or seemed to exceed the representative capacity of householders as political agents in present history, or that substituted private interest for patriarchal responsibility as a motive for political advocacy, was a threat to public peace. Williams’ ‘politics’ placed less emphasis on advocating for power advantage within state institutions, and more on negotiating the construction and preservation of a secure civil society.²⁸ Williams saw disorder in states that exceeded (by his account) their historical position, but also in individual behaviour that disrupted the interwoven web of civil relationships, which worked with conscience to preserve order. Thus Williams had a context for finding clear civil threats in individual, household, and economic behaviour, in addition to particularly

²⁷ Ibid, p. 105. See Chapter two, section three for discussion of the status of visible and invisible church in present history: Williams thought Christ’s resurrection had transferred the covenant once owned by the historical nation Israel to the invisible church composed of elect drawn from all times, races, and nations.

²⁸ cf. Chapter three, note 38, and related discussion: ‘It is instructive to compare Williams’ positive assessment of ‘politics’ in this context with his absolute condemnation of power-seeking for selfish ends, or as an end in itself, which he typified as ‘Machiavellian.’ See for one example, Williams’ condemnation of recent assassinations among Narragansetts and intrigues between Mianatunomi and Canonicus: ‘Their treacheries excede Machiavills, etc.’ ‘To John Winthrop, 10 July, 1637,’ *Correspondence*, I, p. 94. This is not to imply, however, that Williams rejected the cultivation or use of strategic advantage in protecting the peace of the commonwealth, a goal he might interpret widely. See for example his further advice to John Winthrop, the following Spring, where he intentionally misquoted Juvenal, (satire 8, 180) to indicate that the English should seek advantage by punishing unruly tribes lightly. ‘To John Winthrop, 27 May, 1638,’ *Correspondence*, I, p. 156.’

state-centred affairs. He was appalled by the use of politics and the political process for what he considered private, or self-oriented ends, including advocacy to secure personal economic advantage in trade, or control of property in the distribution of land.

Part of what has made the scholarly study of Williams' career challenging to historians is the obscurity of his ideological motives: he derived actual, tangible policy positions by soul-searching study of the implications of the interdependent theological positions he espoused, themselves conditioned by their logical relationships to each other. Thus the 'anatomy' of disorder and order presented above properly introduces no new material to this study, but explains the conjoining of the themes of Williams' world-view to eliminate all but the one system for constructing civil peace, one system for addressing disorder.

Because he assumed that perfect civil peace was an impossibility, for Williams the process of constructing and mediating order equated to that order itself. Quite literally, the process became the product: vigilant management of the system of interwoven and mutually reinforcing conditions and relationships describing the human condition equated to civil peace. Human history was indeed unfinished, by Williams' understanding, and unresolved, and the tension implicit in his management of civil life was the echo of the tension introduced to creation by Adam. Thus Williams' account of civil order was an account of process, of journey rather than destination. The value of civil order, an essentially worldly phenomenon, he claimed only to measure by the access it afforded Grace to the souls of the elect within history. If the system appeared to his contemporaries (or to scholars since) to be unlikely to produce civil harmony, or remove the causes of social conflict, this is because it was: human history was unfinished, awaiting resolution, and the present access of Grace to

human history was only a paradoxical, visiting access. The causes of disorder might (and must) be channelled into useful civil avenues, by Williams' account, but they would not be removed before millennium.²⁹

Section Two: the Conscience of a 'boisterous and desperate' husband

The economy of the statement in the Providence town records of May 21, 1638 obscured a telling episode in the early life of the town and colony. The record stated simply, 'It was agreede that Joshua Verin upon the breach of a covenant for restraining of the liberty of conscience shall be withheld from the liberty of voting till he shall declare the contrary.'³⁰ As accounts of the case would show, the issue at hand was that Verin had been beating his wife Jane, ostensibly to punish and prevent her attendance at worship meetings in Williams' and others' homes. This caused real and immediate concern, not just among her spiritual brothers and sisters, but around the hearths and yards of the profoundly local community, then numbering around fifteen households. Verin's neighbours had remonstrated with him to stop the beatings, and to allow her freedom of movement, without success. When finally challenged in a formal public setting, Verin matched Williams' claim that he impeded his wife's liberty of conscience with his own that the state infringed his liberty of

²⁹ In the conclusion to his study of Williams' 'millenarian piety,' W. Clark Gilpin suggested, though without developing, this avenue of thought. As he concluded, 'The impurity and disorder which he [Williams] deplored in the present were never dissociated in his mind from the golden ages of past and future; the present might lack order or purity but it never lacked meaning, because one was passing through it on the way to lost Zion.' W. Clark Gilpin, *The Millenarian Piety of Roger Williams*, (New York and London: Chicago University Press, 1979) p. 174. The 'meaning' of present history which Gilpin referred to was its position as pathway to the eschaton; the value of order in the present would only in any case be to enable Grace to have continued access to the souls of the elect, in the present. Gilpin was correct in his assessment that Williams' understanding of history was the unifying centre from which his attitudes toward church, state, and religious liberty derived, though he emphasized Williams' expectations for the end of the world over Williams' understanding of the present conditions of human history. Williams also understood God's position to be entirely extra-historical, that is, omni-present.

³⁰ *Early Records of the Town of Providence*, Vol. I, (Providence, RI: Snow and Farnham City Printers, 1892), p. 4. Also Bartlett, *Records*, I, p. 16.

conscience to order his family as he saw fit. A satisfactory resolution was not reached, but a majority of the towns' householders agreed with Williams, and Verin was removed from any position of political agency within the town. He moved his family to Salem, away from Williams' influence, though seeking years later to reclaim his rights in the common land, as one of the first six settlers of the town.³¹

The Verin case disrupted the civil peace for a variety of reasons, on a variety of levels. Williams and his family occupied the lot immediately adjoining the house plot where the Verins lived; he and his family would have been immediately aware of the violence within the Verin household, especially if Jane was a regular attendee of worship in the Williams home.³² It is likely to conjecture that Williams himself and other householders would have tried to reason with Joshua Verin, seeking to make him modify his behaviour, well before the time of the formal hearing. Williams implied as much, when he described the town as 'long afflicted' and 'long bearing' Verin in a letter to John Winthrop the day after the disenfranchisement:

...we have bene long afflicted by a young man, boysterous & desperate...who, as he hath refused to hear the word with us (wch we molested him not for) this twelve month, so because he could not draw his wife, gracious & modest woman, to the same ungodliness with him, he hath troden her under foote tyranically & brutishly: wch she & we long bearing, though with his furious blows she went in danger of life, at the last the major vote of us discard him from our civill freedome, or disenfranchise, &c.: he will have justice (as he clamours) at other Courts: I wish he might, for a fowle & slanderous & brutish cariage, ...he will hale his wife with ropes to Salem, where she must needs be troubled and troublesome as differences yet stand. She is willing to stay & live with him or else where, where she may not offend, &c.³³

³¹ Bartlett, *Records*, I, pp. 16,17. Verin wrote to the town for 'reasonable satisfaction' of his land interest, in 1650; after the town considered the case on April 27, 1651, at its quarterly meeting, Gregory Dexter, the Clerk, wrote to Verin saying that if he would attend the Court and 'prove your right, they will do you justice.'

³² See 'Map of Providence, 1650,' in *Correspondence* I, p. 306. The lot that had been assigned originally to Verin, (lot 13) was in 1650 occupied by Richard Scott. Williams had lot 14. Each lot had frontage on the 'Towne Street' of roughly 125 feet, and extended to the rear; all lots were on the east side of the street, with the street running along the bank (to the north) of the Moshassuck River, which ran ultimately into the Great Salt River, before emptying into the northern tip of Narragansett Bay.

³³ 'To John Winthrop, 22 May, 1638,' *Correspondence* I, p. 156.

Jane was clearly well-known to Williams personally, and must have discussed her position with him and others locally, if he was able to tell Winthrop what her intentions were for a future with her husband. The primary disruption of the civil peace, as Williams saw it, consisted first in the actual and threatened violence against the woman herself.

Winthrop's own recorded account of the conflict, based on reports from William Arnold, another Providence resident and one of Verin's defenders, gave a different picture of the controversy, though without challenging the facts of the case:

At Providence, also, the devil was not idle. For, whereas, at their first coming thither, Mr. Williams and the rest did make an order, that no man should be molested for his conscience, now men's wives, and children, and servants, claimed liberty to go to all religious meeting, though never so often, or though private, upon the week days; and because one Verin refused to let his wife go to Mr. Williams so oft as she was called for, they required to have him censured.³⁴

Winthrop wrote with an eye to showing how Williams' liberty of conscience was tearing civil society apart, disrupting a husband's legitimate authority within the home.³⁵ In his view, the civil magistrate was charged with supporting the patterns of 'oeconomicall' authority, not subverting them. Indeed, as will be explored, Williams agreed, with the important proviso that the husband's authority did not touch religious practice, and the magistrate should act to protect all consciences in explicitly religious convictions. As Williams would write in *the Bloudy Tenent*, concerning the

³⁴ 'The History of New England by John Winthrop, edition of 1853,' quoted in Howard Chapin, *Documentary History of Rhode Island*, 2 Vols. (Providence, RI: Preston and Rounds Co., 1916) I, p. 72. Also Bartlett, *Records* I, p. 16.

³⁵ The place of family institutions in relation to the civil state and civil peace will be discussed below: Williams and the Massachusetts' leaders were actually much in agreement about the importance of family authority as the foundation for civil power in the commonwealth. See also Chapter four, section two, for discussion of the theoretical involvement of family with civil power and individual householders as political agents generally.

magistrate's responsibility to protect all consciences in civil society, '...this also concerns the *conscience* of the *Civill Magistrate*, as he is bound to preserve the *civill peace* and quiet of the *place* and people under him, he is bound to suffer no man to break the *Civill Peace*, by laying hands of *violence* upon any, though as vile as the *Samaritanes* for not receiving of the *Lord Jesus Christ*.'³⁶ Physical violence, especially associated with restricting the expression of worship, necessarily triggered the magistrate's own conscientious response, by Williams' account. If the first project of order in present history, for Williams, was to protect the elect, then Verin violated the most basic reason for the existence of families and other civil institutions.

For Roger Williams, however, Joshua Verin's mal-administration of his household posed a civil threat not just because of the physical violence done to his wife and her conscience (saving or not), but also because of the importance of orderly families to under gird the historical sovereignty of civil government. Roger Williams was much in agreement with his New England contemporaries in Providence and elsewhere that orderly families formed the building blocks of orderly government.³⁷ As he would write, 'The *Civil State*, and *Common-weal* may be compared to a piece of Tapesty, or rich Arras made up of the severall parts and parcels of the Families thereof.'³⁸ In his account of civil order, the householder acted as the steward of patriarchal authority within present history, working with the state to conform the members of his household to the demands of the common good. This was predicated on an assumption that the father and husband in a family had natural authority over

³⁶ *The Bloudy Tenent* (1644), CW III, p. 132. This duty applied even where conscience was clearly much in error, heretical, or 'vile.'

³⁷ See Chapter four, Section 2.3, 'Representation and Consent,' in which Williams' understanding of the interaction of the civil state and the householder is explained in detail, especially sources cited in notes 77-79. See also Edmund Morgan, 'The Family in the Social Order,' in *The Puritan Family: Religion and Domestic Relations in Seventeenth-Century New England*, (NY: Harper and Row, 1966) pp. 133-160.

³⁸ *The Bloody Tenent Yet More Bloody* (1652), CW IV, p. 401.

the members of his household: ‘...by the *Law of God, Nature and Nations*, a Father hath power over his Child, the Husband over the Wife, the Master over, &c.’³⁹ This did not, given the removal of spiritual remit from civil power in present history, give a householder rights over his dependants’ consciences in religious matters. However, the authority relationships within the households that made up Williams’ ‘Tapestry’ of civil society seemed so obvious and unassailable to him that he did not even bother to rehearse the complete list, trusting his reader to fill in blanks, ‘&c.’ Williams expected the strong exercise of conscience to restrain the householder who might act in favour of his own individual interest rather than that of his family members or the state. He acknowledged, however, that any householder (even among the elect) might fall into error, and be subject to ‘...Covetuous and ambitious ends.’⁴⁰ Thus for him, to preserve civil peace, the state was a necessary adjunct to the civil power of the father and husband.

Williams’ belief that orderly families were the foundation of orderly government was characteristic of his New England contemporaries. Preaching about the importance of marriage as a ‘...publike act, & y^e more publike the better; Ruth 4:10.11,’ Thomas Shepard I, prominent minister of the Cambridge church, agreed. In a 1645 series of sermons, Shepard gave explicit and detailed directions to his congregation about how to choose marriage partners, how to conduct themselves within marriage, and how to order households to the civil good. Shepard’s directions on household order included as much notice of a husband’s responsibilities to care for his wife and dependants, and specifically not to mistreat them physically, as affirmations of their obedience toward him. The goal was to maintain family order

³⁹ Ibid. The fact that Williams did not feel he needed to waste text rehearsing the complete list of household authority relationships shows how obvious and unassailable he took this point to be.

⁴⁰ ‘To John Whipple, Jr., 24 August 1669,’ *Correspondence II*, pp 594-609, quote from p. 604. Full discussion of Williams’ conflict with William Harris (Whipple was his son-in-law) will be developed in Section five.

and stability. From 1672, Massachusetts Bay would have and enforce a law forbidding spouses to strike each other, though punishment might be 'moderated,' as in one case where the husband was excused because 'the court was informed [his wife] was 'a woman of great provocation.'⁴¹

That Shepard devoted so much pastoral energy to the minutiae of family life, (going as far as urging married couples to 'remember' to keep their 'conjugal covenant' regularly) perhaps shows that these were (as now) the likely matters of greatest daily concern in the lives of the Congregation. However, it also shows that they were fundamental to public order generally, and the power of the civil government, particularly. He cautioned that marriage and the establishment of households must be exposed to public notice and care, treated as a civil institutions, even if '...private marriages clandestinely may in y^e court of consc: be made man & wife.' This was specifically to avoid '...an injury to [the] civill authority [of] the fathers of y^e country who are to see to y^e foundations of y^r state in families.'⁴² For both Williams and Shepard, making orderly families was part of preserving civil peace; disorder within families, particularly a husband failing to responsibly exercise his authority, was a direct challenge to the power of the state.

Families and households that functioned to endorse conscience's constraining voice, making members conform themselves to their social positions and play their roles in orderly civil society, were central to Williams' whole system for creating civil peace in present history. Williams was characteristic of his milieu in these assumptions about the civil usefulness of family structures. In an unpublished manuscript, historian Sydney James highlighted the ordering role of family as one of a

⁴¹ Morgan, *The Puritan Family*, p. 40.

⁴² Thomas Shepard I, from the section 'Duties mutuall & generally belonging to man & wife,' in sermon of 'May. 18.45 2: Husband & wife,' *Shepard Family Papers c1636-1681*, Mss. Octavo Volumes 'S', Octavo Volume 2, (1643, 1645). Collections of the American Antiquarian Society.

variety of 'lesser institutions' in early Rhode Island structuring the civil interactions and ensuring the material well-being of individuals.⁴³ James explained the continuing interest of the Court of Commissioners, the central state institution of the colony in the administration of family life as '...a by-product of the council's duty to preserve good order and prevent poverty in the towns... that is, [to support] governmental power in general.'⁴⁴ In addition to restricting unruly, or anti-social behaviour, extended families were responsible for the material care and support of their members, and government had a vested interest in making sure these responsibilities were accomplished. Though without offering substantial analysis of the nature or theoretical foundation of this collaboration, James accurately identified the Court's interest in family life as part of securing its own civil power.⁴⁵

Williams was much in line with his neighbours in expecting the formal institutions of civil government to work in relationship with families to restrict anti-social behaviour, encourage obedience to the state, and provide materially for their members. The practical workings of this collaborative relationship, in the early life of Providence and Providence Plantations, show in the implicit assumptions made by the Court about the active role 'conscientious' heads of households would take in accomplishing these ends. The Court of Commissioners, consisting of representatives from each of the four towns (Providence, Newport, Portsmouth, and Warwick) and presided over by Williams as 'Moderator,' accepted several 'Bills' designed to remedy anti-social behaviour at its meeting of 17 March, 1656. The Court showed a

⁴³ Sydney James, 'The Creation of Institutions in Early Rhode Island: 1636-1776,' Rhode Island Historical Society, Mss 511. James considered family in his chapter 'Lesser Institutions,' by which he meant non-governmental institutions that nonetheless played a role in ordering civil society in early Rhode Island. He did not examine the conditions, or nature, of civility per se in any detail, and underplayed the significance of families as models for state power, but the manuscript is largely a factual survey, not a theoretical enquiry.

⁴⁴ Ibid, p. 156.

⁴⁵ Chapter four provides detailed examination of the theoretical underpinnings and nuances influencing Roger Williams' understanding of the relationship between families, their heads, and the state: see especially section two.

clear anxiety about disorderly living among young, single men, labourers, and servants, particularly those who seemed only peripherally under the control of an established householder, or who were making the transition to form their own households. The court assumed that daughters or young single women would remain within their household of birth, adoption, or service until married, and thus directed its positive attention toward young men. First it ordered that ‘...no sonnes that are under y^e tuition [care-taking instruction and support] of their parents, shall claime absolute freedom until y^e age of twenty-one years.’⁴⁶ By keeping younger men under the supervision of their fathers (and mothers) the Court endorsed the authority of the household in conforming individuals to the civil peace. By allowing fathers to keep single men within the family until the age of 21, the Court also implicitly harnessed their economic productivity to the material security of the household, rather than allowing them to act as independent economic agents within the towns.

The Court’s actions at that one meeting in 1656, moderated by Williams, proceeded methodically to negotiate the collaborative relationship between family and state, working toward civil order. Fathers as heads of households should, by conscience, exercise proper control and guidance over their members. But as Williams and others knew, not every householder would be sufficiently well motivated to understand and correctly accomplish this civil stewardship, and might indeed be lazy in their responsibilities, or motivated by entirely less lofty ends. Thus the Court accepted a variety of Bills aimed at remedying potential disorder caused by single men, but touching their fathers and masters directly, by positive legal goad encouraging the correct, conscientious ordering of households. The Court ordered that any servant coming to the end of the period of service before the age of twenty

⁴⁶ Bartlett, *Records I*, p. 332.

one should still 'be disposed of' until that age by their 'parents or guardians,' but failing that best option, would be subject to the control and order of the counsel in their particular town, until they reached majority. Further, any parent or master who allowed the 'licentious courses' of his 'sonnes or servants' would be subject to a fine of £5, a substantial sum.⁴⁷

Significantly, under Williams' leadership, the Court did not seek immediately to circumvent the civil role of the conscientious householder when disorder occurred, but negotiated the practical relationship between the state and the family to provide for civil peace. Williams' 'historical remedy' for disruption of families, as headlined in the Verin case, was for the state to complement the civil role of husbands and fathers, to push them back into the balanced web of inter-woven tensions that would preserve civil peace in present history. He wanted the civil state to take an active, positive role to structure the conforming power of households, making sure that it worked correctly, but endorsing the continuing importance of heads of households as the agents of that power. Encouraging the strong exercise of the householder's own conscience, making him obedient to the considerable demands of his own civil role, was the historical remedy Williams sought, to attack visible anti-social tendencies within the community. Government sanction of householders who failed to control, or in broader terms, did not order correctly, their dependants served to promote what Williams saw as the correct expression of their conscience in civil action. This study has argued in previous chapters that in theoretical terms, Williams expected liberty for these natural (and saving, where occurring) consciences to serve obedience and order rather than dissent: these policy actions by the Court gave concrete expression to his expectations. Liberty of conscience as Williams conceived it was not a liberty for

⁴⁷ Ibid.

individualism, and involved a direct, positive state power promoting the correct function of the householder's conscience to make his actions in the civil relations of family life reflect an understanding of his historical position, and present responsibility in approaching civil peace.

Joshua Verin had failed to act in correct conscience in the ordering of his household, by Williams' estimation; thus Williams' support for positive civil action against Verin was an historical remedy for the disorder caused by what Williams saw as a weak conscience. The state had the remit to act to protect and preserve civil order, in collaboration with families as civil institutions, and conscience would be the mechanism by which baser human motives were conformed to the requirements of civil peace. In this context, Providence's taking civil action against Verin represented the practical expression of Williams' hopes for government involvement in protecting free conscience, in religious matters, and promoting strong conscience, in the correct ordering of households. The outcome, however, achieved neither end. Verin refused to be moved, and Jane remained with him, hauled '...in ropes to Salem,' by Williams' own account. John Winthrop's (albeit, second-hand) report of the actual debate surrounding the disenfranchisement gives important clarifying evidence:

...there stood up one Arnold, a witty man of their [Providence's] company, and withstood it [the charges], telling them that, when he consented to that order [liberty of conscience] he never intended it should extend to the breach of any ordinance of God, such as the subjection of wives to their husbands, etc., and gave divers and solid reasons against it. Then one Greene,...he replied, that, if they should restrain their wives, etc., all the women in the country would cry out of them, etc. Arnold answered him thus: Did you pretend to leave the Massachusetts, because you would not offend God to please men, and would you now break an ordinance and commandment of God to please women? ...when they would have censured Verin, [that is, just before the vote] Arnold told them, that it was against their own order, for Verin did that he did out of

conscience; and their order was, that no man should be censured for his conscience.⁴⁸

There was obviously disagreement among the arbitrating householders who made up the government of Providence at this early stage in its history about exactly what the state's role should be in relation to dissent within households. Unresolved tension surrounded the question of whether the state should simply tolerate dissenting conscience, treating households as sovereign units represented by their heads, or whether it should actively protect the conscience of all a community's members. Fundamentally, the assembly wanted the abuse to stop, and Winthrop recorded suggestions as part of the debate that the Verins' marriage should be dissolved, and Jane '...disposed to some other man, who would use her better.' Her desire seems to have been to stay with her husband, as reported both in the debate by Arnold, and in Williams' letter to Winthrop the next day.

Winthrop clearly thought Williams and 'the major vote' of others had betrayed the initial intention of keeping the state out of affairs of conscience, and gone too far in undermining a husband's authority within the household. Indeed, the outcome in the Verin case may have been a watershed in negotiating, by practice, the relation between state power and families within the commonwealth. It certainly set a precedent for the civil state to go beyond simple toleration of dissent, to actively promote and protect free conscience: this precedent was very much in line with Williams' own understanding of conscience's role in conforming individuals to civil obedience and socially acceptable behaviour. The case and the ambiguity of its outcome did not vindicate a wife's conscience over a husband's, (except as

⁴⁸Bartlett, *Records I*, pp. 16,17; also Chapin, *Documentary History*, Volume I, p. 72, 73.

understood in a saving context), but vindicated conscience as a goad to civil order and conformity over more base human motives.

The Verin case did not begin to redress the disempowerment of wives, within formal politics in Providence, despite the acknowledgement of their 'pester power' entering the debate in Greene's comments. Nor did Williams' support for action against Joshua Verin indicate he had anything but a very traditional Scriptural view of a wife's subjection to her husband. However, the case does show Williams' system for promoting public order, his network of interwoven conforming influences acting on householders, in full relief. Husbands and fathers, though the authors of civil authority within their households, were to be conformed to correct stewardship of that authority by the tug exerted by their dependants, and by the goad of the state. The spiritual purpose of Williams' state becomes more evident, in the development of positive state power in matters of conscience. He had discredited any state remit for the structuring of churches or religious observance, but this was not so much a complete excision of civil power from spiritual matters, as a redefinition of the terms of its engagement. Liberty of conscience was not, for Williams, a liberty for sin: as the state involved itself legitimately to promote the ordering influence of strong conscience, it protected the activity of saving conscience in the elect, and opened greater access for Grace to human history. State collaboration with heads of families and empowerment of their dependants was Williams' historical remedy for the results of sin in family life, so disruptive to the civil power.

Section Three: Conscience and Positive Law

‘...Men of Conscience,’ wrote Roger Williams, were rare in present history. Nonetheless, all people, by his account, could benefit from the study of, and adherence to, conscience as a guide for conduct. The strong exercise of conscience would produce men and women who ‘...dare not lye nor be drunck, nor be Contentious, nor Whore nor steale nor be Covetous nor voluptuous, nor ambitious, nor Lazie bodies nor busie bodies nor dare displease God by omitting either Service or Suffring,’ wrote Williams.⁴⁹ In other words, his ‘men of conscience’ would be active, engaged, and self-restricting civil agents: ideal citizen subjects of any historical commonwealth. ‘Wrapt’ into the interwoven societies of family, market place, and ‘democraticall’ state, the hand of civil institutions should rest easily on such individuals, by Williams’ account, because their consciences would lead them towards obedience without intervention by the state. However, Williams was an historical realist, as has been developed. ‘It is true that Honestie and Innocencie, Reason and Scripture are infinitely Excellent in their Way,’ he wrote, while rhetorically asking, ‘...but are they Sufficient to charme...Adders Serpents, Foxes, Wolves etc. yea or to order tame Beasts without Bit or Bridle[?]’⁵⁰ Even ‘tame beasts,’ that is, citizen subjects of good conscience, needed the guidance of society’s ‘bit and bridle’ to conform them to a communal ‘order,’ let alone individuals who actively opposed or sought to disrupt the civil peace, those ‘wolves’ seeking their own interests over the common good. Williams conceived of positive law as the historical expression of the ‘...Sword of *Civill justice*; which being of a *materiall civill nature*, for the *defence* of *Persons, Estates, Families, Liberties* of a *City or Civill State*,’ neatly setting out the areas he expected to fall within the remit of statutory attention.⁵¹

⁴⁹ Roger Williams, ‘To John Whipple, Jr., 8 July 1669,’ *Correspondence* II, p. 586.

⁵⁰ Ibid, ‘To the Town of Warwick, 1 January 1665/66,’ p. 538.

⁵¹ *The Bloudy Tenent* (1644), CW III, p. 160. Note particularly that Williams ascribed a positive role for the civil state in protecting the liberties of subjects: he extended this positive remit to the promotion

As has been developed, civil order depended on the strong, free, reasoned, and studied exercise of natural conscience, according to Williams. But to let conscience alone serve as a guide for conduct in any of the arenas of civil society would be to ‘...leave our Catle, Children Wives and Lives to be torne out of our bozomes by the strongest Arm, Catch who catch can.’⁵² Thus Williams articulated a need for the positive law, and its enforcement, to complement the activity of conscience, forming a collaborative relationship to serve the ‘peace of the citie.’ Rather than creating a monopoly of conforming power in the agents of the state, Williams relied on the collaborative action of neighbours, social superiors, and heads of households to give an historically appropriate remedy to resistance to positive law, especially resistance based in claims of conscience. He expected the state to legislate to enable the social web conforming (by conscience) each individual to his or her historical role, in present society.

It is worth remembering that one of Williams’ first intellectual role models had been Sir Edward Coke, for whom he had transcribed speeches in the Star Chamber, gaining his patronage as a result.⁵³ Williams believed not just in the necessity, but in the efficacy of law to order human life. Describing a methodological approach to the study of the legal history of Massachusetts, 1630-1650, George Lee Haskins wrote that ‘Law is not simply a body of rules for the settlement of justiciable controversies; law is both a product of, and a means of classifying and bringing into order, complex social actions and interactions.’⁵⁴ This definition shows apt

and protection of free conscience, to protect the religious liberty of the elect, and to encourage obedience to the demands of civil peace.

⁵² Roger Williams, ‘To the Town of Warwick, 1 January 1665/66,’ *Correspondence II*, p. 538. See Chapter four, Section one for detailed discussion of Williams belief in the necessity of government for all people, in all cultures and time periods.

⁵³ See Chapter one, section one, concerning Williams’ education.

⁵⁴ George Lee Haskins, *Law and Authority in Early Massachusetts: A Study in Tradition and Design*, (New York: Macmillan Co., 1960) p. viii.

observation of the position of law in the first years of the New England colonies, as their leaders adapted the traditions of English common law and statutes to their ‘wilderness condition.’ In Williams’ case, he expected law, and its enforcement, to be the means by which the formal civil state interacted with individual conscience to pre-empt and correct socially unacceptable behaviour.⁵⁵ Law, in other words, was for Williams the mechanism by which the state helped strong, conforming conscience to function.

Explaining a legal historian’s interest in ‘...such agencies of control as the family and the church,’ Haskins described the system and function of the legal system in Massachusetts as ‘...a regime both for the ordering of men’s lives and conduct and for securing and adjusting their competing interests.’⁵⁶ Roger Williams was certainly an advocate for strong law to achieve these ends, but he also undertook careful negotiation of the relationship between the law enforcement and resistance to that enforcement. His ‘historical remedy’ for resistance to the dictates of statutes involved

⁵⁵ See Chapter two, section one, ‘Original Sin and Human faculties,’ especially notes 47-50 and related text, for discussion of Williams’ understanding of conscience both as law pre-empting action, and judge correcting it. Williams’ anatomised list of the different roles he expected conscience to play included this division of the functions of conscience, being both a law (*synteresis*) and a witness to action (*syneidesis*). The distinction was articulated by Robert Sanderson in 1647, (but not published until 1660): Robert Sanderson, *De Obligatione Conscientiae*, with English notes including an abridged translation, William Whewell, D.D, (trans.) Lecture One, Section XII, pp. 12-13. Sanderson here explained what were in his view four senses of conscience; for the purposes of this study, the first two are most relevant.

⁵⁶ Ibid, p. x. Although considering in some detail the contribution of Scriptural language and dictates, ‘Puritan ideals,’ to the Massachusetts system of positive law, Haskins did not examine in detail the variance of opinions regarding the effects of original sin on the natural capacities of people, or the theological and intellectual background of his subjects’ expectations of how individuals function as political agents within what they knew as a ‘democraticall’ commonwealth. His study focussed exclusively on Massachusetts. He did, however, acknowledge explicitly that law was ‘...thought to have been made necessary by man’s fall from grace,’ and that ‘...the word “liberty” had very different connotations from what it has today.’ (p. 223) Agreeing with the broad premise of the current study, Haskins argued that studying the way in which a community developed positive law are an important window into that community’s general assumptions about ideal human relations. ‘Legal rules... reflect...the picture of what men of a particular time regard as the ideal of relations among men, thereby further illuminating from an ethical or moral standpoint the patterns of the society in which they operate.’ (p. 228) In the context of this study, the point is apt, as the role of law, and Williams’ negotiation of the relationship between law and individual conscience, illuminate his expectations of conscience, and the conforming responsibility he ascribed to neighbours, social superiors, and heads of households.

not just stronger, more forceful government action, (a 'zero tolerance' approach) but government support for, and empowerment of, the conforming action of neighbours, social superiors, and heads of households. The project of this section will be to build on the collaborative picture introduced in the last, fleshing out the nature of the practical relationship that Williams aimed to sustain, between the action of the civil state in law and the 'civil' authority working within personal household and community relationships to conform individual conscience to the common good. Again, though Williams restricted direct involvement of the state in 'religious concerns,' for historical reasons, he did identify a positive power for the state in promoting and protecting the free exercise of conscience to sustain civil obedience and build order in society. That Williams operated this way shows the significance, in his political framework, of conscience, the faculty that structured the conforming action of an individual's compatriots, and (if all went well) made the individual susceptible to their intervention.

The particular case considered in this section, conscientious objection to military training, demonstrated the practical workings of the interaction between the reach of law and conforming activity of more immediate 'civil agents:' neighbours, heads of households, and social superiors, as Williams expected it to function. Understanding Williams' appropriate remedy for resistance to positive law cloaked in claims of conscience depends on understanding the development, and practical workings of the collaborative project between the state and the web of civil society. The goal of his advocacy was to preserve the state, a state to which accrued an exceptional status because of its statutory 'soul liberty,' and to promote the order by which the persons and property of all inhabitants would be protected from the

aggressive and chaotic influence of self-will in present history.⁵⁷ In spiritual terms, the state's role in buttressing the action of conscience to create this balance of civil peace, ensured the continuing access to souls of the elect by Grace, and protected their historical presence. Thus examining the collaborative relationship between positive law and conscientious civil agents to create civil peace is correctly understood as an examination of the spiritual purpose of Williams' state.

In Massachusetts, General Court supervision of individual town government, and scrutiny of individuals by their church communities gave other tools by which disorder might be addressed; Williams relied much more heavily on the conforming role of family and neighbours, elevating the importance of natural conscience as a conforming influence beyond (he feared) what it could bear, in preventing disorder.⁵⁸ Just because he considered the removal of churches as civil agents and the excision of civil remit over church communities an historical necessity, did not mean that he did not miss the greater appearance of order these relationships might have contributed. As he wrote trying to settle differences among his Providence neighbours in 1654, 'It hath bene tould me that I have laboured for a licentious and Contentious people. That I have foolishly parted with Towne Advantages and Colonie Advantages by wch I might have preserved both Towne and Colonie in as good Order as any Towne or Colonie in the Countrey about us.'⁵⁹ Despite the difficulties and Williams' own

⁵⁷ See Chapter four, section two, 1.1, for discussion of Williams' 'exceptionalism,' and its implications for the position of the state of Providence and its civil officers.

⁵⁸ Haskins, *Law and Authority in Early Massachusetts*, p. 78. 'To a substantial extent, churches could be counted on to inspire and direct the conduct of [their] members, yet those agencies of social control were not always successful in guiding the actions of wayward, mortal men, and ...needed the authority of civil government to fall back on.' Haskins did acknowledge that church members were a minority of the colony, but argued for the cohesive role of churches despite this.

⁵⁹ Roger Williams, 'To the Town of Providence, ca. August 1654,' *Correspondence II*, p. 400.

'Dissention and discord had divided the town's inhabitants so badly that in September 1653 the town meeting had split in two. The insurgents, headed by Robert Williams, informed the main body of townsmen, led by Arthur Fenner, that they considered the transactions of the regular town meeting illegal and the tax rate, previously set by the town, oppressive. When the regular town meeting refused to attend a disputation with the dissident group, the sides remained divided, and no unified town

admission of failure in establishing 'good Order,' he thanked God for '...his wonderfull Providences by wch alone this Towne and Colonie and that Grand Cause and Truth of Freedome of Conscience hath bene upheld to this day.'⁶⁰ Williams reminded his neighbours that they all had a responsibility to God's spiritual purposes in the peace of the state, God '...who hath againe quencht so much of our Fires hiertherto.'

The records of the 'General Court of Tryalls' held at Warwick on 16 October, 1658, announced a special meeting of the colony's commissioners, 'to Tranceact such affayres as are of greate necessity and concernement in the Collony: viztt Touching obstructions and Discouragements in trayneinge.'⁶¹ Earlier that year, at the regular March meeting of the General Court of Commissioners, the colony's leaders had re-confirmed a 1647 order that each town should conduct regular military training, noting that training was 'much neglected by the towns' since the passage of the original order.⁶² The Court had also allowed towns to levy a special rate to arm men who could not afford to arm themselves, never a popular initiative. Getting towns to keep up the preparedness of their militias, requiring men to take time off work to train, had been problematic throughout the life of the colony. As early as 1642, the General Court of Election noted that '...divers orders have...been made...concerning Trainings, and great neglect have been therein hitherto, whereby great detriment hath,

assembly was held over the next eleven months.' (from note 3, p. 403.) At issue aside from the rate and legitimacy of the first assembly was the general question of exactly how the four towns would be federated, and what powers any central civil government would have over towns, expressed in particular division over which (if any) faction to ally with. Bartlett, *Records* I, pp. 268-77. The colony was re-united by 'Articles of agreement' recorded 31 August, 1654. (Bartlett, p. 276-77).

⁶⁰ Ibid, p. 401.

⁶¹ *Rhode Island Court Records*, I, 47. Also on the agenda for the commissioners' meeting was 'writing to England Concerninge the letters received from the United Collonies touchinge the people called Quakers.' Text of letter reprinted in Bartlett, I, pp. 374-376. The United Colonies had written to warn Providence Plantations of a small influx of Quaker settlers.

⁶² Bartlett, I, pp. 370-372.

and is like to ensue upon the State by reason thereof.’⁶³ The colony was responsible for its own defence, and rumbling conflicts between the United Colonies and the Sachem Ninigret during 1653 and 1654, in which war was narrowly averted, heightened leaders’ sense of the danger of under preparedness.

Reluctance to participate in the militia, either by passive foot-dragging and excuses or by overt resistance, was one of the behaviours that Roger Williams classified as the elevation of private interest over that of the common good. The most basic duty of the state, in his view, was to provide for the physical defence of its people when attacked, protecting not only the organs of legitimate government, but also the homes, families, and property of a community. There was no question for Williams that the conscientious householder would submit to training, at whatever reasonable private cost. So when a faction of Providence householders, led by his brother Robert Williams, resisted training particularly out of a conscientious objection ‘...to execute Judgment upon Transgressors, against the private or public Weal,’ Williams was horrified that ‘his’ doctrine of free conscience should be construed to allow such radical non-resistance to worldly threats.⁶⁴ The remedy for this civil threat, by Williams’ account was two-fold: strong (but informal) remonstrance by right-thinking neighbours, and positive law to force compliance.

What was important, in Williams’ practical efforts toward that collaboration, however, was not just to make the men train, but also to re-claim and re-channel the

⁶³ Ibid, p. 120. Closing loop holes that allowed towns’ people to get out of responsibility for training, the Court also stipulated that each town had to choose its own officers, and could not simply name another town’s officers as its own.

⁶⁴ Roger Williams, ‘To the Town of Providence, ca. January 1654/55,’ *Correspondence II*, pp. 423-425. This is the text known as the ‘Ship of State’ letter, in which Williams castigated his neighbours for interpreting their liberty of conscience to be a permission to elevate their private interests over those of the common good. Text quoted (p. 423) is from the title of a treatise circulated by Robert Williams, ‘That it is Blood-Guiltiness, and against the Rule of the Gospel, to execute Judgment upon Transgressors, against the private or public weal.’ No copy of the paper has been found; extrapolated from the title, the argument of the paper may have been that the elect had no remit to oppose material injury concerning the things of the world, and indeed, were bound by the Gospels to forego any resistance to material injury.

wider perceptions of just what liberty of conscience entailed. His remonstrations to the faction sought to do just that. This was important as part of the ‘historical remedy’ to resistance to law, as his hopes for civil order and obedience relied so much on what he took to be the conforming power of conscience, played out in civil relationships. Informal neighbourly remonstrance was as much a function of ensuring order as the power of the civil sword, by Williams’ understanding of the building of civility. He opened what has become known as the ‘Ship of State’ letter, ca. January 1654/55, with reminders that the ‘Liberties’ of the town were to be ‘improved’ ‘...to the Peace and Welfare of the Town and Colony, without our own private Ends.’⁶⁵ Free conscience was meant to ensure the liberty of Grace to act in the lives of the elect, and otherwise to support individual obedience to demands of the common good. As Williams continued, ‘That ever I should speak or write a Tittle that tends to such an infinite Liberty of Conscience, is a Mistake; and which I have ever disclaimed and abhorred.’⁶⁶ In order to make his meaning clear, ‘studious of our common Peace and Liberty,’ Williams developed an extended metaphor of a ship at sea, anatomising the obligations of the individual in an historical Commonwealth. If there were many different faiths, Jew, Turk, Papist and Protestant, on board, liberty of conscience meant that they were not forced to come to the ship’s worship, not restricted from following their own, if any. But as Williams added:

...notwithstanding this Liberty, the Commander of this Ship ought to command the Ship’s Course; yea, and also to command that Justice, Peace, and Sobriety, be kept and practised, both among the Seamen and all the Passengers. If any Seamen refuse to perform their Service, or Passengers to pay their freight; - if any refuse to help in Person or Purse, towards the Common Charges, or Defence; - if any refuse to obey the common Laws and Orders of the Ship, concerning their common Peace and Preservation; - if any

⁶⁵ Ibid, p. 423.

⁶⁶ Ibid.

shall mutiny and rise up against their Commanders, and Officers; - if any shall preach or write, that there ought to be no Commanders, nor Officers, because all are equal in CHRIST, therefore no Masters, nor Officers, no Laws, nor Orders, no Corrections nor Punishments – I say, I never denied, but in such Cases, whatever is pretended, the Commander or Commanders may judge, resist, compel, and punish such Transgressors, according to their Deserts and Merits.⁶⁷

The passage is worth quoting at length, because in it Williams so explicitly stated the duty of magistrates and other civil agents to citizen subjects, and the kinds of threats to civil society he would not have them tolerate. The civil conflict that would derive from resistance to positive law, in this case military training, Williams argued, disrupted the progress of the ‘ship of state’ as a whole, and therefore proved counter-productive even for those authors of it: if the ship sank, all drowned together. This extended metaphor, and the character of Williams’ remonstrance with his brother and neighbours, expressed in practice his understanding of political obligation. In Williams’ historical state, obligation involved the engagement of selfish interest in the common good: his expectations of why individuals would remain obedient to a state did not depend on utopian dreams of perfecting human capacity in the world, but on individuals realising their own interest lay ultimately with those of the whole.⁶⁸ Conscience, correction, and the civil sword collaborated to help this ‘realisation’ along.

⁶⁷ Ibid, p. 423, 424. Williams often used variations of the ship metaphor to talk about the progress of the civil state, in present history, referring to a state under full sail, or losing a fair wind. Most notably, he had developed the metaphor with explicit reference to political obligation in *The Examiner Defended* (1652): ‘...in a Ship there is a *whole*, and there is each *private cabbin*. A *private* good engageth our desires for the *publike*, and raiseth *cares* and *fears* for the due prevention of *common evils*.’ CW VII, p. 203. Bradford Swan wrote about ‘Roger Williams’ Most Persistent Metaphor’ in *Rhode Island History*, 35(1976), pp. 127-129; Williams also used it in *The Bloudy Tenent* (1644), CW III, pp. 376-380, 394, and 399-400, and in correspondence to Governor Leverett of Massachusetts about discerning the God’s causes in King Philip’s War. ‘T Governor John Leverett, 11 October 1675,’ *Correspondence* II, p. 704. It was not unique to him by any means, but he adapted it to suit his needs.

⁶⁸ For full discussion of the theoretical background of this point, in the context of Williams’ historical understanding of the political individual, see Chapter four, section two.

While obviously relying on the constraining power of individual conscience, and the web of checks and restraints presented by personal relationships within civil society, the state in Providence Plantations did retain for itself, and exercise, power to punish those who resisted training. At the same time, it acted explicitly to complement the informal remonstrations of people like Williams, or in more particular cases, the conforming responsibility of the person best placed to influence dissenters. Having identified, in October 1658 a public need to deal centrally with ‘obstructions and Discouragements in trayneings,’ the Court of Commissioners reconvened at Warwick, on November 3. Among other business, the Court recorded that brothers Samuell and Mahorghalelheshbaz Dyer, who had been called to answer charges (not specified in the record from that date) and not appeared, would forfeit their bonds of £20 each. Although the brothers’ reasons for refusing to train with the militia are not recorded, they were both; their mother Mary (who had been an associate of Anne Hutchinson, before her banishment) had been hanged on Boston Common, after refusing to abide by the terms of her own banishment. The forfeit was deferred, however, to allow them another chance: they were invited again to appear, at the next regular meeting, in March. Again, the brothers did not appear, but this time, their father William Dyer, also of Newport, stood in their place, admitted his liability for their non-appearance, and giving assurances that his sons ‘shall macke their personal apeareances at the next Genrl Court of Tryalls, to be held at portsmouth, ...October next.’⁶⁹ The Court accepted this assurance.

Its acceptance endorsed the civil power of their father William, and presumably others of their immediate acquaintance, to convince the two brothers to train. Indeed, when the two men did finally appear at the October 11, 1659 Court,

⁶⁹ The involvement of the brothers Samuell and Mahor is recorded in sequential Court minutes, *Rhode Island Court Records I*, pp. 50, 54, 57. Text quoted p. 54.

where they pled guilty to charges of 'Larceny against the state,' and 'Breach of the Peace,' they were let off as the Court was assured they had been training since the time of the first order, and intended to continue doing so. In retreating from enforcing the letter of the law in the first instance against the brothers, the Court expressed an implicit faith (backed by the £20 Bonds) in the capability, and responsibility of William Dyer to present his sons, and in others to convince them of their error informally. This was an 'historical remedy' to resistance to positive law of which Roger Williams would have approved: the state did not suppress Quakers out of hand as a civil threat, but collaborated with informal civil agents to support the conforming power of conscience in civil behaviour.

It was easier for Williams and others worried about Quaker disturbance to the civil peace to address explicit breaches of positive law, than to deal with the subtler implications of their belief for the system of conscientious obedience to civil peace. The Quaker's belief in an unique, 'inner light,' ordering the behaviour of each believer, removed conscience from relationship with others, and removed it from what Williams understood as its correct historical context. This did, for Williams, pose a potent threat to a system of civil peace relying on the checking and counter-checking, interwoven dictates of conscience operating across relationships within civil society. As Williams wrote, in the last of his anti-Quaker 'Propositions' for public debate, while George Fox visited Newport:

...the Spirit of their Religion tends mainly to reduce persons from civility, to Barbarisme: To an arbitrary Government, and the dangerous dictates and decrees of that Sudden Spirit that acts them: yea to a sudden cutting off of people yea Kings and Princes that Shall oppose them: yea to as fierce and fierie persecution for matters of (Religion and) Conscience as hath beene or can be practised by any [.]⁷⁰

⁷⁰ Roger Williams, 'To George Fox, 15 July 1672,' *Correspondence II*, p. 648, and note 21, p. 653.

It was a threat to which positive law was not by itself a ready solution, however, as the efficacy of positive law, by Williams' account depended on the continuing civil authority of social relationships, with which it collaborated to manage disorder. This was why he responded with such rage to Quaker 'violations' of social mores like not doffing hats, using an informal 'thee,' and shaking hands rather than exchanging a holy kiss, on greeting, let alone reports of Quaker women running naked through the streets.⁷¹ For Williams these things were expressions of Quakers removing themselves, and their consciences, from the public scrutiny of civil society, on which his account of civil peace depended.

The problem of resistance to training rumbled along in the colony's several towns, though Williams' involvement disappeared from the civil record. In terms of examining the mechanics of Williams practical 'remedies' for civil disruption in present history, his involvement highlighted the collaborative role that he and others expected informal civil agents to play in relation to the dictates of positive law. The discussion of the Verin case, and related civil interest in family relationships in the previous section gave one window into this relationship, as Williams expected it to

⁷¹ See Chapter Two, section two, 'Roger Williams' Bible, for discussion of his context and origin of his conflict with the Quakers, which Williams anatomised in *George Fox Digg'd Out of His Burrowes* (1676), CW V. Williams was shocked at what felt to him like the complete jettison of Biblical, as well as social, authority by the Quakers. 'Condemning George Fox's approach, that Scripture might be 'Gods words, though not his [uniquely authoritative] *Word*,' Williams wrote:

...is it not prodigious and monstrous Contempt that these holy Words, this holy Book and Writing of God should be so undervalued and slighted, yea vilified, and nullified, if compar'd with their *new found Light* within them, which was (say they) before the *Scriptures*, and gave forth the *Scriptures*, ...and therefore is not to be judged or tried by the *Scriptures*, but they by it.

As they elevated other authorities above Scripture itself, Williams compared the Quakers to the Pope in their his perception of their parallel abuse of the Bible, referring to '...the *Pope* and the *Quakers Infallible Spirit* and its immediate *Inspirations*.' In the same terms, Williams would condemn familists and libertines of all kinds, equating reference to individual conscience un-tried by Scripture with the attachment of authority to church hierarchies and histories of all kinds. In this elevation of Scriptural authority Williams shared much with his Massachusetts opponents, and such an approach remained logically consistent with his insistence on approaching human judgement from a perspective of humility. Williams' advocacy remained Bible-centred, as his own ideas about spiritual authority in present history progressed.' (from Chapter two, section two: quoted text from *George Fox*..., pp. 49, 50.)

function; this gives another. Civil scrutiny of personal life, and reliance on the remonstrative action of parents, masters, neighbours, church members, and business partners to help conform individual action to socially acceptable norms was hardly unique to Providence, Providence Plantations, or to Williams. Examining the expression of this collaboration in his particular advocacy to promote civil order confirms that his first expectation of natural conscience was that it served obedience, not autonomous action. While conscience was for Williams, the orderer of all actions, and state was not just a passive bystander in relation to conscience's power. His state, using positive law, reinforced the web of checking conscience Williams thought would mitigate the effects of original sin in present civil life.

Section Four: 'Private Ends' and State Prerogatives in Land and Trade

Writing angrily to those in Connecticut (and Plymouth) whose claims to land within the Rhode Island Charter's jurisdiction he thought illegitimate, Roger Williams identified what he took as the real cause of the disorder:

...a depraved Appetite after the great Vanities, Dreams and Shadowes of this Vanishing Life, great Portions of Land, Land, in this Wildernes, as if Men were in as great Necessitie and Danger for Want of great portions of Land, as poore hungry thirsty Seamen have after a sick and stormie, a long and starving passage. This is one of the Gods of N. Engl. wch the Living and most High Eternal will destroy and Famish.⁷²

In the pursuit of self interest, Williams distinguished between seeking to fill the legitimate material needs to ensure basic conditions of survival were met, and the accumulation of wealth or property for its own, or comforts' sake. Just as Williams

⁷² Roger Williams, 'To Major John Mason and Governor Thomas Prentice, 22 June 1670,' *Correspondence II*, pp. 609-623, quoted text from p. 614. Williams had previously referred to land as one of the idolatrous gods of New England in a letter to John Winthrop, Jr., of 28 May 1664, *Correspondence II*, p. 528.

saw resistance to positive law as the elevation of self-will over the prerogatives of conscience, he understood covetousness and material ambition in the conduct of trade and land administration as a potent disruptive force in present history. Predictably, strong exercise of conscience, and the creating the civil conditions conducive to that exercise, was the natural remedy to this disruption. To offer an 'historically appropriate' remedy required the state to regulate conduct in trade and land administration: Williams' conscientious political individual worked hard to support the material viability of his/her family, and community, but practiced self-restraint, foregoing profit or advantage where it would hurt the general economic health of the community. Much in parallel to its positive remit to promote and protect the strong exercise of conscience in family life, and in obedience to law, in the service of civil order, Williams' state had a remit to regulate economic behaviour, to support 'conscientious' conduct in the market place.

For Williams, the threat took two guises: firstly, economically aggressive behaviour would itself divide society, disrupting the civil peace as individuals were drawn after their own wealth, away from the larger economic and civil goals of the community as a whole. This fear involved Williams' understanding of how conduct in work related to a person's place in civil society, reflecting worries that the elevation of selfish interest would pervert an individual's commission of his (or her) role in the web of interwoven conforming civil agents. A householder who did no work, or squandered money, or pursued the acquisition of wealth for its own sake might be less able to care for his family, or less enmeshed in the obligating culture of the commonwealth.⁷³ It was a fear largely shared by his Massachusetts contemporaries,

⁷³ Idleness, or work undertaken inappropriately, could also prove a spiritual disruption, for Williams, and his Massachusetts contemporaries; because the focus here is on disruption to the civil state, these themes are not developed. Williams particularly objected to the 'hireling ministry,' and to state

John Cotton and John Winthrop chief among them. As Stephen Innes wrote of the tie between work culture and the 'common good' in Massachusetts, 'The Parable of the Talents taught people to use the capital and skills temporarily in their possession aggressively and entrepreneurially... Self-indulgent, luxurious living [would have] meant fewer surplus goods available for supporting church and community.'⁷⁴ Industry in work, and careful attention to success in trade was valuable, but the elevation of personal, rather than communal interest as a motive for that stewardship would prove disastrous. As Innes concluded, 'The emphasis throughout was on socially beneficial productivity.'⁷⁵

Williams, of course, did not think he could remove, or completely contain selfish motives in economic behaviour, given the conditions of 'natural' man in present history. Massachusetts at various times legislated directly for the limiting of profits, or to stipulate maximum wage levels; in 1639 the General Court censured and fined the merchant Robert Keayne for taking excessive profits in the sale of imported goods.⁷⁶ As the Massachusetts court perceived self-will in economic behaviour to threaten family life, they also acted to ensure householders' correct commission of material support for their households; here, as Innes pointed out, understanding of the importance of work to order civil society intersected with gender expectations, as magistrates understood the civil good of work of householders in the context of their expectations of masculinity.⁷⁷ Williams acted to protect state power from those he

intervention into mens' 'purses,' in enforced tithes, or fines for non-attendance at state supported churches. See *Hireling Ministry none of Christs* (1652), CW VII.

⁷⁴ Stephen Innes, *Creating the Commonwealth: The Protestant Ethic and the Culture of Discipline*, (NY, London: W. W. Norton and Co., 1995) p. 118.

⁷⁵ Ibid.

⁷⁶ Bruchey, pp. 101-111. See note 17, and related discussion of order and economic activity. In his 1653 'Apologia,' Keayne defended himself by saying he had only been improving his time, seeking to steward his labour and business opportunities wisely. Bernard Bailyn, ed., *The Apologia of Robert Keayne: Self-Portrait of a Puritan Merchant*, (New York: Harper and Row, 1964).

⁷⁷ Innes, p. 149. Innes wrote of the 'gendered implications of the culture of discipline,' with reference to Salem's litigation against James Davis in 1640, accusing him of being a 'drone' on his 'wife's

thought would exploit it to further their own material ends, but sought too to conform the administration of land and trade practices to the good of the whole community primarily by appeals to conscience through strong neighbourly remonstrance. He did use the power, or threat of the power of the civil state in his own attempts as a remedy in particular instances of what he saw as this potent threat to civil peace, but always in such a way as to reinforce the web of civil agents acting to conform people to obedience by conscience.

The second guise of the threat posed by selfish motives in land and trade conduct was particular to Williams, and to his perception of the historical place of Providence Plantations. This commonwealth, in his view, derived exceptional status from its statutory liberty of conscience, and correct commission of political power in present history, a status leading to God's material and economic favour.⁷⁸ Williams referred by example to Amsterdam's economic success, a success he attributed directly to God's favour based on Amsterdam's policy of toleration.⁷⁹ Covetous behaviour in land acquisition particularly posed a great threat by Williams' account, because it curtailed the continued potential for the colony to serve as a haven for

honey.' His idleness was perceived as a civil threat the more so because it offended expectations of masculine conscientious behaviour. Innes does not, however, make more than passing connection between these 'gendered implications of the culture of discipline' and wider expectations of householders as civil agents, in historical context.

⁷⁸ See Chapter four, section two, 'Exceptionalism': 'Although present government was institutionally a worldly or natural phenomenon, he held that God maintained a consistent and persistent interest in political history, favouring some governments over others. [...] Williams attached exceptional status to particular governments, particular historical commonwealths, as they fulfilled God's purposes in history, rather than attaching it in a permanent way to the sovereign identity of any particular people or nation. By his understanding, God's favour attached to the ideal of correct natural government, incorporating 'soul liberty' so that Grace could function in present history, and to particular commonwealths as they embraced that ideal.

⁷⁹ Chapter two, section two: 'As he pointed out in an introduction directed 'To the High Court of Parliament,' concerning the commercial success of Amsterdam, '...a poor fishing Town, yet harbourous and favourable to the *flying*, though dissenting *consciences*: This confluence of the persecuted, by *Gods* most gracious coming with them, drew *Boats*, drew *Trade*, drew *shipping*, and that so mightily in so short a time, that *Shipping*, *Trading*, *wealth*, *Greatnesse*, *Honour*... have appeared to fall as out of Heaven in a Crown or Garland upon the head of that poor fisher Town.' While economic historians might quibble with Williams' explanation of Amsterdam's success, it is adamantly clear that he understood it to derive explicitly from the policy of tolerance.' Williams' text from *The Bloody Tenent Yet More Bloody* (1652), CW VI, p. 9. He sought to show any Parliamentary readers the material benefits of toleration, as against those who argued that it would cause civil chaos.

refugees 'distressed of conscience,' thus threatening its exceptional status, and God's continuing economic favour to the commonwealth as a whole. In early 1661/62, Williams wrote despairingly to oppose a tendency for the first settlers, original 'purchasers' in the town of Providence to deny land rights to incomers. He begged them to remember that '...publike peace and Love, is better Then abundance of Corne and Cattel.'⁸⁰ He warned them that if ever '...they looke for a Blessing from God,' they should restrain their own interest in favour of future refugees:

...after You have gott over the Black-brooke of some Soule Bondage Your Selves, You teare not downe the Bridge after You by leaving no small pittance for distressed soules that may Come after us... if this Towne will give sincerely unto God (setting aside some litle portions for other distressed soules to get bread on) You know who hath engaged His Heavenly Word for Your Reward and Recompense.⁸¹

By Williams' account in this text, God's favour and vengeance would be engaged by covetous conduct in the administration of land, in his exceptional, historical commonwealth. Mal-administration of land, and particularly the exploitation of public land rights for selfish ends, Williams thus understood as a direct threat to liberty of conscience itself. Without available land for future refugees, and without an approach to land acquisition and use based in self-restraint more generally, the historical purpose for the building of Providence would be lost, he feared.

While he feared for the disruption of the civil peace by covetous conduct in economic activity, Williams was not against earning money by labour, or against the private appropriation of land and property sufficient to provide comfortably for one's own household and needy neighbours. Appropriately understood as an 'historical realist,' Williams' certainty that the field of the world could not be re-created as God's 'garden' in the present day extended to his perception of appropriate action in

⁸⁰ Roger Williams, 'To the Town of Providence, ca. early 1661/62,' *Correspondence II*, p. 526.

⁸¹ Ibid.

economic life. Attempts to create perfect economic tranquillity, removing selfish interest from expectations of people's behaviour in civil society altogether would create greater civil evils than they relieved, in Williams' view. He gave as an example of this application of the field/garden dichotomy to economic life, an argument for the allowing of usury, in present states. Acknowledging that 'Governours...doe lawfully permit some evill persons and practices,' Williams argued that permission for usury, '...for the preventing of a *greater evill* in the *civill Body*, as *stealing, robbing, murthering, perishing* of the poore, and the hindrance or stop of *commerce* and dealing in the *Commonwealth*.'⁸² Because of the continuing impact of original sin on people's capacities and relationships, Williams felt it was perverse to try to build an economic culture which did not accommodate, and play on that impact to stabilise material relationships in present, historical states.

Thus his understanding of the civil role in work, property, and economic behaviour was entirely at odds with that expressed by Gerrard Winstanley and others, in their 'Appeal' to Parliament of 1649. As they wrote:

Here we see who are thieves and murderers; even the buyers and sellers of land, with fruits, these are they that take away another man's right from him; and that overthrowes righteous propriety, to uphold particular propriety, which covetousness the God of this world hath set up.⁸³

They argued that civil violence came from the buying, selling, and ownership of land, when everyone had creation's right to it. As such, the real civil threat lay in continuing civil support for 'the God of this world' in human avarice and the desire for ownership, rather, as Williams had it, than in the excess of that desire. Without the possibility of owning land privately, of benefiting personally from private labour,

⁸² *The Bloudy Tenent* (1644), CW III, p. 169.

⁸³ Winstanley, (Gerrard), Baker (John) and Star, (Thomas), '*An Appeal to the House of Commons Desiring their answer, whether the common-peaople shall have the quiet enjoyment of the Comons and Waste Ladn; or whether they shall be under the will of Lords of Mannors Still.*' (London: 1649) Codrington Library, VX.2.5, no. 65, p. 13. The appeal was made after arrests of several for Trespassing and 'digging' on common land at Georges Hill in Surrey.

of borrowing money, and having incentives to lend it, he thought people would starve and trade suffer: Winstanley and his ilk fell prey to the temptation of conflating the field and garden as much as any civil persecutor of conscience, by Williams' account. Policies for the ending of civil conflict that did not acknowledge and explicitly incorporate the tangible effects of original sin were for Williams, entirely historically inappropriate. Therefore, Williams expected and relied on a degree of aggression in economic behaviour, as did his Massachusetts contemporaries, to drive the material well-being of civil society in present history. He disagreed strenuously with those who tried, in religious fervour, to remove selfish interest from economic activity in present life: the natural instinct toward material comfort was to be channelled toward the common good, by conscience and civil action by state and neighbours.

The difficulty Williams faced, in his political advocacy and use of state power to regulate land and trade in Providence Plantations, was how best to manage the potential disruption of covetous action, keeping its civil benefits healthy, but restraining it from unbridled progress in civil society. Much in parallel (and interwoven with) his 'historical remedies' for the disruption of family life and resistance to positive law, Williams expected civil power to collaborate with the conforming influence of neighbours and associates, contingent on each individual's own strong check of conscience. Thus conforming individuals to appropriate economic behaviour was, for Williams, connected intimately with liberty of conscience, as part of managing constructive tensions within the civil peace. Samuel Gorton, long an opponent of Williams and others and persistent thorn in the side of patterns of comfortable sociable civility in southern New England, regarded civil regulation of land occupation and distribution by Providence Plantations patently as a mechanism for ensuring the civil submission of dissident elements. Gorton claimed

the principle purpose of New England's exercise of civil justice in all areas of life was '...To suppress Hereticks, and to confirm that to be truth which the Unity of the most colonies hold....,' and specifically that even those once dissenters themselves, once wielding civil power, had this as their object.⁸⁴ When several of his neighbours in Warwick refused to allow further division of commons into private plots, as part of their erstwhile hope to submit themselves and the area to Massachusetts' jurisdiction, Gorton saw this explicitly as a trap for conscience, 'a snare...laid to intangle us again.' Civil power standing in the way of private acquisition of common land, preventing Gorton from withdrawing further from civil interdependence with his neighbours, he judged '...not only to hinder us to provide for our families, but to bereave us again of what God, through our labour and industry, had raised up unto us as means to maintain our families with.'⁸⁵ To serve his argument, Gorton tried to appropriate the acknowledged civil necessity both of order in families and of industrious work. He identified civil control of land as the mechanism for conforming dissident conscience and aberrant behaviour to the majority view of civil peace: in other words, he understood exactly what people like Williams wanted to accomplish by regulating land distribution, and opposed it.⁸⁶

Williams' political advocacy against William Harris, one of the other original thirteen 'purchasers' in Providence, offered another window into his fear of covetous interest as a divisive force in present history.⁸⁷ Over the course of roughly twenty

⁸⁴ Samuel Gorton, *Simplicities Defence against 7-Headed Policy...* (London: 1646), p. 4. Gorton meant Williams, specifically.

⁸⁵ *Ibid*, p. 5.

⁸⁶ See discussion of Gorton's typology and its implications, in regard to the necessity for government and other 'humane ordinances,' Chapter four, section one, 1.2, 'necessity.'

⁸⁷ A full and precise history of the Williams/Harris factional controversy, deriving from the manuscript sources and with specific regard to the Pawtuxet land dispute, claims and counter-claims of the use of civil bodies and the political process for personal advantage, between 1656 and 1677, is catalogued elsewhere and thus would prove redundant as part of this study. See Lafantasia, ed., *Correspondence II*, pp. 506–513 on the background land evidences and initial conflict concerning Providence's claim to the Pawtuxet territory, pp. 556–570 on factionalism within Providence, in the mid and late 1660s, and

years, between 1656 and 1677, William Harris undertook to accumulate in his own name as much land to the south and west of Providence town, in the Pawtuxet region, as he could. This involved initially, confirming that the region lay within the original limits of Providence agreed by Williams in the 1636 'purchase' from the Narragansett Sachems Canonicus and Miantunomi; then the interpretation of the vague amended language of the Providence 'Town Evidence' to extend the boundaries of the region, and finally working the local and colony courts and political process to provide for the division of the land in a way favourable to him and his faction. Williams objected strongly to what he saw as the arbitrary expansion (based on interpretation) of the purchased region, feeling that if more land were to be added, it should be bought separately. He also strongly objected to what he took as Harris' sole motivation by covetous interest, and Harris' working of factions within the town of Providence to cause an institutional schism in 1666 and 1667. Williams was sure that Harris' advocacy would disrupt the civil order of the colony and betray its purpose as the haven for refugees to boot.

Harris' conversion to Quakerism amplified Williams' concerns: he saw Harris as casting off of conforming conscience in the elevation of private interest. As Lafantasie has noted, the conflict was both personal and political, and involved the inter-weaving of numerous petty controversies, not the least of which was the potent dislike between the two men: the conflict was only ended by Harris' death in 1681.

Williams' attempts to justify his own opposition to Harris (whether or not it was actually motivated by such avowedly selfless ideals as he claimed) did develop the connection that he took to exist between right dealing in land and trade, and the preservation of civil peace, and conforming exercise of free conscience, by extension.

Williams' involvement, and pp. 730-739, on Harris' ultimate court victory, and the final compromises of 1682 and 1711/12. Only the death of the two main opponents, Harris in 1681 and Williams in 1683, allowed the conflict to settle.

Writing to one of Harris' supporters in 1672, well after the battle-lines between the two men were entrenched, Williams specified his motives:

As to W. H. I never appeared in *Town* or *Colony* against him for any private matter (although many wayes extraordinarily provoked and wronged by him) but always in Witness ...against his *running down* and destroying the *Publick*, ...for his Private *Covetous* and *Contentious* Ends.⁸⁸

Williams was sensitive to charges that he was hypocritical in the level of private vitriol which seemed to inform his engagement of Harris; the extant written records show him rejecting that possibility categorically. Williams claimed to fear that Harris' privatisation of common land, if successful, would 'pull up the bridge' and exclude future religious refugees. Interwoven with this was his suspicion that civil disorder was inherent in the Quaker conscience, and certainty that correct civil peace, protecting the position of liberty of conscience in the historical commonwealth, would be impossible if men such as Harris would not conduct their worldly affairs conscientiously, that is, in service to the good of the community. Thus Harris' particular projects and conduct conspired to fulfil Williams' worst fears for civil disorder.

Williams tried to apply his method for 'historical remedy' to disruption of the civil peace deriving from the extended implications of original sin on individual capacities, without success where Harris was concerned. Williams sought collaboration between state power and neighbourly remonstrance to conform individuals to conscientious behaviour and obedience to the civil peace. Harris used the organs of civil power strategically to forward his goals, and convinced a faction of like-minded, mainly younger men to support him within Providence, effectively removing the mechanisms by which Williams had pursued order in other areas. When neighbourly argument failed Williams, he brought charges against Harris at the

⁸⁸ Roger Williams, 'To John Throckmorton, 30 July 1672,' *Correspondence* II, pp. 674, 675.

General Court of Tryalls at Newport, convened 10 March, 1656/67, at which Williams himself sat as President. The charge was for treason, resulting from ‘...his open Defiance...agst. our Charter, all our Lawes, & Court the parliament the Lord protector & all government.’⁸⁹ When the charges were introduced on the thirteenth, however, Williams was not in attendance to argue them (Thomas Olney having replaced him as President) and the matter was dropped on Harris’ strenuous denial. It is unclear why Williams did not pursue the charges, having introduced them, but it may have been that he intended to involve the federated government of the whole colony as a wake up call to Harris, and to warn others about his conduct, making less formal remonstrations work better. It did not. His later correspondence is peppered with polemics and reprisals to notable members of Harris’ faction in Providence, who seem to have effectively drawn Williams’ fire away from the man himself, letting Williams lose public credibility by the persistence and personal nature of his increasingly shrill attacks.

In these remonstrations, Williams offered up the example of his own conduct in land issues and trade practices, attempting to cast himself as the ideal conscientious citizen of an historical commonwealth, eschewing personal profit for the greater good of the community. The picture he presented, whether or not it truly reflected his own economic career within the colony, showed what he thought right behaviour was. Firstly, in contrast to Harris’ apparent personal ‘land-lust,’ Williams argued that he had been the original sole proprietor of the Providence purchase, but had selflessly shared that purchase with others, to aid the establishment of his historical refuge for free conscience.⁹⁰ He had kept house lots and meadows to support his family, farmed and traded to provide income, but had always deferred to the economic good of the

⁸⁹ *Rhode Island Court Records* I, p. 25.

⁹⁰ Williams made this claim on the basis of his having been sole purchaser from the Narragansett Sachems in 1636, not on Royal approval or recognition of any such status.

whole, or other claims for civil obedience in his economic activity.⁹¹ Understanding the threat Roger Williams' perceived in covetousness in land administration or trade, requires an understanding not just of the implications of his theology for individual and corporate life, in present history, but also understanding of his particular exceptionalism and the conforming role he expected conscience to play, in constructing public order. He did understand conflict in present civil society to be inevitable, but sought to channel that conflict to support the material foundations of the historical state, rather than undermining them. Ultimately, his remedies failed, and economic behaviour civil society became more and more will-driven and chaotic, by his account. Just as with private scruples regarding the administration of family life, or opposition to positive law, Williams took conduct in trade and land administration as subject to conscience's conforming influence, and always subordinate to the claims of public order: he was disappointed.

Conclusion

Williams ended his life nearly destitute, having sold his trading post to finance the second trip to England as the colony's agent, and lost his home in the burning of Providence during King Philip's War, in 1676. In a final recorded foray into public discourse within the colony around the role of conscience in constructing civil peace, Williams wrote to the Town of Providence on 15 January, 1681/82, scarcely one year before his death.⁹² He revisited all of the themes of his understanding of government,

⁹¹ Many times in correspondence in later life, Williams would refer to opportunities for liquor and powder trade with Natives that he had passed over, in deference to the claims of common safety, where others less scrupulous had made substantial profits. This charge he directed particularly at Quakers, whom he accused of feeding Native liquor consumption to the considerable detriment of the health and civil peace of their settlements. See, for example, Roger Williams, 'To John Throckmorton, 30 July 1672,' *Correspondence II*, p. 675.

⁹² The complete text is appended, following this chapter. Roger Williams, 'To the Town of Providence, 15 January 1681/82,' *Correspondence II*, pp. 774-776.

its function in relation to individuals, and their conscientious responsibilities to government and each other. The tone is one of clipped, slightly forlorn frustration, as if these things should not have to be repeated, but have been forgotten. Williams opened by reminding his neighbours that ‘Govrment and Order in Families Towns etc. is the Ordinance of the most High (Rom. 13) for the peace and Good of Mankind.’⁹³ The civil powers in Williams’ history had an explicitly spiritual commission and purpose, to which obligations attached. He affirmed his view of the exceptional status of Providence Plantations, saying that its Charter and government ‘...Excels all in N. Engl. or the World, as to the Souls of Men.’ Further, obedience to government under that charter, by Williams’ account, would be ‘...not only for feare, but for Conscience Sake:’ the strong exercise of conscience would act positively to conform individuals to the requirements of public order. Far from a legitimate liberty, Williams argued that in this context it was ‘...but Folly to resist [an order for a rate, as] ...God hath stirred up the Spirit of the Govr, Magistrates and officers Unanimously resolved to see the Matter finished: and it is the dutie of every man to maintayne Encowrage and strengthen the hand of Authoritie.’⁹⁴ Conscience was on the side of authority, expressed in the orders of the ‘democraticall’ commonwealth, resisted by sinful, selfish citizens. The themes of this letter mark the consistency of Williams’ approach, across his career, to the issues considered in this study.

The purpose of the discussion in this Chapter has been to use Williams’ political advocacy in particular instances to explore his ideas about how the conscience contributed to the construction of public order, in historical commonwealths. Chapter two of this study explored Williams’ particular theology, especially his understanding of original sin and Biblical typology, in relation to his

⁹³ Ibid, p. 774.

⁹⁴ Ibid, p. 775.

contemporaries; Chapter three examined the social and political effects of these positions, in theoretical terms, to build a picture of Williams' understanding of the conditions of order, disorder, and human history. This included specific attention to the detail of Williams' understanding of the social and political effects of original sin on individuals and commonwealths. Picking up these themes and integrating them with the analysis of Williams' ideas about government, developed in Chapter four, this Chapter has to look at particular cases in which his account of civility in present history was tested.

Of particular interest for this study has been the interaction that Williams expected between civil institutions and individual conscience, as it provided a lens through which to study his expectations of the character of the political individual in practice. This is a worthwhile avenue of inquiry not only for the better understanding of Williams' own ideas and position, but for the better understanding of New England accounts of the 'political individual' and functional democracy more generally, in the seventeenth century. Understanding Williams' political individual, and his real ideas about the nature of democratic government helps to explain that of his New England contemporaries. In Williams' system for promoting civil peace, the individual householder was more exposed and involved than in systems with the added layer of church authority structuring civil life. His householder, conditioned by the realities of 'natural' history (inheritance of the corruption of original sin, but also of a universal unifying 'humanity,' and Adamic sovereign authority) was not dissimilar from the householder as conceived by men like Winthrop, Shepard, and Cotton. Despite differences of interpretation, Williams' householder thus provides an opening to better understand the nature of seventeenth century New England democracy, especially around issues of freedom, political obligation, and consent.

As the vast numbers of New England election day jeremiads over the course of the seventeenth century testify, getting individuals to do what they ought, in relation to the power of the community expressed in civil institutions was a topic of constant worry and argument. Williams did operate within a coherent system of political ideals, to 'unbind order' in managing the effects of original sin in present historical communities; he relied on the strong exercise of individual conscience to make that possible. Fundamentally, however, the kernel of Williams' advocacy and understanding of public order in present history was, as Thomas Shepard put it, that 'The L^d would have men wrapt up in societie.'

Conclusion

Much in line with the leading lay citizens and clergy of the various colonies, Williams agonised his entire life over the spectre (or reality) of civil disorder, how best to prevent it, and how to remedy it. His goal of preserving civil peace, legitimately constructed, was compelling as it protected the access of saving Grace to the elect, and preserved them in present life. Orthodox New England opinion held that this goal was best accomplished by the state supporting the position of visible churches whose members were among the elect. This, they argued, would create the most fertile ground for Grace to operate, and at the same time by instruction from pulpits and neighbourly remonstrance, encourage the unregenerate to orderly civil obedience.

Williams believed that with the disappearance of the apostolic succession from present history, no present church institution could legitimately assemble itself. Thus the effect of history was to remove the possibility of legitimately commissioned visible churches. But even if he had provided a mature account of a true church institution, Williams typologically removed the state from its role as 'nursing father' of church orthodoxy. Williams provided an alternate account of how order could be created and preserved in present history: state institutions and heads of households would collaborate as civil agents to complement individuals' 'conscientious' suppression of individual interest, serving the civil good. A web of interwoven conscientious activity would enmesh each individual, elect or unregenerate, in his or her useful place in the community, creating civil order. Natural conscience, working in all people, created and preserved this order, serving the civil good. At the same time, a civil policy of liberty for conscience, expressed in the state's role to promote

and protect that liberty and the restriction of state activity to judge in religious cases, Williams took to safeguard the progress of Grace in present history. The invisible church as well as present civil powers, though separate in Williams' description of their remit and legitimate tools, were engaged in the same project: waiting in the field of the world for the restitution of the order of the garden, and the end of human history.

The civil toleration for diverse consciences Williams articulated was a real toleration in practical terms: it was not a mask for his own theological absolutism. That is to say, he did not oppose, with civil means, the institution of visible churches in Providence, or Providence Plantations, of whatever particular persuasion. What Williams did oppose, though he did not articulate it as such, was a creeping secularisation of civil power: he identified this in people like William Harris using civil power for private ends, rather than for what he took as its correct spiritual purpose. He could not accommodate, within his system for creating and preserving civil order, accounts of the state, civil agents, or 'political individuals' that treated preserving order as an instrument for individual private benefit.

Williams understood the conditions of natural history, the 'order of the field,' to apply universally. But the fact that he found a potent civil threat in those who tried to abrogate the reality of original sin in present life should not be confused with religious intolerance, in context. The underlying conditions of present history, Williams understood not as religious dogma, but as *prima facie*, empirical truth. A contemporary analogue may be useful: today, professional economists argue about the exact mechanics of the relationship between interest rates and inflation. They do not, however, generally challenge the basic 'truth' that these two have a relationship to each other, in macroeconomic terms, related to other variables like levels of taxation.

Should anyone suggest that government financial policy be designed without reference, or in direct opposition to this empirical relationship (for which much evidence exists), this would certainly been seen as a threat to the stability of a national economy and civil society. This study suggests that Roger Williams perceived challenges to his empirical understanding of the conditions of the 'field of the world' in much the same terms. Right thinking economic advisors today would certainly work to exclude someone from a powerful position in making policy if he or she suggested that raising the basic rate of interest dramatically would prevent economic slow down, or stave off recession; in much the same way Williams worked to exclude from political power those who seemed to him to misunderstand the real spiritual purposes of government. Indeed, the threat as he perceived it was proportionately greater, as it involved not just people's 'bodies and goodes,' but their spiritual welfare beyond present life. Thus Williams' brand of toleration was real, in practice, despite his attempts to use civil force against some who look in today's terms, to disagree with him only in religious issues.

Williams clearly was misunderstood as a fore-runner of first amendment freedom of religion. There is no causal link between Williams' account of liberty of conscience and any developed liberty in the later nation, except perhaps through the lens of historiographic misinterpretation.¹ What Williams does perhaps offer an 'American political tradition,' is a blue print for critique of an American pluralism which supposes that individuals, even individuals with very different identities and

¹ William Lee Miller has argued that the portrayal of Williams in Isaac Backus' history of Baptists in the colonies created Williams as an early model of civil liberty, even if incorrectly. Despite the influence of Backus' *History*, Miller does not claim that there was any direct causal link between Williams' thought and later developments. William Lee Miller, *The First Liberty: Religion and the American Republic*, (NY: Knopf, 1986). Miller's description of Williams not as a 'libertarian,' but as a 'high communitarian,' in relation to later developed models for freedom of religion in American political life, is a useful description as it acknowledges that Williams' toleration was real, but did not include an elevation of private good over the claim of the community. p. 188.

histories, are autonomous. Contemporary commentators seeking an American 'multicultural identity' with real claims on white, middle class culture, or lamenting the increasing polarisation of wealth in American society, would be unlikely to find anything of use in Williams' understanding of the eschaton and original sin, with all resultant social and political implications. In Williams' version of the interdependence of individuals in civil society, and the claims they routinely exerted on each other, there might, however, be a shadow of an argument against those who define 'liberty' within American civil society today as autonomous individualism. Williams' 'political individuals' were mutually interdependent, and entirely subject to each other and their community, in civil things. They were specifically not autonomous, and became dangerous if they tried to exempt themselves from the claims of community. What little shadow of normative use Williams' thought might offer present commentators on American civil society, would lie in a critique of acquisitive individualism, not because all people do not share equally in its benefits, but because it obscures the underlying interdependence of all members of civil society. In Williams' terms:

...what are these Leaves, and Flowrs, and Smoke and Shadows and Dreams of Earthly Nothings about which we poore Fools and Children (as David saith) disquiet our Selvs in vain? Alas what is all the scuffling of this World for, but Come will you smoke it? What are all the Contentions and Wars of this World about (generally) but for greater Dishes and Bowls of Porridge...?²

For Williams, the civil threat behind the pursuit of individual material gain, the 'greater dish of porridge,' was contained in the spirit of competition it engendered between neighbours, trying to use the tools of civil power for their own, rather than God's, ends. Those commentators looking for models of liberty in an 'American historical tradition' that do not foster such use of civil agencies in the service of

² 'To Major John Mason and Governor Thomas Prence, 22 June 1670,' *Correspondence* II, p. 615.

material competition, might indeed find the 'smoke and shadow' of an argument in Williams' concern to 'wrap men up in societies.'

The primary use of this study, however, is to conclude the process of redefining Williams in correct, and complete political and intellectual context, adding the themes of the *'Esau and Jacob...'* manuscript to the body of evidence. In relation to the wider scholarly study of seventeenth century New England, this study explains exactly how men like John Winthrop, or Thomas Shepard could claim to advocate 'democraticall' government, based in the consent of individuals, without ascribing any autonomy to those individuals as political agents. It suggests that the study of political and intellectual history remains crucial to complement the techniques of social historians, if they are to proceed with useful ways of interpreting the facts and realities of people's day to day lives in these commonwealths, and communities. This study suggests that without an active awareness of the political and religious ideas that inform individuals' self-perception within their communities, social historians cannot adequately assess either their actions, or motivations. Similarly, the study of political ideas or theology removed from the empirical reality of social context has little chance of discerning an individuals' real understanding of his or her position in relation to others.

Building from this study, and those claims, other scholars might use the conclusions of this work to make more general consideration of how individuals are 'schooled' or stewarded into socially useful roles in 17th century New England. Further research suggested by the themes of this study might consider specific instruction to husbands, wives, children, servants, magistrates, businessmen, artisans, etc., so as to ensure their political participation in scheme of acceptable social order. Exploring the views of the Thomas Shepards (especially I and II), John Winthrop, the

Mathers, and others, a project begun here, would allow the development a comparative picture of the expectations and workings of particular social roles in constructing good citizens. Such inquiry might lead to projects like an investigation of the political dimension of housewifery in early modern New England, or further investigations into religious and political responsibilities of merchants, building on the work of Stephen Innes.

In broadest terms, these inquiries are part of the major theme in American Studies concerning American perceptions and 'management' of diversity. The fact that the system Williams devised was founded on explicitly Christian (highly developed Puritan, at that) assumptions about the natural order of human society does not negate this premise. From Williams' standpoint, the conditions of original sin and function of conscience were as fixed and universally observable in human life as any economic or sociological truth one might today use to describe and predict human interactions, as has been discussed. Roger Williams was engaged in the religious and political project, mandated by his interpretation of history, of trying to construct a unifying 'habit of the heart', which did not depend on a homogenous population, but allowed for every variety of religious and cultural diversity. Much otherwise useful commentary on early New England community has failed to treat the systematic theology bound up with Puritan notions of civility in sufficient detail, or dismissed it as irrelevant to questions of political identity outside of a specifically religious sphere: this outlined body of research would remedy that omission.

Appendix One: 'To the Town of Providence, 15 January 1681/82'

Original letter in the Providence Town Papers, second series, Volume I, 0326, Rhode Island Historical Society. Lafantasiae, Correspondence II, pp. 774-776.

Providence 15 Jan, 1681 (so calld)

Considerations presented, touching Rates.

1. Govrment and Order in Families Towns etc. is the Ordinance of the most High (Rom. 13) for the peace and Good of Mankind.
2. Six things are written in the hearts of all Mankind yea even in Pagans: First that there is a Deitie, 2 that Some Actions are naught 3 that the Deitie will punish 4 that there is another Life 5 that Mariage is honble [honorable] 6 that Mankind can not keepe together without some Government.
3. There is not English Man in his Maties Dominions or elsewhere, who is not forced to submit to Govrment.
4. There is not a Man in the World (except Robbers Pyrates, Rebels) but doth Submit to Govrment.
5. Even Robbers, Pyrates and Rebels themselves can not hold together but by Some Law among themselves and Govrment.
6. One of these 2 great Lawes in the World must prevaile, either that of Judges and Justices of peace, in Courts of peace: Or the Law of Arms, the Sword and Bloud.
7. If it Come from the Courts of Trialls in Peace, to the Triall of the Sword and Bloud, the Conquerour is forced to Settle Law and Govrment.
8. Till matters come to a Setled Govrment, No man is ordinarily sure of his Howse, Goods Lands Catle Wife Children or Life.
9. Hence is that Ancient Maxime: It is better to live under a Tirant in peace, then Under the Sword, or Where Every man is a Tirant.
10. His Matie sends Governrs to Barbados Virginia etc. but to us he shews greater favour in our Charters, to choose Whom We please.
11. No Charters are obtaind without great Suit, Favour or Charges. Our first Cost an hundreth pound (though I never recd it all): Our second about a thousand, Conecticuts above Six thousand.
12. No Govrment is maintaind without Tribute Custome, Rates, Taxes, etc.
13. Our Charter Excells all in N. Engl. or the World, as to the Souls of Men.
14. It pleaseth God (Rom. 13) to command Tribute Custome, Rates, Taxes, etc. not only for feare, but for Conscience Sake.
15. Our Rates are the least (by far) of any Colony in N. Engl.
16. There is no man that hate [hath?] a vote in Towne or Colony, but he hath a hand in making the Rates by himselfe or his Deputies.
17. In our Colony the Gen. Assembly, Govr, Magistrates, Deputies[,] Townes[,] Towne Clerkes[,] Raters, Constables etc. have done their duties, the failing lies upon particular persons.
18. It is but Folly to resist (one or more and if one why not more). God hath stirred up the Spirit of the Govr, Magistrates and officers (driven to it by necessitie)

to be Unanimously resolved to see the Matter finished: and it is the dutie of every man to maintayne Encowrage and strengthen the hand of Authorite.

19. Black Clouds (some Yeares) have hung over Old and N. Engl. heads. God hath bene wonderfully patient and long suffering to us? But who sees not Changes and Calamities hanging over us.
20. All men feare that this blazing Herauld from Heaven denounceth from the most High. Wars pestilences, famines. Is it not then our Wisedome to make and keepe peace with God and Men?
21. Your old unworthy Srvant

R. W

Appendix Two: Esau and Jacob's Mystical Harmony Unvailing...(1666)

Introduction

The ninety five page manuscript treatise, *'Esau and Jacob's Mystical Harmony Unvailing...'* (1666) was given to the Massachusetts Historical Society in 1813, by Caleb Gannett. He attributed the treatise to Roger Williams, and it has been catalogued as such; there is no clear reason that it should have escaped the attention of numerous commentators on Williams, or the editorial attention of Perry Miller and other more recent researchers. Although a fair copy and therefore difficult to compare with Williams' hand in less formal correspondence, flourishes and short-hand constructions within the text resemble Williams' hand-writing; the signature 'R.W.^s' on the fly-leaf is also characteristic of his correspondence of the period, both in the shape, or form of the letters and the use of initials instead of a complete signature. Physical evidences alone, however, would not confirm him as the manuscript's author: this introductory essay establishes Williams as the author of *'Esau and Jacob's Mystical Harmony Unvailing...'* considering physical, contextual, stylistic, and thematic evidence to make the case.

It is certainly within existing editorial experience and knowledge of the sources relating to Williams that other works of his should come to light. Williams and his contemporaries often wrote shorter essays or treatises intended to be handed in fair copy around a group of interested readers; that Williams should continue to do so through his intellectual career is not surprising. As early as 1636 there are references to at least one other treatise written by Williams for this kind of circulation,

of which no existing copy has been found.¹ Similarly, Williams referred in 1669 to having written in 1657 a book length manuscript that he tantalisingly described as a ‘...Defence of Civill Order and Governmt,’ no copy of which has been found.² This manuscript responded to Williams’ developing controversy with Harris: his brief description suggests that its text would prove central to this study. Because Williams’ own papers were destroyed during the burning of Providence in 1676, the researcher starts with the premise that the extant record of Williams’ writing is incomplete. Indeed, even the list of his published writings has grown, since the Narragansett Club edition of his printed works and correspondence, with the discovery of the uncatalogued pamphlet *Christenings Make not Christians*, (London: 1645) in 1881.³ The historical record of Williams’ papers is acknowledged to be incomplete; especially for the time period between his return to Providence in 1654 and his debates with the Quakers in 1672, scant sources remain.

¹ ‘There is evidence that he [Williams] circulated at least one treatise concerning the inevitability of persecution in states with an established church following his banishment from Massachusetts in 1636, but any extant copies have eluded all editors and scholars. This treatise has been supposed to be a response to the Reverend John Robinson’s *Treatise of the Lawfulnessse of Hearing of the Ministers in the Church of England* [Amsterdam(?), 1634], which Williams had in his possession the Summer after his banishment. The ‘lost paper’ was said to concern ‘the errors of listening to the preachings of unseparated ministers...[and] the differences between the ancient state of Israel and all modern states,’ disproving the belief that Israel could be seen as a ‘type’ for any contemporary civil government, particularly that of Massachusetts.’ *Correspondence*, I, p. 103, 104. Quoted text from Chapter One, section three, of this study.

² ‘RW to John Whipple, Jr., 24 Aug. 1669,’ *Correspondence* II, p. 602, and note 53, p. 608. Lafantasie, ‘Roger Williams and His Papers,’ *Correspondence* I, p. xlvii.

³ The pamphlet ‘*Christenings Make Not Christians*’ (London: 1645) was not identified until 1881, and then only by chance, as Henry Martyn Dexter recorded: ‘Some years since, in studying Robert Baylie’s *Dissuasive From the Errours of the Time*, I came upon three citations which he credits to ‘Williams, Of the name Heathen;’ and since that time I have diligently searched in every probable locality for such a book. Last winter in London almost my first opening of the Catalogue of the British Museum was to Williams’ name, trusting that, since former searches there, the missing treatise might have been added to their shelves. My endeavor was vain. But March 26 last, having occasion there to consult R. Fage’s *Lawfulnessse of Infants Baptisme*, that treatise came to my desk bringing with it, among the eight or ten pamphlets bound together, the long-sought tract, *Christenings Make Not Christians*.’ CW VII, Foreward to *Christenings Make Not Christians*, p. 28.

Physical Evidence

There is enough evidence to conclude that the manuscript was written in Williams' hand. Williams often signed his correspondence 'R. W.:' of the sixteen letters written by Williams as a single author between 1660 and 1670 collected by Lafantasie, ten are signed with initials. Even written under very different circumstances, and some ten years apart, the characteristic shape and flourishes of the 'R' in the signature in Williams' letter of 21 February, 1655/56 to John Winthrop, Jr. resemble those of the 'R' in the signature on the manuscript fly-leaf.⁴ Conclusive comparisons of the hand in the manuscript and that of correspondence, often written, as Williams himself admitted and Lafantasie confirms, 'late at night or in the early hours of the morning and frequently at breakneck speed,' are difficult, but similarities are readily apparent, in the shape of capital letters (compare capital 'A,' for example) and distinctive lack of punctuation in the text. By signing the preface on the fly-leaf of the volume, 'R. W.'⁵ claimed to be the actual author, as opposed to a pen-man; these physical evidences, though not alone conclusive, point to Williams as the source of the treatise.

Contextual Evidence

Although Williams made no direct reference in extant correspondence or later writing to this or any other treatise concerning his typological understanding of the limitations of human 'policie' in preserving peace in 'these contentious and vexatious times,' he did reference the exact typological development of the brothers' story developed in the manuscript, in a later letter.⁵ Writing to Major John Mason and

⁴ See facsimile copies, for comparison, following this introductory essay.

⁵ text is quoted from *Esau and Jacobs Mystical Harmony Unvailng...* (1666) p. 95. Page numbers refer to page in the manuscript; in the appended transcription the manuscript's line breaks and pagination are maintained, with page numbers [separated] in brackets.

Governor Thomas Prence of Connecticut, on 22 June 1670, Williams chided them for treating material interest as a compelling motive for action. This affection for worldly motives was typed, he suggested, by Esau's sale of his birthright. As Williams wrote:

Alas Sir, (in calme midnight thoughts) what are these Leaves, and Flowrs, and Smoke and Shadows and Dreams of Earthly Nothings about which we poore Fools and Children (as David saith) disquiet our Selvs in vain? Alas what is all the scuffling of this World for, but Come will you smoke it? What are all the Contentions and Wars of this World about (generally) but for greater Dishes and Bowls of Porridge, of wch (if we believe Gods Spirit in Scripture) Esau and Jacob were types? Esau will part with the heavenly Birthright for his Supping (after his hunting) for God Belly: and Jacob will part with his porridge for an Eternal Inheritance...⁶

Williams' point was that Esau had mistaken the material, worldly imperative for the true heavenly one, serving 'God Belly,' just as Connecticut was now mistaking the importance of the material imperative in contentions over land. Williams' larger point, in making this aside in his letter, was to emphasize the futility and emptiness of worldly and material motives *per se*. This argument had formed a central plank in the text of the treatise, which argued firstly that the brothers' conflict typed present historical conflicts over worldly matters, including conflicts within and between visible churches, and secondly that God reconciled these 'worldly contentions' in an extra-historical, 'mystical unity' typed by the brothers' eventual reconciliation.⁷ Although the letter to Prence and Mason does not mention the treatise explicitly, its specific typological reference shows Williams to have exactly the same particular typological understanding of the brothers' story as the author of the earlier manuscript.

Further, Williams in the Prence/Mason letter cited Esau's name first, as opposed to the more usual construction, where Jacob's name was given precedence.

⁶ 'To Major John Mason and Governor Thomas Prence, 22 June 1670,' *Correspondence* II, p. 615.

⁷ See 'Esau and Jacobs...', pp. 95, 96 for brief summation of the typological significance of the brothers' reconciliation: Jacob acknowledged particularly that his 'humane reason' and 'contrived policie' were useless, and the reconciliation was effected solely by the 'Myserie of Jehovahs will.'

This accords with the explanation by the author of the manuscript that he had cited the name Esau before Jacob to emphasize the latter's regaining of the birthright, after their reconciliation.⁸ The unusual care to give Esau's name precedence Williams showed in the letter accords with the particular emphasis in the treatise. These references, though not explicitly citing the manuscript, show a referential context in which it would certainly fit, if Williams was its author.

At the time of the manuscript's writing, 1666, Williams was deeply engaged in the middle stages of the series of disputes with William Harris and the Pawtuxet settlers over what he saw as their 'land lust.' He had already grown frustrated with his inability to use the regular devices of 'humane reason' and 'contrived policie' to end Harris' expansion of the Providence boundaries. As developed in Chapter five, section five, Williams had expected that an obligation to the peace and prerogatives of the commonwealth as a whole would cause individuals to curtail their private, material interests. Indeed, by Williams account, this obligation extended directly from an individual's familial obligations, and position within a patriarchal household order, on which the state was founded. By Williams' reckoning, Harris and his faction had entirely betrayed their responsibilities to the common good of the town and colony, elevating private 'covetous' interest over public peace. Explicitly, Williams worried that their actions would result in the colony abrogating its exceptional position as a 'haven for refugees of conscience,' analogous to Esau choosing 'God Belly' over his divine birth right. Thus the manuscript's lament, 'O where are such Bowels of Brother=hood now in these contentious and vexatious times' would have had an explicit historical context in Williams' own advocacy, at the time of its writing. Along with Williams' later specific typological references,

⁸ Ibid, p. 95. '...thou didst in the Myserie, regain thy Birth=right, in going first as the Eldest, into our fathers Hous.'

this suggests an explicit and intellectual and political context for the manuscript, with Williams as its author, in line with the contemporary events of his life.

Stylistic Evidence

Stylistic similarities between the manuscript 'Esau and Jacob...' and Roger Williams' later printed works, and longer correspondence of the 1660s and 1670s, form the most compelling of the evidences for his authorship of the manuscript. Williams wrote in a characteristic style of long, convoluted sentences, with many appended clauses and parenthetical asides. He used punctuation and capitalization as modes of emphasis, not in a regular way to indicate the finishing or beginning of sentences. His writing was steeped in Scriptural references; he often wrote in extended (and layered) metaphors, cross-referencing several different Scriptural metaphors, or allegorical images. This has the effect of making much of his prose a challenge for the modern reader, and in places nearly impenetrable to the modern lay reader; it also identifies his writing distinctly among that of his contemporaries. Additionally, Williams wrote longer works in a dialogue format, in which supposed combatants or agents carried on a symbolic conversation by way of explaining the themes of the work. The manuscript 'Esau and Jacob...' displays these characteristic stylistic anomalies in sharp relief, throughout the body of the text.

Comparing the prose style of the manuscript with that in longer, polemical correspondence written by Williams during the same time period, a common style emerges immediately. Even when writing a narrative of events, as opposed to developing theological understandings, Williams wrote in long, wandering sentences, punctuated by parenthetical clarifications at different stages of his point. Exemplary, but by no means unique or the most extreme example, is Williams' account of his

own diplomatic role between the Narragansett and the governments of the various English colonies, related to Sir Robert Carr in March of 1666:

I crave leave to add (for the excuse of this boldness) that the Natives in this Bay doe (by my promise to them, at my first breakeing of the ice amongst them) expect my endeavours of preserving the public peace, which it hath pleased God, mercifully to help me to doe many times (with my great hazard, and charge,) when all the Colonies and the Massachusits, in especiall, have meditated, prepared, and been (some times many hundreds) upon the march for warr against the Natives in this Colony.⁹

Williams used the parenthetical asides to add to, or clarify the meaning of the surrounding clauses, to control the message of the text. He wanted to emphasize his own role in opening the Narragansett region to white settlement, with particular reference to his treating with the natives, accomplished in the second parenthetical aside above. He also wanted to reference his own willingness to accept personal risk in service of maintaining peaceful relations, and his own responsible role in negotiations of the past, highlighted in the second aside.

The written style of the manuscript follows the same pattern that Williams used in his correspondence, and other writing, using parenthetical asides, rather than separate sentences, to direct and control the reader's perception of the point under discussion. Extended by commas and semi-colons, sentences often repeated previous points in their asides. For example, Summarizing the points of the preceding pages, the author of the manuscript wrote the following sentence, beginning on page 56:

Then, my Brother Esau, From our Eternal Je=
hovahs, most blessed All powerfull voice, And most
holy mystical Oracle; we are not only visible
Types of the created man=hoods literal strug=
glings together (through two general nations)
in fleshly or spiritual manifestations: But
we are in (chief) ordained, and brought forth heer,
to be the spiritual, and mystical Types of o^e Eternal

⁹ 'To Sir Rober Carr, 1 March 1665/66,' *Correspondence* II, p. 550.

[page 57]

Jehovahs uniting. These two General (figuring) nations
in the unity of one free womb; Even in y^e ever
blessed free womb of universal unity, in the
everlasting Righteousness & Salvation, of His
most glorious Eternal Power & God=Head: from
the Loynes of our fore father Abraham; They
visibly appeared to be distinct, by the literall
figuring two wombs of Hagar & Sarah; Heer
from the Loynes of our Father Isaac; They are
brought into one mystical typing free womb, of o^e
Mother Rebekah; And there in the Myserie, my
Hand of Righteousness and Salvation, might (in y^e figure)
spring up (according unto His most holy Oracle)
in universal unity together; wherein is our E=
ternal Jehovahs universal Promise & Oath,
made good unto our fore Father Abraham [That
in his Seed. All the families, kindreds, and nations
of the Earth, should be blessed] So that, our Eternal
Jehovahs universal unity, in the Essential Being,
of everlasting Righteousness and salvation, Com=
municating in fulnes, from the Eternal Power &
God=Head; Is the universal intire womb from
whence All proceeds, and in which All is Cent^ed.¹⁰

Gen:
22.

Acts.
3.

Although much longer than the particular sentence from the letter to Sir Robert Carr,
this sample sentence from the manuscript shows the same characteristic form and use
of asides as Williams' acknowledged writing. Further examples would repeat the
point: the earlier quote from Williams' letter to Mason and Prence echoes the same
stylistic rhythm, for example.

In addition to sentence length and the characteristic use of parenthetical asides,
the manuscript uses a symbolic dialogue between two imagined interlocutors, the
brothers Jacob and Esau, to structure the argument. This was a common device, but
one Williams had certainly used before, most notably in *The Bloudy Tenent* (1644),
much of which he structured as a dialogue between 'Truth' and 'Peace.' While the

¹⁰ 'Esau and Jacobs....', pp. 56, 57.

dialogue device itself was common enough not to prove authorship of the manuscript, it was a rhetorical crutch Williams had used in the past, and had already demonstrated his comfort with. As such it adds to the larger body of evidence to confirm Williams as the author of the manuscript.

Thematic Evidence

The final test to establish Williams' authorship of the manuscript treatise involves analysis of its themes and message, to establish whether these accord with those of the larger body of Williams' work. In its typology, its expressed view of history, and its understanding of the imperfectability of 'human' society, the manuscript thoroughly accords with historical understanding of Williams' positions. This study has argued that Williams' displayed a modified developmental typology, in terms defined by Sacvan Bercovitch.¹¹ Analysis of Williams' printed writings, and the typological references in his correspondence, show him to use Old Testament figures to refer to events in the life of Christ, but more significantly, to the events of the eschaton, or thereafter. This study has shown that Williams also used Old Testament types to represent events in present history, but only as they related to the time of Revelations: Williams used typological analysis to explain that what looked like present incongruity was only incongruous when viewed through the limited lens

¹¹ See Chapter two, section two, for discussion of Williams' typology, and examples, with reference to Bercovitch's definitions, and Williams' own contemporaries in New England: 'Where in strict terms, developmental typology would insist on a literal identification of Old Testament types with Christ, or with events of the end of history, Williams applied a much more allegorical approach to the Scriptures. This did not mean that he challenged the historical truth of the Old Testament or New, but that he could be more free with his typological assignments, by expanding types as allegories for events in the Life of Christ, or in the life of the godly elect in the passage of history. Williams' manuscript concerning the implications of an allegorical typological approach to the story of Jacob and Esau exemplified this method. The two brothers were not intended to stand as types literally for people or events in the Gospels or at the Revelation, but their story was interpreted as allegory for a variety of present struggling forces' reconciliation in the end time.'

of human history. As such his typology retained a focus on the eschaton, in a broadly developmental model, while concerning itself with events in present history.

This is exactly the form, and function, of the typology in the manuscript treatise. Jacob and Esau (as exemplified in the passage quoted above) ‘typed’ present conflict, but the function of that ‘typing’ was to argue for the ultimate ‘mystical’ extra-historical reconciliation of the ‘two general nations’ of people, elect and non-elect. The typology of the manuscript explains the permission, and positive purpose, of conflict in present history, while pointing firmly towards the end of that history, when all conflicts and warring factions would be reconciled as were the two brothers. This line of typological reasoning is very much in line with that of Williams’ other work, emphasizing the long-suffering, perpetual martyrdom of the elect, besieged in present history but assured of coming glory.

Echoing Williams’ consistent rejection of the validity of Old Testament theocracies to represent actual historical states, the manuscript also makes clear that God’s historical covenant with the Israelites is understood as a type for God’s ‘Spiritual’ nation in the present day, not as pre-figuring any present covenantal status accruing to an actual state. In the words of the manuscript (repeated in several places):

Behold these are my typing Canaanites, whose Land
flowed with milk & Hony, typing forth this my spiritu=
al Canaan...¹²

This is another important instance in which the typological themes of the manuscript accord with those of Williams, in the clear distinguishing of spiritual and civil order, the order of the garden and of the field, in present history. Indeed, developing the point that God’s elect nation in present history had no legitimate expression in a

¹² ‘*Esau and Jacobs....*’ p. 65, bottom.

visible church institution, in the present day, the manuscript speaks of ‘...such universal fierie Contentions, unto bloody executions; which hath overspread, all National visible Churches.’ Such a clear rejection of national, civilly established churches obviously agrees with the emphases of Williams’ earlier work, notably his rejection of national churches in ‘*the Bloudy Tenent*’ (1644) and ‘*the Bloudy Tenent Yet More Bloody*’ (1652).

The view of history expressed in the manuscript also agrees with that Williams expressed in other writings: human history was a temporary disruption of God’s extra-historical, perpetual unity, pointing towards the reconciliation of the gap between creator and creature opened by Adam’s Fall. Human time, defined by a linear progression of moments, according to the author of the manuscript, would not just end, but be entirely reabsorbed at the Second Coming:

In refference to Time, Such Distinction as is between the Beginning, and Ending; between yesterday, today, and for Ever; And all terminated in Christ; who is the Alpha & Omega; The first, and Last; The only manifestation of Eternity, Rev. 1¹³

This account of human history, as beginning with the Fall and ending with Revelations, is much in accord with that expressed by Roger Williams, as discussed in Chapter three of this study. The first condition of human history, for Williams, was the tension created by its digression from God’s plan for his creatures: ‘History, for Williams, was driven by a syllogistic framework, in which God gradually resolved the conflict created by Adam’s sin. The great events in history, then, were points at which conflicting positions were articulated, or resolved: the Fall itself, Christ’s redemptive sacrifice, Christ’s commissioning of apostles to spread knowledge of the redemption in the world, the forsaking of that commission in the adoption of

¹³ Ibid, p. 79.

Christianity by the Roman Empire, and ultimately, the Revelation. History itself only existed as a result of the conflict introduced by Adam's sin, and was therefore not the arena for human activity God intended at the creation, only a temporary way-station perpetuated by human corruption.¹⁴ The manuscript echoes this view of history, de-emphasizing the importance of present events in God's greater scheme of reconciliation (even of the separation of events by human time) at the time of Christ's return.

In line with his particular understanding of history, as discussed in Chapter three, and his understanding of order and disorder in the present day, as developed in Chapter five, section one, of this study, Roger Williams did not think conflict could be engineered out of present human existence. Because of the conditions of 'natural' history, Williams held, utopian efforts, either to produce civil peace or to create a pure visible church institution, were confections of the order of the garden and of the field, and doomed to failure. The manuscript strongly supports and develops this assumption of Williams', explaining the imperfectability of creatures and conditions of present history, while pointing to the ultimate reconciliation of human conflicts at the end time, an end time the author fervently hopes will arrive. According to the author of the manuscript, the present conflict typed by the struggling of the two brothers will be reconciled, but that reconciliation will be 'timeless,' accomplished only in the 'heavenly kingdom of multiplying forgiveness,' in 'the Celestial Body,' but not the 'Terrestrial.'¹⁵ Thus in arguing that there would be an ultimate reconciliation of all conflicts at the end time, the author of the manuscript was explicitly not negating human standards of discrimination of order and disorder, truth and evil, Christ and Anti-Christ, in present history. This view accords with that

¹⁴ Chapter three, section one.

¹⁵ 'Esau and Jacobs....,' p. 82.

expressed by Williams, as developed in detail in Chapters four, and five of this study, in relation to the civil society, and as developed in Chapter two, in relation to conflict within and between churches in present history.

Conclusion

Taken together, the physical, contextual, stylistic, and thematic evidences confirm Roger Williams as the author of 'Esau and Jacobs Mystical Harmony...' (1666). The manuscript appears to be in his hand, it is signed in characteristic style, it would fit with the conflicts in which Williams was embroiled at the time of its writing, its style exactly follows his own, and its typology and other themes accord with those expressed elsewhere in his work. Editorial experience of assembling Williams' writings and correspondence, over time, has pointed out the gaps in the extant record of his work, and the real possibility of more Williams' sources coming to light. It is surprising that this manuscript should have escaped notice in the archive of the Massachusetts Historical Society, given the number of attentive editors of Williams' work, over the years. However, there is no discussion of it in the considerable Williams' historiography: no recognition, let alone proof or disproof of its authorship. While its themes are not at the centre of this present study, its incorporation should cast important new light on Williams mysticism and theological understanding of conflict in present history, in relation to his millenarian vision. This study does conclude, after assessment of a variety of evidences, that Williams was the manuscript's author.

Presentation to the Mass. Histor. Society
By C. Gannett, Esquire
1813.

A (Raised) Lazarus Breathing Meditations.

In the Mystical Dialot, of New Jerusalem; Tho New
Heaven, and the New Earth: (wherein only) dwelleth Right-
teousness: Composed through a Spiritual Discourse (In a
revealed mystery) Between the blessed twin'd Types,
Esau & Jacob; In their Father Isaac's faith; Con-
cerning Things to come: Which saluteth, The hidden
Image of God; In his universal (railing) Creation, of
Man kind; That groweth and travaileth in Pain; Until
the universal Manifestation, of his glorious & glorious
Righteousness (who is most Just, in finisheth the Mystery
of his will, unto his breathed off Spring, His own Image
and likeness) In Eternal Unity &c. &c.

I suppose Roger Williams.

With the second Mystical Order of the Letter.

Providence 21.2/55 (Locate)

& The opportunity makes me venture this Salutation
 though we have question of y^e being at Regent
 these friends can say more of Affairs than I can write
 of have Letters from Engl. of proceedings there, yet
 are not come home & have not yett told us y^e good
 hath yett created grace although the Dutch y^e yett
 (by Governors) to enforce it. I can not trace of open
 Powers with France but only of a peace & protection
 of y^e West India expedition it is not known all the
 world on both sides intended. The Governor of y^e Spanish
 hath taken y^e finger & thought of many English. So y^e
 saving of Troubles now is known y^e Governor with
 Gould though y^e Sullen yett on Crowns him with Thomas
 The former 2 or 3 years with plenty & thankfully
 received in Engl. y^e first abundance of Waters
 this last Summer was good. Their come over most
 parts of y^e Land. & Henry Lane being retired to
 his own private in Lincolnshire hath now published
 his Propositions as to Religion, he hath sent me one
 of his best. Though yett at Boston, his affairs is
 more than ^{double} of his Father has been but a month
 longer, so though his estate last time of yett he hath
 not lost in Temporals, for being cast of for God. He
 acquainted Major Bradwick said to be welcome
 to unsuccessful Venetian Cast into y^e Towns y^e Gov.
 Stephen Success Major Gen. has the hope and success
 of writing of all his Slaves for his Gates, fearing the
 Christianity y^e know whether Archer Gov. has
 signs of Christ. Said then y^e yett y^e Gov. before his
 down fall must be case Engl. & y^e protestant countries
 revolted from him & y^e are sure All flesh is grass
 like y^e sword of y^e sword endures for ever. & you are
 kindly intended to quench a fire between us &
 Codrington & others. But now it is come to y^e side
 Teiath we have Dutch fire just smothered from
 this we are not stormie, only may y^e most gracious Gov.
 of all done & he owes to himself in whom I find
 to be sure y^e R. W.

[Fly-leaf]

Presented to the Mass. History. Society
By C. Gannett, esquire

1813

[new handwriting: Roger Williams]

A (Raised) Lazarus Breathing Meditations.

In the Mystical Dialect, of New Jerusalem; The new
Heaven, and the new Earth; wherein (only) dwelleth Righteousness: Composed through a spiritual Discourse (In A
revealed Myserie) Between the blessed twined Tipes,
Esau & Jacob; In their Father Isaacs faith; Concerning Things to come: Which saluteth, The hidden
Image of God; In his universal (vailing) Creation of
Man-kind; That groweth, and travaileth, in Pain; Until
the universal manifestation, of his glorious redeeming
Righteousness (who is most Just, in finishing the Myserie
of his will; unto his breathed off spring, his own Image
and likeness) In Eternal unity ~ . RW^s

[handwriting same as 1st lines]
I suppose Roger Williams.

With the second mystical Order of the Letter.

[title page]

Allelujah unto our Eternal Jehovah.

Esau and Jacobs Mystical Harmony.

Unvailing.

The Myserie of Jehovahs Eternal will in universal unity.

Branched.

Through several Allegories, or Communication.

On

Their typical Nativity. Visible Separation; and In=
Visible unity.

Which

Divine Allegorie, Compriseth, The universal Figuring
Earthly Dis=union; And Spiritual unity, of all
Precedent and succeeding Generations.

Saluting:

In Faiths Dispensations, The faithfull witnesses; And
Praising Psalmodyans; worshipping throug Christ Jesus;
In believing the Resurrection, of the Man hoods

Spiritual, and glorious manifestations, proceeding from Jehovahs Communicating
Fulness, In universal unity ~:

Also the Myserie of Y^c Eternal

Power and God Head to be

Finished, when veiled

Time & Curse shal be

no longer Rev: 10. &. 22.

Ex: 6.3. And I appeared unto Abraham unto Isaac & unto Jacob, by Y^c
Name of God Almighty but by my name Jehovah I was not known to them.
Heb: 11. By faith Isaac blessed Esau and Jacob concerning things to come.
Psal: 117. O praise the Lord all ye Nations; Praise him all ye people, for his
Mercifull kindnes is great towards is and the Tinth of Y^c Lord
Endureth for ever.

[page 1]

Esau & Jacobs Mystical Harmony.

~ . 1. Mystical Harmony.

On Esau and Jacobs Unity in Brotherly
Embracing Concordancie, for singing –
Allelujah, and Demonstrating the wonderfull
Mysterie of Jehovahs will. In universal
Unity.

Esau. My Brother Jacob; Alpha & Omega, Love &
Hate. Elect & Reprobate; Life & Death; Heaven
& Hell; Salvation & Damnation; Appearing un=
vaild: Let us sing Allelujah; and demonstrate the
wonderfull mysterie, of our Jehovahs will/
For oh! The Breadth and Length and Depth and
Hight of [Immutability] And the unsearchable
Riches, & Counsels, of Jehovahs will? As it is written
many that are ffirst shall be Last; And the Last shall
be ffirst; And all but one in the [All in All] who
is the Beginning, & End; yesterday, to Day, and for
Ever; Good to all; and whose mercies are above
all his works: Therefore my Brother Jacob, I
say again; Let us sing Allelujah, and demonstrate
the most wonderfull mysterie of our Eternal Je=
hovahs will.

Jacob Oh! My Elder Brother Esau; what Tongues, what
Languages, of men, or Angels, are able to demon=
strate the wonderfull mystical Depth & Height
of our Eternal Jehovahs Will? When I saw Jeho=
vah, above the top of that mystical Ladder; which reacht
d from Earth to Heaven; I was but in a dream;
and knew not the Name of Jehovah, nor the Mysterie
thereof; But awaked, was sure, the Lord was in that
place: our Brother Paul in his third Heaven, was
But in a vision, hearing unspeakable words, that was
not possible for man to utter: our Brother Moses,
(then) the chief Servant, over his Masters House,

[page 2]

After his earnest Prayer, could but see the husk-parts
of his Masters Will: The Eternal Son and Heir, who
was not ashamed to call us Brethren, after all his
sufferings, and glorious triumphes; is said (but in a
literal phrase) to set down, at his Fathers right
Hand: Then what words? What Expressions? Can de=
xxare the infinite Nature; of the Mysterie, of our
Eternal Jehovahs will? Yet my Brother Esau,
ffrom our experiential knowledg; That Mercy,
and Truth, are met together; Righteousness and
Peace, kissing each other: Let us (though but in the
Language of Abba Father) Sing Allelujah and de=
monstrate, the most wonderfull Mysterie of our
Eternal Jehovahs Will: And as thy Experience hath
been great, ascending from the depth of Hell, unto the

height of this heavenly Unity; Be pleased to begin our mystical Harmony.

Esau My Brother Jacob; It is true, My paths hath been in Hell; Conversant with Devils, and damned Spirits; from that Mount Seir, which our Jehovah gave unto me; for a vanishing earthly possession; I have passed through Mount Sinai, that burned with fire; Through Blacknes, Darknes, & Tempest; Compassing the whole visible Creation of all principalities & powers; And all the variable Natures, and Spirits, of every Creature, that was made subject to vanity; Greek or Jew; Bond or free; male or female; Barbarian or Scythian, Elect or Reprobate; Upon all which Earth that mystical Ladder thou sawest was set: And my Brother Jacob, it is also true, Thou hast ascended upon the steps of that heavenly Ladder, from thy dwelling in visible & changeable Tents; Unto everlasting Mount Sion; The City of the living God; To an immeasurable Company of Angels; To the general Assembly of the first= Bourne;

[page 3]

And to God the Judge of all, And to the Spirits of Just men made perfect. Therefore be thee pleased my Brother Jacob to begin in the harmonious dialect of those Celestial Bodies.

Jacob My Brither Esau, THAT Dove like language the Olive Branch hath sung, the saving mysterie thereof; But to demonstrate the most wonderfull mysterie of our Jehovahs Will; Doth appear in what became of the Raven? Of our lost Tribes? Of those two nations that struggled (typed by us) in our mother Rebekahs womb of conception? To whom (put elder Brother) the only true Prophet, did preach unto in prison. In the dayes of Noah, while the caving Ark was preparing? And what are the Groines? Travails? Pains? and earnest expectations of the whole Creation untill now? For oh! the unresistable unconceivable and infinite & glorious mysterie, of our Eternal Jehovahs will?

Esau My Brother Jacob, The Ancient of dayes, is Alsufficient; who provides for the Raven; finds those that are lost; Opening the prison Gates; which none can shut again; Giving deliverance, in joyfull Songs of Salvation, under his glorious dominion w^{ch} is everlasting; whose Kingdom is four squar. The Breadth, Length, Height, and Depth are equal; The inhabitants, All people; Nations, & Languages; Therein, no struggling; no taking by the heel; no noise of hammer, Ax, nor any tool of Iron; for the Hammer of the whole Earth, is cut asunder and broken to peeces, as the potter breaks his vessels; The only Sound is Allelujah, Salvation, Glory, Hon^E & Power; unto the Lord our God, the only Jehovah: Thus, my Brother Jacob, In the Unity of Spirit And Bond of Everlasting Truth, Love, and peace,

[page 4]

With one Heart, Hand, and Tongue, Let us unanimously proceed, to sing & demonstrate, the wonderfull mysterie of our Jehovahs will: wherein our ffather Isaac, skillfull David, experienced Solomon, and our Brother Paul, with all spiritual Psalmodyans, that experimentally knowes, and savingly delights, in the power, and Glory of Jehovahs Universal Unity; will Consort in Harmony with us, on their mystical ten stringed Instruments.

2. Mystical Harmony.

On Jehovahs communicating Fulnes, through infinit & wisdom most wonderfull contrivement, admired Concealment, almighty Power; and most gracious Freenes, For glorious manifesting (in the fulnes of time) his mystical will, in universal unity.

Jacob My Brother Esau, Our harmonious Instruments tuned, in the unity of Faiths Concordancie, That Contermands all manner of strugglings, in this spiritual womb of Eternitie: Behold our Eternal Jehovahs Communicating Fulnes: who is the original Foundation, durable Rock of Ages; Everlasting Strength; Eternal Salvation; Alsufficient Provider; victorious Banner; Triumphant Peace; And the only most High, over all the Earth. Having in his infinite wisdom, ffore-ordained a vail, Through the Type our Father Isaac, Gen. 22 Thereby portraying unto the (then) capascitie of his Creations Comprehension, a following unveiled manifestation: of his most gracious free will, in a Substantial Eternal Sacrifice; Once to be offered up, for the universal Sins, & Offences of All:

Ex. 6
Gen. 22

Isa:12.

Judg.6
Ex. 17
Isa. 28
Psal. 83

[page 5]

Proceeds in the following Chapters, to Figure forth the most wonderfull (mysterie) of his most glorious will: As our Brother Paul declares: Having made known to Us, the (Mysterie) of his will. Eph. 1 Causeth our typing Father Isaac (proceeding from our fore Father Abraham) To take a wife: Behold the Mysterie; In the infinite wisdom of our Jehovahs will: male & ffemale, must be conjoined, made one Flesh, one Spirit; whereby the visible Disunion, of the whole posteritie of mankind, might appear, the proceed from Y^c Root of Union.

Gen: 23

He must not take a wife of the Cannanites; of any stranger; But out of his Fathers house: Behold the admired Contrivement of Concealment. the this most wonderfull Mysterie (untill the fulnes of time) so clouded in this Figure; that our Brother peter declares, how the very Angels, desired to peep into it: For a time, all manifestation, All dispensations; All promises, must only run in the line, of the faithfull seed of Abraham: All

Ver. 3.

Strangers, & Infidels rejected; none admitted to mix seed with the faithfull; But a publique Declaration of utter Separation; whereby, in the appointed time, The most glorious Splendour of Y^e durable Riches, of the Mysterie of Jehovahs will, might the more transcendently appear to be magnified by all, visible and Invisible.

A virgin (not a concubine) is provided; very fair to look upon; Neither had any man known her; Called Rebekah: whom after our Father Isaac had known for a season must be barren. Behold in this mysterie Both the wisdom, and Almighty power, of our Jehovahs mystical Will; Sarah (our Grand=mother) must be barren; That Jehovahs Mysteries, might be brought fourth, our of the womb, of his creature barrennes:

Ver. 16.

Chap:
25.

[page 6]

Which wonderfull Mysterie, made our Brother Isaiah break forth in that universal Exaltation; Sing, oh Barren, Rejoyce thou which art not with Chils; for more are the Children of the desolate. then of the married wife: It is not the fairest, or Chastest:

to look upon, that can promise Fruitfulness: Jehovahs Power, must appear, as our Brother Job saith, Out of the Emoty; He hangeth the Earth upon nothing; no tempered, nor untempered Morter; neither of men, nor Angels, must be intermixed, in theis substantial Foundation: The womb must be simple Chaste, and Barren; That Jehovah, the only Rock; and Everlasting Strength of Ages; may be the glorious Founder, and compleat Finisher, of this most wonderfull Mysterie.

Ver. 21 After our Father Isaac had (through faith) intreated Jehovah for ffruitfulness; Our Mother Rebekah Conceiveth: Behold the Mysterie; of the unsearchable wisdom, Almighty power, and pracious Freenes, of our Jehovahs will; yet no knowledg to flesh & Blood; what this desired, and well come Conception, should bring forth; And a great wonderment to Rebekah; Expecting from his happy Conceiving, after barrennes, the Enjoyment of a mothers Comfort; But she finds not, as o^r sister Elizabeth did, the Babe leaping for joy; But the sad panges of Strife; and struggling, in her disquieted womb, unto her great amazement; Causing Implo=ration, upon this wonderfull Paradox: If it be so, why am I thus? Behold the simplicity of this mysterie. The creatures carnal Hopes, ad selfish Ends; All must be frustrated, That the Eternal will, & purpose of Jehovah, may be manifested: of whom Rebekah enquires, Concerning This Mysterie; Jehovah most free to all that asketh; Answers. yet through a more wonderfull mystical Figure: which Compriseth the Substance of o^r harmoniou Com=munication

[page 7]

And the Lord said unto her, two Nations are in the womb;

and two manner of People, shall be separated from the Bowels; and the one People shall be stronger, then the other People; and the Elder shall serve the younger.
 xEsau Thus (My Brother Jacob) Enterance is made into o^e Typical nativity; wherein from our Jehovahs Commu= nicating fullnes; we have beheld some Glimpse, of the Myserie; of his most admirable Contrivement, of Concealment; infinite wisdom, Almighty Power and most gracious Freenes, of his Eternal will, for manifesting the Myserie, of his universal unity.

[Jacob] Oh then (my Brother Esau) having enjoyed, this hea= venly glimpse (observing harmonious order for mag nifying this glorious Myserie; Let thy experienced Harmony next proceed, That we may unanimously witnes, the powerfull Truth of our Jehovahs immu= table Counsels, concerning those unsearchable glo= rious Manifestations, in universal peace and unity; which shall succeed all struggling times, and Literall Significations.

3. Mystical Harmony
 On Jehovahs ordaining the mystical Unity,
 beteen the killinf Letter, & living Spirit;
 with their distinct Sounds; for demonstra=
 tion of his universal unity.

Esau. Oh my Brother Jacob! ffor all fainting Soules Ravishment; In Everlasting Blessednes; It is written; The letter killeth; But the Spirit giveth Life: The voice of this struggling Letter is; 2 Cor. 3.
 Two Nations, and in thy womb; But Y^e blessed voice, of the Spirit of Life, & unity saith; All Acts 17.
 Nations of Mankind, are made of one Blood,

[page 8]

Being the off spring of the living God; who is not only the God of the Jew, but also of the Gentile. Gal: 3.
 The Letter saith, Two manner of people, shall be separated from the bowels; The Spirit saith, In the dispensation of the fulnes of times, All things which are in the Heavens, and which are on Earth, shall be gathered together in One: Eph: 1.
 The Letter saith; One people shall be stronger, then the other people: The Spirit saith, The wolf shall dwell with the Lamb; and the Leopard shall lie down with the Kid, and a little Child shall lead them; no hurting, nor destroying, in all Jehovahs holy mountain; for as the waters cover y^e Sea, So shall the Earth be full of the knowledge of the Lord. Esa: 11
 The Letter saith; The Elder shall serve y^e younger, But the living Spirit of Jehovah saith; Thou art no more a Servant, But a Son, & Heir of the ever= living God. Gal: 4.
 My Brother Jacob, Take the Letter in its killing nature; in its naked Language; It appears y^e great= est man=slayer that ever was; Like unto the Voice of Davids Letter unto Joab, Det Uriah in y^e fore= 2 Sam: 11.

front of the hottest Battel, that he may be smitten, and die.

But my Brother Jacob, Conjoyn the Voice of the Letter with the Voice of the Spirit, in the Body of Jehovahs Unity; Then it appears, the only preserver of man=kind: Then appears for the reviving of all fainting soules; That Branch, with onle Cluster of Grapes, that was raised between the Unity of Two, from Jehovahs Land of Canaan: The' appears, for the annointing, & curing of all wounded Soules, That golden Oyl, in Zechariahs vision, which was emptied, through the (onenes) of the

Num: 13.

Zech: 4.

[page 9]

Two golden Pipes, from the (onenes) of y^e Two Olive Trees, that was on the right Hand, and on the left, of Jehovahs (only) golden Candlestick, which lightens every man that cometh into the World.

John: 1.

Causing to sing the Conclusion of all Experienced Davids prophetical Songs; Let every Thing, that hath Breath, praise the Lord.

Psal: 150.

Again my Brother Jacob, Take this Letter in its killing nature, disjoynes from its proper Body; Jehovahs Spirit of Life, y' appears like unto Aarons Rod, in Moses hand, which being cast upon the ground, (on the earthy Condition of the Creature) It becomes a biting destroying Serpent; But take this Serpent (through the power of Jehovahs Spirit) by the Tail (where is the killing sting) It returnes in the Rod again, that buddeth unto Everlasting Life.

Ex: 4.

It is even as Moses Hand, drawen from its proper Body, and put into the Bosom of fleshy Corruption, behold its all leperous; But being wthdrawn again (through Jehovahs power) into its proper Body of Life; Behold its a blessed Hand of faith, laying hold of Eternal Glorie.

Now the Birth, and natural voice, or sound of this killing Letter; Is most holy, and powerfull; not one jot, or tittle thereof, shall pass away (but have the End of Ordination) til all Things be fulfilled.

Math: 5.

So also, the voice or sound, of the Spirit of Life;

1 Cor: 15.

Is the Lord Himselfe from Heaven; of that most infinite, and universal Being; from whose glorious Language, not one Sparke thereof, shall for ever be extinguished: And both these voices, or

1 Pet: 1.

Sounds, though uttered forth, as Paul saith, at sundrie times, and divers manners; Is but one voice, one word, from one Body; For in the beginning was the word, and the word was with God, and the word was God.

Heb: 1.

John: 1.

[page 10]

As for the written word, or Letter (commonly called the Bible) Compiled Historically by the holy Prophets and Apostles; Therein, it is but as Christs darke Sepulcre, yet hewed out of the Rock of Jehovahs will whose door is sealed, with the stony Heart of the creature; and until the living powerfull Spirit

Math: 27.

of Jehovah rouls away this stone, there is no entering to behold those mystical linen ornaments of Sanctity left; The body (the substance) being risen, and ascended in perfect Glory.

This written Letter, hath been, and is, a great mercy from the most High, for his Creatures to spell upon, unto literall knowledge; notwithstanding the diversities of Translation; humane Interpretations, Confounding Scholastical Difinitions, & Division; Conceited Separations, & opinions; from hence hath proceeded, such hate, and unprofitable Contentions, and bloody Conclusions; Even amongst those that are called Saints in professions; and also others: It being one of the chiefest Books, that the (called) Divill in his Agents, with vaild Antichrist, under his several literall professions; and selfish fancie, doth study on: yet if this written Letter should be blotted out (as in time it shall be) The fool shall not say in his heart, there is no God; nor who shall ascend up to Heaven, or descend into the deep, to bring the word unto us; ffor the unity of killings & living Letter, Jehovahs everlasting word, not written with a mans pen nor engraven on Tables of Stone; shall with the Diamond of Jehovahs Spirit, be engrafted in that great volume, the universal Heart of the whole Creation; wherein all, from y^e greatest Scholler, to the least Great, shall know the Lord Jehovahs will, and be enabled, through y^e power and demonstration of the Spirit of life & glory, to declare & magnifie mysteries of Jehovahs Gospell of Salvation.

[page 11]

Now my Brother Jacob, ffrom our Jehovah, only proceedeth, that Spirit of wisdom, power Counsel, and understanding; who opens the deaf Ear to hear; and the blind Eye, to behold; with a Heart beleevving This most wonderfull mysterie, of the unity and peace, which he hath made between the killing Letter & living Spirit; making of Twain, one new man; Reconsiling Both in one Body, So making peace; That the dreadfull & killing noise of Hate, wrath, Reprobation, Death, Hell, and Damnation; Is converted, into the most blessed Sound, of Love, Election, peace, Joy, Life; Heaven, Salvation, & Eternity: Glorite: ffor it is our Jehovah alone, That wounds, & heales; That kills, and makes alive; That separates, and unites; That causeth servitude, and giveth perfect freedom; To the sounding forth, of that everlasting Triumph; O Death! where is thy sting? O Grave! where id thy victory? Allelujah, into our Eternal Jehovah; who was and is the same; yesterday, to day, and for Ever: But my Brother Jacob, before we proceed further, on demonstrating the main Allegorie, of this our mystical Conception: & Birth; Let is returne and Communicate on the foregoing Paradox, [And the Children struggled within her] Gen. 25.22.

Rev: 1.

Psal: 14

Rom.: 10.

Lev: 30.

Psal: 40.

Jer: 31.

2 Tim: 4.

Job: 12

Esa: 2.

Eph: 2,

Deu: 32.

Gal: 5.

Hos: 13.

Heb: 13

4. Mystical Harmony. ~

On Jehovahs wonderfull precedent Paradox'
As a Preface, to the main Allegorie; First, Causing
Esau & Jacobs struggling together, in their mothers
womb of Conception; ffiguring unto all nations,
and People; By the mystical Path, of literal
struggling Disunion; To usher in, the know=
ledge of his universal unity.

Jacob. Then my Brother Esau, As David said; Let us
Call to mind, the Dayes of old; Even that Time,

[page 12]

when I saw thy face, as though I had seen the face
of God; when thou didst ran to meet me; Embraced
me; fell on my neck; Kissed me; And we both
wept; A lively Emblem of foregoing passages;
The killing Letter, and living Spirit, met together,
and imbraceth each other, in Jehovahs unity:
ffor, behold the most admirable contrived wisdom,
of our Jehovah: That when I was returning (in
hope, after seven years absence, and twice seven)
unto our ffathers House; So to order thy Habitatioⁿ
to be my pathway; That of necessity, I must first
pass my thy power: I then expected from thee, a
just recompence of revenge, for my former un-
brotherly deceiving of thee, both in flesh and,
Spirit; But behold I found sweet Embracements.
and real Brotherly Entertainment; ffears turned
into Joy, Hate into Love, and death into Life:
Which was as that precious ointment, the glorious
Gospel of peace; upon the most high priest, the
only sacrificers Head; that ran down upon the
Beard, Even Aarons beard, the type of the Band
and unity, of the Sacrificers Brotherhood; the
very corners thereof, not to be shaven, nor mared;
yea running doown unto the Skirt of his Garment,
the last & lowest manifestation of y^e sacrificers
Love; upon whose skirts, Nations shall lay hold;
And by that power, shall not lift a Sword up.
gainst on another, neither learn war any more:
which was also, as the dew of Hermon; and as
the Dew , that descended, upon the mountains
of Sion: Even the most happy commanding power
from the Heaven of our Eternal Jehovahs will
that unites, revives, and keeps, the natural, and
wild olive Branches, in that blessed & common
Root, wherein is Life for Evermore.
My Brother Esau; The night before we met
our Eternal Jehovah appeared unto me; in a lively

Gen: 33.

Psal: 133.

Lev: 19. & 21.

Ezek: 16.

Zech: 8.

mica: 4.

Deu: 3.

Rom: 12.

Gen: 32.

[page 13]

vision of this blessed unity, with a deep reflection upon
this struggling Paradox; Being left alone; There wrestled
with me; a man until the breaking of the day; figuring
in part, our former struggling together. in our mothers
dark womb of Conception; And although I prevailed
yet like our Brother Pauls thorne in the flesh, that

2. Cor: 12.

he might not be exalted above measure; I also received a memorial halting, in the hollow of my Thigh; that I might not run to fast, or mount over this our Eternal Brotherhood.

Upon the Ascending of the morning; He that wrestled with me, would depart; But by that Light I perceived I had seen God, face to face. and my Life was preserved; I would not let him goe, untill he had blessed me; who then gave me the name of Israel; having power, with God & men; As thou though (fainting) was called Edom; That so, our Jehovahs strength; might be made perfect in weaknes.

ver: 9.

And as I passed halting over that Peines, that blessing face of God; Our Jehovahs Sun (figuring y^e Eternal Son of Righteousnes) arose upon me; By whose glorious beames, lifting up mine Eyes, I saw thee coming, And found thy presence, as though I had seen y^e face of God (in the unity of Blessednes) ffor thou wast well pleased with me.

Oh! the wonderfull Myserie of our Jehovahs will In the dark night of our mothers womb, To make Thee, A struggling killing Letter; A cunning persecuting Hunter; when the day breaks, and the glorious Son of Unity riseth; The figure of the preserver of Life: In the dark night of our mothers womb; To make me an overcomer of thee; But after the ascending of the morning, And y^e glorious Son of Righteousnes risen; To seek to Thee, that was overcom'd: Behold the myserie in unity; of Strength in weaknes, and weaknes in Strength; in this wonderfull Paradox: the Children struggling together in their mothers womb; And both mother & Children preserved alive, A great wonderment to Nature, But farr greater of ^{^w} this Paradox doth figure

For.

B.

[page 14]

It figures fourth, Those most profound wayes, and most admired paths, in and by which our Eternal Jehovah, doth make known, reveal, & manifest, the myserie, of the wisdom, Power, and Glory, of his most blessed. & Eternal will; That is, By fading Contraies, and vanishing Types, & Shadows, To usher in, the victorious Unity, of the true and everlasting Substance. As.

Eternal Light; in & by darknes; Eternal Love in free Grace, & Mercy; in & by Hate, wrath, & Justice; The Almighty Power, and Eternal Glory of the God Head; in & by, the weak, and most sinfull Deformity of the manhood; The Beauty of Sanctity & Holynes; in & by Sin & wickednes; Eternal Life & Immortalitie; in & by, natures Bondage; Heaven & Salvation; in & by Hell & Destruction. For.

Darknes, must first cover the face of y^e Deep; That Light may appear; The Eternal Light shineth in Darknes, and the Darknes comprehendeth it not: In one man, all men must first son & die; That so, in one man All might be made just & live.

Gen: 1.

John : 1.

1 Cor: 15.

All the Earth, and every living Creature thereon must first be drowned; That the flood may visibly beat up, the Ark of Salvation. The dominion & Reign of Sin, must first enter into the world, and the whole world must first lie in wickednes; That so it might become guilty before God, whereby his most glorious Righteousness, that justifieth the Ungodly, might be revealed; And that where Sin hath abounded The Truth and Glory of Gods free Grace, might abound much more.

[page 15]

The most blessed, and only begotten Son of God, must first descend from the Bosom of his Father, into the Creatures most sinfull man=hood; And be made flesh, Sin a Curse, and most shamefully hang upon the Gallo's; That so the mighty power, and glorious fulnes fof the God=head, might appear, and dwell therein Bodily.

The Body of the Creature, must first be cast into, a most wretched, sinfull, and corrupting molde; To be an indwelling for the Spirit of Life & Glory; That there in he might reveal, the Mysteries, of y^e power joyes, and Glory of Eternal Blessedness; And by his powerfull Operations, and heavenly Revelati=ons; It might be purified, and grow up, unto a holy Temple, in the Lord.

The womb must first be barren; That so it may be fruitfull: The foot lame; That it may walke: The Eye blind; That it may see: The Ear deaf; That it may hear: The H^eart hard; That it may be soft: And the whole ffabrick of man=kind, dissolved into dust and ashes; That it may be raised in Im=mortality.

Peace, must first be taken from the face of the Earth; And the whole Creation, set at Discord; Struggling, Contending, and destroying one another; That so it might travail in paines & Grownes; To be delivered, into the peace & unity, of y^e glorious Liberty of the Sons of God; And that Jehovah, the only King of Love, Peace, Unity, and and Righteousness, may in the fulnes of rimes, Him selfe (alone) Rule & Reign, for Everlasting. The Eternal Son of God, must first break through, the Grave of destruction, and the Gates of Con=demnation in Judgment, descending into Y^e lowest part of Hell; That the Almighty power of Heaven, might there appear for the Universal

[page 16]

Redemption of man=kind; nto the Eternal Praise & Glory, of our Jehovahs mystical will. Thus the fading Contraries, Types, & Shadows are figuratively swallowed up, in the living Substance: Darknes, in the victorious Unity of Light; Hate, in the victorious Unity of Love; Sin, in y^e victorious Unity of mercy; Letter, in the victorious Unity of

Gen: 7.

1 Pet: 3.

Rom: 3.

& 5.

& 6.

Gal: 3.

Col: 2,

Heb: 2.

1 Cor: 3.

& 6.

Eph: 2.

Esa: 9.

2 Cor: 5.

Rev: 6

Rom: 8.

Rev: 11.

Psal: 16

Acts. 2.

Eph: 1.

Spirit; Death, in the victorious Unity of if Life; Cor=ruption, in the victorious Unity of Immortality; Destruction, in the victorious Unity of Salvation; The Grave, & Hell, in the victorious Unity of Heaven; And all Strugglings, & Contentions, in Y^e victorious Unity of Universal Peace, and Everlasting Glory.

Experienced Job, After all his struggling Expostulations, and conceited uprightnes & integritie; when Jehovah had spoken unto him, through the whirlwind, of his powerfull mystical will, Breaks out I have heard of thee, by the hearing of the Ear; But now mine Eye hath seen thee, I know Thou canst doe every thing, and no thought of Thine can be hindered; Therefore, I abhor my selfe, & repent in dust & ashes: The Beginning, & End, of shadowing mortality.

Job: 42.

And David, In all his dayly, and nightly meditations & seekings; finding that Jehovahs wayes, were not as mans wayes; nor His Thoughts, as mans Thoughts; But all his Counsels most hidden and most mystical; Cries out, Shew me thy wayes, O Lord! Teach me thy pathes! for they are All mercy and Truth: The Everlasting Bond of Universal Unity.

Psal: 25.

Thus my Brother Esau, Through ^{^His} typing Paradox (as a preface, or prospective Glass) we have Behold some Glimps, of these admired profound paths, in & by which, our blessed Jehovah, doth

[page 17]

make known, the most wonderfull myserie of his Eternal will; wherein the experiences hanting foot-steps, can witnes the power & Glory thereof; And also here unto additionally (unto thy wearied exercised Soul's triumph) sound forth (a praising) harmonious Illustration.

5. Mystical Harmony ~

The predivine Paradox, further Illustrated, by visible typing Examples, both from the Earthly and professing spiritual State; And also, from the invisible (Soule) experimental strugglings under the sad Conflicts, and fierie Combates, of fleshly & spiritual temptations; for Jehovahs manifestation, of universal triumphing unity.

Esau: Then my Brother Jacob, As this prefacing Paradox, doth tipe for the, our Jehovahs profound paths, for visibly making known, the myserie of his blessed will; So also doth this struggling Paradox figure out, The Creatures natural disposition, In acting of (and ignorantly, in selfish ends, unto the visible Eye appearing against) this most blessed will of unity: All being made subject to vanity, Composed of strife, Infidelity,

Contention, and struggling Opposition; which from the Beginning, hath been, is, and shall be, both in the fleshly & Spiritual State, untill the fullnes of struggling times cessation, and ordained Rest,

[page 18]

In the invisible Eternal Unity.

No sooner had the most glorious Creator made Man (his Creature) and confined him, in the Paradise of Edens fading pleasures; But he stuggles against the will of his maker, to climbe up the Tree of knowledg, of Good & Evil; which was not appointed, in that vanishing shadow of happiness. And after that God had drowned the whole Earth, and gathered the fflood, into its limited bounds, causing the face of his Creation again to appear and to be replenished; The whole Earth, in a Bellonish struggling (to make themselves y^e name) strives to reach up, into the heaven of Jehovahs will; which was not appointed, but their earthly Brick, and slimie mortar.

Gen: 3.

Chap. 11.

Yea (also) Abraham the Father of the faithfull when God had stated his Promise, for manifestation of his glorious will, to be in his blessed free borne seed; He no sooner receives Seed by a Bond woman, but fals into a struggling Prayer with God; O that Ishmael, might live in his sight. And no sooner had we the life of moving; but in the very womb of Conception, we struggled together; with our Eternal Jehovahs will; who should be the Elder, and younger into visible Contention.

Chap. 17.

Now my Brother Jacob, As our fore-father Abraham, had two Sons; The one by a Bond-woman; And the other, by a Free-woman: which as our Paul saith, is an Allegory, of the Two Covenants; The one, from Mount Sinai; which answereth to, or is in the same rank with Jerusalem, that now is in bondage with hir[her?] Children; But Jerusalem which is

Gal: 4. & 5.

[page 19]

above is free: which is the Mother of us all:

So also, our Father Isaac had (us) his Two Sons at One time, by one Free-woman; which is (also) an Allegory of the mystical unity, of the said Two Covenants, both proceeding from one womb; The uncircumcised Gentile, which answereth to, or is in rank with Y^e circumcised Jew; that now is in hate with his Children; But the Heaven of Jehovahs Love, is most infinitely free for all: As it is written; Rejoyce thou Barren that bearest not; break forth and sing Thou that travailest not; for the desolate hath many more Children then shee which hath an Husband. And my Brother Jacob, As our fore-father Abrahams Son, that was borne after y^e Spirit; Even so it is heer figured by us, our father Isaacs Twines: That natural Strife and persecuting

Esa: 54.

opposition, which is, and shall be, where y^e mys=
 terie of Jehovahs will, is not manifested. Be=
 tween the natural and wild Olive=Branches;
 Between the working Jew and unbelieving Gentile,
 Between the Elder Brother and the younger Heir;
 who shall first be brought out of the womb, to
 injoy the Birth-right, of the first fruite: But
 beholds the Myserie of our Jehovahs will;
 The first=Borne was not ordained to enjoy,
 but the last that came forth: Thus both in
 vain struggled, in the dark womb of Ignorance
 be[^]ing uncable of Jehovahs will; wherein is no
 striving, no contending, no opposition, But
 perfect peace and Unity.
 The shadow of which unity, is (also) vailed in this
 struggling, ffor the Children struggled not a part,

[page 20]

but together; as if nature sought disunion, in
 the fruitfull ^womb of Conception; But behold, from
 this struggling into visible Life, the appearance
 of Union, though (then) but with Heel and Hand,
 conjoynd together.

//Yet (now) after Conception, in the appearance
 of Light: what visible struggling? what vible
 contending? and inhumane persecuting is there?
 Concerning Eternall unity, Love, and Hate, Elec
 tion & Reprobation; Heaven & Hell; Salvation
 & Dmnation: Limiting & bounding, the most in=
 finite mercies, of our Eternal Jehovahs free
 will: Even as Hanum, unto whome King David sent
 messengers of peace, to proclaime kindnes unto him
 for his Fathers sake; shaved off one halfe of
 their Beards, and cut their Garments to the
 middle: Such shaving, cutting, dividing, and con
 fining, is there, of our Jehovahs universal
 Gospel of Salvation, by the Sons of Men;
 Especially by those, that professeth themselves
 to be wise, and borne after the Spirit.

Psal: 78.

The younger Brother, and zealous working Jew
 despising his poor Brother the sinfull Gentile;
 not admitting him, so much, as to stand, or appear
 within the doors of his Sanctuary; but to keep
 at a distance, from defiling his conceived Holy=
 ness; Concluding that only unto his working righ=
 teousnes, was made the Covenant & promise
 of Life & Salvation: Even like unto the rich Glut=
 ton; That was cloathed, with the purple & fine
 Linen, of his homespun holynes, and threed bare
 righteousns, faring sumptuously every day;
 upon Jehovahs spiritual dainties; But adultra=
 ting, all Ministrations & Dispensations, engross=
 ing all Salvations, in his unsaciable souls appetite;

2 Sam: 10.

Rom: 2.

Luk: 16.

[page 21]

Suffering poor begging Lazarus, to lye at the Gate
 of his inclosed Treasure, in a hungry, naked, & out
 cast Condition; full of sores, most painfull & most

miserable; not affording him, one rag to cover his deploring nakedness; not one drop of water of Life; not one Crumb of Salvation. for his thirsty, hungry Soul; not one jot of saving Oyl to supple and cure his putrified wounds; But without his Gates, to lye & perish (in his gluttonous judgment) with his despised Companions, the reprobated dogs.

Also, The professing wise Gentile, Boasting over the fall, of his Brother Jew, rejoycing that he is cut off, from the Root (in his conceivings) that he might be grafted on, glorifying that (now) Salvation is (only) come unto him; And most bloodily, Like unto Doeg, the Edomite; Because that Ahimelech, had relieved, and furnished, distressed persecuted David, with Goliaths sword, with victuals, and also inquired of the Lord for him; Saul must presently be acquainted with it, to the cutting of Ahimelech and all his father House:

Such mercies, and envious strugglings; Such bloody, and persecuting Oppositions, are there, in y^e dark womb, of the Creatures Ignorance, But where the Light of our Jehovahs mystical will is transparent; Then the fall of the Jew appears, to be the riches of the Gentile; And the fullness of the Gentile appears to be the more glorious resurrection of the Jew; There fore our Brother Paul concludes, Let not the Jew despise; the riches of the bounty of Jehovahs Mercies, nor y^e Gentile boast, therein, for it is not the Branches, that bears the Root; But the Root y^e Branches.

[page 22]

This mystical Unity, between this Eternal living Root, and these struggling Branches, is portrayed out, by that flame of fire; which Moses (unto his great amazement) beheld, burning in the midst of the Bush and the Bush, not consumed: How natural is it for fire, to consume the thorny Bush of nature? But behold, our Jehovahs continuing flames, of Unity, burning in the midst of these his struggling Branches, unto resurrection of Life, and universal Glory, of his Eternal most mystical power.

Again my Brother Jacob, This struggling Paradox, may also figure forth; The fainting Soules invisible strugglings, in the dark night of Satans temptations; Between flesh and spirit; Between the strength of the Law, and the power of y^e Gospel. The force of Sin, and the weakness of y^e Creature; The state of Darknes, and the kingdom of Light? Between the sight of wrath, Justice, and Condemnation; And the enjoyment of Love; Mercy, and Salvation.

What Torment of Mind? what horror of Conscience? what sad Groans, heavy Throngs, & deep sighes? What bitter restless Resolutions, and most desperate Intentions? hath the poor afflicted Soul passed through; in the sight of its horrid,

Rom: 1.

& 3.

1. Sam: 22.

Rom: 10.

Ex: 3.

louthsom, and bloody sinfull Condition: panting Gasping, fainting, and Breathing? ffor one moment of rest. unto its perplexed & wounded Spirit; ffor one minute of freedom, from y^e multitude of vain & idle Thoughts; ffor one drop of water of Life, to cool its thirsty Soul; ffor one Crum of heavenly Comfort, to subsiste upon; ffor one dram of true peace; One Hope of Salvation; One Conquest over y^e power of Sin;

[page 23]

The filthy Lusts, & mighty passions of the flesh, and the cunning Snares, & subtile wiles of Satan: And no sooner appears one drop of water of Life, but the flames of Hell enrageth, to overwhelm it. no sooner appears the least Crum of Comfort, but Satan is ready to devour it; no sooner the least glimpse of Heaven, but darknes gathers together to overshadow it; no sooner appears one grain of free Grace & mercy, but all the hellish op position, are mustred up to Counterpoise it; no sooner appears a good Thought, but Evil is present to vanquish it; no sooner appears any power against Sin, Lust, & passion, but all the fierie Darknes of sinfull Temptation, both by flesh, and Spirit. are forth with fortified against it, which causeth the poor restles struggling Soul, to wander unto any brooken Sesterne, and bye paths of vanity; passing under many black Clouds to find some present ease, and relief, unto its perplexed mind; But all in vain, and rather adding unto further misery; ffor though y^e Spirit of a man may sustain his infirmities, yet a wounded Spirit, who can bear? Which made our Brother Paul, one of the strongest Cham=

Pro: 18.

Rom: 7.

pions, to break forth into that most direfull, Exclamation, O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver? But when this poor Soul (through the power of Jehovahs Spirit) hath struggled forth out of this dark womb of Corruption; and breathes in the pure Life, of the Eternal Unity of Jehovahs everlasting Love: when the bright morning, of Jehovahs Souls Comforts, and Consolations appears: when Jehovahs Sun of everlasting peace & perfect Righteousnes ariseth, shining

[page 24]

most gloriously, through Jehovahs universal unity, in the Heart & Conscience of the Afflicted, Then is the Eye blind, the Ear deaf, the Heart shut up, from solacing its self, in any outward= perishing, created Comforts; for then All delights & Joyes are inward; in the inward Man; in the inward Unity of Jehovah Love, O then! what unexpressible inward Ravishments? what unconceivable inward Joyes? what unutter= able inward manifestations, and Revelation,

full of Life and Glory; which maketh this victorious Conquerer, to Challenges; who can separate from the unity, of our Eternal Jehovahs Love, ffor lo: The winter afflicting stormes are past^r The raining drowning flood is over and gone; The Flowers of Soules delight appears; The singing of Allelujah is come; The Turtles Voice of Salvation is heard; The barren figg=Tree is become fruitfull; The Vine, with y^e tender Grape, from the power & vertue, of that wine press, which Jehovah hath troden alone, gives a saving & oderous smel; Causing this Elevated Soul, experimentally to boast of Jehovahs free bounty; declaring of him; who hath brought me, into his Banqueting House, of spiritual satisfying dainties; staying & Contenting, my Love=sick Soul (in his bodily absence.) with flagons of wine, proceeding from his most precious Blood; Comforting, and freeing me, with Apples, from y^e Tree of Life, in the knowledge of Good & Evil; which in his spiritual Garden, of heavenly lasting pleasure, is at liberty, and most free to eate off, to the full; wherein I behold, that my (passed) forlome, and desolate Condition, was covered over, with the Banner of his Everlasting Love; And in all my Temptations;

Cant: 2.

[page 25]

His left Hand, was (secretly) under my Head; and his right Hand of unity embraced me; And whose everlasting powerfull Light, shall guid & keep me; in that unity of Jehovahs blessed voice, I in them, and, Thou in me, that They may be made perfect in one, Being perswaded, that neither the Life of Sin; nor Death of the Body; nor the garnished deceivable Doctrines of false Apostles; not the Spiritual reigning Seats, of the Myserie of Iniquitie; nor the monstrous Monarchical powers; nor the sorrows, miseries, and persecutions, present or to come; not the Height of Justice; not the depth of Hell; nor the general Sum, of all created powers together; shall be able to separate me from the universal unity of my Eternal Jehovahs mystical will.

John: 17.

Rom: 8.

The Preface, Concluding the foregoing
Argument, with Allelujah.

Jacob. Oh! My (Beloved) Brother Esau (By o^f Eternal Jehovah) Being now guided, in the glorious splendour of his bright shining Star; Unto mystical womb of unity (which Compriseth the main Allegory of our harmonious Communication) Let us Contemplate (before our progression) on our Brother Paul, his heavenly practice; Cor. 14 Rather to speak five words, with understanding, than ten thousand, in an unknown tongue &c.

Therefore, Let us, and All that hear us, understand unto Edification; ffor it is not any novelty

[page 26]

aimed at, nor now gayned phrases, or conceiting separated opinion; But for Soul spiritual understanding, in magnifying and glorifying, through beleiving Jehovahs universal fulnes; which communicates unto all, that are spiritually hungry, thirsty, and naked, in the deepest poverty; And who is not? for (my Brother Esau) my worn out, professing tented Habitations; And thy stately, lofty Dominions, are all layed wast, and despicable, in a Confused Chaos; That our Jehovahs universal fulnes, may only satisfie, and fill us, All in All, Allelujah! So that, our five (past) Mystical Harmonies, w^{ch} hath sound^d forth, Jehovahs universal food, and Cloathing, for all hungry, and naked spiritual souls, from the inestemable rich Treasure, of his durable fulnes; may resemble, those five meases of meat, and five changes of Rayment, which my little Son Benjamin (the least of all his Brethren) received from my dear Joseph; Jehovahs Type, of feeding and Cloathing Bounty, in times of spiritual famine, and soul nakednes, Allelujah. Which is the Sum of our fore going Argument. ffor, what more sweet? what more precious? what more satisfying? Then Brotherly Unity; manifesting Jehovahs Communicating fulnes; who (in his profound & mystical paths) hath Concerded the killing Letter, with the living Spirit; unvailling (theoufh visible Types, and invisible soul experimental Enjoyments) His mystical Paradox; which ushers in the main Allegory, for demonstration of his universal Unity; which finisheth the End of Universal strife, strugglings, Contentions, Spiritual desolations, and the darling soul anguish in helpless deploration; Being all shadowing for runners, for bringing in, the everliving durable Substance, unto the universal singing of Allelujah: The which my Beloved Brother Esau (in harmonious

[page 27]

Concordancie) Thy proving Testimony (with mine) universally, are exceeding large, And in the Height & depth of Cause; for evermore, to sound forth unto the Mysterie of our Eternal Jehovahs will, Allelujah.

Esau. Oh! My dear and precious Brother Jacob; Jehoahs right Hand (witnessing) Signet; Confirming universal Brotherly Love and unity: Thy heavenly advice, is most sweet, and cordially acceptable; for this concluding Breathing in Allelujah; where by our harmonical Instruments, may be tuned unto a further strain; for magnifying y^e Mysterie of our Eternal Jehovahs will: Allelujah. And my dear Brother Jacob; what thy heavenly Instrument hath sounded; my Heart & Tongue

doth fully witnes, in the sensibility, of the height and depth of universal Being; But only in Jehovahs Eternal good will & pleasure; And if in the Glimps of the fulnes of his infinite unity therein, is satifying fulnes; what then, is the fulnes is Self? But even All in All: The depth, height, length and breadth; Eye hath not seemn, not Ear heard, neither can enter into the Heart of man to understand, that universal fulnes, which is in our Eternal Jehovahs Esential Being: Then how thrice happy (in our Brother Pauls third heavenly vision) are all those Evangelical Spirits; That knowing, and understandingly (through beleaving) Lives, and practically walks, in the Life & power of Jehovahs universal unity; through his communicating fulnes: Continually singing Allelujah. My dear Brother Jacob, our five (passed) Mystical Harmonies; Being as a Preface; unto o^e ensuing Allegorie; may be as little Davids gathering, of

[page 28]

five smooth stones, for victoriously triumphing over the tallest & stoutest Goliaths opposition: And all but rayes, and splendours, from y^e power. of Jehovahs Communicating fulnes: Then (my dear Brother Jacob) for our progression, with unanimous melody, unto Edification; Let our ensuing mystical Sound, be through Communication; Or several Alloquies; wherein our Brother Paul; with others, of our Jehovahs experiences Champions, will witnessingly intercourse, for the publique declaration of our Eternl Jehovahs universal unity; singing y^e most wonderful Myserie, of his most blessed immutable will; in Allelujah: Conjoyning (also) with all the faithfull Psalmonians, that in sincerity of Heart loves the universal Crucified, and glorified Jesus; In sounding Salvation, Glory Honour, and Power (only) unto Jehovah, the Lord our God, omnipotent. Allelujah. ~

[page 29]

Esau & Jacobs harmonious Alloquies.

1. Harmonious Alloquie.

On Esau & Jacobs typical Nativity; in which Jehovah Centers; The Universal Figure of the Manhoods visible disunion; and invisible (concealed) union, in the universal Unity, of the most infinite Eternal Power & God=Head; Throughout all precedent & succeeding Ages; unto the Praise & Glory of the Myserie of His Eternal will: Delineating the natural & spiritual Root, of Descent, and Multiplication of all generations; from earthly Adam unto righteous Noah; Branched unto faith=

ful Abraham; In whose typing seed
 (Isaac) Jehovah promised the blessed
 Revelation of his Mystical will; And
 from whose Loines this figuring Off=
 spring. Esau and Jacob sprung: In which
 Allegorie; both Literally and spiritually,
 the Myserie of Jehovahs universal
 unity is (figuratively) contracted; being
 brought into one free womb of unity;
 by the Alpha & Omega of times Revela=
 tions, unto all Posteritie; for magnify=
 ing & glorifying; both in the History of
 the Letter, and Myserie of the Spirit,
 Jehovahs Universal communicating
 fulnes.
 With the several steps and Mystical
 gradation; ordered by the infinite wisdom
 of

D.

[page 30]

Jehovahs will: Leading the Man=hood,
 experimentally to know, the Life Power,
 and Glory, of universal unity, in the Eter=
 nal Power and God=head: Revealing his
 most infinite Mystical Nature; In the
 unity of his precious Jewels, and Trea=
 sures of darknes, and hidden Riches of
 secret places; for beautifying and glori=
 fying His universal Altar of Salvation.
 In the universal sacrificed Son, of His
 Eternal Love, Christ Jesus.
 Demonstrated from that mystical Answer,
 which Jehovah gave unto Rebekah –
 Genesis.25. 22. And Illustrated, By se=
 veral Alloquies; in a Quadruple mystical
 order: As first, Two nations are in thy
 womb; secondly, Two manner of People
 shall be separated from thy Bowels;
 Thirdly, The one People shall be stronger
 then the other; fourthly, The Elder shall
 serve the younger.

Jacob. My Brother Esau; we now come, unto
 our Eternal Jehovahs Two leaved Gates; which
 (unto the spiritual Eye) are not shut, but open;
 even perpetually; That we (with all y^e faith:
 full in Christ Jesus) may enter, And behold
 his everlasting shining Glories; unto the va
 nishing of the Light of the Sun, and of the
 moon; ffor in this wonderful figuring Con=
 ception; All created Lights, are too dime; to
 show that living Substance; which is veiled
 in this Shadow: But (my Brother Esau) before
 we enter; Let us praise our Jehovah between

Esa:
 45:
 &
 60

[page 31]

the Gates; And as it is written, when our fore

Father Abraham, went to offer up our Father Isaac; He layed the wood in Order; So let us, Take this mystical description. Of this wonderfull Conception; As the Letter lyeth in Order; And we shall (through faith) behold as o^e fore= Father Abraham did' our Jehovah Fireth, on the Mount, providing a Sacrifice of praise; That through his blessed Spirit, which opens y^e Mysterie unto them that knocks; we may be enabled to demonstrate, the Glorie of his most blessed will. Then.

Genesis. 25: 22. And the Lord said unto her, Two Nations are in thy womb; And Two Manner of People, shall be separated from thy bowels; And the one People shall be stronger; then y^e other People; And the Elder; shall serve y^e younger.

The First Mystical Order ~

[And the Lord said unto her; Two Nations are in thy womb.] This Answer or description. From Jehovah unto our Mother Rebekahs request, for satisfying her struggling womb; Appears more mystical and cloudy, then the foregoing Paradox it selfe unto her great amazement; for (in the flesh) wanting divine Interpretation, how unsatisfied and disconsolated, our precious Mother might be, in hopeless Enjoyment of fruit full Comforts, from her barren womb; Not

[page 32]

only feeling the dolorous pang's of strugglings, But to have two Nations, within her womb: Oh! The Admiration, of our Jehovahs cloudy paths unto flesh & blood? As it is written; who hath heard such a thing? Shall the Earth be made, to bring forth in one day? Or shall a nation be borne at once? But behold a greater wonderment. in this our Jehovahs description; Two nations. are Conceived at once; Two nations, are borne together at once, from the womb of one free woman: Therefore, my Brother Esau; Let us first sing our Jehovahs wonders, in the History of the Letter: And then let us come to magnifie his Glory, in the mysterie of the Spirit. Moses, one of the holy pen men of this Letter, which is now Jehovahs visible Paradise, sha= dowing forth the knowledge of Good & Evil in the everlasting Tree, of Eternal Life: In the foregoing Chapters; demonstrates a larg Relation; of the glorious Creation of this vi= sible world; off the descent, and multipli= cation (through time and number) of the Generations of man-kind, off the first ap=

Esa:
66.

pearance of Sin, with the Race of mon=archie, upon the face of the Earth; off Al=mighty visible Significations; miraculous won=ders, and EnsamplarieArts; in manifestation of our Eternal Jehovahs blessed will (with Types & Visions) Especially unto o^e fore Father Abraham and our Father Isaac; That in y^e free borne promised seed; He would reveale the invisible Glorie of his Eternal God=Head; And the Myserie of his blessed will, Concerning his created man (then) visibly representing the universal man=hood.

[page 33]

who is the glorious Image of His invisible Godhead; Creating his fleshly Body, out of common Earth, or Dust, and breathes into that Organ, the Breath of Eternal Life; whereby created man, became an immortal living Soul; shadowing forth that Eter=nal spiritual Unity, which is between, the Eter=nal God=Head, and the universal man=hood. Now my Brother Esau; we may Behold these admired steps, or Gradation; which the most in=finite wisdom, of our Eternal Jehovahs blessed will, hath ordered, for this glorious created man this immortal living Soul, so curiously, and won=derfully lineated out of dust (through times dis=pensations) to come unto the knowledge of uni=versal unity, in the communicating fulnes, of the Eternal Power & God=Head: which invisible knowledge (through the blessed Spirit) is the En=joyment of the full Substance of Eternal Life. from whence his immortal Breath proceeded, That so the most infinite, glorious, and Eternal God=Head, might only have the Eternal Praise, Honour, Power, and Glorie. wherefore, This Representative, This glorious created man, in the moment, or beginning of time, must be taken, from of, that common Earth of dust, out of which his fleshly Body was created; And put (under subjection) into a peculiar Garden, of the Eternal God=Heads created pleasures of Eden; where (also) sha=dowing Sin, must have the first appearance in that pleasant seat, whereby this glorious man Adam, and in him all his posteritie, universally, must become, A guilty, earthy dying outcast, from that visible pleasant Con=dition, into the Common Earth again: Thereby shadowing forth; The first step of universal natural knowledg; The universal weaknes and guilty sinfulness of the Creature; And the Almighty universal Power, & Purity, of y^e Creator

Gen:
1.
& 2.
Job. 33.
John. 1.
Acts. 17.
1 Joh. 1.

Gen/
1. & 2.
& 3.

[page 34/35 missing from photocopy??!]

[page 36]

Eternal power & God=head; That is, to bloodifie

the Man=hood (through guiltiness) in all Self Con=trived Spirituallities, for worshipping his God? wherein (also) is shadowed forth; The murder=ing of the glorious Son of God (in the appearance of humane Nature) both of his person, and his members: And also shadowing forth, the univer=sal decay, and fall of the Jew, for a season; And y^e universal Eclipse, of the glorious Light, of the E=ternal Son of Righteousness; on the face of the Earth, for an appointed time; Also shadowing forth that universal, and overspreading bloody Reigne (under the Garment of formal worship) in sole monarchie, throughout the whole world, until the end of vanishing (contending) time, whose vi=sible Race, proceeded from the loynes of (inter=posing) Ham, who inherited this Cains possessions after the flood.

now about 130. years after the Creation, Adam must begit another son, called Seth, in his own likenes, after his Image, In whome Eve (also) rejoyced: saying, God hath appointed me, another seed, in stead of Abel; And then began men to call upon the name of the Lord: from whose Loynes (also) proceeded many Generations, Noah being the last nominated: In this is shadowed forth: The glorious Resurrection of the Son of God; with the visible appearance of his mem=ber=hood; Also the restoration of the spiritual Jew againe: And heer is now the other (dead) Stock revived: And for the time, of about 1526. years until the flood, was the whole Earth multiplied (with mankind) into several Ge=nerations: from these Two general Stocks, vagabond Cain: And Seth, Adams Image: we may heer behold the continued order of our Jehovahs will; still keeping in y^e path of

Gen:
5.

[page 37]

Two Stocks, for the multiplication of Man=kind, The Stock of Bloodguiltines; And the likeness of an Earthy, Dying Outcast; for the ensuing ma=nifestation of universal unity; which stocks and natural Root, with their posterities having acted the Myserie of our Jehovahs will; As Types and shadows, of Things to come, must all vanish away, in the Myserie of universal, de=monstration: For.

Those that called Themselves, the Sons of God, must take wives, and joyn with the Daughters of men; Thereby, all flesh must actually be=come corrupted, and filled with violence; That so the Issue, and End of all fleshly Union might appear; And that the killing Letter, lying at the door of Sin, Enters without respect of persons; whome ariseth a most wonderfull Myserie; ffor the Almighty Creator, and Eternal God=Head, drownes universally, his glorious fabrick of visible Creation, which he has made, for the universal declaration, of his most infinite power

Chap:
6.
& 7.

and Glorie, with all the Generations of Man=kins; both Root and Branch, And every living Creature, that breathed thereon; By that great Deluge of water; Excepting Noah, his three Sons, with their four wives, And one male and female, of every Beast and foule, both of clean and unclean; to keep seed alive, upon y^e face of the Earth; which were preserved, in an Ark, made of Gopher wood; bared, and lifted up (for a certaine time) by the face of the waters, above the Earth.

Oh! most wonderfull (vailed)Mysterie, That all flesh (universally) must be drownes (excepting eight persons) Surely our Jehovahs might have prevented, such kind of fleshly Conjunction; And if acted; yet have given Repent=ance, for the manifestation of the glorie of his Mercy; whereby his glorious visible Crea=

tion

[page 38]

might still have flourished, as at y^e beginning: It is true, Our Jehovah can doe every good thing; And as true, Who can resist his will? But then this wonderfull (vailed) Mysterie, in univer=sal fleshly destruction, had not been univer=sally prefigured; Therefore all flesh must be drowned: That the power, and Glory, of the mysterie of our Jehovahs will might be revealed. If so. Then my Brother Esau. Let us magnifie the Mysterie; In beholding Another (and the general) step; for the man=hoods universal knowledge, of universal preservation, in y^e u=nity of the Eternal God=Head.

Wherein is shadowed forth; first universal destruction of all flesh; universal preser=vation, of the Breath of the Spirit of Life that is in the Nostrils, either of Blessed, or Cursed, - Clean, or unclean; for Ham was kept & pre=served, as well as his Brethren, The unclean Beast, as well as the clean; with the foules of the Air, altogether in the unity of the one (typing_ Ark of Salvation; beared, and lifted up, by y^e face of the waters, above the Earth; Shadow=ing forth, that mystical and Almighty power, of the Eternal God=Head; Causing the general flow=ing weaknes of his Creation, to bear and lift up above the earthy flesh of Corruption; our Eter=nal Jehovahs unity of Salvation; which was more gloriously and visibly manifested; By the Substance of the universal (Sanctified) lifting up, of the Eternal Son of God, drawing all men unto him.

Oh! the depth, and height, of the Mysticall power, and wisdom, of our Eternal Jehovahs will: To bring his created man=hood, through universal destruction, into the unity of univer=sal preservation; And thus hath our Eternal

Chap:
8.
& 9.

John. 12.

[page 39]

Jehovah figured forth, unto his created man=hood
ffirst, in what the Glorie of his universal unity
is not (corrupted earthy flesh, must have noe
being, nor appearance, in the spiritual Life of
his unity) By the fleshly vanishing, of y^e first
descent, and Generations of man=kind, pro=
ceeding from two natural stocks, of one flesh=
ly Root; whose Breath, of the Spirit of Life;
(also) visibly vanishing away, in invisibly pre=
served, in the Eternal will of the everliving
Substance.

And now my Brother Esua; Having through
the Assistance of our Jehovahs Spirit; passed
over the flood of saving destruction; To y^e be=
holding of the man=hoods drie Ground, on w^{ch}
the Ark of Salvation resteth: Let up (also) be=
hold the most excellent power and wisdom, of
our Eternal Jehovahs path, on this side of y^e
flood (unto our fore Father Abrahams dayes)
In bringing this glorious created, saved man;
unto the actual enjoyment, and spiritual know=
ledg, of the Myserie, of universal union, in the
Eternal glorie of our Jehovahs most blessed will
which also appears through Types & shadows
until the coming of the brightnes of o^e Jehovahs
Glorie, and y^e express Image of his person.
Our Eternal Jehovah, in bringing his glorious
Image man, unto the enjoyment of y^e know=
ledg of the Myserie of his blessed will; At
first (on this side the flood, by the Letter) seems
to appear out of the former order; But in
the progress it is still the old path, with a sha=
dowing, and vanishing addition; furthermore
illustrating of his Eternal power and Glorie,
Then for our Enterance, Let up behold in the
History, the descent, and Multiplication of Man
kind, since the flood.

Which seems literally to ascend from Three

Heb:
1.

[page 40]

General Stocks, of the visible Root; The Three
Sons of Noah, Shem, Ham, & Japet, which stocks
& Roots, had their being before the flood, from
the Loynes of Seth, Adams likenes, & Image, sha=
dowing forth, That all lineal producement, is
from the beginning; of the same dying Earth, &
the same Breath of the Spirit of Life.
ffrom the Loynes of Shem, proceedeth (by the
History) the Race of the Jews; And from the
Loynes of Japet, proceedeth (in the figure)
the Race of the Gentiles; which Races, in regard
of the numberless multiplication, and distinct
visible separation, are distinguished, by Two
General nations (Jew & Gentile) whereby is
still shadowed forth, The continued path of o^e
Jehovahs will; In the literal and mystical, con=
traction of the universal multiplication of

Gen:
10.

man=kind; In this General number, Two. These Two Sons, Shem & Japet, had a knowledge of the most holy, Eternal power & God=head signified by covering their Fathers nakedness, and therein by him blessed; ffor no sooner was Noah saved, upon the Almighty y flood of watery destruction, and set in everlasting salvation, on the Eternal mount of drie Ground, for a publique declaration & manifestation, of y^e glorious fruits thereof; But as his father Adam fell by eating, So was he drowned, by that captivating flood of self-drunkenness, from the fruits of his own vineyard, which his own hand had planted; shadowing forth that notwithstanding Salvation, yet the saved remaineth still, visibly for a time, in the earthy weaknes of the man=hood, the most beautifullest fruits thereof, produceth no good thing but vanity of vanity and vexation of spirit, Therefore there is continual need of being covered;

[page 41]

which Covering shadowed forth; The most glorious Robe, of our Eternal Jehovahs everlasting Righteousness; which covers the weak & naked man=hood; And where this most glorious, & righteous Covering is, there is no beholding of nakedness, but the back parts of Condemnation, are towards it.

As for Ham, the middlemost Son, upon his heathenish Ignorance of the holy & glorious nature of the Eternal God=Head; In discovering his fathers nakedness; he was therein, by his father accursed, and to be a Servant of Servants, unto his Brethren; Here we may behold, the divine Reason; why this middlemost vanishing stock is erected, And how, for the Illustrating of the Almighty power and infinite wisdom, of o^r Eternal Jehovahs will.

In the beginning (before the flood) by the History of the Letter; Sin had a being unto its nature, in the appearance of a serpent=like, and Beast=like forme; But now (after the flood) for making known the Mystery of our Jehovahs will, Sin must visibly appear incarnated, in the face, and Image of a man; And in our Jehovahs wisdom, by this Ham (to be shadowed forth) as a middlemost Son, interposing between his two Brethren, Shem & Japhet, between Jew & Gentile appointed (for a time) as a Servant of Servants unto them; in that discovering office, of their naked, weak, sinful, and earthy Condition, in the Man=hood; That so through incarnated Sin, might appear visible separation, unto divine purity; where bu our Eternal Jehovahs invisible unity, might (in time) break forth, the more glorious; Therefore this shadowing Ham, was ordained, unto most excellent and special use: ffor without nakedness, no knowledge of Covering; without Sin, no knowledge of Righteousness; without darknes, no knowledge of Light;

without death, no knowledge of Life; with ^{^out} Hell, no
knowledg of Heaven; without Destruction, no know=
ledg

[page 42]

of Salvation; And without Separation, and Inter=
posing, no knowledge of the Myserie of our Jehovahs
unity: If so, why then must Ham be cursed? A great
Myserie, worthy of universal memorial; That
Covering, is not to be separated from nakedness;
otherwise, according unto the nature and nakednes
of Sin, the Curse of the Law is anered; therefore
was Ham accursed, in his heathen naked Language
of Sin; being (then) void of knowledge, in everlasting
(covering) Righteousness: In which mystical know=
ledg (and typical acting) of Covering; Shem & Japhet
(in unity) was blessed: Thus in sight of uncovered na=
kednes; Comes the appearance of Sin, Darknes, Hell,
Destruction, Separation, and Interposing; all in=
carnated in the created Man=hood; wherein there
is an incarnated state and kingdom; ordered by
irregular fleshly sensualitie; in opposition, unto our
Jehovahs inward glorious State and Kingdom, governed
by the royal Law, of his spiritual Unity.

And as Ham, was a Shadow & Type, of incarnated
multiplying Sin; So also, of the outward forme and
Image, for from his Loynes proceeded, the Race, and
face; of tyranical, oppressing, and bloody Reign, of
sole monarchie; appointed (also) for a season, to
be adored, throughout the whole man=hood; where
in, the glory of the Almighty invisible power, of y^e
Eternal God=head, might visibly declare, the Omni=
potent nature, in overcoming, his own inward &
outward great power, in the created man=hood;
unto which End (as before) this Ham was erected;
to shadow forth, this inward & outward Image;
of the incarnated multiplier of Sin; which also
oppositing shadowed forth the invisible Glory,
and power of Heaven; for.

This Ham must be the Father, of an Earthly Canaan;
the Riches thereof, figuring the infinite Treasure
of the spiritual Canaan, And the present heathenish
Generations, that (for a time) inhabited that earthly Land;

[page 43]

figuring these mighty numberless multitudes of in=
carnated Sin, that possesseth the Tabernacles
of the man=hood; and by our Jehovahs Omnipo=
tency, to be in time destroyed; which shadow=
ing Land of Canaan, and the Conquest of those
typing heathenish Inhabitants, with their chief
and bloody monarch Chedocloames, God gave in
victorious Conquest, unto our fore Father (be=
leaving Abraham, and his faithfull seed) in a
visible earthly possession, theough the Letter
but more mystical through the Spirit.

Thus notwithstanding the History relates of three
Sons with Noah, for replenishing the Earth again;

yet Ham is no recorded General multiplying stock (by the Myserie of the Letter) for publique li=neal demonstration of the man=hoods multiply=cation, in which Jehovahe reveals the Myserie of his universal unity; for what Generations preceeded, from him through the flesh; they are reduced & contrasted, in the number, that pro=ceedeth, from the two proper original and blessed stocks (since the flood) Shem & Japhet; which evidently appears afterwards: Therefore (as before) he was erected (in the Mystery) an inter=posing vanishing figure of Sin incarnated; being there in a Servant of Servants, unto, and between his two Brethren, in the discovering office of nakedness; whereby the Glorie of our Eternal Jehovahs Almighty power, and infinite wisdom, might declare and cause, the everlast ing praise, and magnifying, of the wonderfull mysterie of his blessed will in universal spiri=tual unity.

The which universal spiritual unity righte=ous Noah, by faith behold, in a heavenly reve=lation: Through that universal (vailed Covenant)

Gen:
9.

[page 44]

which the Eternal Jehovah established with him and his seed, for perpetual Generations [That the waters shall no more be a floud to destroy all flesh] which mystical universal Covenant, was confirmed in the figure by a visible universal Token [of a memorial Rain Bow in the Cloud]. Signifying in the Myserie our Jehovahs uni=versal Strength of Salvation, manifested from Age to Age, through the glorious Lustre of divers Dispensations; Confirmed by and Compassing about the universal man=hood, with so great a Cloud of faithfull witnesses; Especiallt, by that most glorious manifestation, in ascending universal unity, of Humane & divine nature (the Author and finisher of our faith) into the mystical Cloud of Heavenly Revelations.

Heb.
12.
Act.
5.

So then; In our Jehovahs universal Covenant, Established with righteous Noah, upon the floud of fleshly Destruction; By these two recorded general Stocks, Shem & Japhet; being blessed Brethren in universal Unity; for Japhet to dwell in the Tents of Shem (having their Ser=vant Ham (in a figure) as a shadowing, inter=posing, and incarnated vanishing Stock of naked Sin, between them) Came the whole Earth again replenished, and multiplied, in the severall Generations of mankind; for the space of about 292 years (from the floud) unto o^e fore=father, blessed Abrahams dayes: who by y^e flesh proceeded (lineally) from the original of Seth y^e earthly likenes, of the first Adams Image; But through the Spirit, in the Life-Union, of the Second Adam; who is the Eternal Jehovah from Heaven.

Gen:
11:
1 Cor.
15.

Now my Brother Esau; we are come in y^e History,
for demonstrating the Myserie of o^e Eternal
Jehovahs universal unity (being guided by his

[page 45]

glorious Star, in the Spirit) unto the budding
of our Dayes; wherein let us first behold; How
gradually our Jehovah doth manifest his most in=
finite wisdom, in the Myserie of his Eternal will
vailing in the beginning of the Creation, his uni=
versal unity, unto beguiled sinfull Adam (repre=
sented the Man=hoods earthly Image) that (The
Seed of the woman shall break the Serpents head)
from Adam (also) vailing his universal unity, unto
righteous Noah [representing the manhoods spi=
ritual Image] that All flesh shall no more be
destroyed be water] Now heer unto believing
Abraham (representing the father of y^e faithfull
in the man hoods heavenly Image) Is the highest
Step of Trinity in unity; whereon was manifested unto
Him a clear vision, of our Jehovahs Communi=
cating fulnes; Confirming the Immutabilitie
of his Counsels, by an Oath; Even by his unchang=
able God Head, and universal Promise that [In
Blessing, he would Bless; And in Multiplying
He would Multiply] Signifying the number=
lessblessed Multiplication; By an univer=
sal figurative demonstration; Even as y^e stars
in the Skie And the Sands on the Sea Shore
So in numberless Multiplication; shall All the
families Kindreds, and all nations, of y^e Earth
be blessed] And this universal Promise, in blessed
unity, made by heavenly Adjuration not only
at one time, unto faithfull Abraham; But
again, and again, revised, and recorded in divine
writ, for perpetual, and universall Memorial;
Also with the universal Publication; That in
faithful Abrahams blessed believing seed He
would Reveale the Myserie of his Eternal
will.

And now (my Brother Esau) In this glorious
heavenly universal vision; Let us praise, and
magnifie, our Jehovahs most free immutable

Gen:
3.
Chap:
9.

Heb:
6.

Gen:
12.

Chap:
18.

Chap:
22.

Act:
3.
Gal:
3.

[page 46]

Promise, infinite Power and admired wisdom, in
his mystical path of Revelation: ffor notwithstand=
ing our Jehovahs free and gracious Promise made
unto fore father Abraham [That in his Seed, All
the families, kindreds, and All the nations of y^e
Earth should be blessed] yet Abraham must wait
unto the age of sixty & eight years, before he hath
any issue; And also Sarai his wife must be barren:
Shadowing forth [a Life of faith] unto the injoy=
ment, in spiritual knowledge, of the Myserie, of
this blessed universal unity: Ans then (also) He
must not begit, the free borne Son (in whom the
promise was made] But a Bond-Son, by his

Gen:
12.

Chap:

Bond=maid. Shadowing forth [faiths Exercise
Also, that the Stranger, and Sons of bondage must
be brought forth, to have a being (in time) as well
as the free=borne; which Bond Son Abraham
called Ishmael, signifying [God hath heard] who
(also) shadowed forth, The Covenant of works,
and state of Bondage (for hearing Deliverance)
That as before the flood; The man=hood passed
through, a fleshly universal Destruction; unto
the knowledge of universal preservation; So
also heer, must be a passing through, a State of
universal servitude and spiritual thirsting
Bondage, unto the knowledge of Jehovahs uni=
versal unity.

Thirteen years, after the Birth of this Bond Son
our Jehovah through his communicating fulnes;
shines again, in his immutable promise, of the
Mysterie of his universal unity; Appearing
unto Abraham through a Clouding Covenant
which must be sealed in a mystical manner;
Even with the fleshly Token, of his created
Image Circumcision; Shadowing forth, that the
naked face of the man-hoods deformity, is the
outward testifying Token, of the glorious myste=
rie of our Jehovahs universal unity; And that
the very face, and Being of deformity must be
cut off, and have no appearance, in his most pure

[page 47]

and spiritual unity; whereupon Abraham must
circumsise Himself, and his Son Ishmael, and all
the males that was free-borne in his house or were
bought with money, And so also, All his after pos=
terity, must have the general seal of this Covenant
And thereby distinguished from other people; This
General Circumcision, typing, That there is a price
a Redemption, that the Bond man, and the Stranger
may partake of Jehovahs blessed unity, as well as
the free=borne Seed, And further, by this Cove=
nant of works; State of Bondage, and fleshly
Seal; we may still Behold, the general mysti=
cal path of our Jehovahs will; Causing visibly
the shadow to goe before the living substance
works before free Grace; Bondage before
freedom; deformity before purity; That when
the Eternal Substance, of the Life, Light, and
Glory, of this blessed universal unity appears,
Then all shadows, works, Bondages, and defor=
mities, vanisheth away, and hath herein no ap=
pearance of any being; As this Bond Son Ish=
mael, was cast out of his Fathers house.
In which forlorne, and outcast Condition, our Eter=
nal Jehovah, In his communicating fulnes appears;
unto his poor, weeping, hoples mother Hagar, through
the Everlasting well=Springs of living water;
flowing from this blessed fountain of univer=
sal unity; hearing, Conforting, and supplying
the fainting & thirsty wants, both of Her,
and her Don, unto durable preservation w^{ch}

16.

Chap:
17.

shadows forth, That in our Jehovahs Types, the
 Breath of the Spirit of Life, shall not perish;
 They are not utterly lost; Though in the flesh,
 they shadow forth a lost Condition.
 Now this revived Hagar must be ordered (in Je=
 hovahs Mystical path) to take a wife, for
 her Son Ishmael, out of Egypt, from y^c Tabernacles

Chap.
 21.

[page 48]

of Ham; A most wonderfull mystical path; That this
 outcast, Bond-Son Ishmael, must take a wife in
 Egypt; That thereby, the faithfull Seed, in which Je=
 hovah promised the revelation and manifestation
 of his universal saving Glorie, might be visibly pre=
 served; for by the Merchandizing of the Ishmaelites
 was my dear Son Joseph preserved alive from the
 cruelty of his Brethren; Also by these Merchandiz=
 ing Ishmaelites; my dear Joseph, came to b advanced
 as Chief of Egypt, whereby my Self (in my old age) wth
 my Tribes, were relieves & succored, in time of earthly
 famine; Oh the wonderfull mystical path of our Je=
 hovahs will: who (also) herein shadowed forth, an
 appearance of reducing Ham, the middle most inter=
 posing son (with his posterity) into the kindred of the
 proper and national multiplying two stocks, Shem,
 and Japhet, from this vailing Conjunction, by the com=
 mixing of a fleshly union, male and female together:
 which Reducement, our Brother Paul confirms,
 when he brought all the whole world of fleshly
 man=kind, guilty before God; under the denominatioⁿ
 of those two national multiplying stocks, Jew
 and Gentile.

Gen:
 37.

Psal:
 105.

Rom:
 3.

Heerin (also) we may further behold, our Jehovahs
 admired, and vailed path, in bringing about the mani=
 festation of his universal unity, prohibiting (for a
 time) the fleshly union of Circumcised with un=
 circumcised; That even nature itself, might dic=
 tate forth, the impossibility of disunion; for al=
 though the old world was drowned upon Com=
 mixture, yet no sooner had the Creation an appear=
 ance again in multiplication; But the whole Earth
 gathers together in one Lip and word to obtain
 an united name, In their carnal building of
 Babel.

Gen: 11.

So heer (ordered secretly by Jehovah Himself)
 Is a shadowing fleshly Begeting & Birth of Com=
 mixture, That Jehovahs spiritual unity, might at
 last appear, Though as yet in a cloudy & mystical

[page 49]

vail; By an outcast; a Bond=Son, from a Bond=Servant;
 yet a natural son, proceeding from the proper per=
 son of faithfull Abraham; being his Eldest Son; and
 of the number of the Circumcised; Ordered in Jeho=
 vahs Myserie; to Conjoyne (in the Tabernacles of
 Ham) with the uncircumcised.
 The next year after our fore Father Abraham was Cir=
 cumcised; Being 100 years old; He begits (by Sarah his

Gen:

aged barren wife, the free woman) our father Isaac; The freeborne promised Son after the flesh; typing forth the Eternal Seed after the Spirit; By which our Jehovah reveals the Mysteries of his blessed will; By whome (also) was shadowed forth; Our Jehovahs Everlasting Covenant of free Grace, & Mercy; wherein is hid the most glorious Life, and Being, of his universal unity.

21.

And when our father Isaac, was 60 years old; He begat us; In this wonderful, and Mystical Conception; Typing forth (as hath been demonstrated by the Letter) first, these two proper national Stocks, Jew & Gentile; Conteyned (by the figure) in one free womb of Conception.

Chap:
25.

Thus hath the History of the Letter (for ushering the unity of the Mysterie) given is, in divine Record, The destruction of the manhoods descent and multiplication; from Two proper national Stocks; for about 452 years since the flood, until our Dayes; And for about 2509 years, from the Creation; Continuing this universal multiplying denomination (in numer two) Jew & Gentile, unto lasting Ages. Now my Brother Esau, what (further) Cause have we; to praise and magnifie our Eternal Jehovah; who hath brought us unto his two leaved Gates; These two national stocks of mankind; whereby we may behold, from the rising of the Sun, in the East of Paradise, unto his setting in the west of mortalitie, through this glorious History of the Letter (as our Brother Daniel did, by times & numbers) the original descent, Multiplication, and Contraction of y^e created manhood; Also the Almighty Acts of the Eternal

Dan:
9.

[page 50]

God=Head; And the profound and mystical paths of our Jehovahs will: who in the hidden Mysterie of his universal unity; hath through the gracious freedom of his communicating fulness; discovered; and laid wast, the Manhoods crooked places of idolizing vanities; who hath brooken in pieces the Brassen gates of Emnitie and Separation; who hath cut in sunder the iron Barrs of imprisoned Corruption, & chained Infidelity: That (in faiths Dispensations) we may freely Enter, and boldly ascend, upon the Rock of our Jehovahs Shallom, his mount of Everlasting Peace, unto the wonderfull beholding, to all Admiration, with his glorious selected witnessing Jewels; His Treasures (also) of Darknes, and Riches in secret places; Causing the magnifying of our Jehovahs universal unity, in the Mysterie, of his ever blessed communicating Spirit.

Esa:
45.

My Brother Esau, Can Two walke together, except they be agreed? Can Two lye in the bed of y^e womb together, and not receive the heat of unity? Then (Being entered between our Jehovahs mystical Gates) Let us further behold; As it is written; Our Forefather Abraham, had two Sons, distinct at two several times, by two several women; The one a bond woman; The other a free woman; which

Amos.
3.
Eccl.
4.

our Brother Paul saith, was an Allegorie; figuring forth, the Children, or nation, in the womb of Bond=age after the flesh; And the Children, or nation, in the womb of freedom after the Spirit. Also the state of the Covenant of works. And y^e state of the Covenant of Grace.

Now herein (my Brother Esau) our father Isaac, (being the free borne Son; Ans, Type of y^e Covenant of Grace) Begits us, his Two Sons; At one time together; By one free woman; which also is an Allegorie; In which our Jehovah, doth intirely in womb, the forgoing Allegorie; That is, the Separation by the Letter, into the unity of his Spirit – whereby we type forth, those two Sons, or two nations,

Gal:
4.

[page 51]

(Bondage & freedom) that were brought forth in separation through the flesh (by the Letter) at two several times; by two several woman; with the two Covenants, works and Grace, made at sundrie times. All these are heer (in universality) brought in one Bed of Life, at one time, in one free womb; And delivered forth (in unity) altogether. So that in Sum, we are our Jehovahs universal Types; first in the appearance of the Letter; figuring the two General, national, multiplying Stocks of mankind [Jew and Gintail] Including all the mulriplcation, of the created Man=hood Being Conceived, and Contained, and brought forth in, and by, this one mystical womb together; for Generals runs in the natural path of Generalities; not confines by perticulars, but includes all. And this general number Two, which our Jehovah hath appointed, for revealing the Myserie of y^e universal Unite; being two golden pipes, through which He conveys, the heavenly knowledge of his blessed Myseries; Is of divine Institution; and that only General, which includes all numerals. As.

The Heaven and the Earth; includes all Things therein; both visible and invisible; whether Thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers, all created by, and for our Jehovahs universal manifestation.

The male and the female, includes the whole Seed of Man=kind.

The Two Testaments, includes the whole mind and will of the Creator.

Through the Type in the Law, All Sacrifice for Sin, was included in the offering up of two kind. The Seed of the flesh, and the Seed of y^e Spirit, includes all the several, and various operations of Both.

The two Ends of the Mercy Seat, includes all Jehovahs mercies.

[page 52]

By two immutable Things, was Jehovahs Oath Con=

firmed including all his promises of Life and Salvation.
 The Eternal God=Head; and the Man=hood, includes all Substances, in the intire Being.
 So heer these two nations, which are typed by us, in this mystical womb, includes all the multiplications of Man=kind; with all State & Conditions, that appeareth in the created man=hood.
 Then all opened Ears that understands, and true faithful Hearts, that believably glories, in the communicating fulnes, in the Mysterie of our Jehovahs universal unity; may in Spiritual Concord witness; That we are not heer Concepted, and brought forth. As it is blindly & ignorantly conceived; To declare (only) our own particular Stations, man Estate of Eternal Election, and Estate of Eternal Reprobation.

For (my Brother Esau) whereas Thou seemeth to be ordained, by the naked Letter, unto an Eternal State of Reprobation; yet we know in the revealed testimony of the Spirit; That o^c Eternal Jehovah in the mystical Treasures, of his universal unity, hath shode thy hairie Heel, with his blessed shoe, of the Gospel of his everlasting peace and Salvation; on which I did take hold; by my (figuring) Hand of faith; whereby plainly appears an Eternal union betwixt us; in that what Thou art Eternally ordained unto, the same also I am: for our father Isaac blessed us in faith (both) alike; with the fatnes of the Earth, and the Dew of Heaven from above (only) for a time, Thou wast to be the visible Servant, But in time, Thou shouldst have dominion over that Servitude, and then break the yoke, from of thy neck: Therefore was our father Isaac registered in the memorial Catalogue, of the mighty Acts of faith, whom faith (as our Brother Paul writes) blessed us (both) concerning Things to come; now for our father to bless Thee, with me, in faith;

Psal:
108.

Gen:
27.

Heb:
11.

[page 53]

Unto an Estate of Eternal Reprobation; Is altogether improper, and absolutely contradictory. divine Sense, and Orthodoxal Testimonie, which in our Communion, on the second mystical order (concerning visible Separation) will be more largely, and fully demonstrated.
 Notwithstanding all fleshly Strugglings, and opposing Arguments drawn from the bare Letter; which Letter is fulfilled, in its proper natural Sense.
 But being diverted, in the man=hoods blind and carnal understanding; by separating of y^e Spirit which is the very Life & Substance of the Letter, which all the powers of flesh and blood, cannot break, or open to come unto the kernel, which is the spiritual Seed, of the knowledge of o^c Jehovahs mystical will in the Letter.
 Then, as theough the Flesh, in the Letter; Nimrod was a mighty Hunter before the Lord: So hath o^c

Gen:
10.

EternalJehovah in his infinite power & wisdom,
that therein his Glorie might be manifested; Ordered
Thee (my Brother Esau) through the flesh by y^e Letter
to be his Cunning Hunter, in the field of His crea=
ted man=hood; To figure forth the persecuting
fleshly nature, of the Children, or nation, of
Darknes & Bondage. So also (my Brother Esau)
whereas Abraham was the father of y^e faithfull,
in the seed of the Spirit, Yet in the Letter, prosecu=
ting the lively=hoods, of the Sons of men. I am
heerin bu our Jehovah ordered, though y^e flesh
by the Letter; In beguiling Thee of the outward
forme, of They Birth right & Blessing; That
prosecuting, deceiving, greedy, and uncharitable
churlish nature which doth accompany y^e flesh
of the Children or nation of Light and freedom
so long as their tentes earthly Tabernacles, hath
any visible being: now on us both, the judgment
of the Letter is fulfilled, according unto y^e nature
of it; which is but after the Law of a carnal
Commandement; for as our Jehovah hath laid
me wast and desolate, in all my deceitful Paths;

[page 54]

So also hath he laid thee bare and naked, discover=
ing all thy bloody cuning, and secret corrupted paths
whereby we are both in the flesh brought under
the judgment of the condemⁿing naked Letter; And
so likewise the whole created man=hood, con=
trasted in these two nations, being typified by us
all are condemned guilty according unto y^e works
and fruits of the flesh, by which no man can be
justified: But my Brother Esau; There is a sweet
comforting kernel, a precious righteous seed, con=
teyning in this judging condemning thorny Letter;
which in faiths Dispensations through o^e Jehovahs
communicating fulnes, opening his glorious uni=
versall mysterie; That it is (he only) which justi=
fieth the ungodly; powring down the heavenly
dew of his universal unity, upon thy fatherless
which he doth preserve and on thy widowed, w^{ch}
he doth comfort that they may trust in him whose
wayes are all mercy & Truth, Graciously calling
also, unto all my Seed, to glorify him, whose works
of mercy are righteous altogether; Causing us both
and every one, that hath breath, throughout y^e whole
man=hood to praise Jehovah our Lord, that reigneth
for ever unto all Generations.

Psal:
22
&
146.

So that we were nor (as Conceived) only figuring
our particular Stations; But ordained by our E=
ternal Jehovah, for typing forth the gloriouse mani=
festation of the universal unity, in the Eternal
power and God=Head; The whole Creation of the
created man=hood, being in this divine Allegorie con=
trasted in this intire womb, of our Mother Rebekah,
The Children or nation of Bondage & Darkness,
And the Children or nation of freedom & Light;
first in their natural opposition after the flesh
unto the understanding Eye in divine knowledge

the blessed Spirit of Life and peace, is not heer separated from unity, with the veiled Letter

[page 55]

Therefore (my Brother Esau) let us; and all opened Eyes and Ears (herein) behold and hear (unto ever= lasting peace & Comfort) Our Eternal Jehovahs most sacred Oracle; whose heavenly voice, is all powerfull, in the fulnes of Majestie; from the Communicating Throne of his universal unity; Causing everyone to speak of his Glory, from his most holy Temple, And to worship him (only) in the beauty of holynes; giving all praise & Glory due unto his name; that sitteth on the Mercy Seat of universality, Proclaiming.

Psal:
29.

I am the Lord [Jehovah] And there is none else. I forme the Light, And create Darknes; I make peace and create Evil; Drop down yee heavens, from above And let the Skies pour down Righteousnes; Let the Earth open, and let them bring forth Salvation, and let Righteousness spring up together: I that am y^e Eternal Jehovah, and never no created Being, appeared, under this denomination; It is I Jeho= vah; That by this womb of Rebekah, doe shadowe forth, That I forme the Light, of my Eternal unity, I create the Darknes of my created man=hood; That thereby the glorious Substance of my univer= sal Light may appear; I make peace in my Eter= nal will; And I created the opposing Evil, That bu the strugglings, and deformities of my created man=hood, (which by two nations, is heer contras= ted) It may find and enjoy Rest & peace, in the universal unity of my Eternal power & God= Head: Therefore drop down, O yee Heavens of my Eternal universal will, from my infinite & boundless Treasures, of Everlasting Love & Mercies Let the glorious skies, of my bright shining witnesses, of the Immutability of my unsearchable Coun= sels; pour down the Eternal Righteousness of my Everlasting Truth, That the Earth of my created man=hood; This typing womb, that Containes both Light & Darknes, peace & Evil, may open & bring forth, my Salvation, in these typing two nations The believing circumcised Jew, And my Righ= teousness, that justifies the ungodly, in the un=

Esa:
45.

[page 56]

beleeving and uncircumcised Gentile, That all may spring up together in my universal unity. Oh my Brother Esau, what cause hath all flesh to keep silence (in godly fear and reverence) before our Eternal Jehovahs most holy & mystical Oracle? what understanding is able to comprehend y^e un= searchable Counsels, of our Eternal Jehovahs will? what Tongue can express the all powerfull glory, of our Jehovahs communicating universal unity? who is he that can alter or resist o^e blessed Jehovahs Eternal will? ffor saith o^e Brother Paul

(in the Letter) Hath not the Potter power over his Clay, of the same Lump, to make one vessel to honour and another to dishonour? Unfolding this Letter (in the mystical union of fellowship) That these members, which seem to be more feeble are necessary, and those members, which we think to be less honourable, upon these we bestow more abundant honour, and our uncomely parts, hath more abundant comeliness; so hath God tempered the Body together, having given more abundant honour to that part which Lacked: That so my Brother Esau, my Hand that laid hold on thy Heel (in the mysticall union of universal Brotherhood) cannot say I have no need of thy foot: surely no, therefore what our Eternal Jehovah, hath joined together no man can put asunder: now the Letter is dead without the Spirit of Life is in it; And the mind of the Spirit of Life, cannot be fully known, unless the Myserie is revealed.

Then, my Brother Esau, From our Eternal Jehovahs, most blessed All powerfull voice, And most holy mystical Oracle; we are not only visible Types of the created manhoods literal struggles together (through two general nations) in fleshly or spiritual manifestations: But we are in (chief) ordained, and brought forth heir, to be the spiritual, and mystical Types of our Eternal

[page 57]

Jehovahs uniting, These two General (figuring) nations in the unity of one free womb; Even in your ever blessed free womb of universal unity, in the everlasting Righteousness & Salvation, of His most glorious Eternal Power & Godhead: from the Loynes of our fore father Abraham; They visibly appeared to be distinct, by the literall figuring two wombs of Hagar & Sarah; Heir from the Loynes of our Father Isaac; They are brought into one mystical typing free womb, of our Mother Rebekah; And there in the Myserie, my Hand of Righteousness and Salvation, might (in your figure) spring up (according unto His most holy Oracle) in universal unity together; wherein is our Eternal Jehovahs universal Promise & Oath, made good unto our fore Father Abraham [That in his Seed, All the families, kindreds, and nations of the Earth, should be blessed] So that, our Eternal Jehovahs universal unity, in the Essential Being, of everlasting Righteousness and salvation, Communicating in fulness, from the Eternal Power & Godhead; Is the universal intire womb from whence All proceeds, and in which All is Centred. for the magnification of his Eternal Power and Glory; By the created Manhoods, universal worshipping of (one) Almighty God, in Spirit & Truth; whose most glorious infinite nature, Comprehends all Beings, and Communicates all Powers, through the universality and incomprehensibleness of (one) God: In which heavenly unit, All ariseth; And in which

Rom:
9.

1 Cor:
12.

Gen:
22.

Acts.
3.

All is reduced: ffor as natural Number arising from One, produceth Multiplication; so divine and mystical Numeration, reduceth all Multi=

John
10.

plication, into the proper Center of one, which is Eternal universal unity.
As, the heavenly Father, and his Son, is One:
There are three that bear ^{record} in Heaven, the Father the word, and the Holy Ghost, and these three, are one.

1 John.
5.

[page 58]

There are three, that beat witnes on Earth; the Spirit and the water, and the Blood; and these three, aree in one:

The Two witnesses, including all witnesses, in on Spirit of one Truth.

The faces of the two Cherubims, turned into y^e unity of one mercy Seat.

Ex:
25.
Eph: 2.

Christ took flesh upon him, That the Eternal God= Head, and the Man=Hood, might be manifested in one.

The voice of Christ, I in them, and Thou in me; y^t They may be made perfect in One.

John.
17.

So in the Dispensations of the fulnes of Times, All Things which are in Heaven, and on the Earth, and under the Earth, and in the Sea, shall be gathered together in One; And the desire of all nations, shall come, and fill our Jehovahs House, with Glory.

Col:
1.
Eph: 1.
Hag: 2.

Then shall all Things, be subdued to the Son; and the Son, be subject to the Father, that God may be All in All; who is the Essential Being, of Eternal universal unity.

1 Cor:
15.

Thus are our Jehovahs Mystical Types; Ishmael, the bond Son, gathered into Isaac, the free borne; And Ham (as a servant) gathered into blessed Shem and Japhet; And Japhet gathered in the Tents of Shem; And Shem, with universal unity of our Jehovahs ever blessed will: For, There is neither Greek nor Jew, Circumcision nor uncircumcision; Bar=barian, Scythian, Bond, nor Free, But Christ, is All, and in All; The substantial manifestation and Revelation of the most wonderful myste=rie, of our Jehovahs Eternal will.

Col:
3.

But my Brother Esau; If the Ears of flesh & Blood should now hear our discourse; Or the Sons of the Prophets of men, which are almost starved in this great famine of the spiritual Bread of E=ternal Life, and universal unity, which in want of divine & heavenly knowledge, is throughout y^e whole Earth; Should come to satisfie their hunger at this our mystical feast; made of so many wild Gourds, proceeding from a wild vine; would they not cry out, as those did unto Elisha, That

2: Kings.
4.

[page 59]

Death is in the pot, yet, if it so appears unto their present tast; when thy behold the Leaven [of our Jehovahs heavenly kingdom] which is hid in three measures of meal [nature, Law, and Gospel, in o^e

Jehovahs unity] until the whole Lump [of y^e creat=
ed manhood] is leavened; cast into the [universal
earthen] pot, of the wild man=hoods disunion; Then
no untastfull thing appears; But all may freely,
and delightfully partake, unto full satisfaction.

And in the precious Light, of this glorious heavenly
kingdom, our Jehovahs blessed Spirit is able (in our
further Communication) clearly to Demonstrate
the Brightnes of this universal unity; unto y^e vanish=
ing of all dark objecting literal Shadows.

Heb.
12.

For within these two leaved Gates, is no Mount
Sinai, But (only) Mount Sion; The Citie of y^e living
God; The new Jerusalem; The new Heaven, and y^e
New Earth: whose foundation, is everlasting Righ=
teousness; whose walls are Eternal Peace; whose
Bulwarks are free Salvations, made of o^e Jehovahs
pwefect Love; and universal unity. Being filled
with his Subjectes, our of his Treasures of Darknes,
and Riches of secret places; All with our Jehovahs
choice Jewels of his special TreasureL wherein
is no Trumpet sound, nor voice, in burning fire
blacknes, darknes, or tempest; Bit our Jehovahs
Lamblike saving voice, As unto Adam, in y^e cool
of the day, Adam where art thou? That he might
cover his man=hoods nakedness; And, in his covering,
face to face, give the pure knowledge of the glori=
ous nature and unity of his Eternal God=Head;
ffor none is able to declare it, but the Eternal
Brightnes of its most glorious Being.

Rev:
21.

Esa:
26.
&
45.

Mal.
3.
Gen.
3.

Rev.
22.

Experiences David, the sweet Psalmist of Jehovahs
Mystical unity, in omniregency and omnipresence
sings an universal memorial unto all Generations;
acknowledging the glorious Mysterie of y^e Eter=
nal Power and God=Head, too wonderfully, for him
to understand, yet from the Comfort of his heavenly
experience [in Jehovahs unity] He both Queries and
Resolves, That therein, is an impossibility of separation,
ffor (in faiths boldness) At the Throne of Jehovahs uni=

versality;

[page 60]

He demands, whither shall I go from (the Unity of)
the Spirit? or whither shall I flee from [y^e Unity of]
thy presence? If I ascend up into Heaven; If I
make my bed in Hell; If I dwell in the uttermost
parts of the Sea; If the darknes shall cover me; yet
in all is thy Unity; for the night shineth as the day;
And the darknes, and the Light ate both alike unto
Thee; So wonderfull, and so mystical, is our Jehovah
in his Universal Unity; appearing through his com=
municating fulnes, unto all these, which by faith
experimentally rejoyceth, in that bright shining
Being; and glorifyingly worshipping in the Unity
of the Eternal Power & God=Head.

Psal:
139.

Our Brother Paul, in Exhorting Harmony; reflects,
from his divine Light, on the fleshly Man=Hood; not
living in spiritual Communion; nor worshipping of
Jehovahs universal unity; But by corrupt flying
(in fleshly selfish ignorance) from the glory of Je=

Rom:
5.

Jehovahs presence; In all earthly transactions, change in Himself, the Eternal Glory of the incorruptible God=Head, in to the likeness of Himself, to be alterable and changeable as he is; The Eternal God=Heads Omniregencie, in governing of His whole Creation at random, like unto the winged Bird (only) flying to & fro; His Eternal infinite wisdom; like unto the four=footed Beast, void of Reason, not regarding the several Conditions that the Man=hood is cast into, as if the End of all was only ruine and destruction, yea even like unto creeping Things the lowest of all Creatures, without sense, blind & deaf unto the Travails and Groans of His Creations bondage; So vain and foolish is the Man=hood, in the earthly corrupting State, That although by the visible Things, made in uniforme; The invisible power and unity, of the Eternal God=Head is clearly seen; yet he is not glorified, by the fleshly Man=hood, as the God of all power and unity, but all his glory turned into y^e Man=hoods selfish lie. Now herein (my Brother Esau) ffrom our Jehovahs

[page 61]

most sacred all powerfull Convincing Oracle, in communicating fulnes (of unity) unto his whole Creation; we have heard Experienced Davids spiritual witnessing Confidence, in the glorious Being of universal Unity: we have (also) heard how divinely, our Brother Paul, demonstrates the Man=hoods fleshly ignorance; in not worshipping, nor glorifying, the Eternal Power & God=head, in this glorious mysterie of unity.

Yet nevertheless, we may behold our Jehovahs continued manifestations, of his universal unity; from one mystical dispensation, unto another; whereby the man=hood, may be brought, through signes and wonders, to glorifie (in unity) the Eternal power & God=Head: ffor, we may behold a further Revelation of our Jehovahs Eternal unity; in a most wonderfull Mysterie of Mysterie: Causing both flesh & Spirit to glorifie His universal unity, in a fishly dispensation (Oh! the most wonderful mysterie of our Jehovahs will) That so the whole univers, of Heaven, Earth, and Sea; may witness, and preach, unto all Generations; The glorious mysterie of his Almighty power, in universal unity.

By typing Jonah, of Jehovahs descending (through the power of unity into the bottomless Crease of y^e Man=hoods corrupting toement: who flying in will full ignorance (as our antient father Adam did) from the unity of Jehovahs presence but non=performing his Embassy [of Concealed Mercy, in unity, veiled under repentance] unto that great & famous Citie of Ninevah; wherein was more than six score thousands persons that could not discern between their right hand, and their left: was by Jehovah Conceaved, in most wonderful fishly mystical obscurity; Even in the Belly of a devouring fish; in the Ocean of hopeless deliverance.

Jonah,
23.

Where no shining Sun, Moon, or Stars appeared;
nor any Elementary distillations, yielding heavenly refreshments; no Arm of flesh to confide in; no earthly nutriment, to satisfy insatiable
Hunger;

[page 62]

nor humane society to condole with; no not so much as the appearance of the least sensible beast to mourn and sigh unto and not any Sound of struggling strife or contention; but the visible absence, and silence, of the whole Creation (Of profitable school of faith, for studying y^e Mysterie of Jehovahs universal unity) Thus in the Ark of fish (not enjoying those created societies as Noah did) But in the devouring Belly of Jehovahs monstrous Leviathan, was this typing Jonah, swimming up& down, he knew not whether, under the billows and waves of irresistible violence.

What amazement! what horror! what exigent? what monastical posture, might this forlorn prisoner (or rather Jehovahs freeman) be possessed with? what (hopeless) deliverance, might be conceived? for this poor Jonah, our of this dark, fishy dungeon (or rather rich Jonah) who in darkness enjoyed the perfect Light of freedom; and in the depths of all wants, fulness of plenty, in peaceable unity, with the whole silent Creation, and then present Almighty Creator.

For then (only) did our Jehovah appear unto his typing Jonah, through his communicating fulness, in universal unity; Causing him (experimentally) to know enjoy, and sing, the song of songs, [Salvation is of y^e Lord] proclaiming unto all these, which observe lying vanities [in disunion] that they forsake their own mercy; [Even that right which is due unto them, as their own from Jehovahs universal unity of mercy] Thus (only) in Jehovahs communicating unity (which is remarkable) before visible deliverance, is typing Jonah, in y^e midsts of his dark obscure dungeon, enjoy perfect freedom and deliverance; absolutely concluding, with confidence in unity [Thou hast brought up my Soul, from Corruption, O Lord my God] now when Jonah had this Experience in fishly dispensation, of Jehovahs communicating fulness, in universal unity; Then was Jehovahs Almighty Oracle, unto his Leviathan to vomit up Jonah upon the drie Land, for performing his Embassage unto Nineveh; In witnessing Jehovahs Mystical Unity, in everlasting Salvation, perpetually unto all Generations.

[page 63]

So then (my Brother Esau) from this our Communication; we may sing, Allelujah, unto y^e Mysterie of our Jehovahs will; And demonstrate; That when the Manhood, shall have passed through our Jehovahs several dispensations, and experimentally brought out of his dark corrupted dungeon, unto the drie Land of Jehovahs Eternal Sal-

vation; Having his nakedness covered with Jeho=
vah' Garment of purity; His blind Eyes enlighten=
ed, with the glorious Sunshine of Jehovahs unity;
And his feet shode with the Gospe of universal
peace; Being entred within our Jehovahs two
leaved Gates: Then (and not til then) He comes
with knowledge, in understanding, glorifyingly,
to worship the intire nature of the Eternal
Power & God=Head; In Jehovahs holy sanctuary,
of universal unity, Hearing in spiritual under=
standing, His al powerful Communicating oracle
[I am that I am]

The first and the Last; And besides me there is no
God, My God Head is everlasting what it is, with=
out Beginning, or Ending; without Alteration
or Change; without any degree, or digression; with=
out any Addition, or diminution; I am the same
what I am: most Infinite, in my Essence: most
Incomprehensible in my Being. Comprehended
by none: yet am I that which is All in All: I
am the Perfection of all Knowledg; Of all Hear=
ing; of all Seeing, I am the Perfection of all Power;
All wisdom; of all Purity; of all Righteousness;
of all Sanctity; of all Blessedness; of all Glorie;
And of all Eternity. I am that hath Created; That
Rules, and Governs all Things, both visible, and
Invisible: I am All intire in my Eternal God Head;
And all manifestively, in my Man=hood, I am that
moves all Creatures in my creation, And not moved
by any, I am that orders all Creatures in my created
Man=hood, And yet most free from the least de=
filement of impurity, that is in the corrupted
Man=hood, The acknowledgment of my Eternal
Power & God=Head, is my (only) worship of worships
whereby the Man=hood is annihilated; And y^e per=
fection of my Eternal God=Head is All in All.

Esa:
44.
Gen:
21.

Psal:
102.
&
89

Acts:
17.

Esa:
44.

[page 64]

Thus I appear'd unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto
Jacob, by the name of God Almighty [In manifestations
of my Eternal Power & Glory (vailed through Types, &
visions) making my Covenant (especially) with them, and
their beleiving seed, and being my peculiar Types, they
faithfully obeyed, and believed, in the glorious unity of
my Eternal power and God=head] But by my name
Jehovah, I was not known unto them [universally to
save and deliver, a stubborne, stif=necked, murmuring,
rebellious, and unbeleiving people, out of Egyptian
bondage; which was typed by the Israelites, in my ty=
ping Land of Egypt] So that this my Mystical, Saving
delivering, universal name; doth in universality,
overspread, and communicates its glorious Being; unto
all the uttermost parts of my created man=hood; unto y^e
saving and delivering of every Hoof, out of y^e Egyptian
State of bondage, unto my spiritual Canaan of univer=
sal unity; when time, & curse, shalbe no longer.
And this universal saving, delivering, and communi=
cating name, of my most glorious mystical will: Is
(also) intire in its Essence; Being the same name of

Ex:
6.

Chap.10
Rev:
10.

John.
1 & 5.

my Eternal Power & God=Head; only Communicating y^e invisible mystical nature of my God=head, unto my man=hood: That is, The perfect Fulnes of Eternal Life, Light and unity; The perfect Fulnes of all Love, All Mercy; All Truth; All Righteousness; All wisdom, All Sanctification; All Redemption; All Peace; All Joy; All Blessednes; All Salvation; All Heaven; And all Eternal Glory; Being All in All, Both in my intire Essential Being, And Communicatively, through my universal union, in and unto, my Created Man=hood.

It is the Man=hood, In its literal, and visible Separation, from the invisible perfection of unity, in this my Essential Glory (which Separation, is not in Substance, but in a vanishing shadow) That is, All darknes; All Bondage; All discord, All Emnity; All Hate, All wrath, All vengeance, All Corruption; All Judgments, All Condemnation, All Hell; And all Misery.

And where any of these Languages, are uttered in the Letter; It is but in the nature, of y^e Language of the shadowed separated, fleshly Man=hood: ffor I Jehovah, am the perfect fulnes of one

[page 65]

Individual intire Being of Eternal Life, Lights, Love, and unity; Therefore there cannot be in me any appearance of darknes, Hate, Miserie, death, not destruction; or in my Communicative union, in the Man=hood; wherefore, this my glorious nature being unchangeable, the Man=hoods spiritual union, cannot be violated, nor null ed; for the happynes thereof only consisteth, in the unchangablenes and immutability of this my Eternal and Glorious Being.

Wherefore behold not, the shadowing earthy broken vessel; But aske me of Things to come; Concerning my Sons; my offsprings, the substantial workes of my Hadns: I know the Man=hood un the flesh is but a broken earthy consuming potsheard; with whom I will not alwaies strive, nor contend; ffor behold the labour of Egypt, and merchandize of Ethiopia and of the Sabeans; men of stature, shall come in Chaines, and bow down, in universal unity, unto Jehovahs Everlasting Salvation: Come therefore O all yee my People, unto the universal Praise, of my Eternal glory; In the power of that Breath of my Spirit of Life, which I breathed in you; Behold and take a spiritual view, of my Treasuers of darknes, and hidden Riches in secret places, with my witnessing choice Cabinet Jewels; whose Life is his with Christ in God; And when I who am their Life, shall universally appear unveiled; Then shall they also appear with my in glory; And then shall the Mysterie of my will be finished.

Behold (heer) my Son Adam; In whom (visibly) I first breathed the Breath of my Spirit of Life; And in whom being my earthly Type (through the flesh) All men died, That so (with him) all men shall be made alive; in my (only) proceeding Son, from my everlasting

2 Tim.
1.

1 John.
1, 2, 3.
2 Tim. 3.
1. Cor. 1.

Col: 2.
Eph. 4.

Gen. 3.
Deu. 5.

Joh: 3.
Rom:
5. & 8.
Math:
6.

Psal.
19.

Esa:
28.
Mat. 3.

Mark,
17.
Acts. 2.
Heb:
1: & 6.

Esa:
45.

Col:
1. & 2.

Luke:
3.
Gen:
1. & 2.
1. Cor:

Love (visibly) manifested in the Eternal power & Life,
of my Universal unity.
Behold these are my typing Canaanites, whose Land
flowed with milk & Hony, typing forth this my spiritu=
al Canaan; who is now sworn unto the Lord of Host
Even the Citie of Destruction; singing the Universal
Language of my Salvation.

H.

[page 66]

These are my drowned Spirits; for whom the Son of my
Eternal Love did suffer in the flesh; And unto whom
he preached through the Spirit, in the prison of Cor=
ruption, in the dayes of Noah; when my long pa=
tience was Salvation.

These were my wandring Ravens, that flies to &
fro, until the flood of destruction is dried up; whom
I provide for, and young owns, when they crie
unto me.

These are my spiritual Sodomites, wherein my E=
ternal Son was mystically crucified, whose scarlet
and crimson Sins, I have made as white as snow.
These are my spiritual Ammonites, that were my Bed
of nettles; whom my Salvation, hath delivered out of
the Captivity of Egypt.

These are my spiritual Moabites, that are my wash=
pots of continual use, in cleansing the defiled pots
of the corrupting Man=hood.

These were my spiritual bondaged Ishmaelites, that
are now my free=Sons, drinking of the well=springs
of Life and Salvation,

These are my spiritual Edomites, whose bloody and
cuning Heel of the Man=hoods monarchie, is now
shode, with my Alpowerful Gospel, of everlasting
peace; whose fatherless and widowes, I preserve
and Comfort.

These are Israels lost Tribes, with the rest that are
scattered abroad, into the temptations of Egyptians
bondage, whom I have reserved, in the Eternity of
my mystical will and intire Love.

These are my spiritual Egyptians, and Assirians
aho were the Captivatours of Israel mune Inheri=
tance; who are now with Israel; my blessed people
the glorious manifestations, of the Almighty works
of my Hands.

Behold heer, The Generals of all; These are my
spiritual Nebuchadnezers, and Babilonish mon=
archs, That were my fierie Ovens, and Lions Dens
who now sends the Multiplication of universal
peace unto all people, nations, and Languages,
that dwels on all the earth; praising, extolling;
and honouring of me the King of Heaven, in all
my works of Truth, and wayes of Judgm^t abasing

15.

Esa:
19.

1. Pet. 3.

2. Pet. 3.

Job: 38.
Psal.
104.
& 147.

Esa: 1.
Reu: 11.

Jer:
49.
Psal:
108.

Gen:
21.
Psal:
60.

Jer:
49.
Ez: 47

Rom: 11.
Jam. 1.

Esa:
19.

Psal:
87.

Dan:
4.

[page 67]

All the pride of the Earth, and exalting y^e Glory
of my universal Kingdom, in the honoure, & bright=
nes, of my (only) Excellent majesty.

Look heer again, and behold (in universal unity) The fulnes of the Gentiles, and the Resurrection of the Jews; The natural Branches, that were (visibly) broken off; and the wild olive, contrary to nature grassed on; that so boasting might (only) be in the universal bearing Root; Being all for a time shut up in blindness and concluded in unbelief; that I might have mercy upon all; whereby the depth of the riches, both of my wisdom and knowledge, might be unsearchable, in all my judgment, and my wayes past finding out. Again behold (in universality) which cannot be numbered All those that lay under the Curse, being now taken away, and nailed unto my suffering Cross; And all these washed in my crucified Blood; triumphingly rejoicing in the severance vertue, of the Leaves of my Tree of Life; which I ordained, for the healing of the nations. All these my Treasures, of broken and dishonourable vessels; of dried and weathered Bones, wherein the infinite nature of my Mercy, and the Glory of my Eternal power appears, in their resurrection of Life: All these my scape Goats, that received the Sentence, of Condemnation, from my left Hand who are saved, by the Mercy of my right Hands universal unity, in my everlasting salvation; being freely justified by my general Gospels common faith; which is the publique sacrifice, and actual faith of my only Son, the brightness of the manifestation of my Eternal Love; who did in, and for, the Mankind perfectly believe, as He perfectly obeyed unto the perfect fulfilling of all my holy Letter; for all these my off springs; the Breath of my Spirit of Life; my hidden Treasures of darknes, and Riches of secret places, That in all Ages, hath manifested, the Glory of my Almighty power in their fleshly ruin & destruction But their Spirit of Life, returned, in the fountaine of Life, that is clear as Crystal, proceeding out of the Throne of God, and of the Lamb.

Rom:
11.

Rev.
22.

1 Cor:
12.

Exech:
37.

1 John:
2.

Psal:
22.

& 116.

Rom:
3.

2 Cor:
4.

Gal:
2.

Rev:
22.

[page 68]

Beholds (also) my Especial Cabinet Jewels; which from age to age hath been my faithful witnesses, in my visible Creation; unto whom, from faith to faith, I have revealed my blessed will; And communicated the spiritual Mysteries of my glorious Truth; which many of them hath sealed with their Blood; Enjoying now, that immortal Crown of Glory, which I have prepared, in my Eternal Rest of Happines.

Mal:
3.

Hab.
2.

Now, These my hidden Treasures of Darknes; with the rest that are yet (visibly) in bondage; And these my Cabinet Jewels, with the rest of my free-bourne Saints, that are yet in their earthly Tabernacles; Are the Two nations, which through my Letter I shadowed forth in Rebekahs (intire) womb, for the visible manifestation of my Eternal power, and Glory; But in the Spiritual womb, of ^{my} Eternal will & unity; These are but one, All y^e off springs and Breath of my spirit of Life, which cannot be separated, from the Glory of my infinite univer-

Gal: 4

2 Cor:
5.

Eph:
4.

Esa:
44.

sal Being: Therefore, Look upon me; And be yee saved, All the Ends of the Earth; for I am a just God, A saviour, And there is none else besides me. Yea, Let the Glory & Honour of the nations; And the Spirits of all flesh, Sing Allelujah, Salvation and Glory, and Honour and Power, unto yo^e Eternal Jehovah, The Lord your God.

Rev:
19.
&
21.

Thus my beloved Brother Esau; unto the praising and magnifying of the Myserie, of our Eternal Jehovahs will; Having (by the assistance of His spiritual Oracle) passed through the first mystical Order of y^e Letter [As Two nations are in thy womb] Let us proceed in singing Allelujah; upon the next mystical order [of what manner, of people separated, from our mother Rebekahs Bowels] whereby our ensuing Communication may be continued, In the re= veiled Communicating fulnes, of our Eternal Jehovahs universal unity (notwithstanding visi= ble separation) unto the spiritual understand= ing and Edification; of us, and all, that truly & sincerely waites, in faiths dispensations, upon our Jehovahs finishing the Myserie of His will;

[page 69]

In the totall ceasing of all visible & invisible Strugglings; strife, and Contentions, by any created being; unto the universal bowing of every knee, to the omni= potency & omniregency, of our Jehovahs Eternal Love, peace, Righteousness, and Salvation, in His Essential universal unity.

Esau. Oh! My precious Brother Jacob; How most infinite wise, and gracious, is our Eternal Jehovah, in all his profound & mystical paths; Who (in y^e ignorance of our (minority) ordered Thee (by the Letter) to sub= plant me of my (visible) Birth=right, and Blessing; And now (in the real knowledge of our Brotherly mys= tical unity) guiding Thee, to repay me (in the Spirit) with a hundred fold increase; yea by the measure of his most holy Sanctuary, pressed down and runing over; In thy (passed) Harmonious Alloguie; which hath ravished my wandering Love=sick Soul; filled my seeking Heart, with universal peace & joyes uⁿto continual singing Allelujah.

Oh! Therefore my precious Brother, Before we enter upon the Myserie of our visible Separation, Let me take my fulnes of Communication, in this blessed uni= versal womb of unity: which caused the four & twen= ty Evangelical Elders, to cast their worshipping Crowns before His Alglorious Majestie, that sitteth (living for ever) on the triumphing Throne of universality, sing= ing, Thou art worthy o Lord, To receive Glory, Honour, and Power; for Thou hast Created All Things! And for Thy pleasure, they are, and were created.

But my precious Brother; what further joyful melody is this we hear? Let us hearken, and Il' enguire; oh my precious Brother! They are the experimental witness= ers of the glorious Truth, of our Eternal Jehovahs universal unity; Having experimentally (for a mourn=

full season) passed through many bye paths of vanitie
and cloudy Climate of disunion, from the publique desart
into, and from several private and separated Chambers,
seeking Truth, Peace, and Rest, but finding none,
being kept under Babilonish & Antichristian pressures,

[page 70]

with Scorn, Slanders, and Reproches; hanging ther Harps
on the willows, because they could not sing Zions universal Song
in a strang confused Language: But as the willow, the more
pressed, groeth and spreadeth the larger; so hath their
Experience taught them (only from Jehovahs communi=
cating fulnes, in the Center of all outward & inward ex=
perienced discipline) to tune their stringed Instruments
the more artificial and sweeter; for sounding forth Je=
hovahs universal Honour Power & Glorie.

Therefore my precious Brother, Let us keep silence, for
half an hour, spiritually Communicating with their hea=
venly melody: which will be no digression, from our in=
tended proceedings, But rather a witnessing Confirma=
tion of what hath been Communicated; And (also) a pre=
divine usher unto our next ensuing Harmonious Alloguie
on the second Mystical Order.

By their Unanimous Concordancie, In extending o^e Eter=
nal Jehovahs universal worshipping (mystical) Church;
Consisting of His heavenly Host and special (witnessing)
Jewels, with his Treasures of darknes, and Riches
of secreet places; So that the main Burden of their
Allelujah Is:

The universal Church of God: Unto which, not
anything can be added, or diminished.

Being demonstrated by Six Harmonical Queries,
Resolved (also) Queringly, unto Spiritual Edification,
For the faithful and witnessing
worshippers of Jehovahs Church
In universal unity.~

[page 71]

1. Querie.

If the universal Church of God (unto which
not anything can be added, nor diminished) Is
so extensive in unity; what is the Bond of it?

It is not [the Immutable will of God?] Confirmed
by Oath [In Himself] Being more abundantly,
shewed unto the Heirs of Promise; In the visible Pa=
radise of Times Revelations; But veiled under His
sealed Covenant; [from Revelations; But veiled under His
(veiled) Time shall be no more: Heb. 6. 2. Cor. 12.
Rom: 10. Dan: 12.

The immutable Counsel of this Eternal will, and u=
niversal Bonds; God abundantly shewed (in the begin=
ning of time) unto Abraham, the Father of y^e faith=
full; Through the unity of Three heavenly Ma=
ifestations, Gen. 22.

The first Heavenly Manifestation; was in the universal [Nature] of this Bond, Illustrated (also) by Three heavenly Demonstrations; As first [Blessing] with the representation of the universal fulness of all Blessing; saying [That in blessing, I will bless thee] Secondly, The universal [Manner] of this blessed Bond [Multiplying] with the reproduction of the universal fulness of all multiplication. saying [And in multiplying, I will multiply thy Seed] The Myserie of this blessed multiplied Bond; for transcending the nature of Addition; for to multiply all not severals together, but dimensions the perfection of the unity; which in this Myserie, Addition cannot total, nor Numeration denominate; for it is Thirdly denominated illustrating, By the most mystical, universal innumerable figure, saying [As (the stars of the Heaven, signifying the circumcised believing Jew, with the heavenly Host) And the sand which is upon the Sea Shore (signifying) the uncircumcised unbelieving Gentile, with y^e earthly Manhood] The Second Heavenly Manifestation: Is in the Universal [Strength & victorious fortitude] of y^e Bond [And thy seed shall possess the Gated of his Enemies]

[page 72]

no fortified Enclosure whatever (neither Sin, Death, nor Hell) can prevail, take or keep enclosedly' from the victorious Seed, of this universal, blessed, multiplied, figured Bond.

The third Heavenly Manifestation: Is in the universal [Circumference] of this Bond [And in thy seed shall all the nations of the Earth be blessed] not only some out of every nation (who through the myserie of unity, participateth in the spiritual knowledge of understanding, with the general Assemblies of the first-bourne) But the universal worshipping Congregation of all nations; which in the unity of the universal Seed; Is but one nation, Acts. 17. made of one Blood (alluding both unto the Life, and sacrifice of the Seed) Being the offspring of the God=Head: Then in the substantiall Myserie, what Blood? What off=Spring? It is of God; Therefore it is written of the universal Seed; Thou wilt not leave my Soul in the Grave, nor suffer thy holy one to see Corruption. If so, The the least Drop, or Being, of this one Blood, and off-spring; cannot perish, nor be separated from the God=Head; in this universal Bond of blessedness: for to diminish or separate, this one Blood & off=Spring, from the God=Head; doth it not deprive from the most perfecte nature of the Eternal power and God=Head? in this universal Bond of unity: Also diminish or separate the God=Head, from this one Blood and off=Spring, doth it not universally null, this one Blood & off=Spring, in the universal myserie of unity? wherefore, this universal worship of worshipping the Eternal power & God Head, Is in the universal immutable, bonded unity, of God=Head, and off=Spring; for in Him, we live, and more, and have our being.

2. Querie.

If the Bond of the universal Church of God, Is of such Nature and so large, Then what are the proper Materials, or Matter bound together; and Congregated in it; That not any thing can be added, nor diminished?

Is it not the God=Head & off=Spring spiritually (through earthly Man=hood, with heavenly Host) In Christ Jesus,

[page 73]

[God=Man] The Mediatour, Sacrifice, and Sacrificer, the Saviour, the Prophet, Priest, and King, the only Manifestation, of his Heavenly Fathers Eternal Love and Unity, in Universal Blessednes. Psal: 148. Luke. 2. Heb: 5. who is (in this universal unity) The House of God: The Church of the living God; The pillar, and Ground of the Truth: Illustrated (through unity) both in Himselfe, & his Seed [In Himselfe} As it is written; God manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen ^{^of} Angels, preached unto the Gentiles, beleaved on in the world, receives up in= to Glorie; Therefore without controversie, great is the Myserie of Godlines (or right worshipping of God) Il= lustrated through unity [In His Seed] As it is written This is a faithfull saying, and worthy of all acceptation to trust (or worship) in the living God, who is the Sa= viour of all men, specially of those that beleaved, 1. Tim: 3. with Chap. 4. Then these proper Materials, of Mat= ter bound together, in universal Church unity; Being [The God Head & Off Spring spiritually] Through Earth= ly Man=hood, and Heavenly Host [In Christ Jesus, God= Man] Containing the perfection of the universal wor= shipping Church, being all both visibly & invisibly (only) personated, in the Original Unity of Christ; It is written; where Two, or Three are gathered in my Name, there am I in the midst of them] now Gatehred together in my name [*] and midst of them] Containes the uni= versal Essence of the Matter, Both in the worshipper and worshipped; ffor both worshipped & worshipper must be bound, in the Universal matter of unity together And (also) as the God=Head to be worshipped is universal So must the material Act of worship be universal ffor as at first.

In Creating Man, A living (worshipping) Soul, In whom (the created, universal worshipping Man=Hood, was (then in the root) subsisting) The Unity of the mystical breath= ed Breath, of the Spirit of universal Life, proceeded from the mystical Breather into the prepared Organ of dust; whereby the universal living (worshipping) Soul appeared; So that (only) the very mystical breath= ing essencial Being, of the universal Spirit of Life, from the God=Head, was (through Christ Jesus, God= Man) And is, The inseparable material unity, of the universal man=hood wherein (also) the univer= sality of Multiplication appeared (then) in y^e unity of Created (worshipping) Man; Being Two or Three

[page 74]

[male & ffemale, in multiplication] Congregated together, in the Alpowerful name, of the Creating God=Head (then) in the midst of them: And also as then, the Heavenly & Angelical Host, was through unity (by Christ Jesus) in praising Community, with y^e God Head So also were they, through universal unity, (in Christ Jesus) in worshipping Communion with the created Man=hood.

Thus (also) is it in the Myserie of Gospel Congregated worshipping of God the Father; The Essential present Being, of God the Father (through Jesus Christ his son God man) Is the Essential Being, of universal Gospel worshippers, And the whole man=hood, with Heavenly Host, are bound together, in the unity of Christ, God=Man (for faith through worshipping Communioⁿ to witnes) by all those, who doth Gospelly worship in His name. Otherwise, that which is worshipped, Is (in the shadowing ignorance, and weaknes of faith) but a separated humane graven Image, And He that worships, is but a humane, selfish worshipper.

So then, for the Essential Matter of Gospel worshippers, in the universal Church of God, through the Spirit and Trueth of worship; It is not in any visible forme or Order; though draweth forth exactly by the Letter, from any of the Primative practice (yet visible forme and order are comely, so the shadow takes not place of y^e substance) which doth not contain, the true and proper matter of the worshippers: But hath been, and is, the chiefest Seat of Antichrist; adorned (also) with Doctrinal Delusions; Causing such universal fierie Contentions, unto bloody Executions; which hath overspread, all National visible Churches; And also perticular Congregations, in Separation and opposition, one against the other; whin the true spiritual & Essential matter is hid in obscurity, vailed under Scholastical Deformation, or separated Assumption, in Self-seeking to have the only name of the true Church; when it is but the height of Babilonish building: ffor the Essential proper Matter, of Gospel worshipper, Consisteth in Spirit, and in Truth of the Spirit, which worshippers, the Father seeketh to worship him. Therefore, when [Two are Gospelly Congregated, through Community & unity of faith, in the universal Gospel worship of Christ] or [Three in y^e Gospels multiplicatioⁿ]

[page 75]

The Essential name of [Christ, God=Man] being (then) in the midst of them; They doe [in faith] Behold & enjoy, All that Christ is [by unity] in the God=Head; Together with what Christ is in y^e man=Hood, and heavenly Host, [then in the midst of them] which are worshipping: And also, they doe by faith, Behold (then) in the midsts of them personally worshipping [The unity] of the universal Man=hood, and heavenly Host; notwithstanding disunion, and Separation by visible Sight; which is y^e Myserie of Gospel worship, in the Truth of y^e Spirit. Otherwise (in the Myserie of God, and of Christ) They are not Congregated [in the assurance of divine knowledge] Nor doe they worship [in the Myserie of spiritual

understanding] niether beholdeth [In y^e fulnes of u=
nity] the Person [I. God=Man] In the midst of them;
ffor as Christ [this worshipping I] doth consist of y^e
universal God=Head, and man=hood; being justified in
the Spirit, and manifested in the flesh; So also those
His worshipping Members; which foth gospelly wor=
ship in His personal name, Appears [through faith
in the Myserie of the Member=Hood] bearing the
universal unity of both natures; for the worship=
ping and glorifying of God, the Eternal Father.
Wherefore, it is prophesied, of this worshipping name
[this Person, I] This only worshipping Essence, The
only worshipper, and glorifier, of God the Father, And
the only most true, and Compleat Paterne, for all
Gospel worshippers, in His Brother=hoodL Psal: 22.
I will declare The name, unto my Brethren, In the
midst of the Congregation, will I praise Thee: Con=
joyⁿing (also) the universal unity of worship, by y^e great
Congregation; saying my praise shall be of Thee, in y^e
Great Congregation; All the Ends of the world shall
remember, and turne unto the Lord, And all y^e kin=
dreds of the nations, shall worship before Thee;
For the Kingdom is the Lords, And He is the Govern^e
among the nations, Then He, or They, worshipping
gospelly, And not Conjoyning (and thus in praises
beholding) the unity of the Great Congregation [in
the multiplicatioⁿ of three] with the unity of the Con=
gregation [in the Communion of two] The praising
worship (is not through assurance of knowledg) in y^e

[page 76]

name; and Gospel [praise of Christ; neither do they
(in the Myserie of spiritual understanding) enjoy
the Comfort, of the universal praising Being of the
Father, as Lord and Governour among the Nations
in the midst of the (then) worshipping Congregation;
conjoynd (in Unity) with the Great Congregation:
yet those Gospel worshippers, which hath not (as yet)
attained the assurance of knowledg, in faiths Dis=
pensations; not enjoyeth spiritual understanding;
in the Myserie of universal Gospel worship; Are
rightfull worshippers; under the first and second
vail, in the holy Tempes manifestations; Though
not (as yet) come, unto the glorious stature of the
fulnes of Christ; Ascending by faith, in unity with
Him; into the Holiest of All; for praising worship
in the Myserie of universal unity, In the Eternal
Power & God Head.

The mystical hight & depth of making up the patient
sufferings of Christs Brother=hood. By the beleaving
Jew, bearing the Cross of unity [His unbeleaving Bro=
ther Gentile] in his dayly spiritual worship, cannot
fully be received, before the mystical Brother=hood,
of Cain & Abel, is revealed in Seth; And the mystical
communion with Japhet, inhabiting within the wor=
shipping Tents of Shem: The only Reconciler, and ma=
terial Binder together, in the mystical unity of univer=
sal Church worship, As by the only Compleat Paterne,
So also, by His heavenly Doctrinals; fully Demonstrate

Both unto the worshipping Offender, and Offended heerin,
throughout the whole man=hood.

Unto the worshipping Offender (Math. 5.) Therefore
If thou bring thy Gift to the Altar [The Sacrifice
of praise, worshipping on the universal Altar Christ
Jesus] And there rememberest that Thy Brothers Unity
in thy sacrificing worship] Leave there thy Gift
before the Altar, and goe thy way [Thy presence
can be no acceptable worshipper, when y^e absence
of unity in Brother=hood appears therein, however
the Gift (thy Dutie) is bound unto the Altar]

[page 77]

ffirst be reconcciled to thy Brother [Acknowleg thy
Brothers unity, in thy spiritual understanding] And
then come and offer thy Gift [Thou art thou in under=
standing, an acceptable worshipper in Spirit, and in
Truth of Spirit] when thou beareth the universal
Reconciliation of unity, at the universal worship=
ping Altar, Christ Jesus.

So likewise unto the worshipper, in duty towards his
offending Brother (Math: 18.) Moreover, If thy Bro=
ther shall trespass against thee [In opposition unto
thy spiritual worshipping unity] Go and tell him
his fault, between him, and thee alone [Endeavour
the gaining of his private Communion with thee]
If he shall hear thee, thou hast gained thy Brother
[into the unity, of thy spiritual understanding] But
if he will not hear thee; Then take with Thee, one or
Two more [Make known unto him th epraising unioⁿ
of saints, in Christs worshipping Congregation, being
the Mouth of witnesses, established by every word
of Truth] And if he shall neglect to hear them, tell
it to the Church [Declare the free nature of uni=
versal worshipping union, between the God=Head
and the Man=hood, in the praises of the great Con=
gregation, By thy most feww forgivenes therein]
But if he shall neglect to hear the Church; Let him
be unto thee as an heathen man [void of knowledg
in understanding, of Brotherly Union; of worship=
ping Communion; And of universal praising of the
God=Head, in the unity of the great Congregations,
free Congregated in the Gates of Mercy and For=
giveness] ffor Lord, how oft shall my Brother sin
against me, and I forgive him? all seaven Times?
[How long shall I bear my Brothers unity in my
spiritual worship, when he day by day reproch=
ingly sinneth against me, from one Sabbath, to the
other Sabbath?] I say not unto thee until seven times
But until seventy times seaven [the compleat Mul=
tiplication of Multiplication, in the Eternal Sabbath
of universal forgivenes peace, & rest, Christ Jesus]

[page 78]

Thus in the heavenly kingdom of multiplying forgivenes,
is the universal reconciliation of timeles unity stated;
wherein the true worshipper of the father, appears
in the likenes of his heavenly father; forgiving in

(deed) every one their trespasses; And also by acknowledging the universal unity of worship, which he is presented in, at his spiritual worshipping, upon the universal Altar [Christ Jesus] So large, so mystical, is the heavenly and earthly vision of these proper Materials, or matter bound together, in this universal Church, or Congregation unto which not any thing can be added or diminished.

.3. Querie.

whether the Matter of the universal Church of God, admits of Distinction

Can there be distinction of one and the self=same Spirit? for is not the self=same Spirit but one Spirit? yet Distinction (through unity) of Manifestation in Operation; with reference to Person, Time, & Place. Such distinction in reference to Person; As is between the God=Head worshipped; And offspring (in Man=hood and Heavenly Host) worshipping; And therein, Distinction (through unity) for Communion with, and knowledge of the God=Head [Father, Son, and Holy Ghost] to be worshipped; By the Spirit. Through the Son; In the Father; Being essentially but the Spirit, one God, and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in all, Eph: 5. Also Distinction (through unity) In the Man=hood, with heavenly Host worshipping, Such as is between a Mediatour: And that which is mediated for: Between the Sacrifice, And that which is sacrificed for:

[page 79]

Between a Saviour, and that which is saved, Between Christ the Head, and his Members; And there (in the Myserie) Such as is between the ministering Spirit, and that which is ministred unto Between the Eye, and Ear, Between the Hand, and foot; Between feeble, and full of strength, Between less honourable, and more honourable, Between uncomely parts, and more abundant comelines; And yet no Division (through Distinction) Being All through reciprocal and sympathizing Unity; In universal mystical Essence; for all is but the Body of Christ; And members in particular. 1. Cor. 12. In reference to Time, Such Distinction as is between the Beginning, and Ending; between yesterday, today, and for Ever; And all terminated in Christ; who is the Alpha & Omega; The first, and Last; The only manifestation of Eternity, Rev. 1. In reference to Place; Such Distinction, as is between visible, and Invisible, between eaven, and Earth; between mount Sinai, and Mount Sion, between Height and Depth; between Length, and Breadth; And all centred and habited (through mystical unity) with the fulness of the God=Head [Bodily in Christ] who filleth All in All. Col: 1. & 2. Eph: 1.

4. Querie.

If Distinction be admitted; Then whether are All
of one Kind? Or doe They differ in Kind, That are do
Materialled, in the universal Church of God?

Can there be differing kinds, of one and y^e self same
Spirit? for is not the self=same Spirit, but one kind?
Yet differing kind (through unity) of Manifestatioⁿ
in Operation; throughout the Man=hood; with
heavenly Host: But notwithstanding; As in Be=
ginning, The Male & Female (with Multiplication)

[page 80]

made but one Adam, Gen: 5. So from before Beginning in
End of Time; and for Ever; Christ and His Member=hood
with (vailed) Multiplication (in the second Adam) Is but
one Christ, One Body, One Church; In one living God.
This mystical Matter=hood, of universal Church unity;
from the Beginning of the world, hath been hid in
God, who created all Things; By, In, and for Christ
[God=Man] For there is neither Jew, nor Gentile, Cir
cumcision, nor uncircumcision, Bond, nor free, male
nor female, Barbarian, nor Sythian; But Christ is
All & in All; So (herein) All are but on kind [In Christ
Jesus, God=Man] Eph: 3: Gal: 3. Col: 3.

What uncircumcised, unbeleeving Gentiles, Barba=
rians, and Sythians? Yea, If Christ be in Them, and
They in Christ; which the spirit of Christ doth witness;
who can gain=say it? By Interpretation, Explication
Addition, ot Dimidiating: For the Spirit of Christ, being
in a Barbarian, or Sythian; If but manifestation
in operation appears; Then will the Barbarian &
Sythian appear as a blessed Saint.

But can the Spirit of Christ be in a Barbarian of Sythian
And not manifested in Operation? was there not [In the
Beginning] Light in Darknes? When God divided y^e Light
from the Darknes; And did not the Light (then) as Light
Consist invisibly (without Commixture) in Darknes? But
the Darknes, as Darknes (then) Comprehended it not?
for by Christ, was all Things made [As God=Man] whose
Life was, and is, the Light of men. Gen: 1. John. 1.

Now in this vailed darke Chaos, of unbeleeving Bar=
barians and Sythians; Christ the Life & Light, is not, as
yet, visibly (universally) divided, from the (vailing) Dark=
nes, in open manifestation, unto Operation, But the vail
of Blindnes & unbelief, remaineth still: yet in Christ
this vail is already done away, And where the Spirit
of the Lord is, there is Liberty, to be changed in y^e same
Image; from Glory to Glory, Even by the Spirit of
the Lord, 2. Cor. 3.

So that when the Spirit of Life & Light, shall be com=
manded to shine (universally) out of Darknes, in open
manifestation, unto operation, According unto y^e ful=
filling and ceasing of all Prophecies, In Jehovahs Mo=
ment of Day; As at the Beginning, Let there be Light
and there was Light; So will the Almighty Power and

God=Head, In His Moment; As in the Myserie of the

[page 81]

Twinkling of an Eye; Com^mand His spiritual Life, and Light; universally to shine out of Darknes, where by the fulnes of all nations together, shall universally (in that moment of twinkling Change) worship and glorifie the Lord of Host; unto the honour power, and glory of His universal unity; And then shall the glorious Light appear most gloriously, unto the universal knowledge of God, in the glory of the open face of Jesus Christ: notwithstanding the (veiled) God of this world, hath blinded the minds of those who believe not; But are (for time lost) in spiritual knowledge, and understanding, yet Christ (the Life and Light) came to seek and to save, that which is lost; And there is invisible Life in the deepest sleep, when visibility as dead stinketh; And as there is making up of special Jewels, Mal: 3. So there is (also) The giving the Treasures of Darknes, and hidden Riches of secret places, for beautifying & glorifying the House of Glory; with acceptance on, the universal Altar Christ Jesus, Esa. 45 & 50. Therefore all is for the Glory of God, that the Son in the Father, may be glorified, thereby. 2 Cor. 4. Math: 18, Luk: 19: John. 11. Now heerby, Sin is not to abound, because free=Grace hath superabounded; neither is Faith made voyde nor Communion of Saints, needless, or fruitless; for the superabounding proper Nature of free=Grace; In its vigorous, and glorious Being; nulls the frail Life and vanishing power of Sin: And the potent actings of Faith, removes mountains of oppositions, Causing more spiritual activeness, and yielding more heavenly fruitfulness, unto the power and glory of the Author and finisher of universal faith: Therefore though some believe not; yet unbelieve, makes not y^e faith of God, without effect; But that Beleevers, Communicatingly, should enjoy the glorious Myseries of the Kingdom of Heaven, in the Gospels Dispensations: what though in some, the Tongue is dumb? Is (therefore) in others, no need of speaking? If the Ear be deaf; Is (therefore) no need of hearing? If the Eye is blind; Is (therefore) no need of seeing? And if the

[page 82 (number torn away)]

Heart is hard in unbelieve Is (therefore) no need of beleeving? wherefore Blindnes is but in part, until the fulnes of Sight is transparent; And the Myserie of casting away of some is the reconciling of y^e world, who shall be received again, as Life from the Dead; Therefore God hath shut up in unbelieve, that Hee might have mercy upon all; for the Communion of Saints to magnifie, and worship the Depth of y^e Riches, both of the wisdom, and knowledge of God; How unsearchable are his Judgments; and his wayes past finding out? Rom: 11. Wherein then appears (in Unity) the differing kind? Is it not between Spirit and flesh? But not in y^e Spirit,

but in the flesh; not in the Celestial Body, but in the Terrestrial? Not in Incorruption, but in Corruption, not in power, but in weaknes; not in y^e spiritual Body but in the natural: As it is written, The first man, Adam, was made a living Soul; The last Adam a quickening Spirit; And the first man is of the Earth earthly; The second man, is the Lord from Heaven; There= fore as in Adam all dye; Even so in Christ, shall all be made alive, But every man in his own order [for ordained manifestation in resurrection of Life] 1. Cor. 15. But is not this dying differing kind, whilst it is a Body substantiated, in the Church of the living God? Can Mortality be substantiated in Immortality? Can a vanishing Shadow, be in the living Substance? Therefore the shadowing Body being mortal pertakes not with y^e Substance being immortal; notwithstanding the Sub= stance may be enclosed in a Earthen vessel; as y^e glory of the first Tabernacle, was covered upon Coverings, with Badger skines, and as a precious Jewel, may be lockt in the humane art of a painted Cabinet: withdraw y^e Curtains; and the substantial, unmixed, undefiled Glory appears, in the full illustrious splendour of perfection, But of this living kind which is substantiated in the

[page 83]

Church of the living God; Comparitively it is written; There is one glory of the Sun, and another glory of the Moon, and another glory of the Stars, for one star differeth from another Star in glory; which Glory is substantial, so differing kinds of Glory in the Church: How can that be? For is not the universal substantial Glory of Light; the substantial universal Light? And is not this substantial universal Light; Communicative from Sun to Moon, and from Moon to Stars? Also harmonizingly, from stars, to Moon, from Moon to Sun? Therefore not differing kinds of substantial Glory being but one universal Glory, in one universal Light. Then the unity of differing, is in the Communicative Manifestation in one operation; As in the Beginning, the Greater Light of Manifestation, for the rule of the night; yet all was but one, and the selfe same Light, in one operation of Manifestation: But doth not herein appear Addition, and dimidiating? How can that be? For Administration of the veiled Law; Is but y^e Ministration of the glorious Gospel; Is but the Ministration of the unveiled Law; from one most glorious God of one Truth: wherein appears the unity, Between y^e killing Letter, and quickening Spirit, Between I wound and I heal; Between I kill, and I make alive: This kind of unity Moses prophesied of Christ, How the Lord should raise a Prophet from the midst of his Brethren, like unto him, Deu: 18. So that in all this heavenly, and earthly vision, of no Distinction, and Distinction, of not differing, and Differing in kind; There is neither Addition nor Diminishing, in the universal Church of God; for operation in Manifestation; neither adds, nor takes from, The substantial Essential Being of Subsistence.

Whether all relative Respectes [In the universal Church of God] is as proper to everyone, as to any?

Is nor the God=Head to be [worshipped universally] throughout the whole Church? And doth not his worship

[page 84: number ripped away]

require of every one throughout the whole Church?

All the Heart, mind, and Soul? Then relatively, doth not all that is in the God=Head (Communicatively) be= long as proper to everyone in the Church, as to any one? For God is no respecter, or excepter of persons. So that, what Essentially is in the God=Head; which by Appellation is made known, is properly Communica= ted (relatively) for every one in the worshipping Manhood, as to anyone; Therefore it is written; Go Preach the Gospel to, (or for) every Creature throughout the whole world: So also that which every Creature throughout the whole Man=hood, doth substantially subsist in, is relatively returned un= to the God=Head, As it is written, The Dust shall re= turn to the Earth as it was, And the Spirit shall re= turn to God, who gave it. Eccle: 52.

Then the most glorious universal Gospel of Jesus Christ, with all Dignities, Prerogatives, and Priviledges therein, cannot be separated, nor abridged, from any one in the Church; But all doth as properly belong to every one as to any one; otherwise Christ in his glorious Church (which cannot be divided, not parted into severals) Hath not the intire, and compleat Ordination; neither in the in= dividual Substance, ^{^nor} determined immutable End; which is for every one, throughout the whole Man=hood.

So also, All spiritual relative Respectes whatever; which are Communicative (Ministringly) in the Church; doth as ^{^belong} properly to every one as to any one, in the Church; for the foot pertakes, and is in equal Member=hood with y^e Eye, as the Ear; and as the Body, with mouth, and Head, So is it in the spiritual Body; All are in equal Commu= nity of life, ministering unto, and for each other; Therefore it is written, ye are Compleat in Christ; which fulnes of perfection in Christ; derived mi= nistringly, through his members, cannot be Compleat unto the whole, if abridged, in any relative respectes (as is not properly belonging) unto every one.

Wherefore, in Compleat Communion of the Body, through heavenly knowledge, in Spiritual understanding, It is written; we being many are one Bread; for we are pertakers of that one Body [of Eternal Life, ffeeding upon that universal broken Body, which did bear,

[page 85]

And hath taken away the Sins of the whole world] So in the Unity of the ministering relative Respectes Attending on the Eternal sacrificed Body, and the uni= versal Altar of the Lord; It is written, They which wait at the Altar, are pertakers with the Altar; Even so, as they which waitingly ministers, are per=

takers (both) with the Substance of the Altar; And with the relative fellowship, which waitingly attends; So (also) are those pertakers (both with the Substance and relative respectes) which are waitingly ministred unto; Such communitive reciprocal pertaking fellowship; is in this mystical unity of relative Respectes; That what heavenly gift, manifestation, and operation, one Member is treasured with, it is the riches of the whole, whereby there is not want in this universal Community; But the deepest poverty, ascends unto the riches of Liberality And the height of Riches, descends through poverty, unto the Ascention of all fulnes.

For as the Priesthood, in typing Joshuas dayes, sipertake of the wood & water; which the cursed Gibionites did hew and draw, for the Congregation, and for the Altar of the Lord, which of necessity could not be wanting (as with the Altar it self) So also did the Priesthood offer, for those Hewers of wood & Drawers of water (as for any of the Congregation) whereby they were (also) pertakers, with the substance of the Altar; And with the ministering relative Respectes (waitingly) as any of the Congregation; notwithstanding they were visibly disregarded (by ignorance) as being (veiled) under the curse.

So likewise, much more is it in the substantial Joshuas Eternal Priesthood; who being made a Curse hath taken away the Curse (pertaking thereof) Establishing an universal spiritual Communitie, That what soever Christ hath done, And what soever is substantially in Christ, the Eternal high Priest of y^e Lords universal Altar; And also, whatsoever is spiritually Communicated, throughout the whole Congregation of the House of God: All both in the substantial Being, And in the Relative ministering Respectes;

[page 86, page number torn away]

doth as properly belong to every one, as to any one, in the universal Church of the living God: notwithstanding all doth not with knowledge, in Understanding, Communicatively, pertake of the order of this perfection; for the Hour may be in times bondage (as a Servant) though he be Lord of all; yet when the fulnes of times period, shall be expired, in finish in the Mystery of God; And the Curse universally, apparent, that it is no more. Then will appear the mystical pure River, of the water of Life (for all imprisoned thirsty Souls) proceeding out of the Throne of God, and of the Lamb; for universal purifying, through that most precious Blood, running in the midst of the Street, Together on either side of the River (both for Jew & Gentile, blessed & cursed) The Tree of Life; The Leaves thereof ordained, for the healing of y^e nations: So that these Relatives Respectes in this Church, Consisteth not in any earthly Community; As in meats & Drinks, and giving in marriage, neither in formed words, nor bodily conceited gestures, and the like; But this glorious Churches universal Resurrection, Is in Heavenly Angelical unity Through universal Love

Eternal Righteousnes, universal Peace, and Ever=
 lasting Joy in the Holy=Ghost; On which the glorious
 Kingdom of Heaven consisteth.
 Improper therefore, is that Difinition of A Church Mi=
 litant (with tything respectes) And a Church Trium=
 phant; For can the Church of Christ; which is in the
 living God Be dimidiated, or separated, by Interchanges,
 mutation, and earthly Intervailles? Can Christ with
 his Church triumphing, at the right Hand of his Fathers
 Eternal power, over Sin, Death, and Hell, be disthroned?
 For where Christ is, there also, is His Church, And the
 Head & Body, cannot be parted; but in a liveles being;
 Therefore Christ is in his Church universally; In na=
 tions in families, in Houses; Even where two or
 three are gathered together in his name (All being
 branched Manifestations of one River) There if
 Christ in the midst of them; A triumphing glorified
 Church, As the right Hand of his Fathers Eternal Love;

[page 87]

which farr transcends any (tything) militant Discrip=
 tion being a Definition; for an Antichristian Seat;
 Vain (also) Is that Comparative Distinction of Churches,
 of Christ, Distinguishing between purity, and impurity;
 between a man in health, and a sick man, yet a
 true man; so a true Church, If so, then if the Church
 of Christ, which is in God, be impure of sick, Christ
 (also) whose Body is the Church; Is an impure and
 sick Christ; And God (also) in whom is the Church of
 Christ, will appear to be an impure, and sick God;
 But such are the false Church=mongers; And hu=
 mane statours of formal visible Churches.
 Behold then the Myserie of the Church in God,
 (with all spiritual relative respectes) The Mys=
 terie of Christ, The Mystery of the Gospel, The
 Mystery of Communion of Saintes; And y^e Mys=
 terie of the Immutable Counsel of God, throughout
 the whole man=hood, in these ministering relative
 respectes; with in the universal Church of the living God.

6. Querie.

If the Church of God is so universal, and so Compleat in
 all spiritual Respectes; where then can be an Anti=
 christian Congregation admitted? Doth it not want a
 place to be in? And if admitted, Then is not y^e Resident
 of Antichrist for perptuitie?

Nothwithstanding the universality of Sun, Moon,
 with Stars; yet hath not the vanishing Clouds ad=
 mitted Appearance? The ubiquitie of the Air, be=
 ing Universal; yet hath not The ascending Smoke
 and vapours admitted distinction? And notwith=
 standing the universal Substance of formed Light;
 Is there not also, an universal Shadow of created
 darknes?
 Then as there is an Universal Substance; So also
 is there an universal Shadow; yet not two universals

But one substantially; for the Shadow is vanishing;

[page 88, page number torn away]

[n]otwithstanding it hath an universal assigned bending Appearance, upon all that is substantial; Even of God, of Chrst, of Angels, of Saints, of Man=hood; And so of the universal Church, there is an imitating universal Shadow of all; As there is a real univer= sal Substance in all.

It is true Christ hath no Concord with Belial; nither y^c Temple of God agreement with Idols; yet as in the beginning; The Light was divided from the darknes; (being then with the darknes) And the Light was call= ed Day, and the Darknes night; And the morning; (The rising in continuance of Light) were, the first Day of manifestation: So heer in the Myserie, As Christ is the rising (in Continuance) and mani= festation of the Day of knowledge: for Light is not known to be Light; but through ove^rpassed night; Therefore as Light was formed, for a State of knowledge; So also was darknes created for a state of Ignorance, whereby the Myserie of God, in his universal Gospel might be manifested; Through the dark bondage of ignorance; Into the glorious liberty of knowledge; Therefore it is writt= en; I am the Lord, And Created Darknes, I make peace, And Create Evil; I the Lord doe all these things.

Heerin Explications, defining of the God=Head, to make it pure, by their painting Interpretations [Permissive= ly] doe they not grave a God=Head without power? not Active, but passive, In a humane permissiveness which changeth the only, and most glorious Eternal Power and God=Head into a lye, Even into an Image made like unto corruptible man; for none can de= clare the Eternal Power and God=Head; who is uni= versally manifested in Almighty & Eternal Being; But in the universal power of the Being. Then as Christ in his Church, hath an universal Being,

[page 89]

Through Light Eternally; So also, hath Antichrist universal Being of darknes; In time, vanishingly And as the Letteral unite, cannot be Cheifly advanced, but by the Cipher [nought] having no being in the unite; but advancingly causeth the unite to ascend unto manifestation of perfection; So in y^c Myserie; Christ the Eternal unite; Is moat highly advanced by Antichrist [The noughts] who hath no resident in Christ; It being impossible for darknes to be in Light; But Antichrist as noughts having an assigned opposing place, for the abundant advancing the vic= torious manifestation of the perfection, of univer= sal unity, in the Truth of the ascending Substance. For what is AntiChrist? But [for or against Christ] through incarnated spiritual opposition (in vanish= ing noughts) which causeth Christ, more gloriously transcendent in his substantial Truth overcoming

erroneous doctrinal opposition by Antichrist, where in he appears (forcedly) by Truths vanishing or Errours for Christ; So also (mainly) against Christ, In blind zealous profession; which causeth Christ (by ignorance) the more to be veiled; yet for Souls Experience in times revolution; wherein dissembling profession vanisheth unto augmentation of the glorious appearing Stability, in the true witnessing of Jesus in faith and puritie.

Then for, and against Christ (in vanishing opposition against Truth) There is an admitted Congregated place for Antichrist; which mystical Opposition, always attending Truth, Is ordained for magnifying y^e Myserie of Truth; for through experienced darknes; the knowledge of the glorious Light Appears; By vanishing Antichrist, the durable riches of Christ, comes to be revealed; By Congregated shadowing Errours, The glory of the most clear Congregated Truth comes to be revealed, and manifested, even as the shadow signifies, and declares the substance to be substantial, And as the substantial Brightnes of Christs Coming is Continually; So is the dark Shadow of Antichrist (in the Place of exalting against Truth) continually vanishing, By Christ, who with holdeth, and letteth his Residence, for the Myserie to work in Times revelations; But to be taken out of the way, By most glorious Brightnes, in y^e

[page 90, page number torn]

[torn]nes of spiritual Revelation By the Lord Jesus, 2 Thes. 2. [torn]en there is, an ordained, letting, timely place (in Antichrist, the earthly man of Sin, and Son of perdition from the generation of perishing, Consumingly to be destroyed; by the full brightnes of spiritual Revelations; which is in the universal Church of God, personated in Christ Jesus; the Eternal Son, of the Everliving God.

now for the assigned Place, of and Antichristian Congregation [personated in him] It hath a shadowing ubiquitie; But no essential Being, In the proper universal Church of God [Having its substantial ubiquitie in Christ] for the Being of Antichrist, is not materially Essential; but vanishing, And not any Thing can be in the universal Church of God; but what is essentially material; Therefore it is not written in Scriptures, A Church of Antichrist; But a Congregation of Hypocrites, and evil doers, which distinction signifies a difference; Between a substantial Church, And a Congregated Instability: for the durable Substance of a Church, doth not Consiste in the visibility, of a formal Congregated Appearance; But in the invisible unity of Substance; Through the pretious faith of the universal, and Everlasting Gospel of Jesus Christ, which is also Invisible Profession; Held forth, and declared, by the Faithful; [Congregated personally in Christ Jesus] unto witnessing Appearance.

Now in the likenes of Appearance Antichrist (also) hath his chief Seat; Even in the Temples Figurative profession; Judging, and shewing himself (imitatingly) as God;

But not setting in the Holy of Holiest; In the Communionⁿ
and unity of the Faith of Jesus; which is the substantial Temple of God: But for appointed Ends, In the figurative profession; Having therein admitted shadowing Imitation of God, of Christ, of Saints, of Churches By mortal corruptible man, In a confined doctrinal Interpretating Chair, Congregately: And therein disguised, wolfe like devouringly; And lamblike, with all several sorts of deceiveable musique; Alluring, and bewitching, all People, nations, & Languages, for bowing down, unto the golden Image, of selfish confined profession; unto Endeavouring the annihilating, the universal Crucified Body of Christ, in y^e flesh;

[page 91]

who therein was personally made Sin; a Curse, Bear[torn] personally in his own Body (on the tree) the Sins and Taking away thereby the Curse of the Law; Being so pulchered, And risen again; Triumphant over Sin, Death and Hell, In Eternal Glory, And made of God unto all, wisdom, Righteousness, Sanctification, and Redemption; for and in the universal Church, of the living God 2 Cor: 5 Gal:3. 1 Pet. 2. 1. Cor.1. & 15. In which Antichristian Confining Chair; And selfish Profession; Consisteth the Mysterie of Hypocrisie, and Evil doings, Bound together, with Congregated seducing Errours; under the principalities and powers of darkness; over which Christ is the victorious Head, To withhold, Let, and Consume: which Consumation, will be finished, when all Prophecies, and interpretating Tongues shall cease; And all selfish professing knowledge vanished away, Then will be the [Time] of the total fall and rain of Antichrist; And even then; That which is only perfect shall appear universally, In that fulness of Time, when only the Congregated Truth, shall be universally transparent, without any attending shadowing opposition whatsoever, glorifying, of the only God of Truth, which is God Himselfe, Most Blessed for Ever, Amen.

Allelujah. ~

Jacob. My precious Brother Esau; This experimental harmonious witnessing Demonstration; In the universal Truth of our Jehovahs Communicating fulness; Hath not only Consorted our joyful praising returns in Allelujah; But also renovated the memorable mysterie, of that ancient heavenly vision, which I saw, after my departing, from our Fathers House, in fear of thy presence, having so un-Brotherly supplanted Thee; Being (also) the first Appearance of Jehovah; which was in the mystical vision of this universal Church; The Mysterie

[page 92, corner torn]

[torn]n, I (then) knew it not; But heere it hath been [torn]ely unveiled, in universal demonstration; for

singing Allelujah, unto the Myserie of o^c Jehovahs
Eternal will.

when I went unto Padan=aram, The School of
twenty years servitude, for experimental know=
ledg of our Jehovahs mystical Discipline: In my
journey; The Sun being down; I lighted upon a ser=
tain place (being visibly alone, in the wide wilder=
ness, of the Man-hoods Contemplations) to repose
my selfe for rest that night, after the passed days
travail, And when I went to lay me down to sleep
I was Jehovah ordered, to lay a (prepared) hard
stone for my soft pillow; which now appears in the
Myserie, to signifie our Jehovah Himselfe; The
only and Chief Corner Stone, of His universal Church's
Rest; As it is written, on this Rock or Ston, will I
build my Church.

Gen:
28.

Sleeping on this blessed stone (in the then igno=
rance of Jehovahs Myseries) I dreamed; And
Behold, there appeared a mystical Ladder, set upon
the Earth, and the Top of it, reached to Heaven;
And behold the Angels of God; Ascending & des=
cending on it; And behold Jehovah stood above it
and said; I am the Lord Gos of Abraham thy Father
and the God of Isaac; the Land whereon thou
lyest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed; which
shall be as the dust of the Earth, spreading abroad
To the west, to the East, to the north and to the
South, And in thy Seed, shall all the families of
the Earth be blessed.

now in the Revelation of this heavenly vision
Behold this mystical Ladder of such Altitude;
and so earthly Based; yet so commodious for
Ascending; Signified; the Humane & Divine
nature, of our universal Saviour; who was
nailed, and crucified, on the universal Tree; for
universal ascending Redemption (which is the
Gate to Heaven) Set on the universal man-hoods

[page 93]

earthly nature: The top of this mystical L[torn]
being of such Celsitude, reaching unto the Hea[torn]
of Jehovahs universal Love, peace, and unity.
The Angels Ascending & descending on this mys=
tical Ladder; Signifying the glorious Resurrectioⁿ
of Christ; And heavenly descention of His spiri=
tual ministration, in His universal Church; through
the unity of his Evangelical Host, and worship=
ping man=hood; Ascending in His universal Church
(by Abrahams Steps of worshipping faith) ubto
the height of heavenly unity; And descending, in
universal unity, unto the lowest step of the man=
hoods glorious worshipping Resurrection: Above
the Top of this mystical Ladder, Stands Jehovahs
universal unity; Proclaiming and Reivising, His
Immutable Counsels, which at first he revealed,
and established, unto our fore Father Abraham,
And heer (also) unto me; In the universal matter
and immutable blessed Bond of His universal Church:
wherein all nations, families, and kindreds; from

and as the dust of the Earth; In the extensive circumference of west, East, north, and south; shall be gathered in the Communicating Fulnes of universal blessedness; unto the magnifying, and glorifying of Jehovahs Salvation, in the Land of the Living, which Land of the living, was typed by this visible Land of Canaan, on which I then lay, and in the mysterie, distinguished from the Earth; And was promised by Jehovah unto me, and my universal spiritual seed, Christ Jesus: which happy possession; made experienced David crie out O Lord thou art my Refuge, and my Portion, in the Land of the Living. Psal: 142.

Thus (in this heavenly Host descending on y^e praising and worshipping mystical Ladder Christ Jesus) I awaked out of my sleep; and said, surely the Lord is in this place; and I knew it not; for I was afraid, saying how dreadful is this place (having not had any appearance before of Jehovahs visions) however concluded, this none other place, but the Hous (or Church)

[page 94, page number torn]

[torn]and the Gate to Heaven. So rising erly, in the [torn]ing Light (vinishing the nights darknes) I was or[torn]ed, to take the stone, that I had put for my pillows, pouring oyl (signifying the universal Priest=hoods unity) upon the top of it, And to set it up for a pillar, or perpetual memorial; calling the name of that place Beth=el; The Hous, or Church of God; in that wild and wide wilderness.

But my precious Brother Esau; The Mysterie is yet larger (unto all admiration) Concerning this vision; this Beth=el, this Hous, ans signifying universal Church of God; which as Amos prophesieth is the Kings Chappel, the Kings Court, and y^e Hous of the Kingdom: for I must become a visible typing worshipper, at this Beth=el, in the heavenly knowledge of spiritual understanding; And before I appear in the Spirit and Truth of a worshipper, I must be disciplined in twenty years servitude, under Jehovahs mystical Dispensations: And then also, which is the Admiration; I must bring with me, the unity of our Brother=hood; In thy free forgiveness of me: Oh! The most wonderful mysterie of our Jehovahs will; for was there any possibilitie of obtaining forgiveness, and Brotherly unity from thee, being so highly offended by me, in the visible cause of all humane reason; But this must be done before I could (as a visible type) appear a Compleat worshipper, in Jehovahs universal Church of unity. Then my precious Brother Esau, In our Jehovahs ordination, Let us behold His most wise, admired, communicating manifestations, who in His mystical discipline, Calls me out from my servitude to return unto our ancient Fathers Hous & so to worship in this Beth=el; this signifying Church of God, for universal praising demonstrations, And in the was, I must be ordered to take the unity of thy Brother=hood with me, for I

Amos.
7.

had no other way to pass thereunto, but with
thy leave through thy dominions; That so of
necessity I must come before thy then conceived
angry presence, Alas what exigent was I then
in? What fears in humane reason was I possessed with;

[page 95]

That thou wouldest be revenged on [torn]
in utter ruination? for deceiving thee [torn]
ing; or how could I expect any blessing in this [torn]
what hopes could I have, of any real Brotherly En=
ertainment from thee? When I had been so inhumane
unto thee, as not to afforde thee a poor meas of pottage
when thou was fainting, going to die, But I must have
thy Birth=right.

Yet I did believe in Jehovah, who first appeared unto
me at this Beth=el; though accompanied with humane
policie; for how did I then contrive my presents
to appease thee, and to find grace in thy sight? By title
of honour, as my Lord, to allure thee? By obeisance
bowing my Self seven times, before I came neer thee
to animate thy favourable aspect upon me? But be=
hold the Myserie of our Jehovahs will; transcend=
ing farr beyond all my contrived policies; for thou
was ordered in the Unity of Universal Brotherhood,
to disregard all these inticing frailties, surmount=
ing in the height of Brotherly affections; Appear=
ing in the likenes of our heavenly father; Even as
the face of God, in thy free forgiveness to me; for
no sooner didst thou see me coming, but thou didst
run to meet me, And then fell on my neck, Embraced
me with tears, and kissed me, Even as the Gospel=
father did his lost son; O where are such Bowels
of Brother=hood now in these contentious and vex=
atious times.

Thou wouldest not receive any presents from me, but
what I earnestly urged, And how tender and careful
wast thee unto me, and mine, being freely willing,
and ready to accompany me unto our fathers Hous,
offering to come behinde me, or lead the way, and
leave some of thy folk to aide me; when thou might
with thy 400 men in a moment destroyed both my self,
my wives, and my Children, and taken all my Cattel, w^{ch}
on humane account, had been according unto my deserts.
But thou wast lovingly pleased, to doe what I de=
sired, in passing before, where in thou didst in the
Myserie, regain thy Birth=right, in going first as
the Eldest, unto our^{fathers} Hous.

And when we came into our ancient, and joyfull
Fathers possessions; Being above twenty years since
he blessed us; How lovingly in Brotherly peace &
unity, did we dwell together (before our ancient
Father died) for the space of three score years
O the wonderful Myserie of our Jehovahs will,
That our ancient blind father, should be preserved

[page 96, page number torn]

[torn]ve, to understand and enjoy both the

[torn]outward fruit & Comfort of his former
[torn]f us; Both in the fatnes of the Earth, w^{ch}
[torn]enjoyed in fulnes; And the Dew of Heaven,
in our happy Brotherly Unity, after so long visi=
ble disunion.

And when our ancient Father gave up the Ghost &
died, He then being one hundred and four=score
years old; And also then ^{^we} one hundred and twenty
years of age, How Brotherly, lovingly, & carefully
did we unanimously, in our bounden duty of son=ship
bury our antient Father; wherein thou didst visibly
regain thy Eldership; being memorized on divine
Record as first; That when Isaac died, His Sons
Esau & Jacob buried him.

Gen.
35.

Yea, how sweetly did we in Love and peace visibly type
for our Jehovahs universal unity; By our unity of
universal Brother=hood, In universal Church wor=
ship, passing bye all unbrotherly discord, in free for
givens, unto the praise and glory of our Eternal
Jehivahs Mysteries; And Cohabiting together,
til thou wast ordered, by our Jehovah, for further
experience, to goe from my face, into the Country,
for our riches were more, then we might dwell
together, And the Land wherein we were stran=
gers couldst not bear us, because of our Cattell; where=
in is a deep Myserie vailed, concerning this our
future visible earthly separation.

Thus with Concluding Allelujah on this first mystical Order,
having consorted, with the foregoing harmonious witness=
ing Sound of the universal Church of God being most freely
feasted at our Jehovahs Communion Table; Even his uni=
versal mercy Seat; which is not confined, but openly pre=
pared, for all Canaanite & Gospel Dogs, to gather up y^e pre=
cious Crummes, of Everlasting Life & Comfort; where all spi=
ritual hungry, thirsty, naked Souls; yea y^e most deplorable La=
zared, despicable wretched, and deepest poverty, may be
Freely, and fully satisfied, unto particular nourishment
& spiritual application, so large & bountiful is y^e universality
Therefore Let men despaire, Abuse, nor despise, neither
emulate his Brother Gentile for all proceeds
from, and are nourished, and preserved,
By the Eternal, Alpowerful mystical
womb, or universal unity.
Allelujah ~

Bibliography

A bibliography of writing in English, 1634-1974, relating to Roger Williams, is contained in:

Coyle, Wallace, *Roger Williams: a Reference Guide*, (Boston, MA: G. K. Hall and Co., 1977).

Manuscript Sources

Brunkow, R. deVries, '*Individualism and Community on the New England Frontier: Providence Rhode Island in the Age of Roger Williams, 1636-1686*'
(unpublished PhD, University of California at Santa Barbara: 1980).

Chapin, Howard Millar: Papers, Mss. 344: List of Writings of Seventeenth Century Rhode Islanders, Also Mss. C463L, 1887-1940, Rhode Island Historical Society.

Curwen Family Papers, Family Manuscript Collections, Mss. 'C,' Box 1, folders 2-4, 1637-1669, American Antiquarian Society.

Davenport, John (1597-1670), *The Papers of John Davenport*, Mss. 'D,' 1 folder; 1 folio 'Essays,' 1633, 1665, American Antiquarian Society.

Harris, William, *William Harris Papers*, 2 boxes, 1638-1678, Mss. 480, Rhode Island Historical Society.

Hobart, Reverend Peter of Hingham, *Diary, 1635-1671* (1860 copy) SL HIN 6, New England Genealogical Society.

Martin, Sir William to Governor John Winthrop, Misc. Bound Manuscripts, 29 March, 1636, Massachusetts Historical Society.

Minor, Thomas (23 April, 1608 - ?), *Diary, 1653-1685*, (copy by Reverend Roswell Randall Hoes, corrected by Richard Wheeler, 1886), Mss. 9001 – M, Vault 'M' M666T, Rhode Island Historical Society.

Providence Town Papers, first series, Volume I, numbers 1-350, 1642-1761,

(facsimile) (Providence, RI: Rhode Island Historical Society).

Shepard Family Manuscripts, c. 1636-1680, Mss. 'S,' Boxes 'S,' 1 box, folders 1-9;

Mss. Octavo Volumes 'S,' Octavo Volumes 1-7, American Antiquarian Society.

Shepard, Thomas I (1605-1649), '*A Breefe Answer to a Breefe Discourse concerning the punishment of Theft single fornication Rape, &c, &c...*' 1642?, Mass.

Arch.; 87 (Photostat), Massachusetts Historical Society.

Williams, Roger (1603-1683), '*Esau and Jacob's Mystical Harmony Unvailin...*'

(1666, 1667), (given 1813 by G. Gannett), Ms. N-313, Massachusetts Historical Society.

Williams, Roger (1603-1683), *Collected Papers, 1638-1680: scattered*

correspondence, deeds, etc., Mss. 808. Rhode Island Historical Society.

Printed Sources

Addison, William, *Essex Heyday*, (London: J. M. Dent and Sons, Ltd., 1949).

Allen, J. W., *A History of Political Thought in the Sixteenth Century*, (London: Methuen and Co., 1961).

Anderson, Virginia DeJohn, *New England's First Generation: The Great Migration and the Formation of Society and Culture in the Seventeenth Century*, (Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press Syndicate, 1991).

Arch, Stephen Carl, *Authorizing the Past: The Rhetoric of History in Seventeenth Century New England*, (DeKalb, IL: Northern Illinois University Press, 1994).

Atiyah, P. S., *The Rise and Fall of Freedom of Contract*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979).

- Backus, Isaac, *A History of New England With Particular Reference to the Baptists* (two volumes in one), Gaustad, E. S. (advisory ed.), (NY: Arno Press, 1969).
[First Edition (Newton, MA: Backus Historical Society, 1871)]
- Bancroft, George, *History of the United States*, two vols., (tenth edition) (Boston: 1843).
- Bercovitch, Sacvan (ed.), *The American Puritan Imagination: Essays in Re-evaluation*, (London: Cambridge University Press, 1974).
- Bercovitch, Sacvan, (ed.), *Typology in Early American Literature*, (Boston, MA: University of Massachusetts Press, 1972).
- Bercovitch, Sacvan, 'Typology in Puritan New England: The Williams-Cotton Controversy Reassessed,' *American Quarterly* 19 (1967) 166-191.
- Bozeman, Theodore Dwight, 'Religious Liberty and the Problem of Order in Early Rhode Island,' *New England Quarterly* 45 (1972) 44-64.
- Brace, Laura, *The Idea of Property in Seventeenth Century England: Tithes and the Individual*, (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1998).
- Bradford, William (Morison, Samuel Eliot, ed.), *Of Plymouth Plantation: 1620-1647*, New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1959).
- Breen, T. H., *The Character of the Good Ruler: a Study of Puritan Political Ideas in New England, 1630-1730*, (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1970).
- Bremer, Francis J., *Congregational Communion: Clerical Friendship in the Anglo-American Puritan Community, 1610-1692*, (Boston, MA: Northeastern University Press, 1994).

- Bremer, Francis J. (ed.), *Puritanism: Transatlantic Perspectives on a Seventeenth Century Anglo-American Faith*, (Boston, MA: Northeastern University Press, for the Massachusetts Historical Society, 1993).
- Breward, Ian, *The Work of William Perkins*, (Abingdon, Berks.: Sutton Courtenay Press, 1970).
- Bridenbaugh, Carl, *Fat Mutton and Liberty of Conscience: Society in Rhode Island, 1636-1690*, (Providence, RI: Brown University Press, 1974).
- Bridenbaugh, Carl (ed.), (collected by Juliette Tomlinson), *The Pynchon Papers, Volume One: Letters of John Pynchon, 1654-1700*, (Boston, MA: The Colonial Society of Massachusetts, 1982).
- Brockunier, Samuel Hugh, *The Irrepressible Democrat: Roger Williams*, (NY: The Ronald Press, 1940).
- Bruchey, Stuart (ed.), *The Colonial Merchant: Sources and Readings*, (NY, Chicago, San Francisco, Atlanta: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc, 1966).
- Brunkow, R. de V., 'Office-holding in Providence, Rhode Island, 1646-1686: A Quantitative Analysis,' *William and Mary Quarterly*, Third Series 37 (April, 1980) 242-260.
- Bury, J. B., *A History of Freedom of Thought*, (London: Oxford University Press, 1952) (first edition, 1913).
- Bushman, Richard L., *From Puritan to Yankee: Character and the Social Order in Connecticut, 1690-1765*, (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1967).
- Callender, John (1706-1748), *A Historical Discourse on the Civil and Religious Affairs of the Colony of Rhode Island*, third edition (Elton, Romeo, ed), (Boston: T.H. Webb and Co; NY: Bartlett and Welford, 1843).

- Chapin, Howard M., *Documentary History of Rhode Island, being the history of the towns of Providence and Warwick to 1649 and of the colony to 1647*, two volumes, (Providence, RI: Preston and Rounds, Co., 1916).
- Coffey, John, 'Puritanism and Liberty Revisited: the Case for Toleration in the English Revolution,' *Historical Journal* 41(1998) 961-985.
- Commager, Henry Steele, *Documents of American History*, fifth edition, (NY: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1949).
- Cotton, John, (1584-1652), *A Discourse About Civil Government in a New Plantation Whose Design is Religion*, (Cambridge, MA: 1663).
- Cressy, David, *Coming Over: Migration and Communication between England and New England in the Seventeenth Century*, (Cambridge, New York, New Rochelle, Melbourne, Sydney: Cambridge University Press, 1987).
- Daniels, Bruce Colin, *Dissent and Conformity on Narragansett Bay: The Colonial Rhode Island Town*, (Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1984).
- Daniels, Bruce Colin, *Puritans at Play: Leisure and Recreation in Colonial New England*, (London: Macmillan, 1996).
- Dayton, Cornelia Hughes, *Women Before the Bar: Gender, Law, and Society in Connecticut, 1639-1739*, (Chapel Hill, NC and London: University of North Carolina Press, 1995).
- Durfee, Job, *What Cheer, or Roger Williams in Banishment, a poem*, (Providence, RI: Cranston and Hammond, 1832).
- Erikson, Kai T., *Wayward Puritans: A Study in the Sociology of Deviance*, (New York: Macmillan, 1966).
- Fiering, Norman, *Moral Philosophy at Seventeenth Century Harvard*, (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1981).

- Foster, Stephen, *The Long Argument: English Puritanism and the Shaping of New England Culture, 1570-1700*, (Chapel Hill, NC and London: Institute of Early American History and Culture, University of North Carolina Press, 1991).
- Gardiner, Samuel Rawson (ed.), *The Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution, 1625-1660*, third edition, revised, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979).
- Garrett, John, *Roger Williams, Witness Beyond Christendom, 1603-1683*, (London: Macmillan, 1970).
- Gaustad, Edwin S., *Liberty of Conscience: Roger Williams in America*, (Valley Forge: Judson Press, 1999).
- Gilpin, W. Clark, *The Millenarian Piety of Roger Williams*, (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1979).
- Grant, Charles, *Democracy in the Connecticut Frontier Town of Kent*, (NY: W.W. Norton and Co., 1972).
- Guild, Reuben, *Roger Williams, Freeman of Massachusetts*, (Worcester, MA: Press of Charles Hamilton, 1888).
- Hall, David, *Faithful Sheperd: a History of the New England Ministry in the Seventeenth Century*, (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1972).
- Hall, David, *Worlds of Wonder, Days of Judgment: Popular Religious Belief in Early New England*, (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1990).
- Hall, David; Murrin, John; Tate, Thaddeus (eds.), *Saints and Revolutionaries: Essays on Early American History*, (NY and London: W.W. Norton, and Co., 1984).
- Hall, Timothy L., *Separating Church and State: Roger Williams and Religious Liberty*, (Urbana and Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1998).

- Haller, William (ed.), *Tracts on Liberty in the Puritan Revolution, 1638-1647*, (NY: Columbia University Press, 1934).
- Haskins, George Lee, *Law and Authority in Early Massachusetts: a Study in Tradition and Design*, (NY: Macmillan Co., 1960).
- Hawke, David, *United States Colonial History: Readings and Documents*, (Indianapolis, IN and NY: the Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1966).
- Heimert, Alan; Delbanco, Andrew (eds.), *The Puritans in America: a Narrative Anthology*, (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1985).
- Higginson, John (1616-1708), *The Cause of God and His People in New England*, (Boston, MA: 1663).
- Hill, Christopher, *The English Bible and the Seventeenth Century Revolution*, (London: Penguin, 1994).
- Hill, Christopher, *Society and Puritanism in Pre-Revolutionary England*, (London: Secker and Warburg, Ltd., 1969).
- Hosmer, James, *The Life of Young Sir Henry Vane...*, (London: Sampson Low, Marston, Searl and Rivington, Ltd., 1888).
- Hughes, Ann (ed.), *Seventeenth Century England, A Changing Culture, Volume One: Primary Sources*, (London: Open University Press, 1980).
- Innes, Stephen, *Creating the Commonwealth: the Economic Culture of Puritan New England*, (NY and London: W.W. Norton and Co., 1995).
- Innes, Stephen, *Labor in a New Land: Economy and Society in Seventeenth Century Springfield*, (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1983).
- Irwin, R. D., 'A Man for all Eras: the Changing Historical Image of Roger Williams,' *Fides at Historia* 26(1994) 6-23.

- James, Sydney V., (Bozeman, Theodore D., ed.), *John Clarke and His Legacies: Religion and the Law in Colonial Rhode Island, 1638-1750*, (University Park, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999).
- Jordan, W. K., *The Development of Religious Toleration in England, from the beginning of the English Reformation to the Death of Queen Elizabeth I...*, (London: Unwin Press, Ltd., 1932).
- Knott, John R., Jr., *The Sword of the Spirit: Puritan Responses to the Bible*, (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1980).
- Knowles, James D., *Memoir of Roger Williams, the Founder of the State of Rhode Island*, (Boston: Lincoln, Edmund, 1834).
- Kupperman, Karen Ordahl (ed.), *Major Problems in American Colonial History*, (Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath and Co., 1993).
- Lancour, Harold, *A Bibliography of Ship Passenger Lists, 1538-1825*, (New York Public Library: 1938).
- Lafantasie, Glenn W. (ed.), *The Correspondence of Roger Williams, 1629-1682, two volumes*, (Hanover, NH and London: Brown University Press, 1988).
- Lechford, Thomas, *Plain Dealing, or News From New England*, (New York and London: Johnson Reprint Corporation, 1969).
- Lilburne, John, *A Worke of the Beast*, (London: 1638).
- Lucas, Paul R., *Valley of Discord: Church and Society Along the Connecticut River, 1636-1725*, (Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 1976).
- Matthews, William (compiler), *British Diaries: an annotated Bibliography of British Diaries Written Between 1442 and 1942*, (Berkeley, CA and London: University of California Press, Cambridge University Press, 1950).

- Mather, Cotton (1663-1728), *Diary of Cotton Mather, Volume One, 1681-1709*, (NY: Frederick Ungar Publishers, 1957).
- Mather, Cotton (1663-1728), *Magnalia Christi Americana (The Great Works of Christ in America)*, two volumes, (Edinburgh: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1979) (reprint of 1853 edition; orig. London: 1702).
- McAdoo, H. R., *The Structure of Caroline Moral Theology*, (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1949).
- McLoughlin, William G., *Rhode Island: A Bicentennial History*, (NY: W.W. Norton and Co., 1978).
- McLoughlin, William G., *Soul Liberty: The Baptists Struggle in New England, 1630-1833*, (Hanover, NH and London: University Press of New England, 1991).
- Merrell, James H., 'The Customes of Our Countrey,' Indians and Colonists in Early America,' in *Strangers Within the Realm: Cultural Margins of the First British Empire*, (Bailyn, Bernard; Morgan, Edmund, eds.) (Chapel Hill and London: University of North Carolina Press, 1991).
- Miller, Joshua, 'Direct Democracy and the Puritan Theory of Membership,' *The Journal of Politics* 53 (February 1991) 57-74.
- Miller, Perry, *The New England Mind: the Seventeenth Century*, (Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press, 1939).
- Miller, Perry, *Orthodoxy in Massachusetts, 1630-1650*, (New York, Evanston, and London: Harper and Row, 1970) (first published, 1961).
- Miller, Perry, *Roger Williams: His Contribution to the American Tradition*, third edition, (NY: Atheneum, 1965).
- Miller, William Lee, *The First Liberty: Religion and the American Republic*, (NY: Alfred A Knopf, 1986).

- Mitchel, Jonathan (1624-1668), *Nehemiah on the Wall in Troublesome Times...*,
(Cambridge, MA: 1671).
- Morgan, Edmund S., 'New England Puritanism: Another Approach,' *William and Mary Quarterly*, third series, 18 (1961) 236-242.
- Morgan, Edmund S., *The Puritan Dilemma: the Story of John Winthrop*, (Boston, MA: Little Brown and Co., 1958).
- Morgan, Edmund S., *The Puritan Family: Religion and Domestic Relations in Seventeenth Century New England*, (NY: Harper and Row, 1966).
- Morgan, Edmund S. (ed.), *Puritan Political Ideas, 1558-1794*, (NY and Indianapolis, IN: Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1965).
- Morgan, Edmund S., *Roger Williams: the Church and State*, (NY: Harcourt, Brace, and World, 1967).
- Morgan, Edmund S., *Visible Saints: the History of a Puritan Idea*, (NY: Cornell University Press, 1975).
- Nelson, Benjamin, 'Conscience and the Making of Early Modern Cultures: the Protestant Ethic Beyond Max Weber,' *Social Research* 36 (1969) 4-21.
- Norton, John (1606-1663), '*First Sermon...*' (Cambridge, MA: 1664).
- Norton, Mary Beth, *Founding Mothers and Fathers: Gendered Power and the Forming of American Society*, (NY: Alfred A. Knopf, 1996).
- Osgood, Herbert, *The American Colonies in the Seventeenth Century, Volume One, The Chartered Colonies: Beginnings of Self-Government*, (NY: Columbia University Press, 1957).
- [Oxenbridge, John (1609-1674)], *New England Freeman Warned and Warmed...*,
(Cambridge, MA: 1673).

- Parrington, Vernon Louis, *The Colonial Mind, 1620-1800*, (NY: Harcourt, Brace, and Co., 1927).
- Pearson, Revd A.F. Scott, *Church and State: Political Aspects of Sixteenth Century Puritanism*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1928).
- Phillips, Stephen, 'Roger Williams and the Two Tables of the Law,' *Journal of Church and State*, 38 (1996) 547-568.
- Pierce, Richard (ed.), *The Records of the First church in Salem, Massachusetts, 1629-1736*, (Salem, MA: Essex Institute, 1974).
- Ramsay, David, *History of the United States*, two vols., (second edition) (Philadelphia: 1818).
- Rhode Island Court Records: Records of the Court of Trials of the Colony of Providence Plantations, 1647-1662, two volumes*, (Providence, RI: Rhode Island Historical Society, 1920).
- Rutman, Darrett B., 'God's Bridge Falling Down: Another Approach to Puritanism Assayed,' *William and Mary Quarterly*, third series, 19 (1962) 408-421.
- Sanderson, Robert, *De Obligatione Conscientiae (1647)*, Whewell, William (ed.), (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 1851).
- Schieck, William J, *The Will and the Word: The Poetry of Edward Taylor*, (Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 1974).
- Simmons, Richard C., 'Freemanship in Early Massachusetts: Some Suggestions and a Case Study,' *William and Mary Quarterly*, third series, 19 (1962) 422-428.
- Shepard, Thomas (II, 1635-1677/78), *Eye Salve, or a Watch-Word...*, (Cambridge, MA: 1672).
- Sprunger, Keith L., *The Learned Doctor William Ames: Dutch Backgrounds of English and American Puritanism*, (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1972).

- Stephenson, Marmaduke, *A Call From Death to Life...*, (London: 1660).
- Stone, Thomas T., *Roger Williams, The Prophetic Legislator, A Paper read before the Rhode Island Historical Society, November 8, 1871*, (Providence, RI: A. Crawford Greene, 1872).
- Stout, Harry S., 'Word and Order in Colonial New England,' in Hatch, Nathan; Noll, Mark (eds.), *The Bible in America: Essays in Cultural History*, (NY: Oxford University Press, 1982). 19-38.
- Swan, Bradford Fuller, *The Case of Richard Chasmore alias Long Dick*, (Providence, RI: Roger Williams Press, 1944).
- Sweet, William Warren, *Religion in Colonial America*, (NY: Cooper Square Publishers, Inc., 1965).
- Tawney, R. H., *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism*, (Penguin: 1969).
- Taylor, Edward (1642?-1729), *Edward Taylor's Treatise Concerning the Lord's Supper*, Grabo, Norman S. (ed.), (MI: Michigan State University Press, 1965).
- Tuck, Richard, *Philosophy and Government, 1572-1651*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993).
- Ward, Harry M., *Statism in Plymouth Colony*, (Port Washington, NY, London: Kennikat Press, 1973).
- Warden, G. B., 'The Rhode Island Civil Code of 1647,' in Hall, David; Murrin, John; Tate, Thaddeus (eds.), *Saints and Revolutionaries: Essays on Early American History*, (NY, London: W.W. Norton, 1984) 138-151.
- Weeden, William, *Early Rhode Island: A Social History of the People*, (NY: the Grafton Press, 1910).
- Williams, Roger, *The Complete Writings of Roger Williams*, seven volumes, Miller, Perry, (ed.), (NY: Russell and Russell, Inc., 1963).

Winslow, Edward, *Hypocrisie Unmasked: A True Relation of the Proceedings of the Government and Company of the Massachusetts Against Samuel Gorton of Rhode Island*, (London: 1646).

Winslow, Ola Elizabeth, *Master Roger Williams*, (NY: Macmillan, 1957).

Winthrop, John (1588-1649), *A Journal of the Transactions and Occurrences in the Settlement of Massachusetts and the other New England Colonies, from the year 1630 to 1644*, (Hartford, CT: Elisha Babcock, 1790).

Wood, Thomas, *English Casuistical Divinity During the Seventeenth Century, with specific reference to Jeremy Taylor*, (London: SPCK, 1952).

Wood, Joseph S., *The New England Village*, (Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997).

Wilson, Lisa, *Ye Heart of a Man: The Domestic Life of Men in Colonial New England*, (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1999).

Ziff, Larzer, *The Career of John Cotton: Puritanism and the American Experience*, (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1962).